Strasbourg, 17/02/2026

CEPEJ(2025)21rev1
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 2014 to 2024

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

The information and views set out in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this study. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

******

Les informations et les opinions exprimées dans cette étude ne lient que leurs auteurs et ne peuvent en aucun cas être considérées comme reflétant la position officielle de la Commission en la matière. La Commission ne garantit pas l'exactitude des données intégrées dans cette étude. Ni la Commission, ni aucune autre personne agissant en son nom ne peuvent être tenues responsables de l'éventuelle utilisation de l'information contenue dans le présent document.

*Generated on 16/2/26 23:24*

# 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 carry out 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 the CEPEJ for evaluating the functioning of the judicial systems of the Council of Europe member States.

This study is based on collecting, processing, and analysing data and comments provided by the European Union (EU) member States through:

- selected data among those collected for the six CEPEJ evaluation cycles (years of reference of the data: 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, 2020 and 2022).
- and specific questionnaires (for years of reference 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2021, 2023, 2024)

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 Contribution Agreement JUST-2025-IM-JACC/RIGH/1 "Service to support the annual publication of the EU Justice Scoreboard", the study, based on 2024 data and also their evolution in relation to 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 data, is structured in two main parts:

the *first part* examines the judicial systems in the 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, through the 8 indicators, provides an overview of the functioning of the justice system based on the elements, selected by the European Commission (EC) and which, according to the CEPEJ, are essential to the effectivity and quality of judicial systems.

**Human resources**

Different categories of judges (professional, occasional, non-professional) can contribute to the justice system. The 2024 study focuses on professional judges sitting in courts and the European Union average for this category of judges is 22,6 judges per 100 000 inhabitants (the median is 23,4 judges per 100 000 inhabitants). The lowest number of professional judges per 100 000 inhabitants is 3.6 and the highest is 44,4. The average value has slightly increased between 2023 and 2024 from 21,5 to 23,4.

It can be noted that compared with the previous cycle, the number of judges per 100 000 inhabitants increased for more than 1% in 13 member States, whereas it decreased by more than 1% in 5 member States which confirms the mentioned trend of increased median. 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 role is to assist judges directly,
- the staff responsible for administrative matters,
- 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 2014, the average number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants has increased around 5% while the median increased even more (8%). Compared with the last cycle, the average increased 0,63% while the median decreased by 1,33%. The EU median of the non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants is 59,4 with the lowest as 23,9 and highest as 158,8.

It is worth noting that 12 countries reported to have staff with "*Rechspfleger* " functions (or equivalent) among non-judge staff.

Since 2020, the CEPEJ Study for the EU Justice Scoreboard includes prosecution services. The diversity in activities of the prosecution services is evident and the number of prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitant varies in European Union from minimum 2,9 to maximum 24 with an average and median of 11,4 prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitants. Compared to the previous cycle, both the average and median values increased by 1% and 7% respectively.

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 0,9 to 46,68 non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants with an average 15,5 and median 14,5. Compared to the previous cycle, the average and median values are very stable.

Regarding salaries of judges and public prosecutors, it could be noted that their absolute amounts vary largely from state to state depending mostly on the economic situation and the level of the GDP per capita. From 2018 onward, nearly all states showed a consistent trend of salary increase, with 27% increase of average gross annual salary of judges at the beginning of their career and 33% increase of average gross annual salary for judges of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court. A similar trend is also observed with prosecutors, with 30% increase of the average gross annual salary of public prosecutors at the beginning of their career and 36% increase of the average gross annual salary of public prosecutors at the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance.

When viewed in a national context, the judges at the beginning of career on average earn 2 times average annual salary in their respective countries, whereas this ratio is a bit lower for public prosecutors - 1,7. A similar disparity is observed among judges and prosecutors of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance, where the highest salary of a judge at the Supreme Court is on average 4,1 times higher than the average salary in the country, while public prosecutors of the corresponding level earn 3,6 the average salary in the country.

**Lawyers**

The average number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants in the EU member States has generally shown an upward trend since 2014. Between 2014 and 2024 the average number of lawyers in the EU member States increased by 15% and the median by 23%.

Although the southern states (such as Italy, Greece, Cyprus, Spain, Portugal etc.), but also Luxembourg appear to have a higher number of lawyers per 100,000 inhabitants, the significant discrepancy in values, also reflected in the ratio of lawyers to professional judges, suggests considerable heterogeneity in the roles and tasks performed.

**Judicial organisation**

The study distinguishes three types of courts:

- courts of general jurisdiction that deal with any issues which are not attributed to specialised courts – their enumeration is made as legal entities for first, second and third instances;
- specialised courts of first instance and those of higher instances (second and/or third instance combined), also considered as legal entities;
- courts, at all levels and of first instance, as geographic locations.

Since 2014, 12 member States have reduced their number of geographical locations, 3 have the same number and 11 increased it. Between the last two cycles, 3 member States increased, and 3 countries reduced the number of courts' geographic locations.

The geographical locations per 100 000 inhabitants have decreased in most of the member States (the median was 1,54 per 100 000 inhabitants in 2014; 1,38 in 2016 and 1,45 in 2024 which is -4,5 % decrease).

As regards the distribution of the disputes between legal entities, all the EU member States except for the Czech Republic and Hungary have specialised courts of first instance.
The most frequent types of specialised courts in EU states are those that deal with administrative cases (exist in all but 5 member states), labour disputes; (exist in 11 member states) and commercial cases (exist in 11 member states).
Significant number of countries have also other not mentioned specialised courts (11 member states). While the majority of countries have few types of specialised courts there are some that have many specialised courts for different matters like Spain, Portugal, Cyprus, France but also Austria, and Italy.

Portugal, France and Cyprus also have large number of specialised courts of 1st instance compared with all courts of 1st instance (75%, 84% and 63% respectively). 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.

Since 2020 the data on the higher instances specialised, courts were collected. Expectedly, their number is smaller than the 1st instance. Few countries have many specialised courts dealing with different cases at the higher instances. In most of the other countries that have higher instance specialised courts, they deal with the administrative matters (19 countries). There are also some higher instance military courts as well. There are also 4 countries that have specialised courts at 1st instance but no specialised courts on higher instances.

**ADR - Alternative Dispute Resolution measures**
In various EU member States, the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is now widely accepted among the public and legal professionals. It contributes to the improvement of effectiveness of justice by providing court users with alternatives to a regular judicial procedure.
There are different types of ADR in the member States:
Mediation: refers to a voluntary process 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: in 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 concessions. He/she may make suggestions to the parties aimed to settle a dispute. The conciliator has more power and plays a more proactive role in comparison with the mediator.
Arbitration: the parties choose a neutral third party - an arbitrator whose final decision is binding. The parties may present evidence and testimonies to the arbitrators. Sometimes, several arbitrators are appointed to work as a court. Arbitration is most often used for the resolution of commercial disputes because it provides a greater confidentiality.
Court-related mediation exists in all States, essentially in civil and commercial areas. However, only 19 states have accredited/registered mediators and can provide their number.

It could be noted that the median number of accredited or registered mediators per 100 000 inhabitants has strongly increased since 2014 (from 8,9 in 2014 to 19,2 in 2024). This may indicate an intent of the member States to support the policies of enhancement of ADR through increased number of trained mediators.

The CEPEJ Study for the EU Justice Scoreboard includes for the third time data on notaries. Regarding the status of notaries in EU, it is important to note that in 22 states notaries are holders of public offices who exercise a public function and are appointed by the State. Thus, they are a subject of supervision by public authorities (for instance the Ministry of Justice) and exercise their functions in a regulated environment. The number of notaries per 100 000 inhabitants varies in EU from minimum 0,9 to maximum 27,8 with an average of 9,1 and median of 6,7 notaries per 100 000 inhabitants.

**Systems of measuring and evaluating the functioning of courts and prosecution services**

Most countries use quality standards for courts and public prosecution services at the national level. The number of countries that have defined these standards exceeds half of the EU member States (15 member States).

Regarding different modalities of monitoring that are intended to review the day-to-day activity of courts through data gathering and statistical analyses, they appear in all the EU countries. Many fields of courts activity are being monitored particularly case flow data, courts' decisions and efficiency indicators.

**Performance and evaluation of judges and public prosecutors**

As regard, individual judges and public prosecutors, it could be noted that quantitative performance targets are defined for each judge in 8 countries, whereas 5 countries have these targets set for public prosecutors. Out of these countries, only one doesn't envisage sanctions if the targets are not met by judges or prosecutors (Finland), while others have a possibility to impose different sanctions with or without disciplinary procedure, such as warning by court president, temporary salary reduction, reflection in the individual assessment or other sanctions. Regarding individual evaluation of the public prosecutors' work, quantitative evaluation exists in 12 member States whereas qualitative evaluation is used in 22 States.

**Performance of the courts and public prosecution services**

An essential element of the proper functioning of courts is the respect for the right to a fair trial within reasonable time, as guaranteed by Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights. This right must be duly considered when analysing court workload, the length of proceedings and implementing specific measures to reduce delays and to improve the efficiency. CEPEJ has chosen to develop efficiency court indicators at 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 Disposition Time (DT), that measures the theoretical time (in days) necessary for a pending case to be solved in court in the light of the current pace of work of the courts.
When analysing the efficiency of the courts it is important to look at both indicators together and their evolution over time.

**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 2014 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 2024 the EU median is 97,8%, which is slightly higher compared to 97% in 2023 and is lower compared to 100,5% in 2022.

Comparing individual countries' data for 2024 and 2023, most of them (14) show decreased CRs and 9 of them show increase which is in line with the mentioned trend. The largest decrease was registered in Italy (-15,05 percentage points) and Finland (-14,02 percent points). On the other side, 9 member States experienced improvements of the CR with more notable increases in Estonia and Romania (with 18,5 and 13 percentage points respectively).
To understand fully this comparison between the cycles, it is important to examine if the number of incoming and resolved cases increased or decreased during these two years. The data shows that in 2024, the number of incoming cases increased in 19 member States (by 4,6% in median). In some states the increase is as big as 49,9%. On the other side the number of resolved cases increased 5,6%, consequently causing the mentioned subtle increase in CR.

As regards the Disposition Time, 13 member States increased their DT compared to 2023. More specifically, 5 countries increased it by more than 10%, 2 countries from 5-10%, 6countries from 0-5%. On the other hand, 11 countries decreased their DT, 3 of them by more than 10%, 4 between 5% and 10% and 4 by less than 5%. The average and median numbers have not demonstrated large fluctuations but also show different tendencies. The average DT increased by 1,9% and median DT increased by 0,4%. Generally, the situation slightly improved because less than a half of the member states increased their DT, meaning that this cycle it might take a bit less time to process civil and commercial litigious cases.

**Administrative law cases**

Compared with other categories of first instance cases in EU, administrative cases generally have highest DT of 422 days on average in 2024. For example, they still take notably longer time than the civil and commercial cases of the first instance that need 307 days on average in 2024.

The number of countries that decreased their Disposition Time for administrative cases is 10, whereas 15 countries increased disposition time. Three countries improved their performance by decreasing the DT significantly (more than 10%), among others, Estonia, Italy and Slovak Republic.

Increased CR is identified in 8 member States among which Slovak Republic had above +10 percent points increase. CR decreased in 17 countries, out of which significantly (above 10 percent points) in 5, among which Cyprus, Luxembourg, and Portugal.

This analysis shows that majority of states have demonstrated less favourable developments in 2024 regarding administrative cases, since less than half of states have decreased their DT and increased their CR. Therefore, more efforts will be required in future years to shorten the disposition time and come closer to DT levels of civil and criminal cases.

**Criminal law cases**

Since 2020 criminal cases are reported as part of this study, without comparison with previous cycles.

Looking at the efficiency indicators for the first instance criminal cases, it is immediately notable that CR was not very high in 2024 as EU average is 95,7% while median was 98,8%. This situation is almost identical as in 2023.

Regarding DT, in 2024 the average is 189 days and median is 128 days, whereas in 2023 the average is 175 and median 134 days. The improvements are notable in the individual countries' DTs as 6 states reduced them. However, 17 countries increased their level of DT some of them significantly. The maximum values were observed in Malta (862 days) and Greece (583 days). The lowest DT was recorded in Estonia (35 days) and Hungary (51 days) even less than last year.

The level of CR lower than 100% was reported in 18 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 the future.

**Public prosecutors: Total number of 1st instance criminal cases**

Since 2020 public prosecution’s cases are reported as part of this study, without comparison with previous cycles.

During 2024, the average value of incoming cases by public prosecution services in the European Union was 3,24 cases per 100 inhabitants. The number of processed cases was at approximately same level (3,27). The similar tendency was recorded for average numbers in 2023 and 2022. The identified tendency of median showed slightly higher number for processed cases compared with incoming (3,01 for incoming and 3,08 for resolved). The median values were also lower than average numbers probably because the average was affected by the very large number of cases reported for some of the countries, such as Luxembourg with 10,42 incoming.

Out of processed cases, there were 2,17 discontinued cases per 100 inhabitants and 0,57 cases brought to court (median values).

Looking at the individual countries, it is interesting to note that out of 22 that provided relevant data, 10 states have more or equal number of processed than incoming cases, whereas in 12 states incoming outnumbered processed cases which might potentially lead to generating backlogs in the respective prosecution services. Comparing the ratio of processed cases vs incoming cases over the last cycle, it could be concluded that ten countries managed to improve this ratio. Analysis of this indicator implies slight increase in efficiency of public prosecution services in 2024.

**The information and communication technology (ICT) in courts**

While initially acting as a simple support tool for productivity, the information and communication technology (ICT) becomes one of the important leverages for improvement of the efficiency of courts. The increasing role of the ICT in improving productivity and efficiency and assisting decision making, is indeed based on the possibilities of the automation of tasks and the inevitable general technological progress.

The questionnaire related to ICT consists of 38 questions that include deployment and usage rate of different tools used in courts. For the needs of this study EC has selected four questions related to two different tools: writing assistance tools and recording of court hearings.

The data show that almost all the EU member States except Cyprus have writing assistance tools, and these tools are very present, with 95-100% deployment rate on these tools reported by 18 member States in civil and commercial matters, 17 member States in administrative matters and 19 member States in criminal matters. This writing assistance tool shows quite high usage rate and 12 of the countries reported 95-100% usage rate for the civil and commercial, 11 for administrative, and 13 for criminal matter. Functionalities of the writing assistance tools are predominantly templates, which is true for all countries, but majority also have automatically generated text. Electronic signature, and speech to text features are present in half of the countries also. Only Hungary and Latvia have automatic suggestion of decision for all matter while France has for civil and criminal matter.

It's worth noting that most countries have tools for the recording of the court hearing, 18 member States have 95-100% deployment rate, and 14 member States have 95-100% usage rate. For those that have provided information on this tool it should be noted that deployment rate is higher for civil and for administrative matter and slightly lower for criminal. Regarding the functionalities, for example for civil matter 22 countries use audio recording and only 10 also video of hearings. Situation is similar for criminal but much less countries seem to record hearings in administrative matter (18). In some countries the recording is systematic for all hearings. This is the case in 11 countries in civil, 8 in administrative and 11 in criminal matter.

The data show that almost all the EU member States have writing assistance tools, one country did not manage to reply to this question, while in the others these tools are very present, and 95-100% deployment rate on these tools was reported by 18 member States in civil and commercial matters, 17 member States in administrative matters and 19 member States in criminal matters. Collection of information on usage rate is an expansion on the deployment rate collected in previous cycles. For this tool it shows quite high usage rate and 12 of the countries reported 95-100% usage rate for the three civil and commercial and administrative, and 13 for criminal matter. Functionalities of the writing assistance tools are predominantly templates, which is true for all countries but quite many also have automatically generated text, electronic signature, and speech to text features. Only Hungary and Latvia have automatic suggestion of decision for all matter while Luxembourg has for criminal matter only.

It's worth noting that most countries have tools for the recording of the court hearing, 16 member States have 95-100% deployment rate, and 13 member States have 95-100% usage rate. For those that have provided information on this tool it should be noted that deployment rate is higher for civil and for criminal matter and slightly lower for administrative. Regarding the functionalities, for example for civil matter 20 countries use audio recording and only 8 also video of hearings. Situation is similar for criminal but much less countries seem to record hearings in administrative matter. In some countries the recording is systematic for all hearings. This is the case in 11 countries in civil, 8 in administrative and 11 in criminal matter.

## Version française

Depuis 2012, la Commission européenne a sollicité la Commission européenne pour l'efficacité de la justice (CEPEJ) du Conseil de l'Europe pour 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 de l'Union Européenne (UE) au travers de :

- données sélectionnées parmi les données collectées dans le cadre de six cycles d'évaluation (données des années de référence 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, 2020 et 2022)
- et de questionnaires spécifiques (pour les années de référence 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2021 et 2023, 2024).

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

**Structure de l'étude**

Conformément à la dernière proposition technique rédigée dans le cadre du contrat de contribution JUST-2025-IM-JACC/RIGH/1 – "*Service to support the annual publication of the EU Justice Scoreboard* ", l'étude porte sur les données de 2024 et leurs évolutions par rapport aux données de 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 et 2023 Elle est divisée en deux parties :

la première examine les systèmes judiciaires des Etats membres de l'UE à l'aide de tableaux de données par indicateur pour tous les Etats membres ;

la seconde contient des fiches par pays qui présentent 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 (CE) 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 2024 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 22,6 juges pour 100 000 habitants (la médiane est de 23,4 juges pour 100 000 habitants). Le nombre le plus faible de juges professionnels pour 100 000 habitants est de 3,6 et le plus élevé de 44,4. La moyenne a légèrement augmenté entre 2023 et 2024 de 21,5 à 23,4.

On peut noter que, par rapport au cycle précédent, 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 5 pays, ce qui confirme la tendance mentionnée de l'augmentation de la valeur médiane. 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 le rôle est d'assister directement les juges,
- les personnes responsables de tâches administratives,
- 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 2014, le nombre moyen de personnel non-juge pour 100 000 habitants a augmenté de 5% alors que la médiane a augmenté encore plus de 8%. Par rapport au dernier cycle, la valeur moyenne a augmenté de 0,63 %, tandis que la valeur médiane a diminué de 1,33% . La médiane de l'Union européenne du personnel non-juge pour 100 000 habitants est de 59,4avec un minimum de 23,9 et un maximum de 158,8.

Il convient de noter que 12 pays ont indiqué l'existence parmi les personnels non-juge des fonctions de "*Rechspfleger* " (ou équivalent).

Depuis 2020, l'étude de la CEPEJ pour le Scoreboard 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 2,9 à un maximum de 24 avec une moyenne et une médiane de 11,4 procureurs pour 100 000 habitants. Par rapport au cycle précédent, la valeur moyenne -tout comme la médiane- ont augmenté, respectivement de 1 % et 7 %.

Les procureurs sont assistés dans leurs fonctions par du personnel non-procureur attaché aux ministères publics. Leur nombre varie considérablement de 0,9 à 46,68 personnels non-procureurs pour 100 000 habitants avec une moyenne de 15,5 et une médiane de 14,5. Par rapport au cycle précédent, les valeurs moyenne et médiane sont très stables.

Concernant les salaires des juges et des procureurs, il convient de noter que leurs montants absolus varient considérablement d'un État à l'autre, en fonction principalement de la situation économique et du niveau du PIB par habitant. À partir de 2018, presque tous les États ont connu une tendance constante à l'augmentation des salaires, avec 27 % de hausse du salaire annuel brut moyen des juges en début de carrière et 33 % de hausse du salaire annuel brut moyen des juges de la Cour suprême ou de la dernière instance de recours. Une tendance similaire est également observée pour les procureurs, avec une augmentation de 30 % du salaire annuel brut moyen des procureurs en début de carrière et une augmentation de 36 % du salaire annuel brut moyen des procureurs au niveau de la Cour suprême ou de la dernière instance de recours.

Dans un contexte national, les juges en début de carrière gagnent en moyenne 2 fois le salaire annuel moyen de leur pays respectifs, alors que ce ratio est un peu plus faible pour les procureurs - 1,7. Une disparité similaire est observée entre les juges et les procureurs auprès de la Cour suprême ou de la dernière instance de recours, où le salaire le plus élevé d'un juge à la Cour suprême est en moyenne 4,1 fois plus important que le salaire moyen du pays, tandis que les procureurs au même niveau gagnent 3,6 fois le salaire moyen du pays.

**Avocats**

Le nombre moyen d'avocats pour 100 000 habitants dans les États membres de l'UE connaît de façon générale une tendance à la hausse depuis 2014. Entre 2014 et 2024, le nombre moyen d'avocats dans les États membres de l'UE a augmenté de 15 % et leur nombre médian de 23 %.

Bien que les Etats du sud (tels que l'Italie, la Grèce, Chypre, l'Espagne, le Portugal etc.), mais aussi le Luxembourg, semblent avoir un nombre plus élevé d'avocats pour 100.000 habitants, la disparité significative des valeurs, qui se reflète également dans le ratio entre avocats et juges professionnels, suggère une hétérogénéité considérable dans les rôles et les tâches accomplis.

**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 attribuée à une juridiction spécialisée – leur dénombrement est effectué en tant qu'entités juridiques pour les première, seconde et troisième instance ;

- les tribunaux spécialisés de première instance et d'instances supérieures (seconde et/ou troisième instance combinées), compris également comme entités juridiques ;

- les tribunaux, tous niveaux confondus et de première instance, en tant qu'implantations géographiques

Depuis 2014, 12 pays ont réduit leur nombre d'implantations géographiques, 3 ont conservé le même nombre, tandis que 11 pays ont augmenté ce nombre. Entre les deux derniers cycles, 3 pays ont augmenté et 3 pays ont réduit le nombre d'implantations géographiques.
Le nombre d'implantations géographiques pour 100 000 habitants a diminué dans la plupart des Etats membres (la médiane était de 1,54 tribunaux pour 100 000 habitants en 2014, 1,38 en 2016 et 1,45 en 2024, ce qui représente une baisse de 4,5 %).
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.

Le type de tribunaux spécialisés existants le plus souvent dans les Etats Membres de l'UE sont ceux qui traitent des affaires administratives (qui existent dans tous les pays à l'exception de cinq d'entre eux), du contentieux du travail (existe dans 11 états membres) et des affaires commerciales (existe dans 11 états membres).

Un nombre significatif de pays dispose également d'autres tribunaux spécialisés non mentionnés (existe dans 11 états membres). 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.

Le Portugal, la France et Chypre ont également un grand nombre de tribunaux spécialisés de 1ère instance par rapport à l'ensemble des tribunaux de 1ère instance (75%, 84 % et 63% respectivement). Quelques autres pays ont également un grand nombre de tribunaux spécialisés mais ils sont inclus dans la catégorie « autre» ce qui rend la comparaison avec les autres systèmes difficile.

Depuis 2020, 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 (19 pays). Il existe également des tribunaux militaires au niveau des 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.

**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. Toutefois, seuls 19 États ont des médiateurs accrédités/enregistrés et peuvent fournir leur nombre.

Il convient de noter que la médiane du nombre de médiateurs agréés ou enregistrés pour 100 000 habitants a fortement augmenté depuis 2014 (de 8,9 en 2014 à 19,2 en 2024). Cela peut indiquer une intention des États membres de soutenir les politiques de renforcement des ADR par l'augmentation du nombre de médiateurs formés.

L'étude de la CEPEJ pour le tableau de bord de la justice de l'UE inclut pour la troisième fois des données sur les notaires. En ce qui concerne le statut des notaires dans l'UE, il est important de noter que dans 22 Etats, les notaires sont des titulaires de charges publiques qui exercent une fonction publique et sont nommés par l'Etat. Ils sont donc soumis au contrôle des autorités publiques (par exemple le ministère de la justice) et exercent leurs fonctions dans un environnement réglementé. Le nombre de notaires pour 100 000 habitants varie dans l'Union Européenne entre un minimum de 0,9 et un maximum de 27,8 avec une moyenne de 9,1 et une valeur médiane de 6,7 notaires pour 100 000 habitants.

**Système pour mesurer et évaluer le fonctionnement des tribunaux et des services des ministères publics**

La plupart des pays utilisent des normes de qualité au niveau national dans les tribunaux et les services des ministères publics. Le nombre de pays ayant défini ces normes est supérieur à la moitié des Etats membres de l'UE (15 États membres).
En ce qui concerne les différentes modalités de suivi destinées à examiner l'activité quotidienne des tribunaux par le biais de la collecte de données et d'analyses statistiques, elles existent dans tous les pays de l'UE. De nombreux domaines de l'activité des tribunaux font l'objet d'un suivi, en particulier les données sur les flux d'affaires, les décisions des tribunaux et les indicateurs d'efficacité.

**Performance et évaluation des juges et des procureurs**

Concernant les juges et les procureurs individuellement, on peut noter que des objectifs quantitatifs de performance sont définis pour chaque juge dans 8 pays, tandis que 5 pays fixent ces objectifs pour les procureurs. Parmi ces pays, un seul, la Finlande, n’envisage pas de sanctions si les objectifs ne sont pas atteints par les juges ou les procureurs, tandis que les autres ont la possibilité d'imposer différentes sanctions avec ou sans procédure disciplinaire, telles que l'avertissement par le président du tribunal, la réduction temporaire du salaire, la prise en compte dans l'évaluation individuelle ou d'autres sanctions.

En ce qui concerne l'évaluation individuelle du travail des procureurs, l'évaluation quantitative existe dans 12 pays, tandis que l'évaluation qualitative est utilisée dans 22 États.

**Performance des tribunaux et services du ministère public**

Un élément essentiel du bon fonctionnement des tribunaux est le respect du droit à un procès équitable dans un délai raisonnable, tel que garanti par l'article 6 de la Convention européenne des droits de l'homme. Ce droit doit être dûment pris en compte lors de l'analyse de la charge de travail des tribunaux, de la durée des procédures et de la mise en œuvre de mesures spécifiques pour réduire les délais 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, qui mesure le temps théorique (en jours) nécessaire pour qu'une affaire pendante soit résolue par un tribunal, compte tenu du rythme de travail actuel des tribunaux.

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

**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 2014. 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 2024, la médiane de l'UE est de 97,8%, ce qui est légèrement plus élevé par rapport à 97 % en 2023 et est inférieur par rapport à 100,5 % en 2022.

Si l'on compare les données des différents pays pour 2024 et 2023, la plupart d'entre eux (14) affichent des diminutions des CR et 9 d'entre eux montrent une hausse des CR, ce qui correspond à la tendance mentionnée. Les plus fortes diminutions étant enregistrées en Italie (-15,05 points de pourcentage) et en Finlande (-14,02 points de pourcentage). Neuf pays connaissent par ailleurs une amélioration de leur CR, avec une augmentation plus notable en l'Estonie et à la Roumanie (avec 18,5 et 13points de pourcentage respectivement).

Pour mieux comprendre cette comparaison entre les cycles, il convient d'examiner si le nombre d'affaires nouvelles et terminées a augmenté ou diminué au cours de ces deux années. Les données montrent qu'en 2024, le nombre d'affaires nouvelles a augmenté dans 19 Etats membres (avec une médiane de 4,6%). Dans certains États, l'augmentation atteint même 49,9 %. En revanche, le nombre d'affaires terminées a augmenté de 5,6 %, ce qui a entraîné une légère augmentation du CR mentionnée précédemment.

En ce qui concerne le Disposition Time (DT), 13 États membres ont vu leur DT augmenter par rapport à 2023. Plus précisément, 5 pays ont connu une augmentation de plus de 10%, 2 pays de 5 à 10%, 6 pays de 0 à 5%. Par ailleurs, 11 pays ont vu leur DT diminuer, 3 de plus de 10 %, 4 entre 5% et 10% et 4 de moins de 5%. Les valeurs moyennes et médianes n'ont pas connu de grandes fluctuations, mais montrent également des tendances différentes. Le DT moyen a augmenté de 1,9% et le DT médian a augmenté de 0,4 %. D'une manière générale, la situation s'est légèrement améliorée car moins de la moitié des États membres ont augmenté leur DT, ce qui signifie que le traitement des affaires civiles et commerciales pourrait prendre un peu moins de temps au cours de ce cvcle.

**Affaires de droit administratif**

Par rapport aux autres catégories d'affaires de première instance au sein de l'UE, les affaires administratives présentent en général le DT le plus élevé, soit 422 jours en moyenne en 2024. Elles sont par exemple nettement plus longues que les affaires civiles et commerciales de première instance, qui nécessitent 307 jours en moyenne en 2024.

Le nombre de pays qui ont diminué leur DT pour les affaires administratives est de 10, tandis que 15 pays ont augmenté ce DT. Trois pays ont amélioré leurs performances en diminuant le DT de manière significative (plus de 10%), parmi lesquels l'Estonie, l'Italie et la République slovaque.

L'augmentation du Clearance Rate peut être identifiée dans 8 pays parmi lesquels la République slovaque qui ont enregistré une augmentation de plus de +10 points de pourcentage.

Le Clearance Rate a diminué dans 17 pays, et de manière significative (plus de 10 points de pourcentage) dans 5 d'entre eux, dont Chypre, le Luxembourg et le Portugal.

Cette analyse montre que la majorité des États ont évolué moins favorablement en 2024 en ce qui concerne les affaires administratives, puisque moins de la moitié d'entre eux ont diminué leur DT et augmenté leur CR. Par conséquent, des efforts supplémentaires seront nécessaires dans les années à venir pour réduire les DT et se rapprocher des niveaux des DT des affaires civiles et pénales.

**Affaires de droit pénal**

Depuis 2020, les affaires pénales sont incluses dans cette étude, sans comparaison avec les cycles précédents. 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 2024, la moyenne de l'UE étant de 95,7 % tandis que la médiane se situait à 98,8 %. La situation est quasiment identique à celle de 2023.

En ce qui concerne le DT, en 2024 la moyenne est de 189 jours et la médiane de 128 jours, alors qu'en 2023 la moyenne est de 175 jours et la médiane de 134 jours. Les améliorations ne sont notables que pour les DT des différents pays, puisque 6 États les ont réduits. Cependant, 17 pays ont augmenté leur niveau de DT, dont certains de manière significative. Les valeurs maximales ont été observées à Malte (862 jours) et en Grèce (583 jours). Le DT le plus bas a été enregistré en Estonie (35 jours) et en Hongrie (51 jours), soit encore moins que l'année dernière.

Un niveau de CR inférieur à 100 % a été signalé dans les 18 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**

Depuis 2020, les affaires du ministère public sont incluses dans cette étude, sans comparaison avec les cycles précédents. En 2024, la valeur moyenne des affaires nouvelles reçues par les services du ministère public dans l'Union européenne était de 3,24 affaires pour 100 habitants. Le nombre d'affaires traitées se situait approximativement au même niveau (3,27). La même tendance a été enregistrée pour les valeurs moyennes en 2023 et 2022. Les valeurs médiane montrent un nombre légèrement plus élevé d’affaires traitées que d’affaires nouvelles (3,01 pour les affaires nouvelles et 3,08 pour les affaires traitées). Si ces valeurs médianes étaient également inférieures aux nombres moyens, c’est aussi probablement parce que la moyenne était affectée par le très grand nombre d’affaires indiqués pour certains pays, tels que le Luxembourg avec 10,42 affaires nouvelles.

Parmi les affaires traitées, il y a eu 2,17 affaires classées pour 100 habitants (valeur médiane) et 0,57 affaire portée devant le tribunal (valeur médiane).

Si l'on considère les pays individuellement, il est intéressant de noter que sur les 22 qui ont fourni des données pertinentes, 10 Etats ont plus d'affaires traitées que d'affaires nouvelles ou un nombre égal pour ces deux catégories, tandis que dans 12 Etats, les affaires nouvelles étaient plus nombreuses que les affaires traitées, ce qui pourrait potentiellement conduire à la création d'arriérés dans les services de poursuite respectifs. La comparaison du ratio entre affaires traitées et affaires nouvelles au cours du dernier cycle permet de conclure que dix pays ont réussi à améliorer ce ratio. L'analyse de cet indicateur suggère une légère augmentation de l'efficacité des services du ministère public en 2024.

**L’utilisation des technologies de l’information et de la communication (TIC) dans les tribunaux**

Alors qu'elles agissaient initialement comme un simple outil de soutien à la productivité, les technologies de l'information et de la communication (TIC) deviennent l'un des leviers importants pour améliorer l’efficacité des tribunaux. Le rôle croissant des TIC dans l’amélioration de la productivité et de l'efficacité, ainsi que dans l'aide à la prise de décision, repose en effet sur les possibilités de l'automatisation des tâches et l'inévitable progrès technologique général.

Le questionnaire relatif aux TIC comprend 38 questions qui incluent le taux de déploiement et le taux d'utilisation des différents outils utilisés dans les tribunaux. Pour les besoins de cette étude, la Commission européenne a sélectionné quatre questions relatives à deux outils différents : les outils d'assistance à la rédaction et l'enregistrement des audiences.

Les données montrent que presque tous les pays de l'UE sauf Chypre disposent d'outils d'assistance à la rédaction, et ces outils sont très présents avec un taux de déploiement de 95-100% indiqué par 18 Etats membres pour le domaine civil et commercial, 17 pour le domaine administratif et 19 pour le domaine pénal. Pour cet outil d'assistance à la rédaction, le taux d'utilisation est assez élevé : 12 des pays ont déclaré un taux d'utilisation de 95 - 100 % pour le domaine civil et commercial et 11 pour le domaine administratif, 13 pour le domaine pénal. Les fonctionnalités des outils d'aide à la rédaction sont principalement des modèles, ce qui est vrai pour tous les pays, mais un grand nombre d'entre eux disposent également de textes générés automatiquement. La signature électronique et de la conversion automatique de la voix en texte (transcription automatique) sont également présentes dans la moitié des pays. Seule la Hongrie et la Lettonie disposent de décision de justice proposée automatiquement pour toutes les affaires, tandis que la France en dispose pour les affaires civiles et pénales.

Il convient de noter que la plupart des pays disposent d'outils d'enregistrement des audiences, 18 États membres ont un taux de déploiement de 95 à 100 % et 14 États membres ont un taux d'utilisation de 95 - 100 %. Pour ceux qui ont fourni des informations sur cet outil, il est notable que le taux de déploiement est plus élevé pour le domaine civil et administratif et légèrement inférieur pour le domaine pénal. En ce qui concerne les fonctionnalités, pour les affaires civiles, 22 pays utilisent l'enregistrement audio et seulement 10 l'enregistrement vidéo des audiences. La situation est similaire en matière pénale, mais beaucoup moins de pays semblent enregistrer les audiences en matière administrative (18). Dans certains pays, l'enregistrement est systématique pour toutes les audiences. C'est le cas dans 11 pays en matière civile, 8 en matière administrative et 11 en matière pénale.

Les questions relatives aux TIC ont été complètement remaniées en 2022 et consistent en 38 questions qui incluent le taux de déploiement et le taux d'utilisation des différents outils utilisés dans les tribunaux. Pour les besoins de cette étude, la Commission européenne a sélectionné quatre questions relatives à deux outils différents : les outils d'assistance à la rédaction et l'enregistrement des audiences.

Les données montrent que presque tous les pays de l'UE disposent d'outils d'assistance à la rédaction, un pays n'a pas pu répondre à cette question, alors que dans les autres pays, ces outils sont très présents et un taux de déploiement de 95-100% de ces outils a été reporté dans 18 Etats membres pour le domaine civil et commercial, 17 Etats membres pour le domaine administratif et 19 Etats membres pour le domaine pénal. Les informations collectées sur le taux d'utilisation sont une extension de celles concernant le taux de déploiement collectées pour les cycles précédents. Pour cet outil, le taux d'utilisation est assez élevé : 12 % des pays ont déclaré un taux d'utilisation de 95 à 100 % pour les affaires civiles et commerciales et les affaires administratives, 13 pour les affaires pénales. Les fonctionnalités des outils d'aide à la rédaction sont principalement des modèles, ce qui est vrai pour tous les pays, mais un grand nombre d'entre eux disposent également de textes générés automatiquement, de la signature électronique et de la conversion automatique de la voix en texte. Seule la Hongrie et la Lettonie disposent de décision de justice proposée automatiquement pour toutes les affaires, tandis que le Luxembourg ne le fait que pour les affaires pénales.

Il convient de noter que la plupart des pays disposent d'outils d'enregistrement des audiences, 16 États membres ont un taux de déploiement de 95 à 100 % et 13 États membres ont un taux d'utilisation de 95 à 100 %. Pour ceux qui ont fourni des informations sur cet outil, il est notable que le taux de déploiement est plus élevé pour les affaires civiles et pénales et légèrement inférieur pour les affaires administratives. En ce qui concerne les fonctionnalités, pour les affaires civiles, 20 pays utilisent l'enregistrement audio et seulement 8 l'enregistrement vidéo des audiences. La situation est similaire en matière pénale, mais beaucoup moins de pays semblent enregistrer les audiences en matière administrative. Dans certains pays, l'enregistrement est systématique pour toutes les audiences. C'est le cas dans 11 pays en matière civile, 8 en matière administrative et 11 en matière pénale.

# Methodology

The methodology used for this study completely follows CEPEJ methodology for its evaluation cycle using a questionnaire for evaluating European 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.
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 2024. As for previous cycles, 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 2024 data as well on previous cycles (every year, starting with 2014) wherever evolution and trends are presented. "

- **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 which allow to contextualise the data and give more information on each specific judicial system.

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 and/or have then been validated during quality control process finalised 15th December 2025. 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, this is signalised in comments or footnotes under the concerned tables.

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) Certain indicators as well as variations might appear 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.

5) 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.

6) 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.

7) The analyses delivered in the country profiles are based on the data and comments provided from the CEPEJ national correspondent and without use of additional sources.

CEPEJ(2025)21rev1 - Part 1

# General data: economic and demographic data

## Table 0.1: General data: economic and demographic data in 2024 (Q1, Q3, Q4, Q5)

| States | Population | GDP* per capita (in €) | Average gross annual salary (in €) | Exchange rate** in 2022 (on 1st Jan. 2022) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 9 197 213 | 53 834 € | 43 416 € | NAP |
| **Belgium** | 11 825 551 | 51 920 € | 53 818 € | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | 6 437 360 | 16 102 € | 14 264 € | 1,96 |
| **Croatia** | 3 866 343 | 21 740 € | 21 852 € | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | 966 400 | 34 495 € | 29 844 € | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 10 909 500 | 29 403 € | 22 001 € | 25,18 |
| **Denmark** | 5 992 734 | 65 444 € | 41 400 € | 7,45 |
| **Estonia** | 1 374 687 | 28 818 € | 23 772 € | NAP |
| **Finland** | 5 635 971 | 49 096 € | 52 890 € | NAP |
| **France** | 68 605 616 | 42 594 € | 43 730 € | NAP |
| **Germany** | 83 577 140 | 51 833 € | 62 235 € | NAP |
| **Greece** | 10 400 720 | 21 349 € | 19 654 € | NAP |
| **Hungary** | 9 539 502 | 20 699 € | 19 419 € | 411,51 |
| **Ireland** | 5 440 278 | 104 603 € | 50 369 € | NAP |
| **Italy** | 58 934 200 | 37 176 € | 35 460 € | NAP |
| **Latvia** | 1 856 932 | 21 610 € | 20 220 € | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | 2 890 219 | 27 150 € | 26 676 € | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | 681 973 | 126 914 € | 77 954 € | NAP |
| **Malta** | 574 250 | 40 529 € | 23 596 € | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 18 044 027 | 62 380 € | 76 100 € | NAP |
| **Poland** | 37 563 071 | 15 600 € | 22 440 € | 4,28 |
| **Portugal** | 10 749 635 | 26 697 € | 24 818 € | NAP |
| **Romania** | 19 036 031 | 18 556 € | 19 445 € | 4,97 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 5 419 451 | 23 990 € | 18 288 € | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | 2 130 850 | 31 700 € | 35 133 € | NAP |
| **Spain** | 49 077 984 | 32 590 € | 27 558 € | NAP |
| **Sweden** | 10 587 710 | 54 887 € | 45 382 € | 11,00 |
| | | | | |
| **Average** | 16 715 383 | 41 174 € | 35 249 € | |
| **Median** | 9 197 213 | 32 590 € | 27 558 € | |
| **Minimum** | 574 250 | 15 600 € | 14 264 € | |
| **Maximum** | 83 577 140 | 126 914 € | 77 954 € | |
| | | | | |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| **% 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**

**Q001 (2024):** by January 1st, 2025

**Q001 (2023):** Data from January 1st, 2024. Source: Statistics 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 (2022):** Source: Statistik Austria

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

**Belgium**

**Q001 (2023):** https://statbel.fgov.be/fr/themes/population/structure-de-la-population

**Q001 (2022):** source : Statbel - https://statbel.fgov.be/fr/themes/population/structure-de-la-population

**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 (General Comment):** Source: National Bank of Belgium, https://www.nbb.be

**Q003 (2017):** Gross domestic product at market prices

**Q004 (General Comment):** Source: National Bank of Belgium, https://www.nbb.be

**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**

**Q001 (2022):** Data provided by National Statistical Institute
The number of population as of 01.01.2023 (31.12.2022) is calculated based on the data of the Census of population 2021 and the data of natural and mechanical movement of the population.

**Q003 (2023):** Preliminary estimates; Final estimates will be available after 11:00 a.m. on 18 October 2024

**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 (2024):** The final 2024 data is published on 28.11.2024 covering full and part-time employees. It is 27 898 Leva or 14 264 Euro.
The economic activities in which the largest increase was registered were "Construction" - by 22.6%, "Culture, sports and entertainment" - by 17.1%, and "Transport, storage and post" - by 16.9%.

**Q004 (2023):** The final 2023 data is published on 29.11.2024. It is 24 485 Leva or 12 518 Euro

**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 (2024):** Data is provisional and it refers to population estimate for middle of 2024
Final population estimate, state on 31st December 2024, will be published on 30th of June 2025

**Q001 (2022):** State on 31 December 2022

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

**Q003 (2024):** The GDP data for 2024 are estimated, based on the sum of quarterly figures and are classified as "provisional". The annual data for 2024 will be avaleble in October 2025, but the final data for 2024 vill be avalibe in October 2026 at earliest.

**Q003 (2023):** As for 2022, the average monthly gross salary was HRK 10,400 (press release available at: https://podaci.dzs.hr/2022/hr/29062), which would be HRK 124,800 on an annual basis, and applying fixed conversion rate to Euro of 7.53450, we arrive at an annual average gross salary of 16,564 euros
Considering the year 2023, the average monthly gross salary was 1,584 euros (press release available at: https://podaci.dzs.hr/2023/hr/58119), and the annual average is 19,008 euros
o If we compare these two values, we arrive at a difference of 14.75% (19,008 / 16,564 * 100)

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

**Q004 (2024):** Average monthly gross salary for 2024 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/2024/en/76833).
This monthly gross salary (1 821 euro) has been multiplied by 12.

**Q004 (2023):** Values for 2022 and prior years may differ from previous deliveries. The GDP for 1995-2023 was revised and published in 2023, including "Gross Domestic Product, Revised Data" (https://podaci.dzs.hr/media/r1dhalwf/msi-bruto-domaci-proizvod.xlsx) and "Annual Gross Domestic Product - Annual Calculation, Revised Data" (https://podaci.dzs.hr/media/c51dcmbr/bruto-domaci-proizvod-godisnji.xlsx).

**Q004 (2022):** will be explained later

**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 (2024):** On 1 January 2023 Croatia adopted the Euro and became the 20th member of the euro area.

**Q005 (2023):** On 1 January 2023 Croatia adopted the Euro and became the 20th member of the euro area

**Q005 (2022):** On 1 January 2023 Croatia adopted the Euro and became the 20th member of the euro area. On 12 July 2022 the Council of the European Union formally approved Croatia’s accession to the euro area and determined a Croatian kuna conversion rate of 7.53450 per euro.

**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 (2022):** The data is provisional (01/01/2023).

**Q001 (2020):** The number is provisional.

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

**Q003 (2022):** The latest number was published on 20 October 2023.
The increase is due to inflation (8.4% compared to 2021).
**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 (2022):** The GDP is constantly growing + the impact of the exchange rate

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

**Q004 (2022):** The gross salary is constantly growing + the impact of 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 (2024):** www.dst.dk

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

**Q001 (2017):** Per January 1, 2018

**Q003 (2024):** Denmarks Statistics (dst.dk)

**Q003 (2022):** The Source is Denmarks Statistics and is correct. Previously https://www.eu.dk/da/fakta-og-tal/statistik/bnp-pr-indbygger was used but they stopped publishing this statistics.
**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

**Q004 (2024):** These data are calculated as total salary income in Denmark 2024 divided by total population, as this seems to be the way it has been calculated historically. For the record, note that it is not, in our estimation, a precise measurement.

**Q005 (2024):** Danmarks Nationalbank (nationalbanken.dk)

**Q005 (2023):** Denmarks Statistics (dst.dk) and Danmarks Nationalbank (nationalbanken.dk)

**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 (2023):** https://www.stat.ee/

**Q003 (2022):** https://www.stat.ee/et/avasta-statistikat/valdkonnad/rahandus/rahvamajanduse-arvepidamine/skp-reaalkasv-aheldatud-vaartus
**Q003 (2021):** Very high inflation rates.

**Q003 (2017):** Economic growth accelerated

**Q004 (2023):** https://www.stat.ee/

**Q004 (2022):** Inflation

**Q004 (2020):** Inflation

**Q004 (2018):** There is no specific reason.

**Finland**

**Q001 (General Comment):** Source: Population structure, Statistics Finland: 11ra -- Key figures on population by region, 1990-2024

**Q001 (2024):** Number of inhabitants on 1 January 2025

**Q001 (2023):** 1.1.2023: 5 563 970

**Q001 (2022):** On 1 January 2023: 5 563 970 (or 5 548 241 on 1.1.2022).

**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 (2023):** This data is from the year 2023 (Tilastokeskus/Statistics Finland). In 2023 questionnaire´s reply (43 049 euros) the data was based on the data from 2020. Year 2020 there was a worldwide covid epidemic, which had effects on the society and economy. After covid there has been economic growth.

**Q003 (2022):** Newest available data is for the year 2020.

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

**Q004 (2024):** Salary for 2024 has been estimated from structure of earnings 2023 and preliminary data from index of wage and salary earnings 2024.

**Q004 (2023):** Data from the year 2023. Calculation method for full-time employees' annual salary = monthly salary+ vacation pay + performance pay +lump sums + annual service allowance.

**Q004 (2022):** Final data for the year 2021. Calculation method for full-time employees’ annual salary = Monthly salary + vacation pay + performance pay + lump sums + annual service allowance.

**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 (2022):** INSEE

**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 (2023):** The accurate number is 41 331,9 Euro.

**Q003 (2022):** INSEE

**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 (2022):** Revised calculation method: payroll/headcount computed on a full-time equivalent basis.

**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 (2024):** Number of inhabitants as of 31 December 2024

**Q001 (2023):** Number of inhabitants as of 31 December 2023

**Q001 (2022):** Number of inhabitants as of 31 December 2022

**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.
**Q003 (2022):** The national accounts (published by the Federal Statistical Office) are revised in the summer of each year on the basis of newly available statistical information. These revisions usually concern the last four years. The revisions have been stronger than usual, especially from 2020 onwards. This is mainly due to the higher uncertainty in the estimates in the years affected by the Corona pandemic.

**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 (2024):** The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without
special payments: 56 294 EUR)
Special payments are any payments outside of the regular remuneration that can be recurring on an annual basis (such as Christmas bonuses/end-of-the-year bonuses, holiday bonuses, bonuses for the fulfilment of target agreements) or irregular (e.g. payments for jubilees).

**Q004 (2023):** The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without special payments: 53 620 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 (2022):** The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without special payments: 50 805 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 (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 (2024):** https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SPO18/-

**Q001 (2023):** 2023.https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SPO18/-

**Q001 (2022):** Estimated population on 01-01-2021.The estimated population for the year 2022 will be published after the end of February 2024.
**Q001 (2021):** Estimated population on 01-01-2021.The year 2022 will be published after 01-01-2023.

**Q003 (2024):** provisional data. https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SEL33/-

**Q003 (2023):** 2022.https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SEL33/-

**Q003 (2022):** GDP per capita 2022: 19548*(provisional data). Here is the relevant link.:https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SEL33/-
**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 (General Comment):** The survey based on which data on average national salary are established is conducted on a four-year basis. The most recent data are for 2022 and they became available at the end of 2024.

**Q004 (2024):** Total/Avg. Male: 21 947 Female: 17 361. The CEPEJ uses as an estimation the average value of these two figures.
https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SJO47/-
**Q004 (2023):** The most recently available data are 2022 data.
According to the Structure and Distribution of Earnings Survey for 2022, the average annual gross earnings are as follows: Total/Avg. Male: 21 947 Female: 17 361. The CEPEJ uses as an estimation the average value of these two figures.
https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SJO47/-

**Q004 (2022):** 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 o of the survey will be published in late 2024 to early 2025.

**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 (2024):** Comments 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 (2023):** Comments 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 (2022):** Comments 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 (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 (2024):** The Hungarian Central Statistical Office published the relevant official data on its web page (2025: https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/gdp/en/gdp0001.html). The relevant data is currently still in “preliminary” status, therefore it cannot be considered final. It is unknown when the preliminary data will be revised and finalised.
**Q003 (2023):** The Hungarian Central Statistical Office published the relevant official data on its web page (2024: https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/gdp/en/gdp0001.html) after 1 October 2024. The relevant data is currently still in “preliminary” status, therefore it cannot be considered final. It is unknown when the preliminary data will be revised and finalised.

**Q003 (2022):** The Hungarian Central Statistical Office published the relevant official data after October 1, 2023:
https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/gdp/en/gdp0001.html
The general development of the Hungarian economy is the reason or the increase of GDP per capita in 2022.

**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 (2024):** In comparison to the previous year, the average gross annual salary increased due to the raising of the minimum wage, and of course the forint exchange rate change.
The above data is based on the labour market data (693,529 HUF/month) published on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/mun/en/mun0001.html) and the average EUR currency rate (395,20 HUF/EUR) published on the website, based on the National Bank of Hungary data (http://mnbkozeparfolyam.hu/arfolyam-2024.html).
**Q004 (2023):** In comparison to the previous year, the average gross annual salary increased due to the raising of the minimum wage, and of course the forint exchange rate change.
The above data is based on the labour market data (614,426 HUF/month) published on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/mun/en/mun0001.html) and the average EUR currency rate (381.95 HUF/EUR) published on the website of the National Bank of Hungary (http://mnbkozeparfolyam.hu/arfolyam-2023.html). The relevant data of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office is currently still in “preliminary” status, therefore it cannot be considered final. It is unknown when the preliminary data will be revised and finalised.

**Q004 (2022):** 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

**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 (2024):** As 1 January 2025 was a Monday but national holiday, we used the middle exchange rate of the National Bank of Hungary on 2 January 2025:
1 EUR = 411.51 HUF
https://www.mnb.hu/en/arfolyam-tablazat?deviza=rbCurrencySelect&devizaSelected=EUR&datefrom=01%2F01%2F2025&datetill=02%2F01%2F2025&order=1

**Q005 (2023):** As 1 January 2024 was a Monday but national holiday, we used the middle exchange rate of the National Bank of Hungary on 2 January 2024:
1 EUR = 382.12 HUF
https://www.mnb.hu/en/arfolyam-tablazat?deviza=rbCurrencySelect&devizaSelected=EUR&datefrom=01%2F01%2F2023&datetill=02%2F01%2F2023&order=1

**Q005 (2022):** As 1 January 2023 was a Sunday, we used the middle exchange rate of the National Bank of Hungary on 2 January 2023:
1 EUR = 400,66 HUF
https://www.mnb.hu/en/arfolyam-tablazat?deviza=rbCurrencySelect&devizaSelected=EUR&datefrom=01%2F01%2F2023&datetill=02%2F01%2F2023&order=1

**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 (2022):** Year 2022 per Census of Population 2022 results - There were 5,149,139 people in the State on Census Night, Sunday, 03 April 2022. https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-cpsr/censusofpopulation2022-summaryresults/

**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 (2022):** Year 2022 GDP at Current Market Prices per head of population. GDP per person is calculated from Year 2022 GDP at Current Market Prices datum value of €506,282 million divided by 5,100,200, the Estimated Population for Year 2022 (Persons in April)
**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 (2022):** Year 2022 is the latest year for which data are available.

**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 (2024):** Data on 01.01.2025

**Q001 (2023):** Data on 01.01.2024.

**Q001 (2022):** Population at the beginning of the year, 01.01.2023

**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 (2022):** Starting from 2020, an increase in GDP per capita is observed in Latvia, which is influenced by two factors: a decrease in the population and a moderate increase in GDP.
**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 had an effect on the average gross annual salary.
**Q004 (2024):** In 2024, the average gross monthly wage in Latvia increased by approximately 9.7% compared to 2023. The main driver of this growth was a significant rise in public sector salaries, particularly in education, where wages rose by over 18%.
**Q004 (2023):** The changes in the average salary in 2023 were influenced by the increase of the national minimum wage, as well as the increase of the maximum non-taxable minimum and the coefficient applied in the calculations of the differentiated non-taxable minimum.
**Q004 (2022):** The average wage in Latvia continues to rise for several years in a row. In 2022, the increase in average wages was influenced by several factors: the lifting of the restrictions of COVID-19, which boosted economic activity, a low unemployment rate, which created the conditions for a small increase in wages.
**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 (General Comment):** data from the National data agency

**Q001 (2024):** data from the National data agency

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

**Q003 (2022):** Changes in wages were affected from 2022 January 1 as the minimum monthly salary was increased, the basic 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.

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

**Q004 (General Comment):** According to data from the State Data Agency, wage changes were influenced by the increase in the minimum monthly wage from January 1, 2024, the increase in the minimum salary coefficients for employees of budgetary institutions, changes in the calculation of the non-taxable income amount, and other reasons.

**Q004 (2024):** The State Data Agency of the Republic of Lithuania announces that the changes in wages were caused by an increase in the minimum monthly wage from January 1, 2024, an increase in the minimum wage coefficients for employees of budgetary institutions, changes in the calculation of non-taxable income, and other reasons.

**Q004 (2023):** Increase in earnings was influenced by increased basic wages for politicians, judges, civil servants, public service employees and employees of budgetary institutions, increased minimum monthly wage and other reasons.

**Q004 (2022):** Changes in wages were affected from 2022 January 1 as the minimum monthly salary was increased, the basic 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.
It should be noted that from 2019 January 1 the rates of state social insurance contributions paid by the employer and the employee have been changed. gross wages indexed 1.289 times.
**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 (2024):** Total population as of 31 December 2024. https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CPopulation%20et%20emploi%23B%23%7CEtat%20de%20la%20population%23B1%23&pg=0&fc=Th%C3%A8mes&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_B1100&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C&dq=.A&to[TIME_PERIOD]=false

**Q001 (2023):** Total population on 31 December 2023. https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CPopulation%20et%20emploi%23B%23%7CEtat%20de%20la%20population%23B1%23&pg=0&fc=Th%C3%A8mes&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_B1100&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C2023&dq=.A&lo=5

**Q001 (2022):** Total population as of 31st December 2022. Source: https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CPopulation%20et%20emploi%23B%23%7CEtat%20de%20la%20population#B1#&pg=0&fc=Th%C3%A8mes&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_B1100&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015,2022&dq=.A&lo=5

**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 (2024):** Gross domestic product at market prices per inhabitant published by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies of the Grand Duchy of 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=2017%2C2024&dq=.A

**Q003 (2023):** Gross domestic product at market prices per capita published by the Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques du 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%2C&dq=.A, consulted on 30.04.24)

**Q003 (2022):** Gross Domestic Product at market prices per capita published by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg (STATEC) (https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?pg=0&lc=en&df[ds]=release&df[id]=DF_E2105&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C&dq=.A). We refer to the explanations provided during the 2021 Scoreboard for the evolution of GDP per capita between 2020 and 2021. Between 2021 and 2022, there was an increase of +4%.

**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 (2024):** Average annual gross earnings by economic activity – Full-time workers (in EUR) NACE Rev.2: Industrie et services (B-S) https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CConditions%20sociales%23C%23%7CConditions%20de%20vie%23C1%23&fs[1]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C0%7CConditions%20sociales%23C%23&fs[2]=NACE%20Rev.2%2C0%7CActivit%C3%A9s%20financi%C3%A8res%20et%20d%27assurances%20%28K%29%23SL09%23&pg=0&fc=NACE%20Rev.2&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_C1202&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C&dq=L01%2BSL09.A01.A&ly[rw]=NACE_REV2&ly[cl]=TIME_PERIOD&to[TIME_PERIOD]=false (Data provided by STATEC, not yet published as of 31 October 2025 but whose publication is imminent.)

**Q004 (2023):** Average gross annual earnings by economic activity - Full-time workers (in EUR) NACE Rev.2: Industry and services (B-S)
(https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CConditions%20social%23C%23%7CConditions%20de%20vie%23C1%23&fs[1]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C0%7CConditions%20social%23C%23&fs[2]=NACE%20Rev.2%2C0%7CActivit%C3%A9s%20financi%C3%A8res%20et%20d%27assurances%20%28K%29%23SL09%23&pg=0&fc=NACE%20Rev.2 &df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_C1202&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C&dq=L01%2BSL09..A&ly[rw]=NACE_REV2%2CGENDER&ly[cl]=TIME_PERIOD ; consulté le 01.07.2024)

**Q004 (2022):** Average annual gross incomes by economic activity - Full-time workers (in EUR) NACE Rev.2: Industry and services (B-S). https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?pg=0&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_C1202&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2016%2C2022&dq=L01..A&ly[rw]=GENDER&ly[cl]=TIME_PERIOD&lc=en

**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 (2023):** This data was collected from EuroStat.

**Q001 (2022):** The National Statistics Office revised their population data in July 2023 and is now estimating the population of Malta at the end of 2021 to be 520,174. The link to the site is: https://nso.gov.mt/world-population-day-11-july-2023/.

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

**Q003 (2023):** Data provided by the National Statistics Office: https://nso.gov.mt/wp-content/uploads/National-Accounts-Selected-indicators-2024Q2.xlsx

**Q003 (2022):** This is the data provided and verified with the National Statistics Office for the GDP in nominal terms (without taking into consideration the inflation rate).

**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 (2023):** Data provided by the NSO

**Q004 (2022):** This is the data provided and verified with the National Statistics Office

**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 (2024):** Number of inhabitants on January 1, 2024: 17 942 942

**Q001 (2023):** Number of inhabitants on January 1, 2023: 17 811 291

**Q001 (2022):** Inhabitants 2022: 17 590 672

**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 (General Comment):** GDP is based on provisional numbers, definitive numbers (usually available in the next year) may differ slightly from those provided here.

**Q003 (2023):** For now, we have used the 2022 GDP, and number of inhabitants as provided in Q1. Data for 2023 GDP is not yet available.
The following information was used to calculate the per capita GDP: National GDP divided by number of inhabitants on Jan 1, ref year + 1: 958 549 000 000 / 17 942 942

**Q003 (2022):** To bring these numbers in line with the information shared with Eurostat, we have used the following calculation: National GDP: 958 549 000 000, divided by the number of inhabitants on Jan 1, ref year + 1 (17 811 291).

**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):** Average gross annual salary is based on provisional numbers, definitive numbers (usually available in the next year) may differ slightly from those provided here.
Salary is defined as 'reward per working year'. 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). The CBS has somewhat different numbers available than those used by Eurostat, therefore, numbers presented here might differ from those in Eurostat.
**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 (2023):** Data from Central Statistical Office

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

**Q004 (2024):** Data from Central Statistical Office

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

**Q005 (2024):** 1 euro = 4.2758 pln

**Q005 (2023):** 1 euro = 4,3480 pln

**Q005 (2022):** 1 euro=4,6889 pln

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

**Q005 (2020):** 1 euro = 4.6148 PLN

**Q005 (2016):** Source: National Bank of Poland

**Portugal**

**Q003 (2023):** The increase reflects the inflation

**Q004 (2024):** Figures provided by Eurostat

**Q004 (2023):** The increase reflects the inflation
This is the provisional value for year 2022.
Data for 2023 is still not available.
**Q004 (2022):** This value is for year 2021.
Data for 2022 is still not available.
**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 (2024):** Provisional data

**Q001 (2023):** Provisional data

**Q001 (2022):** Usually resident population of Romania on January 1st 2023 - provisional data

**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 (2024):** Provisional data

**Q003 (2023):** Semi-definitive data

**Q003 (2022):** provisional data

**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.
**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 (2024):** The data is provided by the National Institute of Statistics. The difference can be explained based on salary increases and an upward trend can be observed continuing from 2018.
**Q004 (2022):** The difference can be explained based on salary increases and an upward trend can be observed continuing from 2018.
**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 (General Comment):** Source:
https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/portal/ext/products/informationmessages/inf_sprava_detail/df748437-8659-4c0e-9123-e21fb2ab8f30/!ut/p/z1/tVNNc4IwEP0tHjxmsiRR4BioIn5Voajk0kEFpSioMLT--wbHmU4Pgj00lySz-15239tggVdYpEEZ74IiztLgIO--6L7PVVszDIUDGGMK9nDkTgdmn1heBy9_J2hTpwf2G59ZzpApwDpYyHDfnRGuM8t8cV77MmwSzR13CYByx9ck1OGt7h1vWnzA1DGANrY6YPOB5-hzSoHTG_6nPGNBwFanjjKaz62Rwu54eLA4PIevKfApfE2CqNd_gQUWm7Q4FXvsZ-s82KM8QXEaoSAp2iAP2eUo3SzTEOWnS1Be21DmYZHIfRupTGNURVq3oyO2gRDpCqEoJEq0JsFaiyhU9KdNvMX-U9nLpnkR9Wovq_caDG3iEE0zJ2pN8dQGBmmqL9tUH7apqHhZxuEn9tJK_AN2_6jiAPCwyXj5M8llYk52kjko9pXlGV49RS-h8cf5LLicnCwtwq8Cr_5jdE5H77aOGr2ixOlFkx5lYn395K3WN9jiLGI!/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/

**Q001 (2024):** As of December 31, 2024, the Slovak Republic had a population of 5,419,451, which was 5,236 fewer people than in the same period of the previous year (the figure at the end of 2023 was 5,424,687 inhabitants).

**Q001 (2022):** Source
https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/portal/ext/home/!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfljo8ziA809LZycDB0NLPyCXA08QxwD3lO8TAwNTEz1wwkpiAJKG-AAjgZA_VFgJc7ujh4m5j4GBhY-7qYGno4eoUGWgcbGBo7GUAV4zCjIjTDIdFRUBADse0bP/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/
**Q001 (2021):** source: https://slovak.statistics.sk/
**Q003 (2024):** https://datacube.statistics.sk/#!/view/sk/VBD_SLOVSTAT/nu2028qs/v_nu2028qs_00_00_00_sk (
**Q004 (2024):** Source: https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/wcm/connect/1e66330c-9270-436f-897d-d5eeb65c0081/Priemerna_mesacna_mzda_zamestnanca_hospodarstva_SR_v_roku_2024.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=pls9P7Q&CVID=pls9P7Q&CVID=pls9P7Q
**Q004 (2023):** High rise in salaries (based on high inflation - similar to the other EU countries)
https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/wcm/connect/efd89ec1-751c-4692-8a7d-2ba94b2532f6/Priemerna_mesacna_mzda_zamestnanca_hospodarstva_SR_v_roku_2023.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUiz2Xu

**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/
**Q005 (2024):** Slovakia uses Euro as a currency
**Q005 (2023):** Slovakia uses Euro as a currency

**Slovenia**

**Q003 (2024):** Reported according to Eurostat data (in previous years according to Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia)
**Q003 (2022):** Per capita GDP is increasing (increase by 11% from 2020 to 2021 and by 13% from 2021 to 2022).

**Q004 (2024):** Reported according to Eurostat data (in previous years according to Statistical Office of the Republic of 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.

**Spain**

**Q001 (General Comment):** National Institute of Statitistics (INE).

**Q001 (2023):** National Institute of Statitistics (INE).

**Q001 (2022):** National Institute of Statitistics (INE).

**Q003 (2024):** GDP per capita at current prices would stand at 32.590 euros, 5,2% more than in 2023, according to Eurostat data.
**Q003 (2023):** GDP per capita at current prices would stand at 30.320 euros, 7.7% more than in 2022, according to Eurostat data.
**Q003 (2022):** Published Information

**Q004 (2024):** The gross annual salary of Spanish workers grew by 3,8% in 2024, to 27.558,68 euros, according to the data published by the National Statistics Institute (INE) in the annual labour cost survey.
**Q004 (2023):** The gross annual salary of Spanish workers grew by 4.7% in 2023, to 26.555,89 euros, according to the data published by the National Statistics Institute (INE) in the annual labour cost survey.
**Q004 (2022):** The increase can be explained by increase of minimum legal salary.

# 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 determined in courts and public prosecution services in 2024 (Q66 and Q67)

| States | National level quality standards determined in courts and public prosecution services | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Quality standards determined | 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 | 15 | 6 | 7 |
| No | 12 | 21 | 20 |

# Performance and Evaluation for each individual judge

## Table 1.2 Existence of quantitative performance targets defined for each judge and authority responsible in 2024 (Q83 and Q83-1)

| States | Quantitative performance targets defined for each judge | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Existence of quantitative performance targets defined for each judge | Authority responsible for setting these targets: | | | | | |
| | | Executive power (for example the Ministry of Justice) | Legislative power | Judicial power (for example the High Judicial Council, Supreme Court) | President of the court | 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 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| No | 19 | 25 | 26 | 22 | 23 | 27 |

## Table 1.3 Consequences for a judge if quantitative performance targets are not met in 2024 (Q83 and Q83-1-1)

| States | Existence of quantitative performance targets defined for each judge | Consequences for a judge if these targets are not met | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Without disciplinary procedure | | | | With disciplinary procedure | | | | No consequences | No targets defined |
| | | Warning by court's president | Temporary salary reduction | Reflected in the individual assessment | Other | Warning by court's president | Temporary salary reduction | Reflected in the individual assessment | 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 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| No | 19 | 23 | 26 | 22 | 24 | 23 | 25 | 24 | 22 | 26 | 27 |

# Performance and Evaluation - public prosecutors

## Table 1.4 Existence of quantitative performance targets for each public prosecutor, authority responsible as well as individual evaluation in 2024 (Q83-2, Q83-3, Q120 and Q120-1)

| States | Quantitative performance tagets defined for each public prosecutor | | | | | | | Individual evaluation of the public prosecutors' work | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Existence | Authority responsible for setting the individual targets | | | | | | Quantitative | Qualitative | 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 | Different frequency |
| 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** | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 12 | 22 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 11 |
| **No and NAP** | 22 | 26 | 24 | 27 | 26 | 27 | | 15 | 5 | 24 | 21 | 24 | 16 |

## Table 1.5 Consequences for a prosecutor if quantitative performance targets are not met in 2024 (Q83-2 and Q83-3-1)

| States | Existence of quantitative performance targets defined for each prosecutor | Consequences for a prosecutor if these targets are not met | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Without disciplinary procedure | | | | With disciplinary procedure | | | | No consequences |
| | | Warning by head of prosecution | Temporary salary reduction | Reflected in the individual assessment | Other | Warning by head of prosecution | Temporary salary reduction | Reflected in the individual assessment | 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** | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| **No and NAP** | 22 | 25 | 27 | 25 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 25 | 26 |

# Monitoring

## Table 1.6 Modalities for monitoring court activities (performance and quality) in 2024 (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 | 10 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | ■ | | ■ | ■ | |
| Belgium | 7 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | |
| Bulgaria | 8 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | ■ |
| Croatia | 9 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | ■ | | ■ | ■ | |
| Cyprus | 8 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | |
| Czech Republic | 7 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | |
| Denmark | 10 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | ■ | ■ | | | ■ | ■ |
| Estonia | 12 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| Finland | 12 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| France | 13 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| Germany | 10 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| Greece | 10 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| Hungary | 12 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| Ireland | 9 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | ■ | ■ | | ■ | | ■ | | ■ |
| Italy | 8 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | | | ■ | ■ | |
| Latvia | 12 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| Lithuania | 8 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | | | | ■ | | |
| Luxembourg | 10 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| Malta | 9 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| Netherlands | 13 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| Poland | 13 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| Portugal | 13 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| Romania | 13 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| Slovak Republic | 10 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| Slovenia | 13 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| Spain | 12 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| Sweden | 8 | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | ■ | | | | ■ |
| Yes | | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 25 | 19 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 25 | 18 | 21 | 20 | 11 |
| No | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 15 | 17 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 16 |

## Table 1.7 Modalities for monitoring public prosecution services' activities (performance and quality) in 2024 (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 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Belgium | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bulgaria | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Croatia | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Czech Republic | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Denmark | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Estonia | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finland | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| France | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Germany | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greece | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hungary | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latvia | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lithuania | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Luxembourg | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Malta | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Netherlands | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poland | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Portugal | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Romania | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slovak Republic | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slovenia | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sweden | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | | 26 | 25 | 27 | 27 | 25 | 20 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 17 | 22 | 6 |
| No | | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 21 | 23 | 21 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 21 |

## Table 1.8 Monitoring of the number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs) in 2024 (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 | 26 | 26 | 25 |
| No | 1 | 1 | 2 |

## Table 1.9 Monitoring of waiting time during judicial proceedings within courts and the public prosecution services in 2024 (Q72)

| States | Monitoring of 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 | 15 | 13 |
| No | 12 | 14 |

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

*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 083. Are there quantitative performance targets defined for each judge (e.g. the number of resolved cases in a month or year)?*
*Question 083-1. Who is responsible for setting these targets for each judge?*

*Question 083-1-1. What are the consequences for a judge if these targets are not met?*

*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 these targets for each public prosecutor?*

*Question 083-3-1. What are the consequences for a prosecutor if these targets are not met?*

*Question 120. Is there a system of individual evaluation of the public prosecutors' work?*

*Question 120-1. Please specify the frequency of this evaluation:*

**Austria**

**Q070 (General Comment):** .

**Q070 (2024):** As for now, appeal ratio is monitored by the administrative courts only.

**Q070 (2022):** satisfaction of court staff: only supreme administrative court

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

**Q070-1 (2024):** This year the "satisfaction of prosecution staff" included, because the replies have not been answered correctly in the past.
**Q072 (2024):** Judicial proceedings – of both courts and public prosecution services – are systematically monitored for undue waiting periods. Depending on the type of proceeding a waiting period (= time during which no steps are taken in the proceeding) of three months, six months or twelve months is considered to be potentially undue. A waiting period exceeding this timeframe will lead to the proceeding appearing on an automatically generated list for review. The answer is different from last years, because the question has not been answered correctly in the past.

**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 (2018):** There are no specific targets given to the Judges, which are seen as a conflict with the Independence of Courts.

**Q083 (2016):** Provincial Administrative Courts: Maximum 150 cases a year per judge (average value).
Federal Finance Court:
No performance targets, which are seen in conflict with the independence. However based on a continuous transparent controlling the possibility of benchmarking exists. In addition regular dialogues with the judges regarding their performance are held.

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** No specific targets are formulated in respect of judges.

**Q083-1 (2016):** Answer counts only for the administrative courts.
For the other courts, no performance targets, which are seen as a conflict with the independence of courts.
**Q083-3 (2018):** There are no specific targets given to public prosecutors.

**Q120 (General Comment):** In the Austrian judicial system we have diverse and multifaceted statistic products, which are an important basis for the management of justice. The statistics are regularly compiled by the Federal Computing Center and serve to control the deployment of personnel, but also for the supervision that is necessarily linked to the parties' right to a fair trial. The work of the public prosecutors is continuously and systematically reviewed on a quantitative level (i.e. number of completed cases, duration of proceedings). In this way, major deviations from the average can be identified. If a public prosecutor shows too many delays in proceedings or excessively long proceedings, this can lead to disciplinary proceedings or even a reduction in their job description. The assessment is carried out by the heads of the senior public prosecutors' offices. A qualitative assessment of each prosecutor's work is carried out once for the second calendar year following their appointment to a specific position. The evaluation is repeated when they are appointed to a new position (for the second calendar year following that appointment). An assessment at a later time will be carried out, if either the head of the prosecutor's office or the assessed prosecutor themselves have reason to believe that the result of the last assessment is no longer accurate. If the assessment finds the prosecutor's work to be below average, the assessment is repeated for the next calendar year. The assessment is carried out by the personnel commission at the Senior Public Prosecutor's Office, consisting of the Head of the Senior Public Prosecutor's Office, the Head Prosecutor for the Public Prosecutor's Office to which the assessed prosecutor belongs, one prosecutor appointed/chosen by the Union of Public Services and one prosecutor appointed/chosen by staff representatives.
The evaluation takes into account the prosecutor's professional abilities, skills, knowledge, conduct and performance. The assessment can be relevant for the prosecutor's career, as it will be taken into account in later application procedures. If the assessment finds the prosecutor's work failing to meet the absolute minimum peformance standards necessary to fulfill their duties for two consecutive calendar years, the prosecutor will be dismissed.

**Q120 (2024):** In the Austrian judicial system we have diverse and multifaceted statistic products, which are an important basis for the management of justice. The statistics are regularly compiled by the Federal Computing Center and serve to control the deployment of personnel, but also for the supervision that is necessarily linked to the parties' right to a fair trial. The work of the public prosecutors is continuously and systematically reviewed on a quantitative level (i.e. number of completed cases, duration of proceedings). In this way, major deviations from the average can be identified. If a public prosecutor shows too many delays in proceedings or excessively long proceedings, this can lead to disciplinary proceedings or even a reduction in their job description. The assessment is carried out by the heads of the senior public prosecutors' offices. A qualitative assessment of each prosecutor's work is carried out once for the second calendar year following their appointment to a specific position. The evaluation is repeated when they are appointed to a new position (for the second calendar year following that appointment). An assessment at a later time will be carried out, if either the head of the prosecutor's office or the assessed prosecutor themselves have reason to believe that the result of the last assessment is no longer accurate. If the assessment finds the prosecutor's work to be below average, the assessment is repeated for the next calendar year. The assessment is carried out by the personnel commission at the Senior Public Prosecutor's Office, consisting of the Head of the Senior Public Prosecutor's Office, the Head Prosecutor for the Public Prosecutor's Office to which the assessed prosecutor belongs, one prosecutor appointed/chosen by the Union of Public Services and one prosecutor appointed/chosen by staff representatives.
The evaluation takes into account the prosecutor's professional abilities, skills, knowledge, conduct and performance. The assessment can be relevant for the prosecutor's career, as it will be taken into account in later application procedures. If the assessment finds the prosecutor's work failing to meet the absolute minimum peformance standards necessary to fulfill their duties for two consecutive calendar years, the prosecutor will be dismissed.
This is not a change, the reply in the past year was not given correctly.

**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 (2024):** For public prosecution services: although the reply is “no,” there are, in particular, management support assistants who can work in the field of quality.
**Q067 (2023):**
Although the reply is ‘no’, the public prosecutor's department does have management support staff who can work in the quality field.
**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.

**Q070 (2024):** Number and rate (and other details) of appeals: currently only for criminal cases in police courts.

**Q070 (2023):** Other: Dashboards including the following are in development or test-phase: - productivity (judges + court staff) (test phase for courts of appeals)
- number and rate of appeals (test phase for police courts)
**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.

**Q071 (General Comment):** College of Courts and Tribunals: current mechanism (current exercise - backlog project)

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

**Q072 (General Comment):** For the public prosecution services: monitoring using dashboards.

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

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

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

**Q120 (General Comment):** Public prosecutors are assessed on the way in which they carry out their duties. Heads of divisions are also assessed on their management skills and staff management, as well as on initiatives taken to tackle the backlog of cases. The criteria on which this assessment is based are of 3 types:
1) legal knowledge, work efficiency and effectiveness, communication, decisiveness and professional ethics
2) collegiality and self-control
3) interest in continuous training, adaptability and open-mindedness, commitment.
The purpose of the assessment is to ensure quality control, but also to provide a form of coaching that contributes to the prosecutor’s development and to anticipate difficulties or a possible negative mention.
Assessment also plays an essential role in consideration for a subsequent appointment or designation.
Competent authorities:
The assessment is carried out by an absolute majority of votes cast by the head of division and two prosecutors appointed by the general assembly or by the division assembly.
The assessment of the heads of divisions is carried out by the competent chamber of the assessment board, which is made up of two heads of divisions from the public prosecutor's office, two magistrates who are members of the Opinion and Investigation Commission of the High Council of the Judiciary, a magistrate of the Court of Audit and a human resources management specialist (see articles 259novies et seq. of the Judicial Code).

**Q120-1 (General Comment):** The first assessment takes place one year after the judge/prosecutor starts work. Assessments are then carried out every 3 years.
**Q120-1 (2024):** Sources: College of Courts and Tribunals, https://www.tribunaux-rechtbanken.be/fr/college -
Public Prosecutor's Office Support Service, sdaomp@just.fgov.be

**Bulgaria**

**Q066 (General Comment):** Supreme Judicial Council: According to the answers of SJC the competent bodies in these matters are:
The Inspectorate to the SJC:
- checks the organization of the initiation and movement of judicial, prosecutorial and investigative cases, as well as the closing of cases within the established terms and in case of violations, signals the administrative head of the relevant body of the judiciary and the relevant College of the Supreme Judicial Council
- sends signals, proposals and reports to other state bodies, including the competent bodies of the judiciary;
- examines applications against violation of the right to examine and resolve cases within reasonable time.
The Judges' College of the SJC:
- annually analyses and reports the degree of workload of the bodies of the judiciary;
- requests and summarizes every 6 months information from the courts about their activity;
- resolves questions about the organization of the activity of the relevant system of judicial authorities;
- adopts rules for the allocation of cases between the judges who consider cases allocated according to Art. 9, para. 3, in order to equalize their total workload;
- determines the number of judicial officers according to the degree of workload on the proposal of or after agreement with the administrative heads of the bodies of the judiciary, and may open new and lays off positions.
The Plenary of the SJC:
- on the proposal of one of the Colleges, after coordination with the administrative heads of the bodies of the judiciary, determines the number of judges, prosecutors and investigators in all courts, prosecutor's offices and investigative departments according to the degree of workload;
- hears and accepts the annual reports of the bodies of the judiciary under Art. 84, item 16 of the Constitution.
.....
According to the answers of The Prosecutor's office of the Republic of Bulgaria:
The legal regulation is in Art. 84, item 16 of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria, according to which the Parliament hears and accepts the annual report of the Prosecutor General submitted by the SJC and Art. 30, para. 2, item 4 of the Judicial System Act, according to which the Plenum of the SJC hears and accepts this annual report.
Approved by the Prosecutor General/ chief prosecutor is the Directive on the control activity of the Prosecutor's Office, aimed at ensuring the exact and uniform application of the laws in the performance of the functional duties of the prosecutors and investigators. The Directive regulates the conditions, order and procedures for carrying out control activities through audits, checks and analyzes of the work of the prosecutor's offices, the National Investigation Service, as well as individual prosecutors and investigators, outside of the institutional and official verification of the legality of their acts.

**Q066 (2024):** The Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council:
- checks the organization of the initiation and movement of judicial, prosecutorial and investigative cases, as well as the closing of cases within the established terms and in case of violations, signals the administrative head of the relevant body of the judiciary and the relevant College of the Supreme Judicial Council
- sends signals, proposals and reports to other state bodies, including the competent bodies of the judiciary;
- examines applications against violation of the right to examine and resolve cases within reasonable time.
The Judges' and Prosecutors' College of the SJC:
- annually analyses and reports the degree of workload of the bodies of the judiciary;
- requests and summarizes every 6 months information from the courts and prosecutor's offices about their activity;
- resolves questions about the organization of the activity of the relevant system of judicial authorities;
- adopts rules for the allocation of cases between the judges, prosecutors and investigators who consider cases allocated according to Art. 9, para. 3, in order to equalize their total workload;
- determines the number of judicial officers according to the degree of workload on the proposal of or after agreement with the administrative heads of the bodies of the judiciary, and may open new and lays off positions.
The Plenum of the SJC:
- on the proposal of one of the Colleges, after coordination with the administrative heads of the bodies of the judiciary, determines the number of judges, prosecutors and investigators in all courts, prosecutor's offices and investigative departments according to the degree of workload;
- hears and accepts the annual reports of the bodies of the judiciary under Art. 84, item 16 of the Constitution.

**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, (3) 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.

**Q070 (2024):** Pursuant to Art. 54 of the JSA The Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) shall check the organization of administrative operation of the courts, prosecution offices and investigating authorities; 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; analyze and summarize the cases that have been closed by an effective judicial act, as well as the closed files and cases of prosecutors and investigators, by adopting a procedure for regular reporting and publishing of the results of the analysis and summarizing the closed cases; in the presence of conflicting case-law, the existence of which has been found in carrying out the activity under Art. 54 (1), item 3 of the JSA, it shall alert the competent authorities of the need to request the rendition of interpretative judgements or interpretative decrees; carry out integrity testing and examinations for conflict of interest of judges, prosecutors and investigators, 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 investigators; examine applications against an infringement of the right to have a case examined and disposed of within a reasonable time; 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; adopt a template for reporting the completion of cases within the statutory time limits when carrying out its activity under Art. 54 (1), item 2 of the JSA after consultations with the Supreme Judicial Council; summarize annually the good and bad practices regarding the observance of the ethical rules in accordance with the relevant European and international standards in connection with the abovementioned checks and shall provide the information to the Colleges of the Supreme Judicial Council. The ISJC carries out its inspections based on an annual program for the respective calendar year (planned inspections), upon signals and upon self-referral. The ISJC prepares an annual report on its activities, which is presented to the plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council and is considered by the National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria.

**Q070-1 (General Comment):** .Other: The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, pursuant to Art. 54 of the Judiciary System Act, examines the organization of the administrative duties of the courts, prosecutor's offices and investigative bodies; reviews the organization of the initiation and motions of court, prosecutor's and investigative proceedings, as well as the closure of cases within the established deadlines; analyzes and summarizes the cases that have been closed by a final court act, as well as the closed files and cases of prosecutors and investigators, adopting a procedure for regular reporting and publication of the results of the analysis and summary of the closed cases; in the event of contradictory judiciary practices, observed in the execution of work pursuant to Article 54(1)(3) of the Judiciary System Act, notifies the respective authorities to request the adoption of interpretative decisions or interpretative rulings; performs integrity and conflict of interest checks for judges, prosecutors and investigators on their property declarations, as well as on the detection of actions that violate the reputation of the judiciary and those related to the breach of the independence of judges, prosecutors and investigators; reviews applications against the hearing and settlement of cases within a reasonable timeline, prepares an annual programme for planned inspections and an annual report on its activities, submitted to the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council; adopts a model for reporting on the settlement of cases within the legal timeline in the performance of duties under Article 54, (1)(2) of the Judiciary System Act, in coordination with the Supreme Judicial Council; prepares annual summaries of good and bad practices in terms of compliance with the ethical rules in accordance with the relevant European and international standards in relation to the abovementioned checks and provides the information to the relevant Colleges of the Supreme Judicial Council.

**Q070-1 (2024):** Pursuant to Art. 54 of the JSA The Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) shall check the organization of administrative operation of the courts, prosecution offices and investigating authorities; 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; analyze and summarize the cases that have been closed by an effective judicial act, as well as the closed files and cases of prosecutors and investigators, by adopting a procedure for regular reporting and publishing of the results of the analysis and summarizing the closed cases; in the presence of conflicting case-law, the existence of which has been found in carrying out the activity under Art. 54 (1), item 3 of the JSA, it shall alert the competent authorities of the need to request the rendition of interpretative judgements or interpretative decrees; carry out integrity testing and examinations for conflict of interest of judges, prosecutors and investigators, 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 investigators; examine applications against an infringement of the right to have a case examined and disposed of within a reasonable time; 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; adopt a template for reporting the completion of cases within the statutory time limits when carrying out its activity under Art. 54 (1), item 2 of the JSA after consultations with the Supreme Judicial Council; summarize annually the good and bad practices regarding the observance of the ethical rules in accordance with the relevant European and international standards in connection with the abovementioned checks and shall provide the information to the Colleges of the Supreme Judicial Council. The ISJC carries out its inspections based on an annual program for the respective calendar year (planned inspections), upon signals and upon self-referral. The ISJC prepares an annual report on its activities, which is presented to the plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council and is considered by the National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria.

**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.

**Q072 (2024):** The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC):
One of the main powers of the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) is to "check the organization of the initiation and progress of court, prosecution, and investigation cases, as well as the completion of cases within the established time limits" (Article 54, paragraph 1, item 2 of the Judiciary System Act). In exercising this power, the ISJC monitors for delays in the course of the relevant proceedings, which is done within the framework of the inspections carried out on the judicial authorities (comprehensive planned/scheduled inspections or inspections based on reports/signals) or when conducting preliminary investigations into reports/signals from individuals or legal entities of violations in the handling of cases. This year, the ISJC is responding to the questionnaire for the first time, as it has not been sent to it before. In previous years, the SJC probably gave a negative answer to this question in view of its own powers, rather than those exercised by the ISJC, which is an independent body separate from the SJC.

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** NAP- There are no defined purposes.

**Q083-3-1 (2022):** But there is a quantitative evaluation of the work of a prosecutor which reflects in the individual assessment`- please see Q 120

**Q120 (General Comment):** Supreme Judicial Council: Criteria on which the assessment is based: the criteria are general (relevant to the activity of each judge, prosecutor, and investigator); specific (relevant only to the position held – judge, prosecutor, or investigator), and additional (relevant only to administrative heads and their deputies).
Authority competent to carry out the assessment: the assessment is accepted by the Prosecutor's College of the Supreme Judicial Council.
Purposes for which the evaluation results are used: when participating in a competition for promotion or transfer in position; when participating in a procedure for the selection of an administrative head; for appointment to the position of deputy of the administrative head; on promotion to a higher rank; on secondment; for participation in the composition of a Permanent Appraisals Commission to the Appellate Prosecutor's Offices; participation in a competition committee.
Prosecutor's Office of RB: Such a system exists. According to Art. 196 of the Judicial System Act the evaluation is carried out in advance, in order to acquire irreplaceability, periodic and extraordinary attestation of the magistrates, and the criteria for the same are defined in Art. 198 of the Judicial System Act: legal knowledge and skills; ability to analyze legally relevant facts; ability to optimally organize work; expediency and discipline; compliance with the rules of ethical conduct. Attestation also takes into account the following indicators: compliance with deadlines; number of confirmed and canceled acts and the reasons for this; the results of the inspections of the Inspectorate at the Supreme Judicial Council; the overall workload of the relevant judicial authority, as well as the workload of the assessed judge, prosecutor or investigator compared to other judges, prosecutors or investigators from the same judicial authority.

**Q120-1 (General Comment):** Quantitative evaluation of the work of the prosecutors is carried out by applying the Rules for measuring the workload of the prosecutor's offices and the individual workload of each prosecutor and investigator, adopted by the Prosecution College/collegium of the SJC. It is possible to display the data according to the indicators provided for in the Rules in real time, both for the prosecutor's office as a whole, as well as for individual prosecutor's offices and for each specific prosecutor.
Quantitative data on the workload are taken into account in the appraisal procedure of a specific prosecutor, in the course of which an assessment of his work is carried out, both in terms of quantitative indicators and also regarding the quality of the performed activity according to the results achieved.
Prosecutors are assessed in accordance with Ordinance No. 3 of February 23, 2017 of the Supreme Judicial Council on the indicators and Methodology for Assessment and the Criteria for Reporting the Workload Degree of Prosecutors and Investigators and of Administrative Heads and Their Deputies (promulgated SG No. 21 /10.03.2017).
Attestation is carried out:
1. in advance - for a three-year period from the appointment to the position of prosecutor or investigator - when participating in a competition or when being offered a promotion;
2. to acquire irreplaceability - upon completion of 5 years of experience as a prosecutor or investigator;
3. periodically - for a 5-year period from the attestation of irreplaceability of a prosecutor and investigator, of an administrative head and of a deputy administrative head;
4. extraordinary - in the cases under Art. 197, para. 5 of the Judicial System Act.
Junior prosecutors and junior investigators are not assessed in advance, and a report on their work is prepared by the mentor in the second year of their appointment.

**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 (2024):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22), 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, 21/22), 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 Head State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia.

**Q066 (2023):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22), 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, 21/22), 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 (2022):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22), 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 with the prior opinion 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, 21/22), 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

**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.

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

**Q083 (2020):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18) , the Minister in charge for Justice, upon the proposal of the General Assembley of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, adopts the Framework criteria for the work of judges.
**Q083-1 (General Comment):** According to the Courts Act, the Minister of Justice, upon the proposal of the General Session of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, adopts the Framework criteria for the workload of judges.

**Q083-1-1 (2024):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22) , the president of the court where a judge performs judicial duties issues a decision each calendar year assessing whether the judge has fulfilled their duties based on prescribed criteria. If it is determined that the judge, without justified reason, did not meet the required number of decisions or performed duties improperly, disciplinary proceedings must be initiated in accordance with the State Judicial Council Act.
Disciplinary action against a court president is initiated by the president of the higher court. Sanctions for disciplinary offences may include a rebuke, salary reduction (up to one third for up to 12 months), or dismissal.
If justified reasons exist for underperformance, they must be explained and the decision forwarded to the higher court. Judges may object to such a decision within three days; the court president must respond within eight days. If the objection is rejected, the judge may appeal to the higher court, whose decision is final and not subject to further legal remedies.

**Q083-1-1 (2023):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22) the president of the court in which the judge performs judicial duty determines by decision for the previous calendar year whether the judge has fulfilled his duties as a judge according to the prescribed criteria. If the president of the court determines that the judge, without justifiable reason, did not make the number of decisions determined by the Framework Criteria for the work of judges in a one-year period or that he performed his judicial duties improperly, he is obliged to initiate disciplinary proceedings against such a judge, in accordance with the State Judicial Council Act. Disciplinary proceedings against the president of the court are initiated by the president of the immediately higher court. According to the State Judicial Council Act (Official Gazette No. 116/10, 57/11, 130/11, 13/13, 28/13, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) disciplinary penalties may be imposed for committed disciplinary offences: rebuke, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of one to three months, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of four to six months, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of seven to twelve months or dismissal from duty. If the president of the court determines that, due to justified reasons, the judge did not make the number of decisions determined by the Framework Criteria for the work of judges in a one-year period, he is obliged to state in the explanation of the decision what justified reasons are in question and submit the decision immediately to the president of the higher court. Against the decision of the president of the court, which determines whether the judge has fulfilled his duties as a judge, the judge can submit an objection to the president of the court within three days of receiving the decision. The president of the court is obliged to decide on the objection within eight days. The president of the court can reject the complaint or accept it and make a new decision. If the objection is rejected, the judge has the right to appeal to the president of the immediately higher court within eight days from the delivery of the decision on the objection. The president of the immediately higher court can make a decision confirming the decision of the president of the court or accept the appeal and make a new decision. Against this decision, the judge has no right to declare legal remedies.

**Q083-1-1 (2022):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22) the president of the court in which the judge performs judicial duty determines by decision for the previous calendar year whether the judge has fulfilled his duties as a judge according to the prescribed criteria. If the president of the court determines that the judge, without justifiable reason, did not make the number of decisions determined by the Framework Criteria for the work of judges in a one-year period or that he performed his judicial duties improperly, he is obliged to initiate disciplinary proceedings against such a judge, in accordance with the State Judicial Council Act. Disciplinary proceedings against the president of the court are initiated by the president of the immediately higher court. According to the State Judicial Council Act (Official Gazette No. 116/10, 57/11, 130/11, 13/13, 28/13, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) disciplinary penalties may be imposed for committed disciplinary offences: rebuke, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of one to three months, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of four to six months, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of seven to twelve months or dismissal from duty. If the president of the court determines that, due to justified reasons, the judge did not make the number of decisions determined by the Framework Criteria for the work of judges in a one-year period, he is obliged to state in the explanation of the decision what justified reasons are in question and submit the decision immediately to the president of the higher court.
Against the decision of the president of the court, which determines whether the judge has fulfilled his duties as a judge, the judge can submit an objection to the president of the court within three days of receiving the decision.
The president of the court is obliged to decide on the objection within eight days. The president of the court can reject the complaint or accept it and make a new decision.
If the objection is rejected, the judge has the right to appeal to the president of the immediately higher court within eight days from the delivery of the decision on the objection. The president of the immediately higher court can make a decision confirming the decision of the president of the court or accept the appeal and make a new decision. Against this decision, the judge has no right to declare legal remedies.

**Q083-3 (2022):** According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18, 21/22) , the Minister in charge for Justice, with the prior opinion 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.
**Q083-3-1 (2024):** According to the State Attorney Council Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) if the number of resolved cases and actions taken in a one-year period is, without justifiable reason, less than 80% of the average of the state attorney's office in which he holds office, Deputy state attorney is disciplinary liable for disciplinary offence of irregular performance of duty.

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** According to the State Attorney Council Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) if the number of resolved cases and actions taken in a one-year period is, without justifiable reason, less than 80% of the average of the state attorney's office in which he holds office, Deputy state attorney is disciplinary liable for disciplinary offence of irregular performance of duty.

**Q083-3-1 (2022):** According to the State Attorney Council Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) if the number of resolved cases and actions taken in a one-year period is, without justifiable reason, less than 80% of the average of the state attorney's office in which he holds office, Deputy state attorney is disciplinary liable for disciplinary offence of irregular performance of duty.

**Q120 (2024):** State attorneys and deputy state attorneys are evaluated according to the following criteria:
1. achieved results in resolving cases based on the number of cases assigned to work based on the Framework Criteria for the Work of Deputy State Attorneys and the average work results of county and municipal state attorneys' offices for the previous three-year period
2. quality of decisions and justified use of legal remedies
3. proper performance of state attorney duties - compliance with deadlines during the procedure
4. other activities of the state attorney and deputy state attorney
5. experience in performing state attorney duties
6. compliance with the Code of Ethics for State Attorneys and Deputy State Attorneys.

According to the above criteria, the state attorney and deputy state attorney can achieve a maximum of 150 points, whereby a maximum of 60 points can be achieved for the criteria stated in points 1 and 2, a maximum of 10 points for the criteria stated in points 3 and 4, and a maximum of five points for the criteria stated in points 5 and 6.
The grades for the performance of the duties of the State Attorney and Deputy State Attorney are:
1. excellent performance of the duties: 130 - 150 points
2. very successful performance of the duties: 110 - 129 points
3. successful performance of the duties: 90 - 109 points
4. satisfactory performance of the duties: 70 - 89 points
5. unsatisfactory performance of the duties: less than 70 points.

The Deputy State Attorney is evaluated by the State Attorney, and the State Attorney is evaluated by the immediately superior State Attorney.
The assessment must be reasoned. The state attorney and deputy state attorney who disagrees with the assessment have the right to file a complaint with the State Attorney Council.
The assessment of the performance of the duties of a state attorney is taken into account in the procedures for the promotion and permanent transfer of deputy state attorneys and in the procedure for the appointment of state attorneys.
To be appointed to the position of Deputy State Attorney in a higher state attorney's office, the Deputy State Attorney must be assessed at least with the grade "successfully performs his duties" in the last evaluation before appointment.

**Q120 (2023):** According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette, No. 67/18, 21/22), 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.

**Q120 (2022):** According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette, No. 67/18, 21/22), 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.

**Q120-1 (2024):** The State Attorney and the Deputy State Attorney are evaluated every three years. If the Deputy State Attorney is a candidate in the procedure for appointment to a senior State Attorney's office or for State Attorney, the State Attorney will evaluate him/her on the basis of his/her previous work, even if three years have not passed since the date of appointment. This evaluation serves only for the purposes of the specific appointment procedure.

**Cyprus**

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

**Q066 (2024):** 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

**Q070 (2023):** the costs of the judicial procedings and the appeal ratio are now being monitored

**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**

**Q083 (General Comment):** Quantitative performance targets exist but they are not strictly binding. The Ministry of Justice in the Czech Republic uses "measures" (měřítka) as the sole numerical indicators for allocating judge and support staff positions across courts on an annual basis. Functioning similarly to case weights, these measures represent the notional number of cases that a judge or support staff member should handle in a year on a full-time basis; for example, in 2024, each district court judge is expected to manage 352 civil cases or 230 criminal cases annually. The measures are updated or confirmed each year by the systemisation commission, an informal body of representatives from regional, superior, and supreme court management, along with the Ministry of Justice. They are published in documents that accompany the Minister of Justice's annual allocation decision.
Universal across courts of the same level, these measures and historical case data guide the Ministry in distributing judge and staff positions among superior, regional, and district courts. Regional court presidents have the flexibility to adjust these allocations based on local conditions or specific court needs, while staffing for the Supreme Court and Supreme Administrative Court is managed through direct arrangements between their respective presidents and the Minister of Justice.
To improve the accuracy of these allocations, the Ministry of Justice is undertaking a project, supported by the European Commission’s Technical Support Instrument, to gather empirical data on the labour intensity of various tasks performed by judges and support staff. This project aims to strengthen the factual basis for determining the measures.
Additionally, court presidents continuously monitor the performance of judges and support staff to ensure cases are processed within reasonable timeframes, upholding individuals' right to have cases heard promptly. However, the Ministry of Justice does not regulate or oversee this managerial and disciplinary authority, which is independently exercised by court management.

**Q083 (2018):** Quantitative performance targets exist but they are not strictly binding.

**Q120 (2024):** The Head of Public Prosecutor's Office monitors e.g. the number of appeals, the number of returnig cases etc.

**Q120 (2023):** The Head of Public Prosecutor's Office monitors e.g. the number of appeals, the number of returnig cases etc.

**Q120 (2022):** The Head of Public Prosecutor's Office monitors e.g. the number of appeals, the number of returnig cases etc.

**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.

**Q070 (2024):** We collect data on the following, but we do not monitor the courts with this data. We share it with the courts for guidance or The Ministry of Justice, but we do not have mandate to regulate the courts based on this data. The Ministry of Justice do not have mandate to monitor and regulate the courts either. We monitor both "satisfaction of the court staff" and "appeal ratio". The reason for the change from previous years is not that it hasn't been monitored, but that there has been a different interpretation of the question previously in regards to the use of "monitor". We do collect the data however we cannot use the data to force action upon the courts.

**Q070 (2023):** We collect data on the following, but we do not monitor the courts with this data. We share it with the courts for guidance or The Ministry of Justice, but we do not have mandate to regulate the courts based on this data. The Ministry of Justice do not have mandate to monitor and regulate the courts either. We monitor both "satisfaction of the court staff" and "appeal ratio". The reason for the change from previous years is not that it hasn't been monitored, but that there has been a different interpretation of the question previously in regards to the use of "monitor". We do collect the data however we cannot use the data to force action upon the courts.

**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.

**Q070-1 (2024):** Length of procedure: If what is meant is how long from charge to indictment, then that is something we measure and it is not a new procedure.
Cost of judicial procedure: We have changed the answer compared to the previous evaluation cycle. Clearance rate: We monitor both the number of pending charges without indictment and pending charges without decision and can thereby calculate the difference and have been able to do so not just this year, so this is not a new procedure either.

**Q070-1 (2023):** Length of procedure: If what is meant is how long from charge to indictment, then that is something we measure and it is not a new procedure.
Cost of judicial procedure: We have changed the answer compared to the previous evaluation cycle. Clearance rate: We monitor both the number of pending charges without indictment and pending charges without decision and can thereby calculate the difference and have been able to do so not just this year, so this is not a new procedure either.

**Q070-1 (2022):** - The prosecution makes monthly 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.
- The prosecution makes an biannual survey on the satisfaction of the prosecution staff.

**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 (2024):** We monitor all three options regarding pending cases and have been previously as well. The reason for the change is due to a new understanding of the question in regards to the use of the word "monitor". We now understand it as we collect the data, however we cannot force action upon the courts based on this data.

**Q071 (2023):** We monitor all three options regarding pending cases and have been previously as well. The reason for the change is due to a new understanding of the question in regards to the use of the word "monitor". We now understand it as we collect the data, however we cannot force action upon the courts based on this data.

**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 (2024):** We do collect data on the waiting time from the case is recieved in the system until the first court meeting and then until the case is finalized. But we do not use the data for monitoring the courts in regards to regulating the courts. The data is used for analysis among other things. The courts might individually keep track of the waiting time.

**Q072 (2023):** We do collect data on the waiting time from the case is recieved in the system until the first court meeting and then until the case is finalized. But we do not use the data for monitoring the courts in regards to regulating the courts. The data is used for analysis among other things. The courts might individually keep track of the waiting time.

**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
**Q083 (General Comment):** Judges are independent. Therefore measuring is done focusing on case-flows and economic indicators without identifying the individual judge.
**Q083 (2022):** The judges are independent. Therefore measuring is done focusing on case-flows and economic indicators.

**Q083 (2018):** There are no such targets from the side of Danish Court administration, but quantitative performances are used to re-allocate ressources so the court in most need of ressources in case of a vacant judge position also gets the vacant position.
**Q083-1 (General Comment):** Judges are independent. Therefore measuring is done focusing on case-flows and economic indicators.
**Q083-1 (2018):** NA as per answer 083.

**Q083-1-1 (2023):** The Danish judges have absolute independance.

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

**Q120 (General Comment):** Prosecutors are continuously evaluated by their immediate manager, i.a. at the annual employee development interviews, where the manager evaluates the employee's performance in the current position as well as the employee's development goals for the coming year.
In the first 6 months of employment prosecutors have a targeted onboarding program. This also includes feedback and evaluation of the individual prosecutor.
Furthermore prosecutors go through targeted basic training in the first three years of employment, which ends with an exam and assessment. They are also assigned a mentor, who is a professional sparring partner for the prosecutor and provides professional feedback on the prosecutor's performance and legal work.

**Q120 (2024):** The evaluation takes place continuously during the basic training and rotation period but is conducted for all prosecutors, including in connection with performance appraisals (MUS interviews), one-on-one meetings, and similar sessions.The topics may include the following: well-being, motivation, efficiency in task execution, holistic perspective etc.

**Q120 (2023):** Prosecutors are continuously evaluated by their immediate manager, i.a. at the annual employee development interviews, where the manager evaluates the employee's performance in the current position as well as the employee's development goals for the coming year.
In the first 6 months of employment prosecutors have a targeted onboarding program. This also includes feedback and evaluation of the individual prosecutor. Furthermore prosecutors go through targeted basic training in the first three years of employment, which ends with an exam and assessment. They are also assigned a mentor, who is a professional sparring partner for the prosecutor and provides professional feedback on the prosecutor's performance and legal work.

**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):** Prosecutors are continuously evaluated by their immediate manager, i.a. at the annual employee development interviews, where the manager evaluates the employee's performance in the current position as well as the employee's development goals for the coming year.
In the first 6 months of employment prosecutors have a targeted onboarding program. This also includes feedback and evaluation of the individual prosecutor.
Furthermore prosecutors go through targeted basic training in the first three years of employment, which ends with an exam and assessment. They are also assigned a mentor, who is a professional sparring partner for the prosecutor and provides professional feedback on the prosecutor's performance and legal work.

**Q120-1 (2024):** The evaluation takes place continuously during the basic training and rotation period but is conducted for all prosecutors, including in connection with performance appraisals (MUS interviews), one-on-one meetings, and similar sessions.The topics may include the following: well-being, motivation, efficiency in task execution, holistic perspective etc.

**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.

**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 (2023):** There are no "other" in 2023. In general MoJ has not been regulary monitoring as it did before.

**Q070 (2017):** See previous general comments.

**Q070 (2016):** see general comments

**Q072 (General Comment):** There are reminders in the CMS after certain period.

**Finland**

**Q066 (General Comment):** There are no quality standards covering the whole judiciary in Finland. Instead there are several quality projects going on, for example the Quality Project of the Administrative Courts, which started in 2020 and concerns all administrative courts in Finland. The Rovaniemi Court of Appeal Quality Projects have produced quality benchmarks, which evaluate the quality of the adjudication in courts of law. Last assessment was conducted in 2020.
The speed and consistency of prosecutors' work are monitored through statistics and by their supervisors. Additionally, special quality work is carried out, which defines quality matters.

**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.

**Q067 (General Comment):** Nationwide and departmental working groups formed for prosecutors evaluate and set quality standards.
**Q067 (2023):** Nationwide and departmental working groups formed for prosecutors evaluate and set quality standards.

**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

**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.

**Q083 (General Comment):** A court can decide whether it sets quantitative performance targets for each judge. There are targets set for each judge in some courts.
**Q083 (2016):** It is up to each court to decide. In some courts there are targets set for each judge.

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** The National Courts Administration negotiates annually with each court in order to set targets and objectives for the court for the next year. An allocation of permanent staff and possible additional temporary judges or other staff is decided upon these negotiations but within the state budget. Timeframe (length of proceedings) targets are also set. Possible issues and problems with developing the activities of the court are also discussed. Finally, the appropriation to cover the annual costs of the court operations is agreed. A minutes of the negotiation is written and it includes the targets, objectives and estimated workloads for the court for the next year. The chief justices of the courts can then apply this results-based management system in their respective courts as they see appropriate.

**Q083-1-1 (General Comment):** See general comments to Q 83-1

**Q083-3-1 (General Comment):** Prosecutors have quantitave targets (management of the prosecutors service). There will not be disciplinary consequences for the prosecutor. The superior of the prosecutor and the prosecutor can discuss about the targets and the amount of pending cases.
**Q083-3-1 (2023):** Prosecutors have quantitave targets (management of the prosecutors service). There will not be disciplinary consequences for the prosecutor. The superior of the prosecutor and the prosecutor can discuss about the targets and the amount of pending cases.

**France**

**Q066 (General Comment):** Concerning the civil and criminal justice:
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.

As part of the rollout of the national "Public Services +" program (an interministerial program for the continuous improvement of public services aimed at offering users services that are closer, simpler, and more efficient), particular efforts are being made to monitor timelines for civil cases resolved in less than 12 months. This is part of a broader program that improves the quality of reception, information, and communication with litigants. The various SP+ commitments are subject to specific quality management processes, and their effects are partly assessed through annual satisfaction surveys conducted in the courts. Furthermore, good initiatives from the Ministry of Justice services and civil and criminal courts are cataloged and classified to be shared and replicated. Across the country, the creativity of staff members contributes to improving the quality of service provided to litigants. Because these best practices should benefit the largest number, they are now incorporated into a searchable database accessible to all agents. This allows field actors to find sources of inspiration and tools to develop new systems to improve our justice system. It also allows these same actors to share with everyone a best practice they have implemented. The tools necessary for their deployment are also made available, and reviews of certain practices have been conducted since 2024 to assess their implementation and impact on beneficiaries.
As regards administrative justice: following an experimental phase, the drafting of litigious decisions in direct style within the administrative courts was generalised, as of January 1, 2019, through a joint note from the President of the Litigation Section and the President of the Administrative Courts Inspection Mission. In this regard, a vade-mecum on drafting decisions by the administrative courts was developed by a working group chaired by President Stirn and distributed.
The framework letters sent to each court by the General Secretariat of the Council of State reiterate the general objectives outlined in the documents accompanying the finance law regarding promptness and quality: target average judgment deadlines, proportion of cases older than 24 months (which should not exceed 8.5% of the overall caseload across all courts and 4.5% for administrative appeal courts), and the rate of annulment or modification of judgments by the courts or of decisions by the Council of state not exceeding 15%.

**Q066 (2023):** Following an experimental phase, the direct style of drafting of decisions in litigious matters rendered within the administrative court has been generalized, as of January 1, 2019, by a joint note from the president of the Litigation Section and the president of the Inspection Mission of the Administrative Courts. With this in mind, a vade-mecum on the drafting of decisions of the administrative court had been drawn up by a working group chaired by President Stirn and distributed.
The framework letters sent to each court by the General Secretariat of the Council of State recall the general objectives set out in the documents accompanying the Finance Act in terms of speed and quality: target average delivery time, proportion of cases of more than 24 months (must not exceed 8.5% of the overall backlog of all courts and 4.5% of the overall backlog for administrative courts of appeal) and rate of annulment-reversal of judgments of the tribunals by the courts or judgments of the courts by the judge of cassation not exceeding 15%.

**Q066 (2022):** Recently, at the initiative of the Minister of Justice, good practices from the different departments of the ministry of Justice and courts have been listed and classified so that they could be shared and replicated. Across the country, the creativity of staff is helping to improve the quality of service provided to litigants. Because these best practices should be of benefit to as many people as possible, they are now included in a search tool accessible to all staff. For those working in the field, the aim is to provide a source of inspiration and tools for developing new systems to improve the justice system. It is also a way for them to share the best practices they have implemented. The tools needed for their deployment are also made available to them.

**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 (General Comment):** Concerning administrative justice:
There are no specialised personnel specifically responsible for implementing these quality standards, but there is a monitoring responsibility within the competence of the chamber presidents and heads of courts. Concerning civil and criminal justice: with regard to the quality standards of the Public Services + program, each court has a local contact responsible for deploying SP+ on the ground. The Department of Expertise and Modernization of the Ministry's General Secretariat is responsible for coordinating the network of local contacts.

**Q067 (2023):** Strictly speaking, there are no specialised staff responsible for the implementation of these quality standards, but a monitoring responsibility for the presidents of chambers and heads of courts.

**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.

**Q070 (2024):** Administrative justice: source: Council of State
In the case of administrative courts, there is no monitoring of user satisfaction or the cost of judicial procedures.
- Activity monitoring indicators by subject matter, types of judgment formation (panel, summary proceedings, single judge, orders)
- Indicator for monitoring the number of cases resolved per judge and decision support
Social barometers were conducted in 2017, 2021, and 2023, based on a questionnaire addressed to staff and judges (working conditions, etc.).
The additional responses compared to the last CEPEJ campaign do not correspond to new developments.
Civil and criminal justice: source: DSJ
there is no monitoring of user satisfaction or the cost of judicial procedures.

**Q070 (2023):** Indicators for monitoring activity by matters, types of judicial formation (collegial, summary proceedings, single judge, orders)
Indicator for monitoring the number of cases resolved by a judge and decision-making support
* Social barometers were carried out in 2017, 2021 and 2023.
The additional answers compared to last year do not imply innovations

**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.

**Q070-1 (2024):** Civil and criminal courts: source: DSJ
There is no regular monitoring of the activities of public prosecutor services for the satisfaction of public prosecutor staff and for the costs of legal proceedings.

**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 (2024):** Administrative justice : source: Council of state
The mechanism for monitoring waiting time during court proceedings exists only for administrative courts (source: Council of State). The Skipper software allows one to see the status of the case and whether an investigative measure is pending. However, it does not send an alert to the investigating judge.

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

**Q072 (2020):** Answer for the court.

**Q083 (2024):** For civil and criminal courts the reply is "No". For administrative courts the reply is "Yes".

**Q083 (2022):** The positive reply concerns administrative courts.

**Q083 (2016):** Individual quantitative objectives are established only with regard to administrative judges by the respective court president.

**Q083-1 (2024):** Civil and criminal courts, the reply is NAP. For administrative courts, it is the court president. No quantitative objective per judge is defined at the national level. The General Secretariat of the Council of State sets an overall objective per court, in consultation with the court president. Court presidents can set quantitative performance objectives per judge: number of cases per year, priority to the oldest cases.

**Q083-1 (2023):** No quantitative objective is defined per judge at the national level. For administrative courts, the General Secretariat of the Council of State, in consultation with the head of court, sets an overall objective for each court.
The heads of jurisdiction can set quantitative performance objectives per judge: number of cases per year, priority to the oldest cases.

**Q083-1-1 (2023):** The individual part of the administrative judges' function allowance (there is also a functional part that depends on the responsibilities, the level of experience and the constraints relating to the functions performed), which takes into account the results obtained and the way of serving, may be adjusted if the objectives, qualitative and in particular quantitative, are not met.
During the previous collection, all items had been checked. In reality, rather than disciplinary proceedings, proceedings for professional inadequacy would be initiated.
In civil and criminal justice, on the other hand, there are no defined targets.

**Q083-2 (2021):** source DSJ

**Q120 (2022):** The assessment of public prosecutors provided for by statutory ordinance No. 58-1270 of 22 December 1958 aims to determine the professional value of the magistrate. It must reflect his/her legal and technical professional skills, his/her level of commitment, assess his/her abilities to exercise a specific function and identify training needs within his/her career path. The assessment is made by the Attorney general at the Court of appeal or the public prosecutor at the High Court of appeal for prosecutors in their jurisdiction. Considered as a moment for exchange, this evaluation should highlight both the skills that were mobilized by the prosecutor and areas where improvement could be made. It contributes to better situate his/her activity within the service organization and operation while specifying the missions related to his/her duties by highlighting his/her professional potential.

For prosecutors, the evaluation offers a privileged opportunity to take stock of their activities, consider developments in their professional practice and regularly position themselves relative to their career goals. For evaluators it should enable them detect each individual's potential so as contribute towards efficient human resource management.

**Q120 (2021):** source DSJ

**Q120-1 (2022):** Article 12-1 of the ordinance of December 22, 1958 establishes the principle of evaluating the professional activity of each judge/prosecutor every two years. An evaluation must also be conducted when applying for promotion.

**Q120-1 (2021):** source DSJ

**Germany**

**Q066 (2024):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Q066 (2023):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Q066 (2022):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Q067 (2024):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Q067 (2023):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Q067 (2022):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**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.

**Q070 (General Comment):** The Federal Statistical Office collects key figures on court performance (incoming cases, resolved cases, pending cases on the beginning and the end of a year) from the federal states. The Federal Statistical Office processes and publishes the data once per year for the civil, criminal, family, administrative, labour, social and financial courts.

**Q070 (2024):** All feredal states reported monitoring regarding number of incoming, resolved and pending cases as well as lenght of proceedings, number of appeals and disposition time.
2 federal states reported monitoring productivity of judges and court staff.

**Q070 (2023):** The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all respondent federal states and the activities no. 5 and 9-13 were selected by the majority of the federal states.
A minority of the federal states reported the following "other" monitoring activities: statistics on the nature of resolution (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.), number of main-trial days, participation of interpreters and experts.

**Q070 (2022):** The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all respondent federal statesa and the activities no. 5 and 9-13 were selcted by the majority of the federal states.
A minority of the federal states (as in previous years) reported the following "other" monitoring activities: statistics on the nature of resolution (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.), number of main-trial days, participation of interpreters and experts. (While the situation has not changed since the last cycle, the option "other" was not selected this time for the purpose of methodological consistency with the answers to other questions in this section).
One federal state has not yet replied.

**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.).

**Q070-1 (General Comment):** The Federal Statistical Office collects key figures on the public prosecution offices' performance (incoming cases, resolved cases, pending cases on the beginning and the end of a year) from the federal states and publishes the data once per year.

**Q070-1 (2024):** All feredal states reported monitoring regarding number of incoming, resolved and pending cases as well as lenght of proceedings and disposition time.
4 federal states reported monitornig costs of the judicial procedures and 2 reported monitoring productivity of prosecutors and prosecution staff.

**Q070-1 (2023):** The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all respondent federal states and the activities and 5 and 10 to 12 were selected by the majority of the federal states. A minority of the federal states also monitors the costs of the judicial proceedings

**Q070-1 (2022):** The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all respondent federal states and the activitiers and 5 and 10 to 12 were selected by the majority of the federal states. A minority of the federal states also monitors the costs of the judicial proceedings.
One federal state has not yet replied.

**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 (2024):** The majority of the respondent federal states monitor pending cases and backlogs.

**Q071 (2023):** The majority of the respondent federal states monitor pending cases and backlogs.

**Q071 (2022):** The majority of the respondent federal states monitor pending cases and backlogs. Two federal states could not provide an answer, one federal state has not yet replied.
**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 (2024):** One federal state monitors waiting time with respect to the ordinary courts. A minority of 2 federal states monitor waiting time with regard to the public prosecution services. The vast majority of the federal states does not monitor waiting time.

**Q072 (2023):** One federal state monitors waiting time with respect to the ordinary courts. A minority of 2 federal states monitor waiting time with regard to the public prosecution services. The vast majority of the federal states does not monitor waiting time.
**Q072 (2022):** One federal state monitors waiting time with respect to the ordinary courts. A minority of 3 federal states monitor waiting time with regard to the public prosecution services. The vast majority of the federal states does not monitor waiting time.

**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".

**Q083 (General Comment):** There are no quantitative performance targets because this might interfere with judicial independence as defined by article 97 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany ("Judges shall be independent and subject only to the law.").
**Q083 (2024):** Of the respondent federal states, all but one reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for judges.
**Q083 (2023):** Of the respondent federal states, all but one reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for judges.
**Q083 (2022):** Of the respondent 15 federal states, 14 reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for judges. One federal state has not yet replied.

**Q083-1 (2024):** One federal state reported, that quantitative performance targets can be defined based on the system used to determine staffing requirements of the judiciary.
**Q083-1 (2023):** One federal state reported, that quantitative performance targets can be defined based on the system used to determine staffing requirements of the judiciary.
**Q083-1 (2020):** There are no quantitative performance targets for each judge

**Q083-1-1 (2024):** One federal state selected "reflected in the individual assessment" and "warning by the court's president".

**Q083-1-1 (2023):** One federal state selected "reflected in the individual assessment" and "warning by the court's president".

**Q083-2 (2024):** Of the respondent federal states, all but one reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for public prosecutors.
**Q083-2 (2023):** Of the respondent federal states, all but one reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for public prosecutors
**Q083-2 (2022):** Out of 15 respondent federal states, 14 reported that there are no quantitative performane targets for public prosecutors. One federal state has not yet replied.
**Q083-2 (2021):** The vast majority of the Länder selected "no", 2 of the Länder answered "yes".

**Q083-3 (2024):** One federal state reported, that quantitative performance targets can be defined based on the system used to determine staffing requirements of the judiciary.
**Q083-3 (2023):** One federal state reported, that quantitative performance targets can be defined based on the system used to determine staffing requirements of the judiciary.
**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

**Q083-3-1 (2024):** One federal state selected "reflected in the individual assessment" and "warning by head of prosecution".

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** One federal state selected "reflected in the individual assessment" and "warning by head of prosecution".

**Q120 (2024):** Of the respondent federal states, 13 reported that there is a quantitative evaluation of the public prosecutors' work and 14 reported that there is a qualitative evaluation.
The assessment is generally carried out by the direct superior and is based on different criteria such as specialised knowledge, expression, cooperation, leadership skills, negotiating skills, etc. The results are mostly used for decisions about promotions

**Q120 (2023):** Of the respondent federal states, 14 reported that there is a quantitative evaluation of the public prosecutors' work and 15 reported that there is a qualitative evaluation.
The assessment is generally carried out by the direct superior and is based on different criteria such as specialised knowledge, expression, cooperation, leadership skills, negotiating skills, etc. The results are mostly used for decisions about promotions.

**Q120 (2022):** Out of 15 respondent federal states, 12 reported that there is a quantitative evaluation of the public prosecutors' work and 12 reported that there is a qualitative evaluation (one federal state has not yet replied).
The assessment is generally carried out by the direct superior and is based on different criteria such as specialised knowledge, expression, cooperation, leadership skills, negotiating skills, etc. The results are mostly used for decisions about promotions.

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

**Q120-1 (2024):** Assessment intervals vary among the federal states. Assments are generally more frequent at the beginning of the career (approx. every 6 to 9 months) and become less frequent over time (approx. every year to every 5 years). Additionally, occasion-related assessments may be performed in case of promotions or applications for new positions.

**Q120-1 (2023):** Assessment intervals vary among the federal states. Assments are generally more frequent at the beginning of the career (approx. every 6 to 9 months) and become less frequent over time (approx. every year to every 5 years). Additionally, occasion-related assessments may be performed in case of promotions or applications for new positions.

**Greece**

**Q066 (General Comment):** Law 4938/2022, article 102 par.4 subsection, includes among other evaluation elements the quality of the judges' work with the additional consideration of any successful appeal or cassation against their decisions. The inspector examines, among other things, the quality of their work, i.e. the processing of the legal and factual part of each case and takes into account the cassation or appeal of the decisions drawn up by the inspectors upon admission of the respective legal remedy during the inspected period as well as the wording of the judicial decisions. Article 104 refers to plenary of the Supreme Courts issuing directions in conjunction with Article 102 which refers to assessment criteria. From the combination of articles 104 and 102 and 100, 101, 102, 104 of Law 4938/22, the following innovations regarding the inspection system result: a) the drafting of an evaluation report on the operation of each court and prosecutor's office (not foreseen before) b) the drafting of an evaluation report of the directors, the courts and the prosecutor's offices (not foreseen before) c) the drafting of an evaluation report of the presidents and the presiding departments and judicial formations of each court and prosecutor's office d) for the inspection of the judges, they take into account the available statistical data.
The two-year term of the inspectors is expected to significantly upgrade the evaluation system, because it will provide the possibility of controlling the judicial work over a longer period of time, especially for the crowded judicial formations.
There is a system for inspecting the quantitative and qualitative performance of judicial officials (law 4938/2022) and decisions of the Administrative Plenary of the Council of State regarding the framework of instructions, practices and guidelines for the evaluation of the Council of State's Associate Councillors and Rapporteurs, as well as judges of the administrative courts. A Charter of Ethics for judges of the Council of State has also been approved. ( Council of State).
With the 19/2023 decision of the Council of State in Plenary and the Council, a framework of guidelines, instructions and practices for the inspection of ordinary administrative courts, their directors and other judges was formulated on the basis of article 104 of the Code of the Organization of Courts (Law 4938/22). {General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts}.
Decision 7/23 of Areios Pagos in Plenary and the Council.

**Q066 (2024):** -With the 19/2023 decision of the Council of State in Plenary and the Council, a framework of guidelines, instructions and practices for the inspection of ordinary administrative courts, their head of administration and other judges was formulated on the basis of article 104 of the Code of the Organization of Courts (Law 4938/22).
-The Plenary Session of the Council of State has issued guidelines to the judges serving in it for the better drafting of decisions. Specifically, for the rapporteurs, it has provided concrete recommendations on how to write their reports. Moreover, the Plenary Session has approved a document analyzing the elements taken into account when evaluating the judges.

**Q066 (2023):** There is a system for inspecting the quantitative and qualitative performance of judicial officials (law 4938/2022) and decisions of the Administrative Plenary of the Council of State regarding the framework of instructions, practices and guidelines for the evaluation of the Council of State's Associate Councillors and Rapporteurs, as well as judges of the administrative courts. A Charter of Ethics for judges of the Council of State has also been approved. ( Council of State).
With the 19/2023 decision of the Council of State in Plenary and the Council, a framework of guidelines, instructions and practices for the inspection of ordinary administrative courts, their directors and other judges was formulated on the basis of article 104 of the Code of the Organization of Courts (Law 4938/22). {General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts}.
Decision 7/23 of Areios Pagos in Plenary and the Council.
-Article 104 of the Code of the Organization of Courts (Law 4938/22).

**Q066 (2022):** According to Law 4938/2022 (art.104) of the organization of court and tribunals code.

**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 (2023):** The Inspectors of the courts receive for the first time instructions from the Plenaries of the courts, specific directions for the operation of the courts and the evaluation of the supervisors, statistical data are used and specially reasoned reports are drawn up. The new way of evaluation has been systematized and good practices are reported.

**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.
**Q070 (General Comment):** According to Law 4938/2022 (art. 99-104), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for two 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.
**Q070 (2024):** -Costs of the judicial procedures have not been chosen by the majority of the courts.
-Disposition time refers only to Administrative Courts.
-According to Law No 4938/2022 (OG A' 109/06.06.2022) “Code of Organization of Courts and Status of Judicial Officers and other provisions”, Justices of Supreme Court, appointed as inspectors for a period of two years, draw up an annual report on the work carried out by each court and prosecutor’s office, recommending the necessary measures that should be performed for the proper functioning of judicial bodies.
-According to Law 4938/2022 (art. 99-104), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for two 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 the administrative courts, the General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts monitors and inspects the functioning of the administrative courts and assists their work (Articles 32-33 of Law 4938/2022). In the near future we hope to be able to use a business intelligence program through the upgraded Integrated Data Management System for the Administrative Justice, in order to extract composite statistical data without contacting any court.

**Q070 (2023):** According to Law 4938/2022 (art. 99-104), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for two 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 the administrative courts, the General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts monitors and inspects the functioning of the administrative courts and assists their work (Articles 32-33 of Law 4938/2022). In the near future we hope to be able to use a business intelligence program through the upgraded Integrated Data Management System for the Administrative Justice, in order to extract composite statistical data without contacting any court. [E-mail: g-epitropia-d-d@otenet.gr].

**Q070 (2022):** Many courts have chosen the option number of Appeals but not all. The Council of State has additionally selected the options number of Appeals and ratio of Appeals. The General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts has additionally selected the options number of Appeals and clearance rate.
According to Law 4938/2022 (art. 99-104), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for two 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. In the near future we hope to be able 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]

**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]
**Q070-1 (2024):** The twelfth option has been chosen by some courts.
**Q070-1 (2022):** It is noted that the clearance rate was not selected by all prosecutors'offices, in addition several prosecutors' offices but not all have chosen the option of percentage of convictions and acquittals.
**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 (2024):** The President of the Court and the Presidents of the Departments oversee the proceedings, and if it is observed that a case has been pending for an extended period, they issue recommendations to the judges to whom the case has been assigned( Council of State).
**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.
**Q083 (General Comment):** The Head of each court is responsible for the assignment of the cases between judges of his/her competence. In this sense, he/she is aware of the quantitative performance of judges. The assigned cases have to be dealt with by the judges within the period of 8 (eight) months according to Law 4983/2022 (art. 99-104) and Law 2717/1999 art. 194 par.1.
Each administrative court sets up an internal service regulation (Article 19 of Law 4938/2022) which specifies, among other things, the number of cases assigned to each judge per month or year, taking into consideration the special circumstances of each court, the number of serving judges and the seriousness of the cases(General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts).

**Q083 (2023):** Each administrative court sets up an internal service regulation (Article 19 of Law 4938/2022) which specifies, among other things, the number of cases assigned to each judge per month or year, taking into consideration the special circumstances of each court, the number of serving judges and the seriousness of the cases(General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts).
**Q083 (2022):** Every administrative judge is charged each year with a specific number of cases to carry out, stipulated by an internal Regulation, according to a model adopted by the General Commission of the State.
**Q083 (2020):** Every administrative judge is charged each year with a specific number of cases to carry out, stipulated by an internal Regulation.
**Q083 (2018):** Every judge is charged each year with a specific number of cases to carry out, stipulated by an internal Regulation.
**Q083 (2016):** Every judge is charged each year with a specific number of cases to carry out, stipulated by an internal Regulation.
**Q083-1 (General Comment):** Besides the heads of courts, there are also the plenary of the Supreme Courts.
**Q083-1-1 (2024):** "Other": Disciplinary punishment pronounced by the competent disciplinary body, that can reach the permanent termination.
**Q083-2 (2022):** There is, however, as far as possible an equal distribution of cases between them by the Head of the Service (Prosecution Service) and the obligation of the public prosecutor to process the cases assigned to him in the time frames provided for each case.
**Q083-3 (2022):** The answer chosen is in accordance with the answers of the majority of the prosecutors ' offices.

**Q083-3-1 (2022):** NAP:No targets are set

**Q120 (General Comment):** Annual inspection reports concerning prosecutors are prepared (Appeals Prosecutors or Deputy Prosecutors of the Supreme Court), and in the context of these reports, the judicial work of each prosecutor is evaluated and assessed as a whole, both in terms of the quality and legal correctness of the processing of the criminal files handled by each prosecutor, both in terms of their quantity in the inspected period of time, the legal and substantive correctness of provisions or acts issued by her/ him, her/his hard work, her/ his morals and her/his social representation. The purpose of the evaluation of prosecutors is to assess whether they should be promoted to the next level and to establish whether disciplinary offenses have been committed.
The criteria on which the evaluation is based, the authority responsible for the evaluation and the purposes for which the results of the evaluation are used are defined in the Code of the Organization of Courts and the Status of Judiciary (Law 4938/2022). Articles 93,100,101,102,103,104.

**Q120 (2024):** The criteria on which the evaluation is based, the authority responsible for the evaluation, and the purposes for which the results of the evaluation are used are defined in the Code of the Organization of Courts and the Status of the Judiciary (Law 4938/2022), specifically in Articles 93, 100, 101, 102, 103, and 104, with Articles 93, 100, and 102 as amended and currently in force.
**Q120 (2023):** The criteria on which the evaluation is based, who is the authority responsible for the evaluation and the purposes for which the results of the evaluation are used are defined in the Code of the Organization of Courts and the Status of Judiciary (Law 4938/2022). Articles 93,100,101,102,103,104.
**Q120 (2022):** The question was answered by the prosecutor's office of the Supreme Court.
**Q120-1 (2022):** The question was answered by the prosecutor's office of the Supreme Court.

**Hungary**
**Q066 (General Comment):** Second instance courts have to 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, the departments of the Supreme Court (Kúria) responsible for examining the judicial practice evaluates the practice of the courts and regularly inform judges about their experience.
**Q066 (2024):** The president of the panel of the regional courts and regional courts of appeal, in connection with the case reviewed by the panel, shall prepare a note on the decision and the trial of the first-instance court, based on professional criteria in every case. The judge or panel that proceeded in the case may access the note directly in the system.

**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 (2024):** Other - statistics on the reasons to postpone trials - number of hearing days in cases - number of hearings per day - the subject of 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 (2023):** - 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 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 (2022):** - 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 (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.

**Q070-1 (2022):** The public prosecution services are led in a hierarchical structure. Leaders perform their duties at a national and regional level, as well as at the level of each organizational unit. It is up to the decision of the leader who exercises the employer's rights to determine how the activities (performance, quality) of the prosecution office should be evaluated and on the basis of what indicators in order to manage the organizational unit effectively. The set of indicators may vary from year to year, depending on the circumstances. Therefore, more than one answer could be given to the given question.
For example, the performance of individual prosecutors or officers may be assessed at the level of an organizational unit; a staff satisfaction survey may be conducted; or a target analysis based on client satisfaction may be carried out.
The clearance rate could also be considered as a reference point and is actually monitored by the public prosecution services. However, statistics are produced at the level of the prosecution services and at the regional level on a calendar year basis. Therefore, those decisions on the termination of prosecution proceedings which are made at the end of a year, but become final only in the following year, can only be taken into account in the next year. The number of indictments and the number of finally closed cases that are closed because of finally closed court cases in the years after the indictment may also differ from the number of indictments on an annual basis. Therefore, the "clearance rate" – as a reference point – is a difficult criterion to follow.
At the national level, the Prosecutor General is required to present a report to Parliament. This report does not focus on the performance of individual public prosecutors; instead, it assesses the performance of the public prosecution service as a whole and according to a breakdown of organizational units. In our 2023 response, we tried to take this into account and, in this respect, we have indicated that primarily the indicators indicated were taken into account. Compared to our previous response in 2020, there was no change in terms of the fact that the clearance rate had been taken into account, even if it was not the primary evaluation criterion.

**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 (2023):** Judges: Two legal institutions are not taken into account in the length of the procedure:
Interruption of proceedings - Act CXXX of 2016 on the Code of Civil Procedure point 34.
Stay of proceedings - Act CXXX of 2016 on the Code of Civil Procedure point 35.
Prosecutors: The Prosecution Service takes into account the inactive period in court proceedings and has answered 'yes' to the question accordingly.
**Q072 (2022):** It was not possible to give an unambiguous answer to this question because of the reasons given in point 70-1. There are several possible "waiting times" in court proceedings which can be monitored. The length of proceedings can be and is monitored by the public prosecution services at the organizational, regional and local levels to different extents. As there was no substantive change in this respect, our reply is modified as follows, in line with the previous answer.
If the question refers to the judicial recess, the answer is "yes"; it is monitored by those who exercise the employer's rights, mainly for the purpose of granting a leave of absence.

**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.

**Q083 (2024):** There is no specified number of cases to resolve for each judge, but according to the act on the Legal Status and Remuneration of Judges and the regulation governing the administration of courts, the number of hearing days is mandatorily specified.
**Q083 (2023):** There is no specified number of cases to resolve for each judge, but according to the act on the Legal Status and Remuneration of Judges and the regulation governing the administration of courts, the number of hearing days is mandatorily specified.
**Q083-1-1 (2024):** Without disciplinary procedure - Other: withdrawal of remote work
With disciplinary procedure - Other: discharge from executive office
**Q083-1-1 (2023):** According to the Act on the Legal Status and Remuneration of Judges -section 124 - disciplinary measures may be imposed against a judge for professional misconduct. Although it is theoretically possible for the above measures to be applied in the event of non-compliance with the quantitative requirement indicated in question 83, this does not occur in practice.

**Q083-2 (2022):** Quantitative performance targets have not yet been set. The public prosecution services were in the process of installing a new specialized IT system (IIDR), which was originally planned to affect internal prosecution statistics too. However, it has not been introduced. The planned system is currently under revision, so it is not possible to provide information on how and when it will be introduced and whether quantitative performance targets will be set.

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

**Q120 (2024):** In accordance with Section 50 (1) of Act CLXIV of 2011 on the Status and Career Path of the Prosecutor General, Prosecutors and other Prosecution Employees, prosecutors, with the exception of the prosecutor general and the deputy prosecutor general, shall be assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first prosecution appointment (for the purpose of appointment for an indefinite period), while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of three years following the appointment, and thereafter every eight years, provided that they worked under the supervision of the assessor or his/her deputy for a minimum of one year during the assessment period. The assessment is the responsibility of the person exercising the employer's authority.
The purpose of assessment is to assess the quality of the prosecutor’s professional activities, to evaluate their skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. The assessment may only feature duly supported, factual findings.
Prosecutors do not need to be assessed during the six years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age.
In addition to cases mentioned above, a prosecutor shall also be assessed if requested by the prosecutor, provided that two years have elapsed since the previous assessment, circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor’s professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment.
In the event of an ineligible grade, upon the disclosure of the result of the assessment, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If despite the call the prosecutor does not resign his/her office, his/her prosecution service employment shall be terminated by exempting him/her from office. If a prosecutor on fixed-term service is assessed as ineligible before the expiry of the fixed term, the prosecutor's service relationship shall be terminated on the date of expiry of the fixed term.
In accordance with Sections 13/A-13/F of Instruction 4/2012. (I. 6.) of the Prosecutor General on specific questions regarding the status of employees of the Prosecution Service, a case file examination shall be carried out as a basis for the assessment which is due to follow with regard to prosecutors appointed to a prosecution office subordinated to the Office of the Prosecutor General prior to the time when the assessment is due. Such a case file examination shall not be carried out for senior head prosecutors. Case file examinations shall discover the examined prosecutor’s practice regarding the application of substantive and procedural law during at least a one-year period prior to the case file examination, or since the prosecutor’s latest assessment – or in absence of an assessment – since the time of his/her appointment. The case file examination and its evaluation shall be done by a prosecutor (hereinafter: examiner prosecutor) who works at the prosecution office directly superior to the prosecution office where the examined prosecutor is appointed to and who works in the same field of prosecutorial activity or expertise as the examined prosecutor. The examiner prosecutor shall be designated by the directly superior prosecution office, whereas at the Office of the Prosecutor General by the head of the structural unit that is competent regarding the examined prosecutor’s duties.
In the future, the workload calculation system may also be suitable for quantitatively measuring and monitoring the work of

prosecutors in the longer term, by performing calculations on an individual basis.

**Q120 (2023):** In accordance with Section 50 (1) of Act CLXIV of 2011 on the Status and Career Path of the Prosecutor General, Prosecutors and other Prosecution Employees, prosecutors, with the exception of the prosecutor general and the deputy prosecutor general, shall be assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first prosecution appointment, while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of three years following the appointment, and thereafter every eight years, provided that they worked under the supervision of the assessor or his/her deputy for a minimum of one year during the assessment period.
The purpose of assessment is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's professional activities, to evaluate their skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. The assessment may only feature duly supported, factual findings.
Prosecutors do not need to be assessed during the six years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age.
In addition to cases mentioned above, a prosecutor shall also be assessed if requested by the prosecutor, provided that two years have elapsed since the previous assessment, circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor's professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment.
In the event of an ineligible grade, upon the disclosure of the result of the assessment, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If despite the call the prosecutor does not resign his/her office, his/her prosecution service employment shall be terminated by exempting him/her from office. If a prosecutor on fixed-term service is assessed as ineligible before the expiry of the fixed term, the prosecutor's service relationship shall be terminated on the date of expiry of the fixed term.
In accordance with Sections 13/A-13/F of Instruction 4/2012. (I. 6.) of the Prosecutor General on specific questions regarding the status of employees of the Prosecution Service, a case file examination shall be carried out as a basis for the assessment which is due to follow with regard to prosecutors appointed to a prosecution office subordinated to the Office of the Prosecutor General prior to the time when the assessment is due. Such a case file examination shall not be carried out for senior head prosecutors. Case file examinations shall discover the examined prosecutor's practice regarding the application of substantive and procedural law during at least a one-year period prior to the case file examination, or since the prosecutor's latest assessment – or in absence of an assessment – since the time of his/her appointment. The case file examination and its evaluation shall be done by a prosecutor (hereinafter: examiner prosecutor) who works at the prosecution office directly superior to the prosecution office where the examined prosecutor is appointed to and who works in the same field of prosecutorial activity or expertise as the examined prosecutor. The examiner prosecutor shall be designated by the directly superior prosecution office, whereas at the Office of the Prosecutor General by the head of the structural unit that is competent regarding the examined prosecutor's duties.

**Q120 (2022):** The person exercising the employer's rights assesses a prosecutor's work every eight years. The purpose of assessment based on the examination of case files is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's professional activities, to evaluate his/her skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development.
In accordance with Section 50 (1) of the Prosecution Employment Status Act, prosecutors, with the exception of the Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutor General, shall be assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first prosecution appointment, while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of three years following the appointment, and thereafter every eight years, provided that they worked under the supervision of the assessor or his/her deputy for minimum one year during the assessment period. Prosecutors do not need to be assessed during the six years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age. In addition to cases mentioned above, a prosecutor shall also be assessed if requested by the prosecutor, provided that two years have elapsed since the previous assessment, circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor's professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment. The purpose of assessment is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's professional activities, to evaluate his/her skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. The assessment may only feature duly supported, factual findings.
In the event of an ineligible grade, upon the disclosure of the result of the assessment, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If despite the call the prosecutor does not resign his/her office, his/her prosecution service employment shall be terminated by exempting him/her from office. In accordance with Sections 13/A-13/F of Instruction 4/2012. (I. 6.) of the Prosecutor General on specific questions regarding the status of employees of the Prosecution Service, a case file examination shall be carried out as a basis for the assessment which is due to follow with regard to the prosecutor appointed to a prosecution office subordinated to the Office of the Prosecutor General prior to the time when the assessment is due. Such a case file examination shall not be carried out for senior head prosecutors. Case file examinations shall discover the examined prosecutor's practice regarding the application of substantive and procedural law during at least a one-year period prior to the case file examination, or since the prosecutor's latest assessment – or in absence of an assessment – since the time of his/her appointment at the most. The case file examination and its evaluation shall be done by a prosecutor (hereinafter: examiner prosecutor) who works at the prosecution office directly superior to the prosecution office where the examined prosecutor is appointed to and who works in the same field of prosecutorial activity or expertise as the examined prosecutor. The examiner prosecutor shall be designated by the directly superior prosecution office or at the Office of the Prosecutor General by the head of the organizational unit in the prosecution service that is competent in view of the examined prosecutor's duties.

**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 (2023):** Following on from the Commission on the Future of Policing in Ireland Report in 2021, and the subsequent work of the High Level Review Group, the establishment of a Quality Assurance Unit, within the ODPP, was agreed in 2023. It is anticipated that this Unit will be formally established in September 2024.
**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 (2023):** NAP within the public prosecution services

**Q067 (2021):** Secretary of Judicial Council and Judicial Conduct Committee of that Committee investigate and adjudicate complaints.
**Q070 (2024):** While we do not routinely measure the missing activities above – that is not to say we cannot measure them.
•The Appeal ratio can be calculated if and when required.
•While we do not use disposition time, we can monitor it.
•We routinely measure waiting times and durations of proceedings.
•Productivity is measured in multiple ways, including via performance management processes

**Q070 (2023):** While we do not routinely measure the missing activities above – that is not to say we cannot measure them.
•Productivity is measured in multiple ways, including via performance management processes.
•The Appeal ratio can be calculated if and when required.
•While we do not use disposition time, we do have waiting times and durations of proceedings which are routinely captured and provide a good proxy.

**Q070 (2022):** These are not new or recently introduced monitoring options.

**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.
**Q070-1 (2023):** Information is published in Part 2 and Appendix 3 of ODPP Annual Report 2022 (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2024/05/AR-2022-eng-copy.pdf)
**Q070-1 (2022):** Information is published in Part 2 and Part 4 of ODPP Annual Report 2021 (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/02/AR2021eng.pdf).
**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 (2024):** Civil Law statistics are recorded by cases received and cases resolved during the year. The majority of civil cases initiated in Ireland do not proceed to trial. Typically, they are settled between the parties (with or without a court approval), are formally discontinued (with notification to the defendant and the court), or are not pursued further by the plaintiff (without the plaintiff notifying the court). It is therefore not possible to provide figures for pending caseloads in most courts. In Criminal Law, backlogs can be measured when required.

**Q071 (2023):** Civil Law statistics are recorded by cases received and cases resolved during the year. The majority of civil cases initiated in Ireland do not proceed to trial. Typically, they are either settled between the parties (with or without a court approving a settlement), are formally discontinued (involving notification to the defendant and the court), or are not pursued further by the plaintiff (without the plaintiff notifying the court). It is therefore not possible to provide figures for pending caseloads in most courts.
In Criminal Law, cases are counted by offence, not by case/defendant. We record resolved cases as cases where an order is made. As there may be more than one penalty imposed in respect of an offence and a separate order made in respect of each penalty, the figures for resolved cases can appear to be higher than those for incoming cases and can cause difficulty in calculating figures for pending cases.

**Q071 (2022):** N/A

**Q071 (2020):** NAP

**Q071 (2018):** NAP

**Q071 (2016):** NAP

**Q072 (2023):** We currently capture waiting times for most jurisdictions and areas of law, and we are increasing the capture of duration of proceedings.
**Q083-1 (2018):** NAP

**Q083-1 (2016):** NAP

**Q083-2 (2024):** It should be noted that the answer is dependent on how the term “target” is defined. Allocation of files happens in some divisions but not all, and not all prosecutors are assigned a specific number of files per week. Additionally, targets can be influenced by external factors such as: the number of investigation files received, or the availability of court dates in order to process cases. The main reason why prosecutors are not assigned a set number of files is because the size and complexity of files can vary significantly. Therefore, our answer has to be nuanced given the type of system we operate in and this would explain discrepancies in answers.
So while there are no targets defined, there is an expectation of work completion and case management through action lists, etc which we report in our annual report and also to DPER (Department of Public Expenditure and Reform) as part of our budget/ performance metrics.

**Q083-2 (2023):** It should be noted that the answer is dependent on how the term “target” is defined. Allocation of files happens in some divisions but not all, and not all prosecutors are assigned a specific number of files per week. Additionally, targets can be influenced by external factors such as: the number of investigation files received, or the availability of court dates in order to process cases. The main reason why prosecutors are not assigned a set number of files is because the size and complexity of files can vary significantly. Therefore, our answer has to be nuanced given the type of system we operate in and this would explain discrepancies in answer

**Q083-2 (2022):** Allocation of files happens in some divisions but not all, and not all prosecutors are assigned a specific number of files per week. Additionally, targets can be influenced by external factors such as: the number of investigation files received, or the availability of court dates in order to process cases. The main reason why prosecutors are not assigned a set number of files is because the size and complexity of files can vary significantly.

**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

**Q083-3 (2024):** Unit Heads assign a number of files to each Prosecutor depending on ability or grade. The targets for the Office are ultimately greatly impacted by external factors like the amount of investigation files that are submitted to the office, the availability of court dates to process cases and the fact that the size and complexity of files varies. A Prosecutor’s ability to progress their caseload is very much impacted by these factors so within this Office we don’t usually reference “targets.”

**Q083-3 (2023):** Unit Heads assign a number of files to each Prosecutor depending on ability or grade. The targets for the Office are ultimately greatly impacted by external factors like the amount of investigation files that are submitted to the office, the availability of court dates to process cases and the fact that the size and complexity of files varies. A Prosecutor’s ability to progress their caseload is very much impacted by these factors so within this Office we don’t usually reference “targets”.

**Q083-3 (2022):** Unit Heads assign a number of files to each Prosecutor depending on ability or grade. This might not mean that “targets” are set. The targets for the Office are ultimately greatly impacted by external factors like the amount of investigation files that are submitted to the office, the availability of court dates to process cases and the fact that the size and complexity of files varies. A Prosecutor’s ability to progress their caseload is very much impacted by these factors so within this Office we don’t usually reference “targets”.

**Q120 (2024):** Performance Management Development System (PMDS) is the on-going management of performance and is a key enabler of current and future Civil Service reform. PMDS is designed to be a meaningful and useful support to all Staff and Managers in the management and improvement of individual performance.

**Q120 (2023):** A Prosecutor’s performance is individually assessed through PMDS (Performance Management and Development System). PMDS assesses how a jobholder's work performance, career and development needs are managed. It links the management of individual performance to the objectives of the Office, as set out in the Strategy of Statement and Business Plan. PMDS seeks to strike a balance between the needs of the organisation and the development needs of those who work in it. It recognises the need for continual change and improvement and for the involvement of staff in bringing this about. Individual prosecutors are responsible for carrying out their own goal setting and assessment. The PMDS form is then reviewed and assessed by the prosecutor’s manager.

**Q120 (2022):** A Prosecutor’s performance is individually assessed through PMDS (Performance Management and Development System). PMDS assesses how a jobholder's work performance, career and development needs are managed. It links the management of individual performance to the objectives of the Office, as set out in the Strategy of Statement and Business Plan. PMDS seeks to strike a balance between the needs of the organisation and the development needs of those who work in it. It recognises the need for continual change and improvement and for the involvement of staff in bringing this about. Individual prosecutors are responsible for carrying out their own goal setting and assessment. The PMDS form is then reviewed and assessed by the prosecutor’s manager.

**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.
**Q070 (General Comment):** Within the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR), the Ministry of Justice has introduced an additional monitoring system specifically designed for PNRR purposes, in order to keep track of a series of KPIs related to the efficiency of the Italian courts.
**Q072 (2018):** Waiting time is monitored only for Administrative Justice.

**Q083 (General Comment):** Law n.71 of 17 June 2022 has recently modified article 2 of Legislative Decree n.109, 23 February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates. The amendment has introduced specific disciplinary offences regarding the conduct of the magistrate who does not cooperate in reaching the goals laid in the 'Program for the management of civil and criminal proceedings' (in Italian 'Programma di Gestione'), which is disciplined by art37 of Decree-Law II. 98 of 6 of July 2011 and regularly approved by each Court.

**Q083 (2020):** Quantitative performance targets are set in terms of length and timeframe of proceedings. Judges who fail to meet certain
requirements may face disciplinary proceedings.

**Q083 (2018):** Quantitative performance targets are set in terms of length and timeframe of proceedings. Judges who fail to meet certain requirements may face disciplinary proceedings.
**Q083 (2016):** Quantitative performance targets are set in terms of length and timeframe of proceedings. Judges who fail to meet certain requirements may face disciplinary proceedings.
**Q083-1-1 (2022):** Disciplinary sanction as provided by the Legislative Decree no 109 of 23rd February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates.
**Q083-2 (General Comment):** Law n.71 of 17 June 2022 has recently modified article 2 of Legislative Decree n.109, 23 February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates. The amendment has introduced specific disciplinary offences regarding the conduct of the magistrate who does not cooperate in reaching the goals laid in the 'Program for the management of civil and criminal proceedings' (in Italian 'Programma di Gestione'), which is disciplined by art37 of Decree-Law II. 98 of 6 of July 2011 and regularly approved by each Court.

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** Disciplinary sanction as provided by the Legislative Decree no 109 of 23rd February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates.
**Q083-3-1 (2022):** Disciplinary sanction as provided by the Legislative Decree no 109 of 23rd February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates.
**Q120 (General Comment):** The assessment procedure applies to both judges and public prosecutors. Every four years, the High Council for the Judiciary (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, work capacity, 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: • "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); • work related publications, If any;
• reports from the lawyers' council, if any.

**Q120-1 (2023):** Every four years
**Q120-1 (2022):** Every four years

**Latvia**

**Q066 (General Comment):** For judges: The reply is partly “yes” because according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1., a 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 (standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year, in co-operation with court judges. This standard 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 other basic principles related to the guarantee of fair trial. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. He/she shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard until 1 February of each year. Implementing the task of the working group for strengthening judicial efficiency established by Judicial Council, Division of Case-law and Research of the Supreme Court has developed guidelines for writing court judgments in both civil cases and administrative cases for courts of first instance and appeal instance. Within the framework of the project, twelve judges of the first and appeal instances were interviewed about the experience of writing court judgments in civil cases and also four judges of the administrative court of the first and appeal instance were interviewed in the administrative courts, and the courts were also asked to select and send good and critical examples of writing court judgments.
For prosecutors: On 6th February 2023 Council of the Prosecutor General adopted a decision “On measures for the implementation of the quality management system in the Prosecution Office in 2023-2027”.
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 (2024):** For judges: The reply is partly "yes" because, according to the Law on Judicial Power, Section 27.1, a Chief Judge of a court shall plan and determine the objectives of the court's work in relation to average time periods for adjudication of matters in court (standard time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year, in co-operation with the court judges. This standard shall be determined by taking into account the court's resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to the adjudication of a matter in a reasonable time period, as well as other basic principles related to the guarantee of a fair trial. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard and supervise the actual time periods for examining matters in court. He/she shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard by 1 February of each year.
Implementing the task of the working group for strengthening judicial efficiency established by the Judicial Council, the Division of Case-law and Research of the Supreme Court has developed guidelines for writing court judgments in both civil cases and administrative cases for courts of first instance and appeal instances. Within the framework of the project, twelve judges of the first and appeal instances were interviewed about their experience of writing court judgments in civil cases, and also four judges of the administrative courts of the first and appeal instances were interviewed in the administrative courts. The courts were also asked to select and send good and critical examples of writing court judgments.
In 2024, courts also began using a new model to balance court and judge workloads – “Case Weighting”. A new tool has been introduced to modernize court administration, aimed at helping determine case complexity, assess statistics, performance indicators, and case distribution. The model evaluates the complexity of each case received by the court using a point-based system.
To determine the weight of a case, all cases are classified into 42 groups based on types of proceedings and sub-branches of law. Taking all of this into account, the case weight is determined for distribution purposes, as well as for calculating judge and court workload indicators. The implementation of this model enables a more equitable distribution of workload among courts and judges, helps better plan case review timelines, and allows for evaluation of implemented reforms. It is important to note that active work is still ongoing to implement and utilize this case weighting model in courts.
On 6th February 2023 Council of the Prosecutor General adopted a decision “On measures for the implementation of the quality management system in the Prosecution Office in 2023-2027”. In 2024 several internal documents were adopted to implement the quality management system. This system covers administrative and management processes of the PO, including support tasks provided by the non-prosecutor stuff such as case preparation, assistance during the hearings, helping to draft the decisions.

**Q066 (2023):** For judges: The reply is partly “yes” because according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1., a 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 (standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year, in co-operation with court judges. This standard 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 other basic principles related to the guarantee of fair trial. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. He/she shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard until 1 February of each year. Implementing the task of the working group for strengthening judicial efficiency established by Judicial Council, Division of Case-law and Research of the Supreme Court has developed guidelines for writing court judgments in both civil cases and administrative cases for courts of first instance and appeal instance. Within the framework of the project, twelve judges of the first and appeal instances were interviewed about the experience of writing court judgments in civil cases and also four judges of the administrative court of the first and appeal instance were interviewed in the administrative courts, and the courts were also asked to select and send good and critical examples of writing court judgments.
For prosecutors: On 6th February 2023 Council of the Prosecutor General adopted a decision “On measures for the implementation of the quality management system in the Prosecution Office in 2023-2027”.

**Q066 (2022):** The reply is partly “yes” because according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1., a 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 (standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year, in co-operation with court judges. This standard 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 other basic principles related to the guarantee of fair trial. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. He/she shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard until 1 February of each year. 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.
**Q067 (General Comment):** In order to implement high-quality investigation supervision, to achieve a quick, economical and effective fair settlement of criminal legal relations in criminal proceedings, as well as to ensure a uniform policy of criminal penalties and control of prosecutors' work, the prosecutor's office has adopted internal legal acts that ensure timely informing of senior officials about the manner and necessity of completing criminal proceedings in case of involvement of the said official.
As regards everyday duties, responsibility lies upon every prosecutor. There are cases, provided by in the order of the Prosecutor General, when the prosecutor is obliged to report to the supervising prosecutor, higher-ranking prosecutor or other prosecutors (chief prosecutor of the relevant prosecution office, or chief prosecutor of the Criminal Justice Department of the Office of the Prosecutor General). During the evaluation process of prosecutors (with the new system – the annual rating of the indicators of the professional performance of the prosecutors of first instance level; or the one carried out no less frequent than once in 5 years), one department of the Office of the Prosecutor General is responsible for creating an assessment of the quality and efficiency of the professional activities of district-level prosecutors and monitoring the results.

**Q070 (2023):** 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.

**Q070 (2022):** 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.

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

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

**Q070-1 (2024):** Discontinued/closed criminal cases, quality of the final decisions made by the prosecutors, the motives of the protests submitted by the prosecutors and the examination results, crime trends in certain topical qualifications of criminal offenses (e.g. money laundering, human trafficking, sex crimes, violent crimes, etc.). Different quantitative performance targets have been assessed and monitored. The data in the monthly reports provided by public prosecutors allows (and has allowed in previous years too) to see the disposition time as well, however, there have been no standards set, for instance as to how long is too long. With the new system this indicator (disposition time), among others, is used to evaluate the professional performance of the prosecutor, even though only in comparison with other prosecutors.

**Q070-1 (2023):** Discontinued/closed criminal cases, quality of the final decisions made by the prosecutors, the motives of the protests submitted by the prosecutors and the examination results, crime trends in certain topical qualifications of criminal offenses (e.g. money laundering, human trafficking, sex crimes, violent crimes, etc.).
As stated in comments provided before (e.g. in the answer to Q83-2), different quantitative performance targets have been assessed and monitored. The data in the monthly reports provided by public prosecutors (referred to in comment to Q83.1-1 in 2022) allows (and has allowed in previous years too) to see the disposition time as well, however there have been no standards set, for instance as to how long is too long. With the new system this indicator (disposition time), among others, is used to evaluate the professional performance of the prosecutor, even though only in comparison with other prosecutors.

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

**Q072 (2024):** On an irregular basis, the Ministry of Justice and the Council of Justice analyze the number of days (period) from the initiation or receipt of the case in court to the moment when the case review is started.
**Q072 (2022):** "Within the courts": On an irregular basis, the Ministry of Justice and the Council of Justice analyze the number of days (period) from the initiation or receipt of the case in court to the moment when the case review is started.

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** According to the Law on Judicial Power, when adjudicating, judges are independent and are subject only to the law. Therefore, judges set targets by themselves. However, the President of the court monitors the workload of the judges in the court as a whole, assigning cases to another judge if necessary.

**Q083-1 (2024):** According to the Law on Judicial Power, when adjudicating, judges are independent and are subject only to the law. Therefore, judges set targets by themselves. However, the President of the court monitors the workload of the judges in the court as a whole, assigning cases to another judge if necessary.
**Q083-1 (2023):** According to the Law on Judicial Power, when adjudicating, judges are independent and are subject only to the law. Therefore, judges set targets by themselves. However, the President of the court monitors the workload of the judges in the court as a whole, assigning cases to another judge if necessary.

**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).

**Q083-2 (2024):** During 2023 the number of processed (closed, brought to court and concluded by a penalty imposed/negotiated by the prosecutor) cases was assessed and monitored, but no standard was set for how many cases should be completed. The new system for evaluating the professional performance of prosecutors (effective as of 1st of January 2024) provides that the quantitative indicator of the work performed by the district-level prosecutor is evaluated every year in comparison to other prosecutors.
**Q083-2 (2023):** During 2023 the number of processed (closed, brought to court and concluded by a penalty imposed/negotiated by the prosecutor) cases was assessed and monitored, but no standard was set for how many cases should be completed. The new system for evaluating the professional performance of prosecutors (effective as of 1st January 2024) provides that the quantitative indicator of the work performed by the district-level prosecutor is evaluated every year.

**Q083-3 (2023):** During 2023 the number of processed (closed, brought to court and concluded by a penalty imposed/negotiated by the prosecutor) cases was assessed and monitored, but no standard was set for how many cases should be completed.
**Q120 (General Comment):** Evaluation is carried out by the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors. During the evaluation of a public prosecutor the following indicators of the quality of performance of the functions are assessed: supervision, criminal prosecution, maintenance of state prosecution in court, as well as the protection of state and individual rights. An assessment of professional competences is also carried out. The results are generally used to evaluate professional performance and suitability for the position. In the case of a negative opinion, the Commission can determine specific tasks that must be performed to eliminate the deficiencies found in prosecutor’s professional activity or to improve his/her professional activity.

**Q120 (2024):** The purpose of evaluating professional performance of prosecutors is to promote the continuous professional development. The evaluation of the prosecutor's professional activity is carried out by the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors established by the Council of Prosecutor General at least once every five years. In cases where deficiencies are found in the prosecutor's professional activity, the assessment can be carried out any time before the term of five years. When evaluating the professional performance of the prosecutor, the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors analyses the quality of performance of the prosecutor's functions, the organization of individual work, the participation in activities improving qualification, the statistical indicators, as well as other criteria provided for in the Regulation on the Evaluation of Professional Performance of Prosecutors. Following the evaluation the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors gives a positive or negative opinion, in some cases specific tasks can be determined for the prosecutor to eliminate the deficiencies found in professional activity or to improve his professional performance. The opinion of the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors acquires legal force when it is approved by the Prosecutor General.

**Q120 (2023):** The purpose of evaluating the professional performance of the prosecutor is to promote the continuous professional development of the prosecutor during the performance of his/her duties. The evaluation of the prosecutor's professional activity is carried out by the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors established by the Council of Prosecutor General at least once every five years. In cases where deficiencies are found in the prosecutor's professional activity, the assessment of his/her professional performance can be (in certain cases must be) carried out any time before the term of 5 years. When evaluating the professional performance of the prosecutor, the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors analyses the quality of performance of the prosecutor's functions, the organization of individual work, participation in qualification raising events, statistical indicators of work, as well as other criteria provided for in the Regulation on the Evaluation of Professional Performance of Prosecutors. The Attestation Commission of Prosecutors gives a positive or negative opinion on the professional activity of the prosecutor, including, specific tasks can be determined for the prosecutor to be performed in order to eliminate the deficiencies found in his professional activity or to improve his professional performance. The opinion of the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors acquires legal force when it is approved by the Prosecutor General.

**Q120-1 (General Comment):** The assessment of the professional activities of prosecutors have been commenced and is operational from 1 January 2014, within which the professional activities of prosecutors are assessed on a regular basis (not less than once every five years).
**Q120-1 (2024):** In general, no less than once every five years, if all skills are assessed at an appropriate level. If deficiencies are found in the actions of the prosecutor and the measures taken have not brought positive results, then the assessment is carried out earlier. If the prosecutor's skills are assessed negatively, the evaluation must be carried out immediately. As from 2024, a new system of the evaluation of prosecutors is introduced, which also provides for annual evaluation. In accordance with this new system, starting from the reporting period of 2023, an annual evaluation of the activities of district-level prosecutors is carried out – the results of the activities of all district-level prosecutors in four main work areas are compared with each other:
– supervision of criminal cases under investigation,
– completion of the pre-trial investigation,
– maintenance of state prosecution in court,
– work in the field of non-criminal cases.
Each of the mentioned areas is evaluated according to the performance indicators, which are grouped into three categories – quantity, quality and compliance with the strategic goals of the Prosecution Office. As a result of the evaluation, prosecutors are divided into three groups – good efficiency, satisfactory efficiency (minor improvements necessary), unsatisfactory efficiency (significant improvements necessary). Regarding prosecutors that are evaluated as working satisfactorily, their direct managers set development goals for them for the current year. Regarding prosecutors that are evaluated as working unsatisfactory, the responsible structural unit of the Prosecutor General’s Office creates a professional development program with performance improvement tasks for the current year. The execution of this program is controlled by the prosecutor's immediate supervisor and/or a higher-ranking prosecutor. For the period from 2023, in relation to chief prosecutors (organizational management) and higher-ranking prosecutors, a 360-degree performance and competence evaluation is carried out using survey questionnaires. The results of the survey are sent to the corresponding next level chief prosecutors and next higher-ranking prosecutors. Based on the survey results, they set professional development goals for their chief prosecutors and lower-ranking prosecutors for the current year.

**Q120-1 (2023):** In general, no less than once every five years, if all skills are assessed at an appropriate level. If deficiencies are found in the actions of the prosecutor and the measures taken have not brought positive results, then the assessment is carried out earlier. If the prosecutor's skills are assessed negatively, the evaluation must be carried out immediately.
As from 2024, a new system of professional activity of prosecutors is introduced, which also provides for annual evaluation. In accordance with this new system, starting from the reporting period of 2023, an annual evaluation of the activities of district-level prosecutors is carried out - the results of the activities of all district-level prosecutors in four main work areas are compared with each other:
– supervision of criminal cases under investigation,
– completion of the pre-trial investigation,
– maintenance of state prosecution in court,
– work in the field of non-criminal cases.
Each of the mentioned areas is evaluated according to the performance indicators, which are grouped into three categories - quantity, quality and compliance with the strategic goals of the Prosecution Office.
As a result of the evaluation, prosecutors are divided into three groups - good efficiency, satisfactory efficiency (minor improvements necessary), unsatisfactory efficiency (significant improvements necessary).
Regarding prosecutors working satisfactorily, their direct managers set development goals for them for the current year.
Regarding unsatisfactory working prosecutors, the responsible structural unit of the Prosecutor General's Office creates a professional development program with precise performance improvement tasks for the current year, the execution of which is controlled by the prosecutor's immediate supervisor and/or a higher-ranking prosecutor.
For the period from 2023, in relation to chief prosecutors (organizational management) and higher-ranking prosecutors, a 360-degree performance and competence evaluation is carried out using survey questionnaires.
The results of the survey are sent to the corresponding next level chief prosecutors and next higher-ranking prosecutors.
Based on the survey results, they set professional development goals for their chief prosecutors and lower-ranking prosecutors for the current year.

**Q120-1 (2020):** Not less than once every five years

**Lithuania**

**Q070 (General Comment):** All data except satisfaction of users, 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.
**Q070 (2023):** National court administration carries out the courts assessing the quality of services and service delivery survey every year.
**Q071 (2024):** The number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs) for civil, criminal and administrative law cases are monitoring.
**Q072 (2024):** Through administrative supervision mechanism

**Q072 (2023):** Through administrative supervision mechanism

**Q072 (2022):** Within the courts: through an administrative supervision mechanism.

**Q072 (2020):** courts: through administrative supervision mechanism

**Q083-2 (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.

**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 (2024):** no targets in the system

**Q083-3 (2018):** The quantitative performance targets are defined for the Prosecutor’s Offices, but not for individual public prosecutors.
**Q083-3-1 (2024):** no targets in the system

**Q120 (2024):** The service, qualifications of the prosecutors and their suitability for the position are assessed by the Prosecutors' Assessment Commission.
The Commission is composed of seven members (four prosecutors and three persons (non-prosecutors) of impeccable reputation, nominated by the President of the Republic, the Speaker of the Seimas, and the Prime Minister) for a period of three years.
The Commission assesses data on the procedural and non-procedural performance and professional qualities of the prosecutor, and, in the case of the evaluation of the chief prosecutor (or deputy), also on the administrative performance.

**Q120 (2023):** The service, qualifications of the prosecutors and their suitability for the position are assessed by the Prosecutors'
Assessment Commission.
The Commission is composed of seven members (four prosecutors and three persons (non-prosecutors) of impeccable reputation, nominated by the President of the Republic, the Speaker of the Seimas, and the Prime Minister) for a period of three years.
The Commission assesses data on the procedural and non-procedural performance and professional qualities of the prosecutor, and, in the case of the evaluation of the chief prosecutor (or deputy), also on the administrative performance.

**Q120 (2022):** The service, qualifications of the prosecutors and their suitability for the position are assessed by the Prosecutors' Assessment Commission.
The Commission is composed of seven members (four prosecutors and three persons (non-prosecutors) of impeccable reputation, nominated by the President of the Republic, the Speaker of the Seimas, and the Prime Minister) for a period of three years.
The Commission assesses data on the procedural and non-procedural performance and professional qualities of the prosecutor, and, in the case of the evaluation of the chief prosecutor (or deputy), also on the administrative performance.

**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.

**Q120-1 (2024):** The Commission carries out regular and extraordinary assessments of the service.
Regular service assessments are carried out:
1. at the end of the prosecutor's traineeship;
2. every five years.
An extraordinary service assessment may be carried out:
1. at the reasoned request of the prosecutor, if at least half a year has elapsed since the last assessment;
2. when, at the end of his/her term of office, the prosecutor seeks appointment to a higher, the same or an equivalent post, provided that three years have elapsed since the last service assessment;
3. in cases where it is established that the prosecutor's performance has repeatedly been deficient, giving rise to reasonable doubts as to his suitability for the post in question.

**Q120-1 (2022):** The Commission carries out regular and extraordinary assessments of the service.
Regular service assessments are carried out:
1. at the end of the prosecutor's traineeship;
2. every five years.
An extraordinary service assessment may be carried out:
1. at the reasoned request of the prosecutor, if at least half a year has elapsed since the last assessment;
2. when, at the end of his/her term of office, the prosecutor seeks appointment to a higher, the same or an equivalent post, provided that three years have elapsed since the last service assessment;
3. in cases where it is established that the prosecutor's performance has repeatedly been deficient, giving rise to reasonable doubts as to his suitability for the post in question.

**Luxembourg**

**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.
**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.
**Q083-1 (2018):** NAP

**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.
**Q070 (2022):** Other: Age of the pending caseload.

**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.
**Q070-1 (2022):** The Office of the Attorney General has embarked on a data management process that is seeing more information being collected in respect of the efficiency parameters of the Office. This explains why in this evaluation cycle, the cathegories of 'Backlog' and ' Productivity of Prosecutors and prosecutors staff' have been marked.

**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.

**Q083 (General Comment):** The administration of the case load is left in the hands of the individual judge and magistrate together with the Chief Justice who assigns the particular duties to each judge and magistrate.
**Q083 (2016):** The administration of the case load is left in the hands of the individual judge/ magistrate together with the Chief Justice who assigns the particular duties to each judge and magistrate.
**Q083-1 (2018):** NA

**Q083-3 (2018):** NA

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** Performance targets do not warrant disciplinary action unless the reason why these were not reached constitutes a disciplinary offence. The AG carries out performance appraisals on the staff and if their targets are not met, then it will normally reflect in their performance appraisal.
**Q120-1 (General Comment):** It is up to the discretion of the Attorney General to conduct such an evaluation, but it must be carried out at least once annually..
**Q120-1 (2022):** It is up to the discretion of the Attorney General to carry out such evaluation but it has be carried out at least once annually.
**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):** Quality standards determined for the judicial system at national level in the Netherlands:
1.Legal remedies e.g. public hearing, public ruling, publication of judgements, appeal
2.Quality indicators e.g. appeal rates, processing times, complaints
3.Quality standards – the professional standards (including professional development, reflection and feedback) These standards are publicly 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
4.Quality measurement instruments Judiciary: customer survey, employee survey, independent review
The quality system for the judiciary is published on: https://www.rechtspraak.nl/Organisatie-en-contact/Organisatie/Raad-voor-de-rechtspraak/Kwaliteit-van-de-rechtspraak

**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 TJK (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

**Q070 (2024):** Many of these activities are included in the annual report, see for example Chapter 7 of 2024's Annual Report.

**Q070 (2023):** Many of these activities are included in the annual report, see for example Chapter 6 of 2023's Annual Report: https://www.rechtspraak.nl/SiteCollectionDocuments/Jaarverslag%20Rechtspraak%202023.pdf
**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.
**Q071 (General Comment):** The public prosecution logically only monitors criminal law cases, the courts monitor all types of cases.
**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).

**Q083 (2016):** There is a planning and control cycle (3 times per year) which involves financial/accounting evaluation but also visits ('bestuurlijke overleggen), there is once per year an accountant check of the annual report (per court and for total of 19 district courts, 5 general appeal courts and 2 specialised courts (Trade and Inductry Tribunal (CBb) and Central Appeals Tribunal (CRvB)), and once every 4 years there is a round of visitations.

**Q083-1 (2018):** NAP

**Q083-1 (2016):** The planning and control cycle is done by The Council for the Judiciary, on a court level (not at individual judge level). Targets for each individual judge are not imposed by The Council for the Judiciary.

**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.

**Q083-3 (General Comment):** There is no national policy on targets for every prosecutor. An office could choose to set targets for their prosecutors (the head of the organisational unit or hierarchically superior public prosecutor would do this), but these 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 certificate 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 (2024):** There are no specific norms, but the evaluation system operates as part of internal and external administrative supervision in the form of:
- visits covering the full activity of the courts or individual court divisions, which are carried out as necessary at the order of the president of the court of appeal and the president of the regional court;
- vetting, covering selected issues in the administrative activity of a court or a division of a court upon the order of the president of a court of appeal and the president of a circuit court;
- within the framework of the general directions, made annually by the Minister of Justice, of internal administrative supervision performed by presidents of courts of appeal, in which indicators related to efficiency of common courts' activity may be defined, on the basis of which presidents of courts of appeal establish directions of internal administrative supervision performed by presidents of courts from the area of appeal. - within the framework of the annual evaluation by the Minister of Justice of the annual information submitted by presidents of courts of appeal on the activity of common courts within the area of appellate courts, which he accepts or refuses to accept, and within the framework of the control of performance of supervisory duties by presidents of courts of appeal. The results of the courts, presented in the annual information prepared by the presidents of appellate courts, are subjected to a thorough analysis in the Ministry of Justice by supervisory services. In relation to the courts with bad results, actions are taken within the scope of external administrative supervision of the Minister of Justice over the courts, aimed at ensuring the proper course of the courts in the adjudication of cases. If significant deficiencies in the administrative performance of a court are found, or if the president of an appellate court fails to carry out orders, the Minister of Justice may also order a vetting of the court or court division or a vetting of the supervisory performance of the court president. The Minister of Justice may also draw the attention of the president or vice-president of an appellate court in writing if he or she finds deficiencies in the management of the court, in the exercise of internal administrative supervision or in the performance of other administrative activities, and demand the rectification of its consequences.□

**Q066 (2023):** There are no specific norms, but the evaluation system operates as part of internal and external administrative supervision in the form of:
- visits covering the full activity of the courts or individual court divisions, which are carried out as necessary at the order of the president of the court of appeal and the president of the regional court;
- vetting, covering selected issues in the administrative activity of a court or a division of a court upon the order of the president of a court of appeal and the president of a circuit court;
- within the framework of the general directions, made annually by the Minister of Justice, of internal administrative supervision performed by presidents of courts of appeal, in which indicators related to efficiency of common courts' activity may be defined, on the basis of which presidents of courts of appeal establish directions of internal administrative supervision performed by presidents of courts from the area of appeal. - within the framework of the annual evaluation by the Minister of Justice of the annual information submitted by presidents of courts of appeal on the activity of common courts within the area of appellate courts, which he accepts or refuses to accept, and within the framework of the control of performance of supervisory duties by presidents of courts of appeal. The results of the courts, presented in the annual information prepared by the presidents of appellate courts, are subjected to a thorough analysis in the Ministry of Justice by supervisory services. In relation to the courts with bad results, actions are taken within the scope of external administrative supervision of the Minister of Justice over the courts, aimed at ensuring the proper course of the courts in the adjudication of cases. If significant deficiencies in the administrative performance of a court are found, or if the president of an appellate court fails to carry out orders, the Minister of Justice may also order a vetting of the court or court division or a vetting of the supervisory performance of the court president. The Minister of Justice may also draw the attention of the president or vice-president of an appellate court in writing if he or she finds deficiencies in the management of the court, in the exercise of internal administrative supervision or in the performance of other administrative activities, and demand the rectification of its consequences.□

**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.

**Q067 (2023):** There are no specialised units in all courts, but at the level of the Courts of Appeal and District Courts there are Visiting Magistrates' Departments where visiting magistrates specialised in a particular field are appointed to supervise cases on a permanent basis. The comments on visiting judges in paragraph 66 remain valid. A visiting judge in an appellate court is appointed by the president of the appellate court, and in a circuit court by the president of the circuit court, for a period of four years, from among judges with at least seven years' experience as a judge. Before appointing the visiting judge, the president of the relevant court consults the Minister of Justice.

**Q070 (2024):** other - timeliness of the awarding of fees to experts and translators, timeliness of the preparation of motivations, workload of judges and registrars.
The selection of question 70 in the questionnaire, ‘User satisfaction regarding court services,’ is based on monitoring the quality of customer service using satisfaction surveys conducted in common courts. Monitoring of service quality focuses mainly on assessing communication aspects of service, such as: assistance from court staff in handling cases, staff patience, clear and understandable communication between staff and users.
This information was collected in previous years.
As regards the data on ‘court costs’ in this question, data on the enforcement of court judgments in relation to fines, fees and court costs are monitored by the Ministry of Justice in NS1 reports for individual statistical periods. The data was collected in previous years.

**Q070 (2023):** * other - timeliness of the awarding of fees to experts and translators, timeliness of the preparation of motivations, workload of judges and registrars. Others - the data comes from the Department of Administrative Supervision and has also been used previously.
**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.
**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 (2024):** ongoing monitoring of statistical data by court presidents regarding the duration of proceedings in specific categories of cases

**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.

**Q083 (General Comment):** In general there are not any quantitative performance targets defined for each judge but for certain cases the law imposes timeframe for performing specific action or handling specific matters. President of the court sets the performance target with using statistically calculated indicators of average performance that court and individual judge is expected to achieve.

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** .

**Q083-1 (2016):** For certain cases the law imposes timeframe for performing specific action or handling specific matters. President of court sets the performance target with using statistically calculated indicators of average performance that court and individual judge is expected to achieve.

**Q083-3 (2024):** If one were to consider that this question, is linked to question 83-2 on quantitative objectives, then the answer is NAP. Which is not to say that the efficiency of a prosecutor is not subject to any assessment by superiors. Indeed, it is the task of prosecutors exercising a managerial function to ensure the proper and efficient performance of official tasks in the units and organisational units entrusted to them, in particular to ensure the efficiency of the proceedings conducted by the prosecutors subordinate to them. Executives are therefore obliged to have knowledge of, inter alia, the number of proceedings conducted by their subordinate prosecutors, the number of proceedings completed by them, the number of protracted proceedings and to react to cases of, for example, protracted proceedings.

**Q083-3 (2023):** If one were to consider that this question, is linked to question 83-2 on quantitative objectives, then the answer is NAP. Which is not to say that the efficiency of a prosecutor is not subject to any assessment by superiors. Indeed, it is the task of prosecutors exercising a managerial function to ensure the proper and efficient performance of official tasks in the units and organisational units entrusted to them, in particular to ensure the efficiency of the proceedings conducted by the prosecutors subordinate to them. Executives are therefore obliged to have knowledge of, inter alia, the number of proceedings conducted by their subordinate prosecutors, the number of proceedings completed by them, the number of protracted proceedings and to react to cases of, for example, protracted proceedings.

**Q083-3 (2022):** If one were to consider that this question, is linked to question 83-2 on quantitative objectives, then the answer is NAP. Which is not to say that the efficiency of a prosecutor is not subject to any assessment by superiors. Indeed, it is the task of prosecutors exercising a managerial function to ensure the proper and efficient performance of official tasks in the units and organisational units entrusted to them, in particular to ensure the efficiency of the proceedings conducted by the prosecutors subordinate to them. Executives are therefore obliged to have knowledge of, inter alia, the number of proceedings conducted by their subordinate prosecutors, the number of proceedings completed by them, the number of protracted proceedings and to react to cases of, for example, protracted proceedings.

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

**Q083-3-1 (2024):** *without disciplinary procedure:
- Warning by head of prosecution
In the event that the objectives of the criminal proceedings are not achieved or in the event that an obvious violation of the law is found in the conduct of the case, the superior public prosecutor shall, irrespective of his other powers, point out the misconduct to the public prosecutor who committed the misconduct, after requesting an explanation. The prosecutor to whom the misconduct has been pointed out may, within 7 days, submit a written objection to the superior prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct. If the public prosecutor does not agree with the infringement pointed out, he/she is entitled to appeal. If an objection is lodged, the superior public prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct shall either rescind the finding of misconduct or refer the case to the disciplinary court for consideration. The appeal procedure before the disciplinary court is then initiated.
- Temporary salary reduction
Without a disciplinary procedure, a salary reduction is not possible. A supervisor cannot decide on a pay cut alone.
- Reflected in the individual assessment The whistleblowing notice shall be reflected in the prosecutor's personnel file. A copy of the notice of reproof that has not been rescinded shall be attached to the prosecutor's personnel file.
- Other, please specify: _____
For minor disciplinary offences that do not justify the initiation of disciplinary proceedings, the public prosecutor in charge shall inflict on subordinate public prosecutors an orderly penalty of admonition.
A copy of the letter inflicted with an orderly penalty of admonishment shall be attached to the prosecutor's personal file. The public prosecutor to whom an admonishment by order penalty has been inflicted may, within 7 days from the date of service of the admonition, lodge an objection to the public prosecutor directly superior to the public prosecutor who inflicted the penalty.
*With disciplinary procedure:
-Warning by head of prosecution
With the application of the disciplinary procedure, the initial route is the same as described above. Except that once the appeal procedure is triggered, the course of action is as follows. If an objection is lodged, the superior prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct shall either rescind the pointing out of the misconduct or refer the case to the disciplinary court for consideration. The disciplinary court shall issue an order upholding the reproof of misconduct or revoking the reproof of misconduct and discontinuing the proceedings after hearing the disciplinary ombudsman and the public prosecutor to whom the misconduct was reproved, unless a hearing is not possible. The prosecutor to whom the misconduct has been pointed out is entitled to lodge a complaint against the decision refusing to consider the objection. The complaint shall be examined by the same disciplinary court in another equivalent composition.
- Temporary salary reduction
A prosecutor may be suspended for up to 6 months if the nature of the disciplinary offence makes it necessary to immediately remove him or her from the performance of duties. In the case of a valid authorisation to prosecute a public prosecutor, and also when a request for incapacitation has been submitted to the competent court, the disciplinary supervisor may suspend the public prosecutor from his/her duties until the proceedings are validly concluded. The decision on suspension may be appealed to the Disciplinary Court of the Prosecutor General. Where a public prosecutor has been suspended, the Disciplinary Court at the Prosecutor General, on the motion of the disciplinary superior, may reduce the amount of the public prosecutor's salary up to 50% for the duration of the suspension. The decision on the reduction of remuneration may be appealed against.
- Reflected in the individual assessment The whistleblowing notice shall be reflected in the prosecutor's personnel file. A copy of the notice of reproof that has not been rescinded shall be attached to the prosecutor's personnel file.
- Other, please specify: _____
A disciplinary penalty may be imposed on a prosecutor following a disciplinary procedure. The disciplinary penalties are: 1) admonishment; 2) reprimand; 2a) a 5% - 50% reduction in basic salary for a period of six months to two years; 2b) a pecuniary penalty in the amount of one month's basic salary payable for the month preceding the final conviction plus the prosecutor's long-term service allowance, function allowance and special allowance; 3) removal from the position held; 4) transfer to another official position;
5) expulsion from the prosecution service. In the event of an appeal procedure against a warning, disciplinary proceedings shall be initiated. If an objection is lodged, the superior prosecutor: 1) repeals the disciplinary penalty of admonishment and notifies the prosecutor of the acceptance of the objection, or 2) overturns the disciplinary penalty of admonishment and refers the case to the disciplinary ombudsman for investigation, or 3) overturns the punishment of a caution and refers the case through the disciplinary ombudsman to the disciplinary court for examination. After the lapse of 3 years from the date on which the orderly penalty of admonishment becomes final, the Prosecutor General or the competent regional or district prosecutor shall order the removal of the copy of the letter of admonishment from the prosecutor's personal file, if during this period no misconduct in the efficiency of the pre-trial proceedings, the management of the prosecution or the exercise of supervision resulting in the drawing of attention, no misconduct was pointed out or no disciplinary offence was found to have been committed. In such a case, only the simultaneous. Removal from the prosecutor's personal file of copies of all such letters and judgments. At the request of the prosecutor, the removal may take place after one year. The decision of the disciplinary court may be appealed to the disciplinary court of the second instance.

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** *without disciplinary procedure:
- Warning by head of prosecution
In the event that the objectives of the criminal proceedings are not achieved or in the event that an obvious violation of the law is found in the conduct of the case, the superior public prosecutor shall, irrespective of his other powers, point out the misconduct to the public prosecutor who committed the misconduct, after requesting an explanation. The prosecutor to whom the misconduct has been pointed out may, within 7 days, submit a written objection to the superior prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct. If the public prosecutor does not agree with the infringement pointed out, he/she is entitled to appeal. If an objection is lodged, the superior public prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct shall either rescind the finding of misconduct or refer the case to the disciplinary court for consideration. The appeal procedure before the disciplinary court is then initiated.
- Temporary salary reduction
Without a disciplinary procedure, a salary reduction is not possible. A supervisor cannot decide on a pay cut alone.
- Reflected in the individual assessment The whistleblowing notice shall be reflected in the prosecutor's personnel file. A copy of the notice of reproof that has not been rescinded shall be attached to the prosecutor's personnel file.
- Other, please specify: _____
For minor disciplinary offences that do not justify the initiation of disciplinary proceedings, the public prosecutor in charge shall inflict on subordinate public prosecutors an orderly penalty of admonition.
A copy of the letter inflicted with an orderly penalty of admonishment shall be attached to the prosecutor's personal file. The public prosecutor to whom an admonishment by order penalty has been inflicted may, within 7 days from the date of service of the admonition, lodge an objection to the public prosecutor directly superior to the public prosecutor who inflicted the penalty.
*With disciplinary procedure:
-Warning by head of prosecution
With the application of the disciplinary procedure, the initial route is the same as described above. Except that once the appeal procedure is triggered, the course of action is as follows. If an objection is lodged, the superior prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct shall either rescind the pointing out of the misconduct or refer the case to the disciplinary court for consideration. The disciplinary court shall issue an order upholding the reproof of misconduct or revoking the reproof of misconduct and discontinuing the proceedings after hearing the disciplinary ombudsman and the public prosecutor to whom the misconduct was reproved, unless a hearing is not possible. The prosecutor to whom the misconduct has been pointed out is entitled to lodge a complaint against the decision refusing to consider the objection. The complaint shall be examined by the same disciplinary court in another equivalent composition.
- Temporary salary reduction
A prosecutor may be suspended for up to 6 months if the nature of the disciplinary offence makes it necessary to immediately remove him or her from the performance of duties. In the case of a valid authorisation to prosecute a public prosecutor, and also when a request for incapacitation has been submitted to the competent court, the disciplinary supervisor may suspend the public prosecutor from his/her duties until the proceedings are validly concluded. The decision on suspension may be appealed to the Disciplinary Court of the Prosecutor General. Where a public prosecutor has been suspended, the Disciplinary Court at the Prosecutor General, on the motion of the disciplinary superior, may reduce the amount of the public prosecutor's salary up to 50% for the duration of the suspension. The decision on the reduction of remuneration may be appealed against.
- Reflected in the individual assessment The whistleblowing notice shall be reflected in the prosecutor's personnel file. A copy of the notice of reproof that has not been rescinded shall be attached to the prosecutor's personnel file.
- Other, please specify: _____
A disciplinary penalty may be imposed on a prosecutor following a disciplinary procedure. The disciplinary penalties are: 1) admonishment; 2) reprimand; 2a) a 5% - 50% reduction in basic salary for a period of six months to two years; 2b) a pecuniary penalty in the amount of one month's basic salary payable for the month preceding the final conviction plus the prosecutor's long-term service allowance, function allowance and special allowance; 3) removal from the position held; 4) transfer to another official position;
5) expulsion from the prosecution service. In the event of an appeal procedure against a warning, disciplinary proceedings shall be initiated. If an objection is lodged, the superior prosecutor: 1) repeals the disciplinary penalty of admonishment and notifies the prosecutor of the acceptance of the objection, or 2) overturns the disciplinary penalty of admonishment and refers the case to the disciplinary ombudsman for investigation, or 3) overturns the punishment of a caution and refers the case through the disciplinary ombudsman to the disciplinary court for examination. After the lapse of 3 years from the date on which the orderly penalty of admonishment becomes final, the Prosecutor General or the competent regional or district prosecutor shall order the removal of the copy of the letter of admonishment from the prosecutor's personal file, if during this period no misconduct in the efficiency of the pre-trial proceedings, the management of the prosecution or the exercise of supervision resulting in the drawing of attention, no misconduct was pointed out or no disciplinary offence was found to have been committed. In such a case, only the simultaneous. Removal from the prosecutor's personal file of copies of all such letters and judgments. At the request of the prosecutor, the removal may take place after one year. The decision of the disciplinary court may be appealed to the disciplinary court of the second instance.

**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 (2022):** 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 (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.

**Q070 (2022):** Users satisfaction is monitored through surveys and indirectly by the consulting body of each court that includes members of the community. The appeal ratio is only monitored in the context of judges evaluation.

**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 (2022):** The waiting period is monitored in the quarterly monitoring of all judicial courts. The Court President reports to the council the number of cases that are waiting procedural movement for more then 1, 2, 3 or 4 months.

**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 (General Comment):** Taking into account the results obtained in the previous year and the strategic objectives formulated for the following year, the president of the court and the coordinating prosecutor, after hearing the judicial administrator, articulate, for the following year, proposals for objectives of a procedural nature (management or administrative) for the district and for the courts of extended territorial jurisdiction, as well as for the Public Prosecution Offices located there, which have to be ratified respectively by the Judicial High Council and the Attorney General's Office.
The procedural objectives of the district shall refer, in particular, to the number of completed cases and the time of their duration, taking into account, among other factors, the nature of the process or the value of the case, considering the human resources and the means related to the functioning of the district and based, namely, on the established procedural reference values.
The procedural objectives of the district may not impose, limit or condition the decisions to be rendered in specific cases, either on the merits of the matter, or on the option for the procedural form understood as more appropriate.
The procedural objectives of the district must be reflected in the objectives established annually for judicial officers and be considered in the respective assessment.
The procedural objectives of the district must be considered in the evaluation criteria of the magistrates, defined by the respective Councils.

**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):** The prosecutors are evaluated periodically in time lapses between 3 to 5 years. The evaluation is held by the Prosecutors Superior High Council and it evaluates the quality of the work held by all prosecutors. A higher ranked prosecutor does the evaluation and produces a report that is sanctioned by the Prosecutors Superior High Council.

**Q120 (2024):** The criteria are the following: capacity to exercise the profession, technical preparation and adaptation to the inspected service – article 11 of the evaluation regulations - https://www.ministeriopublico.pt/iframe/regulamento-de-inspecoes-do-ministerio-publico.
The authority competent for carrying out the assessment are the public prosecutors appointed by the Superior Council of the Public Prosecutor.
The assessment is used to: career progression and to check whether the prosecutor is able to perform duties in the court where he is placed.

**Q120 (2023):** The criteria are the following: capacity to exercise the profession, technical preparation and adaptation to the inspected service – article 11 of the evaluation regulations - https://www.ministeriopublico.pt/iframe/regulamento-de-inspecoes-do-ministerio-publico.
The authority competent for carrying out the assessment are the public prosecutors appointed by the Superior Council of the Public Prosecutor.
The assessment is used to: career progression and to check whether the prosecutor is able to perform duties in the court where he is placed.

**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.

**Q070 (2024):** ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment •The ReJust Desktop App and the Notebook module implemented on the website www.rejust.ro are work tools aimed at the optimization of the management of cases. Their scope is the speedy resolution of cases, through automation and simplification of administrative tasks, the reduction of processing times and facilitating quick access to necessary information. These tools ensure a more efficient management of cases, a faster resolution thereof and an adequate monitoring, significantly contributing to the modernization and standardization of judicial activities. Furthermore, the App offers advanced IT solutions for reasoning repetitive cases, allowing the use of standardized templates for ensuring the speeding up of the case reasoning process.
•The portal registratura.rejust.ro is a work tool which facilitates the submission of claims, documents and the payment of the stamp duties. The objective of this tool is the digitalization and streamlining of judicial processes, ensuring the acceleration of case resolution, as well as costs reduction and the standardization of activities, offering a unitary and accessible platform for interested parties.

**Q070 (2023):** ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment •The ReJust Desktop App and the Notebook module implemented on the website www.rejust.ro are work tools aimed at the optimization of the management of cases. Their scope is the speedy resolution of cases, through automation and simplification of administrative tasks, the reduction of processing times and facilitating quick access to necessary information. These tools ensure a more efficient management of cases, a faster resolution thereof and an adequate monitoring, significantly contributing to the modernization and standardization of judicial activities. Furthermore, the App offers advanced IT solutions for reasoning repetitive cases, allowing the use of standardized templates for ensuring the speeding up of the case reasoning process.
•The portal registratura.rejust.ro is a work tool which facilitates the submission of claims, documents and the payment of the stamp duties. The objective of this tool is the digitalization and streamlining of judicial processes, ensuring the acceleration of case resolution, as well as costs reduction and the standardization of activities, offering a unitary and accessible platform for interested parties.

**Q070 (2022):** ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment
**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.

**Q070-1 (2024):** Other: National Repository-starting 2023 the ECRIS 3 application (that was used only locally, at the level of each prosecution office) was extended and centralized in order to replicate most of the data available in the local ECRIS. ROARMIS-an application that monitors the debt recovery process starting the first stages of criminal investigation. SOICCAP-SAS - an application that monitors the complexity of the activity of each prosecutor and prosecution office, taking into account not only the number of cases, but the totality of activities for each case.

**Q070-1 (2023):** Other: National Repository-starting 2023 the ECRIS 3 application (that was used only locally, at the level of each prosecution office) was extended and centralized in order to replicate most of the data available in the local ECRIS. ROARMIS-an application that monitors the debt recovery process starting the first stages of criminal investigation. SOICCAP-SAS - an application that monitors the complexity of the activity of each prosecutor and prosecution office, taking into account not only the number of cases, but the totality of activities for each case.

**Q071 (2024):** STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment
**Q071 (2023):** STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment
**Q071 (2022):** STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment
**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 (2024):** 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 (2023):** 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 (2022):** 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 (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.

**Q083-1 (2016):** 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.)

**Q120 (2024):** According to Article 87 of Law No 303/2022 -The individual professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors involves analysing and noting of the criteria and indicators for assessing the professional performance of judges and prosecutors, indicators which concern, in particular, the quality of the activity, the efficiency, the integrity and the obligation to continue vocational training, and in the case of judges and prosecutors appointed to senior positions, the manner of carrying out the managerial duties. (2) Professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors aims to establish the level of their professional competence and also to improve professional performance, increase the efficiency of the activity of courts and prosecutor’s offices and public trust in judicial authority, maintain and consolidate the of the quality of the judicial system

**Q120 (2023):** According to Article 87 of Law No 303/2022 -The individual professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors involves analysing and noting of the criteria and indicators for assessing the professional performance of judges and prosecutors, indicators which concern, in particular, the quality of the activity, the efficiency, the integrity and the obligation to continue vocational training, and in the case of judges and prosecutors appointed to senior positions, the manner of carrying out the managerial duties. (2) Professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors aims to establish the level of their professional competence and also to improve professional performance, increase the efficiency of the activity of courts and prosecutor’s offices and public trust in judicial authority, maintain and consolidate the of the quality of the judicial system

**Q120 (2022):** According to Article 87 of Law No 303/2022 -The individual professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors involves analysing and noting of the criteria and indicators for assessing the professional performance of judges and prosecutors, indicators which concern, in particular, the quality of the activity, the efficiency, the integrity and the obligation to continue vocational training, and in the case of judges and prosecutors appointed to senior positions, the manner of carrying out the managerial duties. (2) Professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors aims to establish the level of their professional competence and also to improve professional performance, increase the efficiency of the activity of courts and prosecutor’s offices and public trust in judicial authority, maintain and consolidate the of the quality of the judicial system

**Q120-1 (2024):** Legislation on the statute of judges and prosecutors was replaced by Law no. 303/2022
Frequency: from to 2 to 5 years depending on the seniority; According to Article 88 of Law No 303/2022 - (1) Considering the seniority in the position of judge or prosecutor, the assessment shall be carried out as follows: a) every 2 years, for judges and prosecutors with a seniority of between one and five years; b) every 3 years, for judges and prosecutors with a seniority of between 5 and 10 years; c) every 4 years, for judges and prosecutors with a seniority of between 10 and 15 years; d) every 5 years, for judges and prosecutors with a seniority of more than 15 years. (2) Judges of the High Court of Cassation and Justice shall not be subject to evaluation. (3) Professional evaluation may also be carried out whenever requested by the judge or prosecutor

**Q120-1 (2023):** Legislation on the statute of judges and prosecutors was replaced by Law no. 303/2022

**Q120-1 (2022):** Legislation on the statute of judges and prosecutors was replaced by Law no. 303/2022

**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):** 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 (2024):** Internal revision

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 (2023):** Internal revision

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 (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

**Q070 (General Comment):** The category “other” encompasses: the number of cases according to types of disputes, the results of the cases
(reconciliation, dismissals, full satisfaction, partial satisfaction, etc.).

**Q070-1 (2024):** The verification activity is carried out once a year, either randomly or based on a plan. It focuses on one subordinate prosecutor's office, either regional or district, in the non-criminal section.
The monitoring process focuses on all files from a specific period and reviews them thoroughly. This includes making sure the files are complete, and meet both procedural and legal standards

**Q070-1 (2023):** The verification activity is carried out once a year, either randomly or based on a plan. It focuses on one subordinate prosecutor's office, either regional or district, in the non-criminal section.
The monitoring process focuses on all files from a specific period and reviews them thoroughly. This includes making sure the files are complete, and meet both procedural and legal standards.

**Q072 (2024):** The prosecutor's office, as one of the parties to the legal proceedings, cannot fundamentally influence its length. However, prosecutors continuously monitor the status of criminal cases after the indictment has been filed and, in justified cases, communicate with the courts to determine the reasons for inaction or the current status of the case, usually by written requests.
The prosecutor, as a party to the proceedings, also has the authority in this regard arising from the legal regulation, namely to file a complaint for inaction pursuant to Section 55, paragraph 3 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Complaints for inaction under Section 55(3) of the Criminal Procedure Code were filed by prosecutors in a total of 186 cases in 2024.

**Q072 (2023):** If the prosecutor becomes involved in a specific procedure, receives a complaint about court inactivity, or becomes aware of such inactivity through other means, they must either highlight the inactivity within the proceedings or request the president of the court to take action to resolve it.

**Q083-2 (2024):** Quantitative performance goals for the prosecutor are not set, but in general, the prosecutor's office sets goals, for example, with a plan of main tasks, and it is monitored. The General Prosecutor as well as the leading prosecutors are responsible for setting these goals, and disciplinary action may be taken if they are not met.

**Q083-2 (2023):** Quantitative performance goals for the prosecutor are not set, but in general, the prosecutor's office sets goals, for example, with a plan of main tasks, and it is monitored. The General Prosecutor as well as the leading prosecutors are responsible for setting these goals, and disciplinary action may be taken if they are not met.

**Q083-3 (2022):** Prosecutors do not have quantitative performance targets within a certain period, but at the same time they have responsibility for their work, and therefore the hierarchically superior public prosecutor is responsible for observing the duties and goals of each prosecutor.

**Q120 (2024):** Evaluation of a prosecutor pursuant to Section 31 of Act No. 154/2001 Coll.

**Q120-1 (2024):** Evaluation of a prosecutor pursuant to Section 31 of Act No. 154/2001 Coll., which is conducted in connection with selection procedures, disciplinary proceedings, or at the prosecutor's request in relation to the termination of the prosecutor's service relationship.
The evaluation of a prosecutor is carried out by the head of the service office on the basis of documents prepared by the supervising prosecutor. In the case of a prosecutor who has been temporarily assigned to another prosecutor's office for a period exceeding six months, the head of the service office shall also request supporting documents from the supervising prosecutor of the office to which the prosecutor has been temporarily assigned.
The evaluation of a prosecutor includes, in particular, an assessment of:
a) the prosecutor's procedures and decision-making activities, focusing on the professional quality of decisions and the timeliness of proceedings;
b) the prosecutor's knowledge of generally binding legal regulations, internal service regulations, and the results of professional development;
c) compliance with service discipline.

**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.

**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.

**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).

**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 (2024):** Other: percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions…
**Q070-1 (2023):** "other": percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions.
**Q070-1 (2022):** "other": percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions…
**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.

**Q083 (General Comment):** Since 2016, the Criteria on the work abilities does not include standards for the minimal expected number of solved cases (however the number of resolved cases is still monitored).
**Q083 (2018):** Since 2016, the Criteria on the work abilities does not include standards for the minimal expected number of solved cases (however the number of resolved cases is still monitored).
**Q083 (2016):** Since 2016, the Criteria on the work abilities does not include standards for the minimal expected number of solved cases (however the number of resolved cases is still monitored).
**Q083-1 (General Comment):** See Q114.

**Q083-2 (General Comment):** .

**Q083-3 (General Comment):** .

**Q120 (General Comment):** On the proposal of the State Prosecutor General, State Prosecutorial Council adopts Criteria for the assessment of state prosecutors' performance. They 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. Head of state prosecutor's office as competent authority for the matters od state prosecution administration can alert the public prosecutor to his duty to meet the targets.
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 (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 (2024):** Every year in the first three years of appointment, then every three years.

**Q120-1 (2018):** Every three years

**Spain**

**Q066 (General Comment):** The Judicial Statistics Section of the CGPJ General Council of the Judiciary publishes annually the document La justicia dato a dato, which focuses on the quality of justice, adding key indicators for the year. It is published in Spanish and English.
Justice 2030 is a common 10-year work plan, developed in co-governance, which represents the realisation of the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan for the Public Justice Service. This plan includes various programme that includes the overall quality objectives of user-oriented justice and data-oriented, digitally accessible and sustainable justice.

**Q066 (2024):** In June 2024, the instrument "Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Administration of Justice" was approved. Its objective is to improve the efficiency of the judicial system through the use of AI-based solutions, ensuring a responsible, legal, and ethical use of these technologies.
**Q066 (2023):** The Judicial Statistics Section of the CGPJ General Council of the Judiciary publishes annually the document La justicia dato a dato, which focuses on the quality of justice, adding key indicators for the year. It is published in Spanish and English.
Justice 2030 is a common 10-year work plan, developed in co-governance, which represents the realisation of the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan for the Public Justice Service. This plan includes various programme that includes the overall quality objectives of user-oriented justice and data-oriented, digitally accessible and sustainable justice.

**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.
**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 (2023):** An example of monitoring user satisfaction is the opinion poll commissioned by the General Council of the Judiciary, entitled "The Perception of Justice Among Its Service Users", conducted in February 2023. The results are published on the website

**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.

**Q070-1 (General Comment):** The inspection service of the Public Prosecutor Office

**Q070-1 (2024):** The Fiscal Inspection Service is an internal body within the Public Prosecutor, responsible for overseeing and monitoring compliance with the duties and obligations of prosecutors and the proper functioning of the prosecutor's offices

**Q070-1 (2023):** The Fiscal Inspection Service is an internal body within the Public Prosecutor, responsible for overseeing and monitoring compliance with the duties and obligations of prosecutors and the proper functioning of the prosecutor's offices

**Q071 (General Comment):** The CGPJ publishes quarterly territorial reports on the activity of judicial bodies and annual reports at state, High Court, provincial, and judicial district levels. For each specific territory and period, a wide range of indicators are provided for each type of body within the selected territorial scope: number of cases filed, resolved, and pending; number of final judgments, orders, and decrees; number of executions filed, resolved, and pending; resolution, backlog, congestion, and sentencing rates; evolution of key indicators compared to the same period of the previous year.
A set of indicators describe the situation of each jurisdiction and the system as a whole: resolution, backlog, congestion, and litigation rates; number of cases filed per judge; percentage of judgments handed down by career judges; number of judgments handed down per judge; estimated average durations at each instance. Each indicator is provided for the period and the same period of the year before. They are generated at state and High Court levels.

**Q071 (2023):** The CGPJ publishes quarterly territorial reports on the activity of judicial bodies and annual reports at state, High Court, provincial, and judicial district levels. For each specific territory and period, a wide range of indicators are provided for each type of body within the selected territorial scope: number of cases filed, resolved, and pending; number of final judgments, orders, and decrees; number of executions filed, resolved, and pending; resolution, backlog, congestion, and sentencing rates; evolution of key indicators compared to the same period of the previous year.
A set of indicators describe the situation of each jurisdiction and the system as a whole: resolution, backlog, congestion, and litigation rates; number of cases filed per judge; percentage of judgments handed down by career judges; number of judgments handed down per judge; estimated average durations at each instance. Each indicator is provided for the period and the same period of the year before. They are generated at state and High Court levels.

**Q083 (General Comment):** According to Article 403 of the Organic Law of the Judiciary, "Variable remuneration for objectives shall be linked to the individual performance demonstrated by each judge or magistrate in the performance of his or her jurisdictional and professional functions."
The Agreement of November 29, 2018, of the Plenary of the General Council of the Judiciary, which approves Regulation 2/2018, establishes a complex system in which "individualization is done by establishing certain categories of Courts, taking into account the material content of their respective competence, and certain categories of cases, so that, based on this categorization, a value is obtained, representative of the average resolution time, which is assigned to the types of resolutions." Certain correction factors are then applied.

**Q083 (2023):** According to Article 403 of the Organic Law of the Judiciary, "Variable remuneration for objectives shall be linked to the individual performance demonstrated by each judge or magistrate in the performance of his or her jurisdictional and professional functions."
The Agreement of November 29, 2018, of the Plenary of the General Council of the Judiciary, which approves Regulation 2/2018, establishes a complex system in which "individualization is done by establishing certain categories of Courts, taking into account the material content of their respective competence, and certain categories of cases, so that, based on this categorization, a value is obtained, representative of the average resolution time, which is assigned to the types of resolutions." Certain correction factors are then applied.

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

*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 083. Are there quantitative performance targets defined for each judge (e.g. the number of resolved cases in a month or year)?*
*Question 083-1. Who is responsible for setting these targets for each judge?*

*Question 083-1-1. What are the consequences for a judge if these targets are not met?*

*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 these targets for each public prosecutor?*

*Question 083-3-1. What are the consequences for a prosecutor if these targets are not met?*

*Question 120. Is there a system of individual evaluation of the public prosecutors' work?*

*Question 120-1. Please specify the frequency of this evaluation:*

### Question 066

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q066 (General Comment):** Supreme Judicial Council: According to the answers of SJC the competent bodies in these matters are:
The Inspectorate to the SJC:
- checks the organization of the initiation and movement of judicial, prosecutorial and investigative cases, as well as the closing of cases within the established terms and in case of violations, signals the administrative head of the relevant body of the judiciary and the relevant College of the Supreme Judicial Council
- sends signals, proposals and reports to other state bodies, including the competent bodies of the judiciary;
- examines applications against violation of the right to examine and resolve cases within reasonable time.
The Judges' College of the SJC:
- annually analyses and reports the degree of workload of the bodies of the judiciary;
- requests and summarizes every 6 months information from the courts about their activity;
- resolves questions about the organization of the activity of the relevant system of judicial authorities;
- adopts rules for the allocation of cases between the judges who consider cases allocated according to Art. 9, para. 3, in order to equalize their total workload;
- determines the number of judicial officers according to the degree of workload on the proposal of or after agreement with the administrative heads of the bodies of the judiciary, and may open new and lays off positions.
The Plenary of the SJC:
- on the proposal of one of the Colleges, after coordination with the administrative heads of the bodies of the judiciary, determines the number of judges, prosecutors and investigators in all courts, prosecutor's offices and investigative departments according to the degree of workload;
- hears and accepts the annual reports of the bodies of the judiciary under Art. 84, item 16 of the Constitution.
.....
According to the answers of The Prosecutor's office of the Republic of Bulgaria:
The legal regulation is in Art. 84, item 16 of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria, according to which the Parliament hears and accepts the annual report of the Prosecutor General submitted by the SJC and Art. 30, para. 2, item 4 of the Judicial System Act, according to which the Plenum of the SJC hears and accepts this annual report.
Approved by the Prosecutor General/ chief prosecutor is the Directive on the control activity of the Prosecutor's Office, aimed at ensuring the exact and uniform application of the laws in the performance of the functional duties of the prosecutors and investigators. The Directive regulates the conditions, order and procedures for carrying out control activities through audits, checks and analyzes of the work of the prosecutor's offices, the National Investigation Service, as well as individual prosecutors and investigators, outside of the institutional and official verification of the legality of their acts.

**Q066 (2024):** The Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council:
- checks the organization of the initiation and movement of judicial, prosecutorial and investigative cases, as well as the closing of cases within the established terms and in case of violations, signals the administrative head of the relevant body of the judiciary and the relevant College of the Supreme Judicial Council
- sends signals, proposals and reports to other state bodies, including the competent bodies of the judiciary;
- examines applications against violation of the right to examine and resolve cases within reasonable time.
The Judges' and Prosecutors' College of the SJC:
- annually analyses and reports the degree of workload of the bodies of the judiciary;
- requests and summarizes every 6 months information from the courts and prosecutor's offices about their activity;
- resolves questions about the organization of the activity of the relevant system of judicial authorities;
- adopts rules for the allocation of cases between the judges, prosecutors and investigators who consider cases allocated according to Art. 9, para. 3, in order to equalize their total workload;
- determines the number of judicial officers according to the degree of workload on the proposal of or after agreement with the administrative heads of the bodies of the judiciary, and may open new and lays off positions.
The Plenum of the SJC:
- on the proposal of one of the Colleges, after coordination with the administrative heads of the bodies of the judiciary, determines the number of judges, prosecutors and investigators in all courts, prosecutor's offices and investigative departments according to the degree of workload;
- hears and accepts the annual reports of the bodies of the judiciary under Art. 84, item 16 of the Constitution.

**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. (3) An investigating

**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 (2024):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22), 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, 21/22), 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 Head State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia.

**Q066 (2023):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22), 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, 21/22), 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 (2022):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22), 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 with the prior opinion 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, 21/22), 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

**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.

**Cyprus**

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

**Q066 (2024):** 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

**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.

**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.

**Finland**

**Q066 (General Comment):** There are no quality standards covering the whole judiciary in Finland. Instead there are several quality projects going on, for example the Quality Project of the Administrative Courts, which started in 2020 and concerns all administrative courts in Finland. The Rovaniemi Court of Appeal Quality Projects have produced quality benchmarks, which evaluate the quality of the adjudication in courts of law. Last assessment was conducted in 2020.
The speed and consistency of prosecutors' work are monitored through statistics and by their supervisors. Additionally, special quality work is carried out, which defines quality matters.

**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.

**France**

**Q066 (General Comment):** Concerning the civil and criminal justice:
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.

As part of the rollout of the national "Public Services +" program (an interministerial program for the continuous improvement of public services aimed at offering users services that are closer, simpler, and more efficient), particular efforts are being made to monitor timelines for civil cases resolved in less than 12 months. This is part of a broader program that improves the quality of reception, information, and communication with litigants. The various SP+ commitments are subject to specific quality management processes, and their effects are partly assessed through annual satisfaction surveys conducted in the courts. Furthermore, good initiatives from the Ministry of Justice services and civil and criminal courts are cataloged and classified to be shared and replicated. Across the country, the creativity of staff members contributes to improving the quality of service provided to litigants. Because these best practices should benefit the largest number, they are now incorporated into a searchable database accessible to all agents. This allows field actors to find sources of inspiration and tools to develop new systems to improve our justice system. It also allows these same actors to share with everyone a best practice they have implemented. The tools necessary for their deployment are also made available, and reviews of certain practices have been conducted since 2024 to assess their implementation and impact on beneficiaries.
As regards administrative justice: following an experimental phase, the drafting of litigious decisions in direct style within the administrative courts was generalised, as of January 1, 2019, through a joint note from the President of the Litigation Section and the President of the Administrative Courts Inspection Mission. In this regard, a vade-mecum on drafting decisions by the administrative courts was developed by a working group chaired by President Stirn and distributed.
The framework letters sent to each court by the General Secretariat of the Council of State reiterate the general objectives outlined in the documents accompanying the finance law regarding promptness and quality: target average judgment deadlines, proportion of cases older than 24 months (which should not exceed 8.5% of the overall caseload across all courts and 4.5% for administrative appeal courts), and the rate of annulment or modification of judgments by the courts or of decisions by the Council of state not exceeding 15%.

**Q066 (2023):** Following an experimental phase, the direct style of drafting of decisions in litigious matters rendered within the administrative court has been generalized, as of January 1, 2019, by a joint note from the president of the Litigation Section and the president of the Inspection Mission of the Administrative Courts. With this in mind, a vade-mecum on the drafting of decisions of the administrative court had been drawn up by a working group chaired by President Stirn and distributed.
The framework letters sent to each court by the General Secretariat of the Council of State recall the general objectives set out in the documents accompanying the Finance Act in terms of speed and quality: target average delivery time, proportion of cases of more than 24 months (must not exceed 8.5% of the overall backlog of all courts and 4.5% of the overall backlog for administrative courts of appeal) and rate of annulment-reversal of judgments of the tribunals by the courts or judgments of the courts by the judge of cassation not exceeding 15%.

**Q066 (2022):** Recently, at the initiative of the Minister of Justice, good practices from the different departments of the ministry of Justice and courts have been listed and classified so that they could be shared and replicated. Across the country, the creativity of staff is helping to improve the quality of service provided to litigants. Because these best practices should be of benefit to as many people as possible, they are now included in a search tool accessible to all staff. For those working in the field, the aim is to provide a source of inspiration and tools for developing new systems to improve the justice system. It is also a way for them to share the best practices they have implemented. The tools needed for their deployment are also made available to them.

**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.

**Germany**

**Q066 (2024):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Q066 (2023):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Q066 (2022):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Greece**

**Q066 (General Comment):** Law 4938/2022, article 102 par.4 subsection, includes among other evaluation elements the quality of the judges' work with the additional consideration of any successful appeal or cassation against their decisions. The inspector examines, among other things, the quality of their work, i.e. the processing of the legal and factual part of each case and takes into account the cassation or appeal of the decisions drawn up by the inspectors upon admission of the respective legal remedy during the inspected period as well as the wording of the judicial decisions. Article 104 refers to plenary of the Supreme Courts issuing directions in conjunction with Article 102 which refers to assessment criteria. From the combination of articles 104 and 102 and 100, 101, 102, 104 of Law 4938/22, the following innovations regarding the inspection system result: a) the drafting of an evaluation report on the operation of each court and prosecutor's office (not foreseen before) b) the drafting of an evaluation report of the directors, the courts and the prosecutor's offices (not foreseen before) c) the drafting of an evaluation report of the presidents and the presiding departments and judicial formations of each court and prosecutor's office d) for the inspection of the judges, they take into account the available statistical data.
The two-year term of the inspectors is expected to significantly upgrade the evaluation system, because it will provide the possibility of controlling the judicial work over a longer period of time, especially for the crowded judicial formations.
There is a system for inspecting the quantitative and qualitative performance of judicial officials (law 4938/2022) and decisions of the Administrative Plenary of the Council of State regarding the framework of instructions, practices and guidelines for the evaluation of the Council of State's Associate Councillors and Rapporteurs, as well as judges of the administrative courts. A Charter of Ethics for judges of the Council of State has also been approved. ( Council of State).
With the 19/2023 decision of the Council of State in Plenary and the Council, a framework of guidelines, instructions and practices for the inspection of ordinary administrative courts, their directors and other judges was formulated on the basis of article 104 of the Code of the Organization of Courts (Law 4938/22). {General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts}.
Decision 7/23 of Areios Pagos in Plenary and the Council.

**Q066 (2024):** -With the 19/2023 decision of the Council of State in Plenary and the Council, a framework of guidelines, instructions and practices for the inspection of ordinary administrative courts, their head of administration and other judges was formulated on the basis of article 104 of the Code of the Organization of Courts (Law 4938/22).
-The Plenary Session of the Council of State has issued guidelines to the judges serving in it for the better drafting of decisions. Specifically, for the rapporteurs, it has provided concrete recommendations on how to write their reports. Moreover, the Plenary Session has approved a document analyzing the elements taken into account when evaluating the judges.

**Q066 (2023):** There is a system for inspecting the quantitative and qualitative performance of judicial officials (law 4938/2022) and decisions of the Administrative Plenary of the Council of State regarding the framework of instructions, practices and guidelines for the evaluation of the Council of State's Associate Councillors and Rapporteurs, as well as judges of the administrative courts. A Charter of Ethics for judges of the Council of State has also been approved. ( Council of State).
With the 19/2023 decision of the Council of State in Plenary and the Council, a framework of guidelines, instructions and practices for the inspection of ordinary administrative courts, their directors and other judges was formulated on the basis of article 104 of the Code of the Organization of Courts (Law 4938/22). {General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts}.
Decision 7/23 of Areios Pagos in Plenary and the Council.
-Article 104 of the Code of the Organization of Courts (Law 4938/22).

**Q066 (2022):** According to Law 4938/2022 (art.104) of the organization of court and tribunals code.

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q066 (General Comment):** Second instance courts have to 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, the departments of the Supreme Court (Kúria) responsible for examining the judicial practice evaluates the practice of the courts and regularly inform judges about their experience.

**Q066 (2024):** The president of the panel of the regional courts and regional courts of appeal, in connection with the case reviewed by the panel, shall prepare a note on the decision and the trial of the first-instance court, based on professional criteria in every case. The judge or panel that proceeded in the case may access the note directly in the system.

**Ireland**

**Q066 (2023):** Following on from the Commission on the Future of Policing in Ireland Report in 2021, and the subsequent work of the High Level Review Group, the establishment of a Quality Assurance Unit, within the ODPP, was agreed in 2023. It is anticipated that this Unit will be formally established in September 2024.

**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.

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q066 (General Comment):** For judges: The reply is partly “yes” because according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1., a 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 (standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year, in co-operation with court judges. This standard 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 other basic principles related to the guarantee of fair trial. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. He/she shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard until 1 February of each year. Implementing the task of the working group for strengthening judicial efficiency established by Judicial Council, Division of Case-law and Research of the Supreme Court has developed guidelines for writing court judgments in both civil cases and administrative cases for courts of first instance and appeal instance. Within the framework of the project, twelve judges of the first and appeal instances were interviewed about the experience of writing court judgments in civil cases and also four judges of the administrative court of the first and appeal instance were interviewed in the administrative courts, and the courts were also asked to select and send good and critical examples of writing court judgments.
For prosecutors: On 6th February 2023 Council of the Prosecutor General adopted a decision “On measures for the implementation of the quality management system in the Prosecution Office in 2023-2027”.
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 (2024):** For judges: The reply is partly "yes" because, according to the Law on Judicial Power, Section 27.1, a Chief Judge of a court shall plan and determine the objectives of the court's work in relation to average time periods for adjudication of matters in court (standard time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year, in co-operation with the court judges. This standard shall be determined by taking into account the court's resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to the adjudication of a matter in a reasonable time period, as well as other basic principles related to the guarantee of a fair trial. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard and supervise the actual time periods for examining matters in court. He/she shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard by 1 February of each year.
Implementing the task of the working group for strengthening judicial efficiency established by the Judicial Council, the Division of Case-law and Research of the Supreme Court has developed guidelines for writing court judgments in both civil cases and administrative cases for courts of first instance and appeal instances. Within the framework of the project, twelve judges of the first and appeal instances were interviewed about their experience of writing court judgments in civil cases, and also four judges of the administrative courts of the first and appeal instances were interviewed in the administrative courts. The courts were also asked to select and send good and critical examples of writing court judgments.
In 2024, courts also began using a new model to balance court and judge workloads – “Case Weighting”. A new tool has been introduced to modernize court administration, aimed at helping determine case complexity, assess statistics, performance indicators, and case distribution. The model evaluates the complexity of each case received by the court using a point-based system.
To determine the weight of a case, all cases are classified into 42 groups based on types of proceedings and sub-branches of law. Taking all of this into account, the case weight is determined for distribution purposes, as well as for calculating judge and court workload indicators. The implementation of this model enables a more equitable distribution of workload among courts and judges, helps better plan case review timelines, and allows for evaluation of implemented reforms. It is important to note that active work is still ongoing to implement and utilize this case weighting model in courts.
On 6th February 2023 Council of the Prosecutor General adopted a decision “On measures for the implementation of the quality management system in the Prosecution Office in 2023-2027”. In 2024 several internal documents were adopted to implement the quality management system. This system covers administrative and management processes of the PO, including support tasks provided by the non-prosecutor stuff such as case preparation, assistance during the hearings, helping to draft the decisions.

**Q066 (2023):** For judges: The reply is partly “yes” because according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1., a 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 (standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year, in co-operation with court judges. This standard 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 other basic principles related to the guarantee of fair trial. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. He/she shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard until 1 February of each year. Implementing the task of the working group for strengthening judicial efficiency established by Judicial Council, Division of Case-law and Research of the Supreme Court has developed guidelines for writing court judgments in both civil cases and administrative cases for courts of first instance and appeal instance. Within the framework of the project, twelve judges of the first and appeal instances were interviewed about the experience of writing court judgments in civil cases and also four judges of the administrative court of the first and appeal instance were interviewed in the administrative courts, and the courts were also asked to select and send good and critical examples of writing court judgments.
For prosecutors: On 6th February 2023 Council of the Prosecutor General adopted a decision “On measures for the implementation of the quality management system in the Prosecution Office in 2023-2027”.

**Q066 (2022):** The reply is partly “yes” because according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1., a 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 (standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year, in co-operation with court judges. This standard 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 other basic principles related to the guarantee of fair trial. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. He/she shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard until 1 February of each year. 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.

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q066 (General Comment):** Quality standards determined for the judicial system at national level in the Netherlands:
1.Legal remedies e.g. public hearing, public ruling, publication of judgements, appeal
2.Quality indicators e.g. appeal rates, processing times, complaints
3.Quality standards – the professional standards (including professional development, reflection and feedback) These standards are publicly 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
4.Quality measurement instruments Judiciary: customer survey, employee survey, independent review
The quality system for the judiciary is published on: https://www.rechtspraak.nl/Organisatie-en-contact/Organisatie/Raad-voor-de-rechtspraak/Kwaliteit-van-de-rechtspraak

**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.

**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 (2024):** There are no specific norms, but the evaluation system operates as part of internal and external administrative supervision in the form of:
- visits covering the full activity of the courts or individual court divisions, which are carried out as necessary at the order of the president of the court of appeal and the president of the regional court;
- vetting, covering selected issues in the administrative activity of a court or a division of a court upon the order of the president of a court of appeal and the president of a circuit court;
- within the framework of the general directions, made annually by the Minister of Justice, of internal administrative supervision performed by presidents of courts of appeal, in which indicators related to efficiency of common courts' activity may be defined, on the basis of which presidents of courts of appeal establish directions of internal administrative supervision performed by presidents of courts from the area of appeal. - within the framework of the annual evaluation by the Minister of Justice of the annual information submitted by presidents of courts of appeal on the activity of common courts within the area of appellate courts, which he accepts or refuses to accept, and within the framework of the control of performance of supervisory duties by presidents of courts of appeal. The results of the courts, presented in the annual information prepared by the presidents of appellate courts, are subjected to a thorough analysis in the Ministry of Justice by supervisory services. In relation to the courts with bad results, actions are taken within the scope of external administrative supervision of the Minister of Justice over the courts, aimed at ensuring the proper course of the courts in the adjudication of cases. If significant deficiencies in the administrative performance of a court are found, or if the president of an appellate court fails to carry out orders, the Minister of Justice may also order a vetting of the court or court division or a vetting of the supervisory performance of the court president. The Minister of Justice may also draw the attention of the president or vice-president of an appellate court in writing if he or she finds deficiencies in the management of the court, in the exercise of internal administrative supervision or in the performance of other administrative activities, and demand the rectification of its consequences.□

**Q066 (2023):** There are no specific norms, but the evaluation system operates as part of internal and external administrative supervision in the form of:
- visits covering the full activity of the courts or individual court divisions, which are carried out as necessary at the order of the president of the court of appeal and the president of the regional court;
- vetting, covering selected issues in the administrative activity of a court or a division of a court upon the order of the president of a court of appeal and the president of a circuit court;
- within the framework of the general directions, made annually by the Minister of Justice, of internal administrative supervision performed by presidents of courts of appeal, in which indicators related to efficiency of common courts' activity may be defined, on the basis of which presidents of courts of appeal establish directions of internal administrative supervision performed by presidents of courts from the area of appeal. - within the framework of the annual evaluation by the Minister of Justice of the annual information submitted by presidents of courts of appeal on the activity of common courts within the area of appellate courts, which he accepts or refuses to accept, and within the framework of the control of performance of supervisory duties by presidents of courts of appeal. The results of the courts, presented in the annual information prepared by the presidents of appellate courts, are subjected to a thorough analysis in the Ministry of Justice by supervisory services. In relation to the courts with bad results, actions are taken within the scope of external administrative supervision of the Minister of Justice over the courts, aimed at ensuring the proper course of the courts in the adjudication of cases. If significant deficiencies in the administrative performance of a court are found, or if the president of an appellate court fails to carry out orders, the Minister of Justice may also order a vetting of the court or court division or a vetting of the supervisory performance of the court president. The Minister of Justice may also draw the attention of the president or vice-president of an appellate court in writing if he or she finds deficiencies in the management of the court, in the exercise of internal administrative supervision or in the performance of other administrative activities, and demand the rectification of its consequences.□

**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.

**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.

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q066 (General Comment):** 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 (2024):** Internal revision
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 (2023):** Internal revision
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 (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

**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.

**Spain**

**Q066 (General Comment):** The Judicial Statistics Section of the CGPJ General Council of the Judiciary publishes annually the document La justicia dato a dato, which focuses on the quality of justice, adding key indicators for the year. It is published in Spanish and English.
Justice 2030 is a common 10-year work plan, developed in co-governance, which represents the realisation of the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan for the Public Justice Service. This plan includes various programme that includes the overall quality objectives of user-oriented justice and data-oriented, digitally accessible and sustainable justice.

**Q066 (2024):** In June 2024, the instrument "Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Administration of Justice" was approved. Its objective is to improve the efficiency of the judicial system through the use of AI-based solutions, ensuring a responsible, legal, and ethical use of these technologies.

**Q066 (2023):** The Judicial Statistics Section of the CGPJ General Council of the Judiciary publishes annually the document La justicia dato a dato, which focuses on the quality of justice, adding key indicators for the year. It is published in Spanish and English.
Justice 2030 is a common 10-year work plan, developed in co-governance, which represents the realisation of the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan for the Public Justice Service. This plan includes various programme that includes the overall quality objectives of user-oriented justice and data-oriented, digitally accessible and sustainable justice.

**Q066 (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**

**Q067 (2024):** For public prosecution services: although the reply is “no,” there are, in particular, management support assistants who can work in the field of quality.

**Q067 (2023):**
Although the reply is ‘no’, the public prosecutor's department does have management support staff who can work in the quality field.

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**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.

**Denmark**

**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.

**Finland**

**Q067 (General Comment):** Nationwide and departmental working groups formed for prosecutors evaluate and set quality standards.

**Q067 (2023):** Nationwide and departmental working groups formed for prosecutors evaluate and set quality standards.

**France**

**Q067 (General Comment):** Concerning administrative justice:
There are no specialised personnel specifically responsible for implementing these quality standards, but there is a monitoring responsibility within the competence of the chamber presidents and heads of courts. Concerning civil and criminal justice: with regard to the quality standards of the Public Services + program, each court has a local contact responsible for deploying SP+ on the ground. The Department of Expertise and Modernization of the Ministry's General Secretariat is responsible for coordinating the network of local contacts.

**Q067 (2023):** Strictly speaking, there are no specialised staff responsible for the implementation of these quality standards, but a monitoring responsibility for the presidents of chambers and heads of courts.

**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.

**Germany**

**Q067 (2024):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Q067 (2023):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**Q067 (2022):** Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

**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.

**Greece**

**Q067 (2023):** The Inspectors of the courts receive for the first time instructions from the Plenaries of the courts, specific directions for the operation of the courts and the evaluation of the supervisors, statistical data are used and specially reasoned reports are drawn up. The new way of evaluation has been systematized and good practices are reported.

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q067 (2023):** NAP within the public prosecution services

**Q067 (2021):** Secretary of Judicial Council and Judicial Conduct Committee of that Committee investigate and adjudicate complaints.

**Latvia**

**Q067 (General Comment):** In order to implement high-quality investigation supervision, to achieve a quick, economical and effective fair settlement of criminal legal relations in criminal proceedings, as well as to ensure a uniform policy of criminal penalties and control of prosecutors' work, the prosecutor's office has adopted internal legal acts that ensure timely informing of senior officials about the manner and necessity of completing criminal proceedings in case of involvement of the said official.
As regards everyday duties, responsibility lies upon every prosecutor. There are cases, provided by in the order of the Prosecutor General, when the prosecutor is obliged to report to the supervising prosecutor, higher-ranking prosecutor or other prosecutors (chief prosecutor of the relevant prosecution office, or chief prosecutor of the Criminal Justice Department of the Office of the Prosecutor General). During the evaluation process of prosecutors (with the new system – the annual rating of the indicators of the professional performance of the prosecutors of first instance level; or the one carried out no less frequent than once in 5 years), one department of the Office of the Prosecutor General is responsible for creating an assessment of the quality and efficiency of the professional activities of district-level prosecutors and monitoring the results.

**Malta**

**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.

**Netherlands**

**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 TJK (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

**Poland**

**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.

**Q067 (2023):** There are no specialised units in all courts, but at the level of the Courts of Appeal and District Courts there are Visiting Magistrates' Departments where visiting magistrates specialised in a particular field are appointed to supervise cases on a permanent basis. The comments on visiting judges in paragraph 66 remain valid. A visiting judge in an appellate court is appointed by the president of the appellate court, and in a circuit court by the president of the circuit court, for a period of four years, from among judges with at least seven years' experience as a judge. Before appointing the visiting judge, the president of the relevant court consults the Minister of Justice.

**Portugal**

**Q067 (2022):** 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 (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.

**Slovak Republic**

**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

**Slovenia**

**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.

**Spain**

**Q067 (2015):** Every three months each Court sends statistics to the Council for the Judiciary with complete information about the activity of the Court.

### Question 070

**Austria**

**Q070 (General Comment):** .

**Q070 (2024):** As for now, appeal ratio is monitored by the administrative courts only.

**Q070 (2022):** satisfaction of court staff: only supreme administrative court

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

**Belgium**

**Q070 (2024):** Number and rate (and other details) of appeals: currently only for criminal cases in police courts.

**Q070 (2023):** Other: Dashboards including the following are in development or test-phase: - productivity (judges + court staff) (test phase for courts of appeals)
- number and rate of appeals (test phase for police courts)

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q070 (2024):** Pursuant to Art. 54 of the JSA The Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) shall check the organization of administrative operation of the courts, prosecution offices and investigating authorities; 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; analyze and summarize the cases that have been closed by an effective judicial act, as well as the closed files and cases of prosecutors and investigators, by adopting a procedure for regular reporting and publishing of the results of the analysis and summarizing the closed cases; in the presence of conflicting case-law, the existence of which has been found in carrying out the activity under Art. 54 (1), item 3 of the JSA, it shall alert the competent authorities of the need to request the rendition of interpretative judgements or interpretative decrees; carry out integrity testing and examinations for conflict of interest of judges, prosecutors and investigators, 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 investigators; examine applications against an infringement of the right to have a case examined and disposed of within a reasonable time; 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; adopt a template for reporting the completion of cases within the statutory time limits when carrying out its activity under Art. 54 (1), item 2 of the JSA after consultations with the Supreme Judicial Council; summarize annually the good and bad practices regarding the observance of the ethical rules in accordance with the relevant European and international standards in connection with the abovementioned checks and shall provide the information to the Colleges of the Supreme Judicial Council. The ISJC carries out its inspections based on an annual program for the respective calendar year (planned inspections), upon signals and upon self-referral. The ISJC prepares an annual report on its activities, which is presented to the plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council and is considered by the National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria.

**Croatia**

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

**Cyprus**

**Q070 (2023):** the costs of the judicial procedings and the appeal ratio are now being monitored

**Denmark**

**Q070 (2024):** We collect data on the following, but we do not monitor the courts with this data. We share it with the courts for guidance or The Ministry of Justice, but we do not have mandate to regulate the courts based on this data. The Ministry of Justice do not have mandate to monitor and regulate the courts either. We monitor both "satisfaction of the court staff" and "appeal ratio". The reason for the change from previous years is not that it hasn't been monitored, but that there has been a different interpretation of the question previously in regards to the use of "monitor". We do collect the data however we cannot use the data to force action upon the courts.

**Q070 (2023):** We collect data on the following, but we do not monitor the courts with this data. We share it with the courts for guidance or The Ministry of Justice, but we do not have mandate to regulate the courts based on this data. The Ministry of Justice do not have mandate to monitor and regulate the courts either. We monitor both "satisfaction of the court staff" and "appeal ratio". The reason for the change from previous years is not that it hasn't been monitored, but that there has been a different interpretation of the question previously in regards to the use of "monitor". We do collect the data however we cannot use the data to force action upon the courts.

**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.

**Estonia**

**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 (2023):** There are no "other" in 2023. In general MoJ has not been regulary monitoring as it did before.

**Q070 (2017):** See previous general comments.

**Q070 (2016):** see general comments

**Finland**

**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

**France**

**Q070 (2024):** Administrative justice: source: Council of State
In the case of administrative courts, there is no monitoring of user satisfaction or the cost of judicial procedures.
- Activity monitoring indicators by subject matter, types of judgment formation (panel, summary proceedings, single judge, orders)
- Indicator for monitoring the number of cases resolved per judge and decision support
Social barometers were conducted in 2017, 2021, and 2023, based on a questionnaire addressed to staff and judges (working conditions, etc.).
The additional responses compared to the last CEPEJ campaign do not correspond to new developments.
Civil and criminal justice: source: DSJ
there is no monitoring of user satisfaction or the cost of judicial procedures.

**Q070 (2023):** Indicators for monitoring activity by matters, types of judicial formation (collegial, summary proceedings, single judge, orders)
Indicator for monitoring the number of cases resolved by a judge and decision-making support
* Social barometers were carried out in 2017, 2021 and 2023.
The additional answers compared to last year do not imply innovations

**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.

**Germany**

**Q070 (General Comment):** The Federal Statistical Office collects key figures on court performance (incoming cases, resolved cases, pending cases on the beginning and the end of a year) from the federal states. The Federal Statistical Office processes and publishes the data once per year for the civil, criminal, family, administrative, labour, social and financial courts.

**Q070 (2024):** All feredal states reported monitoring regarding number of incoming, resolved and pending cases as well as lenght of proceedings, number of appeals and disposition time.
2 federal states reported monitoring productivity of judges and court staff.

**Q070 (2023):** The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all respondent federal states and the activities no. 5 and 9-13 were selected by the majority of the federal states.
A minority of the federal states reported the following "other" monitoring activities: statistics on the nature of resolution (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.), number of main-trial days, participation of interpreters and experts.

**Q070 (2022):** The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all respondent federal statesa and the activities no. 5 and 9-13 were selcted by the majority of the federal states.
A minority of the federal states (as in previous years) reported the following "other" monitoring activities: statistics on the nature of resolution (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.), number of main-trial days, participation of interpreters and experts. (While the situation has not changed since the last cycle, the option "other" was not selected this time for the purpose of methodological consistency with the answers to other questions in this section).
One federal state has not yet replied.

**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.).

**Greece**

**Q070 (General Comment):** According to Law 4938/2022 (art. 99-104), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for two 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.

**Q070 (2024):** -Costs of the judicial procedures have not been chosen by the majority of the courts.
-Disposition time refers only to Administrative Courts.
-According to Law No 4938/2022 (OG A' 109/06.06.2022) “Code of Organization of Courts and Status of Judicial Officers and other provisions”, Justices of Supreme Court, appointed as inspectors for a period of two years, draw up an annual report on the work carried out by each court and prosecutor’s office, recommending the necessary measures that should be performed for the proper functioning of judicial bodies.
-According to Law 4938/2022 (art. 99-104), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for two 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 the administrative courts, the General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts monitors and inspects the functioning of the administrative courts and assists their work (Articles 32-33 of Law 4938/2022). In the near future we hope to be able to use a business intelligence program through the upgraded Integrated Data Management System for the Administrative Justice, in order to extract composite statistical data without contacting any court.

**Q070 (2023):** According to Law 4938/2022 (art. 99-104), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for two 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 the administrative courts, the General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts monitors and inspects the functioning of the administrative courts and assists their work (Articles 32-33 of Law 4938/2022). In the near future we hope to be able to use a business intelligence program through the upgraded Integrated Data Management System for the Administrative Justice, in order to extract composite statistical data without contacting any court. [E-mail: g-epitropia-d-d@otenet.gr].

**Q070 (2022):** Many courts have chosen the option number of Appeals but not all. The Council of State has additionally selected the options number of Appeals and ratio of Appeals. The General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts has additionally selected the options number of Appeals and clearance rate.
According to Law 4938/2022 (art. 99-104), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for two 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. In the near future we hope to be able 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]

**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]

**Hungary**

**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 (2024):** Other - statistics on the reasons to postpone trials - number of hearing days in cases - number of hearings per day - the subject of 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 (2023):** - 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 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 (2022):** - 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 (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.

**Ireland**

**Q070 (2024):** While we do not routinely measure the missing activities above – that is not to say we cannot measure them.
•The Appeal ratio can be calculated if and when required.
•While we do not use disposition time, we can monitor it.
•We routinely measure waiting times and durations of proceedings.
•Productivity is measured in multiple ways, including via performance management processes

**Q070 (2023):** While we do not routinely measure the missing activities above – that is not to say we cannot measure them.
•Productivity is measured in multiple ways, including via performance management processes.
•The Appeal ratio can be calculated if and when required.
•While we do not use disposition time, we do have waiting times and durations of proceedings which are routinely captured and provide a good proxy.

**Q070 (2022):** These are not new or recently introduced monitoring options.

**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.

**Italy**

**Q070 (General Comment):** Within the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR), the Ministry of Justice has introduced an additional monitoring system specifically designed for PNRR purposes, in order to keep track of a series of KPIs related to the efficiency of the Italian courts.

**Latvia**

**Q070 (2023):** 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.

**Q070 (2022):** 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.

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

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

**Lithuania**

**Q070 (General Comment):** All data except satisfaction of users, 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.

**Q070 (2023):** National court administration carries out the courts assessing the quality of services and service delivery survey every year.

**Luxembourg**

**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.

**Malta**

**Q070 (2022):** Other: Age of the pending caseload.

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q070 (2024):** Many of these activities are included in the annual report, see for example Chapter 7 of 2024's Annual Report.

**Q070 (2023):** Many of these activities are included in the annual report, see for example Chapter 6 of 2023’s Annual Report: https://www.rechtspraak.nl/SiteCollectionDocuments/Jaarverslag%20Rechtspraak%202023.pdf

**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.

**Poland**

**Q070 (2024):** other - timeliness of the awarding of fees to experts and translators, timeliness of the preparation of motivations, workload of judges and registrars.
The selection of question 70 in the questionnaire, ‘User satisfaction regarding court services,’ is based on monitoring the quality of customer service using satisfaction surveys conducted in common courts. Monitoring of service quality focuses mainly on assessing communication aspects of service, such as: assistance from court staff in handling cases, staff patience, clear and understandable communication between staff and users.
This information was collected in previous years.
As regards the data on ‘court costs’ in this question, data on the enforcement of court judgments in relation to fines, fees and court costs are monitored by the Ministry of Justice in NS1 reports for individual statistical periods. The data was collected in previous years.

**Q070 (2023):** * other - timeliness of the awarding of fees to experts and translators, timeliness of the preparation of motivations, workload of judges and registrars. Others - the data comes from the Department of Administrative Supervision and has also been used previously.

**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.

**Portugal**

**Q070 (2022):** Users satisfaction is monitored through surveys and indirectly by the consulting body of each court that includes members of the community. The appeal ratio is only monitored in the context of judges evaluation.

**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.

**Romania**

**Q070 (2024):** ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment •The ReJust Desktop App and the Notebook module implemented on the website www.rejust.ro are work tools aimed at the optimization of the management of cases. Their scope is the speedy resolution of cases, through automation and simplification of administrative tasks, the reduction of processing times and facilitating quick access to necessary information. These tools ensure a more efficient management of cases, a faster resolution thereof and an adequate monitoring, significantly contributing to the modernization and standardization of judicial activities. Furthermore, the App offers advanced IT solutions for reasoning repetitive cases, allowing the use of standardized templates for ensuring the speeding up of the case reasoning process.
•The portal registratura.rejust.ro is a work tool which facilitates the submission of claims, documents and the payment of the stamp duties. The objective of this tool is the digitalization and streamlining of judicial processes, ensuring the acceleration of case resolution, as well as costs reduction and the standardization of activities, offering a unitary and accessible platform for interested parties.

**Q070 (2023):** ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment •The ReJust Desktop App and the Notebook module implemented on the website www.rejust.ro are work tools aimed at the optimization of the management of cases. Their scope is the speedy resolution of cases, through automation and simplification of administrative tasks, the reduction of processing times and facilitating quick access to necessary information. These tools ensure a more efficient management of cases, a faster resolution thereof and an adequate monitoring, significantly contributing to the modernization and standardization of judicial activities. Furthermore, the App offers advanced IT solutions for reasoning repetitive cases, allowing the use of standardized templates for ensuring the speeding up of the case reasoning process.
•The portal registratura.rejust.ro is a work tool which facilitates the submission of claims, documents and the payment of the stamp duties. The objective of this tool is the digitalization and streamlining of judicial processes, ensuring the acceleration of case resolution, as well as costs reduction and the standardization of activities, offering a unitary and accessible platform for interested parties.

**Q070 (2022):** ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q070 (General Comment):** The category “other” encompasses: the number of cases according to types of disputes, the results of the cases
(reconciliation, dismissals, full satisfaction, partial satisfaction, etc.).

**Slovenia**

**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).

**Spain**

**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 (2023):** An example of monitoring user satisfaction is the opinion poll commissioned by the General Council of the Judiciary, entitled "The Perception of Justice Among Its Service Users", conducted in February 2023. The results are published on the website

**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.

### Question 070-1

**Austria**

**Q070-1 (2024):** This year the "satisfaction of prosecution staff" included, because the replies have not been answered correctly in the past.

**Bulgaria**

**Q070-1 (General Comment):** .Other: The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, pursuant to Art. 54 of the Judiciary System Act, examines the organization of the administrative duties of the courts, prosecutor's offices and investigative bodies; reviews the organization of the initiation and motions of court, prosecutor's and investigative proceedings, as well as the closure of cases within the established deadlines; analyzes and summarizes the cases that have been closed by a final court act, as well as the closed files and cases of prosecutors and investigators, adopting a procedure for regular reporting and publication of the results of the analysis and summary of the closed cases; in the event of contradictory judiciary practices, observed in the execution of work pursuant to Article 54(1)(3) of the Judiciary System Act, notifies the respective authorities to request the adoption of interpretative decisions or interpretative rulings; performs integrity and conflict of interest checks for judges, prosecutors and investigators on their property declarations, as well as on the detection of actions that violate the reputation of the judiciary and those related to the breach of the independence of judges, prosecutors and investigators; reviews applications against the hearing and settlement of cases within a reasonable timeline, prepares an annual programme for planned inspections and an annual report on its activities, submitted to the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council; adopts a model for reporting on the settlement of cases within the legal timeline in the performance of duties under Article 54, (1)(2) of the Judiciary System Act, in coordination with the Supreme Judicial Council; prepares annual summaries of good and bad practices in terms of compliance with the ethical rules in accordance with the relevant European and international standards in relation to the abovementioned checks and provides the information to the relevant Colleges of the Supreme Judicial Council.

**Q070-1 (2024):** Pursuant to Art. 54 of the JSA The Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) shall check the organization of administrative operation of the courts, prosecution offices and investigating authorities; 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; analyze and summarize the cases that have been closed by an effective judicial act, as well as the closed files and cases of prosecutors and investigators, by adopting a procedure for regular reporting and publishing of the results of the analysis and summarizing the closed cases; in the presence of conflicting case-law, the existence of which has been found in carrying out the activity under Art. 54 (1), item 3 of the JSA, it shall alert the competent authorities of the need to request the rendition of interpretative judgements or interpretative decrees; carry out integrity testing and examinations for conflict of interest of judges, prosecutors and investigators, 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 investigators; examine applications against an infringement of the right to have a case examined and disposed of within a reasonable time; 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; adopt a template for reporting the completion of cases within the statutory time limits when carrying out its activity under Art. 54 (1), item 2 of the JSA after consultations with the Supreme Judicial Council; summarize annually the good and bad practices regarding the observance of the ethical rules in accordance with the relevant European and international standards in connection with the abovementioned checks and shall provide the information to the Colleges of the Supreme Judicial Council. The ISJC carries out its inspections based on an annual program for the respective calendar year (planned inspections), upon signals and upon self-referral. The ISJC prepares an annual report on its activities, which is presented to the plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council and is considered by the National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria.

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

**Denmark**

**Q070-1 (2024):** Length of procedure: If what is meant is how long from charge to indictment, then that is something we measure and it is not a new procedure.
Cost of judicial procedure: We have changed the answer compared to the previous evaluation cycle. Clearance rate: We monitor both the number of pending charges without indictment and pending charges without decision and can thereby calculate the difference and have been able to do so not just this year, so this is not a new procedure either.

**Q070-1 (2023):** Length of procedure: If what is meant is how long from charge to indictment, then that is something we measure and it is not a new procedure.
Cost of judicial procedure: We have changed the answer compared to the previous evaluation cycle. Clearance rate: We monitor both the number of pending charges without indictment and pending charges without decision and can thereby calculate the difference and have been able to do so not just this year, so this is not a new procedure either.

**Q070-1 (2022):** - The prosecution makes monthly 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.
- The prosecution makes an biannual survey on the satisfaction of the prosecution staff.

**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.

**Finland**

**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.

**France**

**Q070-1 (2024):** Civil and criminal courts: source: DSJ
There is no regular monitoring of the activities of public prosecutor services for the satisfaction of public prosecutor staff and for the costs of legal proceedings.

**Q070-1 (2021):** Source DSJ

**Q070-1 (2020):** Judicial jurisdiction.

**Germany**

**Q070-1 (General Comment):** The Federal Statistical Office collects key figures on the public prosecution offices' performance (incoming cases, resolved cases, pending cases on the beginning and the end of a year) from the federal states and publishes the data once per year.

**Q070-1 (2024):** All feredal states reported monitoring regarding number of incoming, resolved and pending cases as well as lenght of proceedings and disposition time.
4 federal states reported monitornig costs of the judicial procedures and 2 reported monitoring productivity of prosecutors and prosecution staff.

**Q070-1 (2023):** The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all respondent federal states and the activities and 5 and 10 to 12 were selected by the majority of the federal states. A minority of the federal states also monitors the costs of the judicial proceedings

**Q070-1 (2022):** The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all respondent federal states and the activitiers and 5 and 10 to 12 were selected by the majority of the federal states. A minority of the federal states also monitors the costs of the judicial proceedings.
One federal state has not yet replied.

**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.

**Greece**

**Q070-1 (2024):** The twelfth option has been chosen by some courts.

**Q070-1 (2022):** It is noted that the clearance rate was not selected by all prosecutors'offices, in addition several prosecutors' offices but not all have chosen the option of percentage of convictions and acquittals.

**Hungary**

**Q070-1 (2022):** The public prosecution services are led in a hierarchical structure. Leaders perform their duties at a national and regional level, as well as at the level of each organizational unit. It is up to the decision of the leader who exercises the employer’s rights to determine how the activities (performance, quality) of the prosecution office should be evaluated and on the basis of what indicators in order to manage the organizational unit effectively. The set of indicators may vary from year to year, depending on the circumstances. Therefore, more than one answer could be given to the given question.
For example, the performance of individual prosecutors or officers may be assessed at the level of an organizational unit; a staff satisfaction survey may be conducted; or a target analysis based on client satisfaction may be carried out.
The clearance rate could also be considered as a reference point and is actually monitored by the public prosecution services. However, statistics are produced at the level of the prosecution services and at the regional level on a calendar year basis. Therefore, those decisions on the termination of prosecution proceedings which are made at the end of a year, but become final only in the following year, can only be taken into account in the next year. The number of indictments and the number of finally closed cases that are closed because of finally closed court cases in the years after the indictment may also differ from the number of indictments on an annual basis. Therefore, the “clearance rate” – as a reference point – is a difficult criterion to follow.
At the national level, the Prosecutor General is required to present a report to Parliament. This report does not focus on the performance of individual public prosecutors; instead, it assesses the performance of the public prosecution service as a whole and according to a breakdown of organizational units. In our 2023 response, we tried to take this into account and, in this respect, we have indicated that primarily the indicators indicated were taken into account. Compared to our previous response in 2020, there was no change in terms of the fact that the clearance rate had been taken into account, even if it was not the primary evaluation criterion.

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q070-1 (2023):** Information is published in Part 2 and Appendix 3 of ODPP Annual Report 2022 (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2024/05/AR-2022-eng-copy.pdf)

**Q070-1 (2022):** Information is published in Part 2 and Part 4 of ODPP Annual Report 2021 (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/02/AR2021eng.pdf).

**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

**Latvia**

**Q070-1 (2024):** Discontinued/closed criminal cases, quality of the final decisions made by the prosecutors, the motives of the protests submitted by the prosecutors and the examination results, crime trends in certain topical qualifications of criminal offenses (e.g. money laundering, human trafficking, sex crimes, violent crimes, etc.). Different quantitative performance targets have been assessed and monitored. The data in the monthly reports provided by public prosecutors allows (and has allowed in previous years too) to see the disposition time as well, however, there have been no standards set, for instance as to how long is too long. With the new system this indicator (disposition time), among others, is used to evaluate the professional performance of the prosecutor, even though only in comparison with other prosecutors.

**Q070-1 (2023):** Discontinued/closed criminal cases, quality of the final decisions made by the prosecutors, the motives of the protests submitted by the prosecutors and the examination results, crime trends in certain topical qualifications of criminal offenses (e.g. money laundering, human trafficking, sex crimes, violent crimes, etc.).
As stated in comments provided before (e.g. in the answer to Q83-2), different quantitative performance targets have been assessed and monitored. The data in the monthly reports provided by public prosecutors (referred to in comment to Q83.1-1 in 2022) allows (and has allowed in previous years too) to see the disposition time as well, however there have been no standards set, for instance as to how long is too long. With the new system this indicator (disposition time), among others, is used to evaluate the professional performance of the prosecutor, even though only in comparison with other prosecutors.

**Malta**

**Q070-1 (2022):** The Office of the Attorney General has embarked on a data management process that is seeing more information being collected in respect of the efficiency parameters of the Office. This explains why in this evaluation cycle, the cathegories of 'Backlog' and ' Productivity of Prosecutors and prosecutors staff' have been marked.

**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.

**Poland**

**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.

**Portugal**

**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.

**Romania**

**Q070-1 (2024):** Other: National Repository-starting 2023 the ECRIS 3 application (that was used only locally, at the level of each prosecution office) was extended and centralized in order to replicate most of the data available in the local ECRIS. ROARMIS-an application that monitors the debt recovery process starting the first stages of criminal investigation. SOICCAP-SAS - an application that monitors the complexity of the activity of each prosecutor and prosecution office, taking into account not only the number of cases, but the totality of activities for each case.

**Q070-1 (2023):** Other: National Repository-starting 2023 the ECRIS 3 application (that was used only locally, at the level of each prosecution office) was extended and centralized in order to replicate most of the data available in the local ECRIS. ROARMIS-an application that monitors the debt recovery process starting the first stages of criminal investigation. SOICCAP-SAS - an application that monitors the complexity of the activity of each prosecutor and prosecution office, taking into account not only the number of cases, but the totality of activities for each case.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q070-1 (2024):** The verification activity is carried out once a year, either randomly or based on a plan. It focuses on one subordinate prosecutor's office, either regional or district, in the non-criminal section.
The monitoring process focuses on all files from a specific period and reviews them thoroughly. This includes making sure the files are complete, and meet both procedural and legal standards

**Q070-1 (2023):** The verification activity is carried out once a year, either randomly or based on a plan. It focuses on one subordinate prosecutor's office, either regional or district, in the non-criminal section.
The monitoring process focuses on all files from a specific period and reviews them thoroughly. This includes making sure the files are complete, and meet both procedural and legal standards.

**Slovenia**

**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 (2024):** Other: percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions…

**Q070-1 (2023):** "other": percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions.

**Q070-1 (2022):** "other": percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions…

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

**Spain**

**Q070-1 (General Comment):** The inspection service of the Public Prosecutor Office

**Q070-1 (2024):** The Fiscal Inspection Service is an internal body within the Public Prosecutor, responsible for overseeing and monitoring compliance with the duties and obligations of prosecutors and the proper functioning of the prosecutor's offices

**Q070-1 (2023):** The Fiscal Inspection Service is an internal body within the Public Prosecutor, responsible for overseeing and monitoring compliance with the duties and obligations of prosecutors and the proper functioning of the prosecutor's offices

## Question 071

**Belgium**

**Q071 (General Comment):** College of Courts and Tribunals: current mechanism (current exercise - backlog project)

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

**Bulgaria**

**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.

**Denmark**

**Q071 (2024):** We monitor all three options regarding pending cases and have been previously as well. The reason for the change is due to a new understanding of the question in regards to the use of the word "monitor". We now understand it as we collect the data, however we cannot force action upon the courts based on this data.

**Q071 (2023):** We monitor all three options regarding pending cases and have been previously as well. The reason for the change is due to a new understanding of the question in regards to the use of the word "monitor". We now understand it as we collect the data, however we cannot force action upon the courts based on this data.

**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.

**France**

**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.

**Germany**

**Q071 (2024):** The majority of the respondent federal states monitor pending cases and backlogs.

**Q071 (2023):** The majority of the respondent federal states monitor pending cases and backlogs.

**Q071 (2022):** The majority of the respondent federal states monitor pending cases and backlogs. Two federal states could not provide an answer, one federal state has not yet replied.

**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.

**Hungary**

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q071 (2024):** Civil Law statistics are recorded by cases received and cases resolved during the year. The majority of civil cases initiated in Ireland do not proceed to trial. Typically, they are settled between the parties (with or without a court approval), are formally discontinued (with notification to the defendant and the court), or are not pursued further by the plaintiff (without the plaintiff notifying the court). It is therefore not possible to provide figures for pending caseloads in most courts. In Criminal Law, backlogs can be measured when required.

**Q071 (2023):** Civil Law statistics are recorded by cases received and cases resolved during the year. The majority of civil cases initiated in Ireland do not proceed to trial. Typically, they are either settled between the parties (with or without a court approving a settlement), are formally discontinued (involving notification to the defendant and the court), or are not pursued further by the plaintiff (without the plaintiff notifying the court). It is therefore not possible to provide figures for pending caseloads in most courts.
In Criminal Law, cases are counted by offence, not by case/defendant. We record resolved cases as cases where an order is made. As there may be more than one penalty imposed in respect of an offence and a separate order made in respect of each penalty, the figures for resolved cases can appear to be higher than those for incoming cases and can cause difficulty in calculating figures for pending cases.

**Q071 (2022):** N/A

**Q071 (2020):** NAP

**Q071 (2018):** NAP

**Q071 (2016):** NAP

**Latvia**

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

**Lithuania**

**Q071 (2024):** The number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs) for civil, criminal and administrative law cases are monitoring.

**Luxembourg**

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q071 (General Comment):** The public prosecution logically only monitors criminal law cases, the courts monitor all types of cases.

**Q071 (2021):** Public prosecution only monitors criminal law cases, the courts monitor all.

**Romania**

**Q071 (2024):** STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

**Q071 (2023):** STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

**Q071 (2022):** STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

**Q071 (2021):** STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

**Q071 (2020):** STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

**Spain**

**Q071 (General Comment):** The CGPJ publishes quarterly territorial reports on the activity of judicial bodies and annual reports at state, High Court, provincial, and judicial district levels. For each specific territory and period, a wide range of indicators are provided for each type of body within the selected territorial scope: number of cases filed, resolved, and pending; number of final judgments, orders, and decrees; number of executions filed, resolved, and pending; resolution, backlog, congestion, and sentencing rates; evolution of key indicators compared to the same period of the previous year.
A set of indicators describe the situation of each jurisdiction and the system as a whole: resolution, backlog, congestion, and litigation rates; number of cases filed per judge; percentage of judgments handed down by career judges; number of judgments handed down per judge; estimated average durations at each instance. Each indicator is provided for the period and the same period of the year before. They are generated at state and High Court levels.

**Q071 (2023):** The CGPJ publishes quarterly territorial reports on the activity of judicial bodies and annual reports at state, High Court, provincial, and judicial district levels. For each specific territory and period, a wide range of indicators are provided for each type of body within the selected territorial scope: number of cases filed, resolved, and pending; number of final judgments, orders, and decrees; number of executions filed, resolved, and pending; resolution, backlog, congestion, and sentencing rates; evolution of key indicators compared to the same period of the previous year.
A set of indicators describe the situation of each jurisdiction and the system as a whole: resolution, backlog, congestion, and litigation rates; number of cases filed per judge; percentage of judgments handed down by career judges; number of judgments handed down per judge; estimated average durations at each instance. Each indicator is provided for the period and the same period of the year before. They are generated at state and High Court levels.

## Question 072

### Austria

**Q072 (2024):** Judicial proceedings – of both courts and public prosecution services – are systematically monitored for undue waiting periods. Depending on the type of proceeding a waiting period (= time during which no steps are taken in the proceeding) of three months, six months or twelve months is considered to be potentially undue. A waiting period exceeding this timeframe will lead to the proceeding appearing on an automatically generated list for review. The answer is different from last years, because the question has not been answered correctly in the past.

**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

### Belgium

**Q072 (General Comment):** For the public prosecution services: monitoring using dashboards.

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

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

### Bulgaria

**Q072 (2024):** The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC):
One of the main powers of the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) is to "check the organization of the initiation and progress of court, prosecution, and investigation cases, as well as the completion of cases within the established time limits" (Article 54, paragraph 1, item 2 of the Judiciary System Act). In exercising this power, the ISJC monitors for delays in the course of the relevant proceedings, which is done within the framework of the inspections carried out on the judicial authorities (comprehensive planned/scheduled inspections or inspections based on reports/signals) or when conducting preliminary investigations into reports/signals from individuals or legal entities of violations in the handling of cases. This year, the ISJC is responding to the questionnaire for the first time, as it has not been sent to it before. In previous years, the SJC probably gave a negative answer to this question in view of its own powers, rather than those exercised by the ISJC, which is an independent body separate from the SJC.

**Denmark**

**Q072 (2024):** We do collect data on the waiting time from the case is recieved in the system until the first court meeting and then until the case is finalized. But we do not use the data for monitoring the courts in regards to regulating the courts. The data is used for analysis among other things. The courts might individually keep track of the waiting time.

**Q072 (2023):** We do collect data on the waiting time from the case is recieved in the system until the first court meeting and then until the case is finalized. But we do not use the data for monitoring the courts in regards to regulating the courts. The data is used for analysis among other things. The courts might individually keep track of the waiting time.

**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

**Estonia**

**Q072 (General Comment):** There are reminders in the CMS after certain period.

**Finland**

**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.

**France**

**Q072 (2024):** Administrative justice : source: Council of state
The mechanism for monitoring waiting time during court proceedings exists only for administrative courts (source: Council of State). The Skipper software allows one to see the status of the case and whether an investigative measure is pending. However, it does not send an alert to the investigating judge.

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

**Q072 (2020):** Answer for the court.

**Germany**

**Q072 (2024):** One federal state monitors waiting time with respect to the ordinary courts. A minority of 2 federal states monitor waiting time with regard to the public prosecution services. The vast majority of the federal states does not monitor waiting time.

**Q072 (2023):** One federal state monitors waiting time with respect to the ordinary courts. A minority of 2 federal states monitor waiting time with regard to the public prosecution services. The vast majority of the federal states does not monitor waiting time.

**Q072 (2022):** One federal state monitors waiting time with respect to the ordinary courts. A minority of 3 federal states monitor waiting time with regard to the public prosecution services. The vast majority of the federal states does not monitor waiting time.

**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".

**Greece**

**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 (2024):** The President of the Court and the Presidents of the Departments oversee the proceedings, and if it is observed that a case has been pending for an extended period, they issue recommendations to the judges to whom the case has been assigned( Council of State).

**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.

**Hungary**

**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 (2023):** Judges: Two legal institutions are not taken into account in the length of the procedure:
Interruption of proceedings - Act CXXX of 2016 on the Code of Civil Procedure point 34.
Stay of proceedings - Act CXXX of 2016 on the Code of Civil Procedure point 35.
Prosecutors: The Prosecution Service takes into account the inactive period in court proceedings and has answered 'yes' to the question accordingly.

**Q072 (2022):** It was not possible to give an unambiguous answer to this question because of the reasons given in point 70-1. There are several possible "waiting times" in court proceedings which can be monitored. The length of proceedings can be and is monitored by the public prosecution services at the organizational, regional and local levels to different extents. As there was no substantive change in this respect, our reply is modified as follows, in line with the previous answer.
If the question refers to the judicial recess, the answer is "yes"; it is monitored by those who exercise the employer's rights, mainly for the purpose of granting a leave of absence.

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q072 (2023):** We currently capture waiting times for most jurisdictions and areas of law, and we are increasing the capture of duration of proceedings.

**Italy**

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

**Latvia**

**Q072 (2024):** On an irregular basis, the Ministry of Justice and the Council of Justice analyze the number of days (period) from the initiation or receipt of the case in court to the moment when the case review is started.

**Q072 (2022):** "Within the courts": On an irregular basis, the Ministry of Justice and the Council of Justice analyze the number of days (period) from the initiation or receipt of the case in court to the moment when the case review is started.

**Lithuania**

**Q072 (2024):** Through administrative supervision mechanism

**Q072 (2023):** Through administrative supervision mechanism

**Q072 (2022):** Within the courts: through an administrative supervision mechanism.

**Q072 (2020):** courts: through administrative supervision mechanism

**Luxembourg**

**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.

**Malta**

**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.

**Netherlands**

**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).

**Poland**

**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 (2024):** ongoing monitoring of statistical data by court presidents regarding the duration of proceedings in specific categories of cases

**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.

**Portugal**

**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 (2022):** The waiting period is monitored in the quarterly monitoring of all judicial courts. The Court President reports to the council the number of cases that are waiting procedural movement for more then 1, 2, 3 or 4 months.

**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.

**Romania**

**Q072 (2024):** 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 (2023):** 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 (2022):** 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 (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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q072 (2024):** The prosecutor's office, as one of the parties to the legal proceedings, cannot fundamentally influence its length. However, prosecutors continuously monitor the status of criminal cases after the indictment has been filed and, in justified cases, communicate with the courts to determine the reasons for inaction or the current status of the case, usually by written requests.
The prosecutor, as a party to the proceedings, also has the authority in this regard arising from the legal regulation, namely to file a complaint for inaction pursuant to Section 55, paragraph 3 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Complaints for inaction under Section 55(3) of the Criminal Procedure Code were filed by prosecutors in a total of 186 cases in 2024.

**Q072 (2023):** If the prosecutor becomes involved in a specific procedure, receives a complaint about court inactivity, or becomes aware of such inactivity through other means, they must either highlight the inactivity within the proceedings or request the president of the court to take action to resolve it.

**Slovenia**

**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.

## Question 083

**Austria**

**Q083 (2018):** There are no specific targets given to the Judges, which are seen as a conflict with the Independence of Courts.

**Q083 (2016):** Provincial Administrative Courts: Maximum 150 cases a year per judge (average value).
Federal Finance Court:
No performance targets, which are seen in conflict with the independence. However based on a continuous transparent controlling the possibility of benchmarking exists. In addition regular dialogues with the judges regarding their performance are held.

**Croatia**

**Q083 (2020):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18) , the Minister in charge for Justice, upon the proposal of the General Assembley of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, adopts the Framework criteria for the work of judges.

**Czech Republic**

**Q083 (General Comment):** Quantitative performance targets exist but they are not strictly binding. The Ministry of Justice in the Czech Republic uses "measures" (měřítka) as the sole numerical indicators for allocating judge and support staff positions across courts on an annual basis. Functioning similarly to case weights, these measures represent the notional number of cases that a judge or support staff member should handle in a year on a full-time basis; for example, in 2024, each district court judge is expected to manage 352 civil cases or 230 criminal cases annually. The measures are updated or confirmed each year by the systemisation commission, an informal body of representatives from regional, superior, and supreme court management, along with the Ministry of Justice. They are published in documents that accompany the Minister of Justice's annual allocation decision.
Universal across courts of the same level, these measures and historical case data guide the Ministry in distributing judge and staff positions among superior, regional, and district courts. Regional court presidents have the flexibility to adjust these allocations based on local conditions or specific court needs, while staffing for the Supreme Court and Supreme Administrative Court is managed through direct arrangements between their respective presidents and the Minister of Justice.
To improve the accuracy of these allocations, the Ministry of Justice is undertaking a project, supported by the European Commission’s Technical Support Instrument, to gather empirical data on the labour intensity of various tasks performed by judges and support staff. This project aims to strengthen the factual basis for determining the measures.
Additionally, court presidents continuously monitor the performance of judges and support staff to ensure cases are processed within reasonable timeframes, upholding individuals' right to have cases heard promptly. However, the Ministry of Justice does not regulate or oversee this managerial and disciplinary authority, which is independently exercised by court management.

**Q083 (2018):** Quantitative performance targets exist but they are not strictly binding.

**Denmark**

**Q083 (General Comment):** Judges are independent. Therefore measuring is done focusing on case-flows and economic indicators without identifying the individual judge.

**Q083 (2022):** The judges are independent. Therefore measuring is done focusing on case-flows and economic indicators.

**Q083 (2018):** There are no such targets from the side of Danish Court administration, but quantitative performances are used to re-allocate ressources so the court in most need of ressources in case of a vacant judge position also gets the vacant position.

**Finland**

**Q083 (General Comment):** A court can decide whether it sets quantitative performance targets for each judge. There are targets set for each judge in some courts.

**Q083 (2016):** It is up to each court to decide. In some courts there are targets set for each judge.

**France**

**Q083 (2024):** For civil and criminal courts the reply is "No". For administrative courts the reply is "Yes".

**Q083 (2022):** The positive reply concerns administrative courts.

**Q083 (2016):** Individual quantitative objectives are established only with regard to administrative judges by the respective court president.

**Germany**

**Q083 (General Comment):** There are no quantitative performance targets because this might interfere with judicial independence as defined by article 97 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany ("Judges shall be independent and subject only to the law.").

**Q083 (2024):** Of the respondent federal states, all but one reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for judges.

**Q083 (2023):** Of the respondent federal states, all but one reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for judges.

**Q083 (2022):** Of the respondent 15 federal states, 14 reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for judges. One federal state has not yet replied.

**Greece**

**Q083 (General Comment):** The Head of each court is responsible for the assignment of the cases between judges of his/her competence. In this sense, he/she is aware of the quantitative performance of judges. The assigned cases have to be dealt with by the judges within the period of 8 (eight) months according to Law 4983/2022 (art. 99-104) and Law 2717/1999 art. 194 par.1.
Each administrative court sets up an internal service regulation (Article 19 of Law 4938/2022) which specifies, among other things, the number of cases assigned to each judge per month or year, taking into consideration the special circumstances of each court, the number of serving judges and the seriousness of the cases(General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts).

**Q083 (2023):** Each administrative court sets up an internal service regulation (Article 19 of Law 4938/2022) which specifies, among other things, the number of cases assigned to each judge per month or year, taking into consideration the special circumstances of each court, the number of serving judges and the seriousness of the cases(General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts).

**Q083 (2022):** Every administrative judge is charged each year with a specific number of cases to carry out, stipulated by an internal Regulation, according to a model adopted by the General Commission of the State.

**Q083 (2020):** Every administrative judge is charged each year with a specific number of cases to carry out, stipulated by an internal Regulation.

**Q083 (2018):** Every judge is charged each year with a specific number of cases to carry out, stipulated by an internal Regulation.

**Q083 (2016):** Every judge is charged each year with a specific number of cases to carry out, stipulated by an internal Regulation.

**Hungary**

**Q083 (2024):** There is no specified number of cases to resolve for each judge, but according to the act on the Legal Status and Remuneration of Judges and the regulation governing the administration of courts, the number of hearing days is mandatorily specified.

**Q083 (2023):** There is no specified number of cases to resolve for each judge, but according to the act on the Legal Status and Remuneration of Judges and the regulation governing the administration of courts, the number of hearing days is mandatorily specified.

**Italy**

**Q083 (General Comment):** Law n.71 of 17 June 2022 has recently modified article 2 of Legislative Decree n.109, 23 February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates. The amendment has introduced specific disciplinary offences regarding the conduct of the magistrate who does not cooperate in reaching the goals laid in the 'Program for the management of civil and criminal proceedings' (in Italian 'Programma di Gestione'), which is disciplined by art37 of Decree-Law II. 98 of 6 of July 2011 and regularly approved by each Court.

**Q083 (2020):** Quantitative performance targets are set in terms of length and timeframe of proceedings. Judges who fail to meet certain
requirements may face disciplinary proceedings.

**Q083 (2018):** Quantitative performance targets are set in terms of length and timeframe of proceedings. Judges who fail to meet certain requirements may face disciplinary proceedings.

**Q083 (2016):** Quantitative performance targets are set in terms of length and timeframe of proceedings. Judges who fail to meet certain requirements may face disciplinary proceedings.

**Malta**

**Q083 (General Comment):** The administration of the case load is left in the hands of the individual judge and magistrate together with the Chief Justice who assigns the particular duties to each judge and magistrate.

**Q083 (2016):** The administration of the case load is left in the hands of the individual judge/ magistrate together with the Chief Justice who assigns the particular duties to each judge and magistrate.

**Netherlands**

**Q083 (2016):** There is a planning and control cycle (3 times per year) which involves financial/accounting evaluation but also visits ('bestuurlijke overleggen), there is once per year an accountant check of the annual report (per court and for total of 19 district courts, 5 general appeal courts and 2 specialised courts (Trade and Inductry Tribunal (CBb) and Central Appeals Tribunal (CRvB)), and once every 4 years there is a round of visitations.

**Poland**

**Q083 (General Comment):** In general there are not any quantitative performance targets defined for each judge but for certain cases the law imposes timeframe for performing specific action or handling specific matters. President of the court sets the performance target with using statistically calculated indicators of average performance that court and individual judge is expected to achieve.

**Portugal**

**Q083 (General Comment):** Taking into account the results obtained in the previous year and the strategic objectives formulated for the following year, the president of the court and the coordinating prosecutor, after hearing the judicial administrator, articulate, for the following year, proposals for objectives of a procedural nature (management or administrative) for the district and for the courts of extended territorial jurisdiction, as well as for the Public Prosecution Offices located there, which have to be ratified respectively by the Judicial High Council and the Attorney General's Office.
The procedural objectives of the district shall refer, in particular, to the number of completed cases and the time of their duration, taking into account, among other factors, the nature of the process or the value of the case, considering the human resources and the means related to the functioning of the district and based, namely, on the established procedural reference values.
The procedural objectives of the district may not impose, limit or condition the decisions to be rendered in specific cases, either on the merits of the matter, or on the option for the procedural form understood as more appropriate.
The procedural objectives of the district must be reflected in the objectives established annually for judicial officers and be considered in the respective assessment.
The procedural objectives of the district must be considered in the evaluation criteria of the magistrates, defined by the respective Councils.

**Slovenia**

**Q083 (General Comment):** Since 2016, the Criteria on the work abilities does not include standards for the minimal expected number of solved cases (however the number of resolved cases is still monitored).

**Q083 (2018):** Since 2016, the Criteria on the work abilities does not include standards for the minimal expected number of solved cases (however the number of resolved cases is still monitored).

**Q083 (2016):** Since 2016, the Criteria on the work abilities does not include standards for the minimal expected number of solved cases (however the number of resolved cases is still monitored).

**Spain**

**Q083 (General Comment):** According to Article 403 of the Organic Law of the Judiciary, "Variable remuneration for objectives shall be linked to the individual performance demonstrated by each judge or magistrate in the performance of his or her jurisdictional and professional functions."
The Agreement of November 29, 2018, of the Plenary of the General Council of the Judiciary, which approves Regulation 2/2018, establishes a complex system in which "individualization is done by establishing certain categories of Courts, taking into account the material content of their respective competence, and certain categories of cases, so that, based on this categorization, a value is obtained, representative of the average resolution time, which is assigned to the types of resolutions." Certain correction factors are then applied.

**Q083 (2023):** According to Article 403 of the Organic Law of the Judiciary, "Variable remuneration for objectives shall be linked to the individual performance demonstrated by each judge or magistrate in the performance of his or her jurisdictional and professional functions."
The Agreement of November 29, 2018, of the Plenary of the General Council of the Judiciary, which approves Regulation 2/2018, establishes a complex system in which "individualization is done by establishing certain categories of Courts, taking into account the material content of their respective competence, and certain categories of cases, so that, based on this categorization, a value is obtained, representative of the average resolution time, which is assigned to the types of resolutions." Certain correction factors are then applied.

### Question 083-1

**Austria**

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** No specific targets are formulated in respect of judges.

**Q083-1 (2016):** Answer counts only for the administrative courts.
For the other courts, no performance targets, which are seen as a conflict with the independence of courts.

**Croatia**

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** According to the Courts Act, the Minister of Justice, upon the proposal of the General Session of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, adopts the Framework criteria for the workload of judges.

**Denmark**

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** Judges are independent. Therefore measuring is done focusing on case-flows and economic indicators.

**Q083-1 (2018):** NA as per answer 083.

**Finland**

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** The National Courts Administration negotiates annually with each court in order to set targets and objectives for the court for the next year. An allocation of permanent staff and possible additional temporary judges or other staff is decided upon these negotiations but within the state budget. Timeframe (length of proceedings) targets are also set. Possible issues and problems with developing the activities of the court are also discussed. Finally, the appropriation to cover the annual costs of the court operations is agreed. A minutes of the negotiation is written and it includes the targets, objectives and estimated workloads for the court for the next year. The chief justices of the courts can then apply this results-based management system in their respective courts as they see appropriate.

**France**

**Q083-1 (2024):** Civil and criminal courts, the reply is NAP. For administrative courts, it is the court president. No quantitative objective per judge is defined at the national level. The General Secretariat of the Council of State sets an overall objective per court, in consultation with the court president. Court presidents can set quantitative performance objectives per judge: number of cases per year, priority to the oldest cases.

**Q083-1 (2023):** No quantitative objective is defined per judge at the national level. For administrative courts, the General Secretariat of the Council of State, in consultation with the head of court, sets an overall objective for each court.
The heads of jurisdiction can set quantitative performance objectives per judge: number of cases per year, priority to the oldest cases.

**Germany**

**Q083-1 (2024):** One federal state reported, that quantitative performance targets can be defined based on the system used to determine staffing requirements of the judiciary.

**Q083-1 (2023):** One federal state reported, that quantitative performance targets can be defined based on the system used to determine staffing requirements of the judiciary.

**Q083-1 (2020):** There are no quantitative performance targets for each judge

**Greece**

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** Besides the heads of courts, there are also the plenary of the Supreme Courts.

**Ireland**

**Q083-1 (2018):** NAP

**Q083-1 (2016):** NAP

**Latvia**

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** According to the Law on Judicial Power, when adjudicating, judges are independent and are subject only to the law. Therefore, judges set targets by themselves. However, the President of the court monitors the workload of the judges in the court as a whole, assigning cases to another judge if necessary.

**Q083-1 (2024):** According to the Law on Judicial Power, when adjudicating, judges are independent and are subject only to the law. Therefore, judges set targets by themselves. However, the President of the court monitors the workload of the judges in the court as a whole, assigning cases to another judge if necessary.

**Q083-1 (2023):** According to the Law on Judicial Power, when adjudicating, judges are independent and are subject only to the law. Therefore, judges set targets by themselves. However, the President of the court monitors the workload of the judges in the court as a whole, assigning cases to another judge if necessary.

**Luxembourg**

**Q083-1 (2018):** NAP

**Malta**

**Q083-1 (2018):** NA

**Netherlands**

**Q083-1 (2018):** NAP

**Q083-1 (2016):** The planning and control cycle is done by The Council for the Judiciary, on a court level (not at individual judge level). Targets for each individual judge are not imposed by The Council for the Judiciary.

**Poland**

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** .

**Q083-1 (2016):** For certain cases the law imposes timeframe for performing specific action or handling specific matters. President of court sets the performance target with using statistically calculated indicators of average performance that court and individual judge is expected to achieve.

**Romania**

**Q083-1 (2016):** 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.)

**Slovenia**

**Q083-1 (General Comment):** See Q114.

### Question 083-1-1

**Croatia**

**Q083-1-1 (2024):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22) , the president of the court where a judge performs judicial duties issues a decision each calendar year assessing whether the judge has fulfilled their duties based on prescribed criteria. If it is determined that the judge, without justified reason, did not meet the required number of decisions or performed duties improperly, disciplinary proceedings must be initiated in accordance with the State Judicial Council Act.
Disciplinary action against a court president is initiated by the president of the higher court. Sanctions for disciplinary offences may include a rebuke, salary reduction (up to one third for up to 12 months), or dismissal.
If justified reasons exist for underperformance, they must be explained and the decision forwarded to the higher court. Judges may object to such a decision within three days; the court president must respond within eight days. If the objection is rejected, the judge may appeal to the higher court, whose decision is final and not subject to further legal remedies.

**Q083-1-1 (2023):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22) the president of the court in which the judge performs judicial duty determines by decision for the previous calendar year whether the judge has fulfilled his duties as a judge according to the prescribed criteria. If the president of the court determines that the judge, without justifiable reason, did not make the number of decisions determined by the Framework Criteria for the work of judges in a one-year period or that he performed his judicial duties improperly, he is obliged to initiate disciplinary proceedings against such a judge, in accordance with the State Judicial Council Act. Disciplinary proceedings against the president of the court are initiated by the president of the immediately higher court. According to the State Judicial Council Act (Official Gazette No. 116/10, 57/11, 130/11, 13/13, 28/13, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) disciplinary penalties may be imposed for committed disciplinary offences: rebuke, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of one to three months, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of four to six months, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of seven to twelve months or dismissal from duty. If the president of the court determines that, due to justified reasons, the judge did not make the number of decisions determined by the Framework Criteria for the work of judges in a one-year period, he is obliged to state in the explanation of the decision what justified reasons are in question and submit the decision immediately to the president of the higher court. Against the decision of the president of the court, which determines whether the judge has fulfilled his duties as a judge, the judge can submit an objection to the president of the court within three days of receiving the decision. The president of the court is obliged to decide on the objection within eight days. The president of the court can reject the complaint or accept it and make a new decision. If the objection is rejected, the judge has the right to appeal to the president of the immediately higher court within eight days from the delivery of the decision on the objection. The president of the immediately higher court can make a decision confirming the decision of the president of the court or accept the appeal and make a new decision. Against this decision, the judge has no right to declare legal remedies.

**Q083-1-1 (2022):** According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 130/20, 21/22, 60/22) the president of the court in which the judge performs judicial duty determines by decision for the previous calendar year whether the judge has fulfilled his duties as a judge according to the prescribed criteria. If the president of the court determines that the judge, without justifiable reason, did not make the number of decisions determined by the Framework Criteria for the work of judges in a one-year period or that he performed his judicial duties improperly, he is obliged to initiate disciplinary proceedings against such a judge, in accordance with the State Judicial Council Act. Disciplinary proceedings against the president of the court are initiated by the president of the immediately higher court. According to the State Judicial Council Act (Official Gazette No. 116/10, 57/11, 130/11, 13/13, 28/13, 82/15, 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) disciplinary penalties may be imposed for committed disciplinary offences: rebuke, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of one to three months, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of four to six months, a fine of up to one third of the salary earned in the previous month in a period of seven to twelve months or dismissal from duty. If the president of the court determines that, due to justified reasons, the judge did not make the number of decisions determined by the Framework Criteria for the work of judges in a one-year period, he is obliged to state in the explanation of the decision what justified reasons are in question and submit the decision immediately to the president of the higher court.
Against the decision of the president of the court, which determines whether the judge has fulfilled his duties as a judge, the judge can submit an objection to the president of the court within three days of receiving the decision.
The president of the court is obliged to decide on the objection within eight days. The president of the court can reject the complaint or accept it and make a new decision.
If the objection is rejected, the judge has the right to appeal to the president of the immediately higher court within eight days from the delivery of the decision on the objection. The president of the immediately higher court can make a decision confirming the decision of the president of the court or accept the appeal and make a new decision. Against this decision, the judge has no right to declare legal remedies.

**Denmark**

**Q083-1-1 (2023):** The Danish judges have absolute independance.

**Finland**

**Q083-1-1 (General Comment):** See general comments to Q 83-1

**France**

**Q083-1-1 (2023):** The individual part of the administrative judges' function allowance (there is also a functional part that depends on the responsibilities, the level of experience and the constraints relating to the functions performed), which takes into account the results obtained and the way of serving, may be adjusted if the objectives, qualitative and in particular quantitative, are not met.
During the previous collection, all items had been checked. In reality, rather than disciplinary proceedings, proceedings for professional inadequacy would be initiated.
In civil and criminal justice, on the other hand, there are no defined targets.

**Germany**

**Q083-1-1 (2024):** One federal state selected "reflected in the individual assessment" and "warning by the court's president".

**Q083-1-1 (2023):** One federal state selected "reflected in the individual assessment" and "warning by the court's president".

**Greece**

**Q083-1-1 (2024):** "Other": Disciplinary punishment pronounced by the competent disciplinary body, that can reach the permanent termination.

**Hungary**

**Q083-1-1 (2024):** Without disciplinary procedure - Other: withdrawal of remote work
With disciplinary procedure - Other: discharge from executive office

**Q083-1-1 (2023):** According to the Act on the Legal Status and Remuneration of Judges -section 124 - disciplinary measures may be imposed against a judge for professional misconduct. Although it is theoretically possible for the above measures to be applied in the event of non-compliance with the quantitative requirement indicated in question 83, this does not occur in practice.

**Italy**

**Q083-1-1 (2022):** Disciplinary sanction as provided by the Legislative Decree no 109 of 23rd February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates.

### Question 083-2

**Denmark**

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

**France**

**Q083-2 (2021):** source DSJ

**Germany**

**Q083-2 (2024):** Of the respondent federal states, all but one reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for public prosecutors.

**Q083-2 (2023):** Of the respondent federal states, all but one reported that there are no quantitative performance targets for public prosecutors

**Q083-2 (2022):** Out of 15 respondent federal states, 14 reported that there are no quantitative performane targets for public prosecutors. One federal state has not yet replied.

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

**Greece**

**Q083-2 (2022):** There is, however, as far as possible an equal distribution of cases between them by the Head of the Service (Prosecution Service) and the obligation of the public prosecutor to process the cases assigned to him in the time frames provided for each case.

**Hungary**

**Q083-2 (2022):** Quantitative performance targets have not yet been set. The public prosecution services were in the process of installing a new specialized IT system (IIDR), which was originally planned to affect internal prosecution statistics too. However, it has not been introduced. The planned system is currently under revision, so it is not possible to provide information on how and when it will be introduced and whether quantitative performance targets will be set.

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

**Ireland**

**Q083-2 (2024):** It should be noted that the answer is dependent on how the term “target” is defined. Allocation of files happens in some divisions but not all, and not all prosecutors are assigned a specific number of files per week. Additionally, targets can be influenced by external factors such as: the number of investigation files received, or the availability of court dates in order to process cases. The main reason why prosecutors are not assigned a set number of files is because the size and complexity of files can vary significantly. Therefore, our answer has to be nuanced given the type of system we operate in and this would explain discrepancies in answers.
So while there are no targets defined, there is an expectation of work completion and case management through action lists, etc which we report in our annual report and also to DPER (Department of Public Expenditure and Reform) as part of our budget/ performance metrics.

**Q083-2 (2023):** It should be noted that the answer is dependent on how the term “target” is defined. Allocation of files happens in some divisions but not all, and not all prosecutors are assigned a specific number of files per week. Additionally, targets can be influenced by external factors such as: the number of investigation files received, or the availability of court dates in order to process cases. The main reason why prosecutors are not assigned a set number of files is because the size and complexity of files can vary significantly. Therefore, our answer has to be nuanced given the type of system we operate in and this would explain discrepancies in answer

**Q083-2 (2022):** Allocation of files happens in some divisions but not all, and not all prosecutors are assigned a specific number of files per week. Additionally, targets can be influenced by external factors such as: the number of investigation files received, or the availability of court dates in order to process cases. The main reason why prosecutors are not assigned a set number of files is because the size and complexity of files can vary significantly.

**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

**Italy**

**Q083-2 (General Comment):** Law n.71 of 17 June 2022 has recently modified article 2 of Legislative Decree n.109, 23 February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates. The amendment has introduced specific disciplinary offences regarding the conduct of the magistrate who does not cooperate in reaching the goals laid in the 'Program for the management of civil and criminal proceedings' (in Italian 'Programma di Gestione'), which is disciplined by art37 of Decree-Law II. 98 of 6 of July 2011 and regularly approved by each Court.

**Latvia**

**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).

**Q083-2 (2024):** During 2023 the number of processed (closed, brought to court and concluded by a penalty imposed/negotiated by the prosecutor) cases was assessed and monitored, but no standard was set for how many cases should be completed. The new system for evaluating the professional performance of prosecutors (effective as of 1st of January 2024) provides that the quantitative indicator of the work performed by the district-level prosecutor is evaluated every year in comparison to other prosecutors.

**Q083-2 (2023):** During 2023 the number of processed (closed, brought to court and concluded by a penalty imposed/negotiated by the prosecutor) cases was assessed and monitored, but no standard was set for how many cases should be completed. The new system for evaluating the professional performance of prosecutors (effective as of 1st January 2024) provides that the quantitative indicator of the work performed by the district-level prosecutor is evaluated every year.

**Lithuania**

**Q083-2 (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.

**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q083-2 (2018):** NAP

**Netherlands**

**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.

**Portugal**

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q083-2 (2024):** Quantitative performance goals for the prosecutor are not set, but in general, the prosecutor's office sets goals, for example, with a plan of main tasks, and it is monitored. The General Prosecutor as well as the leading prosecutors are responsible for setting these goals, and disciplinary action may be taken if they are not met.

**Q083-2 (2023):** Quantitative performance goals for the prosecutor are not set, but in general, the prosecutor's office sets goals, for example, with a plan of main tasks, and it is monitored. The General Prosecutor as well as the leading prosecutors are responsible for setting these goals, and disciplinary action may be taken if they are not met.

**Slovenia**

**Q083-2 (General Comment):** .

## Question 083-3

**Austria**

**Q083-3 (2018):** There are no specific targets given to public prosecutors.

**Belgium**

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

**Croatia**

**Q083-3 (2022):** According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18, 21/22) , the Minister in charge for Justice, with the prior opinion 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.

**Germany**

**Q083-3 (2024):** One federal state reported, that quantitative performance targets can be defined based on the system used to determine staffing requirements of the judiciary.

**Q083-3 (2023):** One federal state reported, that quantitative performance targets can be defined based on the system used to determine staffing requirements of the judiciary.

**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

**Greece**

**Q083-3 (2022):** The answer chosen is in accordance with the answers of the majority of the prosecutors ' offices.

**Ireland**

**Q083-3 (2024):** Unit Heads assign a number of files to each Prosecutor depending on ability or grade. The targets for the Office are ultimately greatly impacted by external factors like the amount of investigation files that are submitted to the office, the availability of court dates to process cases and the fact that the size and complexity of files varies. A Prosecutor's ability to progress their caseload is very much impacted by these factors so within this Office we don't usually reference "targets."

**Q083-3 (2023):** Unit Heads assign a number of files to each Prosecutor depending on ability or grade. The targets for the Office are ultimately greatly impacted by external factors like the amount of investigation files that are submitted to the office, the availability of court dates to process cases and the fact that the size and complexity of files varies. A Prosecutor's ability to progress their caseload is very much impacted by these factors so within this Office we don't usually reference "targets".

**Q083-3 (2022):** Unit Heads assign a number of files to each Prosecutor depending on ability or grade. This might not mean that "targets" are set. The targets for the Office are ultimately greatly impacted by external factors like the amount of investigation files that are submitted to the office, the availability of court dates to process cases and the fact that the size and complexity of files varies. A Prosecutor's ability to progress their caseload is very much impacted by these factors so within this Office we don't usually reference "targets".

**Latvia**

**Q083-3 (2023):** During 2023 the number of processed (closed, brought to court and concluded by a penalty imposed/negotiated by the prosecutor) cases was assessed and monitored, but no standard was set for how many cases should be completed.

**Lithuania**

**Q083-3 (2024):** no targets in the system

**Q083-3 (2018):** The quantitative performance targets are defined for the Prosecutor's Offices, but not for individual public prosecutors.

**Luxembourg**

**Q083-3 (2018):** NAP

**Malta**

**Q083-3 (2018):** NA

**Netherlands**

**Q083-3 (General Comment):** There is no national policy on targets for every prosecutor. An office could choose to set targets for their prosecutors (the head of the organisational unit or hierarchically superior public prosecutor would do this), but these may vary across offices.

**Poland**

**Q083-3 (2024):** If one were to consider that this question, is linked to question 83-2 on quantitative objectives, then the answer is NAP. Which is not to say that the efficiency of a prosecutor is not subject to any assessment by superiors. Indeed, it is the task of prosecutors exercising a managerial function to ensure the proper and efficient performance of official tasks in the units and organisational units entrusted to them, in particular to ensure the efficiency of the proceedings conducted by the prosecutors subordinate to them. Executives are therefore obliged to have knowledge of, inter alia, the number of proceedings conducted by their subordinate prosecutors, the number of proceedings completed by them, the number of protracted proceedings and to react to cases of, for example, protracted proceedings.

**Q083-3 (2023):** If one were to consider that this question, is linked to question 83-2 on quantitative objectives, then the answer is NAP. Which is not to say that the efficiency of a prosecutor is not subject to any assessment by superiors. Indeed, it is the task of prosecutors exercising a managerial function to ensure the proper and efficient performance of official tasks in the units and organisational units entrusted to them, in particular to ensure the efficiency of the proceedings conducted by the prosecutors subordinate to them. Executives are therefore obliged to have knowledge of, inter alia, the number of proceedings conducted by their subordinate prosecutors, the number of proceedings completed by them, the number of protracted proceedings and to react to cases of, for example, protracted proceedings.

**Q083-3 (2022):** If one were to consider that this question, is linked to question 83-2 on quantitative objectives, then the answer is NAP. Which is not to say that the efficiency of a prosecutor is not subject to any assessment by superiors. Indeed, it is the task of prosecutors exercising a managerial function to ensure the proper and efficient performance of official tasks in the units and organisational units entrusted to them, in particular to ensure the efficiency of the proceedings conducted by the prosecutors subordinate to them. Executives are therefore obliged to have knowledge of, inter alia, the number of proceedings conducted by their subordinate prosecutors, the number of proceedings completed by them, the number of protracted proceedings and to react to cases of, for example, protracted proceedings.

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

**Portugal**

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q083-3 (2022):** Prosecutors do not have quantitative performance targets within a certain period, but at the same time they have responsibility for their work, and therefore the hierarchically superior public prosecutor is responsible for observing the duties and goals of each prosecutor.

**Slovenia**

**Q083-3 (General Comment):** .

**Spain**

**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.

### Question 083-3-1

**Bulgaria**

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** NAP- There are no defined purposes.

**Q083-3-1 (2022):** But there is a quantitative evaluation of the work of a prosecutor which reflects in the individual assessment`- please see Q 120

**Croatia**

**Q083-3-1 (2024):** According to the State Attorney Council Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) if the number of resolved cases and actions taken in a one-year period is, without justifiable reason, less than 80% of the average of the state attorney's office in which he holds office, Deputy state attorney is disciplinary liable for disciplinary offence of irregular performance of duty.

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** According to the State Attorney Council Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) if the number of resolved cases and actions taken in a one-year period is, without justifiable reason, less than 80% of the average of the state attorney's office in which he holds office, Deputy state attorney is disciplinary liable for disciplinary offence of irregular performance of duty.

**Q083-3-1 (2022):** According to the State Attorney Council Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18, 126/19, 80/22) if the number of resolved cases and actions taken in a one-year period is, without justifiable reason, less than 80% of the average of the state attorney's office in which he holds office, Deputy state attorney is disciplinary liable for disciplinary offence of irregular performance of duty.

**Finland**

**Q083-3-1 (General Comment):** Prosecutors have quantitave targets (management of the prosecutors service). There will not be disciplinary consequences for the prosecutor. The superior of the prosecutor and the prosecutor can discuss about the targets and the amount of pending cases.

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** Prosecutors have quantitave targets (management of the prosecutors service). There will not be disciplinary consequences for the prosecutor. The superior of the prosecutor and the prosecutor can discuss about the targets and the amount of pending cases.

**Germany**

**Q083-3-1 (2024):** One federal state selected "reflected in the individual assessment" and "warning by head of prosecution".

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** One federal state selected "reflected in the individual assessment" and "warning by head of prosecution".

**Greece**

**Q083-3-1 (2022):** NAP:No targets are set

**Italy**

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** Disciplinary sanction as provided by the Legislative Decree no 109 of 23rd February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates.

**Q083-3-1 (2022):** Disciplinary sanction as provided by the Legislative Decree no 109 of 23rd February 2006, regarding disciplinary responsibility of professional magistrates.

**Lithuania**

**Q083-3-1 (2024):** no targets in the system

**Malta**

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** Performance targets do not warrant disciplinary action unless the reason why these were not reached constitutes a disciplinary offence. The AG carries out performance appraisals on the staff and if their targets are not met, then it will normally reflect in their performance appraisal.

**Poland**

**Q083-3-1 (2024):** *without disciplinary procedure:
- Warning by head of prosecution
In the event that the objectives of the criminal proceedings are not achieved or in the event that an obvious violation of the law is found in the conduct of the case, the superior public prosecutor shall, irrespective of his other powers, point out the misconduct to the public prosecutor who committed the misconduct, after requesting an explanation. The prosecutor to whom the misconduct has been pointed out may, within 7 days, submit a written objection to the superior prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct. If the public prosecutor does not agree with the infringement pointed out, he/she is entitled to appeal. If an objection is lodged, the superior public prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct shall either rescind the finding of misconduct or refer the case to the disciplinary court for consideration. The appeal procedure before the disciplinary court is then initiated.
- Temporary salary reduction
Without a disciplinary procedure, a salary reduction is not possible. A supervisor cannot decide on a pay cut alone.
- Reflected in the individual assessment The whistleblowing notice shall be reflected in the prosecutor's personnel file. A copy of the notice of reproof that has not been rescinded shall be attached to the prosecutor's personnel file.
- Other, please specify: _____
For minor disciplinary offences that do not justify the initiation of disciplinary proceedings, the public prosecutor in charge shall inflict on subordinate public prosecutors an orderly penalty of admonition.
A copy of the letter inflicted with an orderly penalty of admonishment shall be attached to the prosecutor's personal file. The public prosecutor to whom an admonishment by order penalty has been inflicted may, within 7 days from the date of service of the admonition, lodge an objection to the public prosecutor directly superior to the public prosecutor who inflicted the penalty.
*With disciplinary procedure:
-Warning by head of prosecution
With the application of the disciplinary procedure, the initial route is the same as described above. Except that once the appeal procedure is triggered, the course of action is as follows. If an objection is lodged, the superior prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct shall either rescind the pointing out of the misconduct or refer the case to the disciplinary court for consideration. The disciplinary court shall issue an order upholding the reproof of misconduct or revoking the reproof of misconduct and discontinuing the proceedings after hearing the disciplinary ombudsman and the public prosecutor to whom the misconduct was reproved, unless a hearing is not possible. The prosecutor to whom the misconduct has been pointed out is entitled to lodge a complaint against the decision refusing to consider the objection. The complaint shall be examined by the same disciplinary court in another equivalent composition.
- Temporary salary reduction
A prosecutor may be suspended for up to 6 months if the nature of the disciplinary offence makes it necessary to immediately remove him or her from the performance of duties. In the case of a valid authorisation to prosecute a public prosecutor, and also when a request for incapacitation has been submitted to the competent court, the disciplinary supervisor may suspend the public prosecutor from his/her duties until the proceedings are validly concluded. The decision on suspension may be appealed to the Disciplinary Court of the Prosecutor General. Where a public prosecutor has been suspended, the Disciplinary

Court at the Prosecutor General, on the motion of the disciplinary superior, may reduce the amount of the public prosecutor's salary up to 50% for the duration of the suspension. The decision on the reduction of remuneration may be appealed against.
- Reflected in the individual assessment The whistleblowing notice shall be reflected in the prosecutor's personnel file. A copy of the notice of reproof that has not been rescinded shall be attached to the prosecutor's personnel file.
- Other, please specify: _____
A disciplinary penalty may be imposed on a prosecutor following a disciplinary procedure. The disciplinary penalties are: 1) admonishment; 2) reprimand; 2a) a 5% - 50% reduction in basic salary for a period of six months to two years; 2b) a pecuniary penalty in the amount of one month's basic salary payable for the month preceding the final conviction plus the prosecutor's long-term service allowance, function allowance and special allowance; 3) removal from the position held; 4) transfer to another official position;
5) expulsion from the prosecution service. In the event of an appeal procedure against a warning, disciplinary proceedings shall be initiated. If an objection is lodged, the superior prosecutor: 1) repeals the disciplinary penalty of admonishment and notifies the prosecutor of the acceptance of the objection, or 2) overturns the disciplinary penalty of admonishment and refers the case to the disciplinary ombudsman for investigation, or 3) overturns the punishment of a caution and refers the case through the disciplinary ombudsman to the disciplinary court for examination. After the lapse of 3 years from the date on which the orderly penalty of admonishment becomes final, the Prosecutor General or the competent regional or district prosecutor shall order the removal of the copy of the letter of admonishment from the prosecutor's personal file, if during this period no misconduct in the efficiency of the pre-trial proceedings, the management of the prosecution or the exercise of supervision resulting in the drawing of attention, no misconduct was pointed out or no disciplinary offence was found to have been committed. In such a case, only the simultaneous. Removal from the prosecutor's personal file of copies of all such letters and judgments. At the request of the prosecutor, the removal may take place after one year. The decision of the disciplinary court may be appealed to the disciplinary court of the second instance.

**Q083-3-1 (2023):** *without disciplinary procedure:
- Warning by head of prosecution
In the event that the objectives of the criminal proceedings are not achieved or in the event that an obvious violation of the law is found in the conduct of the case, the superior public prosecutor shall, irrespective of his other powers, point out the misconduct to the public prosecutor who committed the misconduct, after requesting an explanation. The prosecutor to whom the misconduct has been pointed out may, within 7 days, submit a written objection to the superior prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct. If the public prosecutor does not agree with the infringement pointed out, he/she is entitled to appeal. If an objection is lodged, the superior public prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct shall either rescind the finding of misconduct or refer the case to the disciplinary court for consideration. The appeal procedure before the disciplinary court is then initiated.
- Temporary salary reduction
Without a disciplinary procedure, a salary reduction is not possible. A supervisor cannot decide on a pay cut alone.
- Reflected in the individual assessment The whistleblowing notice shall be reflected in the prosecutor's personnel file. A copy of the notice of reproof that has not been rescinded shall be attached to the prosecutor's personnel file.
- Other, please specify: _____
For minor disciplinary offences that do not justify the initiation of disciplinary proceedings, the public prosecutor in charge shall inflict on subordinate public prosecutors an orderly penalty of admonition.
A copy of the letter inflicted with an orderly penalty of admonishment shall be attached to the prosecutor's personal file. The public prosecutor to whom an admonishment by order penalty has been inflicted may, within 7 days from the date of service of the admonition, lodge an objection to the public prosecutor directly superior to the public prosecutor who inflicted the penalty.
*With disciplinary procedure:
-Warning by head of prosecution
With the application of the disciplinary procedure, the initial route is the same as described above. Except that once the appeal procedure is triggered, the course of action is as follows. If an objection is lodged, the superior prosecutor who pointed out the misconduct shall either rescind the pointing out of the misconduct or refer the case to the disciplinary court for consideration. The disciplinary court shall issue an order upholding the reproof of misconduct or revoking the reproof of misconduct and discontinuing the proceedings after hearing the disciplinary ombudsman and the public prosecutor to whom the misconduct was reproved, unless a hearing is not possible. The prosecutor to whom the misconduct has been pointed out is entitled to lodge a complaint against the decision refusing to consider the objection. The complaint shall be examined by the same disciplinary court in another equivalent composition.
- Temporary salary reduction
A prosecutor may be suspended for up to 6 months if the nature of the disciplinary offence makes it necessary to immediately remove him or her from the performance of duties. In the case of a valid authorisation to prosecute a public prosecutor, and also when a request for incapacitation has been submitted to the competent court, the disciplinary supervisor may suspend the public prosecutor from his/her duties until the proceedings are validly concluded. The decision on suspension may be appealed to the Disciplinary Court of the Prosecutor General. Where a public prosecutor has been suspended, the Disciplinary

Court at the Prosecutor General, on the motion of the disciplinary superior, may reduce the amount of the public prosecutor's salary up to 50% for the duration of the suspension. The decision on the reduction of remuneration may be appealed against.
- Reflected in the individual assessment The whistleblowing notice shall be reflected in the prosecutor's personnel file. A copy of the notice of reproof that has not been rescinded shall be attached to the prosecutor's personnel file.
- Other, please specify: _____
A disciplinary penalty may be imposed on a prosecutor following a disciplinary procedure. The disciplinary penalties are: 1) admonishment; 2) reprimand; 2a) a 5% - 50% reduction in basic salary for a period of six months to two years; 2b) a pecuniary penalty in the amount of one month's basic salary payable for the month preceding the final conviction plus the prosecutor's long-term service allowance, function allowance and special allowance; 3) removal from the position held; 4) transfer to another official position;
5) expulsion from the prosecution service. In the event of an appeal procedure against a warning, disciplinary proceedings shall be initiated. If an objection is lodged, the superior prosecutor: 1) repeals the disciplinary penalty of admonishment and notifies the prosecutor of the acceptance of the objection, or 2) overturns the disciplinary penalty of admonishment and refers the case to the disciplinary ombudsman for investigation, or 3) overturns the punishment of a caution and refers the case through the disciplinary ombudsman to the disciplinary court for examination. After the lapse of 3 years from the date on which the orderly penalty of admonishment becomes final, the Prosecutor General or the competent regional or district prosecutor shall order the removal of the copy of the letter of admonishment from the prosecutor's personal file, if during this period no misconduct in the efficiency of the pre-trial proceedings, the management of the prosecution or the exercise of supervision resulting in the drawing of attention, no misconduct was pointed out or no disciplinary offence was found to have been committed. In such a case, only the simultaneous. Removal from the prosecutor's personal file of copies of all such letters and judgments. At the request of the prosecutor, the removal may take place after one year. The decision of the disciplinary court may be appealed to the disciplinary court of the second instance.

## Question 120

**Austria**

**Q120 (General Comment):** In the Austrian judicial system we have diverse and multifaceted statistic products, which are an important basis for the management of justice. The statistics are regularly compiled by the Federal Computing Center and serve to control the deployment of personnel, but also for the supervision that is necessarily linked to the parties' right to a fair trial. The work of the public prosecutors is continuously and systematically reviewed on a quantitative level (i.e. number of completed cases, duration of proceedings). In this way, major deviations from the average can be identified. If a public prosecutor shows too many delays in proceedings or excessively long proceedings, this can lead to disciplinary proceedings or even a reduction in their job description. The assessment is carried out by the heads of the senior public prosecutors' offices. A qualitative assessment of each prosecutor’s work is carried out once for the second calendar year following their appointment to a specific position. The evaluation is repeated when they are appointed to a new position (for the second calendar year following that appointment). An assessment at a later time will be carried out, if either the head of the prosecutor’s office or the assessed prosecutor themselves have reason to believe that the result of the last assessment is no longer accurate. If the assessment finds the prosecutor’s work to be below average, the assessment is repeated for the next calendar year. The assessment is carried out by the personnel commission at the Senior Public Prosecutor’s Office, consisting of the Head of the Senior Public Prosecutor’s Office, the Head Prosecutor for the Public Prosecutor’s Office to which the assessed prosecutor belongs, one prosecutor appointed/chosen by the Union of Public Services and one prosecutor appointed/chosen by staff representatives.
The evaluation takes into account the prosecutor’s professional abilities, skills, knowledge, conduct and performance. The assessment can be relevant for the prosecutor’s career, as it will be taken into account in later application procedures. If the assessment finds the prosecutor’s work failing to meet the absolute minimum peformance standards necessary to fulfill their duties for two consecutive calendar years, the prosecutor will be dismissed.

**Q120 (2024):** In the Austrian judicial system we have diverse and multifaceted statistic products, which are an important basis for the management of justice. The statistics are regularly compiled by the Federal Computing Center and serve to control the deployment of personnel, but also for the supervision that is necessarily linked to the parties' right to a fair trial. The work of the public prosecutors is continuously and systematically reviewed on a quantitative level (i.e. number of completed cases, duration of proceedings). In this way, major deviations from the average can be identified. If a public prosecutor shows too many delays in proceedings or excessively long proceedings, this can lead to disciplinary proceedings or even a reduction in their job description. The assessment is carried out by the heads of the senior public prosecutors' offices. A qualitative assessment of each prosecutor's work is carried out once for the second calendar year following their appointment to a specific position. The evaluation is repeated when they are appointed to a new position (for the second calendar year following that appointment). An assessment at a later time will be carried out, if either the head of the prosecutor's office or the assessed prosecutor themselves have reason to believe that the result of the last assessment is no longer accurate. If the assessment finds the prosecutor's work to be below average, the assessment is repeated for the next calendar year. The assessment is carried out by the personnel commission at the Senior Public Prosecutor's Office, consisting of the Head of the Senior Public Prosecutor's Office, the Head Prosecutor for the Public Prosecutor's Office to which the assessed prosecutor belongs, one prosecutor appointed/chosen by the Union of Public Services and one prosecutor appointed/chosen by staff representatives.
The evaluation takes into account the prosecutor's professional abilities, skills, knowledge, conduct and performance. The assessment can be relevant for the prosecutor's career, as it will be taken into account in later application procedures. If the assessment finds the prosecutor's work failing to meet the absolute minimum peformance standards necessary to fulfill their duties for two consecutive calendar years, the prosecutor will be dismissed.
This is not a change, the reply in the past year was not given correctly.

**Belgium**

**Q120 (General Comment):** Public prosecutors are assessed on the way in which they carry out their duties. Heads of divisions are also assessed on their management skills and staff management, as well as on initiatives taken to tackle the backlog of cases. The criteria on which this assessment is based are of 3 types:
1) legal knowledge, work efficiency and effectiveness, communication, decisiveness and professional ethics
2) collegiality and self-control
3) interest in continuous training, adaptability and open-mindedness, commitment.
The purpose of the assessment is to ensure quality control, but also to provide a form of coaching that contributes to the prosecutor's development and to anticipate difficulties or a possible negative mention.
Assessment also plays an essential role in consideration for a subsequent appointment or designation.
Competent authorities:
The assessment is carried out by an absolute majority of votes cast by the head of division and two prosecutors appointed by the general assembly or by the division assembly.
The assessment of the heads of divisions is carried out by the competent chamber of the assessment board, which is made up of two heads of divisions from the public prosecutor's office, two magistrates who are members of the Opinion and Investigation Commission of the High Council of the Judiciary, a magistrate of the Court of Audit and a human resources management specialist (see articles 259novies et seq. of the Judicial Code).

**Bulgaria**

**Q120 (General Comment):** Supreme Judicial Council: Criteria on which the assessment is based: the criteria are general (relevant to the activity of each judge, prosecutor, and investigator); specific (relevant only to the position held – judge, prosecutor, or investigator), and additional (relevant only to administrative heads and their deputies).
Authority competent to carry out the assessment: the assessment is accepted by the Prosecutor's College of the Supreme Judicial Council.
Purposes for which the evaluation results are used: when participating in a competition for promotion or transfer in position; when participating in a procedure for the selection of an administrative head; for appointment to the position of deputy of the administrative head; on promotion to a higher rank; on secondment; for participation in the composition of a Permanent Appraisals Commission to the Appellate Prosecutor's Offices; participation in a competition committee.
Prosecutor's Office of RB: Such a system exists. According to Art. 196 of the Judicial System Act the evaluation is carried out in advance, in order to acquire irreplaceability, periodic and extraordinary attestation of the magistrates, and the criteria for the same are defined in Art. 198 of the Judicial System Act: legal knowledge and skills; ability to analyze legally relevant facts; ability to optimally organize work; expediency and discipline; compliance with the rules of ethical conduct. Attestation also takes into account the following indicators: compliance with deadlines; number of confirmed and canceled acts and the reasons for this; the results of the inspections of the Inspectorate at the Supreme Judicial Council; the overall workload of the relevant judicial authority, as well as the workload of the assessed judge, prosecutor or investigator compared to other judges, prosecutors or investigators from the same judicial authority.

**Croatia**

**Q120 (2024):** State attorneys and deputy state attorneys are evaluated according to the following criteria:
1. achieved results in resolving cases based on the number of cases assigned to work based on the Framework Criteria for the Work of Deputy State Attorneys and the average work results of county and municipal state attorneys' offices for the previous three-year period
2. quality of decisions and justified use of legal remedies
3. proper performance of state attorney duties - compliance with deadlines during the procedure
4. other activities of the state attorney and deputy state attorney
5. experience in performing state attorney duties
6. compliance with the Code of Ethics for State Attorneys and Deputy State Attorneys.
According to the above criteria, the state attorney and deputy state attorney can achieve a maximum of 150 points, whereby a maximum of 60 points can be achieved for the criteria stated in points 1 and 2, a maximum of 10 points for the criteria stated in points 3 and 4, and a maximum of five points for the criteria stated in points 5 and 6.
The grades for the performance of the duties of the State Attorney and Deputy State Attorney are:
1. excellent performance of the duties: 130 - 150 points
2. very successful performance of the duties: 110 - 129 points
3. successful performance of the duties: 90 - 109 points
4. satisfactory performance of the duties: 70 - 89 points
5. unsatisfactory performance of the duties: less than 70 points.
The Deputy State Attorney is evaluated by the State Attorney, and the State Attorney is evaluated by the immediately superior State Attorney.
The assessment must be reasoned. The state attorney and deputy state attorney who disagrees with the assessment have the right to file a complaint with the State Attorney Council.
The assessment of the performance of the duties of a state attorney is taken into account in the procedures for the promotion and permanent transfer of deputy state attorneys and in the procedure for the appointment of state attorneys.
To be appointed to the position of Deputy State Attorney in a higher state attorney's office, the Deputy State Attorney must be assessed at least with the grade "successfully performs his duties" in the last evaluation before appointment.

**Q120 (2023):** According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette, No. 67/18, 21/22), 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.

**Q120 (2022):** According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette, No. 67/18, 21/22), 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.

**Czech Republic**

**Q120 (2024):** The Head of Public Prosecutor's Office monitors e.g. the number of appeals, the number of returnig cases etc.

**Q120 (2023):** The Head of Public Prosecutor's Office monitors e.g. the number of appeals, the number of returnig cases etc.

**Q120 (2022):** The Head of Public Prosecutor's Office monitors e.g. the number of appeals, the number of returnig cases etc.

**Denmark**

**Q120 (General Comment):** Prosecutors are continuously evaluated by their immediate manager, i.a. at the annual employee development interviews, where the manager evaluates the employee's performance in the current position as well as the employee's development goals for the coming year.
In the first 6 months of employment prosecutors have a targeted onboarding program. This also includes feedback and evaluation of the individual prosecutor.
Furthermore prosecutors go through targeted basic training in the first three years of employment, which ends with an exam and assessment. They are also assigned a mentor, who is a professional sparring partner for the prosecutor and provides professional feedback on the prosecutor's performance and legal work.

**Q120 (2024):** The evaluation takes place continuously during the basic training and rotation period but is conducted for all prosecutors, including in connection with performance appraisals (MUS interviews), one-on-one meetings, and similar sessions.The topics may include the following: well-being, motivation, efficiency in task execution, holistic perspective etc.

**Q120 (2023):** Prosecutors are continuously evaluated by their immediate manager, i.a. at the annual employee development interviews, where the manager evaluates the employee's performance in the current position as well as the employee's development goals for the coming year.
In the first 6 months of employment prosecutors have a targeted onboarding program. This also includes feedback and evaluation of the individual prosecutor. Furthermore prosecutors go through targeted basic training in the first three years of employment, which ends with an exam and assessment. They are also assigned a mentor, who is a professional sparring partner for the prosecutor and provides professional feedback on the prosecutor's performance and legal work.

**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.

**France**

**Q120 (2022):** The assessment of public prosecutors provided for by statutory ordinance No. 58-1270 of 22 December 1958 aims to determine the professional value of the magistrate. It must reflect his/her legal and technical professional skills, his/her level of commitment, assess his/her abilities to exercise a specific function and identify training needs within his/her career path. The assessment is made by the Attorney general at the Court of appeal or the public prosecutor at the High Court of appeal for prosecutors in their jurisdiction. Considered as a moment for exchange, this evaluation should highlight both the skills that were mobilized by the prosecutor and areas where improvement could be made. It contributes to better situate his/her activity within the service organization and operation while specifying the missions related to his/her duties by highlighting his/her professional potential.

For prosecutors, the evaluation offers a privileged opportunity to take stock of their activities, consider developments in their professional practice and regularly position themselves relative to their career goals. For evaluators it should enable them detect each individual’s potential so as contribute towards efficient human resource management.

**Q120 (2021):** source DSJ

**Germany**

**Q120 (2024):** Of the respondent federal states, 13 reported that there is a quantitative evaluation of the public prosecutors' work and 14 reported that there is a qualitative evaluation.
The assessment is generally carried out by the direct superior and is based on different criteria such as specialised knowledge, expression, cooperation, leadership skills, negotiating skills, etc. The results are mostly used for decisions about promotions

**Q120 (2023):** Of the respondent federal states, 14 reported that there is a quantitative evaluation of the public prosecutors' work and 15 reported that there is a qualitative evaluation.
The assessment is generally carried out by the direct superior and is based on different criteria such as specialised knowledge, expression, cooperation, leadership skills, negotiating skills, etc. The results are mostly used for decisions about promotions.

**Q120 (2022):** Out of 15 respondent federal states, 12 reported that there is a quantitative evaluation of the public prosecutors' work and 12 reported that there is a qualitative evaluation (one federal state has not yet replied).
The assessment is generally carried out by the direct superior and is based on different criteria such as specialised knowledge, expression, cooperation, leadership skills, negotiating skills, etc. The results are mostly used for decisions about promotions.

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

**Greece**

**Q120 (General Comment):** Annual inspection reports concerning prosecutors are prepared (Appeals Prosecutors or Deputy Prosecutors of the Supreme Court), and in the context of these reports, the judicial work of each prosecutor is evaluated and assessed as a whole, both in terms of the quality and legal correctness of the processing of the criminal files handled by each prosecutor, both in terms of their quantity in the inspected period of time, the legal and substantive correctness of provisions or acts issued by her/ him, her/his hard work, her/ his morals and her/his social representation. The purpose of the evaluation of prosecutors is to assess whether they should be promoted to the next level and to establish whether disciplinary offenses have been committed.
The criteria on which the evaluation is based, the authority responsible for the evaluation and the purposes for which the results of the evaluation are used are defined in the Code of the Organization of Courts and the Status of Judiciary (Law 4938/2022). Articles 93,100,101,102,103,104.

**Q120 (2024):** The criteria on which the evaluation is based, the authority responsible for the evaluation, and the purposes for which the results of the evaluation are used are defined in the Code of the Organization of Courts and the Status of the Judiciary (Law 4938/2022), specifically in Articles 93, 100, 101, 102, 103, and 104, with Articles 93, 100, and 102 as amended and currently in force.

**Q120 (2023):** The criteria on which the evaluation is based, who is the authority responsible for the evaluation and the purposes for which the results of the evaluation are used are defined in the Code of the Organization of Courts and the Status of Judiciary (Law 4938/2022). Articles 93,100,101,102,103,104.

**Q120 (2022):** The question was answered by the prosecutor's office of the Supreme Court.

**Hungary**

**Q120 (2024):** In accordance with Section 50 (1) of Act CLXIV of 2011 on the Status and Career Path of the Prosecutor General, Prosecutors and other Prosecution Employees, prosecutors, with the exception of the prosecutor general and the deputy prosecutor general, shall be assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first prosecution appointment (for the purpose of appointment for an indefinite period), while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of three years following the appointment, and thereafter every eight years, provided that they worked under the supervision of the assessor or his/her deputy for a minimum of one year during the assessment period. The assessment is the responsibility of the person exercising the employer's authority.
The purpose of assessment is to assess the quality of the prosecutor’s professional activities, to evaluate their skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. The assessment may only feature duly supported, factual findings.
Prosecutors do not need to be assessed during the six years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age.
In addition to cases mentioned above, a prosecutor shall also be assessed if requested by the prosecutor, provided that two years have elapsed since the previous assessment, circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor’s professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment.
In the event of an ineligible grade, upon the disclosure of the result of the assessment, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If despite the call the prosecutor does not resign his/her office, his/her prosecution service employment shall be terminated by exempting him/her from office. If a prosecutor on fixed-term service is assessed as ineligible before the expiry of the fixed term, the prosecutor's service relationship shall be terminated on the date of expiry of the fixed term.
In accordance with Sections 13/A-13/F of Instruction 4/2012. (I. 6.) of the Prosecutor General on specific questions regarding the status of employees of the Prosecution Service, a case file examination shall be carried out as a basis for the assessment which is due to follow with regard to prosecutors appointed to a prosecution office subordinated to the Office of the Prosecutor General prior to the time when the assessment is due. Such a case file examination shall not be carried out for senior head prosecutors. Case file examinations shall discover the examined prosecutor’s practice regarding the application of substantive and procedural law during at least a one-year period prior to the case file examination, or since the prosecutor’s latest assessment – or in absence of an assessment – since the time of his/her appointment. The case file examination and its evaluation shall be done by a prosecutor (hereinafter: examiner prosecutor) who works at the prosecution office directly superior to the prosecution office where the examined prosecutor is appointed to and who works in the same field of prosecutorial activity or expertise as the examined prosecutor. The examiner prosecutor shall be designated by the directly superior prosecution office, whereas at the Office of the Prosecutor General by the head of the structural unit that is competent regarding the examined prosecutor’s duties.
In the future, the workload calculation system may also be suitable for quantitatively measuring and monitoring the work of

prosecutors in the longer term, by performing calculations on an individual basis.

**Q120 (2023):** In accordance with Section 50 (1) of Act CLXIV of 2011 on the Status and Career Path of the Prosecutor General, Prosecutors and other Prosecution Employees, prosecutors, with the exception of the prosecutor general and the deputy prosecutor general, shall be assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first prosecution appointment, while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of three years following the appointment, and thereafter every eight years, provided that they worked under the supervision of the assessor or his/her deputy for a minimum of one year during the assessment period.
The purpose of assessment is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's professional activities, to evaluate their skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. The assessment may only feature duly supported, factual findings.
Prosecutors do not need to be assessed during the six years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age.
In addition to cases mentioned above, a prosecutor shall also be assessed if requested by the prosecutor, provided that two years have elapsed since the previous assessment, circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor's professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment.
In the event of an ineligible grade, upon the disclosure of the result of the assessment, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If despite the call the prosecutor does not resign his/her office, his/her prosecution service employment shall be terminated by exempting him/her from office. If a prosecutor on fixed-term service is assessed as ineligible before the expiry of the fixed term, the prosecutor's service relationship shall be terminated on the date of expiry of the fixed term.
In accordance with Sections 13/A-13/F of Instruction 4/2012. (I. 6.) of the Prosecutor General on specific questions regarding the status of employees of the Prosecution Service, a case file examination shall be carried out as a basis for the assessment which is due to follow with regard to prosecutors appointed to a prosecution office subordinated to the Office of the Prosecutor General prior to the time when the assessment is due. Such a case file examination shall not be carried out for senior head prosecutors. Case file examinations shall discover the examined prosecutor's practice regarding the application of substantive and procedural law during at least a one-year period prior to the case file examination, or since the prosecutor's latest assessment – or in absence of an assessment – since the time of his/her appointment. The case file examination and its evaluation shall be done by a prosecutor (hereinafter: examiner prosecutor) who works at the prosecution office directly superior to the prosecution office where the examined prosecutor is appointed to and who works in the same field of prosecutorial activity or expertise as the examined prosecutor. The examiner prosecutor shall be designated by the directly superior prosecution office, whereas at the Office of the Prosecutor General by the head of the structural unit that is competent regarding the examined prosecutor's duties.

**Q120 (2022):** The person exercising the employer's rights assesses a prosecutor's work every eight years. The purpose of assessment based on the examination of case files is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's professional activities, to evaluate his/her skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development.
In accordance with Section 50 (1) of the Prosecution Employment Status Act, prosecutors, with the exception of the Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutor General, shall be assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first prosecution appointment, while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of three years following the appointment, and thereafter every eight years, provided that they worked under the supervision of the assessor or his/her deputy for minimum one year during the assessment period. Prosecutors do not need to be assessed during the six years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age. In addition to cases mentioned above, a prosecutor shall also be assessed if requested by the prosecutor, provided that two years have elapsed since the previous assessment, circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor's professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment. The purpose of assessment is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's professional activities, to evaluate his/her skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. The assessment may only feature duly supported, factual findings.
In the event of an ineligible grade, upon the disclosure of the result of the assessment, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If despite the call the prosecutor does not resign his/her office, his/her prosecution service employment shall be terminated by exempting him/her from office. In accordance with Sections 13/A-13/F of Instruction 4/2012. (I. 6.) of the Prosecutor General on specific questions regarding the status of employees of the Prosecution Service, a case file examination shall be carried out as a basis for the assessment which is due to follow with regard to the prosecutor appointed to a prosecution office subordinated to the Office of the Prosecutor General prior to the time when the assessment is due. Such a case file examination shall not be carried out for senior head prosecutors. Case file examinations shall discover the examined prosecutor's practice regarding the application of substantive and procedural law during at least a one-year period prior to the case file examination, or since the prosecutor's latest assessment – or in absence of an assessment – since the time of his/her appointment at the most. The case file examination and its evaluation shall be done by a prosecutor (hereinafter: examiner prosecutor) who works at the prosecution office directly superior to the prosecution office where the examined prosecutor is appointed to and who works in the same field of prosecutorial activity or expertise as the examined prosecutor. The examiner prosecutor shall be designated by the directly superior prosecution office or at the Office of the Prosecutor General by the head of the organizational unit in the prosecution service that is competent in view of the examined prosecutor's duties.

**Ireland**

**Q120 (2024):** Performance Management Development System (PMDS) is the on-going management of performance and is a key enabler of current and future Civil Service reform. PMDS is designed to be a meaningful and useful support to all Staff and Managers in the management and improvement of individual performance.

**Q120 (2023):** A Prosecutor's performance is individually assessed through PMDS (Performance Management and Development System). PMDS assesses how a jobholder's work performance, career and development needs are managed. It links the management of individual performance to the objectives of the Office, as set out in the Strategy of Statement and Business Plan. PMDS seeks to strike a balance between the needs of the organisation and the development needs of those who work in it. It recognises the need for continual change and improvement and for the involvement of staff in bringing this about. Individual prosecutors are responsible for carrying out their own goal setting and assessment. The PMDS form is then reviewed and assessed by the prosecutor's manager.

**Q120 (2022):** A Prosecutor's performance is individually assessed through PMDS (Performance Management and Development System). PMDS assesses how a jobholder's work performance, career and development needs are managed. It links the management of individual performance to the objectives of the Office, as set out in the Strategy of Statement and Business Plan. PMDS seeks to strike a balance between the needs of the organisation and the development needs of those who work in it. It recognises the need for continual change and improvement and for the involvement of staff in bringing this about. Individual prosecutors are responsible for carrying out their own goal setting and assessment. The PMDS form is then reviewed and assessed by the prosecutor's manager.

**Italy**

**Q120 (General Comment):** The assessment procedure applies to both judges and public prosecutors. Every four years, the High Council for the Judiciary (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, work capacity, 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: •"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); •work related publications, If any;
•reports from the lawyers' council, if any.

**Latvia**

**Q120 (General Comment):** Evaluation is carried out by the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors. During the evaluation of a public prosecutor the following indicators of the quality of performance of the functions are assessed: supervision, criminal prosecution, maintenance of state prosecution in court, as well as the protection of state and individual rights. An assessment of professional competences is also carried out. The results are generally used to evaluate professional performance and suitability for the position. In the case of a negative opinion, the Commission can determine specific tasks that must be performed to eliminate the deficiencies found in prosecutor’s professional activity or to improve his/her professional activity.

**Q120 (2024):** The purpose of evaluating professional performance of prosecutors is to promote the continuous professional development. The evaluation of the prosecutor's professional activity is carried out by the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors established by the Council of Prosecutor General at least once every five years. In cases where deficiencies are found in the prosecutor's professional activity, the assessment can be carried out any time before the term of five years. When evaluating the professional performance of the prosecutor, the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors analyses the quality of performance of the prosecutor's functions, the organization of individual work, the participation in activities improving qualification, the statistical indicators, as well as other criteria provided for in the Regulation on the Evaluation of Professional Performance of Prosecutors. Following the evaluation the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors gives a positive or negative opinion, in some cases specific tasks can be determined for the prosecutor to eliminate the deficiencies found in professional activity or to improve his professional performance. The opinion of the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors acquires legal force when it is approved by the Prosecutor General.

**Q120 (2023):** The purpose of evaluating the professional performance of the prosecutor is to promote the continuous professional development of the prosecutor during the performance of his/her duties. The evaluation of the prosecutor's professional activity is carried out by the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors established by the Council of Prosecutor General at least once every five years. In cases where deficiencies are found in the prosecutor's professional activity, the assessment of his/her professional performance can be (in certain cases must be) carried out any time before the term of 5 years. When evaluating the professional performance of the prosecutor, the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors analyses the quality of performance of the prosecutor's functions, the organization of individual work, participation in qualification raising events, statistical indicators of work, as well as other criteria provided for in the Regulation on the Evaluation of Professional Performance of Prosecutors. The Attestation Commission of Prosecutors gives a positive or negative opinion on the professional activity of the prosecutor, including, specific tasks can be determined for the prosecutor to be performed in order to eliminate the deficiencies found in his professional activity or to improve his professional performance. The opinion of the Attestation Commission of Prosecutors acquires legal force when it is approved by the Prosecutor General.

**Lithuania**

**Q120 (2024):** The service, qualifications of the prosecutors and their suitability for the position are assessed by the Prosecutors' Assessment Commission.
The Commission is composed of seven members (four prosecutors and three persons (non-prosecutors) of impeccable reputation, nominated by the President of the Republic, the Speaker of the Seimas, and the Prime Minister) for a period of three years.
The Commission assesses data on the procedural and non-procedural performance and professional qualities of the prosecutor, and, in the case of the evaluation of the chief prosecutor (or deputy), also on the administrative performance.

**Q120 (2023):** The service, qualifications of the prosecutors and their suitability for the position are assessed by the Prosecutors'
Assessment Commission.
The Commission is composed of seven members (four prosecutors and three persons (non-prosecutors) of impeccable reputation, nominated by the President of the Republic, the Speaker of the Seimas, and the Prime Minister) for a period of three years.
The Commission assesses data on the procedural and non-procedural performance and professional qualities of the prosecutor, and, in the case of the evaluation of the chief prosecutor (or deputy), also on the administrative performance.

**Q120 (2022):** The service, qualifications of the prosecutors and their suitability for the position are assessed by the Prosecutors' Assessment Commission.
The Commission is composed of seven members (four prosecutors and three persons (non-prosecutors) of impeccable reputation, nominated by the President of the Republic, the Speaker of the Seimas, and the Prime Minister) for a period of three years.
The Commission assesses data on the procedural and non-procedural performance and professional qualities of the prosecutor, and, in the case of the evaluation of the chief prosecutor (or deputy), also on the administrative performance.

**Netherlands**

**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.

**Portugal**

**Q120 (General Comment):** The prosecutors are evaluated periodically in time lapses between 3 to 5 years. The evaluation is held by the Prosecutors Superior High Council and it evaluates the quality of the work held by all prosecutors. A higher ranked prosecutor does the evaluation and produces a report that is sanctioned by the Prosecutors Superior High Council.

**Q120 (2024):** The criteria are the following: capacity to exercise the profession, technical preparation and adaptation to the inspected service – article 11 of the evaluation regulations - https://www.ministeriopublico.pt/iframe/regulamento-de-inspecoes-do-ministerio-publico.
The authority competent for carrying out the assessment are the public prosecutors appointed by the Superior Council of the Public Prosecutor.
The assessment is used to: career progression and to check whether the prosecutor is able to perform duties in the court where he is placed.

**Q120 (2023):** The criteria are the following: capacity to exercise the profession, technical preparation and adaptation to the inspected service – article 11 of the evaluation regulations - https://www.ministeriopublico.pt/iframe/regulamento-de-inspecoes-do-ministerio-publico.
The authority competent for carrying out the assessment are the public prosecutors appointed by the Superior Council of the Public Prosecutor.
The assessment is used to: career progression and to check whether the prosecutor is able to perform duties in the court where he is placed.

**Romania**

**Q120 (2024):** According to Article 87 of Law No 303/2022 -The individual professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors involves analysing and noting of the criteria and indicators for assessing the professional performance of judges and prosecutors, indicators which concern, in particular, the quality of the activity, the efficiency, the integrity and the obligation to continue vocational training, and in the case of judges and prosecutors appointed to senior positions, the manner of carrying out the managerial duties. (2) Professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors aims to establish the level of their professional competence and also to improve professional performance, increase the efficiency of the activity of courts and prosecutor’s offices and public trust in judicial authority, maintain and consolidate the of the quality of the judicial system

**Q120 (2023):** According to Article 87 of Law No 303/2022 -The individual professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors involves analysing and noting of the criteria and indicators for assessing the professional performance of judges and prosecutors, indicators which concern, in particular, the quality of the activity, the efficiency, the integrity and the obligation to continue vocational training, and in the case of judges and prosecutors appointed to senior positions, the manner of carrying out the managerial duties. (2) Professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors aims to establish the level of their professional competence and also to improve professional performance, increase the efficiency of the activity of courts and prosecutor’s offices and public trust in judicial authority, maintain and consolidate the of the quality of the judicial system

**Q120 (2022):** According to Article 87 of Law No 303/2022 -The individual professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors involves analysing and noting of the criteria and indicators for assessing the professional performance of judges and prosecutors, indicators which concern, in particular, the quality of the activity, the efficiency, the integrity and the obligation to continue vocational training, and in the case of judges and prosecutors appointed to senior positions, the manner of carrying out the managerial duties. (2) Professional evaluation of judges and prosecutors aims to establish the level of their professional competence and also to improve professional performance, increase the efficiency of the activity of courts and prosecutor’s offices and public trust in judicial authority, maintain and consolidate the of the quality of the judicial system

**Slovak Republic**

**Q120 (2024):** Evaluation of a prosecutor pursuant to Section 31 of Act No. 154/2001 Coll.

**Slovenia**

**Q120 (General Comment):** On the proposal of the State Prosecutor General, State Prosecutorial Council adopts Criteria for the assessment of state prosecutors' performance. They 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. Head of state prosecutor's office as competent authority for the matters od state prosecution administration can alert the public prosecutor to his duty to meet the targets.
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.

**Spain**

**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

### Question 120-1

**Belgium**

**Q120-1 (General Comment):** The first assessment takes place one year after the judge/prosecutor starts work. Assessments are then carried out every 3 years.

**Q120-1 (2024):** Sources: College of Courts and Tribunals, https://www.tribunaux-rechtbanken.be/fr/college -
Public Prosecutor's Office Support Service, sdaomp@just.fgov.be

**Bulgaria**

**Q120-1 (General Comment):** Quantitative evaluation of the work of the prosecutors is carried out by applying the Rules for measuring the workload of the prosecutor's offices and the individual workload of each prosecutor and investigator, adopted by the Prosecution College/collegium of the SJC. It is possible to display the data according to the indicators provided for in the Rules in real time, both for the prosecutor's office as a whole, as well as for individual prosecutor's offices and for each specific prosecutor.
Quantitative data on the workload are taken into account in the appraisal procedure of a specific prosecutor, in the course of which an assessment of his work is carried out, both in terms of quantitative indicators and also regarding the quality of the performed activity according to the results achieved.
Prosecutors are assessed in accordance with Ordinance No. 3 of February 23, 2017 of the Supreme Judicial Council on the indicators and Methodology for Assessment and the Criteria for Reporting the Workload Degree of Prosecutors and Investigators and of Administrative Heads and Their Deputies (promulgated SG No. 21 /10.03.2017).
Attestation is carried out:
1. in advance - for a three-year period from the appointment to the position of prosecutor or investigator - when participating in a competition or when being offered a promotion;
2. to acquire irreplaceability - upon completion of 5 years of experience as a prosecutor or investigator;
3. periodically - for a 5-year period from the attestation of irreplaceability of a prosecutor and investigator, of an administrative head and of a deputy administrative head;
4. extraordinary - in the cases under Art. 197, para. 5 of the Judicial System Act.
Junior prosecutors and junior investigators are not assessed in advance, and a report on their work is prepared by the mentor in the second year of their appointment.

**Croatia**

**Q120-1 (2024):** The State Attorney and the Deputy State Attorney are evaluated every three years. If the Deputy State Attorney is a candidate in the procedure for appointment to a senior State Attorney's office or for State Attorney, the State Attorney will evaluate him/her on the basis of his/her previous work, even if three years have not passed since the date of appointment. This evaluation serves only for the purposes of the specific appointment procedure.

**Cyprus**

**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**

**Q120-1 (2018):** The individual assessment of the public prosecutors' work take place at least once every two years.

**Denmark**

**Q120-1 (General Comment):** Prosecutors are continuously evaluated by their immediate manager, i.a. at the annual employee development interviews, where the manager evaluates the employee's performance in the current position as well as the employee's development goals for the coming year.
In the first 6 months of employment prosecutors have a targeted onboarding program. This also includes feedback and evaluation of the individual prosecutor.
Furthermore prosecutors go through targeted basic training in the first three years of employment, which ends with an exam and assessment. They are also assigned a mentor, who is a professional sparring partner for the prosecutor and provides professional feedback on the prosecutor's performance and legal work.

**Q120-1 (2024):** The evaluation takes place continuously during the basic training and rotation period but is conducted for all prosecutors, including in connection with performance appraisals (MUS interviews), one-on-one meetings, and similar sessions.The topics may include the following: well-being, motivation, efficiency in task execution, holistic perspective etc.

**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.

**France**

**Q120-1 (2022):** Article 12-1 of the ordinance of December 22, 1958 establishes the principle of evaluating the professional activity of each judge/prosecutor every two years. An evaluation must also be conducted when applying for promotion.

**Q120-1 (2021):** source DSJ

**Germany**

**Q120-1 (2024):** Assessment intervals vary among the federal states. Assments are generally more frequent at the beginning of the career (approx. every 6 to 9 months) and become less frequent over time (approx. every year to every 5 years). Additionally, occasion-related assessments may be performed in case of promotions or applications for new positions.

**Q120-1 (2023):** Assessment intervals vary among the federal states. Assments are generally more frequent at the beginning of the career (approx. every 6 to 9 months) and become less frequent over time (approx. every year to every 5 years). Additionally, occasion-related assessments may be performed in case of promotions or applications for new positions.

**Greece**

**Q120-1 (2022):** The question was answered by the prosecutor's office of the Supreme Court.

**Hungary**

**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**

**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**

**Q120-1 (2023):** Every four years

**Q120-1 (2022):** Every four years

**Latvia**

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

**Q120-1 (2024):** In general, no less than once every five years, if all skills are assessed at an appropriate level. If deficiencies are found in the actions of the prosecutor and the measures taken have not brought positive results, then the assessment is carried out earlier. If the prosecutor's skills are assessed negatively, the evaluation must be carried out immediately. As from 2024, a new system of the evaluation of prosecutors is introduced, which also provides for annual evaluation. In accordance with this new system, starting from the reporting period of 2023, an annual evaluation of the activities of district-level prosecutors is carried out – the results of the activities of all district-level prosecutors in four main work areas are compared with each other:
– supervision of criminal cases under investigation,
– completion of the pre-trial investigation,
– maintenance of state prosecution in court,
– work in the field of non-criminal cases.
Each of the mentioned areas is evaluated according to the performance indicators, which are grouped into three categories – quantity, quality and compliance with the strategic goals of the Prosecution Office. As a result of the evaluation, prosecutors are divided into three groups – good efficiency, satisfactory efficiency (minor improvements necessary), unsatisfactory efficiency (significant improvements necessary). Regarding prosecutors that are evaluated as working satisfactorily, their direct managers set development goals for them for the current year. Regarding prosecutors that are evaluated as working unsatisfactory, the responsible structural unit of the Prosecutor General's Office creates a professional development program with performance improvement tasks for the current year. The execution of this program is controlled by the prosecutor's immediate supervisor and/or a higher-ranking prosecutor. For the period from 2023, in relation to chief prosecutors (organizational management) and higher-ranking prosecutors, a 360-degree performance and competence evaluation is carried out using survey questionnaires. The results of the survey are sent to the corresponding next level chief prosecutors and next higher-ranking prosecutors. Based on the survey results, they set professional development goals for their chief prosecutors and lower-ranking prosecutors for the current year.

**Q120-1 (2023):** In general, no less than once every five years, if all skills are assessed at an appropriate level. If deficiencies are found in the actions of the prosecutor and the measures taken have not brought positive results, then the assessment is carried out earlier. If the prosecutor's skills are assessed negatively, the evaluation must be carried out immediately.
As from 2024, a new system of professional activity of prosecutors is introduced, which also provides for annual evaluation. In accordance with this new system, starting from the reporting period of 2023, an annual evaluation of the activities of district-level prosecutors is carried out - the results of the activities of all district-level prosecutors in four main work areas are compared with each other:
– supervision of criminal cases under investigation,
– completion of the pre-trial investigation,
– maintenance of state prosecution in court,
– work in the field of non-criminal cases.
Each of the mentioned areas is evaluated according to the performance indicators, which are grouped into three categories - quantity, quality and compliance with the strategic goals of the Prosecution Office.
As a result of the evaluation, prosecutors are divided into three groups - good efficiency, satisfactory efficiency (minor improvements necessary), unsatisfactory efficiency (significant improvements necessary).
Regarding prosecutors working satisfactorily, their direct managers set development goals for them for the current year.
Regarding unsatisfactory working prosecutors, the responsible structural unit of the Prosecutor General's Office creates a professional development program with precise performance improvement tasks for the current year, the execution of which is controlled by the prosecutor's immediate supervisor and/or a higher-ranking prosecutor.
For the period from 2023, in relation to chief prosecutors (organizational management) and higher-ranking prosecutors, a 360-degree performance and competence evaluation is carried out using survey questionnaires.
The results of the survey are sent to the corresponding next level chief prosecutors and next higher-ranking prosecutors.
Based on the survey results, they set professional development goals for their chief prosecutors and lower-ranking prosecutors for the current year.

**Q120-1 (2020):** Not less than once every five years

**Lithuania**

**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.

**Q120-1 (2024):** The Commission carries out regular and extraordinary assessments of the service.
Regular service assessments are carried out:
1. at the end of the prosecutor's traineeship;
2. every five years.
An extraordinary service assessment may be carried out:
1. at the reasoned request of the prosecutor, if at least half a year has elapsed since the last assessment;
2. when, at the end of his/her term of office, the prosecutor seeks appointment to a higher, the same or an equivalent post, provided that three years have elapsed since the last service assessment;
3. in cases where it is established that the prosecutor's performance has repeatedly been deficient, giving rise to reasonable doubts as to his suitability for the post in question.

**Q120-1 (2022):** The Commission carries out regular and extraordinary assessments of the service.
Regular service assessments are carried out:
1. at the end of the prosecutor's traineeship;
2. every five years.
An extraordinary service assessment may be carried out:
1. at the reasoned request of the prosecutor, if at least half a year has elapsed since the last assessment;
2. when, at the end of his/her term of office, the prosecutor seeks appointment to a higher, the same or an equivalent post, provided that three years have elapsed since the last service assessment;
3. in cases where it is established that the prosecutor's performance has repeatedly been deficient, giving rise to reasonable doubts as to his suitability for the post in question.

**Malta**

**Q120-1 (General Comment):** It is up to the discretion of the Attorney General to conduct such an evaluation, but it must be carried out at least once annually..

**Q120-1 (2022):** It is up to the discretion of the Attorney General to carry out such evaluation but it has be carried out at least once annually.

**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**

**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 certificate implying they are ‘fit for trial’, that they have the necessary skills to represent the public prosecution at trial.

**Romania**

**Q120-1 (2024):** Legislation on the statute of judges and prosecutors was replaced by Law no. 303/2022
Frequency: from to 2 to 5 years depending on the seniority; According to Article 88 of Law No 303/2022 - (1) Considering the seniority in the position of judge or prosecutor, the assessment shall be carried out as follows: a) every 2 years, for judges and prosecutors with a seniority of between one and five years; b) every 3 years, for judges and prosecutors with a seniority of between 5 and 10 years; c) every 4 years, for judges and prosecutors with a seniority of between 10 and 15 years; d) every 5 years, for judges and prosecutors with a seniority of more than 15 years. (2) Judges of the High Court of Cassation and Justice shall not be subject to evaluation. (3) Professional evaluation may also be carried out whenever requested by the judge or prosecutor

**Q120-1 (2023):** Legislation on the statute of judges and prosecutors was replaced by Law no. 303/2022

**Q120-1 (2022):** Legislation on the statute of judges and prosecutors was replaced by Law no. 303/2022

**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**

**Q120-1 (2024):** Evaluation of a prosecutor pursuant to Section 31 of Act No. 154/2001 Coll., which is conducted in connection with selection procedures, disciplinary proceedings, or at the prosecutor’s request in relation to the termination of the prosecutor’s service relationship.
The evaluation of a prosecutor is carried out by the head of the service office on the basis of documents prepared by the supervising prosecutor. In the case of a prosecutor who has been temporarily assigned to another prosecutor’s office for a period exceeding six months, the head of the service office shall also request supporting documents from the supervising prosecutor of the office to which the prosecutor has been temporarily assigned.
The evaluation of a prosecutor includes, in particular, an assessment of:
a) the prosecutor’s procedures and decision-making activities, focusing on the professional quality of decisions and the timeliness of proceedings;
b) the prosecutor’s knowledge of generally binding legal regulations, internal service regulations, and the results of professional development;
c) compliance with service discipline.

**Slovenia**

**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 (2024):** Every year in the first three years of appointment, then every three years.

**Q120-1 (2018):** Every three years

# Indicator 2: The judicial organisation

**Table 2.1a Number of courts in 2024 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of first instance and all courts as geographic locations) (Q42, Q43 and Q44)**

| States | Number of courts - Legal entities | | | | | | | | Number of courts - 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** | 150 | 131 | 126 | 4 | 1 | 19 | 18 | 1 | 166 | 160 |
| **Belgium** | 224 | 196 | 190 | 5 | 1 | 28 | 23 | 6 | 225 | 218 |
| **Bulgaria** | 180 | 147 | 113 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 31 | 2 | 183 | 145 |
| **Croatia** | 67 | 51 | 33 | 17 | 1 | 16 | 14 | 2 | 143 | 120 |
| **Cyprus** | 33 | 13 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 19 | 1 | 33 | 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** | 1 095 | 206 | 168 | 37 | 1 | 889 | 877 | 12 | 844 | 791 |
| **Germany** | 1 075 | 778 | 752 | 25 | 1 | 297 | 245 | 52 | 1 075 | 997 |
| **Greece** | 133 | 76 | 56 | 19 | 1 | 57 | 45 | 12 | 181 | 150 |
| **Hungary** | 139 | 139 | 113 | 25 | 1 | 0 | NAP | NAP | 139 | 113 |
| **Ireland** | 7 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | NAP | 155 | 152 |
| **Italy** | 802 | 543 | 516 | 26 | 1 | 259 | 236 | 23 | 832 | 761 |
| **Latvia** | 15 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 52 | 42 |
| **Lithuania** | 20 | 18 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 62 | 59 |
| **Luxembourg** | 13 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
| **Malta** | 16 | 8 | 4 | 4 | NAP | 8 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| **Netherlands** | 19 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 43 | 33 |
| **Poland** | 404 | 378 | 366 | 11 | 1 | 26 | 23 | 3 | 491 | 426 |
| **Portugal** | 591 | 151 | 145 | 5 | 1 | 440 | 437 | 3 | 329 | 320 |
| **Romania** | 242 | 233 | 175 | 57 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 242 | 182 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 50 | 45 | 36 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 60 | 47 |
| **Slovenia** | 66 | 60 | 55 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 76 | 70 |
| **Spain** | 4 249 | 2 585 | 2 344 | 240 | 1 | 1 664 | 1 605 | 59 | 713 | 632 |
| **Sweden** | 94 | 55 | 48 | 6 | 1 | 39 | 31 | 8 | 99 | 84 |
| **Average** | 365 | 223 | 201 | 21 | 1 | 142 | 146 | 9 | 236 | 212 |
| **Median** | 94 | 60 | 55 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 14 | 2 | 139 | 113 |
| **Minimum** | 7 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| **Maximum** | 4 249 | 2 585 | 2 344 | 240 | 1 | 1 664 | 1 605 | 59 | 1 075 | 997 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 7% | 15% | 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.

**Malta**: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country.

**Spain:** As general rule, the first instance courts - legal entities are unipersonal courts - one judge is considered one court.

**Table 2.1b Number of courts per 100 000 inhabitants in 2024 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of first instance and all courts as geographic locations) (Q1, Q42, Q43 and Q44)**

| States | Number of courts - Legal entities | | | | | | | | Number of courts - 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** | 1,63 | 1,42 | 1,37 | 0,04 | 0,01 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,01 | 1,80 | 1,74 |
| **Belgium** | 1,89 | 1,66 | 1,61 | 0,04 | 0,01 | 0,24 | 0,19 | 0,05 | 1,90 | 1,84 |
| **Bulgaria** | 2,80 | 2,28 | 1,76 | 0,51 | 0,02 | 0,51 | 0,48 | 0,03 | 2,84 | 2,25 |
| **Croatia** | 1,73 | 1,32 | 0,85 | 0,44 | 0,03 | 0,41 | 0,36 | 0,05 | 3,70 | 3,10 |
| **Cyprus** | 3,41 | 1,35 | 1,14 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 2,07 | 1,97 | 0,10 | 3,41 | 3,10 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,90 | 0,89 | 0,79 | 0,09 | 0,01 | 0,01 | NAP | 0,01 | 0,98 | 0,82 |
| **Denmark** | 0,48 | 0,45 | 0,40 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | NAP | 0,48 | 0,43 |
| **Estonia** | 0,65 | 0,51 | 0,29 | 0,15 | 0,07 | 0,15 | 0,15 | NAP | 1,45 | 1,24 |
| **Finland** | 0,64 | 0,46 | 0,35 | 0,09 | 0,02 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,02 | 0,92 | 0,80 |
| **France** | 1,60 | 0,30 | 0,24 | 0,05 | 0,00 | 1,30 | 1,28 | 0,02 | 1,23 | 1,15 |
| **Germany** | 1,29 | 0,93 | 0,90 | 0,03 | 0,00 | 0,36 | 0,29 | 0,06 | 1,29 | 1,19 |
| **Greece** | 1,28 | 0,73 | 0,54 | 0,18 | 0,01 | 0,55 | 0,43 | 0,12 | 1,74 | 1,44 |
| **Hungary** | 1,46 | 1,46 | 1,18 | 0,26 | 0,01 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | 1,46 | 1,18 |
| **Ireland** | 0,13 | 0,09 | 0,06 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,04 | NAP | 2,85 | 2,79 |
| **Italy** | 1,36 | 0,92 | 0,88 | 0,04 | 0,00 | 0,44 | 0,40 | 0,04 | 1,41 | 1,29 |
| **Latvia** | 0,81 | 0,65 | 0,32 | 0,27 | 0,05 | 0,16 | 0,11 | 0,05 | 2,80 | 2,26 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,69 | 0,62 | 0,38 | 0,21 | 0,03 | 0,07 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 2,15 | 2,04 |
| **Luxembourg** | 1,91 | 1,03 | 0,73 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,88 | 0,44 | 0,44 | 1,17 | 0,44 |
| **Malta** | 2,79 | 1,39 | 0,70 | 0,70 | NAP | 1,39 | 1,22 | 0,17 | 0,70 | 0,35 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,06 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,24 | 0,18 |
| **Poland** | 1,08 | 1,01 | 0,97 | 0,03 | 0,00 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,01 | 1,31 | 1,13 |
| **Portugal** | 5,50 | 1,40 | 1,35 | 0,05 | 0,01 | 4,09 | 4,07 | 0,03 | 3,06 | 2,98 |
| **Romania** | 1,27 | 1,22 | 0,92 | 0,30 | 0,01 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,01 | 1,27 | 0,96 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,92 | 0,83 | 0,66 | 0,15 | 0,02 | 0,09 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 1,11 | 0,87 |
| **Slovenia** | 3,10 | 2,82 | 2,58 | 0,19 | 0,05 | 0,28 | 0,23 | 0,05 | 3,57 | 3,29 |
| **Spain** | 8,66 | 5,27 | 4,78 | 0,49 | 0,00 | 3,39 | 3,27 | 0,12 | 1,45 | 1,29 |
| **Sweden** | 0,89 | 0,52 | 0,45 | 0,06 | 0,01 | 0,37 | 0,29 | 0,08 | 0,94 | 0,79 |
| **Average** | 1,81 | 1,17 | 0,97 | 0,17 | 0,03 | 0,64 | 0,63 | 0,07 | 1,75 | 1,52 |
| **Median** | 1,29 | 0,93 | 0,79 | 0,10 | 0,01 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,04 | 1,45 | 1,24 |
| **Minimum** | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,06 | 0,02 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,24 | 0,18 |
| **Maximum** | 8,66 | 5,27 | 4,78 | 0,70 | 0,15 | 4,09 | 4,07 | 0,44 | 3,70 | 3,29 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 7% | 15% | 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.

**Malta**: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country.

**Spain:** As general rule, the first instance courts - legal entities are unipersonal courts - one judge is considered one court.

**Table 2.2a Number of first instance courts from 2014 to 2024 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and first instance courts as geographic locations) (Q42, Q43 and Q44)**

| States | Number of first instance courts - Legal entities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Number of first instance courts - Geographic locations | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number in 2024 (1) + (2) | General jurisdiction | | | | | | | | | | | Specialised courts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 (1) | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 (2) | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | **144** | 129 | 129 | 129 | 129 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 126 | **126** | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | **18** | 158 | 158 | 158 | 156 | **160** |
| **Belgium** | **213** | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 201 | 201 | 201 | 201 | **190** | 225 | 225 | 225 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | **23** | 218 | 218 | 218 | 218 | **218** |
| **Bulgaria** | **144** | 113 | 113 | 113 | 113 | 113 | 113 | 113 | 113 | 113 | 113 | **113** | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 31 | **31** | 145 | 145 | 145 | 145 | **145** |
| **Croatia** | **47** | 65 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 30 | 30 | 33 | 33 | 33 | **33** | 74 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 14 | 14 | **14** | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | **120** |
| **Cyprus** | **30** | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 11 | **11** | 13 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 19 | 19 | 19 | **19** | 22 | 30 | 30 | 30 | **30** |
| **Czech Republic** | **86** | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | **86** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | **89** |
| **Denmark** | **26** | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | **24** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **2** | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | **26** |
| **Estonia** | **6** | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | **4** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **2** | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | **17** |
| **Finland** | **29** | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | **20** | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | **9** | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | **45** |
| **France** | **1 045** | 786 | 786 | 786 | 786 | 168 | 168 | 168 | 168 | 168 | 168 | **168** | 1 094 | 1 094 | 1 086 | 1 086 | 1 463 | 1 186 | 851 | 848 | 847 | NA | **877** | 618 | 661 | 737 | 789 | **791** |
| **Germany** | **997** | 761 | 754 | 761 | 753 | 753 | 753 | 753 | 753 | 753 | 752 | **752** | 247 | 247 | 247 | 246 | 245 | 245 | 245 | 245 | 245 | 245 | **245** | 998 | 998 | 998 | 997 | **997** |
| **Greece** | **101** | 298 | 298 | 289 | 289 | 289 | 289 | 259 | 259 | 259 | 259 | **56** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **45** | 289 | 289 | 289 | 289 | **150** |
| **Hungary** | **113** | 111 | 111 | 111 | 112 | 113 | 113 | 113 | 113 | 114 | 113 | **113** | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 113 | 113 | 114 | 113 | **113** |
| **Ireland** | **5** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **3** | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **2** | 153 | 153 | 153 | 152 | **152** |
| **Italy** | **752** | 510 | 510 | 510 | 534 | 531 | 527 | 525 | 525 | 525 | 517 | **516** | 245 | 245 | 245 | 245 | 237 | 237 | 236 | 236 | 236 | 236 | **236** | 773 | 773 | 773 | 762 | **761** |
| **Latvia** | **8** | 34 | 28 | 28 | 25 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 6 | **6** | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **2** | 47 | 46 | 42 | 42 | **42** |
| **Lithuania** | **12** | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 12 | 12 | 12 | **11** | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **1** | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | **59** |
| **Luxembourg** | **8** | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | **5** | - | 2 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **3** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **3** |
| **Malta** | **11** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | **4** | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | **7** | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | **2** |
| **Netherlands** | **13** | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | **11** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **2** | 33 | 34 | 34 | 33 | **33** |
| **Poland** | **389** | 287 | - | 363 | 363 | 363 | 363 | 364 | 364 | 365 | 366 | **366** | 26 | - | 26 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | **23** | 433 | 433 | 434 | 434 | **426** |
| **Portugal** | **582** | 292 | 292 | 292 | 150 | 150 | 145 | 145 | 145 | 145 | 145 | **145** | 248 | 248 | 245 | 411 | 411 | 435 | 436 | 437 | 437 | 437 | **437** | 319 | 319 | 318 | 318 | **320** |
| **Romania** | **183** | 233 | 232 | 233 | 233 | 233 | 233 | 175 | 175 | 175 | 175 | **175** | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | **8** | 182 | 182 | 182 | 182 | **182** |
| **Slovak Republic** | **39** | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 36 | **36** | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | **3** | 55 | 55 | 55 | 47 | **47** |
| **Slovenia** | **60** | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | **55** | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | **5** | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | **70** |
| **Spain** | **3 949** | 2 224 | 2 224 | 2 223 | 2 282 | 2 269 | 2 317 | 2 298 | 2 313 | 2 342 | 2 334 | **2 344** | 1 443 | 1 432 | 1 434 | 1 451 | 1 465 | 1 493 | 1 531 | 1 549 | 1 578 | 1 554 | **1 605** | 617 | 621 | 695 | 629 | **632** |
| **Sweden** | **79** | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | **48** | 12 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | **31** | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | **84** |
| **Average** | **336** | 231 | 227 | 232 | 229 | 204 | 205 | 208 | 209 | 210 | 208 | 201 | 156 | 153 | 148 | 154 | 170 | 161 | 140 | 147 | 148 | 116 | 146 | 211 | 213 | 218 | 217 | 212 |
| **Median** | **79** | 60 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 113 | 113 | 114 | 113 | 113 |
| **Minimum** | **5** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **Maximum** | **3 949** | 2 224 | 2 224 | 2 223 | 2 282 | 2 269 | 2 317 | 2 298 | 2 313 | 2 342 | 2 334 | 2 344 | 1 443 | 1 432 | 1 434 | 1 451 | 1 465 | 1 493 | 1 531 | 1 549 | 1 578 | 1 554 | 1 605 | 998 | 998 | 998 | 997 | 997 |
| **% of NA** | **0%** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 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.

**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

**Greece**: Following a judicial map reform, all magistrate courts were abolished. Accordingly, the number of first instance courts considerably decreased for 2024.

**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**: Administrative courts, established under Act No. 151/2022 Coll. as part of the new court map effective 1 June 2023, are included in the count of specialised courts.

**Spain:** As general rule, the first instance courts - legal entities are unipersonal courts - one judge is considered one court.

**Table 2.2b Number of first instance courts per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and first instance courts as geographic locations) (Q1, Q42, Q43 and Q44)**

| States | Number of first instance courts - Legal entities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Number of first instance courts - Geographic locations | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number in 2024 (1) + (2) | General jurisdiction | | | | | | | | | | | Specialised courts | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 (1) | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 (2) | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | **1,57** | 1,50 | 1,48 | 1,48 | 1,47 | 1,45 | 1,44 | 1,43 | 1,43 | 1,41 | 1,38 | **1,37** | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,20 | **0,20** | 1,76 | 1,74 | 1,70 | **1,74** |
| **Belgium** | **1,80** | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 1,74 | 1,74 | 1,72 | 1,71 | **1,61** | 2,01 | 2,00 | 1,99 | 1,76 | 1,75 | 1,75 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,20 | **0,19** | 1,88 | 1,86 | 1,85 | **1,84** |
| **Bulgaria** | **2,24** | 1,57 | 1,58 | 1,59 | 1,60 | 1,61 | 1,63 | 1,63 | 1,65 | 1,75 | 1,75 | **1,76** | 0,44 | 0,45 | 0,45 | 0,45 | 0,46 | 0,46 | 0,46 | 0,47 | 0,48 | 0,48 | **0,48** | 2,12 | 2,25 | 2,25 | **2,25** |
| **Croatia** | **1,22** | 1,54 | 0,52 | 0,53 | 0,54 | 0,54 | 0,74 | 0,74 | 0,85 | 0,86 | 0,86 | **0,85** | 1,75 | 0,86 | 0,87 | 0,88 | 0,88 | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,36 | 0,36 | 0,36 | **0,36** | 3,10 | 3,12 | 3,11 | **3,10** |
| **Cyprus** | **3,10** | 0,70 | 0,71 | 0,71 | 0,70 | 0,69 | 0,68 | 0,67 | 1,22 | 1,19 | 1,18 | **1,14** | 1,52 | 1,77 | 1,77 | 1,75 | 1,71 | 1,80 | 1,79 | 2,10 | 2,06 | 2,04 | **1,97** | 3,32 | 3,26 | 3,21 | **3,10** |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,79** | 0,82 | 0,81 | 0,81 | 0,81 | 0,81 | 0,81 | 0,80 | 0,82 | 0,79 | 0,79 | **0,79** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 0,85 | 0,82 | 0,82 | **0,82** |
| **Denmark** | **0,43** | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,41 | 0,41 | 0,41 | 0,41 | 0,40 | 0,40 | **0,40** | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | **0,03** | 0,44 | 0,44 | 0,44 | **0,43** |
| **Estonia** | **0,44** | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,29 | **0,29** | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | **0,15** | 1,28 | 1,28 | 1,24 | **1,24** |
| **Finland** | **0,51** | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,36 | 0,36 | 0,36 | 0,36 | 0,36 | **0,35** | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | **0,16** | 0,81 | 0,81 | 0,80 | **0,80** |
| **France** | **1,52** | 1,19 | 1,18 | 1,17 | 1,17 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | **0,24** | 1,65 | 1,64 | 1,62 | 1,62 | 2,18 | 1,77 | 1,26 | 1,25 | 1,24 | NA | **1,28** | 0,98 | 1,08 | 1,15 | **1,15** |
| **Germany** | **1,19** | 0,94 | 0,92 | 0,93 | 0,91 | 0,91 | 0,91 | 0,91 | 0,90 | 0,89 | 0,89 | **0,90** | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,29 | **0,29** | 1,20 | 1,18 | 1,18 | **1,19** |
| **Greece** | **0,97** | 2,75 | 2,74 | 2,68 | 2,68 | 2,69 | 2,69 | 2,42 | 2,43 | 2,43 | 2,49 | **0,54** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,43** | 2,71 | 2,71 | 2,78 | **1,44** |
| **Hungary** | **1,18** | 1,13 | 1,13 | 1,13 | 1,13 | 1,18 | 1,16 | 1,14 | 1,17 | 1,19 | 1,18 | **1,18** | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 1,17 | 1,19 | 1,18 | **1,18** |
| **Ireland** | **0,09** | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | **0,06** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | **0,04** | 2,99 | 2,97 | 2,84 | **2,79** |
| **Italy** | **1,28** | 0,84 | 0,84 | 0,84 | 0,88 | 0,88 | 0,87 | 0,89 | 0,89 | 0,89 | 0,88 | **0,88** | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,41 | 0,39 | 0,39 | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,40 | **0,40** | 1,31 | 1,31 | 1,29 | **1,29** |
| **Latvia** | **0,43** | 1,70 | 1,42 | 1,42 | 1,28 | 0,47 | 0,47 | 0,48 | 0,48 | 0,37 | 0,32 | **0,32** | 0,05 | 0,25 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | **0,11** | 2,45 | 2,23 | 2,24 | **2,26** |
| **Lithuania** | **0,42** | 1,85 | 1,87 | 1,90 | 1,92 | 0,61 | 0,61 | 0,61 | 0,43 | 0,42 | 0,42 | **0,38** | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | **0,03** | 2,10 | 2,06 | 2,04 | **2,04** |
| **Luxembourg** | **1,17** | 0,89 | 0,89 | 0,85 | 0,83 | 0,81 | 0,80 | 0,79 | 0,77 | 0,76 | 0,74 | **0,73** | - | 0,36 | 2,20 | 2,16 | 2,12 | 2,08 | 0,47 | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,45 | **0,44** | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,45 | **0,44** |
| **Malta** | **1,92** | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,78 | 0,78 | 0,77 | 0,71 | **0,70** | 1,59 | 1,55 | 1,52 | 1,68 | 1,89 | 1,82 | 1,36 | 1,36 | 1,35 | 1,24 | **1,22** | 0,58 | 0,38 | 0,35 | **0,35** |
| **Netherlands** | **0,07** | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 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 | 0,01 | 0,01 | **0,01** | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,18 | **0,18** |
| **Poland** | **1,04** | 0,75 | - | 0,94 | 0,94 | 0,95 | 0,95 | 0,95 | 0,96 | 0,97 | 0,97 | **0,97** | 0,07 | - | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | **0,06** | 1,14 | 1,15 | 1,15 | **1,13** |
| **Portugal** | **5,41** | 2,81 | 2,82 | 2,83 | 1,46 | 1,46 | 1,41 | 1,41 | 1,40 | 1,39 | 1,36 | **1,35** | 2,39 | 2,40 | 2,38 | 3,99 | 4,00 | 4,22 | 4,23 | 4,22 | 4,17 | 4,11 | **4,07** | 3,08 | 3,04 | 2,99 | **2,98** |
| **Romania** | **0,96** | 1,05 | 1,17 | 1,19 | 1,19 | 1,20 | 1,20 | 0,91 | 0,92 | 0,92 | 0,92 | **0,92** | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | **0,04** | 0,96 | 0,96 | 0,95 | **0,96** |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,72** | 1,00 | 1,00 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 0,66 | **0,66** | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,06 | **0,06** | 1,01 | 1,01 | 0,87 | **0,87** |
| **Slovenia** | **2,82** | 2,67 | 2,66 | 2,66 | 2,66 | 2,64 | 2,62 | 2,61 | 2,61 | 2,60 | 2,59 | **2,58** | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | **0,23** | 3,32 | 3,31 | 3,30 | **3,29** |
| **Spain** | **8,05** | 4,79 | 4,79 | 4,78 | 4,89 | 4,83 | 4,88 | 4,85 | 4,88 | 4,87 | 4,80 | **4,78** | 3,11 | 3,08 | 3,08 | 3,11 | 3,12 | 3,15 | 3,23 | 3,27 | 3,28 | 3,20 | **3,27** | 1,31 | 1,45 | 1,29 | **1,29** |
| **Sweden** | **0,75** | 0,62 | 0,61 | 0,60 | 0,59 | 0,47 | 0,46 | 0,46 | 0,46 | 0,46 | 0,45 | **0,45** | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,29 | **0,29** | 0,80 | 0,80 | 0,80 | **0,79** |
| **Average** | **1,56** | 1,21 | 1,19 | 1,17 | 1,12 | 1,00 | 1,00 | 1,06 | 1,08 | 1,08 | 1,05 | **0,97** | 0,70 | 0,69 | 0,73 | 0,79 | 0,82 | 0,80 | 0,62 | 0,66 | 0,65 | 0,62 | **0,63** | 1,60 | 1,59 | 1,57 | **1,52** |
| **Median** | **1,17** | 0,94 | 0,91 | 0,93 | 0,91 | 0,81 | 0,80 | 0,80 | 0,89 | 0,89 | 0,86 | **0,79** | 0,21 | 0,25 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,20 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,20 | **0,23** | 1,28 | 1,28 | 1,24 | **1,24** |
| **Minimum** | **0,07** | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 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 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | **0,01** | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,18 | **0,18** |
| **Maximum** | **8,05** | 4,79 | 4,79 | 4,78 | 4,89 | 4,83 | 4,88 | 4,85 | 4,88 | 4,87 | 4,80 | **4,78** | 3,11 | 3,08 | 3,08 | 3,99 | 4,00 | 4,22 | 4,23 | 4,22 | 4,17 | 4,11 | **4,07** | 3,32 | 3,31 | 3,30 | **3,29** |
| **% of NA** | **0%** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | **0%** | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 7% | **0%** | 0% | 0% | 0% | **0%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | **0%** | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | **7%** | 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.

**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

**Greece:** Following a judicial map reform, all magistrate courts were abolished. Accordingly, the number of first instance courts considerably decreased for 2024.

**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**: Administrative courts, established under Act No. 151/2022 Coll. as part of the new court map effective 1 June 2023, are included in the count of specialised courts.

**Spain:** As general rule, the first instance courts - legal entities are unipersonal courts - one judge is considered one court.

## Table 2.3a Number of all courts as geographic locations from 2014 to 2024 (Q44)

| States | Number of all courts - Geographic locations (1) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Austria | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 102 | 102 | 164 | 164 | 164 | 162 | 166 |
| Belgium | 288 | 288 | 267 | 264 | 253 | 232 | 225 | 225 | 225 | 225 | 225 |
| Bulgaria | 168 | 175 | 182 | 182 | 182 | 182 | 182 | 182 | 181 | 183 | 183 |
| Croatia | 203 | 203 | 203 | 203 | 205 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 |
| Cyprus | 21 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 31 | 31 | 33 | 33 |
| Czech Republic | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 107 | 107 | 107 | 107 | 107 |
| Denmark | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 |
| Estonia | 22 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Finland | 81 | 79 | 73 | 73 | 71 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| France | 643 | 643 | 641 | 641 | 641 | 641 | 672 | 715 | 781 | 842 | 844 |
| Germany | 1 101 | 1 095 | 1 102 | 1 093 | 1 076 | 1 076 | 1 092 | 1 092 | 1 075 | 1 075 | 1 075 |
| Greece | 329 | 329 | 319 | 319 | 319 | 319 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 181 |
| Hungary | 157 | 157 | 157 | 158 | 159 | 159 | 139 | 139 | 140 | 139 | 139 |
| Ireland | 94 | 94 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 156 | 156 | 156 | 155 | 155 |
| Italy | 836 | 836 | 836 | 831 | 828 | 828 | 844 | 844 | 844 | 833 | 832 |
| Latvia | 48 | 49 | 42 | 47 | 52 | 56 | 55 | 53 | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| Lithuania | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| Luxembourg | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Malta | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Netherlands | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 42 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 |
| Poland | NA | - | 401 | 401 | 401 | 401 | 494 | 494 | 496 | 496 | 491 |
| Portugal | 253 | 253 | 253 | 312 | 312 | 316 | 328 | 328 | 327 | 325 | 329 |
| Romania | 244 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 242 | 242 | 242 | 242 | 242 |
| Slovak Republic | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 60 | 60 |
| Slovenia | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Spain | 763 | 763 | 763 | 698 | 701 | 702 | 695 | 700 | 715 | 712 | 713 |
| Sweden | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 |
| Average | 224 | 224 | 230 | 229 | 228 | 225 | 235 | 237 | 239 | 241 | 236 |
| Median | 97 | 97 | 98 | 98 | 99 | 99 | 139 | 139 | 140 | 139 | 139 |
| Minimum | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Maximum | 1 101 | 1 095 | 1 102 | 1 093 | 1 076 | 1 076 | 1 092 | 1 092 | 1 075 | 1 075 | 1 075 |
| % of NA | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

(1) Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

**Greece:** Following a judicial map reform, all magistrate courts were abolished. Accordingly, the number of first instance courts considerably decreased for 2024.

**Ireland:** As of 2020, the methodology used to count the number of courts – geographic locations changed to fully align it with the CEPEJ definitions.

**Italy**: Before 2014 only courts financed by Ministry of justice were included.

**Table 2.3b Number of all courts as geographic locations per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q44)**

| States | Number of all courts - Geographic locations per 100 000 inhabitants | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | 1,20 | 1,18 | 1,18 | 1,17 | 1,16 | 1,15 | 1,84 | 1,83 | 1,80 | 1,77 | 1,80 |
| **Belgium** | 2,57 | 2,56 | 2,36 | 2,32 | 2,21 | 2,03 | 1,95 | 1,94 | 1,92 | 1,91 | 1,90 |
| **Bulgaria** | 2,33 | 2,45 | 2,56 | 2,58 | 2,60 | 2,62 | 2,63 | 2,66 | 2,81 | 2,84 | 2,84 |
| **Croatia** | 4,80 | 4,84 | 4,89 | 4,94 | 5,03 | 3,52 | 3,54 | 3,69 | 3,71 | 3,71 | 3,70 |
| **Cyprus** | 2,45 | 2,59 | 2,59 | 2,57 | 2,40 | 2,48 | 2,57 | 3,43 | 3,37 | 3,54 | 3,41 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,93 | 0,93 | 0,93 | 0,93 | 0,92 | 0,92 | 1,00 | 1,02 | 0,99 | 0,98 | 0,98 |
| **Denmark** | 0,51 | 0,51 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,48 |
| **Estonia** | 1,68 | 1,67 | 1,60 | 1,67 | 1,59 | 1,59 | 1,50 | 1,50 | 1,51 | 1,46 | 1,45 |
| **Finland** | 1,48 | 1,44 | 1,33 | 1,32 | 1,29 | 0,94 | 0,94 | 0,94 | 0,93 | 0,93 | 0,92 |
| **France** | 0,97 | 0,97 | 0,96 | 0,95 | 0,96 | 0,96 | 1,00 | 1,06 | 1,15 | 1,23 | 1,23 |
| **Germany** | 1,36 | 1,34 | 1,34 | 1,32 | 1,30 | 1,29 | 1,31 | 1,31 | 1,27 | 1,27 | 1,29 |
| **Greece** | 3,03 | 3,03 | 2,96 | 2,96 | 2,97 | 2,97 | 2,99 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,07 | 1,74 |
| **Hungary** | 1,59 | 1,60 | 1,60 | 1,60 | 1,66 | 1,63 | 1,41 | 1,43 | 1,46 | 1,45 | 1,46 |
| **Ireland** | 2,03 | 2,02 | 2,03 | 1,98 | 1,96 | 1,93 | 3,13 | 3,04 | 3,03 | 2,90 | 2,85 |
| **Italy** | 1,38 | 1,38 | 1,38 | 1,37 | 1,37 | 1,37 | 1,42 | 1,43 | 1,43 | 1,41 | 1,41 |
| **Latvia** | 2,40 | 2,49 | 2,13 | 2,41 | 2,71 | 2,94 | 2,91 | 2,83 | 2,76 | 2,78 | 2,80 |
| **Lithuania** | 2,12 | 2,15 | 2,18 | 2,21 | 2,22 | 2,22 | 2,22 | 2,21 | 2,17 | 2,15 | 2,15 |
| **Luxembourg** | 1,42 | 1,42 | 1,35 | 1,33 | 1,30 | 1,28 | 1,26 | 1,24 | 1,21 | 1,19 | 1,17 |
| **Malta** | 0,45 | 0,44 | 0,43 | 0,42 | 0,63 | 0,61 | 0,58 | 0,78 | 0,77 | 0,71 | 0,70 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | 1,04 | 1,04 | 1,04 | 1,04 | 1,29 | 1,30 | 1,31 | 1,32 | 1,31 |
| **Portugal** | 2,44 | 2,45 | 2,45 | 3,03 | 3,04 | 3,07 | 3,19 | 3,17 | 3,12 | 3,05 | 3,06 |
| **Romania** | 1,10 | 1,23 | 1,24 | 1,24 | 1,25 | 1,25 | 1,26 | 1,27 | 1,27 | 1,27 | 1,27 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1,18 | 1,18 | 1,18 | 1,18 | 1,16 | 1,17 | 1,17 | 1,20 | 1,20 | 1,11 | 1,11 |
| **Slovenia** | 3,74 | 3,73 | 3,73 | 3,73 | 3,70 | 3,67 | 3,60 | 3,61 | 3,59 | 3,58 | 3,57 |
| **Spain** | 1,64 | 1,64 | 1,64 | 1,49 | 1,49 | 1,48 | 1,47 | 1,48 | 1,49 | 1,46 | 1,45 |
| **Sweden** | 0,97 | 0,96 | 0,95 | 0,94 | 0,97 | 0,96 | 0,95 | 0,95 | 0,94 | 0,94 | 0,94 |
| **Average** | 1,77 | 1,79 | 1,73 | 1,76 | 1,76 | 1,70 | 1,77 | 1,82 | 1,81 | 1,81 | 1,75 |
| **Median** | 1,54 | 1,52 | 1,38 | 1,37 | 1,37 | 1,37 | 1,42 | 1,43 | 1,46 | 1,45 | 1,45 |
| **Minimum** | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 |
| **Maximum** | 4,80 | 4,84 | 4,89 | 4,94 | 5,03 | 3,67 | 3,60 | 3,69 | 3,71 | 3,71 | 3,70 |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

(1) Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

**Greece:** Following a judicial map reform, all magistrate courts were abolished. Accordingly, the number of first instance courts considerably decreased for 2024.

**Ireland:** As of 2020, the methodology used to count the number of courts – geographic locations changed to fully align it with the CEPEJ definitions.

**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 2024 (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 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** | **31** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 28 | NAP | 3 | NAP | NAP |
| **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** | **877** | 150 | NAP | 216 | NAP | 272 | 28 | NAP | NAP | 40 | NAP | NAP | 155 | 16 |
| **Germany** | **245** | NAP | NAP | 106 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 53 | 68 | NAP | NAP | 18 |
| **Greece** | **45** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 30 | NAP | 15 | 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** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 | NAP | NA | NAP | 1 |
| **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** | **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 | 0 | 17 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 294 |
| **Romania** | **8** | 3 | NAP | NAP | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 4 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **3** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 3 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **5** | NAP | NAP | 4 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | **1 605** | 121 | NAP | 394 | 143 | NAP | 19 | 7 | NAP | 243 | NAP | NAP | 82 | 596 |
| **Sweden** | **31** | NAP | NAP | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 12 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 18 |
| **Average** | **146** | 34 | - | 71 | - | - | - | - | - | 23 | - | 5 | - | 96 |
| **Median** | **14** | 9 | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | 4 | - | 16 |
| **Minimum** | **1** | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| **Maximum** | **1 605** | 150 | - | 394 | - | - | - | - | - | 243 | - | 15 | - | 596 |
| **% of NA** | **0%** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | **7%** | 63% | 96% | 59% | 85% | 89% | 81% | 93% | 96% | 19% | 81% | 70% | 81% | 59% |

**Spain:** As general rule, the first instance courts - legal entities are unipersonal courts - one judge is considered one court.

**Table 2.4b Number and distribution of higher instance specialised courts as legal entities in 2024 (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** | **6** | NAP | NAP | 5 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **2** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 | NAP | 1 | NAP | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **2** | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **1** | 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** | **12** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 10 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 2 |
| **Germany** | **52** | NAP | NAP | 19 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 16 | 15 | NAP | NAP | 2 |
| **Greece** | **12** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 10 | NAP | 1 | 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 | NA | 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** | **2** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 | NAP | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **1** | NAP | NAP | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | **59** | 5 | NAP | 23 | 6 | NAP | NAP | 2 | NAP | 23 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **8** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 5 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 3 |
| **Average** | **9** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - |
| **Median** | **2** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| **Minimum** | **1** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| **Maximum** | **59** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 23 | - | - | - | - |
| **% of NA** | **0%** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | **15%** | 93% | 100% | 85% | 96% | 100% | 100% | 93% | 100% | 30% | 89% | 74% | 100% | 78% |

**Spain:** As general rule, the first instance courts - legal entities are unipersonal courts - one judge is considered one court.

**Table 2.5 (EC) Absolute number of all courts (geographic locations) from 2014 to 2024 and their variations between 2014 and 2024 and between 2023 and 2024 (Q44)**

| States | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | Variation 2023-2024 | Variation 2014-2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 20 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 102 | 102 | 164 | 164 | 164 | 162 | 166 | 2,5% | 61,2% |
| Belgium | 1 | 288 | 288 | 267 | 264 | 253 | 232 | 225 | 225 | 225 | 225 | 225 | 0,0% | -21,9% |
| Bulgaria | 2 | 168 | 175 | 182 | 182 | 182 | 182 | 182 | 182 | 181 | 183 | 183 | 0,0% | 8,9% |
| Croatia | 11 | 203 | 203 | 203 | 203 | 205 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 0,0% | -29,6% |
| Cyprus | 13 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 31 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 0,0% | 57,1% |
| Czech Republic | 3 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 107 | 107 | 107 | 107 | 107 | 0,0% | 9,2% |
| Denmark | 4 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 0,0% | 0,0% |
| Estonia | 6 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0,0% | -9,1% |
| Finland | 26 | 81 | 79 | 73 | 73 | 71 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 0,0% | -35,8% |
| France | 10 | 643 | 643 | 641 | 641 | 641 | 641 | 672 | 715 | 781 | 842 | 844 | 0,2% | 31,3% |
| Germany | 5 | 1101 | 1095 | 1102 | 1093 | 1076 | 1076 | 1092 | 1092 | 1075 | 1075 | 1075 | 0,0% | -2,4% |
| Greece | 8 | 329 | 329 | 319 | 319 | 319 | 319 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 181 | -43,4% | -45,0% |
| Hungary | 17 | 157 | 157 | 157 | 158 | 159 | 159 | 139 | 139 | 140 | 139 | 139 | 0,0% | -11,5% |
| Ireland | 7 | 94 | 94 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 156 | 156 | 156 | 155 | 155 | 0,0% | 64,9% |
| Italy | 12 | 836 | 836 | 836 | 831 | 828 | 828 | 844 | 844 | 844 | 833 | 832 | -0,1% | -0,5% |
| Latvia | 14 | 48 | 49 | 42 | 47 | 52 | 56 | 55 | 53 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 0,0% | 8,3% |
| Lithuania | 15 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 0,0% | 0,0% |
| Luxembourg | 16 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0,0% | 0,0% |
| Malta | 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| Netherlands | 19 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 42 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 0,0% | 7,5% |
| Poland | 21 | NA | - | 401 | 401 | 401 | 401 | 494 | 494 | 496 | 496 | 491 | -1,0% | - |
| Portugal | 22 | 253 | 253 | 253 | 312 | 312 | 316 | 328 | 328 | 327 | 325 | 329 | 1,2% | 30,0% |
| Romania | 23 | 244 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 242 | 242 | 242 | 242 | 242 | 0,0% | -0,8% |
| Slovak Republic | 25 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 60 | 60 | 0,0% | -6,3% |
| Slovenia | 24 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 0,0% | -1,3% |
| Spain | 9 | 763 | 763 | 763 | 698 | 701 | 702 | 695 | 700 | 715 | 712 | 713 | 0,1% | -6,6% |
| Sweden | 27 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 0,0% | 4,2% |

(1) 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.

**Greece:** Following a judicial map reform, all magistrate courts were abolished. Accordingly, the number of first instance courts considerably decreased for 2024.

**Ireland:** As of 2020, the methodology used to count the number of courts – geographic locations changed to fully align it with the CEPEJ definitions.

# Indicator 2: The judicial organisation

## Comments provided by the national correspondents

## organised by country

*Question 042.*

*Question 043.*

*Question 044.*

**Austria**

**Q042 (2024):** In 2024 in Austria, the number of courts considered as legal entities is 150. Namely, there are 131 courts of general jurisdiction and 19 specialised courts. Among the 131 legal entities of general jurisdiction, 126 act at first instance, 4 at second instance and one at third instance. More precisely, the 113 District courts and the 13 Regional courts of general jurisdiction intervene as first instance courts. It is noteworthy that the 6 other regional and 1 district court 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 (2023):** In 2023 in Austria, the number of courts considered as legal entities is 150. Namely, there are 131 courts of general
jurisdiction and 19 specialised courts. Among the 131 legal entities of general jurisdiction, 126 act at first instance, 4 at second instance and one at third instance. More precisely, the 113 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 (2022):** In 2022 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 (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):** As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. six in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Since there are special courts for civil law cases in Vienna and Graz, which cannot be selected individually here, and 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 (2024):** As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. six in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Since there are special courts for civil law cases in Vienna and Graz, which cannot be selected individually here, and 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 (2023):** As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. six in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Since there are special courts for civil law cases in Vienna and Graz, which cannot be selected individually here, and 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 (2022):** As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. six in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Since there are special courts for civil law cases in Vienna and Graz, which cannot be selected individually here, and 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 (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 (2024):** The discrepency is due to an error in calculation last year. This should also have been the correct numbers in last years' report. The Lower Austria Regional Administrative courts has "external offices" in parts of Lower Austria, and the Federal Administrative Court as well as the Federal Tax Court do have regional buildings in the Federal States as well. This was taken into account in 2022 data, where another mistake seems to have been included (the number should have been 162 and 168 in 2022. Afterwards we lost 2 district courts).
**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, involving a reduction in geographic locations, was consolidated by the law of 25th December 2017. The implementation of the reform took place between 2016 and 2019.

“1.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities”: 13 first-instance courts, 162 Justices of the peace and 15 police courts. As for the assize courts governed by Articles 114 et seq. of the Judicial Code, due to their specific nature, they are not considered legal entities within the meaning of the CEPEJ and are not included in the table. In principle, the assize court sits in the capital of the various provinces and in the administrative district of Brussels-Capital. Thus, it sits in Antwerp, Arlon, Bruges, Brussels, Ghent, Liège, Leuven, Mons, Namur, Nivelles, or Tongeren, depending on the circumstances (Article 115 of the Judicial Code). There are therefore 11 assize courts in Belgium.

“1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities” : there are five appellate courts ; however, it should be mentioned that the 13 first-instance courts also act as appellate courts with regard to decisions made by the justices of the peace.

Starting from 2022, both justices of the peace and police courts are included under courts of general jurisdiction. In previous cycles, they were categorized as specialized first-instance courts. The assize courts were taken into account from 2020 to 2023, but starting from 2024, due to their specific nature (they do not sit permanently) they are no longer included in the table as first instance courts of general jurisdiction.

Given that the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) acts both at first instance level and on appeal, it has been accounted for under both columns Q43 but only once within the total of Q42.2.

**Q042 (2024):** Point “1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities”: only the five courts of appeal are listed here, even though the 13 first instance courts also have jurisdiction to hear appeals against decisions of justices of the peace. Point “2. Total number of specialised courts - legal entities”: labor courts are included under “specialized courts of second instance.” From 2024 onwards, due to their specific nature, the 11 assize courts that do not sit permanently are no longer included in the table as first instance courts of general jurisdiction.

**Q042 (2023):** Point “1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities”: only the 5 courts of appeal have been indicated here, but the 13 courts of first instance also have jurisdiction to hear appeals against decisions of the justices of the peace.
Point 2: Labour courts are included under ‘specialised courts of second instance’.
**Q042 (2022):** 1.2. Second instance courts of general jurisdiction – legal entities : only the 5 courts of appeal have been mentioned here, but the 13 first instance courts also have jurisdiction to hear appeals against decisions of the Justices of the peace.
**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):** « Higher instances": 5 labour courts + 1 Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) – administrative law litigation section = 6

Starting from 2020, justices of the peace and police courts are counted as courts of general jurisdiction. Administrative courts: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
Six courts of first instance have specialised enforcement divisions. The term ‘enforcement court’ is used, but in reality, this is a specialised chamber.

All the first instance courts (13) have a specialised family and youth section. The term ‘family court’ is used, but in reality, it is a specialised section.

**Q043 (2024):** "Specialised courts - higher instances" - 5 labour courts and the Council of State, administrative law litigation section (Conseil d'Etat)
**Q043 (2023):** Higher courts: 5 labour courts + 1 Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) - administrative litigation 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 (General Comment):** 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 court groups together the first instance court, the labour court and the company court, giving a total of 8 labour courts and company courts (Law of 14 February 2014).

**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, Courts of Appeals - 5, 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 (2024):** 1.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities- district courts
1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities- regional and appellate courts
Regional courts are courts of first instance for a certain category of cases and courts of second instance for another category of cases. Here, they are included in the number of courts of second instance with general jurisdiction as the decisive indicator used being the number of incoming cases
1.3 Highest instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities- Supreme Court of Cassation
2 Total number of specialised courts - legal entities– Supreme Administrative Court, military appellate, administrative, military courts

**Q042 (2023):** Regional courts are courts of first instance for a certain category of cases and courts of second instance for another category of cases. In this case, they are included in the number of courts of second instance with general jurisdiction as the decisive indicator used being the number of incoming cases

**Q042 (2022):** Regional/ Provincial courts are courts of first instance for a certain category of cases and courts of second instance for another category of cases. In this case, they are included in the number of courts of second instance with general jurisdiction, the decisive indicator used is the number of incoming cases.

**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
**Q043 (2022):** •Previous cycles the category “other specialised courts” encompasses the Specialized Criminal Court of Republic of Bulgaria and Specialized Criminal Court of Appeal. In the State Gazette, no. 32 of 26.04.2022, the Law on Amendments and Supplements to the Law on the Judiciary/ Judiciary System Act was promulgated, which closed the specialized court and prosecutor's office.
**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 (2024):** 1/ First instance courts geographic locations (this includes 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction and first instance specialised courts) – administrative, military and district as the Sofia District Court is located in two premises;
2/ All the courts (geographic locations) (this includes 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction, first instance specialised courts, all second instance courts and courts of appeal and all Supreme Courts)– Supreme Court of Cassation, Supreme Administrative Court, military appellate courts, administrative courts, regional courts, military courts and district courts (Sofia District Court, Sofia City Court and Sofia Appellate Court are located each in two premises for a total of six)

**Q044 (2023):** The Sofia Appellate Court, Sofia City Court and Sofia District Court are housed in two court buildings each, where sessions are held

**Q044 (2022):** Sofia District Court has two buildings where hearings are held.

**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.

**Q043 (General Comment):** No comment.

**Q043 (2022):** will be explained later

**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 (2023):** An appeal Court and a Supreme Constitutional Court were established.

**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 (General Comment):** "Other" first instance specialised court: the Administrative court for international protection.

**Q043 (2024):** Administrative Court of International Protection.
As of the 1st of July the Supreme court and the Supreme Constitutional court were established. the supreme court acts as the third and final instance in criminal and civil cases, whereas the supreme constitutional court acts as the third and final instance in Administrative Cases.

**Q043 (2023):** As of 1s of July 2023 a Supreme Constitutional Court and an Appeal Court were established.
The Supreme Constitutional Court has jurisdiction for the review of constitutionality of laws, but it also acts as the supreme administrative court. The Supreme Court decides, at third and last instance on civil or criminal cases on points of law.
The Court of Appeal will hear civil, criminal and revisional (administrative law) appeals.

**Q043 (2022):** Administrative Court for International Protection

**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 (2024):** 2. Supreme Administrative Court

**Q042 (2023):** 2. Supreme Administrative Court

**Q042 (2022):** 2. Supreme Administrative Court

**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 (2024):** 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

**Q044 (2023):** 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

**Q044 (2022):** 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

**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 (2024):** The specialised courts include the Land Registration Court and the Maritime and Commercial Court.

**Q042 (2023):** The specialised courts include the Land Registration Court and the Maritime and Commercial 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):** Re "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. 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.
There are only two specialised courts - the reason for checking out three specialised courts in this category is because 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.). Therefore it's the same court that specialises in both commercial court and insolvency.

**Q043 (2024):** The 'other' specialised court is The Land Registration Court.

**Q043 (2023):** The 'other' specialised court is The Land Registration Court.

**Q043 (2022):** 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 (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 (2024):** Included in the 26 courts are the 24 districs courts as well as the Maritime and Commercial Court and the Land Registration Court. Inlcuded in the 29 courts are the two high courts and the Supreme Court.
**Q044 (2023):** Included in the 26 courts are the 24 districs courts as well as the Maritime and Commercial Court and the Land Registration Court. Inlcuded in the 29 courts are the two high courts and the Supreme Court.
**Q044 (2022):** Included in first instance courts are district courts, Land Registration Court and the Maritime and Commercial 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 (2024):** First instance courts of general jurisdiction = 164 district courts (tribunaux judiciaires) + 4 courts of first instance. Police courts (167), criminal courts (168), and assize courts (104) are not counted as separate legal entities.
Second instance courts of general jurisdiction = 36 courts of appeal + 1 Superior Court of Appeal of Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon. Assize courts of appeal are not counted as separate legal entities (104).

**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/her 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 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 due to the complexity of the case or the personality of the convicted person (article 712-6 al 3 of the CPP), this referral to the collegiality may be made ex officio or at the request of the convicted person or the public prosecutor.
In terrorism matters, there is a derogation from ordinary law (articles 706-22-1 and D 49-75 to D49-81-5 of the Criminal Procedure Code). The Paris sentence enforcement courts specialising in terrorist matters (JAPAT, TAPAT and the sentence enforcement chamber) have: exclusive jurisdiction to monitor persons convicted by specialised terrorism courts pursuant to article 706-17 of the Criminal Procedure Code; concurrent jurisdiction with ordinary courts for the enforcement of sentences to monitor persons convicted of acts of terrorism and other offences falling within the scope of article 706-16 of the Criminal Procedure Code by ordinary courts.
source DACG.

**Q043 (2024):** Administrative justice (ordre administrative):
40 = 38 administrative courts (first instance) + 1 National Court of Asylum + 1 Commission for Parking Disputes; 10 = Council of State + 9 administrative courts of appeal.
Civil and criminal justice (ordre judiciaire):
Commercial courts = 134 commercial courts + 9 mixed commercial courts + 7 district courts with commercial competence.
Other specialised courts:
Courts of first instance: 1 court for paid parking disputes (Article R. 2133-120-20 of the General Code of Local Authorities), 1 court for navigation on the Rhine (Article L. 4261-2 of the Transport Code, Article D. 215-2 of the Judicial Organization Code), 1 court for navigation on the Moselle (Article L. 4262-2 of the Transport Code, Article D. 215-2 of the Judicial Organization Code), 7 enforcement courts (Article L. 218-8 of the Judicial Organization Code), 6 maritime courts (Decree No. 2015-261 of March 5, 2015 / Decree No. 2014-1581 of December 23, 2014); not counted as separate legal entities are the 11 land registry offices (Article D. 215-3 of the Code of Judicial Organization, Appendix Table XIII of the Code of Judicial Organization), and the 102 departmental criminal courts (Article 380-17 of the Code of Criminal Procedure).

Compared to previous years, rural courts have been moved from the “other” category to the “Rent and tenancies courts” category.

Higher instance courts: 1 appeal court for navigation on the Rhine (Article L. 313-1 of the COJ), 1 appeal court for navigation on the Moselle (Article L. 313-2 of the Code of Judicial Organization); for 2024, the National Court of Asylum (Article L. 131-1 of the CESEDA, counted among the administrative courts) is counted among the administrative courts.

**Q043 (2023):** 272 courts for rural leases + 1 court for navigation on the Rhine + 1 court of first instance for navigation on the Moselle + 6 maritime courts + 1 National court of asylum + 1 Court for disputes relating to paid parking.
Administrative courts: 38 administrative courts (first instance). There has been no reduction in the number of courts of first instance. Until now, we indicated 43 courts of first instance. This figure included:
- the National court of asylum
- the Court for disputes relating to paid parking
- 3 courts for the administrative courts of Guadeloupe, Saint-Martin and Saint-Barthelemy
- 2 courts for the administrative courts of Reunion and Mayotte - 2 courts for the administrative courts of New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna
- but only one court for the administrative courts of Martinique and Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon.

However, the following form a single legal entity (same head of court, same judges, same registry and same financial management):
- the administrative court of Guadeloupe, Saint-Martin and Saint-Barthelemy
- the administrative court of New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna
- the administrative court of Martinique and Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon.

On the other hand, although the administrative courts of Réunion and Mayotte have the same head of court and the same judges, they have separate registries and separate financial management: in our view, they therefore form two legal entities.
10 higher instances in administrative matters: Council of State + 9 administrative courts of appeal

**Q043 (2022):** 272 TPBR (tribunaux paritaires des baux ruraux), along with 1 Court for navigation on the Rhine, 1 Court for navigation on the Moselle, 6 maritime courts, the National court of Asylum and the Commission of litigation regarding paid parking.
**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 s

ocial 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. 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 the specially designated courts of appeal, numbering 26 which allows better accessibility to justice. On military jurisdictions: -In peacetime: ordinary judicial jurisdictions
In times of war: territorial courts of the armed forces: exceptional jurisdictions:
-bankruptcy courts: depending on the nature of the litigants -Bankruptcy courts: depending on the nature of the litigants, either under the jurisdiction of the Judicial Court, the Commercial Court or the TPBR, - Family courts: the family court judges who work within the TJs are competent in this matter
-Rental/lease courts: depending on the nature of the lease, jurisdiction between TJ, TCommerce, TPBR
-Courts for the execution of penal sanctions: this is a dispute falling within the competence of the Judges and Courts for the application of penalties
-Courts dealing with terrorism: this is a specialization of the TJ, CA and JAP Paris
-Courts dealing with Internet litigation: nonexistent
So NAP in each of the boxes relating to these courts.
There are no specialized second instance Court for commercial or labor law. They are chambers within the CAs that will manage this litigation. Thus NAP Source Direction des services judiciaires
With regard to the category ""other specialized courts"": joint courts for rural leases: 275, including that of St Pierre et Miquelon;
court for navigation on the Rhine: 1 ;
maritime courts: 6; national court of asylum: 1;
Specialized courts include the CNDA (National Asylum Court) and the CCSP (Commission du contentieux du stationnement payant). Commentary on other specialized courts: the discrepancy can be explained on the one hand by the merger of the TI and TGI, which led to the disappearance of the TASS and TPBR. On the other hand, the TPEs were previously counted in the category of other specialized courts; they are now the subject of a separate question and are thus removed from the "other" field. With regard to courts for the enforcement of criminal sanctions: In matters of enforcement of sentences, the enforcement judge (JAP) is a first-level enforcement court that is 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 the judicial courts, appointed by order of the First President of the second instance Court. In each second instance Court, a TAP is established whose territorial jurisdiction extends to the

**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.

**Q044 (2024):** The figures shown in the table relate to both, administrative courts and civil and criminal courts. For administrative courts:
54 courts of first instance - geographical locations
63 all courts - geographical locations Some courts of first instance have several premises where hearings are held:
- Administrative court of Guadeloupe, Saint Martin, and Saint Barthélemy: administrative court building in Guadeloupe, local court in Marigot (Saint Martin), and the converted Public Treasury room in Gustavia (Saint Barthélemy): 3
- Administrative court of Martinique and Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon: court building in Martinique and the judicial court of Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon: 2
- Administrative court of New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna: court building in New Caledonia and court of first instance in Mata-Utu (Wallis and Futuna): 2
- National Court of Asylum: National Court of Asylum building, Administrative Court of Réunion, Administrative Court of Mayotte, Administrative Court of Martinique, Administrative Court of Guadeloupe, and Administrative Court of French Guiana (6).
When hearings are not held at the National Court of Asylum, mobile hearings or video hearings are held.
In addition, pursuant to Article 70 of Law No. 2024-42 of January 26, 2024, on immigration control and improved integration, five regional chambers of the National Court of Asylum were created on September 1, 2024, in Bordeaux, Lyon (two chambers: one geographical location), Nancy, and Toulouse.

**Q044 (2023):** This was not taken into account in the data provided in previous years, but some administrative courts of first instance have several premises where hearings are held:
- administrative court of Guadeloupe, Saint-Martin and Saint-Barthelemy: building of the administrative court in Guadeloupe, the local court in Marigot (Saint-Martin) and the room at the Treasury in Gustavia (Saint-Barthelemy): 3
- Martinique and Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon administrative court: court building in Martinique and the Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon judicial court: 2
- administrative court of New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna: court building in New Caledonia and court of first instance in Mata-Utu (Wallis and Futuna): 2
- National court of asylum: National court of asylum building, Lyon administrative court of appeal, Nancy administrative court of appeal, Reunion administrative court, Mayotte administrative court, Martinique administrative court, Guadeloupe administrative court and French Guyana administrative court (8). When hearings are not held at the National court of asylum, mobile hearings or video hearings are held.

**Q044 (2022):** The data encompass both judicial orders: "ordre judiciaire" and "ordre administrative": 1) administrative courts at first instance (including common law jurisdictions at first instance and specialized jurisdictions at first instance): 32 in mainland France / 11 overseas territories; 2) all administrative courts (this figure includes common law courts at first instance, specialized courts at first instance, all second-instance courts and appellate courts, as well as all Supreme Courts): 42 in mainland France / 11 overseas territories.

**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):** Even though 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 may serve as second instance courts (for cases that were initially dealt with at regional courts or for cases in family matters) and as highest instance courts for cases that were initiated at the local courts (especially in criminal cases). In some specific cases, higher regional courts may also be courts of first instance.
The constitutional courts of the federal states and the Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht) are not part of the stages of appeal. Constitutional jurisdiction is also seen as separate 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 (2024):** 1.1 First instance courts include: 637 local courts, 115 regional courts
1.2 Second instance courts include: 24 higher regional courts and the bavarian highest regional court
1.3 Highest instance courts include: Federal Supreme Court
2. The total number of specialised courts includes administrative, labour, financial, and social courts as well as the Federal Patent Court.

**Q042 (2023):** 1.1 First instance courts include: 637 local courts, 115 regional courts
1.2 Second instance courts include: 24 higher regional courts and the bavarian highest regional court
1.3 Highest instance courts include: Federal Supreme Court
2. The total number of specialised courts includes administrative, labour, financial, and social courts as well as the Federal Patent Court.

**Q042 (2022):** 1.1 First instance courts include: 638 local courts, 115 regional courts
regional courts handle first as well as second instance cases. In 2022, regional courts registered 300 266 incoming first instance cases and 68 876 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 2022, higher regional courts recorded 72 201 incoming second instance cases (excluding family matters) and 4 761 incoming third/last instance cases. For further information see General Comment.
1.3 Highest instance courts include: Federal Surpreme Court
2. The total number of specialised courts includes administrative, labour, financial, and social courts as well as the Federal Patent Court.
Discrepancy in comparison to the 2022-2020 cycle:
regional courts were originally counted twice as first instance and second instance courts. Higher regional courts were counted as second instance courts. This was changed during the 2023-2021 cycle (EU-Scoreboard). The regional courts and higher regional courts are now placed according to the number of incoming cases as outlined in the explanatory note.
In previous cycles, the total number of specialised courts included 16 constitutional courts of the federal states as well as the Federal Constitutional Court. In the current cycle, these courts are no longer included as they are mostly seen as seperate from the ordninary justice system (for further information please refer to the general comment).

**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 generally subject to civil jurisdiction.The federal military disciplinary courts are first instance courts of administrative jurisdiction for disciplinary proceedings against members of the armed forces. The second and highest instance court for isciplinary proceedings against members of the armed forces is the Federal Administrative Court.
Juvenile courts do not exist as independent 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 judges together with lay youth assessors.

**Q043 (2024):** The category "administrative courts - first instance" inculdes 2 federal military disciplinary courts.
The category “other” covers:
18 finance courts (first instance)
Federal Patent Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)

**Q043 (2023):** The category "administrative courts - first instance" inculdes 2 federal military disciplinary courts.
The category “other” covers:
18 finance courts (first instance)
Federal Patent Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)

**Q043 (2022):** Comments - If “Other specialised courts”, please specify:
The category “other” covers:
18 finance courts (first instance)
Federal Patent Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)
In previous cycles, other specialised courts included 16 constitutional courts of the federal states as well as the Federal Constitutional Court. In the current cycle, these courts are no longer included as they are mostly seen as seperate from the ordninary justice system (for further information please refer to the general comment).

**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 statistic "Federal and State Courts" that does not distinguish between legal entities and geographic location of the courts. Generally, one legal entity equals one geographic location. Some courts have 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 statistic "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 (2024):** The consolidation of magistrates' and first instance courts resulted in the abolition of all magistrates'courts.The magistrates' court courthouses, which were located in the same places as the first instance courts have been closed down. Their facilities are now serving as additional installations for the relevant first instance courts.As regards the 50 magistrates' courts, these have been transformed into regional seats for the first instance courts, while the remaining have been closed. The basic principle of the new spatial restructuring of the courts is that each regional unit (former administrative "Prefecture") will have a central Court of First Instance, to which all the judges of this Prefecture (former Magistrates'' as well as First Instance Court Judges) will receive permanent positions. Exceptions are valid for border regions or island regions due to constitutional provisions (thus prefectures in Thrace, Northern Macedonia, Western Macedonia regions and Aegean islands, where the rule of one first instance court per administrative prefecture does not apply) .
The total number of the First Instance Courts in Greece before the adoption of Law 5108/2024 was 63. 56 of them are now First Instance Courts and 7 that are considered as "parallel" court seats to the (central) Courts - since there were previously some Prefectures where two or more First Instance Courts co-existed, providing full jurisdiction. Thus, delocalization and simplification of the first instance is achieved and, at the same time, better and more direct access to justice for citizens is provided. According to the new framework, lawyers and citizens can submit documents/claims either to the central or the regional/parallel courts (not independent judicial structures), since there is only one first Instance court in each administrative Prefecture, served by one or more premises.

**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 (specialized divisions within courts of general criminal jurisdiction), 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. The Hellenic Court of Audit is a special administrative court. According to the Greek Constitution, administrative disputes are divided between the Council of State, the regular administrative courts, and the Court of Audit. The Court of Audit is staffed by graduates of the National School of Judicial Officers.

**Q043 (2024):** Court of Audit

**Q043 (2023):** The Court of Auditors is one of three supreme courts in Greece.

**Q043 (2022):** The Court of Auditors is one of three supreme courts in Greece.

**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 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. The number of judges in the largest district court is 357, whereas the smallest court operates with one judge. Out of the 113 district courts, the district courts in the seat of the regional courts have special competences in many cases.

**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.

**Q043 (2023):** Regional courts deal with labour cases on first instance. 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 (2024):** For the purpose of this section, we have included each court only once, whether or not that court has both first and second instance jurisdiction.
First Instance courts of general jurisdiction – District Court, Circuit Court, High Court
Second Instance courts of general jurisdiction – Court of Appeal
Highest Instance courts of general jurisdiction – Supreme Court
Specialised Courts – Special Criminal Courts

**Q042 (2023):** For the purpose of this section, we have included each court only once, whether or not that court has both first and second instance jurisdiction.
First Instance courts of general jurisdiction – District Court, Circuit Court, High Court
Second Instance courts of general jurisdiction – Court of Appeal
Highest Instance courts of general jurisdiction – Supreme Court
Specialised Courts – Special Criminal Courts

**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.
The Labour Court in Ireland is a tribunal rather than a court of law, which is why it is not included in the table of Q43. It cannot award costs; instead, it hears both sides of a case and issues non-binding recommendations. While these recommendations are expected to be given serious consideration, the responsibility for resolving disputes ultimately rests with the parties involved.

**Q043 (2024):** The Commercial Court cannot be defined as a recognised branch of the High Court but is rather a list of commercial cases heard by the High Court. The Labour Court is a tribunal rather than a court of law.
The Family Courts Act was signed into law in 2024 but has yet to commence. This Act provides for the establishment of a Family High Court, Family Circuit Court and Family District Court as divisions of the existing court jurisdictions and provides for the reallocation of jurisdiction in family law proceedings between the family law courts.

**Q043 (2023):** There are currently 2 Special Criminal Courts in Ireland who (in general) deal with crimes relating to terrorism and organised crime. While divisions of other courts deal with many of the matters set out in the table above, there are no specialised courts per se to deal with same.
Furthermore, while there are other tribunals or bodies outside of the court system which have powers to make determinations in some of the matters in the table (e.g., the Labour Court and Military Courts), these tribunals are not within the courts system.

**Q043 (2022):** There are currently 2 Special Criminal Courts in Ireland who (in general) deal with crimes relating to terrorism and organised crime. While divisions of other courts deal with many of the matters set out in the table above, there are no specialised courts per se to deal with same.
Furthermore, while there are other tribunals or bodies outside of the court system which have powers to make determinations in some of the matters in the table (e.g., the Labour Court and Military Courts). These tribunals are not within the courts system.

**Q043 (2019):** Legislation to provide for a Family Court has been proposed

**Q044 (2024):** This answer is based on the explanatory note wherein if there are two courts, e.g. District Court and Circuit Court sitting in one specific location, they are to be counted separately.
There are currently 90 District Court and 49 Circuit Court venues.
There are 2 High Court venues in Dublin and there were 11 provincial sittings of the High Court in 2024.
The Supreme Court, Special Criminal Court and Court of Appeal each have one venue.

**Q044 (2023):** This answer is based on the explanatory note wherein if there are two courts, e.g. District and Circuit courts sitting in one specific location, they are to be counted separately.
**Q044 (2022):** There has not been an increase in venues since 2020. This answer is based on the explanatory note wherein if there are two courts, e.g. District and Circuit courts sitting in one specific location, they are to be counted separately whereas previously they were counted together.
**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 (2023):** The decrease in the number of courts is due to the fact that some Offices of the Justice of Peace closed in 2023.

**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.).
Notably, in Italy, some specialised first-instance courts are not administered or financed by the Ministry of Justice. These include regional audit commissions, local tax commissions and military courts. As a result, these courts are not considered in responses regarding court budgets, cases, judges, or non-judge staff. Regional audit commissions are not even counted in the number of courts. Conversely, regional administrative courts (first-instance administrative courts) and the supreme administrative court, although they are also not administered or financed by the Ministry of Justice, are included in the counts. Since 2014, they have been considered in the totals for the number of courts and cases. Additionally, starting from 2018, they have been included in the counts for the number of judges, non-judge staff and in the courts budget.
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 (2023):** 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. The option “Other specialised courts” refers to tax courts.

**Q043 (2022):** 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. The option “Other specialised courts” refers to tax courts.

**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

**Q044 (2023):** The decrease in the number of geographic locations is due to the fact that some Offices of the Justice of Peace closed in 2023.

**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 (2024):** Total number of specialised courts - legal entities - There is indicated one Administrative district Court, one Administrative Regional Court (appeal instance) and one Economic Court. There is a specialised court which cannot be listed as a court of any instance - the Constitutional Court, which within the jurisdiction specified in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and Constitutional Court 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 Constitutional Court Law.

**Q042 (2023):** 1.1. First instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities- comparing with 2022 data there is a small difference, because in 2023 Rezekne Court and Daugavpils Court were merged in one Latgale District Court.
2. Total number of specialised courts - legal entities - There are indicated 1 Administrative district Court, 1 Administrative Regional Court (appeal instance) and 1 Economic Court. There is a specialised court which cannot be listed as a court of any instance - the Constitutional Court, which within the jurisdiction specified in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and Constitutional Court 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 Constitutional Court Law.

**Q042 (2022):** "1.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities": in 2022, three courts were merged into one, creating the Riga City Court.
In Latvia, the two administrative courts and the Economic court are considered as courts of general jurisdiction, but according to the CEPEJ methodology, data are inserted in line 2 "Total number of specialized courts".
**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):** The Economic court, is specialized in commercial cases so it can be classified as a specialized court within the scope of this question. It is a first instance court.
The administrative court can be considered as a first and second instance specialized court (within the scope of this question). The Administrative District Court in Riga and the Administrative Regional Court are located in one building. 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 (2024):** There is an Economic Court, which is specialized in commercial cases, so it can be classified as a specialized court within the scope of this question; however, it is a first instance court. There is also a specialized court that cannot be listed as a court of any instance — the Constitutional Court, which adjudicates matters regarding the conformity of laws and other regulatory enactments with the Constitution, as well as other matters within its jurisdiction.
The Administrative Court can be considered a specialized court of both first and second instance (within the scope of this question). As for 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; however, in a state of emergency or during wartime, it may also be exercised by military courts. The rest of the courts in Latvia are not established and, therefore, in this case, the appropriate response is “NAP.”

**Q043 (2023):** There is Economic court, which is specialized in commercial cases so it can be classified as a specialized court within the scope of this question, but it’s a first instance court.
There is a specialised court which cannot be listed as a court of any instance - the Constitutional Court, which adjudicates 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.
Administrative court can be considered as a first and second instance specialized court (within the scope of this question). 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. 11 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. 1 regional administrative court, which consists of five chambers, 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 (2023):** Regional courts are counted only as second instance.

**Q042 (2022):** according to 2021 answers, Regional courts are counted only as second instance.

**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: 11 district courts (49 locations), 5 regional courts (5 locations) of general jurisdiction and 1 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 (2024):** There are 59 1st instance courts locations: 11 district courts (49 locations), 5 regional courts (5 locations) of general jurisdiction and 1 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 (2023):** 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 (2022):** 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) In addition to the actual jurisdictions, the law of July 27, 1997 organizing the Constitutional Court established this court which is seized, as a preliminary ruling, when a question arises regarding the conformity of a law with the Constitution before a judicial or administrative jurisdiction.

It rules by way of judgment on laws' conformity with the Constitution, except for those approving treaties.

When one party raises an issue concerning a law's compliance with the Constitution before either judicial or administrative jurisdiction, that jurisdiction must refer it to The Constitutional Court unless it considers that making a decision on the raised issue is unnecessary for its judgment; that such question lacks any foundation; or that The Constitutional Court has already ruled on an identical matter.

If any jurisdiction deems there’s an issue about whether certain legislation complies with constitutional provisions and deciding upon this point is necessary for delivering its verdict then it should raise this matter ex officio after previously inviting parties to present their observations.

Parties are entitled to conclude and plead before the Constitutional Court through representation by a counsel listed in Category I annually compiled tables set up by bar councils’ orders."

The judgments of the Constitutional Court are published in the Official Journal of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg within thirty days from their pronouncement." (Justice Portal : https://justice.public.lu/fr/organisation-justice/cour-constitutionnelle.html)

**Q042 (2022):** In addition to the regular courts, the Law of 27 July 1997 on the organization of the Constitutional Court, established this court, which is seized for a preliminary ruling when a question arises before a judicial or administrative jurisdiction concerning the conformity of a law with the Constitution. It rules by way of judgment on the conformity of laws with the Constitution, except those approving treaties.

When a party raises an issue regarding compliance of a law with the Constitution before a judicial or administrative jurisdiction, that jurisdiction is required to refer it to the Constitutional Court, unless it considers that deciding on such matter is not necessary for its judgment, that there are no grounds for such issue or that there has already been an decision by the Constitutional Court on an identical matter.

If any jurisdiction deems that an issue relating to compliance of a law with the Constitution arises and a decision on this point is necessary for its judgment, it must raise it ex officio after having previously invited the parties to present their observations.

The parties are entitled to conclude and plead before the Constitutional Court through a counsel registered in List I annually drawn up by the councils of bar associations.

Judgments from the Constitutional Court are published in the Official Gazette of Luxembourg within thirty days from their pronouncement. (Justice Portal: https://justice.public.lu/fr/organisation-justice/cour-constitutionnelle.html)

**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.

**Malta**

**Q042 (2023):** The courts identified at 1.1 are: Court of Magistrates, Civil Jurisdiction; Court of Magistrates, Criminal Jurisdiction, Criminal Jurisdiction; Criminal Court; Civil Court, First Hall. The courts identified for at 2 are: the Rent Regulation Board; the Rural Leases Control Board; the Administrative Review Tribunal; the Land Arbitration Board; the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction; the Small Claims Tribunal; the Constitutional Court.
**Q042 (2022):** The 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction are:
- the Court of Magistrates, Civil Jurisdiction
- the Court of Magistrates, Criminal Jurisdiction
- the Civil Court, First Hall - the Criminal Court

The 2nd instance courts of general jurisdiction are:
- the Civil Court of Appeal, Inferior Jurisdiction
- the Civil Court of Appeal, Superior Jurisdiction
- the Criminal Court of Appeal, Inferior Jurisdiction
- the Criminal 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

Q2: The increase by 1 in the number of specialised courts reflects the addition of the Constitutional Court (in line with 2021 data).

**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) 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. 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. The higher instance 'Otehr specialised court' refers to the Constitutional Court.

**Q043 (2022):** 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 Constitutional Court (higher instance court)

The Juvenile Court is a specialised criminal court.

**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 (2022):** The Juvenile Court that until the previous evaluation was in a separate geographical location, has since been relocated to the Courts of Justice in Valletta. Hence the change in the figure quoted.
**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):** 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 handled 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).
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):** See the comment under Q42 on the other special (not specialised) appeal tribunals as well.
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 (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).
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 (General Comment):** 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 geographic locations:
-32 first instance geographic locations 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. It is not the same court, but a separate, specialized court (this change in counting occurred between 2020 and 2021). See Q43 for why this is counted as a first instance court.
See also a law that assigns 32 geographic locations, and the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal:
https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0032316/2013-04-01
All courts geographic locations:
-33 first instance geographic locations (see above).
-6 second instance geographic locations of general jurisdiction, of which 4 are located at the same geographic location as a first instance court.
-1 Supreme Court, located at a separate location.
-1 Central Appeals Tribunal, located at the same geographic 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 (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 (regional courts within their jurisdiction have the majority of first-instance cases), 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 (2024):** 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 (2023):** 1.1 first instance courts (district courts), 1.2 second (regional + appellate courts) , 1.3 third instance courts (cassation of the judgment) (Supreme Court) of general jurisdiction.
**Q042 (2022):** 1.1 first instance courts (district courts + regional courts);
1.2 second (appellate courts); 1.3 third instance courts (cassation of the judgment) (Supreme Court) of general jurisdiction;

**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.

**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 (2024):** The number 426 represents the total number of courts of first instance of general jurisdiction and courts of first instance of specialised jurisdiction (319 district courts + 47 regional courts + 23 specialist courts of first instance = 426). The number 491 represents the total number of all courts, including all their seats in various locations (319 district courts + 47 regional courts of first instance + 47 regional courts of second instance + 11 courts of appeal + 26 specialised courts of first and second instance + 1 Supreme Court + 1 Supreme Administrative Court + 39 non-local courts = 491).

**Q044 (2023):** The figure of 496 indicated in 2023 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 434) was added the number of 62 courts:- regional courts:47, courts of appeal:11, military courts:2, Supreme Administrative Court:1, Supreme Court:1. Total: 434+62= 496.

**Q044 (2022):** The figure of 496 indicated in 2022 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 434) was added
the number of 62 courts: - regional courts: 47; - courts of appeal: 11; - military courts: 2; - Supreme Administrative Court: 1; - Supreme Court: 1;
Total: 494 (434 + 62).

**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 (2024):** We put the intelectual property court that was before under internet disputes in "other

**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.

**Q044 (2024):** We have included the Administrative Supreme Court as well as the 2nd instance administrative 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):** 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 (2024):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q042 (2023):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q042 (2022):** Law no. 304/2022 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 (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 (2024):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q043 (2023):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q043 (2022):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q043 (2020):** Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.

**Q044 (2024):** It should be mentioned that some of the first instance specialised courts share the location with „judecatorii".

**Q044 (2023):** It should be mentioned that some of the first instance specialised courts share the location with „judecatorii".

**Q044 (2022):** 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 (2024):** There are 36 courts operating at first instance, including municpal and district courts. 8 regional courts operating at second instance.
1 Supreme Court. The 5 specialised courts are detailed in Q43.
**Q042 (2023):** There are 36 courts operating at first instance, including municpal and district courts. 8 regional courts operating at second instance.
1 Supreme Court. The 5 specialised courts are detailed in Q43.

**Q042 (2022):** The new Supreme Administravive Court - specialized court of higher instance was establish in 2021 and started its full work in 2022.
**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, Supreme Administrative Court and the Constitutional 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):** In Spain, as general rule, the First Instance are unipersonal Courts: One Judge-courts. In Spain we have two types of specialization: Special Jurisdictions established by Organic Law (Violence against women, Commercial, for example), and the possibility for GCJ to determine that in some places, a general jurisdiction Court (Civil) is focused in some kind of cases.

**Q042 (2023):** In spain there is 1 Supreme Court with several Chambers. When attending the presentation of the report of 2024, we change this response to avoid missunderstandings.

**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.
In Spain, as general rule, the First Instance are unipersonal Courts: One Judge-courts. In Spain we have two types of specialization: Special Jurisdictions established by Organic Law (Violence against women, Commercial, for example), and the possibility for GCJ to determine that in some places, a general jurisdiction Court (Civil) is focused in some kind of cases.

**Q043 (2024):** Courts Labour specialised in enforcement; Courts on enforcement of Arbitration; Civil Registry; Courts on Penitentiary Surveillance; Courts for mortgage enforcement; Courts on capacity of persons; Criminal Courts of Violence against Women; other
There was an increase in the number of commercial courts.

**Q043 (2023):** Specialized Courts: Specialized Labor Enforcement Courts, Arbitration Enforcement Court, Penitentiary Surveillance Courts, Mortgage Enforcement Courts, Courts for Personal Capacity, Criminal Courts for Violence Against Women, other. The final number is lower than that of the previous year.

**Q043 (2022):** Courts Labour specialised in enforcement; Courts on enforcement of Arbitration; Civil Registry; Courts on Penitentiary Surveillance; Courts for mortgage enforcement; Courts on capacity of persons; Criminal Courts of Violence against Women; other

**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.

**Q044 (General Comment):** One building usually houses different courts.

**Q044 (2023):** The latest data shows a slight decrease compared to previous figures. This could be attributed to the implementation of "Ciudades de la Justicia" (Justice Cities) in certain regions, like Andalusia. These "Justicie Cities" tend to group together in a single building, courthouses that were previously dispersed in several addresses.

**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**

**Q042 (2024):** In 2024 in Austria, the number of courts considered as legal entities is 150. Namely, there are 131 courts of general jurisdiction and 19 specialised courts. Among the 131 legal entities of general jurisdiction, 126 act at first instance, 4 at second instance and one at third instance. More precisely, the 113 District courts and the 13 Regional courts of general jurisdiction intervene as first instance courts. It is noteworthy that the 6 other regional and 1 district court 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 (2023):** In 2023 in Austria, the number of courts considered as legal entities is 150. Namely, there are 131 courts of general
jurisdiction and 19 specialised courts. Among the 131 legal entities of general jurisdiction, 126 act at first instance, 4 at second instance and one at third instance. More precisely, the 113 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 (2022):** In 2022 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 (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.

**Belgium**

**Q042 (General Comment):** The reform of the Justices of the peace, involving a reduction in geographic locations, was consolidated by the law of 25th December 2017. The implementation of the reform took place between 2016 and 2019.

"1.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities": 13 first-instance courts, 162 Justices of the peace and 15 police courts. As for the assize courts governed by Articles 114 et seq. of the Judicial Code, due to their specific nature, they are not considered legal entities within the meaning of the CEPEJ and are not included in the table. In principle, the assize court sits in the capital of the various provinces and in the administrative district of Brussels-Capital. Thus, it sits in Antwerp, Arlon, Bruges, Brussels, Ghent, Liège, Leuven, Mons, Namur, Nivelles, or Tongeren, depending on the circumstances (Article 115 of the Judicial Code). There are therefore 11 assize courts in Belgium.

"1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities" : there are five appellate courts ; however, it should be mentioned that the 13 first-instance courts also act as appellate courts with regard to decisions made by the justices of the peace.

Starting from 2022, both justices of the peace and police courts are included under courts of general jurisdiction. In previous cycles, they were categorized as specialized first-instance courts. The assize courts were taken into account from 2020 to 2023, but starting from 2024, due to their specific nature (they do not sit permanently) they are no longer included in the table as first instance courts of general jurisdiction.

Given that the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) acts both at first instance level and on appeal, it has been accounted for under both columns Q43 but only once within the total of Q42.2.

**Q042 (2024):** Point "1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities": only the five courts of appeal are listed here, even though the 13 first instance courts also have jurisdiction to hear appeals against decisions of justices of the peace. Point "2. Total number of specialised courts - legal entities": labor courts are included under "specialized courts of second instance." From 2024 onwards, due to their specific nature, the 11 assize courts that do not sit permanently are no longer included in the table as first instance courts of general jurisdiction.

**Q042 (2023):** Point "1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities": only the 5 courts of appeal have been indicated here, but the 13 courts of first instance also have jurisdiction to hear appeals against decisions of the justices of the peace.
Point 2: Labour courts are included under 'specialised courts of second instance'.

**Q042 (2022):** 1.2. Second instance courts of general jurisdiction – legal entities : only the 5 courts of appeal have been mentioned here, but the 13 first instance courts also have jurisdiction to hear appeals against decisions of the Justices of the peace.

**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.

**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, Courts of Appeals - 5, 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 (2024):** 1.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities- district courts
1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities- regional and appellate courts
Regional courts are courts of first instance for a certain category of cases and courts of second instance for another category of cases. Here, they are included in the number of courts of second instance with general jurisdiction as the decisive indicator used being the number of incoming cases
1.3 Highest instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities- Supreme Court of Cassation
2 Total number of specialised courts - legal entities– Supreme Administrative Court, military appellate, administrative, military courts

**Q042 (2023):** Regional courts are courts of first instance for a certain category of cases and courts of second instance for another category of cases. In this case, they are included in the number of courts of second instance with general jurisdiction as the decisive indicator used being the number of incoming cases

**Q042 (2022):** Regional/ Provincial courts are courts of first instance for a certain category of cases and courts of second instance for another category of cases. In this case, they are included in the number of courts of second instance with general jurisdiction, the decisive indicator used is the number of incoming cases.

**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.

**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.

**Cyprus**

**Q042 (2023):** An appeal Court and a Supreme Constitutional Court were established.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**Q042 (2024):** 2. Supreme Administrative Court

**Q042 (2023):** 2. Supreme Administrative Court

**Q042 (2022):** 2. Supreme Administrative Court

**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).

**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 (2024):** The specialised courts include the Land Registration Court and the Maritime and Commercial Court.

**Q042 (2023):** The specialised courts include the Land Registration Court and the Maritime and Commercial 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.

**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.

**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.

**France**

**Q042 (2024):** First instance courts of general jurisdiction = 164 district courts (tribunaux judiciaires) + 4 courts of first instance. Police courts (167), criminal courts (168), and assize courts (104) are not counted as separate legal entities.
Second instance courts of general jurisdiction = 36 courts of appeal + 1 Superior Court of Appeal of Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon. Assize courts of appeal are not counted as separate legal entities (104).

**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).

**Germany**

**Q042 (General Comment):** Even though 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 may serve as second instance courts (for cases that were initially dealt with at regional courts or for cases in family matters) and as highest instance courts for cases that were initiated at the local courts (especially in criminal cases). In some specific cases, higher regional courts may also be courts of first instance.
The constitutional courts of the federal states and the Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht) are not part of the stages of appeal. Constitutional jurisdiction is also seen as separate 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 (2024):** 1.1 First instance courts include: 637 local courts, 115 regional courts
1.2 Second instance courts include: 24 higher regional courts and the bavarian highest regional court
1.3 Highest instance courts include: Federal Supreme Court
2. The total number of specialised courts includes administrative, labour, financial, and social courts as well as the Federal Patent Court.

**Q042 (2023):** 1.1 First instance courts include: 637 local courts, 115 regional courts
1.2 Second instance courts include: 24 higher regional courts and the bavarian highest regional court
1.3 Highest instance courts include: Federal Supreme Court
2. The total number of specialised courts includes administrative, labour, financial, and social courts as well as the Federal Patent Court.

**Q042 (2022):** 1.1 First instance courts include: 638 local courts, 115 regional courts
regional courts handle first as well as second instance cases. In 2022, regional courts registered 300 266 incoming first instance cases and 68 876 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 2022, higher regional courts recorded 72 201 incoming second instance cases (excluding family matters) and 4 761 incoming third/last instance cases. For further information see General Comment.
1.3 Highest instance courts include: Federal Surpreme Court
2. The total number of specialised courts includes administrative, labour, financial, and social courts as well as the Federal Patent Court.
Discrepancy in comparison to the 2022-2020 cycle:
regional courts were originally counted twice as first instance and second instance courts. Higher regional courts were counted as second instance courts. This was changed during the 2023-2021 cycle (EU-Scoreboard). The regional courts and higher regional courts are now placed according to the number of incoming cases as outlined in the explanatory note.
In previous cycles, the total number of specialised courts included 16 constitutional courts of the federal states as well as the Federal Constitutional Court. In the current cycle, these courts are no longer included as they are mostly seen as seperate from the ordninary justice system (for further information please refer to the general comment).

**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.

**Greece**

**Q042 (2024):** The consolidation of magistrates' and first instance courts resulted in the abolition of all magistrates'courts.The magistrates' court courthouses, which were located in the same places as the first instance courts have been closed down. Their facilities are now serving as additional installations for the relevant first instance courts.As regards the 50 magistrates' courts, these have been transformed into regional seats for the first instance courts, while the remaining have been closed. The basic principle of the new spatial restructuring of the courts is that each regional unit (former administrative "Prefecture") will have a central Court of First Instance, to which all the judges of this Prefecture (former Magistrates'' as well as First Instance Court Judges) will receive permanent positions. Exceptions are valid for border regions or island regions due to constitutional provisions (thus prefectures in Thrace, Northern Macedonia, Western Macedonia regions and Aegean islands, where the rule of one first instance court per administrative prefecture does not apply) .
The total number of the First Instance Courts in Greece before the adoption of Law 5108/2024 was 63. 56 of them are now First Instance Courts and 7 that are considered as "parallel" court seats to the (central) Courts - since there were previously some Prefectures where two or more First Instance Courts co-existed, providing full jurisdiction. Thus, delocalization and simplification of the first instance is achieved and, at the same time, better and more direct access to justice for citizens is provided. According to the new framework, lawyers and citizens can submit documents/claims either to the central or the regional/parallel courts (not independent judicial structures), since there is only one first Instance court in each administrative Prefecture, served by one or more premises.

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q042 (General Comment):** 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. The number of judges in the largest district court is 357, whereas the smallest court operates with one judge. Out of the 113 district courts, the district courts in the seat of the regional courts have special competences in many cases.

**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.

**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 (2024):** For the purpose of this section, we have included each court only once, whether or not that court has both first and second instance jurisdiction.
First Instance courts of general jurisdiction – District Court, Circuit Court, High Court
Second Instance courts of general jurisdiction – Court of Appeal
Highest Instance courts of general jurisdiction – Supreme Court
Specialised Courts – Special Criminal Courts

**Q042 (2023):** For the purpose of this section, we have included each court only once, whether or not that court has both first and second instance jurisdiction.
First Instance courts of general jurisdiction – District Court, Circuit Court, High Court
Second Instance courts of general jurisdiction – Court of Appeal
Highest Instance courts of general jurisdiction – Supreme Court
Specialised Courts – Special Criminal Courts

**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.

**Italy**

**Q042 (2023):** The decrease in the number of courts is due to the fact that some Offices of the Justice of Peace closed in 2023.

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q042 (2024):** Total number of specialised courts - legal entities - There is indicated one Administrative district Court, one Administrative Regional Court (appeal instance) and one Economic Court. There is a specialised court which cannot be listed as a court of any instance - the Constitutional Court, which within the jurisdiction specified in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and Constitutional Court 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 Constitutional Court Law.

**Q042 (2023):** 1.1. First instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities- comparing with 2022 data there is a small difference, because in 2023 Rezekne Court and Daugavpils Court were merged in one Latgale District Court.
2. Total number of specialised courts - legal entities - There are indicated 1 Administrative district Court, 1 Administrative Regional Court (appeal instance) and 1 Economic Court. There is a specialised court which cannot be listed as a court of any instance - the Constitutional Court, which within the jurisdiction specified in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and Constitutional Court 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 Constitutional Court Law.

**Q042 (2022):** "1.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - legal entities": in 2022, three courts were merged into one, creating the Riga City Court.
In Latvia, the two administrative courts and the Economic court are considered as courts of general jurisdiction, but according to the CEPEJ methodology, data are inserted in line 2 "Total number of specialized courts".

**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

**Lithuania**

**Q042 (General Comment):** 1.1. 11 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. 1 regional administrative court, which consists of five chambers, 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 (2023):** Regional courts are counted only as second instance.

**Q042 (2022):** according to 2021 answers, Regional courts are counted only as second instance.

**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.

**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) In addition to the actual jurisdictions, the law of July 27, 1997 organizing the Constitutional Court established this court which is seized, as a preliminary ruling, when a question arises regarding the conformity of a law with the Constitution before a judicial or administrative jurisdiction.

It rules by way of judgment on laws' conformity with the Constitution, except for those approving treaties.

When one party raises an issue concerning a law's compliance with the Constitution before either judicial or administrative jurisdiction, that jurisdiction must refer it to The Constitutional Court unless it considers that making a decision on the raised issue is unnecessary for its judgment; that such question lacks any foundation; or that The Constitutional Court has already ruled on an identical matter.

If any jurisdiction deems there’s an issue about whether certain legislation complies with constitutional provisions and deciding upon this point is necessary for delivering its verdict then it should raise this matter ex officio after previously inviting parties to present their observations.

Parties are entitled to conclude and plead before the Constitutional Court through representation by a counsel listed in Category I annually compiled tables set up by bar councils’ orders."

The judgments of the Constitutional Court are published in the Official Journal of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg within thirty days from their pronouncement." (Justice Portal : https://justice.public.lu/fr/organisation-justice/cour-constitutionnelle.html)

**Q042 (2022):** In addition to the regular courts, the Law of 27 July 1997 on the organization of the Constitutional Court, established this court, which is seized for a preliminary ruling when a question arises before a judicial or administrative jurisdiction concerning the conformity of a law with the Constitution. It rules by way of judgment on the conformity of laws with the Constitution, except those approving treaties.

When a party raises an issue regarding compliance of a law with the Constitution before a judicial or administrative jurisdiction, that jurisdiction is required to refer it to the Constitutional Court, unless it considers that deciding on such matter is not necessary for its judgment, that there are no grounds for such issue or that there has already been an decision by the Constitutional Court on an identical matter.

If any jurisdiction deems that an issue relating to compliance of a law with the Constitution arises and a decision on this point is necessary for its judgment, it must raise it ex officio after having previously invited the parties to present their observations.

The parties are entitled to conclude and plead before the Constitutional Court through a counsel registered in List I annually drawn up by the councils of bar associations.

Judgments from the Constitutional Court are published in the Official Gazette of Luxembourg within thirty days from their pronouncement. (Justice Portal: https://justice.public.lu/fr/organisation-justice/cour-constitutionnelle.html)

**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.

**Malta**

**Q042 (2023):** The courts identified at 1.1 are: Court of Magistrates, Civil Jurisdiction; Court of Magistrates, Criminal Jurisdiction, Criminal Jurisdiction; Criminal Court; Civil Court, First Hall. The courts identified for at 2 are: the Rent Regulation Board; the Rural Leases Control Board; the Administrative Review Tribunal; the Land Arbitration Board; the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction; the Small Claims Tribunal; the Constitutional Court.

**Q042 (2022):** The 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction are:
- the Court of Magistrates, Civil Jurisdiction
- the Court of Magistrates, Criminal Jurisdiction
- the Civil Court, First Hall - the Criminal Court

The 2nd instance courts of general jurisdiction are:
- the Civil Court of Appeal, Inferior Jurisdiction
- the Civil Court of Appeal, Superior Jurisdiction
- the Criminal Court of Appeal, Inferior Jurisdiction
- the Criminal 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

Q2: The increase by 1 in the number of specialised courts reflects the addition of the Constitutional Court (in line with 2021 data).

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q042 (General Comment):** 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 handled 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).
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

**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 (regional courts within their jurisdiction have the majority of first-instance cases), 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 (2024):** 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 (2023):** 1.1 first instance courts (district courts), 1.2 second (regional + appellate courts) , 1.3 third instance courts (cassation of the judgment) (Supreme Court) of general jurisdiction.

**Q042 (2022):** 1.1 first instance courts (district courts + regional courts);
1.2 second (appellate courts); 1.3 third instance courts (cassation of the judgment) (Supreme Court) of general jurisdiction;

**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.

**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.

**Romania**

**Q042 (General Comment):** 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 (2024):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q042 (2023):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q042 (2022):** Law no. 304/2022 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 (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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q042 (2024):** There are 36 courts operating at first instance, including municpal and district courts. 8 regional courts operating at second instance.
1 Supreme Court. The 5 specialised courts are detailed in Q43.

**Q042 (2023):** There are 36 courts operating at first instance, including municpal and district courts. 8 regional courts operating at second instance.
1 Supreme Court. The 5 specialised courts are detailed in Q43.

**Q042 (2022):** The new Supreme Administravive Court - specialized court of higher instance was establish in 2021 and started its full work in 2022.

**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

**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.

**Spain**

**Q042 (General Comment):** In Spain, as general rule, the First Instance are unipersonal Courts: One Judge-courts. In Spain we have two types of specialization: Special Jurisdictions established by Organic Law (Violence against women, Commercial, for example), and the possibility for GCJ to determine that in some places, a general jurisdiction Court (Civil) is focused in some kind of cases.

**Q042 (2023):** In spain there is 1 Supreme Court with several Chambers. When attending the presentation of the report of 2024, we change this response to avoid missunderstandings.

## Question 043

**Austria**

**Q043 (General Comment):** As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. six in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Since there are special courts for civil law cases in Vienna and Graz, which cannot be selected individually here, and 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 (2024):** As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. six in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Since there are special courts for civil law cases in Vienna and Graz, which cannot be selected individually here, and 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 (2023):** As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. six in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Since there are special courts for civil law cases in Vienna and Graz, which cannot be selected individually here, and 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 (2022):** As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. six in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Since there are special courts for civil law cases in Vienna and Graz, which cannot be selected individually here, and 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 (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)

**Belgium**

**Q043 (General Comment):** « Higher instances": 5 labour courts + 1 Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) – administrative law litigation section = 6

Starting from 2020, justices of the peace and police courts are counted as courts of general jurisdiction. Administrative courts: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
Six courts of first instance have specialised enforcement divisions. The term ‘enforcement court’ is used, but in reality, this is a specialised chamber.

All the first instance courts (13) have a specialised family and youth section. The term ‘family court’ is used, but in reality, it is a specialised section.

**Q043 (2024):** "Specialised courts - higher instances" - 5 labour courts and the Council of State, administrative law litigation section (Conseil d'Etat)

**Q043 (2023):** Higher courts: 5 labour courts + 1 Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) - administrative litigation 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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q043 (General Comment):** Administrative Courts- 28
Supreme Administrative Court - 1
MilitaryCourts - 3
Military Court of Appeal - 1

**Q043 (2022):** •Previous cycles the category “other specialised courts” encompasses the Specialized Criminal Court of Republic of Bulgaria and Specialized Criminal Court of Appeal. In the State Gazette, no. 32 of 26.04.2022, the Law on Amendments and Supplements to the Law on the Judiciary/ Judiciary System Act was promulgated, which closed the specialized court and prosecutor's office.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q043 (General Comment):** No comment.

**Q043 (2022):** will be explained later

**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.

**Cyprus**

**Q043 (General Comment):** "Other" first instance specialised court: the Administrative court for international protection.

**Q043 (2024):** Administrative Court of International Protection.
As of the 1st of July the Supreme court and the Supreme Constitutional court were established. the supreme court acts as the third and final instance in criminal and civil cases, whereas the supreme constitutional court acts as the third and final instance in Administrative Cases.

**Q043 (2023):** As of 1s of July 2023 a Supreme Constitutional Court and an Appeal Court were established.
The Supreme Constitutional Court has jurisdiction for the review of constitutionality of laws, but it also acts as the supreme administrative court. The Supreme Court decides, at third and last instance on civil or criminal cases on points of law.
The Court of Appeal will hear civil, criminal and revisional (administrative law) appeals.

**Q043 (2022):** Administrative Court for International Protection

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**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).

**Denmark**

**Q043 (General Comment):** Re "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. 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.
There are only two specialised courts - the reason for checking out three specialised courts in this category is because 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.). Therefore it's the same court that specialises in both commercial court and insolvency.

**Q043 (2024):** The 'other' specialised court is The Land Registration Court.

**Q043 (2023):** The 'other' specialised court is The Land Registration Court.

**Q043 (2022):** 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 (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.

**Estonia**

**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.

**Finland**

**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.

**France**

**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/her 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 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 due to the complexity of the case or the personality of the convicted person (article 712-6 al 3 of the CPP), this referral to the collegiality may be made ex officio or at the request of the convicted person or the public prosecutor.
In terrorism matters, there is a derogation from ordinary law (articles 706-22-1 and D 49-75 to D49-81-5 of the Criminal Procedure Code). The Paris sentence enforcement courts specialising in terrorist matters (JAPAT, TAPAT and the sentence enforcement chamber) have: exclusive jurisdiction to monitor persons convicted by specialised terrorism courts pursuant to article 706-17 of the Criminal Procedure Code; concurrent jurisdiction with ordinary courts for the enforcement of sentences to monitor persons convicted of acts of terrorism and other offences falling within the scope of article 706-16 of the Criminal Procedure Code by ordinary courts.
source DACG.

**Q043 (2024):** Administrative justice (ordre administrative):
40 = 38 administrative courts (first instance) + 1 National Court of Asylum + 1 Commission for Parking Disputes; 10 = Council of State + 9 administrative courts of appeal.
Civil and criminal justice (ordre judiciaire):
Commercial courts = 134 commercial courts + 9 mixed commercial courts + 7 district courts with commercial competence.
Other specialised courts:
Courts of first instance: 1 court for paid parking disputes (Article R. 2133-120-20 of the General Code of Local Authorities), 1 court for navigation on the Rhine (Article L. 4261-2 of the Transport Code, Article D. 215-2 of the Judicial Organization Code), 1 court for navigation on the Moselle (Article L. 4262-2 of the Transport Code, Article D. 215-2 of the Judicial Organization Code), 7 enforcement courts (Article L. 218-8 of the Judicial Organization Code), 6 maritime courts (Decree No. 2015-261 of March 5, 2015 / Decree No. 2014-1581 of December 23, 2014); not counted as separate legal entities are the 11 land registry offices (Article D. 215-3 of the Code of Judicial Organization, Appendix Table XIII of the Code of Judicial Organization), and the 102 departmental criminal courts (Article 380-17 of the Code of Criminal Procedure).

Compared to previous years, rural courts have been moved from the “other” category to the “Rent and tenancies courts” category.

Higher instance courts: 1 appeal court for navigation on the Rhine (Article L. 313-1 of the COJ), 1 appeal court for navigation on the Moselle (Article L. 313-2 of the Code of Judicial Organization); for 2024, the National Court of Asylum (Article L. 131-1 of the CESEDA, counted among the administrative courts) is counted among the administrative courts.

**Q043 (2023):** 272 courts for rural leases + 1 court for navigation on the Rhine + 1 court of first instance for navigation on the Moselle + 6 maritime courts + 1 National court of asylum + 1 Court for disputes relating to paid parking.
Administrative courts: 38 administrative courts (first instance). There has been no reduction in the number of courts of first instance. Until now, we indicated 43 courts of first instance. This figure included:
- the National court of asylum
- the Court for disputes relating to paid parking
- 3 courts for the administrative courts of Guadeloupe, Saint-Martin and Saint-Barthelemy
- 2 courts for the administrative courts of Reunion and Mayotte - 2 courts for the administrative courts of New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna
- but only one court for the administrative courts of Martinique and Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon.

However, the following form a single legal entity (same head of court, same judges, same registry and same financial management):
- the administrative court of Guadeloupe, Saint-Martin and Saint-Barthelemy
- the administrative court of New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna
- the administrative court of Martinique and Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon.

On the other hand, although the administrative courts of Réunion and Mayotte have the same head of court and the same judges, they have separate registries and separate financial management: in our view, they therefore form two legal entities.
10 higher instances in administrative matters: Council of State + 9 administrative courts of appeal

**Q043 (2022):** 272 TPBR (tribunaux paritaires des baux ruraux), along with 1 Court for navigation on the Rhine, 1 Court for navigation on the Moselle, 6 maritime courts, the National court of Asylum and the Commission of litigation regarding paid parking.

**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 s

ocial 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. 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 the specially designated courts of appeal, numbering 26 which allows better accessibility to justice. On military jurisdictions: -In peacetime: ordinary judicial jurisdictions
In times of war: territorial courts of the armed forces: exceptional jurisdictions:
-bankruptcy courts: depending on the nature of the litigants -Bankruptcy courts: depending on the nature of the litigants, either under the jurisdiction of the Judicial Court, the Commercial Court or the TPBR, - Family courts: the family court judges who work within the TJs are competent in this matter
-Rental/lease courts: depending on the nature of the lease, jurisdiction between TJ, TCommerce, TPBR
-Courts for the execution of penal sanctions: this is a dispute falling within the competence of the Judges and Courts for the application of penalties
-Courts dealing with terrorism: this is a specialization of the TJ, CA and JAP Paris
-Courts dealing with Internet litigation: nonexistent
So NAP in each of the boxes relating to these courts.
There are no specialized second instance Court for commercial or labor law. They are chambers within the CAs that will manage this litigation. Thus NAP Source Direction des services judiciaires
With regard to the category ""other specialized courts"": joint courts for rural leases: 275, including that of St Pierre et Miquelon;
court for navigation on the Rhine: 1 ;
maritime courts: 6; national court of asylum: 1;
Specialized courts include the CNDA (National Asylum Court) and the CCSP (Commission du contentieux du stationnement payant). Commentary on other specialized courts: the discrepancy can be explained on the one hand by the merger of the TI and TGI, which led to the disappearance of the TASS and TPBR. On the other hand, the TPEs were previously counted in the category of other specialized courts; they are now the subject of a separate question and are thus removed from the "other" field. With regard to courts for the enforcement of criminal sanctions: In matters of enforcement of sentences, the enforcement judge (JAP) is a first-level enforcement court that is 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 the judicial courts, appointed by order of the First President of the second instance Court. In each second instance Court, a TAP is established whose territorial jurisdiction extends to the

**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.

**Germany**

**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 generally subject to civil jurisdiction.The federal military disciplinary courts are first instance courts of administrative jurisdiction for disciplinary proceedings against members of the armed forces. The second and highest instance court for isciplinary proceedings against members of the armed forces is the Federal Administrative Court.
Juvenile courts do not exist as independent 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 judges together with lay youth assessors.

**Q043 (2024):** The category "administrative courts - first instance" inculdes 2 federal military disciplinary courts.
The category “other” covers:
18 finance courts (first instance)
Federal Patent Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)

**Q043 (2023):** The category "administrative courts - first instance" inculdes 2 federal military disciplinary courts.
The category “other” covers:
18 finance courts (first instance)
Federal Patent Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)

**Q043 (2022):** Comments - If “Other specialised courts”, please specify:
The category “other” covers:
18 finance courts (first instance)
Federal Patent Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)
In previous cycles, other specialised courts included 16 constitutional courts of the federal states as well as the Federal Constitutional Court. In the current cycle, these courts are no longer included as they are mostly seen as seperate from the ordninary justice system (for further information please refer to the general comment).

**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.

**Greece**

**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 (specialized divisions within courts of general criminal jurisdiction), 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. The Hellenic Court of Audit is a special administrative court. According to the Greek Constitution, administrative disputes are divided between the Council of State, the regular administrative courts, and the Court of Audit. The Court of Audit is staffed by graduates of the National School of Judicial Officers.

**Q043 (2024):** Court of Audit

**Q043 (2023):** The Court of Auditors is one of three supreme courts in Greece.

**Q043 (2022):** The Court of Auditors is one of three supreme courts in Greece.

**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.

**Hungary**

**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.

**Q043 (2023):** Regional courts deal with labour cases on first instance. 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”.

**Ireland**

**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.
The Labour Court in Ireland is a tribunal rather than a court of law, which is why it is not included in the table of Q43. It cannot award costs; instead, it hears both sides of a case and issues non-binding recommendations. While these recommendations are expected to be given serious consideration, the responsibility for resolving disputes ultimately rests with the parties involved.

**Q043 (2024):** The Commercial Court cannot be defined as a recognised branch of the High Court but is rather a list of commercial cases heard by the High Court. The Labour Court is a tribunal rather than a court of law.
The Family Courts Act was signed into law in 2024 but has yet to commence. This Act provides for the establishment of a Family High Court, Family Circuit Court and Family District Court as divisions of the existing court jurisdictions and provides for the reallocation of jurisdiction in family law proceedings between the family law courts.

**Q043 (2023):** There are currently 2 Special Criminal Courts in Ireland who (in general) deal with crimes relating to terrorism and organised crime. While divisions of other courts deal with many of the matters set out in the table above, there are no specialised courts per se to deal with same.
Furthermore, while there are other tribunals or bodies outside of the court system which have powers to make determinations in some of the matters in the table (e.g., the Labour Court and Military Courts), these tribunals are not within the courts system.

**Q043 (2022):** There are currently 2 Special Criminal Courts in Ireland who (in general) deal with crimes relating to terrorism and organised crime. While divisions of other courts deal with many of the matters set out in the table above, there are no specialised courts per se to deal with same.
Furthermore, while there are other tribunals or bodies outside of the court system which have powers to make determinations in some of the matters in the table (e.g., the Labour Court and Military Courts). These tribunals are not within the courts system.

**Q043 (2019):** Legislation to provide for a Family Court has been proposed

**Italy**

**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.).
Notably, in Italy, some specialised first-instance courts are not administered or financed by the Ministry of Justice. These include regional audit commissions, local tax commissions and military courts. As a result, these courts are not considered in responses regarding court budgets, cases, judges, or non-judge staff. Regional audit commissions are not even counted in the number of courts. Conversely, regional administrative courts (first-instance administrative courts) and the supreme administrative court, although they are also not administered or financed by the Ministry of Justice, are included in the counts. Since 2014, they have been considered in the totals for the number of courts and cases. Additionally, starting from 2018, they have been included in the counts for the number of judges, non-judge staff and in the courts budget.
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 (2023):** 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. The option “Other specialised courts” refers to tax courts.

**Q043 (2022):** 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. The option “Other specialised courts” refers to tax courts.

**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

**Latvia**

**Q043 (General Comment):** The Economic court, is specialized in commercial cases so it can be classified as a specialized court within the scope of this question. It is a first instance court.
The administrative court can be considered as a first and second instance specialized court (within the scope of this question). The Administrative District Court in Riga and the Administrative Regional Court are located in one building. 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 (2024):** There is an Economic Court, which is specialized in commercial cases, so it can be classified as a specialized court within the scope of this question; however, it is a first instance court. There is also a specialized court that cannot be listed as a court of any instance — the Constitutional Court, which adjudicates matters regarding the conformity of laws and other regulatory enactments with the Constitution, as well as other matters within its jurisdiction.
The Administrative Court can be considered a specialized court of both first and second instance (within the scope of this question). As for 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; however, in a state of emergency or during wartime, it may also be exercised by military courts. The rest of the courts in Latvia are not established and, therefore, in this case, the appropriate response is “NAP.”

**Q043 (2023):** There is Economic court, which is specialized in commercial cases so it can be classified as a specialized court within the scope of this question, but it’s a first instance court.
There is a specialised court which cannot be listed as a court of any instance - the Constitutional Court, which adjudicates 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.
Administrative court can be considered as a first and second instance specialized court (within the scope of this question). 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

**Luxembourg**

**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.

**Malta**

**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) 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. 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. The higher instance 'Otehr specialised court' refers to the Constitutional Court.

**Q043 (2022):** 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 Constitutional Court (higher instance court)

The Juvenile Court is a specialised criminal court.

**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

**Netherlands**

**Q043 (General Comment):** See the comment under Q42 on the other special (not specialised) appeal tribunals as well.
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 (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).
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).

**Poland**

**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.

**Portugal**

**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 (2024):** We put the intelectual property court that was before under internet disputes in "other

**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.

**Romania**

**Q043 (2024):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q043 (2023):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q043 (2022):** Law no. 304/2022 on the judicial organisation.

**Q043 (2020):** Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.

**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, Supreme Administrative Court and the Constitutional 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.

**Slovenia**

**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.

**Spain**

**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.
In Spain, as general rule, the First Instance are unipersonal Courts: One Judge-courts. In Spain we have two types of specialization: Special Jurisdictions established by Organic Law (Violence against women, Commercial, for example), and the possibility for GCJ to determine that in some places, a general jurisdiction Court (Civil) is focused in some kind of cases.

**Q043 (2024):** Courts Labour specialised in enforcement; Courts on enforcement of Arbitration; Civil Registry; Courts on Penitentiary Surveillance; Courts for mortgage enforcement; Courts on capacity of persons; Criminal Courts of Violence against Women; other
There was an increase in the number of commercial courts.

**Q043 (2023):** Specialized Courts: Specialized Labor Enforcement Courts, Arbitration Enforcement Court, Penitentiary Surveillance Courts, Mortgage Enforcement Courts, Courts for Personal Capacity, Criminal Courts for Violence Against Women, other. The final number is lower than that of the previous year.

**Q043 (2022):** Courts Labour specialised in enforcement; Courts on enforcement of Arbitration; Civil Registry; Courts on Penitentiary Surveillance; Courts for mortgage enforcement; Courts on capacity of persons; Criminal Courts of Violence against Women; other

**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.

### Question 044

**Austria**

**Q044 (2024):** The discrepency is due to an error in calculation last year. This should also have been the correct numbers in last years' report. The Lower Austria Regional Administrative courts has "external offices" in parts of Lower Austria, and the Federal Administrative Court as well as the Federal Tax Court do have regional buildings in the Federal States as well. This was taken into account in 2022 data, where another mistake seems to have been included (the number should have been 162 and 168 in 2022. Afterwards we lost 2 district courts).

**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**

**Q044 (General Comment):** 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 court groups together the first instance court, the labour court and the company court, giving a total of 8 labour courts and company courts (Law of 14 February 2014).

**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**

**Q044 (2024):** 1/ First instance courts geographic locations (this includes 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction and first instance specialised courts) – administrative, military and district as the Sofia District Court is located in two premises;
2/ All the courts (geographic locations) (this includes 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction, first instance specialised courts, all second instance courts and courts of appeal and all Supreme Courts)– Supreme Court of Cassation, Supreme Administrative Court, military appellate courts, administrative courts, regional courts, military courts and district courts (Sofia District Court, Sofia City Court and Sofia Appellate Court are located each in two premises for a total of six)

**Q044 (2023):** The Sofia Appellate Court, Sofia City Court and Sofia District Court are housed in two court buildings each, where sessions are held

**Q044 (2022):** Sofia District Court has two buildings where hearings are held.

**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**

**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**

**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**

**Q044 (2024):** 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

**Q044 (2023):** 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

**Q044 (2022):** 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

**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**

**Q044 (2024):** Included in the 26 courts are the 24 districs courts as well as the Maritime and Commercial Court and the Land Registration Court. Inlcuded in the 29 courts are the two high courts and the Supreme Court.

**Q044 (2023):** Included in the 26 courts are the 24 districs courts as well as the Maritime and Commercial Court and the Land Registration Court. Inlcuded in the 29 courts are the two high courts and the Supreme Court.

**Q044 (2022):** Included in first instance courts are district courts, Land Registration Court and the Maritime and Commercial 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**

**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**

**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**

**Q044 (2024):** The figures shown in the table relate to both, administrative courts and civil and criminal courts. For administrative courts:
54 courts of first instance - geographical locations
63 all courts - geographical locations Some courts of first instance have several premises where hearings are held:
- Administrative court of Guadeloupe, Saint Martin, and Saint Barthélemy: administrative court building in Guadeloupe, local court in Marigot (Saint Martin), and the converted Public Treasury room in Gustavia (Saint Barthélemy): 3
- Administrative court of Martinique and Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon: court building in Martinique and the judicial court of Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon: 2
- Administrative court of New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna: court building in New Caledonia and court of first instance in Mata-Utu (Wallis and Futuna): 2
- National Court of Asylum: National Court of Asylum building, Administrative Court of Réunion, Administrative Court of Mayotte, Administrative Court of Martinique, Administrative Court of Guadeloupe, and Administrative Court of French Guiana (6).
When hearings are not held at the National Court of Asylum, mobile hearings or video hearings are held.
In addition, pursuant to Article 70 of Law No. 2024-42 of January 26, 2024, on immigration control and improved integration, five regional chambers of the National Court of Asylum were created on September 1, 2024, in Bordeaux, Lyon (two chambers: one geographical location), Nancy, and Toulouse.

**Q044 (2023):** This was not taken into account in the data provided in previous years, but some administrative courts of first instance have several premises where hearings are held:
- administrative court of Guadeloupe, Saint-Martin and Saint-Barthelemy: building of the administrative court in Guadeloupe, the local court in Marigot (Saint-Martin) and the room at the Treasury in Gustavia (Saint-Barthelemy): 3
- Martinique and Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon administrative court: court building in Martinique and the Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon judicial court: 2
- administrative court of New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna: court building in New Caledonia and court of first instance in Mata-Utu (Wallis and Futuna): 2
- National court of asylum: National court of asylum building, Lyon administrative court of appeal, Nancy administrative court of appeal, Reunion administrative court, Mayotte administrative court, Martinique administrative court, Guadeloupe administrative court and French Guyana administrative court (8). When hearings are not held at the National court of asylum, mobile hearings or video hearings are held.

**Q044 (2022):** The data encompass both judicial orders: "ordre judiciaire" and "ordre administrative": 1) administrative courts at first instance (including common law jurisdictions at first instance and specialized jurisdictions at first instance): 32 in mainland France / 11 overseas territories; 2) all administrative courts (this figure includes common law courts at first instance, specialized courts at first instance, all second-instance courts and appellate courts, as well as all Supreme Courts): 42 in mainland France / 11 overseas territories.

**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**

**Q044 (General Comment):** The figures in this section are taken from the statistic "Federal and State Courts" that does not distinguish between legal entities and geographic location of the courts. Generally, one legal entity equals one geographic location. Some courts have 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 statistic "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**

**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**

**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**

**Q044 (2024):** This answer is based on the explanatory note wherein if there are two courts, e.g. District Court and Circuit Court sitting in one specific location, they are to be counted separately.
There are currently 90 District Court and 49 Circuit Court venues.
There are 2 High Court venues in Dublin and there were 11 provincial sittings of the High Court in 2024.
The Supreme Court, Special Criminal Court and Court of Appeal each have one venue.

**Q044 (2023):** This answer is based on the explanatory note wherein if there are two courts, e.g. District and Circuit courts sitting in one specific location, they are to be counted separately.

**Q044 (2022):** There has not been an increase in venues since 2020. This answer is based on the explanatory note wherein if there are two courts, e.g. District and Circuit courts sitting in one specific location, they are to be counted separately whereas previously they were counted together.

**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**

**Q044 (2023):** The decrease in the number of geographic locations is due to the fact that some Offices of the Justice of Peace closed in 2023.

**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**

**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**

**Q044 (General Comment):** There are 59 1st instance courts locations: 11 district courts (49 locations), 5 regional courts (5 locations) of general jurisdiction and 1 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 (2024):** There are 59 1st instance courts locations: 11 district courts (49 locations), 5 regional courts (5 locations) of general jurisdiction and 1 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 (2023):** 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 (2022):** 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).

**Malta**

**Q044 (2022):** The Juvenile Court that until the previous evaluation was in a separate geographical location, has since been relocated to the Courts of Justice in Valletta. Hence the change in the figure quoted.

**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**

**Q044 (General Comment):** 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 geographic locations:
-32 first instance geographic locations 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. It is not the same court, but a separate, specialized court (this change in counting occurred between 2020 and 2021). See Q43 for why this is counted as a first instance court.
See also a law that assigns 32 geographic locations, and the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal:
https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0032316/2013-04-01
All courts geographic locations:
-33 first instance geographic locations (see above).
-6 second instance geographic locations of general jurisdiction, of which 4 are located at the same geographic location as a first instance court.
-1 Supreme Court, located at a separate location.
-1 Central Appeals Tribunal, located at the same geographic 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 (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**

**Q044 (2024):** The number 426 represents the total number of courts of first instance of general jurisdiction and courts of first instance of specialised jurisdiction (319 district courts + 47 regional courts + 23 specialist courts of first instance = 426). The number 491 represents the total number of all courts, including all their seats in various locations (319 district courts + 47 regional courts of first instance + 47 regional courts of second instance + 11 courts of appeal + 26 specialised courts of first and second instance + 1 Supreme Court + 1 Supreme Administrative Court + 39 non-local courts = 491).

**Q044 (2023):** The figure of 496 indicated in 2023 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 434) was added the number of 62 courts:- regional courts:47, courts of appeal:11, military courts:2, Supreme Administrative Court:1, Supreme Court:1. Total: 434+62= 496.

**Q044 (2022):** The figure of 496 indicated in 2022 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 434) was added
the number of 62 courts: - regional courts: 47; - courts of appeal: 11; - military courts: 2; - Supreme Administrative Court: 1; - Supreme Court: 1;
Total: 494 (434 + 62).

**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**

**Q044 (2024):** We have included the Administrative Supreme Court as well as the 2nd instance administrative 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**

**Q044 (2024):** It should be mentioned that some of the first instance specialised courts share the location with „judecatorii".

**Q044 (2023):** It should be mentioned that some of the first instance specialised courts share the location with „judecatorii".

**Q044 (2022):** 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**

**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**

**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**

**Q044 (General Comment):** One building usually houses different courts.

**Q044 (2023):** The latest data shows a slight decrease compared to previous figures. This could be attributed to the implementation of "Ciudades de la Justicia" (Justice Cities) in certain regions, like Andalusia. These "Justicie Cities" tend to group together in a single building, courthouses that were previously dispersed in several addresses.

**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 3: Performance of courts at all stages of the proceedings

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Other than criminal cases - First instance cases by case categories and by case status |
| 2 | Evolution of first instance other than criminal cases |
| 3 | Clearance Rate and Disposition Time for first instance other than criminal cases |
| 4 | Variations of first instance other than criminal cases by case categories |
| 5 | Second instance other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status |
| 6 | Evolution of second instance other than criminal cases |
| 7 | Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases |
| 8 | Variations of second instance other than criminal cases by case categories |
| 9 | Supreme court other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status |
| 10 | Evolution of Supreme court other than criminal cases for total, civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases |
| 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 data on other than criminal instance cases |
| 14 | First instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status |
| 15 | Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases, severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| 16 | Clearance rate and Disposition time for first instance criminal cases |
| 17 | Variations for first instance criminal cases |
| 18 | Second instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status |
| 19 | Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases, severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| 20 | Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance criminal cases |
| 21 | Variations for second instance criminal cases |
| 22 | Supreme courts, criminal cases by case categories and by case status |
| 23 | Supreme courts, Evolution of the absolute number of criminal cases |
| 24 | Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court criminal cases |
| 25 | Supreme courts, Variations for criminal cases |

# Other than criminal cases - First instance cases by case categories and by case status

## Table 3.1.1.1a: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

### 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** | **514 267** | **30 343** | 379 440 | 352 094 | 27 346 | 14 826 | 12 520 | NAP | NAP | **43 538** | 60 946 |
| **Belgium** | **535 321** | **515 711** | 0 | NAP | 0 | NAP | 0 | NAP | NAP | **19 610** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **84 057** | **67 676** | 7 052 | 7 029 | 23 | NAP | NAP | 23 | NAP | **9 329** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **298 875** | **158 947** | 131 520 | 89 210 | 42 310 | 36 411 | 5 899 | NAP | NAP | **8 408** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **54 557** | **42 729** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **11 828** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **365 426** | **118 938** | 148 305 | 143 806 | 4 223 | NAP | 4 223 | NAP | 276 | **5 132** | 93 051 |
| **Denmark** | **147 978** | **36 586** | 78 499 | 63 063 | 12 263 | 1 800 | 10 463 | NAP | 3 173 | **NA** | 32 893 |
| **Estonia** | **25 337** | **8 711** | 15 257 | 9 653 | 5 604 | 2 474 | 3 130 | NAP | NAP | **1 369** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **155 741** | **9 856** | 124 381 | 124 381 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **16 020** | 5 484 |
| **France** | **2 249 635** | **1 623 393** | 74 120 | 74 120 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **241 625** | 310 497 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **712 975** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2 037 621 | NA | NA | **583 494** | 552 790 |
| **Greece** | **421 068** | **310 064** | 30 918 | 27 716 | 762 | 651 | 109 | 2 | 2 440 | **74 266** | 5 820 |
| **Hungary** | **115 301** | **45 900** | 36 155 | 13 523 | 22 349 | NAP | 20 159 | 2 190 | 283 | **6 433** | 26 813 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **3 135 447** | **2 016 401** | 1 019 019 | 1 019 019 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **100 027** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **31 377** | **16 941** | 13 478 | 9 557 | 3 921 | 3 921 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **958** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **33 513** | **27 642** | 1 133 | 832 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 301 | **3 953** | 785 |
| **Luxembourg** | **6 409** | **3 802** | 1 057 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 057 | **1 550** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **12 607** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **429** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **243 476** | **43 381** | 120 509 | 120 509 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **79 586** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **2 639 628** | **911 476** | 1 576 526 | 510 894 | 1 065 632 | 966 294 | 99 338 | NAP | NAP | **27 605** | 124 021 |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **185 544** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **49 979** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **871 180** | **769 823** | 23 705 | 9 398 | 14 307 | 8 150 | 6 157 | NAP | NAP | **77 652** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **141 954** | **45 100** | 79 430 | 23 261 | 6 365 | NAP | 5 813 | 552 | 49 804 | **9 704** | 7 720 |
| **Slovenia** | **86 848** | **27 351** | 39 405 | 35 316 | 4 089 | 3 798 | 291 | NAP | NAP | **4 168** | 15 924 |
| **Spain** | **2 481 513** | **1 545 217** | 746 875 | 746 875 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **189 421** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **76 997** | **28 098** | 7 464 | 7 464 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **38 055** | 3 380 |
| **Average** | **639 822** | **358 277** | 211 557 | 169 386 | 86 371 | 115 369 | 169 671 | 692 | 8 191 | **64 166** | 95 394 |
| **Median** | **155 741** | **45 500** | 56 763 | 49 190 | 5 985 | 3 921 | 5 899 | 288 | 1 057 | **16 020** | 26 813 |
| **Minimum** | **6 409** | **3 802** | 0 | 832 | 0 | 651 | 0 | 2 | 276 | **429** | 785 |
| **Maximum** | **3 135 447** | **2 016 401** | 1 576 526 | 1 019 019 | 1 065 632 | 966 294 | 2 037 621 | 2 190 | 49 804 | **583 494** | 552 790 |
| **% of NA** | **15%** | **4%** | **19%** | 19% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | **7%** | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | 7% | 41% | 59% | 48% | 78% | 67% | **0%** | 48% |

## Table 3.1.1.1b: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

### 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** | **5,59** | **0,33** | 4,13 | 3,83 | 0,30 | 0,16 | 0,14 | NAP | NAP | **0,47** | 0,66 |
| **Belgium** | **4,53** | **4,36** | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | **0,17** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **1,31** | **1,05** | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | **0,14** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **7,73** | **4,11** | 3,40 | 2,31 | 1,09 | 0,94 | 0,15 | NAP | NAP | **0,22** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **5,65** | **4,42** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **1,22** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **3,35** | **1,09** | 1,36 | 1,32 | 0,04 | NAP | 0,04 | NAP | 0,00 | **0,05** | 0,85 |
| **Denmark** | **2,47** | **0,61** | 1,31 | 1,05 | 0,20 | 0,03 | 0,17 | NAP | 0,05 | **NA** | 0,55 |
| **Estonia** | **1,84** | **0,63** | 1,11 | 0,70 | 0,41 | 0,18 | 0,23 | NAP | NAP | **0,10** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **2,76** | **0,17** | 2,21 | 2,21 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,28** | 0,10 |
| **France** | **3,28** | **2,37** | 0,11 | 0,11 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,35** | 0,45 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **0,85** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2,44 | NA | NA | **0,70** | 0,66 |
| **Greece** | **4,05** | **2,98** | 0,30 | 0,27 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,02 | **0,71** | 0,06 |
| **Hungary** | **1,21** | **0,48** | 0,38 | 0,14 | 0,23 | NAP | 0,21 | 0,02 | 0,00 | **0,07** | 0,28 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **5,32** | **3,42** | 1,73 | 1,73 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,17** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **1,69** | **0,91** | 0,73 | 0,51 | 0,21 | 0,21 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,05** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **1,16** | **0,96** | 0,04 | 0,03 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,01 | **0,14** | 0,03 |
| **Luxembourg** | **0,94** | **0,56** | 0,15 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,15 | **0,23** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **2,20** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,07** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **1,35** | **0,24** | 0,67 | 0,67 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,44** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **7,03** | **2,43** | 4,20 | 1,36 | 2,84 | 2,57 | 0,26 | NAP | NAP | **0,07** | 0,33 |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **1,73** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,46** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **4,58** | **4,04** | 0,12 | 0,05 | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,03 | NAP | NAP | **0,41** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **2,62** | **0,83** | 1,47 | 0,43 | 0,12 | NAP | 0,11 | 0,01 | 0,92 | **0,18** | 0,14 |
| **Slovenia** | **4,08** | **1,28** | 1,85 | 1,66 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,01 | NAP | NAP | **0,20** | 0,75 |
| **Spain** | **5,06** | **3,15** | 1,52 | 1,52 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,39** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,73** | **0,27** | 0,07 | 0,07 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,36** | 0,03 |
| **Average** | **3,40** | **1,75** | 1,23 | 1,00 | 0,41 | 0,48 | 0,29 | 0,01 | 0,17 | **0,31** | 0,38 |
| **Median** | **3,28** | **1,07** | 0,92 | 0,69 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,14 | 0,01 | 0,02 | **0,22** | 0,33 |
| **Minimum** | **0,73** | **0,17** | 0,00 | 0,03 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,05** | 0,03 |
| **Maximum** | **7,73** | **4,42** | 4,20 | 3,83 | 2,84 | 2,57 | 2,44 | 0,02 | 0,92 | **1,22** | 0,85 |
| **% of NA** | **15%** | **4%** | 19% | 19% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | **7%** | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 0% | 7% | 41% | 59% | 48% | 78% | 67% | **0%** | 48% |

## Table 3.1.1.2a: First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2024

### 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** | **3 274 411** | **84 092** | 2 593 912 | 1 660 099 | 933 813 | 544 315 | 389 498 | NAP | NAP | **52 480** | 543 927 |
| **Belgium** | **1 182 749** | **684 344** | 471 537 | NAP | 471 537 | NAP | 471 537 | NAP | NAP | **26 868** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **365 138** | **140 858** | 195 034 | 194 726 | 308 | NAP | NAP | 308 | NAP | **29 246** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **999 827** | **102 686** | 882 240 | 183 590 | 698 650 | 587 504 | 111 146 | NAP | NAP | **14 901** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **20 384** | **12 263** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **8 121** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **905 402** | **347 457** | 528 031 | 409 052 | 116 345 | NAP | 116 345 | NAP | 2 634 | **8 180** | 21 734 |
| **Denmark** | **2 403 804** | **54 990** | 2 047 374 | 252 302 | 1 789 499 | 1 774 471 | 15 028 | NAP | 5 573 | **NA** | 301 440 |
| **Estonia** | **317 762** | **16 135** | 298 250 | 66 479 | 231 771 | 103 706 | 128 005 | NAP | NAP | **3 377** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **567 259** | **13 894** | 519 590 | 519 590 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **23 211** | 10 564 |
| **France** | **2 716 521** | **1 492 505** | 142 065 | 142 065 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **335 461** | 746 490 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **1 123 545** | NA | 2 328 188 | NA | 4 708 970 | 142 837 | NA | NA | **555 873** | 900 969 |
| **Greece** | **302 191** | **214 114** | 32 338 | 25 701 | 2 586 | 2 429 | 144 | 13 | 4 051 | **50 177** | 5 562 |
| **Hungary** | **685 369** | **124 977** | 513 849 | 195 382 | 316 612 | NAP | 310 858 | 5 754 | 1 855 | **18 500** | 28 043 |
| **Ireland** | **203 297** | **120 029** | 83 268 | 83 268 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **3 270 474** | **1 373 293** | 1 844 679 | 1 844 679 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **52 502** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **381 551** | **34 211** | 345 652 | 110 367 | 235 285 | 235 285 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 688** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **183 419** | **80 368** | 74 689 | 70 238 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 4 451 | **16 427** | 11 935 |
| **Luxembourg** | **13 608** | **6 709** | 4 917 | 1 043 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 3 874 | **1 982** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **10 385** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **172** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **1 117 083** | **118 242** | 856 616 | 856 616 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **142 225** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **10 302 053** | **1 047 238** | 8 864 502 | 3 418 553 | 5 445 949 | 4 588 574 | 857 375 | NAP | NAP | **69 419** | 320 894 |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **280 033** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **79 784** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **1 727 482** | **1 602 689** | 41 296 | 35 792 | 5 504 | 5 500 | 4 | NAP | NAP | **83 497** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **610 125** | **86 449** | 329 414 | 124 036 | 134 283 | NAP | 120 378 | 13 905 | 71 095 | **4 562** | 189 700 |
| **Slovenia** | **611 696** | **30 585** | 423 728 | 155 669 | 268 059 | 225 842 | 42 217 | NAP | NAP | **3 069** | 154 314 |
| **Spain** | **3 672 753** | **2 024 663** | 1 476 566 | 1 476 566 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **171 524** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **274 483** | **73 929** | 19 227 | 19 227 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **173 871** | 7 456 |
| **Average** | **1 504 535** | **418 544** | 982 121 | 616 227 | 760 729 | 1 277 660 | 208 106 | 4 995 | 13 362 | **77 085** | 249 464 |
| **Median** | **648 533** | **118 242** | 423 728 | 183 590 | 251 672 | 389 800 | 120 378 | 3 031 | 4 051 | **26 868** | 154 314 |
| **Minimum** | **13 608** | **6 709** | 4 917 | 1 043 | 308 | 2 429 | 4 | 13 | 1 855 | **172** | 5 562 |
| **Maximum** | **10 302 053** | **2 024 663** | 8 864 502 | 3 418 553 | 5 445 949 | 4 708 970 | 857 375 | 13 905 | 71 095 | **555 873** | 900 969 |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **0%** | 15% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 7% | **7%** | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 0% | 4% | 41% | 59% | 48% | 78% | 67% | **0%** | 48% |

## Table 3.1.1.2b: First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2024

### 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** | **35,60** | **0,91** | 28,20 | 18,05 | 10,15 | 5,92 | 4,23 | NAP | NAP | **0,57** | 5,91 |
| **Belgium** | **10,00** | **5,79** | 3,99 | NAP | 3,99 | NAP | 3,99 | NAP | NAP | **0,23** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **5,67** | **2,19** | 3,03 | 3,02 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | **0,45** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **25,86** | **2,66** | 22,82 | 4,75 | 18,07 | 15,20 | 2,87 | NAP | NAP | **0,39** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **2,11** | **1,27** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,84** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **8,30** | **3,18** | 4,84 | 3,75 | 1,07 | NAP | 1,07 | NAP | 0,02 | **0,07** | 0,20 |
| **Denmark** | **40,11** | **0,92** | 34,16 | 4,21 | 29,86 | 29,61 | 0,25 | NAP | 0,09 | **NA** | 5,03 |
| **Estonia** | **23,12** | **1,17** | 21,70 | 4,84 | 16,86 | 7,54 | 9,31 | NAP | NAP | **0,25** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **10,06** | **0,25** | 9,22 | 9,22 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,41** | 0,19 |
| **France** | **3,96** | **2,18** | 0,21 | 0,21 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,49** | 1,09 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **1,34** | NA | 2,79 | NA | 5,63 | 0,17 | NA | NA | **0,67** | 1,08 |
| **Greece** | **2,91** | **2,06** | 0,31 | 0,25 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,04 | **0,48** | 0,05 |
| **Hungary** | **7,18** | **1,31** | 5,39 | 2,05 | 3,32 | NAP | 3,26 | 0,06 | 0,02 | **0,19** | 0,29 |
| **Ireland** | **3,74** | **2,21** | 1,53 | 1,53 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **5,55** | **2,33** | 3,13 | 3,13 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,09** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **20,55** | **1,84** | 18,61 | 5,94 | 12,67 | 12,67 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,09** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **6,35** | **2,78** | 2,58 | 2,43 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,15 | **0,57** | 0,41 |
| **Luxembourg** | **2,00** | **0,98** | 0,72 | 0,15 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,57 | **0,29** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **1,81** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,03** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **6,19** | **0,66** | 4,75 | 4,75 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,79** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **27,43** | **2,79** | 23,60 | 9,10 | 14,50 | 12,22 | 2,28 | NAP | NAP | **0,18** | 0,85 |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **2,61** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,74** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **9,07** | **8,42** | 0,22 | 0,19 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | **0,44** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **11,26** | **1,60** | 6,08 | 2,29 | 2,48 | NAP | 2,22 | 0,26 | 1,31 | **0,08** | 3,50 |
| **Slovenia** | **28,71** | **1,44** | 19,89 | 7,31 | 12,58 | 10,60 | 1,98 | NAP | NAP | **0,14** | 7,24 |
| **Spain** | **7,48** | **4,13** | 3,01 | 3,01 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,35** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **2,59** | **0,70** | 0,18 | 0,18 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1,64** | 0,07 |
| **Average** | **12,74** | **2,20** | 9,49 | 4,05 | 8,97 | 9,94 | 2,43 | 0,08 | 0,32 | **0,42** | **1,99** |
| **Median** | **7,89** | **1,84** | 4,75 | 3,02 | 7,07 | 9,07 | 2,22 | 0,03 | 0,09 | **0,39** | **0,85** |
| **Minimum** | **2,00** | **0,25** | 0,18 | 0,15 | 0,00 | 0,02 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,02 | **0,03** | **0,05** |
| **Maximum** | **40,11** | **8,42** | 34,16 | 18,05 | 29,86 | 29,61 | 9,31 | 0,26 | 1,31 | **1,64** | **7,24** |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 0% | 15% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 41% | 59% | 48% | 78% | 67% | 0% | 48% |

## Table 3.1.1.3a: First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2024

### 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** | **3 274 461** | **83 986** | 2 592 801 | 1 660 641 | 932 160 | 544 476 | 387 684 | NAP | NAP | **50 638** | 547 036 |
| **Belgium** | **1 211 549** | **716 948** | 471 537 | NAP | 471 537 | NAP | 471 537 | NAP | NAP | **23 064** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **360 095** | **137 288** | 194 321 | 194 019 | 302 | NAP | NAP | 302 | NAP | **28 486** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **1 027 528** | **115 411** | 898 679 | 191 581 | 706 828 | 596 863 | 109 965 | NAP | NAP | **13 438** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **25 477** | **19 164** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **6 313** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **914 890** | **346 403** | 534 219 | 414 180 | 117 318 | NAP | 117 318 | NAP | 2 721 | **8 565** | 25 703 |
| **Denmark** | **2 423 151** | **54 388** | 2 066 515 | 269 590 | 1 791 199 | 1 775 718 | 15 481 | NAP | 5 726 | **NA** | 302 248 |
| **Estonia** | **319 712** | **17 745** | 298 582 | 64 321 | 234 261 | 103 680 | 130 581 | NAP | NAP | **3 385** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **528 132** | **10 458** | 485 158 | 485 158 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **22 522** | 9 994 |
| **France** | **2 567 576** | **1 423 967** | 130 574 | 130 574 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **316 237** | 696 798 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **1 122 198** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 92 325 | NA | NA | **551 528** | 890 107 |
| **Greece** | **263 244** | **173 560** | 27 248 | 21 407 | 1 147 | 999 | 138 | 10 | 4 694 | **56 108** | 6 328 |
| **Hungary** | **683 209** | **123 572** | 509 645 | 195 004 | 312 752 | NAP | 307 048 | 5 704 | 1 889 | **18 363** | 31 629 |
| **Ireland** | **168 141** | **86 171** | 81 970 | 81 970 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **3 169 443** | **1 304 144** | 1 799 640 | 1 799 640 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **65 659** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **371 347** | **30 633** | 339 035 | 104 578 | 234 457 | 234 457 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 679** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **181 884** | **80 139** | 74 922 | 70 549 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 4 373 | **14 738** | 12 085 |
| **Luxembourg** | **12 226** | **6 233** | 4 805 | 1 043 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 3 762 | **1 188** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **9 714** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **104** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **1 116 348** | **120 576** | 863 350 | 863 350 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **132 422** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **10 073 016** | **985 745** | 8 706 916 | 3 357 727 | 5 349 189 | 4 488 849 | 860 340 | NAP | NAP | **71 032** | 309 323 |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **270 437** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **38 643** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **1 702 253** | **1 589 460** | 36 923 | 32 390 | 4 533 | 4 501 | 32 | NAP | NAP | **75 870** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **625 358** | **93 038** | 335 895 | 123 427 | 133 739 | NAP | 119 701 | 14 038 | 78 729 | **4 249** | 192 176 |
| **Slovenia** | **611 479** | **29 384** | 425 904 | 157 676 | 268 228 | 225 983 | 42 245 | NAP | NAP | **2 826** | 153 365 |
| **Spain** | **3 259 485** | **1 650 687** | 1 432 495 | 1 432 495 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **176 303** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **272 143** | **72 281** | 19 167 | 19 167 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **173 273** | 7 422 |
| **Average** | **1 465 089** | **395 323** | 970 883 | 530 477 | 754 118 | 886 170 | 204 184 | 5 014 | 14 556 | **74 265** | 244 940 |
| **Median** | **654 284** | **115 411** | 425 904 | 174 629 | 251 343 | 234 457 | 117 318 | 3 003 | 4 373 | **23 064** | 153 365 |
| **Minimum** | **12 226** | **6 233** | 4 805 | 1 043 | 302 | 999 | 32 | 10 | 1 889 | **104** | 6 328 |
| **Maximum** | **10 073 016** | **1 650 687** | 8 706 916 | 3 357 727 | 5 349 189 | 4 488 849 | 860 340 | 14 038 | 78 729 | **551 528** | 890 107 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 0% | 15% | 15% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 41% | 59% | 48% | 78% | 67% | 0% | 48% |

## Table 3.1.1.3b: First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2024

**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** | **35,60** | **0,91** | 28,19 | 18,06 | 10,14 | 5,92 | 4,22 | NAP | NAP | **0,55** | 5,95 |
| **Belgium** | **10,25** | **6,06** | 3,99 | NAP | 3,99 | NAP | 3,99 | NAP | NAP | **0,20** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **5,59** | **2,13** | 3,02 | 3,01 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | **0,44** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **26,58** | **2,99** | 23,24 | 4,96 | 18,28 | 15,44 | 2,84 | NAP | NAP | **0,35** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **2,64** | **1,98** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,65** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **8,39** | **3,18** | 4,90 | 3,80 | 1,08 | NAP | 1,08 | NAP | 0,02 | **0,08** | 0,24 |
| **Denmark** | **40,43** | **0,91** | 34,48 | 4,50 | 29,89 | 29,63 | 0,26 | NAP | 0,10 | **NA** | 5,04 |
| **Estonia** | **23,26** | **1,29** | 21,72 | 4,68 | 17,04 | 7,54 | 9,50 | NAP | NAP | **0,25** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **9,37** | **0,19** | 8,61 | 8,61 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,40** | 0,18 |
| **France** | **3,74** | **2,08** | 0,19 | 0,19 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,46** | 1,02 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **1,34** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,11 | NA | NA | **0,66** | 1,07 |
| **Greece** | **2,53** | **1,67** | 0,26 | 0,21 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,05 | **0,54** | 0,06 |
| **Hungary** | **7,16** | **1,30** | 5,34 | 2,04 | 3,28 | NAP | 3,22 | 0,06 | 0,02 | **0,19** | 0,33 |
| **Ireland** | **3,09** | **1,58** | 1,51 | 1,51 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **5,38** | **2,21** | 3,05 | 3,05 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,11** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **20,00** | **1,65** | 18,26 | 5,63 | 12,63 | 12,63 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,09** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **6,29** | **2,77** | 2,59 | 2,44 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,15 | **0,51** | 0,42 |
| **Luxembourg** | **1,79** | **0,91** | 0,70 | 0,15 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,55 | **0,17** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **1,69** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,02** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **6,19** | **0,67** | 4,78 | 4,78 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,73** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **26,82** | **2,62** | 23,18 | 8,94 | 14,24 | 11,95 | 2,29 | NAP | NAP | **0,19** | 0,82 |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **2,52** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,36** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **8,94** | **8,35** | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | **0,40** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **11,54** | **1,72** | 6,20 | 2,28 | 2,47 | NAP | 2,21 | 0,26 | 1,45 | **0,08** | 3,55 |
| **Slovenia** | **28,70** | **1,38** | 19,99 | 7,40 | 12,59 | 10,61 | 1,98 | NAP | NAP | **0,13** | 7,20 |
| **Spain** | **6,64** | **3,36** | 2,92 | 2,92 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,36** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **2,57** | **0,68** | 0,18 | 0,18 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1,64** | 0,07 |
| **Average** | **12,65** | **2,15** | 9,46 | 4,07 | 8,98 | 10,42 | 2,44 | 0,08 | 0,33 | **0,38** | 1,99 |
| **Median** | **7,77** | **1,69** | 4,78 | 3,03 | 7,06 | 10,61 | 2,21 | 0,03 | 0,10 | **0,36** | 0,82 |
| **Minimum** | **1,79** | **0,19** | 0,18 | 0,15 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,02 | **0,02** | 0,06 |
| **Maximum** | **40,43** | **8,35** | 34,48 | 18,06 | 29,89 | 29,63 | 9,50 | 0,26 | 1,45 | **1,64** | 7,20 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 0% | 15% | 15% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 41% | 59% | 48% | 78% | 67% | 0% | 48% |

## Table 3.1.1.4a: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2024

### 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** | **514 217** | **30 449** | 380 551 | 351 552 | 28 999 | 14 665 | 14 334 | NAP | NAP | **45 380** | 57 837 |
| **Belgium** | **506 481** | **483 107** | 0 | NAP | 0 | NAP | 0 | NAP | NAP | **23 374** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **89 100** | **71 246** | 7 765 | 7 736 | 29 | NAP | NAP | 29 | NAP | **10 089** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **267 674** | **147 171** | 110 625 | 81 526 | 29 099 | 22 019 | 7 080 | NAP | NAP | **9 878** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **49 464** | **35 828** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **13 636** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **355 938** | **119 992** | 142 117 | 138 678 | 3 250 | NAP | 3 250 | NAP | 189 | **4 747** | 89 082 |
| **Denmark** | **127 876** | **37 188** | 58 642 | 45 775 | 10 010 | 553 | 10 010 | NAP | 3 020 | **NA** | 32 085 |
| **Estonia** | **27 430** | **8 990** | 17 167 | 11 688 | 5 179 | 2 503 | 554 | NAP | NAP | **1 273** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **194 674** | **13 292** | 158 813 | 158 813 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **16 541** | 6 028 |
| **France** | **2 398 580** | **1 691 931** | 85 611 | 85 611 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **260 849** | 360 189 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **713 783** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2 088 133 | NA | NA | **587 994** | 566 949 |
| **Greece** | **460 015** | **350 618** | 36 008 | 32 010 | 2 201 | 2 081 | 115 | 5 | 1 797 | **68 335** | 5 054 |
| **Hungary** | **117 461** | **47 305** | 40 359 | 13 901 | 26 209 | NAP | 23 969 | 2 240 | 249 | **6 570** | 23 227 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **3 236 478** | **2 085 550** | 1 064 058 | 1 064 058 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **86 870** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **41 581** | **20 519** | 20 095 | 15 346 | 4 749 | 4 749 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **967** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **35 048** | **27 871** | 900 | 521 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 379 | **5 642** | 635 |
| **Luxembourg** | **7 791** | **4 278** | 1 169 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 169 | **2 344** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **13 063** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **479** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **244 211** | **41 047** | 113 775 | 113 775 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **89 389** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **2 868 665** | **972 969** | 1 734 112 | 571 720 | 1 162 392 | 1 066 019 | 96 373 | NAP | NAP | **25 992** | 135 592 |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **195 140** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **91 120** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **896 409** | **783 052** | 28 078 | 12 800 | 15 278 | 9 150 | 6 129 | NAP | NAP | **85 279** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **126 721** | **38 511** | 72 949 | 23 870 | 6 909 | NAP | 6 490 | 419 | 42 170 | **10 017** | 5 244 |
| **Slovenia** | **86 950** | **28 552** | 37 115 | 33 195 | 3 920 | 3 657 | 263 | NAP | NAP | **4 411** | 16 872 |
| **Spain** | **2 898 926** | **1 911 935** | 800 719 | 800 719 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **186 272** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **79 337** | **29 746** | 7 524 | 7 524 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **38 653** | 3 414 |
| **Average** | **679 610** | **380 890** | 223 552 | 178 541 | 92 730 | 125 044 | 173 592 | 673 | 6 996 | **67 044** | 100 170 |
| **Median** | **194 674** | **44 176** | 49 501 | 39 485 | 6 044 | 4 749 | 6 490 | 224 | 1 169 | **16 541** | 23 227 |
| **Minimum** | **7 791** | **4 278** | 0 | 521 | 0 | 553 | 0 | 5 | 189 | **479** | 635 |
| **Maximum** | **3 236 478** | **2 085 550** | 1 734 112 | 1 064 058 | 1 162 392 | 1 066 019 | 2 088 133 | 2 240 | 42 170 | **587 994** | 566 949 |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 4% | 19% | 19% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 41% | 59% | 48% | 78% | 67% | 0% | 48% |

## Table 3.1.1.4b: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2024

### 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** | **5,59** | **0,33** | 4,14 | 3,82 | 0,32 | *0,16* | *0,16* | NAP | NAP | **0,49** | 0,63 |
| **Belgium** | **4,28** | **4,09** | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | *0,00* | NAP | NAP | **0,20** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **1,38** | **1,11** | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | *0,00* | NAP | **0,16** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **6,92** | **3,81** | 2,86 | 2,11 | 0,75 | *0,57* | *0,18* | NAP | NAP | **0,26** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **5,12** | **3,71** | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | **1,41** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **3,26** | **1,10** | 1,30 | 1,27 | 0,03 | NAP | *0,03* | NAP | 0,00 | **0,04** | 0,82 |
| **Denmark** | **2,13** | **0,62** | 0,98 | 0,76 | 0,17 | *0,01* | *0,17* | NAP | 0,05 | **NA** | 0,54 |
| **Estonia** | **2,00** | **0,65** | 1,25 | 0,85 | 0,38 | *0,18* | *0,04* | NAP | NAP | **0,09** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **3,45** | **0,24** | 2,82 | 2,82 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,29** | 0,11 |
| **France** | **3,50** | **2,47** | 0,12 | 0,12 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,38** | 0,53 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **0,85** | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *2,50* | *NA* | NA | **0,70** | 0,68 |
| **Greece** | **4,42** | **3,37** | 0,35 | 0,31 | 0,02 | *0,02* | *0,00* | *0,00* | 0,02 | **0,66** | 0,05 |
| **Hungary** | **1,23** | **0,50** | 0,42 | 0,15 | 0,27 | NAP | *0,25* | *0,02* | 0,00 | **0,07** | 0,24 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **5,49** | **3,54** | 1,81 | 1,81 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,15** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **2,24** | **1,10** | 1,08 | 0,83 | 0,26 | *0,26* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,05** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **1,21** | **0,96** | 0,03 | 0,02 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | 0,01 | **0,20** | 0,02 |
| **Luxembourg** | **1,14** | **0,63** | 0,17 | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | 0,17 | **0,34** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **2,27** | NA | NA | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,08** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **1,35** | **0,23** | 0,63 | 0,63 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,50** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **7,64** | **2,59** | 4,62 | 1,52 | 3,09 | *2,84* | *0,26* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,07** | 0,36 |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **1,82** | NA | NA | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,85** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **4,71** | **4,11** | 0,15 | 0,07 | 0,08 | *0,05* | *0,03* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,45** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **2,34** | **0,71** | 1,35 | 0,44 | 0,13 | *NAP* | *0,12* | *0,01* | 0,78 | **0,18** | 0,10 |
| **Slovenia** | **4,08** | **1,34** | 1,74 | 1,56 | 0,18 | *0,17* | *0,01* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,21** | 0,79 |
| **Spain** | **5,91** | **3,90** | 1,63 | 1,63 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,38** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,75** | **0,28** | 0,07 | 0,07 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,37** | 0,03 |
| **Average** | **3,49** | **1,78** | 1,26 | 1,05 | 0,41 | 0,47 | 0,29 | 0,01 | 0,15 | **0,34** | 0,38 |
| **Median** | **3,45** | **1,11** | 1,03 | 0,80 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,12 | 0,00 | 0,02 | **0,26** | 0,36 |
| **Minimum** | **0,75** | **0,23** | 0,00 | 0,02 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,04** | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | **7,64** | **4,11** | 4,62 | 3,82 | 3,09 | 2,84 | 2,50 | 0,02 | 0,78 | **1,41** | 0,82 |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 4% | 19% | 19% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 41% | 59% | 48% | 78% | 67% | 0% | 48% |

## Table 3.1.1.5: First instance othen than criminal cases, civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2024

**Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q91)**

| States | Total of other than criminal cases | | 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 | Number | as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 12 769 | 28,14% |
| **Belgium** | 221 331 | 43,7% | 220 001 | 45,5% | 1 330 | 5,69% |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 45 323 | 16,9% | 45 127 | 30,7% | 196 | 1,98% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 1 085 | 4,0% | 833 | 9,3% | 51 | 4,01% |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 27 271 | 10,45% |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | 61 406 | 13,3% | 11 810 | 3,4% | 45 188 | 66,13% |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | 2 365 | 5,0% | 71 | 1,08% |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 30 936 | 35,61% |
| **Latvia** | 1 176 | 2,8% | 1 138 | 5,5% | 36 | 3,72% |
| **Lithuania** | 1 373 | 3,9% | 934 | 3,4% | 437 | 7,75% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | 12 043 | 92,2% | 307 | 64,09% |
| **Netherlands** | 17 166 | 7,0% | NA | NA | 3 972 | 4,44% |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | 40 922 | 21,0% | 25 277 | 27,74% |
| **Romania** | 34 064 | 3,8% | 25 677 | 3,3% | 2 204 | 2,58% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 11 314 | 8,9% | 5 154 | 13,4% | 3 | 0,03% |
| **Slovenia** | 17 432 | 20,0% | 7 966 | 27,9% | 927 | 21,02% |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 855 | 1,1% | 430 | 1,4% | 83 | 0,21% |
| **Average** | **37 502** | **11,4%** | **28 800** | **20,1%** | **8 886** | **16,7%** |
| **Median** | **17 166** | **7,0%** | **7 966** | **9,3%** | **927** | **5,7%** |
| **Minimum** | **855** | **1,1%** | **430** | **1,4%** | **3** | **0,0%** |
| **Maximum** | **221 331** | **43,7%** | **220 001** | **92,2%** | **45 188** | **66,1%** |
| **% of NA** | **59%** | **59%** | **52%** | **52%** | **33%** | **33%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0,0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **4%** | **4%** |

**Romania**: Due to the peculiarity of the national statistical system, cases older than 3 years instead of 2 are communicated.

# Evolution of first instance other than criminal cases

## Table 3.1.2.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | 5,55 | 6,00 | 6,04 | 5,92 | 5,87 | 5,95 | 5,72 | 5,76 | 5,85 | 5,59 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3,87 | 4,53 |
| **Bulgaria** | 1,06 | 0,98 | 1,03 | 1,10 | 1,18 | 1,32 | 1,38 | 1,35 | 1,37 | 1,36 | 1,31 |
| **Croatia** | 9,27 | 8,46 | 7,99 | 7,64 | 7,30 | 6,34 | 8,21 | 7,80 | 8,60 | 7,25 | 7,73 |
| **Cyprus** | 5,79 | 6,90 | 6,18 | 6,39 | 6,62 | 5,50 | 6,03 | 6,04 | 6,52 | 6,39 | 5,65 |
| **Czech Republic** | 3,57 | 5,18 | 4,89 | 4,40 | 4,19 | 3,98 | 3,82 | 4,05 | 3,71 | 3,53 | 3,35 |
| **Denmark** | 2,02 | 2,04 | 2,12 | 2,35 | 2,49 | 2,82 | 2,63 | 2,35 | 2,20 | 2,31 | 2,47 |
| **Estonia** | 1,84 | 1,81 | 2,19 | 2,27 | 1,98 | 1,92 | 1,87 | 1,59 | 1,81 | 1,82 | 1,84 |
| **Finland** | 2,51 | 2,32 | 2,33 | 2,47 | 2,79 | 2,10 | 2,81 | 2,38 | 2,17 | 2,28 | 2,76 |
| **France** | 2,55 | 2,72 | 2,78 | 2,83 | 2,72 | 2,82 | 2,82 | 2,94 | 2,79 | 2,75 | 3,28 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3,82 | 3,52 | 3,60 | 4,05 |
| **Hungary** | 1,65 | 1,53 | 1,51 | 1,40 | 1,81 | 1,34 | 1,28 | 1,42 | 1,19 | 1,18 | 1,21 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 8,04 | 7,61 | 6,96 | 6,59 | 6,29 | 6,13 | 6,09 | 6,06 | 5,69 | 5,45 | 5,32 |
| **Latvia** | 1,79 | 1,90 | 1,64 | 1,51 | 1,32 | 1,30 | 1,26 | 1,53 | 1,67 | 1,82 | 1,69 |
| **Lithuania** | 1,44 | 1,58 | 1,55 | 1,37 | 1,18 | 1,11 | 1,02 | 1,25 | 1,16 | 1,19 | 1,16 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,77 | 0,85 | 0,85 | 0,87 | 0,94 |
| **Malta** | 2,47 | 2,35 | 2,05 | NA | 2,00 | 2,05 | 2,18 | 2,18 | 2,19 | 2,33 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 1,81 | 1,83 | 1,75 | 1,66 | 1,62 | 1,53 | NA | NA | NA | 1,35 | 1,35 |
| **Poland** | 4,47 | - | 4,11 | 6,22 | 6,05 | 6,29 | 9,84 | 8,71 | 8,36 | 7,55 | 7,03 |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 4,12 | 3,71 | 3,31 | 3,23 | 3,29 | 3,05 | 3,06 | 3,31 | 3,14 | 3,43 | 4,58 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 7,52 | 7,30 | 5,90 | 4,85 | 4,94 | 3,64 | 4,95 | 3,37 | 3,33 | 3,22 | 2,62 |
| **Slovenia** | 13,84 | 12,20 | 9,30 | 7,19 | 5,89 | 5,23 | 4,65 | 4,93 | 4,31 | 4,06 | 4,08 |
| **Spain** | 3,17 | 3,11 | 2,97 | 2,74 | 3,03 | 3,41 | 3,74 | 4,24 | 4,10 | 4,33 | 5,06 |
| **Sweden** | 0,83 | 0,76 | 0,71 | 0,80 | 0,96 | 1,02 | 1,01 | 0,94 | 0,85 | 0,79 | 0,73 |
| **Average** | 3,99 | 3,99 | 3,68 | 3,65 | 3,50 | 3,27 | 3,59 | 3,49 | 3,42 | 3,27 | 3,40 |
| **Median** | 2,53 | 2,53 | 2,78 | 2,79 | 2,79 | 2,82 | 2,82 | 3,13 | 2,96 | 2,99 | 3,28 |
| **Minimum** | 0,83 | 0,76 | 0,71 | 0,80 | 0,96 | 1,02 | 0,77 | 0,85 | 0,85 | 0,79 | 0,73 |
| **Maximum** | 13,84 | 12,20 | 9,30 | 7,64 | 7,30 | 6,34 | 9,84 | 8,71 | 8,60 | 7,55 | 7,73 |
| **% of NA** | 26% | 22% | 22% | 26% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 11% | 15% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.1.2.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,44 | 0,40 | 0,38 | 0,36 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,32 | 0,31 | 0,33 |
| Belgium | NA | 1,61 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3,74 | 4,36 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,08 | 1,05 |
| Croatia | 5,16 | 4,67 | 4,44 | 3,90 | 3,65 | 3,30 | 3,74 | 4,35 | 5,20 | 4,11 | 4,11 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4,42 |
| Czech Republic | 2,36 | 2,04 | 1,76 | 1,54 | 1,40 | 1,34 | 1,21 | 1,29 | 1,15 | 1,13 | 1,09 |
| Denmark | 0,38 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,40 | 0,48 | 0,45 | 0,48 | 0,55 | 0,61 |
| Estonia | 0,52 | 0,46 | 0,44 | 0,47 | 0,48 | 0,46 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,63 |
| Finland | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,17 |
| France | 2,22 | 2,36 | 2,41 | 2,43 | 2,37 | 2,46 | 2,46 | 2,56 | 1,87 | 1,91 | 2,37 |
| Germany | 0,97 | 0,96 | 0,92 | 0,87 | 0,85 | 0,89 | 0,91 | 0,93 | 0,85 | 0,81 | 0,85 |
| Greece | 2,57 | 2,27 | 2,24 | 2,27 | 2,35 | 2,63 | NA | 2,54 | 2,40 | 2,55 | 2,98 |
| Hungary | 0,83 | 0,76 | 0,78 | 0,80 | 0,89 | 0,65 | 0,59 | 0,60 | 0,53 | 0,48 | 0,48 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 5,04 | 4,93 | 4,44 | 4,10 | 3,86 | 3,83 | 3,77 | 3,76 | 3,53 | 3,54 | 3,42 |
| Latvia | 1,52 | 1,60 | 1,42 | 1,29 | 1,02 | 0,98 | 0,90 | 0,96 | 0,89 | 0,92 | 0,91 |
| Lithuania | 0,93 | 1,04 | 0,97 | 1,05 | 0,97 | 0,84 | 0,80 | 1,00 | 0,94 | 0,96 | 0,96 |
| Luxembourg | 0,22 | 0,25 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,21 | 0,26 | 0,40 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,50 | 0,56 |
| Malta | 2,30 | 2,19 | 1,96 | NA | 1,86 | 1,97 | 2,03 | 1,97 | 2,11 | 2,18 | 2,20 |
| Netherlands | NA | 0,31 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,24 |
| Poland | 1,74 | - | 1,86 | 1,89 | 2,10 | 2,38 | 2,39 | 2,30 | 2,24 | 2,29 | 2,43 |
| Portugal | NA | 3,57 | 3,03 | 2,64 | 2,24 | 1,97 | 1,80 | 1,84 | 1,76 | 1,65 | 1,73 |
| Romania | 3,56 | 3,35 | 3,04 | 2,92 | 3,00 | 2,83 | 2,83 | 2,85 | 2,69 | 2,95 | 4,04 |
| Slovak Republic | 3,44 | 3,67 | 2,92 | 1,73 | 2,02 | 1,31 | 1,10 | 1,13 | 1,05 | 0,91 | 0,83 |
| Slovenia | 2,61 | 2,34 | 2,20 | 2,04 | 1,86 | 1,65 | 1,48 | 1,47 | 1,34 | 1,30 | 1,28 |
| Spain | 1,80 | 1,85 | 1,81 | 1,70 | 2,01 | 2,33 | 2,48 | 2,83 | 2,71 | 2,72 | 3,15 |
| Sweden | 0,32 | 0,29 | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,28 | 0,29 | 0,27 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,27 |
| **Average** | 1,86 | 1,80 | 1,73 | 1,57 | 1,56 | 1,51 | 1,46 | 1,57 | 1,52 | 1,56 | 1,75 |
| **Median** | 1,74 | 1,61 | 1,78 | 1,54 | 1,63 | 1,33 | 1,10 | 1,21 | 1,10 | 1,11 | 1,07 |
| **Minimum** | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,17 |
| **Maximum** | 5,16 | 4,93 | 4,44 | 4,10 | 3,86 | 3,83 | 3,77 | 4,35 | 5,20 | 4,11 | 4,42 |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 11% | 19% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 11% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

## Table 3.1.2.3: Evolution of the first instance administrativel cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 0,55 | 0,65 | 0,81 | *0,89* | *0,82* | *0,68* | 0,54 | 0,48 | 0,47 |
| **Belgium** | 0,29 | 0,33 | 0,28 | 0,24 | 0,19 | *0,21* | *0,19* | *0,18* | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,17 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,13 | *0,14* | *0,14* | *0,15* | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,14 |
| **Croatia** | 0,28 | 0,33 | 0,36 | 0,33 | 0,26 | *0,21* | *0,18* | *0,17* | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,22 |
| **Cyprus** | 0,95 | 0,95 | 0,91 | 0,88 | 0,92 | *0,64* | *0,57* | *0,62* | 1,24 | 1,38 | 1,22 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,10 | 0,10 | *0,11* | *0,10* | *0,09* | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NA* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,08 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | *0,06* | *0,07* | *0,08* | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| **Finland** | 0,37 | 0,38 | 0,28 | 0,42 | 0,38 | *0,32* | *0,33* | *0,33* | 0,32 | 0,30 | 0,28 |
| **France** | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | *0,25* | *0,26* | *0,27* | 0,28 | 0,29 | 0,35 |
| **Germany** | 0,82 | 0,81 | 0,78 | 0,85 | 1,02 | *1,04* | *0,97* | *0,90* | 0,82 | 0,74 | 0,70 |
| **Greece** | NA | 2,84 | 2,44 | 2,23 | 1,87 | *NA* | *1,31* | *1,06* | 0,93 | 0,82 | 0,71 |
| **Hungary** | 0,05 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | *0,05* | *0,05* | *0,08* | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,50 | 0,44 | 0,40 | 0,35 | 0,30 | *0,28* | *0,25* | *0,23* | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,17 |
| **Latvia** | 0,13 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | *0,07* | *0,06* | *0,06* | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,32 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,15 | 0,10 | *0,16* | *0,14* | *0,15* | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,14 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *0,19* | *0,21* | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,23 |
| **Malta** | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | *0,08* | *0,07* | *0,07* | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,29 | 0,30 | 0,28 | 0,31 | 0,27 | *0,30* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | 0,36 | 0,44 |
| **Poland** | 0,05 | - | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,07 | *0,06* | *0,06* | *0,07* | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,07 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,66 | 0,73 | 0,71 | 0,70 | *0,67* | *0,64* | *0,59* | 0,56 | 0,52 | 0,46 |
| **Romania** | 0,49 | 0,31 | 0,21 | 0,26 | 0,24 | *0,16* | *0,16* | *0,38* | 0,36 | 0,37 | 0,41 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,34 | 0,30 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,09 | *0,10* | *0,12* | *0,13* | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,18 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,10 | 0,16 | *0,17* | *0,19* | *0,18* | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,20 |
| **Spain** | 0,49 | 0,44 | 0,38 | 0,34 | 0,32 | *0,33* | *0,36* | *0,36* | 0,36 | 0,37 | 0,39 |
| **Sweden** | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,34 | 0,42 | 0,58 | *0,63* | *0,59* | *0,55* | 0,49 | 0,44 | 0,36 |
| **Average** | 0,31 | 0,44 | 0,39 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,30 | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,32 | 0,31 | 0,31 |
| **Median** | 0,29 | 0,32 | 0,28 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,22 |
| **Minimum** | 0,05 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| **Maximum** | 0,95 | 2,84 | 2,44 | 2,23 | 1,87 | 1,04 | 1,31 | 1,06 | 1,24 | 1,38 | 1,22 |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **11%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

## Table 3.1.3.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | 37,78 | 37,58 | 36,72 | 37,03 | *36,21* | *34,97* | *34,71* | 34,82 | 35,23 | 35,6 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | 8,75 | 4,38 | 9,28 | *8,6* | *8,56* | *8,39* | 8,34 | 9,48 | 10, |
| **Bulgaria** | 4,43 | 4,83 | 4,79 | 5,64 | 5,41 | *5,43* | *4,51* | *5,1* | 5,01 | 5,1 | 5,67 |
| **Croatia** | 22,22 | 21,56 | 23,2 | 22,9 | 21,65 | *24,63* | *22,05* | *26,75* | 26,33 | 25,8 | 25,86 |
| **Cyprus** | 2,79 | 3,5 | 2,4 | 1,77 | 2,39 | *2,34* | *2,4* | *3,14* | 3,06 | 2,99 | 2,11 |
| **Czech Republic** | 9,11 | 10,76 | 9,83 | 9,52 | 8,8 | *9,* | *8,69* | *8,57* | 8,59 | 8,78 | 8,3 |
| **Denmark** | 40,44 | 45,43 | 38,84 | 39,54 | 39,22 | *49,28* | *47,51* | *46,12* | 48,66 | 40,27 | 40,11 |
| **Estonia** | 18,12 | 17,95 | 24,71 | 20,35 | 22,58 | *22,7* | *23,39* | *24,33* | 24,07 | 24,03 | 23,12 |
| **Finland** | 8,05 | 8,05 | 8,2 | 9,01 | 9,05 | *9,47* | *8,46* | *8,82* | 8,24 | 9,22 | 10,06 |
| **France** | 3,45 | 3,43 | 3,36 | 3,18 | 2,81 | *2,69* | *2,08* | *2,22* | 3,58 | 3,87 | 3,96 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *2,43* | 2,01 | 2,11 | 2,91 |
| **Hungary** | 8,61 | 9,18 | 8,88 | 8,58 | 7,5 | *6,79* | *6,41* | *6,39* | 6,81 | 7,06 | 7,18 |
| **Ireland** | 5,41 | 5,26 | 4,99 | 4,7 | 4,61 | *4,68* | *3,6* | *2,7* | 3,57 | 3,73 | 3,74 |
| **Italy** | 6,58 | 5,74 | 6,04 | 5,71 | 5,83 | *5,72* | *4,51* | *5,12* | 5,21 | 5,08 | 5,55 |
| **Latvia** | 3,59 | 15,69 | 16,19 | 16,39 | 16,52 | *18,72* | *19,28* | *18,26* | 19,65 | 18,92 | 20,55 |
| **Lithuania** | 10,7 | 11,13 | 11,72 | 9,52 | 7,54 | *7,18* | *6,96* | *6,56* | 6,47 | 6,35 | 6,35 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | 1,85 | 1,79 | 1,93 | *2,27* | *2,1* | *2,03* | 1,81 | 1,83 | 2, |
| **Malta** | 1,54 | 1,55 | 1,46 | 2,29 | 2,49 | *2,65* | *2,12* | *2,58* | 2,63 | 2,52 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 7,46 | 7,39 | 7,29 | 7,24 | 6,94 | *6,98* | *6,44* | *6,18* | 6,11 | 6,08 | 6,19 |
| **Poland** | 25,96 | - | 28,04 | 30,26 | 28,59 | *35,61* | *27,6* | *27,55* | 26,79 | 27,14 | 27,43 |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 7,33 | 7,31 | 7,53 | 7,46 | 6,98 | *7,27* | *6,68* | *6,98* | 7,59 | 8,47 | 9,07 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 11,33 | 9,87 | 16,98 | 15,72 | 10,88 | *14,71* | *12,42* | *14,53* | 14,41 | 12,05 | 11,26 |
| **Slovenia** | 42,3 | 38,77 | 34,39 | 32,16 | 30,66 | *30,07* | *26,17* | *28,54* | 27,39 | 27,15 | 28,71 |
| **Spain** | 4,64 | 4,8 | 4,24 | 4,59 | 4,94 | *5,3* | *4,93* | *5,63* | 5,9 | 6,35 | 7,48 |
| **Sweden** | 2,03 | 1,92 | 2,32 | 2,5 | 2,54 | *2,66* | *2,74* | *2,57* | 2,28 | 2,4 | 2,59 |
| **Average** | 11,72 | 12,95 | 13,07 | 12,58 | 12,34 | 13,37 | 12,27 | 12,25 | 12,37 | 12,08 | 12,74 |
| **Median** | 7,46 | 8,05 | 8,47 | 8,02 | 7,52 | 7,22 | 6,82 | 6,56 | 6,81 | 7,06 | 7,89 |
| **Minimum** | 1,54 | 1,55 | 1,46 | 1,77 | 1,93 | 2,27 | 2,08 | 2,03 | 1,81 | 1,83 | 2, |
| **Maximum** | 42,3 | 45,43 | 38,84 | 39,54 | 39,22 | 49,28 | 47,51 | 46,12 | 48,66 | 40,27 | 40,11 |
| **% of NA** | **22%** | **19%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **11%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Latvia**: The figures for 2014 do not include all types of non-litigious cases, since these case groups were not collected and published at that time. Consequently, the scope of the 2014 Latvian data is not fully comparable with the 2024 dataset, where all case groups are included

## Table 3.1.3.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - incoming 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 1,11 | 1,05 | 0,97 | 0,96 | 0,95 | 0,94 | 0,83 | 0,83 | 0,80 | 0,88 | 0,91 |
| **Belgium** | 6,72 | 6,81 | 6,42 | 1,89 | 6,71 | 6,13 | 6,06 | 5,87 | 5,72 | 5,79 | 5,79 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2,00 | 2,19 |
| **Croatia** | 3,92 | 3,83 | 3,26 | 3,15 | 2,86 | 3,18 | 2,73 | 4,19 | 2,53 | 2,74 | 2,66 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,27 |
| **Czech Republic** | 4,57 | 3,77 | 3,14 | 3,41 | 3,25 | 3,33 | 2,85 | 2,96 | 2,89 | 3,13 | 3,18 |
| **Denmark** | 0,74 | 0,74 | 0,72 | 0,71 | 0,72 | 0,84 | 0,70 | 0,74 | 0,79 | 0,92 | 0,92 |
| **Estonia** | 1,28 | 1,15 | 1,25 | 1,23 | 1,17 | 1,40 | 1,43 | 1,32 | 1,26 | 1,29 | 1,17 |
| **Finland** | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,17 | 0,25 |
| **France** | 2,64 | 2,61 | 2,54 | 2,47 | 2,24 | 2,09 | 1,59 | 1,68 | 1,98 | 2,14 | 2,18 |
| **Germany** | 1,78 | 1,74 | 1,59 | 1,51 | 1,52 | 1,54 | 1,47 | 1,30 | 1,19 | 1,27 | 1,34 |
| **Greece** | 2,23 | 2,12 | 1,36 | 1,86 | 1,99 | 1,92 | NA | 1,73 | 1,31 | 1,37 | 2,06 |
| **Hungary** | 1,83 | 1,79 | 1,89 | 1,81 | 1,38 | 1,37 | 1,29 | 1,25 | 1,25 | 1,30 | 1,31 |
| **Ireland** | 3,11 | 2,97 | 2,73 | 2,69 | 2,70 | 2,75 | 2,67 | 2,09 | 2,00 | 2,12 | 2,21 |
| **Italy** | 2,61 | 2,55 | 2,57 | 2,47 | 2,55 | 2,44 | 1,92 | 2,13 | 2,23 | 2,15 | 2,33 |
| **Latvia** | 2,25 | 2,01 | 1,99 | 1,47 | 1,45 | 1,58 | 1,53 | 1,52 | 1,59 | 1,61 | 1,84 |
| **Lithuania** | 3,97 | 3,56 | 4,39 | 4,05 | 3,55 | 3,32 | 3,32 | 3,26 | 3,07 | 2,91 | 2,78 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,90 | 0,81 | 0,77 | 0,76 | 0,85 | 1,22 | 1,21 | 1,19 | 1,03 | 1,01 | 0,98 |
| **Malta** | 1,51 | 1,54 | 1,44 | 1,61 | 1,82 | 1,81 | 1,44 | 1,88 | 2,01 | 1,89 | 1,81 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,99 | 0,95 | 0,94 | 0,86 | 0,78 | 0,80 | 0,73 | NA | NA | NA | 0,66 |
| **Poland** | 3,19 | - | 3,11 | 3,52 | 3,45 | 3,27 | 2,47 | 2,38 | 2,35 | 2,60 | 2,79 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 3,06 | 3,00 | 2,92 | 2,89 | 3,14 | 2,47 | 2,52 | 2,51 | 2,48 | 2,61 |
| **Romania** | 6,85 | 6,85 | 6,80 | 6,55 | 6,39 | 6,68 | 6,12 | 6,40 | 6,99 | 7,85 | 8,42 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 2,79 | 2,05 | 3,70 | 3,54 | 2,33 | 2,14 | 1,97 | 1,79 | 1,84 | 1,67 | 1,60 |
| **Slovenia** | 2,91 | 2,77 | 2,50 | 2,17 | 1,96 | 1,76 | 1,52 | 1,50 | 1,38 | 1,35 | 1,44 |
| **Spain** | 2,16 | 2,34 | 2,15 | 2,54 | 2,73 | 2,73 | 2,55 | 2,85 | 2,85 | 3,13 | 4,13 |
| **Sweden** | 0,66 | 0,61 | 0,60 | 0,61 | 0,63 | 0,66 | 0,60 | 0,61 | 0,58 | 0,64 | 0,70 |
| **Average** | 2,54 | 2,41 | 2,40 | 2,20 | 2,28 | 2,29 | 2,07 | 2,17 | 2,10 | 2,18 | 2,20 |
| **Median** | 2,24 | 2,09 | 2,15 | 1,89 | 1,99 | 1,92 | 1,56 | 1,76 | 1,91 | 1,89 | 1,84 |
| **Minimum** | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,17 | 0,25 |
| **Maximum** | 6,85 | 6,85 | 6,80 | 6,55 | 6,71 | 6,68 | 6,12 | 6,40 | 6,99 | 7,85 | 8,42 |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **7%** | **0%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

## Table 3.1.3.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - incoming 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 0,65 | 0,84 | 0,81 | 0,62 | 0,51 | 0,52 | 0,55 | 0,55 | 0,57 |
| **Belgium** | 0,22 | 0,20 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,21 | 0,23 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,34 | 0,37 | 0,35 | 0,44 | 0,44 | 0,50 | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,44 | 0,45 | 0,45 |
| **Croatia** | 0,33 | 0,34 | 0,35 | 0,29 | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,30 | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,42 | 0,39 |
| **Cyprus** | 0,19 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,32 | 1,19 | 1,26 | 1,11 | 0,84 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,29 | 0,26 | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,21 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,23 | 0,25 |
| **Finland** | 0,52 | 0,49 | 0,71 | 0,50 | 0,45 | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,39 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,41 |
| **France** | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,32 | 0,34 | 0,31 | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,38 | 0,49 |
| **Germany** | 0,81 | 0,80 | 0,90 | 1,05 | 0,90 | 0,82 | 0,70 | 0,66 | 0,58 | 0,59 | 0,67 |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,56 | 0,56 | NA | 0,42 | 0,44 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,48 |
| **Hungary** | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,20 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,30 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,19 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| **Latvia** | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,09 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,49 | 0,59 | 0,52 | 0,42 | 0,53 | 0,51 | 0,51 | 0,58 | 0,82 | 0,74 | 0,57 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,24 | 0,22 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,23 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,29 |
| **Malta** | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,65 | 0,59 | 0,66 | 0,58 | 0,58 | 0,61 | 0,57 | 0,50 | 0,52 | 0,69 | 0,79 |
| **Poland** | 0,22 | - | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,18 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,34 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,27 | 0,20 | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,74 |
| **Romania** | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,60 | 0,75 | 0,43 | 0,43 | 0,41 | 0,42 | 0,44 | 0,42 | 0,44 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,16 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,26 | 0,23 | 0,14 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,14 |
| **Spain** | 0,39 | 0,37 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,37 | 0,42 | 0,33 | 0,39 | 0,38 | 0,36 | 0,35 |
| **Sweden** | 1,09 | 1,03 | 1,44 | 1,62 | 1,63 | 1,72 | 1,85 | 1,70 | 1,45 | 1,51 | 1,64 |
| **Average** | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,38 | 0,39 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,39 | 0,39 | 0,39 | 0,42 |
| **Median** | 0,27 | 0,29 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,30 | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,36 | 0,39 |
| **Minimum** | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Maximum** | 1,09 | 1,03 | 1,44 | 1,62 | 1,63 | 1,72 | 1,85 | 1,70 | 1,45 | 1,51 | 1,64 |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **7%** | **4%** | **4%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **11%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Portugal:** In 2024, there was a significant increase in applications for the authorisation or renewal of residence permits, which led to a noticable decline in the Clearance Rate. As a result, the number of pending cases and the Disposition Time increased considerably.

## Table 3.1.4.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | 37,86 | 37,74 | 36,94 | 37,12 | *36,36* | *34,87* | *34,64* | 34,70 | 35,47 | 35,60 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | 8,94 | NA | 10,06 | *8,67* | *8,42* | *8,77* | 8,47 | 9,34 | 10,25 |
| **Bulgaria** | 4,52 | 4,78 | 4,73 | 5,49 | 5,28 | *5,38* | *4,55* | *5,16* | 5,01 | 5,16 | 5,59 |
| **Croatia** | 22,92 | 21,90 | 23,61 | 23,29 | 22,64 | *22,85* | *22,85* | *26,04* | 27,48 | 24,93 | 26,58 |
| **Cyprus** | 2,47 | 3,15 | 2,55 | 2,01 | 2,99 | *2,30* | *2,12* | *2,55* | 3,11 | 3,53 | 2,64 |
| **Czech Republic** | 8,86 | 11,01 | 10,33 | 9,61 | 9,00 | *9,07* | *8,53* | *8,80* | 8,76 | 8,96 | 8,39 |
| **Denmark** | 40,43 | 45,42 | 38,70 | 39,44 | 39,06 | *49,55* | *47,87* | *46,27* | 48,57 | 40,09 | 40,43 |
| **Estonia** | 17,79 | 25,07 | 24,15 | 21,17 | 22,69 | *22,71* | *23,71* | *24,08* | 24,00 | 24,06 | 23,26 |
| **Finland** | 8,23 | 7,95 | 8,04 | 8,68 | 9,60 | *8,97* | *8,89* | *9,03* | 8,12 | 8,77 | 9,37 |
| **France** | 3,27 | 3,36 | 3,31 | 3,30 | 2,71 | *2,67* | *1,94* | *2,34* | 3,46 | 3,58 | 3,74 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *2,22* | 2,02 | 2,07 | 2,53 |
| **Hungary** | 8,85 | 9,30 | 9,07 | 8,51 | 7,95 | *6,84* | *6,30* | *6,62* | 6,83 | 7,03 | 7,16 |
| **Ireland** | 3,94 | 4,03 | 3,79 | 3,84 | 3,62 | *3,53* | *2,01* | *2,04* | 2,99 | 3,02 | 3,09 |
| **Italy** | 7,19 | 6,41 | 6,31 | 5,88 | 6,00 | *5,90* | *4,63* | *5,47* | 5,50 | 5,40 | 5,38 |
| **Latvia** | 3,61 | 15,85 | 16,35 | 16,57 | 16,56 | *18,71* | *19,09* | *18,30* | 19,52 | 19,05 | 20,00 |
| **Lithuania** | 10,57 | 11,18 | 11,92 | 9,71 | 7,62 | *7,26* | *6,74* | *6,63* | 6,42 | 6,37 | 6,29 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | 1,88 | 1,77 | 1,84 | *2,10* | *2,00* | *2,01* | 1,78 | 1,75 | 1,79 |
| **Malta** | 1,57 | 1,72 | 1,57 | 2,20 | 2,41 | *2,42* | *1,93* | *2,30* | 2,28 | 2,25 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 7,39 | 7,43 | 7,31 | 7,20 | 6,99 | *6,95* | *6,34* | *6,40* | 6,02 | 6,07 | 6,19 |
| **Poland** | 26,44 | - | 26,06 | 30,43 | 28,31 | *32,11* | *28,78* | *28,02* | 27,60 | 27,68 | 26,82 |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 8,14 | 7,75 | 7,62 | 7,42 | 7,23 | *7,28* | *6,46* | *7,15* | 7,30 | 7,33 | 8,94 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 11,55 | 10,37 | 18,02 | 17,08 | 12,12 | *13,40* | *14,03* | *14,58* | 14,51 | 12,66 | 11,54 |
| **Slovenia** | 43,91 | 41,65 | 36,48 | 33,41 | 31,28 | *30,60* | *25,89* | *29,13* | 27,63 | 27,11 | 28,70 |
| **Spain** | 4,69 | 4,79 | 4,43 | 4,31 | 4,54 | *4,96* | *4,43* | *5,73* | 5,64 | 5,55 | 6,64 |
| **Sweden** | 2,09 | 1,99 | 2,22 | 2,34 | 2,47 | *2,67* | *2,80* | *2,66* | 2,34 | 2,46 | 2,57 |
| **Average** | 11,83 | 13,47 | 13,13 | 13,07 | 12,50 | 13,05 | 12,30 | 12,28 | 12,40 | 11,99 | 12,65 |
| **Median** | 8,14 | 7,95 | 8,49 | 8,51 | 7,78 | 7,27 | 6,60 | 6,63 | 6,83 | 7,03 | 7,77 |
| **Minimum** | 1,57 | 1,72 | 1,57 | 1,77 | 1,84 | 2,10 | 1,93 | 2,01 | 1,78 | 1,75 | 1,79 |
| **Maximum** | 43,91 | 45,42 | 38,70 | 39,44 | 39,06 | 49,55 | 47,87 | 46,27 | 48,57 | 40,09 | 40,43 |
| **% of NA** | **22%** | **19%** | **11%** | **15%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **11%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Latvia**: The figures for 2014 do not include all types of non-litigious cases, since these case groups were not collected and published at that time. Consequently, the scope of the 2014 Latvian data is not fully comparable with the 2024 dataset, where all case groups are included

## Table 3.1.4.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - resolved 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 1,14 | 1,07 | 0,99 | 0,95 | 0,95 | 0,94 | 0,82 | 0,86 | 0,80 | 0,86 | 0,91 |
| **Belgium** | 6,57 | 6,74 | 6,58 | 2,12 | 7,55 | 6,18 | 5,99 | 6,20 | 5,86 | 5,69 | 6,06 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2,04 | 2,13 |
| **Croatia** | 4,45 | 4,10 | 3,86 | 3,42 | 3,21 | 2,78 | 2,32 | 3,38 | 3,66 | 2,83 | 2,99 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,98 |
| **Czech Republic** | 4,79 | 4,05 | 3,46 | 3,46 | 3,30 | 3,38 | 2,80 | 3,06 | 2,95 | 3,17 | 3,18 |
| **Denmark** | 0,75 | 0,75 | 0,73 | 0,73 | 0,68 | 0,77 | 0,78 | 0,72 | 0,73 | 0,85 | 0,91 |
| **Estonia** | 1,33 | 1,18 | 1,22 | 1,22 | 1,17 | 1,32 | 1,42 | 1,32 | 1,24 | 1,18 | 1,29 |
| **Finland** | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,19 |
| **France** | 2,49 | 2,55 | 2,51 | 2,53 | 2,14 | 2,09 | 1,47 | 1,80 | 2,03 | 2,05 | 2,08 |
| **Germany** | 1,78 | 1,78 | 1,63 | 1,52 | 1,48 | 1,52 | 1,44 | 1,37 | 1,23 | 1,24 | 1,34 |
| **Greece** | 2,52 | 2,15 | 1,35 | 1,79 | 1,71 | 1,66 | NA | 1,43 | 1,22 | 1,26 | 1,67 |
| **Hungary** | 1,91 | 1,78 | 1,86 | 1,74 | 1,61 | 1,43 | 1,29 | 1,32 | 1,30 | 1,30 | 1,30 |
| **Ireland** | 1,73 | 1,88 | 1,61 | 1,96 | 1,70 | 1,73 | 1,37 | 1,50 | 1,42 | 1,53 | 1,58 |
| **Italy** | 3,11 | 3,06 | 2,91 | 2,63 | 2,62 | 2,55 | 2,00 | 2,32 | 2,32 | 2,37 | 2,21 |
| **Latvia** | 2,22 | 2,18 | 2,14 | 1,75 | 1,50 | 1,62 | 1,47 | 1,56 | 1,58 | 1,61 | 1,65 |
| **Lithuania** | 3,87 | 3,65 | 4,32 | 4,14 | 3,68 | 3,37 | 3,12 | 3,30 | 3,05 | 2,91 | 2,77 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,87 | 0,85 | 0,77 | 0,74 | 0,80 | 1,07 | 1,12 | 1,18 | 1,01 | 0,94 | 0,91 |
| **Malta** | 1,53 | 1,65 | 1,55 | 1,56 | 1,70 | 1,66 | 1,31 | 1,47 | 1,75 | 1,80 | 1,69 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,99 | 0,96 | 0,95 | 0,85 | 0,79 | 0,80 | 0,73 | 0,74 | 0,70 | 0,69 | 0,67 |
| **Poland** | 3,16 | - | 3,08 | 3,30 | 3,18 | 3,24 | 2,60 | 2,46 | 2,31 | 2,47 | 2,62 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 3,56 | 3,36 | 3,30 | 3,15 | 3,30 | 2,42 | 2,57 | 2,58 | 2,38 | 2,52 |
| **Romania** | 7,44 | 7,17 | 6,94 | 6,50 | 6,56 | 6,70 | 6,13 | 6,55 | 6,73 | 6,76 | 8,35 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 2,56 | 2,73 | 4,89 | 4,57 | 3,04 | 2,35 | 1,97 | 1,86 | 1,98 | 1,76 | 1,72 |
| **Slovenia** | 3,17 | 2,91 | 2,66 | 2,34 | 2,15 | 1,93 | 1,53 | 1,61 | 1,42 | 1,37 | 1,38 |
| **Spain** | 2,12 | 2,21 | 2,22 | 2,23 | 2,37 | 2,56 | 2,20 | 2,91 | 2,80 | 2,63 | 3,36 |
| **Sweden** | 0,68 | 0,64 | 0,59 | 0,61 | 0,61 | 0,64 | 0,62 | 0,63 | 0,59 | 0,62 | 0,68 |
| **Average** | 2,56 | 2,49 | 2,49 | 2,25 | 2,31 | 2,23 | 1,96 | 2,09 | 2,06 | 2,02 | 2,15 |
| **Median** | 2,17 | 2,17 | 2,14 | 1,96 | 1,71 | 1,73 | 1,47 | 1,56 | 1,58 | 1,68 | 1,69 |
| **Minimum** | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,19 |
| **Maximum** | 7,44 | 7,17 | 6,94 | 6,50 | 7,55 | 6,70 | 6,13 | 6,55 | 6,73 | 6,76 | 8,35 |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **4%** | **0%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

## Table 3.1.4.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - resolved 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 0,59 | 0,67 | 0,73 | 0,68 | 0,65 | 0,65 | 0,62 | 0,55 | 0,55 |
| **Belgium** | 0,20 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,20 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,20 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,35 | 0,37 | 0,37 | 0,42 | 0,44 | 0,49 | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,44 | 0,46 | 0,44 |
| **Croatia** | 0,28 | 0,32 | 0,38 | 0,36 | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,32 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,36 | 0,35 |
| **Cyprus** | 0,19 | 0,24 | 0,21 | 0,16 | 0,49 | 0,36 | 0,26 | 0,55 | 1,11 | 1,22 | 0,65 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,26 | 0,27 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,25 |
| **Finland** | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,56 | 0,54 | 0,50 | 0,46 | 0,44 | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,40 |
| **France** | 0,28 | 0,28 | 0,29 | 0,30 | 0,31 | 0,33 | 0,30 | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,36 | 0,46 |
| **Germany** | 0,81 | 0,82 | 0,83 | 0,88 | 0,88 | 0,89 | 0,77 | 0,72 | 0,66 | 0,64 | 0,66 |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,92 | 0,74 | 0,93 | 0,92 | NA | 0,69 | 0,57 | 0,62 | 0,59 | 0,54 |
| **Hungary** | 0,17 | 0,19 | 0,20 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,26 | 0,23 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,19 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,11 |
| **Latvia** | 0,17 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,44 | 0,58 | 0,76 | 0,47 | 0,47 | 0,53 | 0,50 | 0,57 | 0,81 | 0,78 | 0,51 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,23 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,18 | 0,17 |
| **Malta** | 0,04 | 0,07 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,64 | 0,61 | 0,63 | 0,61 | 0,55 | 0,57 | 0,49 | 0,54 | 0,52 | 0,61 | 0,73 |
| **Poland** | 0,21 | - | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,19 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,27 | 0,28 | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,28 | 0,25 | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,29 | 0,36 |
| **Romania** | 0,57 | 0,44 | 0,55 | 0,77 | 0,51 | 0,43 | 0,20 | 0,45 | 0,42 | 0,38 | 0,40 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,27 | 0,25 | 0,18 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,06 | 0,08 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,27 | 0,24 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,15 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,13 |
| **Spain** | 0,44 | 0,43 | 0,40 | 0,37 | 0,37 | 0,39 | 0,33 | 0,38 | 0,37 | 0,34 | 0,36 |
| **Sweden** | 1,12 | 1,07 | 1,35 | 1,45 | 1,58 | 1,74 | 1,89 | 1,76 | 1,50 | 1,59 | 1,64 |
| **Average** | 0,35 | 0,38 | 0,39 | 0,39 | 0,39 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,38 | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,38 |
| **Median** | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,28 | 0,26 | 0,31 | 0,31 | 0,26 | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,36 |
| **Minimum** | 0,04 | 0,07 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | 1,12 | 1,07 | 1,35 | 1,45 | 1,58 | 1,74 | 1,89 | 1,76 | 1,50 | 1,59 | 1,64 |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **7%** | **4%** | **4%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **11%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Portugal:** In 2024, there was a significant increase in applications for the authorisation or renewal of residence permits, which led to a noticable decline in the Clearance Rate. As a result, the number of pending cases and the Disposition Time increased considerably.

## Table 3.1.5.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | 5,47 | 5,84 | 5,95 | 5,84 | 5,84 | 6,04 | 5,79 | 5,89 | 5,62 | 5,59 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4,00 | 4,28 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,97 | 1,03 | 1,09 | 1,25 | 1,31 | 1,37 | 1,34 | 1,29 | 1,36 | 1,30 | 1,38 |
| **Croatia** | 8,39 | 7,92 | 7,55 | 7,25 | 6,31 | 8,16 | 7,48 | 8,56 | 7,25 | 7,62 | 6,92 |
| **Cyprus** | 6,11 | 7,25 | 6,03 | 6,15 | 6,02 | 5,55 | 6,32 | 6,62 | 6,48 | 5,85 | 5,12 |
| **Czech Republic** | 3,81 | 4,94 | 4,39 | 4,30 | 3,98 | 3,91 | 3,98 | 3,83 | 3,54 | 3,34 | 3,26 |
| **Denmark** | 2,09 | 2,10 | 2,26 | 2,43 | 2,58 | 2,55 | 2,27 | 2,19 | 2,29 | 2,49 | 2,13 |
| **Estonia** | 1,62 | 2,68 | 2,67 | 1,41 | 1,84 | 1,96 | 1,61 | 1,81 | 1,87 | 1,85 | 2,00 |
| **Finland** | 2,33 | 2,42 | 2,49 | 2,80 | 2,25 | 2,59 | 2,37 | 2,17 | 2,29 | 2,73 | 3,45 |
| **France** | 2,73 | 2,80 | 2,83 | 2,71 | 2,82 | 2,84 | 2,95 | 2,82 | 2,81 | 3,04 | 3,50 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4,03 | 3,51 | 3,64 | 4,42 |
| **Hungary** | 1,52 | 1,49 | 1,41 | 1,47 | 1,37 | 1,30 | 1,39 | 1,18 | 1,18 | 1,20 | 1,23 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 7,42 | 6,90 | 6,69 | 6,42 | 6,13 | 5,94 | 5,98 | 5,71 | 5,40 | 5,14 | 5,49 |
| **Latvia** | 1,77 | 1,64 | 1,49 | 1,30 | 1,29 | 1,30 | 1,45 | 1,50 | 1,80 | 1,67 | 2,24 |
| **Lithuania** | 1,57 | 1,53 | 1,35 | 1,18 | 1,11 | 1,02 | 1,25 | 1,18 | 1,20 | 1,16 | 1,21 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,87 | 0,87 | 0,89 | 0,95 | 1,14 |
| **Malta** | 2,40 | 2,10 | 1,92 | 2,00 | 2,13 | 2,28 | 2,18 | 2,20 | 2,52 | 2,49 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 1,84 | 1,76 | 1,67 | 1,63 | 1,54 | 1,52 | 1,58 | 1,32 | 1,35 | 1,36 | 1,35 |
| **Poland** | 3,98 | - | 6,10 | 6,05 | 6,34 | 9,78 | 8,67 | 8,24 | 7,55 | 7,01 | 7,64 |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 3,31 | 3,27 | 3,21 | 3,27 | 3,05 | 3,03 | 3,29 | 3,14 | 3,43 | 4,57 | 4,71 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 7,30 | 6,80 | 4,86 | 5,02 | 3,70 | 4,95 | 3,34 | 3,32 | 3,22 | 2,62 | 2,34 |
| **Slovenia** | 12,22 | 9,31 | 7,20 | 5,93 | 5,26 | 4,69 | 4,93 | 4,33 | 4,07 | 4,09 | 4,08 |
| **Spain** | 3,12 | 3,13 | 2,76 | 3,04 | 3,43 | 3,73 | 4,23 | 4,15 | 4,35 | 5,13 | 5,91 |
| **Sweden** | 0,76 | 0,69 | 0,81 | 0,97 | 1,03 | 1,01 | 0,95 | 0,85 | 0,79 | 0,73 | 0,75 |
| **Average** | 3,76 | 3,76 | 3,55 | 3,45 | 3,30 | 3,59 | 3,38 | 3,35 | 3,26 | 3,32 | 3,49 |
| **Median** | 2,57 | 2,74 | 2,76 | 2,80 | 2,82 | 2,84 | 2,66 | 2,82 | 2,81 | 2,88 | 3,45 |
| **Minimum** | 0,76 | 0,69 | 0,81 | 0,97 | 1,03 | 1,01 | 0,87 | 0,85 | 0,79 | 0,73 | 0,75 |
| **Maximum** | 12,22 | 9,31 | 7,55 | 7,25 | 6,34 | 9,78 | 8,67 | 8,56 | 7,55 | 7,62 | 7,64 |
| **% of NA** | **26%** | **22%** | **22%** | **22%** | **22%** | **22%** | **19%** | **15%** | **15%** | **11%** | **15%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

## Table 3.1.5.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 31st Dec.2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,41 | 0,38 | 0,36 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,32 | 0,31 | 0,33 | 0,33 |
| **Belgium** | NA | 1,60 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3,83 | 4,09 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,04 | 1,11 |
| **Croatia** | 4,63 | 4,40 | 3,84 | 3,63 | 3,29 | 3,72 | 4,17 | 5,17 | 4,11 | 4,12 | 3,81 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3,71 |
| **Czech Republic** | 2,14 | 1,76 | 1,45 | 1,49 | 1,34 | 1,29 | 1,26 | 1,18 | 1,08 | 1,09 | 1,10 |
| **Denmark** | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,34 | 0,39 | 0,47 | 0,40 | 0,47 | 0,54 | 0,62 | 0,62 |
| **Estonia** | 0,46 | 0,44 | 0,46 | 0,47 | 0,46 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,54 | 0,63 | 0,65 |
| **Finland** | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,15 | 0,24 |
| **France** | 2,37 | 2,42 | 2,43 | 2,36 | 2,47 | 2,47 | 2,57 | 2,44 | 1,85 | 1,99 | 2,47 |
| **Germany** | 0,97 | 0,92 | 0,88 | 0,85 | 0,89 | 0,91 | 0,93 | 0,87 | 0,81 | 0,84 | 0,85 |
| **Greece** | 2,28 | 2,23 | 2,25 | 2,35 | 2,63 | 2,89 | NA | 2,84 | 2,49 | 2,67 | 3,37 |
| **Hungary** | 0,75 | 0,77 | 0,81 | 0,86 | 0,67 | 0,59 | 0,58 | 0,53 | 0,48 | 0,48 | 0,50 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 4,54 | 4,41 | 4,10 | 3,94 | 3,79 | 3,72 | 3,69 | 3,56 | 3,44 | 3,32 | 3,54 |
| **Latvia** | 1,55 | 1,42 | 1,27 | 1,00 | 0,97 | 0,94 | 0,96 | 0,92 | 0,90 | 0,90 | 1,10 |
| **Lithuania** | 1,03 | 0,96 | 1,04 | 0,97 | 0,84 | 0,80 | 1,00 | 0,96 | 0,97 | 0,96 | 0,96 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,25 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,22 | 0,27 | 0,41 | 0,49 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,57 | 0,63 |
| **Malta** | 2,25 | 2,01 | 1,83 | 1,86 | 2,04 | 2,11 | 1,97 | 2,13 | 2,36 | 2,24 | 2,27 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,36 | 0,30 | 0,32 | 0,29 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,25 | NA | NA | NA | 0,23 |
| **Poland** | 1,76 | - | 1,89 | 2,10 | 2,38 | 2,40 | 2,26 | 2,22 | 2,29 | 2,42 | 2,59 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 3,07 | 2,66 | 2,26 | 1,98 | 1,81 | 1,85 | 1,78 | 1,68 | 1,75 | 1,82 |
| **Romania** | 2,97 | 3,02 | 2,91 | 2,98 | 2,83 | 2,80 | 2,83 | 2,70 | 2,96 | 4,04 | 4,11 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 3,67 | 3,00 | 1,74 | 2,14 | 1,31 | 1,10 | 1,10 | 1,05 | 0,91 | 0,83 | 0,71 |
| **Slovenia** | 2,35 | 2,21 | 2,04 | 1,87 | 1,66 | 1,49 | 1,47 | 1,36 | 1,31 | 1,29 | 1,34 |
| **Spain** | 1,85 | 1,97 | 1,71 | 2,02 | 2,35 | 2,48 | 2,82 | 2,75 | 2,75 | 3,20 | 3,90 |
| **Sweden** | 0,29 | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,28 | 0,29 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,24 | 0,27 | 0,28 |
| **Average** | 1,70 | 1,67 | 1,52 | 1,51 | 1,46 | 1,48 | 1,45 | 1,58 | 1,48 | 1,65 | 1,78 |
| **Median** | 1,66 | 1,60 | 1,45 | 1,49 | 1,31 | 1,10 | 1,05 | 1,12 | 1,03 | 1,07 | 1,11 |
| **Minimum** | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,15 | 0,23 |
| **Maximum** | 4,63 | 4,41 | 4,10 | 3,94 | 3,79 | 3,72 | 4,17 | 5,17 | 4,11 | 4,12 | 4,11 |
| **% of NA** | **19%** | **11%** | **15%** | **15%** | **15%** | **15%** | **19%** | **19%** | **19%** | **11%** | **4%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

## Table 3.1.5.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 0,61 | 0,82 | 0,90 | *0,82* | *0,69* | *0,55* | 0,48 | 0,48 | 0,49 |
| **Belgium** | 0,34 | 0,28 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,18 | *0,19* | *0,18* | *0,13* | 0,13 | 0,17 | 0,20 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,14 | *0,14* | *0,14* | *0,14* | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,16 |
| **Croatia** | 0,33 | 0,36 | 0,33 | 0,26 | 0,21 | *0,18* | *0,16* | *0,16* | 0,14 | 0,22 | 0,26 |
| **Cyprus** | 0,94 | 0,91 | 0,89 | 0,94 | 0,65 | *0,49* | *0,63* | *1,27* | 1,40 | 1,27 | 1,41 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,11 | *0,10* | *0,09* | *0,08* | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NA* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | *0,07* | *0,07* | *0,09* | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 |
| **Finland** | 0,38 | 0,37 | 0,43 | 0,38 | 0,32 | *0,32* | *0,33* | *0,32* | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,29 |
| **France** | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 | *0,26* | *0,27* | *0,28* | 0,29 | 0,31 | 0,38 |
| **Germany** | 0,82 | 0,79 | 0,85 | 1,02 | 1,04 | *0,97* | *0,90* | *0,83* | 0,74 | 0,69 | 0,70 |
| **Greece** | NA | 2,43 | 2,20 | 1,87 | 1,51 | *NA* | *1,04* | *0,93* | 0,79 | 0,71 | 0,66 |
| **Hungary** | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | *0,05* | *0,08* | *0,06* | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,44 | 0,40 | 0,35 | 0,30 | 0,27 | *0,25* | *0,23* | *0,21* | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,15 |
| **Latvia** | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | *0,06* | *0,06* | *0,07* | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,37 | 0,38 | 0,15 | 0,10 | 0,16 | *0,14* | *0,15* | *0,16* | 0,17 | 0,14 | 0,20 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *0,21* | *0,22* | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,34 |
| **Malta** | 0,16 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | *0,07* | *0,07* | *0,08* | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,30 | 0,28 | 0,31 | 0,28 | 0,30 | *0,34* | *0,41* | *0,39* | 0,36 | 0,44 | 0,50 |
| **Poland** | 0,08 | - | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,06 | *0,06* | *0,07* | *0,09* | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,73 | 0,70 | 0,69 | 0,67 | *0,65* | *0,59* | *0,57* | 0,53 | 0,47 | 0,85 |
| **Romania** | 0,28 | 0,20 | 0,26 | 0,24 | 0,16 | *0,16* | *0,38* | *0,36* | 0,37 | 0,41 | 0,45 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,29 | 0,25 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 | *0,12* | *0,13* | *0,15* | 0,16 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,10 | 0,16 | 0,17 | *0,19* | *0,18* | *0,18* | 0,19 | 0,20 | 0,21 |
| **Spain** | 0,44 | 0,37 | 0,34 | 0,33 | 0,33 | *0,36* | *0,36* | *0,37* | 0,38 | 0,39 | 0,38 |
| **Sweden** | 0,35 | 0,31 | 0,43 | 0,59 | 0,63 | *0,60* | *0,55* | *0,49* | 0,44 | 0,36 | 0,37 |
| **Average** | 0,30 | 0,40 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,29 | 0,32 | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,31 | 0,34 |
| **Median** | 0,29 | 0,28 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,22 | 0,26 |
| **Minimum** | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 |
| **Maximum** | 0,94 | 2,43 | 2,20 | 1,87 | 1,51 | 0,97 | 1,04 | 1,27 | 1,40 | 1,27 | 1,41 |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **11%** | **4%** | **4%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **11%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Portugal:** In 2024, there was a significant increase in applications for the authorisation or renewal of residence permits, which led to a noticable decline in the Clearance Rate. As a result, the number of pending cases and the Disposition Time increased considerably.

## Table 3.1.6.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,25 | 0,27 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,71 | 1,87 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,75 | 1,17 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,08 |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,04 | 0,51 | 0,59 |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | 0,14 | 0,21 | 0,11 | 0,07 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,06 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,10 |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,49 | 0,51 | 0,48 | 0,22 | 0,21 |
| **Slovenia** | 4,03 | 3,04 | 2,13 | 1,47 | 1,11 | 1,06 | 1,09 | 0,96 | 0,82 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Average** | 0,75 | 0,59 | 0,41 | 0,32 | 0,28 | 0,28 | 0,24 | 0,55 | 0,47 |
| **Median** | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,20 | 0,18 |
| **Minimum** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Maximum** | 4,03 | 3,04 | 2,13 | 1,47 | 1,11 | 1,06 | 1,09 | 1,75 | 1,87 |
| **% of NA** | 78% | 78% | 78% | 78% | 74% | 74% | 70% | 63% | 59% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.1.6.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)**

| States | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,05 | 0,05 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,69 | 1,86 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 1,26 | 1,20 | 1,16 | 1,07 | 1,16 | 1,62 | 1,21 | 1,37 | 1,17 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,11 |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | 0,14 | 0,20 | 0,10 | 0,07 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,06 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | 0,87 | NA | 0,77 | 0,90 | 0,93 | 0,92 | 2,10 |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 0,79 | 0,62 | 0,46 | 0,33 | 0,33 | 0,34 | 0,35 | 0,36 | 0,38 |
| **Romania** | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,14 | 0,13 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,34 | 0,33 | 0,28 | 0,11 | 0,10 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,47 | 0,51 | 0,51 | 0,46 | 0,40 | 0,42 | 0,45 | 0,43 | 0,37 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Average** | 0,35 | 0,32 | 0,37 | 0,28 | 0,33 | 0,36 | 0,32 | 0,40 | 0,49 |
| **Median** | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,22 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 |
| **Minimum** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 1,26 | 1,20 | 1,16 | 1,07 | 1,16 | 1,62 | 1,21 | 1,69 | 2,10 |
| **% of NA** | 70% | 70% | 67% | 70% | 63% | 59% | 59% | 52% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

## Table 3.1.6.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

| States | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,15 | 0,19 | 0,22 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,24 | 0,19 | 0,16 | 0,139 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,011 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,005 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,004 |
| Finland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | 0,04 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,040 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,48 | 0,434 |
| Hungary | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,001 |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | NA | NA | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,052 |
| Latvia | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,002 |
| Lithuania | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,015 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,053 |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,022 |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | NA |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,235 |
| Romania | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,012 |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | NA | 0,000 |
| Slovenia | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,044 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,001 |
| Average | 0,03 | | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,063 |
| Median | 0,01 | | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,015 |
| Minimum | 0,00 | | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,000 |
| Maximum | 0,15 | | 0,22 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,24 | 0,19 | 0,48 | 0,434 |
| % of NA | 67% | | 59% | 59% | 52% | 48% | 52% | 41% | 33% |
| % of NAP | 7% | | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

**Portugal:** In 2024, there was a significant increase in applications for the authorisation or renewal of residence permits, which led to a noticable decline in the Clearance Rate. As a result, the number of pending cases and the Disposition Time increased considerably.

# Clearance Rate and Disposition Time for first instance other than criminal cases

## Table 3.2.1.1: Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2024 (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** | **100,0%** | **99,9%** | 100,0% | 100,0% | 99,8% | 100,0% | 99,5% | NAP | NAP | **96,5%** | 100,6% |
| **Belgium** | **102,4%** | **104,8%** | 100,0% | NAP | 100,0% | NAP | 100,0% | NAP | NAP | **85,8%** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **98,6%** | **97,5%** | 99,6% | 99,6% | 98,1% | NAP | NAP | 98,1% | NAP | **97,4%** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **102,8%** | **112,4%** | 101,9% | 104,4% | 101,2% | 101,6% | 98,9% | NAP | NAP | **90,2%** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **125,0%** | **156,3%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **77,7%** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **101,0%** | **99,7%** | 101,2% | 101,3% | 100,8% | NAP | 100,8% | NAP | 103,3% | **104,7%** | 118,3% |
| **Denmark** | **100,8%** | **98,9%** | 100,9% | 106,9% | 100,1% | 100,1% | 103,0% | NAP | 102,7% | **NA** | 100,3% |
| **Estonia** | **100,6%** | **110,0%** | 100,1% | 96,8% | 101,1% | 100,0% | 102,0% | NAP | NAP | **100,2%** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **93,1%** | **75,3%** | 93,4% | 93,4% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **97,0%** | 94,6% |
| **France** | **94,5%** | **95,4%** | 91,9% | 91,9% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **94,3%** | 93,3% |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **99,9%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 64,6% | NA | NA | **99,2%** | 98,8% |
| **Greece** | **87,1%** | **81,1%** | 84,3% | 83,3% | 44,4% | 41,1% | 95,8% | 76,9% | 115,9% | **111,8%** | 113,8% |
| **Hungary** | **99,7%** | **98,9%** | 99,2% | 99,8% | 98,8% | NAP | 98,8% | 99,1% | 101,8% | **99,3%** | 112,8% |
| **Ireland** | **82,7%** | **71,8%** | 98,4% | 98,4% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **96,9%** | **95,0%** | 97,6% | 97,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **125,1%** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **97,3%** | **89,5%** | 98,1% | 94,8% | 99,6% | 99,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP | **99,5%** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **99,2%** | **99,7%** | 100,3% | 100,4% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 98,2% | **89,7%** | 101,3% |
| **Luxembourg** | **89,8%** | **92,9%** | 97,7% | 100,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 97,1% | **59,9%** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **93,5%** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **60,5%** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **99,9%** | **102,0%** | 100,8% | 100,8% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **93,1%** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **97,8%** | **94,1%** | 98,2% | 98,2% | 98,2% | 97,8% | 100,3% | NAP | NAP | **102,3%** | 96,4% |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **96,6%** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **48,4%** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **98,5%** | **99,2%** | 89,4% | 90,5% | 82,4% | 81,8% | 800,0% | NAP | NAP | **90,9%** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **102,5%** | **107,6%** | 102,0% | 99,5% | 99,6% | NAP | 99,4% | 101,0% | 110,7% | **93,1%** | 101,3% |
| **Slovenia** | **100,0%** | **96,1%** | 100,5% | 101,3% | 100,1% | 100,1% | 100,1% | NAP | NAP | **92,1%** | 99,4% |
| **Spain** | **88,7%** | **81,5%** | 97,0% | 97,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **102,8%** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **99,1%** | **97,8%** | 99,7% | 99,7% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **99,7%** | 99,5% |
| **Average** | **98,3%** | **98,0%** | 97,9% | 98,0% | 94,6% | *91,4%* | *151,0%* | *93,8%* | 104,3% | **92,4%** | 102,3% |
| **Median** | **99,2%** | **97,8%** | 99,6% | 99,6% | 99,7% | *100,0%* | *100,0%* | *98,6%* | 102,7% | **96,5%** | 100,3% |
| **Minimum** | **82,7%** | **71,8%** | 84,3% | 83,3% | 44,4% | *41,1%* | *64,6%* | *76,9%* | 97,1% | **48,4%** | 93,3% |
| **Maximum** | **125,0%** | **156,3%** | 102,0% | 106,9% | 101,2% | *101,6%* | *800,0%* | *101,0%* | 115,9% | **125,1%** | 118,3% |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **0%** | 15% | 15% | 7% | *7%* | *4%* | *7%* | 7% | **7%** | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 0% | 4% | 41% | *59%* | *48%* | *78%* | 67% | **0%** | 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: Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in in 2024 (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** | **132** | 54 | 77 | 11 | 10 | 13 | NAP | NAP | **327** | 39 |
| **Belgium** | **153** | **246** | 0 | NAP | 0 | NAP | 0 | NAP | NAP | **370** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **90** | **189** | 15 | 15 | 35 | NAP | NAP | 35 | NAP | **129** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **95** | **465** | 45 | 155 | 15 | 13 | 24 | NAP | NAP | **268** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **709** | **682** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **788** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **142** | **126** | 97 | 122 | 10 | NAP | 10 | NAP | 25 | **202** | 1265 |
| **Denmark** | **19** | **250** | 10 | 62 | 2 | 0 | 236 | NAP | 193 | **NA** | 39 |
| **Estonia** | **31** | **185** | 21 | 66 | 8 | 9 | 2 | NAP | NAP | **137** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **135** | **464** | 119 | 119 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **268** | 220 |
| **France** | **341** | **434** | 239 | 239 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **301** | 189 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **232** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 8255 | NA | NA | **389** | 232 |
| **Greece** | **638** | **737** | 482 | 546 | 700 | 760 | 304 | 183 | 140 | **445** | 292 |
| **Hungary** | **63** | **140** | 29 | 26 | 31 | NAP | 28 | 143 | 48 | **131** | 268 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **373** | **584** | 216 | 216 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **483** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **41** | **244** | 22 | 54 | 7 | 7 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **210** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **70** | **127** | 4 | 3 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 32 | **140** | 19 |
| **Luxembourg** | **233** | **251** | 89 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 113 | **720** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NA** | **491** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1681** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **80** | **124** | 48 | 48 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **246** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **104** | **360** | 73 | 62 | 79 | 87 | 41 | NAP | NAP | **134** | 160 |
| **Portugal** | **NA** | **263** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **861** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **192** | **180** | 278 | 144 | 1230 | 742 | 69909 | NAP | NAP | **410** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **74** | **151** | 79 | 71 | 19 | NAP | 20 | 11 | 196 | **860** | 10 |
| **Slovenia** | **52** | **355** | 32 | 77 | 5 | 6 | 2 | NAP | NAP | **570** | 40 |
| **Spain** | **325** | **423** | 204 | 204 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **386** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **106** | **150** | 143 | 143 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **81** | 168 |
| **Average** | **179** | **307** | 104 | 122 | 154 | *182* | *6 065* | *93* | 107 | **422** | **226** |
| **Median** | **104** | **248** | 63 | 77 | 13 | *10* | *24* | *89* | 113 | **327** | **168** |
| **Minimum** | **19** | **124** | 0 | 3 | 0 | *0* | *0* | *11* | 25 | **81** | **10** |
| **Maximum** | **709** | **737** | 482 | 546 | 1 230 | *760* | *69 909* | *183* | 196 | **1 681** | **1 265** |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 4% | 19% | 19% | 7% | *7%* | *4%* | *7%* | 7% | 7% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 41% | *59%* | *48%* | *78%* | 67% | 0% | 48% |

## Table 3.2.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
**(Q091)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | 100% | 100% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 101% | 100% |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | 102% | NA | 108% | 101% | 98% | 105% | 102% | 98% | 102% |
| **Bulgaria** | 102% | 99% | 99% | 97% | 98% | 99% | 101% | 101% | 100% | 101% | 99% |
| **Croatia** | 103% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 105% | 93% | 104% | 97% | 104% | 97% | 103% |
| **Cyprus** | 88% | 90% | 106% | 113% | 125% | 98% | 88% | 81% | 101% | 118% | 125% |
| **Czech Republic** | 97% | 102% | 105% | 101% | 102% | 101% | 98% | 103% | 102% | 102% | 101% |
| **Denmark** | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 101% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 101% |
| **Estonia** | 98% | 140% | 98% | 104% | 101% | 100% | 101% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 101% |
| **Finland** | 102% | 99% | 98% | 96% | 106% | 95% | 105% | 102% | 99% | 95% | 93% |
| **France** | 95% | 98% | 98% | 104% | 96% | 99% | 94% | 105% | 97% | 93% | 95% |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 91% | 101% | 98% | 87% |
| **Hungary** | 103% | 101% | 102% | 99% | 106% | 101% | 98% | 104% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| **Ireland** | 73% | 77% | 76% | 82% | 79% | 75% | 56% | 75% | 84% | 81% | 83% |
| **Italy** | 109% | 112% | 105% | 103% | 103% | 103% | 103% | 107% | 106% | 106% | 97% |
| **Latvia** | 100% | 101% | 101% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 99% | 101% | 97% |
| **Lithuania** | 99% | 100% | 102% | 102% | 101% | 101% | 97% | 101% | 99% | 100% | 99% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | 102% | 99% | 96% | 93% | 95% | 99% | 98% | 96% | 90% |
| **Malta** | 102% | 111% | 107% | 96% | 97% | 91% | 91% | 89% | 87% | 89% | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 99% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 101% | 100% | 98% | 103% | 98% | 100% | 100% |
| **Poland** | 102% | - | 93% | 101% | 99% | 90% | 104% | 102% | 103% | 102% | 98% |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 111% | 106% | 101% | 99% | 104% | 100% | 97% | 102% | 96% | 87% | 99% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 102% | 105% | 106% | 109% | 111% | 91% | 113% | 100% | 101% | 105% | 102% |
| **Slovenia** | 104% | 107% | 106% | 104% | 102% | 102% | 99% | 102% | 101% | 100% | 100% |
| **Spain** | 101% | 100% | 105% | 94% | 92% | 94% | 90% | 102% | 96% | 87% | 89% |
| **Sweden** | 103% | 103% | 96% | 93% | 97% | 100% | 102% | 103% | 103% | 102% | 99% |
| **Average** | 100% | 103% | 100% | 100% | 101% | 97% | 97% | 99% | 99% | 98% | 98% |
| **Median** | 102% | 101% | 101% | 101% | 101% | 100% | 99% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 99% |
| **Minimum** | 73% | 77% | 76% | 82% | 79% | 75% | 56% | 75% | 84% | 81% | 83% |
| **Maximum** | 111% | 140% | 107% | 113% | 125% | 103% | 113% | 107% | 106% | 118% | 125% |
| **% of NA** | **22%** | **19%** | **11%** | **15%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **11%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

## Table 3.2.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
(Q091)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NA | 53 | 57 | 59 | 57 | 59 | 63 | 61 | 62 | 58 | 57 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 156 | 153 |
| Bulgaria | 78 | 78 | 84 | 83 | 91 | 93 | 107 | 91 | 99 | 92 | 90 |
| Croatia | 134 | 132 | 117 | 114 | 102 | 130 | 120 | 120 | 96 | 112 | 95 |
| Cyprus | 903 | 839 | 862 | 1118 | 737 | 882 | 1087 | 947 | 761 | 605 | 709 |
| Czech Republic | 157 | 164 | 155 | 163 | 162 | 158 | 170 | 159 | 148 | 136 | 142 |
| Denmark | 19 | 17 | 21 | 22 | 24 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 23 | 19 |
| Estonia | 33 | 39 | 40 | 24 | 30 | 32 | 25 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 31 |
| Finland | 103 | 111 | 113 | 118 | 86 | 105 | 97 | 88 | 103 | 114 | 135 |
| France | 304 | 304 | 312 | 300 | 381 | 388 | 554 | 440 | 297 | 310 | 341 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 664 | 634 | 642 | 638 |
| Hungary | 63 | 59 | 57 | 63 | 63 | 69 | 80 | 65 | 63 | 62 | 63 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 377 | 393 | 387 | 399 | 373 | 367 | 471 | 381 | 358 | 347 | 373 |
| Latvia | 179 | 38 | 33 | 29 | 28 | 25 | 28 | 30 | 34 | 32 | 41 |
| Lithuania | 54 | 50 | 41 | 44 | 53 | 52 | 68 | 65 | 68 | 66 | 70 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 158 | 158 | 183 | 198 | 233 |
| Malta | 558 | 447 | 446 | 331 | 322 | 344 | 414 | 350 | 404 | 404 | NA |
| Netherlands | 91 | 87 | 83 | 83 | 80 | 80 | 91 | 76 | 82 | 82 | 80 |
| Poland | 55 | - | 85 | 73 | 82 | 111 | 110 | 107 | 100 | 92 | 104 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 148 | 154 | 154 | 161 | 154 | 152 | 186 | 160 | 171 | 228 | 192 |
| Slovak Republic | 231 | 240 | 98 | 107 | 111 | 135 | 87 | 83 | 81 | 75 | 74 |
| Slovenia | 102 | 82 | 72 | 65 | 61 | 56 | 69 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 52 |
| Spain | 242 | 238 | 227 | 258 | 276 | 274 | 349 | 265 | 282 | 337 | 325 |
| Sweden | 133 | 126 | 133 | 151 | 152 | 138 | 123 | 117 | 123 | 108 | 106 |
| Average | 198 | 182 | 170 | 179 | 163 | 175 | 203 | 197 | 185 | 182 | 179 |
| Median | 133 | 119 | 98 | 107 | 91 | 111 | 109 | 107 | 100 | 110 | 104 |
| Minimum | 19 | 17 | 21 | 22 | 24 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 23 | 19 |
| Maximum | 903 | 839 | 862 | 1118 | 737 | 882 | 1087 | 947 | 761 | 642 | 709 |
| % of NA | 26% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 11% | 15% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.2.3.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
**(Q091)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 103% | 102% | 102% | 99% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 104% | 101% | 98% | 100% |
| **Belgium** | 98% | 99% | 102% | 112% | 112% | 101% | 99% | 106% | 102% | 98% | 105% |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 102% | 97% |
| **Croatia** | 113% | 107% | 118% | 109% | 112% | 87% | 85% | 81% | 145% | 103% | 112% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 156% |
| **Czech Republic** | 105% | 107% | 110% | 101% | 102% | 101% | 98% | 103% | 102% | 101% | 100% |
| **Denmark** | 102% | 102% | 101% | 102% | 95% | 92% | 111% | 98% | 93% | 93% | 99% |
| **Estonia** | 104% | 102% | 98% | 99% | 101% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 91% | 110% |
| **Finland** | 105% | 94% | 125% | 111% | 102% | 100% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 89% | 75% |
| **France** | 94% | 98% | 99% | 103% | 96% | 100% | 93% | 107% | 103% | 96% | 95% |
| **Germany** | 100% | 102% | 103% | 101% | 97% | 99% | 98% | 105% | 104% | 97% | 100% |
| **Greece** | 113% | 102% | 99% | 96% | 86% | 86% | NA | 82% | 93% | 92% | 81% |
| **Hungary** | 104% | 99% | 98% | 96% | 116% | 104% | 100% | 106% | 104% | 100% | 99% |
| **Ireland** | 56% | 63% | 59% | 73% | 63% | 63% | 51% | 72% | 71% | 72% | 72% |
| **Italy** | 119% | 120% | 113% | 106% | 103% | 104% | 104% | 109% | 104% | 110% | 95% |
| **Latvia** | 98% | 109% | 107% | 119% | 103% | 102% | 96% | 103% | 99% | 100% | 90% |
| **Lithuania** | 97% | 102% | 98% | 102% | 104% | 101% | 94% | 101% | 99% | 100% | 100% |
| **Luxembourg** | 97% | 105% | 100% | 96% | 93% | 88% | 93% | 99% | 98% | 93% | 93% |
| **Malta** | 101% | 107% | 107% | 97% | 93% | 92% | 91% | 78% | 87% | 95% | 94% |
| **Netherlands** | 99% | 100% | 101% | 99% | 101% | 100% | 100% | NA | NA | NA | 102% |
| **Poland** | 99% | - | 99% | 94% | 92% | 99% | 105% | 103% | 98% | 95% | 94% |
| **Portugal** | NA | 116% | 112% | 113% | 109% | 105% | 98% | 102% | 103% | 96% | 97% |
| **Romania** | 109% | 105% | 102% | 99% | 103% | 100% | 100% | 102% | 96% | 86% | 99% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 92% | 133% | 132% | 129% | 131% | 110% | 100% | 104% | 108% | 105% | 108% |
| **Slovenia** | 109% | 105% | 106% | 108% | 110% | 109% | 101% | 107% | 102% | 101% | 96% |
| **Spain** | 98% | 95% | 103% | 88% | 87% | 94% | 86% | 102% | 98% | 84% | 82% |
| **Sweden** | 104% | 104% | 99% | 100% | 97% | 97% | 103% | 103% | 102% | 97% | 98% |
| **Average** | 101% | 103% | 104% | 102% | 100% | 97% | 96% | 99% | 100% | 96% | 98% |
| **Median** | 102% | 102% | 102% | 101% | 101% | 100% | 98% | 103% | 101% | 97% | 98% |
| **Minimum** | 56% | 63% | 59% | 73% | 63% | 63% | 51% | 72% | 71% | 72% | 72% |
| **Maximum** | 119% | 133% | 132% | 129% | 131% | 110% | 111% | 109% | 145% | 110% | 156% |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

## Table 3.2.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
**(Q091)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 130 | 131 | 133 | 141 | 138 | 137 | 156 | 135 | 142 | 141 | 132 |
| **Belgium** | NA | 87 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 246 | 246 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 186 | 189 |
| **Croatia** | 380 | 391 | 364 | 387 | 374 | 488 | 655 | 559 | 410 | 533 | 465 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 682 |
| **Czech Republic** | 163 | 159 | 153 | 157 | 149 | 140 | 165 | 141 | 134 | 126 | 126 |
| **Denmark** | 177 | 174 | 176 | 172 | 207 | 222 | 190 | 238 | 268 | 265 | 250 |
| **Estonia** | 125 | 136 | 139 | 140 | 143 | 147 | 135 | 146 | 158 | 196 | 185 |
| **Finland** | 289 | 332 | 252 | 258 | 273 | 280 | 300 | 305 | 327 | 349 | 464 |
| **France** | 348 | 346 | 353 | 341 | 420 | 432 | 637 | 495 | 333 | 354 | 434 |
| **Germany** | 198 | 190 | 196 | 204 | 220 | 217 | 237 | 231 | 241 | 249 | 232 |
| **Greece** | 330 | 378 | 610 | 479 | 559 | 637 | NA | 728 | 746 | 771 | 737 |
| **Hungary** | 144 | 159 | 159 | 181 | 151 | 152 | 165 | 145 | 134 | 135 | 140 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 532 | 527 | 514 | 548 | 527 | 532 | 674 | 560 | 540 | 511 | 584 |
| **Latvia** | 255 | 238 | 217 | 208 | 236 | 213 | 239 | 216 | 209 | 204 | 244 |
| **Lithuania** | 97 | 96 | 88 | 85 | 84 | 87 | 117 | 106 | 116 | 120 | 127 |
| **Luxembourg** | 103 | 86 | 91 | 108 | 123 | 139 | 161 | 154 | 182 | 221 | 251 |
| **Malta** | 536 | 445 | 432 | 435 | 440 | 465 | 550 | 529 | 491 | 454 | 491 |
| **Netherlands** | 132 | 115 | 121 | 124 | 110 | 110 | 127 | NA | NA | NA | 124 |
| **Poland** | 203 | - | 225 | 232 | 273 | 270 | 317 | 330 | 362 | 357 | 360 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 315 | 289 | 250 | 229 | 200 | 280 | 253 | 238 | 267 | 263 |
| **Romania** | 146 | 154 | 153 | 167 | 157 | 152 | 168 | 150 | 160 | 218 | 180 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 524 | 401 | 130 | 171 | 157 | 170 | 204 | 206 | 168 | 173 | 151 |
| **Slovenia** | 270 | 277 | 280 | 292 | 283 | 281 | 350 | 309 | 337 | 344 | 355 |
| **Spain** | 318 | 325 | 282 | 329 | 362 | 353 | 468 | 344 | 359 | 444 | 423 |
| **Sweden** | 157 | 152 | 164 | 159 | 166 | 167 | 161 | 148 | 152 | 157 | 150 |
| **Average** | 253 | 244 | 240 | 242 | 251 | 261 | 294 | 292 | 282 | 292 | 307 |
| **Median** | 201 | 190 | 196 | 204 | 220 | 213 | 221 | 234 | 239 | 247 | 248 |
| **Minimum** | 97 | 86 | 88 | 85 | 84 | 87 | 117 | 106 | 116 | 120 | 124 |
| **Maximum** | 536 | 527 | 610 | 548 | 559 | 637 | 674 | 728 | 746 | 771 | 737 |
| **% of NA** | **19%** | **11%** | **15%** | **15%** | **15%** | **15%** | **19%** | **19%** | **19%** | **11%** | **4%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

## Table 3.2.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance administrative cases 2014 - 2024
**(Q091)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 91% | 80% | 90% | 111% | 126% | 125% | 112% | 100% | 96% |
| **Belgium** | 88% | 117% | 121% | 101% | 119% | 112% | 108% | 131% | 97% | 81% | 86% |
| **Bulgaria** | 101% | 99% | 104% | 95% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 101% | 101% | 97% |
| **Croatia** | 86% | 93% | 109% | 126% | 116% | 109% | 107% | 102% | 107% | 87% | 90% |
| **Cyprus** | 103% | 120% | 113% | 74% | 219% | 170% | 84% | 46% | 88% | 110% | 78% |
| **Czech Republic** | 91% | 92% | 80% | 92% | 88% | 107% | 113% | 119% | 126% | 111% | 105% |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 90% | 105% | 106% | 99% | 100% | 94% | 92% | 90% | 99% | 95% | 100% |
| **Finland** | 97% | 102% | 79% | 107% | 112% | 100% | 99% | 102% | 104% | 105% | 97% |
| **France** | 96% | 98% | 99% | 102% | 98% | 97% | 95% | 97% | 96% | 94% | 94% |
| **Germany** | 100% | 103% | 92% | 84% | 97% | 109% | 110% | 110% | 114% | 109% | 99% |
| **Greece** | NA | 183% | 148% | 166% | 164% | NA | 163% | 130% | 127% | 121% | 112% |
| **Hungary** | 92% | 105% | 100% | 102% | 102% | 103% | 89% | 108% | 98% | 101% | 99% |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 156% | 142% | 153% | 156% | 136% | 131% | 136% | 125% | 134% | 121% | 125% |
| **Latvia** | 144% | 106% | 95% | 100% | 105% | 105% | 107% | 93% | 107% | 109% | 99% |
| **Lithuania** | 89% | 100% | 144% | 113% | 88% | 105% | 97% | 98% | 98% | 105% | 90% |
| **Luxembourg** | 94% | 91% | 98% | 94% | 86% | 75% | 87% | 92% | 92% | 98% | 60% |
| **Malta** | 149% | 411% | 114% | 147% | 91% | 121% | 106% | 70% | 95% | 78% | 60% |
| **Netherlands** | 99% | 103% | 95% | 105% | 95% | 94% | 86% | 108% | 99% | 88% | 93% |
| **Poland** | 97% | - | 103% | 107% | 105% | 99% | 95% | 93% | 99% | 110% | 102% |
| **Portugal** | NA | 80% | 112% | 105% | 111% | 106% | 126% | 107% | 112% | 120% | 48% |
| **Romania** | 161% | 133% | 92% | 102% | 118% | 100% | 48% | 105% | 97% | 92% | 91% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 125% | 124% | 112% | 118% | 96% | 81% | 87% | 80% | 93% | 74% | 93% |
| **Slovenia** | 103% | 101% | 87% | 67% | 91% | 89% | 107% | 95% | 98% | 92% | 92% |
| **Spain** | 113% | 117% | 112% | 104% | 100% | 92% | 99% | 99% | 97% | 95% | 103% |
| **Sweden** | 103% | 104% | 94% | 90% | 97% | 102% | 102% | 103% | 103% | 105% | 100% |
| **Average** | 108% | 123% | 106% | 105% | 109% | 105% | 103% | 101% | 104% | 100% | 92% |
| **Median** | 100% | 104% | 103% | 102% | 100% | 102% | 100% | 102% | 99% | 101% | 96% |
| **Minimum** | 86% | 80% | 79% | 67% | 86% | 75% | 48% | 46% | 88% | 74% | 48% |
| **Maximum** | 161% | 411% | 153% | 166% | 219% | 170% | 163% | 131% | 134% | 121% | 125% |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Portugal:** In 2024, there was a significant increase in applications for the authorisation or renewal of residence permits, which led to a noticable decline in the Clearance Rate. As a result, the number of pending cases and the Disposition Time increased considerably.

## Table 3.2.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance administrative cases 2014 - 2024
**(Q091)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 380 | 446 | 449 | 440 | 388 | 312 | 285 | 313 | 327 |
| **Belgium** | 625 | 444 | 429 | 497 | 370 | 418 | 399 | 235 | 288 | 360 | 370 |
| **Bulgaria** | 124 | 122 | 108 | 116 | 112 | 107 | 124 | 125 | 129 | 121 | 129 |
| **Croatia** | 426 | 413 | 319 | 258 | 197 | 187 | 179 | 166 | 143 | 221 | 268 |
| **Cyprus** | 1775 | 1391 | 1582 | 2162 | 487 | 495 | 863 | 844 | 461 | 380 | 788 |
| **Czech Republic** | 415 | 437 | 421 | 408 | 412 | 356 | 317 | 265 | 225 | 212 | 202 |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 141 | 117 | 108 | 108 | 119 | 136 | 142 | 162 | 166 | 167 | 137 |
| **Finland** | 280 | 271 | 279 | 255 | 235 | 254 | 274 | 296 | 281 | 263 | 268 |
| **France** | 305 | 313 | 314 | 290 | 285 | 284 | 333 | 299 | 314 | 322 | 301 |
| **Germany** | 367 | 349 | 375 | 421 | 435 | 397 | 426 | 422 | 408 | 391 | 389 |
| **Greece** | NA | 964 | 1086 | 735 | 601 | NA | 551 | 595 | 464 | 439 | 445 |
| **Hungary** | 148 | 110 | 109 | 116 | 109 | 103 | 110 | 103 | 125 | 120 | 131 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 984 | 1008 | 925 | 887 | 889 | 821 | 862 | 756 | 574 | 595 | 483 |
| **Latvia** | 155 | 200 | 228 | 249 | 248 | 225 | 220 | 256 | 200 | 205 | 210 |
| **Lithuania** | 310 | 236 | 72 | 76 | 129 | 96 | 112 | 106 | 79 | 64 | 140 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 513 | 524 | 528 | 479 | 720 |
| **Malta** | 1408 | 495 | 1464 | 1147 | 1057 | 839 | 924 | 1356 | 1081 | 1350 | 1681 |
| **Netherlands** | 171 | 168 | 178 | 165 | 200 | 215 | 304 | 265 | 257 | 267 | 246 |
| **Poland** | 139 | - | 143 | 121 | 118 | 123 | 150 | 151 | 163 | 130 | 134 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 989 | 911 | 988 | 928 | 846 | 847 | 792 | 747 | 597 | 861 |
| **Romania** | 179 | 170 | 170 | 114 | 117 | 138 | 690 | 293 | 321 | 387 | 410 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 397 | 374 | 203 | 317 | 401 | 518 | 585 | 679 | 648 | 1040 | 860 |
| **Slovenia** | 112 | 122 | 282 | 448 | 406 | 516 | 443 | 546 | 540 | 627 | 570 |
| **Spain** | 361 | 317 | 312 | 322 | 331 | 338 | 406 | 352 | 369 | 414 | 386 |
| **Sweden** | 114 | 105 | 115 | 147 | 146 | 125 | 107 | 102 | 107 | 83 | 81 |
| **Average** | 426 | 414 | 438 | 450 | 366 | 347 | 411 | 400 | 356 | 382 | 422 |
| **Median** | 305 | 315 | 297 | 303 | 308 | 284 | 388 | 296 | 288 | 322 | 327 |
| **Minimum** | 112 | 105 | 72 | 76 | 109 | 96 | 107 | 102 | 79 | 64 | 81 |
| **Maximum** | 1775 | 1391 | 1582 | 2162 | 1057 | 846 | 924 | 1356 | 1081 | 1350 | 1681 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 11% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Portugal:** In 2024, there was a significant increase in applications for the authorisation or renewal of residence permits, which led to a noticable decline in the Clearance Rate. As a result, the number of pending cases and the Disposition Time increased considerably.

# 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 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q91)**

| States | Variations of incoming 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations of incoming 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | NA | -11,9% | NAP | 1,5% | 4,3% | 3,7% |
| **Belgium** | NA | -9,1% | 7,1% | 6,0% | 0,4% | 9,7% |
| **Bulgaria** | 14,3% | NA | 18,1% | 11,0% | 9,1% | 0,1% |
| **Croatia** | 6,5% | -38,0% | 6,9% | 0,6% | -2,9% | -6,9% |
| **Cyprus** | -14,9% | NA | 406,3% | -26,9% | NA | -21,8% |
| **Czech Republic** | -5,5% | -27,8% | -9,7% | -5,4% | 2,0% | 2,5% |
| **Denmark** | 5,0% | 31,8% | NA | 0,6% | 0,9% | NA |
| **Estonia** | 33,6% | -3,8% | -10,8% | -3,2% | -8,7% | 9,6% |
| **Finland** | 28,8% | 30,1% | -17,8% | 9,6% | 41,8% | 8,9% |
| **France** | 18,8% | -14,6% | 71,5% | 2,8% | 2,1% | 30,4% |
| **Germany** | NA | -21,9% | -15,2% | NA | 4,6% | 10,9% |
| **Greece** | NA | -11,3% | NA | 37,7% | 49,7% | -1,9% |
| **Hungary** | -19,3% | -30,7% | 2,7% | 1,3% | 0,4% | -4,8% |
| **Ireland** | -18,8% | -16,6% | NA | 1,9% | 5,8% | NA |
| **Italy** | -18,2% | -13,4% | -17,6% | 9,1% | 8,1% | 4,3% |
| **Latvia** | 430,4% | -24,2% | -29,3% | 7,8% | 13,8% | 7,8% |
| **Lithuania** | -41,3% | -30,7% | 15,1% | 0,2% | -4,3% | -23,3% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 32,2% | 44,5% | 10,4% | -0,8% | 64,3% |
| **Malta** | NA | 56,3% | 44,5% | NA | -2,6% | 15,4% |
| **Netherlands** | -11,4% | -29,7% | 29,5% | 2,4% | NA | 15,1% |
| **Poland** | 3,1% | -14,6% | -17,5% | 0,8% | 7,0% | -1,1% |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 6,1% | 211,6% |
| **Romania** | 5,8% | 5,0% | 6,5% | 7,0% | 7,1% | 4,3% |
| **Slovak Republic** | -0,7% | -42,9% | -60,7% | -6,7% | -4,8% | -1,1% |
| **Slovenia** | -29,8% | -49,0% | -42,6% | 6,1% | 6,5% | 15,9% |
| **Spain** | 70,5% | 101,5% | -6,1% | 18,9% | 33,2% | -2,2% |
| **Sweden** | 38,7% | 15,7% | 63,9% | 8,3% | 9,0% | 9,0% |
| **Average** | 24,8% | -4,9% | 22,2% | 4,2% | 7,5% | 14,4% |
| **Median** | 4,1% | -14,0% | 4,6% | 2,6% | 4,6% | 4,3% |
| **Minimum** | -41,3% | -49,0% | -60,7% | -26,9% | -8,7% | -23,3% |
| **Maximum** | 430,4% | 101,5% | 406,3% | 37,7% | 49,7% | 211,6% |
| **% of NA** | 26% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

**Latvia**: The figures for 2014 do not include all types of non-litigious cases, since these case groups were not collected and published at that time. Consequently, the scope of the 2014 Latvian data is not fully comparable with the 2024 dataset, where all case groups are included

## Table 3.3.2: First instance courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q91)**

| States | Variations of resolved 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations of resolved 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | NA | -14,5% | NAP | 0,8% | 6,7% | -0,2% |
| **Belgium** | NA | -2,7% | 4,2% | 10,3% | 7,1% | 16,6% |
| **Bulgaria** | 10,5% | NA | 14,1% | 8,3% | 4,2% | -3,4% |
| **Croatia** | 6,1% | -38,6% | 12,3% | 7,0% | 6,0% | -3,4% |
| **Cyprus** | 20,3% | NA | 280,3% | -22,6% | NA | -44,5% |
| **Czech Republic** | -1,9% | -31,2% | 4,0% | -6,3% | 0,4% | -3,2% |
| **Denmark** | 5,9% | 27,6% | NA | 1,9% | 7,8% | NA |
| **Estonia** | 36,9% | 1,5% | -1,1% | -2,7% | 9,8% | 15,8% |
| **Finland** | 17,2% | -6,3% | -17,9% | 7,3% | 19,5% | 0,7% |
| **France** | 18,4% | -13,7% | 67,9% | 5,0% | 1,5% | 30,1% |
| **Germany** | NA | -22,2% | -16,1% | NA | 7,3% | 1,3% |
| **Greece** | NA | -36,4% | NA | 22,2% | 32,0% | -9,2% |
| **Hungary** | -21,7% | -34,3% | 10,7% | 1,3% | -0,7% | -6,3% |
| **Ireland** | -7,8% | 7,7% | NA | 4,2% | 5,2% | NA |
| **Italy** | -27,5% | -31,1% | -33,8% | -0,4% | -6,7% | 7,8% |
| **Latvia** | 413,9% | -31,1% | -51,1% | 4,1% | 1,5% | -1,8% |
| **Lithuania** | -41,1% | -29,1% | 15,5% | -1,1% | -4,6% | -34,4% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 26,9% | -7,4% | 3,7% | -0,9% | 0,6% |
| **Malta** | NA | 44,3% | -41,2% | NA | -4,2% | -10,3% |
| **Netherlands** | -10,6% | -27,6% | 21,9% | 2,4% | -3,2% | 21,6% |
| **Poland** | -1,0% | -19,0% | -12,6% | -3,3% | 5,9% | -7,6% |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 6,6% | 26,0% |
| **Romania** | -6,2% | -4,2% | -39,9% | 21,9% | 23,3% | 3,5% |
| **Slovak Republic** | -0,1% | -33,0% | -70,7% | -9,0% | -2,4% | 24,7% |
| **Slovenia** | -32,4% | -55,1% | -48,7% | 6,2% | 1,3% | 16,4% |
| **Spain** | 49,6% | 67,6% | -14,2% | 20,8% | 29,1% | 5,5% |
| **Sweden** | 33,3% | 8,8% | 58,8% | 4,8% | 10,3% | 3,3% |
| **Average** | 23,1% | -10,2% | 6,1% | 3,6% | 6,3% | 2,0% |
| **Median** | 2,9% | -16,8% | -4,2% | 3,9% | 5,6% | 0,7% |
| **Minimum** | -41,1% | -55,1% | -70,7% | -22,6% | -6,7% | -44,5% |
| **Maximum** | 413,9% | 67,6% | 280,3% | 22,2% | 32,0% | 30,1% |
| **% of NA** | **26%** | **11%** | **15%** | **11%** | **4%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **4%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.
**Latvia**: The figures for 2014 do not include all types of non-litigious cases, since these case groups were not collected and published at that time. Consequently, the scope of the 2014 Latvian data is not fully comparable with the 2024 dataset, where all case groups are included

## Table 3.3.3: First instance courts, variation of pending 31 Dec. other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q91)**

| States | Variations of pending 31 Dec. 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations of pending 31 Dec. 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | NA | -13,2% | NAP | 0,0% | 0,3% | 4,2% |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | -38,3% | 7,6% | 7,1% | 19,9% |
| **Bulgaria** | 27,6% | NA | 19,5% | 6,0% | 5,9% | 3,5% |
| **Croatia** | -24,5% | -24,8% | -29,3% | -8,8% | -7,4% | 17,5% |
| **Cyprus** | -5,6% | NA | 68,9% | -9,4% | NA | 15,2% |
| **Czech Republic** | -11,3% | -46,8% | -49,3% | -2,3% | 1,1% | -7,5% |
| **Denmark** | 7,9% | 79,6% | NA | -13,4% | 1,6% | NA |
| **Estonia** | 29,1% | 50,1% | -4,0% | 8,8% | 3,8% | -4,9% |
| **Finland** | 52,9% | 50,5% | -21,5% | 27,1% | 58,8% | 2,6% |
| **France** | 32,6% | 7,7% | 65,9% | 15,5% | 24,3% | 21,7% |
| **Germany** | NA | -8,8% | -11,2% | NA | 0,1% | 0,8% |
| **Greece** | NA | 42,0% | NA | 21,4% | 26,3% | -8,0% |
| **Hungary** | -21,7% | -36,3% | -2,4% | 1,9% | 3,1% | 2,1% |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | -28,3% | -24,4% | -67,5% | 6,8% | 6,5% | -12,5% |
| **Latvia** | 17,2% | -34,0% | -33,8% | 33,0% | 21,9% | 0,7% |
| **Lithuania** | -23,4% | -7,6% | -48,0% | 4,6% | 0,8% | 42,7% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 209,6% | NA | 21,6% | 12,5% | 51,2% |
| **Malta** | NA | 32,1% | -29,9% | NA | 3,6% | 11,7% |
| **Netherlands** | -21,3% | -31,8% | 75,2% | 0,3% | NA | 12,3% |
| **Poland** | 87,0% | 43,7% | -16,1% | 8,7% | 6,7% | -5,3% |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 5,0% | 81,7% |
| **Romania** | 21,7% | 18,4% | 37,9% | 2,9% | 1,7% | 9,8% |
| **Slovak Republic** | -68,0% | -80,7% | -36,5% | -10,7% | -14,6% | 3,2% |
| **Slovenia** | -65,5% | -41,0% | 162,2% | 0,1% | 4,3% | 5,9% |
| **Spain** | 100,4% | 123,1% | -8,4% | 16,4% | 22,9% | -1,6% |
| **Sweden** | 6,6% | 4,3% | 13,7% | 3,0% | 5,8% | 1,6% |
| **Average** | 6,0% | 14,2% | 2,2% | 6,1% | 8,4% | 10,7% |
| **Median** | 6,6% | -1,6% | -11,2% | 4,6% | 4,6% | 3,5% |
| **Minimum** | -68,0% | -80,7% | -67,5% | -13,4% | -14,6% | -12,5% |
| **Maximum** | 100,4% | 209,6% | 162,2% | 33,0% | 58,8% | 81,7% |
| **% of NA** | **30%** | **19%** | **19%** | **15%** | **11%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **4%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

**Luxembourg:** The 2018 legislation on civil matters, including divorce, explains significant variations in case data between 2013 and 2023. The introduction of the Family Affairs Judge (JAF) on 1 November 2018, reclassified cases and simplified access to justice, increasing case volumes. Faster procedures also led to more frequent demands for modifications of decisions.

## Table 3.3.4: First instance courts, variation of Clearance Rate of other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percent points (Q91)**

| States | Variations of Clearence Rate 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations of Clearence Rate 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | NA | -3,08 | NAP | -0,67 | 2,27 | -3,80 |
| **Belgium** | NA | 6,90 | -2,39 | 3,95 | 6,55 | 5,05 |
| **Bulgaria** | -3,37 | NA | -3,40 | -2,53 | -4,58 | -3,55 |
| **Croatia** | -0,39 | -1,01 | 4,33 | 6,14 | 9,40 | 3,18 |
| **Cyprus** | 36,50 | NA | -25,75 | 6,91 | NA | -31,93 |
| **Czech Republic** | 3,72 | -5,02 | 13,78 | -1,00 | -1,57 | -6,14 |
| **Denmark** | 0,82 | -3,30 | NA | 1,25 | 6,31 | NA |
| **Estonia** | 2,44 | 5,74 | 9,85 | 0,48 | 18,50 | 5,37 |
| **Finland** | -9,15 | -29,29 | -0,05 | -2,04 | -14,02 | -7,89 |
| **France** | -0,38 | 1,03 | -1,98 | 1,96 | -0,56 | -0,20 |
| **Germany** | NA | -0,30 | -1,10 | NA | 2,51 | -9,44 |
| **Greece** | NA | -32,04 | NA | -11,06 | -10,83 | -9,01 |
| **Hungary** | -3,06 | -5,46 | 7,11 | 0,00 | -1,15 | -1,62 |
| **Ireland** | 9,86 | 16,21 | NA | 1,84 | -0,40 | NA |
| **Italy** | -12,44 | -24,32 | -30,57 | -9,33 | -15,05 | 4,01 |
| **Latvia** | -3,11 | -8,93 | -44,48 | -3,41 | -10,87 | -9,66 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,36 | 2,26 | 0,32 | -1,29 | -0,34 | -15,08 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | -3,86 | -33,57 | -5,78 | -0,08 | -37,99 |
| **Malta** | NA | -7,80 | -88,27 | NA | -1,59 | -17,39 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,84 | 2,86 | -5,78 | 0,04 | NA | 5,01 |
| **Poland** | -4,08 | -5,15 | 5,79 | -4,19 | -0,94 | -7,22 |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,43 | -71,33 |
| **Romania** | -12,58 | -9,48 | -70,15 | 12,04 | 13,00 | -0,70 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,57 | 15,88 | -31,70 | -2,58 | 2,60 | 19,28 |
| **Slovenia** | -3,83 | -12,99 | -10,89 | 0,09 | -4,94 | 0,43 |
| **Spain** | -12,35 | -16,47 | -9,73 | 1,39 | -2,60 | 7,50 |
| **Sweden** | -3,96 | -6,17 | -3,19 | -3,26 | 1,18 | -5,49 |
| **Average** | -0,68 | -5,16 | -14,63 | -0,46 | -0,27 | -7,54 |
| **Median** | -1,72 | -4,44 | -3,29 | -0,33 | -0,40 | -3,80 |
| **Minimum** | -12,58 | -32,04 | -88,27 | -11,06 | -15,05 | -71,33 |
| **Maximum** | 36,50 | 16,21 | 13,78 | 12,04 | 18,50 | 19,28 |
| **% of NA** | **26%** | **11%** | **15%** | **11%** | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **4%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

**Luxembourg:** The 2018 legislation on civil matters, including divorce, explains significant variations in case data between 2013 and 2023. The introduction of the Family Affairs Judge (JAF) on 1 November 2018, reclassified cases and simplified access to justice, increasing case volumes. Faster procedures also led to more frequent demands for modifications of decisions.

## Table 3.3.5: First instance courts, variation of Disposition time of other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q91)**

| States | Variations of Disposition Time 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations f Disposition Time 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | NA | 1,6% | NAP | -0,8% | -6,0% | 4,5% |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | -40,8% | -2,4% | 0,0% | 2,8% |
| **Bulgaria** | 15,5% | NA | 4,7% | -2,1% | 1,6% | 7,2% |
| **Croatia** | -28,9% | 22,5% | -37,0% | -14,8% | -12,6% | 21,7% |
| **Cyprus** | -21,5% | NA | -55,6% | 17,1% | NA | 107,7% |
| **Czech Republic** | -9,6% | -22,7% | -51,3% | 4,2% | 0,7% | -4,4% |
| **Denmark** | 1,9% | 40,8% | NA | -15,0% | -5,7% | NA |
| **Estonia** | -5,7% | 47,9% | -2,9% | 11,8% | -5,4% | -17,8% |
| **Finland** | 30,4% | 60,6% | -4,3% | 18,5% | 32,9% | 1,9% |
| **France** | 12,0% | 24,7% | -1,2% | 10,1% | 22,4% | -6,4% |
| **Germany** | NA | 17,1% | 5,9% | NA | -6,7% | -0,5% |
| **Greece** | NA | 123,5% | NA | -0,7% | -4,3% | 1,3% |
| **Hungary** | -0,1% | -3,0% | -11,8% | 0,5% | 3,8% | 9,0% |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | -1,0% | 9,7% | -50,9% | 7,3% | 14,2% | -18,8% |
| **Latvia** | -77,2% | -4,2% | 35,4% | 27,7% | 20,1% | 2,5% |
| **Lithuania** | 30,1% | 30,3% | -54,9% | 5,8% | 5,7% | 117,4% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 143,8% | NA | 17,2% | 13,5% | 50,3% |
| **Malta** | NA | -8,4% | 19,4% | NA | 8,2% | 24,5% |
| **Netherlands** | -11,9% | -5,7% | 43,7% | -2,1% | NA | -7,6% |
| **Poland** | 89,0% | 77,6% | -4,1% | 12,4% | 0,8% | 2,4% |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | -1,5% | 44,2% |
| **Romania** | 29,7% | 23,5% | 129,4% | -15,6% | -17,5% | 6,1% |
| **Slovak Republic** | -67,9% | -71,2% | 116,7% | -2,0% | -12,5% | -17,2% |
| **Slovenia** | -48,9% | 31,4% | 410,8% | -5,7% | 3,0% | -9,1% |
| **Spain** | 33,9% | 33,1% | 6,8% | -3,7% | -4,8% | -6,8% |
| **Sweden** | -20,0% | -4,1% | -28,4% | -1,7% | -4,1% | -1,6% |
| **Average** | -2,7% | 25,8% | 20,4% | 2,9% | 1,9% | 12,5% |
| **Median** | -1,0% | 23,0% | -2,9% | -0,7% | 0,4% | 2,4% |
| **Minimum** | -77,2% | -71,2% | -55,6% | -15,6% | -17,5% | -18,8% |
| **Maximum** | 89,0% | 143,8% | 410,8% | 27,7% | 32,9% | 117,4% |
| **% of NA** | **30%** | **19%** | **19%** | **15%** | **11%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **4%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** |

**Greece:** The variations are due to the judicial map reform in 2024 and the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts which cases that were not reported before, have been redistributed between first instance courts.

**Luxembourg:** The 2018 legislation on civil matters, including divorce, explains significant variations in case data between 2013 and 2023. The introduction of the Family Affairs Judge (JAF) on 1 November 2018, reclassified cases and simplified access to justice, increasing case volumes. Faster procedures also led to more frequent demands for modifications of decisions.

# Second instance other than criminal cases by case category and by case status

## Table 3.4.1.1a: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2024

### 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** | **5 393** | **3 679** | 1 714 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **NAP** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **42 298** | **42 298** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **17 247** | **14 878** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **2 369** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **28 260** | **19 638** | 5 873 | 4 861 | 957 | 953 | 4 | NAP | 55 | **2 749** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **3 785** | **2 729** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **1 056** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **8 636** | **8 636** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 0 |
| **Denmark** | **2 772** | **2 772** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **1 711** | **740** | 311 | 311 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **660** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **1 236** | **1 049** | 187 | 187 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **France** | **264 934** | **227 460** | 1 713 | 1 713 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **28 323** | 7 438 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **97 391** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **47 611** | 16 877 |
| **Greece** | **51 547** | **18 159** | 248 | 214 | 26 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 8 | **33 086** | 54 |
| **Hungary** | **6 702** | **2 684** | 2 839 | 2 747 | 73 | NAP | 60 | 13 | 19 | **815** | 364 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **224 576** | **221 211** | 3 365 | 3 365 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **1 751** | **1 127** | 19 | 10 | 9 | 9 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **605** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **3 740** | **1 702** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **1 907** | 131 |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **1 604** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **196** | NA |
| **Malta** | **1 527** | **1 527** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **23 144** | **8 974** | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **14 170** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **140 939** | **109 891** | 6 729 | 6 567 | 162 | NAP | 162 | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 24 319 |
| **Portugal** | **17 003** | **4 541** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **12 462** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **96 127** | **94 879** | 1 248 | 308 | 940 | 940 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **9 794** | **7 970** | 1 824 | 1 824 | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **2 132** | **1 607** | 525 | 497 | 28 | 23 | 5 | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **205 001** | **177 608** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **27 393** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **10 884** | **913** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **7 185** | 2 786 |
| **Average** | **48 797** | **41 372** | 1 900 | 1 739 | 314 | 390 | 46 | 7 | 27 | **12 039** | 6 496 |
| **Median** | **10 339** | **6 256** | 1 481 | 497 | 73 | 26 | 5 | 7 | 19 | **2 749** | 1 575 |
| **Minimum** | **1 236** | **740** | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | **196** | 0 |
| **Maximum** | **264 934** | **227 460** | 6 729 | 6 567 | 957 | 953 | 162 | 13 | 55 | **47 611** | 24 319 |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **4%** | 19% | 22% | 19% | *15%* | *19%* | *15%* | 22% | **11%** | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 30% | 30% | 56% | *67%* | *63%* | *78%* | 67% | **33%** | 59% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established as a separate institution. It acts as second instance court in the administrative cases. It took over all the administrative law cases of the Supreme Court.

## Table 3.4.1.1b: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2024

### 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** | **0,36** | **0,36** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **0,27** | **0,23** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,04** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **0,73** | **0,51** | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | **0,07** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0,39** | **0,28** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,11** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,08** | **0,08** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 0,00 |
| **Denmark** | **0,05** | **0,05** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0,12** | **0,05** | 0,02 | 0,02 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,05** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **0,02** | **0,02** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **France** | **0,39** | **0,33** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,04** | 0,01 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **0,12** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,06** | 0,02 |
| **Greece** | **0,50** | **0,17** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,32** | 0,00 |
| **Hungary** | **0,07** | **0,03** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 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** | **0,38** | **0,38** | 0,01 | 0,01 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **0,09** | **0,06** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,03** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **0,13** | **0,06** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **0,07** | 0,00 |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **0,24** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **0,03** | NA |
| **Malta** | **0,27** | **0,27** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **0,13** | **0,05** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,08** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **0,38** | **0,29** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 0,06 |
| **Portugal** | **0,16** | **0,04** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,12** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **0,50** | **0,50** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,18** | **0,15** | 0,03 | 0,03 | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **0,10** | **0,08** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **0,42** | **0,36** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,06** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,10** | **0,01** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,07** | 0,03 |
| **Average** | **0,24** | **0,18** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,08** | 0,02 |
| **Median** | **0,17** | **0,13** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,06** | 0,01 |
| **Minimum** | **0,02** | **0,01** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,01** | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | **0,73** | **0,51** | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,32** | 0,06 |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **4%** | 19% | 22% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 22% | **11%** | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 30% | 30% | 56% | 67% | 63% | 78% | 67% | **33%** | 59% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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 3.4.1.2a: Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2024

### 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** | **24 346** | **14 146** | 10 200 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **NAP** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **21 116** | **21 116** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **52 247** | **39 712** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **12 535** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **51 109** | **30 180** | 15 735 | 13 587 | 2 024 | 1 899 | 125 | NAP | 124 | **5 194** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **834** | **579** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **255** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **60 991** | **60 991** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 0 |
| **Denmark** | **5 719** | **5 719** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **4 531** | **1 469** | 1 231 | 1 231 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 831** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **2 538** | **1 726** | 812 | 812 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **France** | **225 314** | **155 336** | 1 558 | 1 558 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **31 522** | 36 898 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **73 594** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **35 331** | 32 032 |
| **Greece** | **33 929** | **15 665** | 303 | 252 | 27 | 24 | 3 | 0 | 24 | **17 837** | 124 |
| **Hungary** | **31 840** | **8 246** | 19 687 | 18 899 | 598 | NAP | 496 | 102 | 190 | **2 026** | 1 881 |
| **Ireland** | **1 602** | **1 602** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **92 169** | **88 446** | 3 723 | 3 723 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **3 573** | **2 662** | 122 | 65 | 57 | 57 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **789** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **12 607** | **8 085** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **3 122** | 1 400 |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **1 217** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **230** | NA |
| **Malta** | **1 053** | **1 053** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **21 424** | **9 389** | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **12 035** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **244 526** | **192 563** | 21 885 | 21 598 | 287 | NAP | 287 | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 30 078 |
| **Portugal** | **25 572** | **20 227** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **5 345** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **163 940** | **161 709** | 2 231 | 1 040 | 1 191 | 1 191 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **19 880** | **13 371** | 6 509 | 6 509 | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **10 072** | **6 090** | 3 982 | 3 699 | 283 | 229 | 54 | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **261 142** | **232 637** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **28 505** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **62 217** | **3 173** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **38 411** | 20 633 |
| **Average** | **57 372** | **43 359** | 6 284 | 5 613 | 638 | 680 | 193 | 51 | 113 | **12 998** | 15 381 |
| **Median** | **24 346** | **13 371** | 2 977 | 1 558 | 287 | 229 | 125 | 51 | 124 | **5 345** | 11 257 |
| **Minimum** | **834** | **579** | 0 | 0 | 27 | 24 | 3 | 0 | 24 | **230** | 0 |
| **Maximum** | **261 142** | **232 637** | 21 885 | 21 598 | 2 024 | 1 899 | 496 | 102 | 190 | **38 411** | 36 898 |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **0%** | 19% | 22% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 22% | **11%** | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 30% | 30% | 56% | 67% | 63% | 78% | 67% | **33%** | 59% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.1.2b: Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming cases in 2024

### 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** | 0,11 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Belgium** | **0,18** | **0,18** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **0,81** | **0,62** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,19** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **1,32** | **0,78** | 0,41 | 0,35 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | **0,13** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0,09** | **0,06** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,03** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,56** | **0,56** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,00 |
| **Denmark** | **0,10** | **0,10** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0,33** | **0,11** | 0,09 | 0,09 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,13** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **0,05** | **0,03** | 0,01 | 0,01 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | **0,33** | **0,23** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,05** | 0,05 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **0,09** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,04** | 0,04 |
| **Greece** | **0,33** | **0,15** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,17** | 0,00 |
| **Hungary** | **0,33** | **0,09** | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,01 | NAP | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,02** | 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** | **0,19** | **0,14** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,04** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **0,44** | **0,28** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **0,11** | 0,05 |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **0,18** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **0,03** | NA |
| **Malta** | **0,18** | **0,18** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **0,12** | **0,05** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,07** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **0,65** | **0,51** | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,08 |
| **Portugal** | **0,24** | **0,19** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,05** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **0,86** | **0,85** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,37** | **0,25** | 0,12 | 0,12 | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **0,47** | **0,29** | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | **0,53** | **0,47** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,06** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,59** | **0,03** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,36** | 0,19 |
| **Average** | **0,38** | **0,25** | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,10** | **0,05** |
| **Median** | **0,33** | **0,18** | 0,04 | 0,01 | 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 | **0,02** | **0,00** |
| **Maximum** | **1,32** | **0,85** | 0,41 | 0,35 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,36** | **0,19** |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **0%** | 19% | 22% | 19% | *15%* | *19%* | *15%* | 22% | **11%** | **11%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 30% | 30% | 56% | *67%* | *63%* | *78%* | 67% | **33%** | **59%** |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.1.3a: Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved cases in 2024

### 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** | **24 641** | **14 484** | 10 157 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Belgium** | **24 380** | **24 380** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **50 982** | **39 235** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **11 747** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **48 340** | **28 126** | 15 218 | 13 310 | 1 804 | 1 684 | 120 | NAP | 104 | **4 996** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **1 234** | **674** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **560** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **57 156** | **57 156** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 |
| **Denmark** | **5 524** | **5 524** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **4 319** | **1 528** | 1 134 | 1 134 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 657** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **2 564** | **1 788** | 776 | 776 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | **226 118** | **156 582** | 1 596 | 1 596 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **31 025** | 36 915 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **92 980** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **36 121** | 33 427 |
| **Greece** | **29 815** | **11 971** | 353 | 304 | 22 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 27 | **17 393** | 98 |
| **Hungary** | **32 046** | **8 359** | 19 923 | 19 150 | 579 | NAP | 480 | 99 | 194 | **2 069** | 1 695 |
| **Ireland** | **1 273** | **1 273** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | **111 749** | **107 071** | 4 678 | 4 678 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **3 749** | **2 784** | 127 | 70 | 57 | 57 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **838** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **11 936** | **7 985** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **2 567** | 1 384 |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **1 154** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **264** | NA |
| **Malta** | **1 344** | **1 344** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **23 454** | **10 062** | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **13 392** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **212 653** | **157 872** | 20 905 | 20 612 | 293 | NAP | 293 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 33 876 |
| **Portugal** | **24 309** | **19 700** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **4 609** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **164 242** | **161 940** | 2 302 | 1 193 | 1 109 | 1 109 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **21 158** | **13 963** | 7 195 | 7 195 | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **9 847** | **5 941** | 3 906 | 3 619 | 287 | 229 | 58 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | **207 511** | **181 887** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **25 624** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **62 252** | **3 311** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **37 830** | 21 111 |
| **Average** | **54 504** | **41 447** | 6 305 | 5 664 | 593 | *620* | *191* | *50* | 108 | **12 713** | 16 063 |
| **Median** | **24 380** | **11 971** | 3 104 | 1 596 | 293 | *229* | *120* | *50* | 104 | **4 996** | 11 403 |
| **Minimum** | **1 234** | **674** | 0 | 0 | 22 | *19* | *3* | *0* | 27 | **264** | 0 |
| **Maximum** | **226 118** | **181 887** | 20 905 | 20 612 | 1 804 | *1 684* | *480* | *99* | 194 | **37 830** | 36 915 |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **0%** | 19% | 22% | 19% | *15%* | *19%* | *15%* | 22% | **11%** | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 30% | 30% | 56% | *67%* | *63%* | *78%* | 67% | **33%** | 59% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.1.3b: Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved cases per 100 inhabitants in 2024

### 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** | **0,16** | 0,11 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Belgium** | **0,21** | **0,21** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **0,79** | **0,61** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,18** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **1,25** | **0,73** | 0,39 | 0,34 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | **0,13** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0,13** | **0,07** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,06** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,52** | **0,52** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,00 |
| **Denmark** | **0,09** | **0,09** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0,31** | **0,11** | 0,08 | 0,08 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,12** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **0,05** | **0,03** | 0,01 | 0,01 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | **0,33** | **0,23** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,05** | 0,05 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **0,11** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,04** | 0,04 |
| **Greece** | **0,29** | **0,12** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,17** | 0,00 |
| **Hungary** | **0,34** | **0,09** | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,01 | NAP | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,02** | 0,02 |
| **Ireland** | **0,02** | **0,02** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | **0,19** | **0,18** | 0,01 | 0,01 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **0,20** | **0,15** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,05** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **0,41** | **0,28** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **0,09** | 0,05 |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **0,17** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **0,04** | NA |
| **Malta** | **0,23** | **0,23** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **0,13** | **0,06** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,07** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **0,57** | **0,42** | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,09 |
| **Portugal** | **0,23** | **0,18** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,04** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **0,86** | **0,85** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,39** | **0,26** | 0,13 | 0,13 | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **0,46** | **0,28** | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | **0,42** | **0,37** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,05** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,59** | **0,03** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,36** | 0,20 |
| **Average** | **0,37** | **0,24** | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,01 | *0,01* | *0,00* | *0,00* | 0,00 | **0,10** | **0,06** |
| **Median** | **0,31** | **0,18** | 0,03 | 0,01 | 0,01 | *0,01* | *0,00* | *0,00* | 0,00 | **0,06** | **0,04** |
| **Minimum** | **0,02** | **0,02** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | *0,00* | *0,00* | *0,00* | 0,00 | **0,02** | **0,00** |
| **Maximum** | **1,25** | **0,85** | 0,39 | 0,34 | 0,05 | *0,04* | *0,01* | *0,00* | 0,00 | **0,36** | **0,20** |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **0%** | 19% | 22% | 19% | *15%* | *19%* | *15%* | 22% | **11%** | **11%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 30% | 30% | 56% | *67%* | *63%* | *78%* | 67% | **33%** | **59%** |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.1.4a: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024

### 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** | **5 098** | **3 341** | 1 757 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | **NA** |
| **Belgium** | **39 034** | **39 034** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **18 512** | **15 355** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **3 157** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **31 029** | **21 692** | 6 390 | 5 138 | 1 177 | 1 168 | 9 | NAP | 75 | **2 947** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **3 385** | **2 634** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **751** | **NA** |
| **Czech Republic** | **12 471** | **12 471** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0** |
| **Denmark** | **2 967** | **2 967** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **1 913** | **681** | 428 | 428 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **834** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **1 210** | **987** | 223 | 223 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | **264 130** | **226 214** | 1 675 | 1 675 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **28 820** | **7 421** |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **78 001** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **46 889** | **15 506** |
| **Greece** | **55 661** | **21 853** | 198 | 162 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 5 | **33 530** | **80** |
| **Hungary** | **6 496** | **2 571** | 2 603 | 2 496 | 92 | NAP | 76 | 16 | 15 | **772** | **550** |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **204 996** | **202 586** | 2 410 | 2 410 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **1 575** | **1 005** | 14 | 5 | 9 | 9 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **556** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **4 411** | **1 802** | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **2 462** | **147** |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **1 667** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **162** | **NA** |
| **Malta** | **1 185** | **1 185** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **21 114** | **8 301** | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **12 813** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **172 812** | **144 582** | 7 709 | 7 553 | 156 | NAP | 156 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **20 521** |
| **Portugal** | **18 266** | **5 068** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **13 198** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **95 825** | **94 648** | 1 177 | 155 | 1 022 | 1 022 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **8 516** | **7 378** | 1 138 | 1 138 | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **2 357** | **1 756** | 601 | 577 | 24 | 23 | 1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | **258 644** | **228 605** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **30 039** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **10 849** | **775** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **7 766** | **2 308** |
| **Average** | **51 769** | **43 352** | 1 880 | 1 689 | 359 | 451 | 48 | 8 | 32 | **12 313** | **5 817** |
| **Median** | **11 660** | **6 223** | 1 158 | 577 | 92 | 31 | 9 | 8 | 15 | **3 157** | **1 429** |
| **Minimum** | **1 185** | **681** | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 5 | **162** | **0** |
| **Maximum** | **264 130** | **228 605** | 7 709 | 7 553 | 1 177 | 1 168 | 156 | 16 | 75 | **46 889** | **20 521** |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **4%** | 19% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 22% | **11%** | **11%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 30% | 33% | 56% | 67% | 63% | 78% | 67% | **33%** | **59%** |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.1.4b: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024

### 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** | **0,33** | **0,33** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **0,29** | **0,24** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,05** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **0,80** | **0,56** | 0,17 | 0,13 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | **0,08** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0,35** | **0,27** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,08** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,11** | **0,11** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,00 |
| **Denmark** | **0,05** | **0,05** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0,14** | **0,05** | 0,03 | 0,03 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,06** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **0,02** | **0,02** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | **0,38** | **0,33** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,04** | 0,01 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **0,09** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,06** | 0,02 |
| **Greece** | **0,54** | **0,21** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,32** | 0,00 |
| **Hungary** | **0,07** | **0,03** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,01** | 0,01 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | **0,35** | **0,34** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **0,08** | **0,05** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,03** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **0,15** | **0,06** | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **0,09** | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **0,24** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **0,02** | NA |
| **Malta** | **0,21** | **0,21** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **0,12** | **0,05** | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,07** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **0,46** | **0,38** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,00 | NAP | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,05 |
| **Portugal** | **0,17** | **0,05** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,12** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **0,50** | **0,50** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,16** | **0,14** | 0,02 | 0,02 | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **0,11** | **0,08** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | **0,53** | **0,47** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,06** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,10** | **0,01** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,07** | 0,02 |
| **Average** | **0,25** | **0,19** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,08** | **0,01** |
| **Median** | **0,16** | **0,13** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,06** | **0,01** |
| **Minimum** | **0,02** | **0,01** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,01** | **0,00** |
| **Maximum** | **0,80** | **0,56** | 0,17 | 0,13 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | **0,32** | **0,05** |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **4%** | 19% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 22% | **11%** | **11%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 30% | 33% | 56% | 67% | 63% | 78% | 67% | **33%** | **59%** |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.1.5: Second instance civil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - pending more than 2 years in 2024

**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** | 16 413 | 42,0% | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 2 110 | 9,7% | 40 | 1,4% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 10 | 1,5% | 19 | 2,3% |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | NA | NA | 1 356 | 4,7% |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | 1 144 | 5,2% | 19 627 | 58,5% |
| **Hungary** | 7 | 0,3% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 88 522 | 43,7% | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | 38 | 3,8% | 22 | 4,0% |
| **Lithuania** | 9 | 0,5% | 33 | 1,3% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | 1 372 | 115,8% | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 718 | 8,6% | 854 | 6,7% |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 1 837 | 1,9% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 292 | 4,0% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | 6 | 0,3% | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 22 | 2,8% | 66 | 0,8% |
| **Average** | **7 500** | **16,0%** | **2 446** | **8,9%** |
| **Median** | **292** | **3,8%** | **40** | **2,3%** |
| **Minimum** | **1** | **0,0%** | **0** | **0,0%** |
| **Maximum** | **88 522** | **115,8%** | **19 627** | **58,5%** |
| **% of NA** | **44%** | **44%** | **33%** | **33%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | **33%** | **33%** |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: n 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

# Evolution of second instance other than criminal cases

## Table 3.4.2.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,39 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,36 | 0,36 |
| Bulgaria | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,20 | 0,23 | 0,27 | 0,30 | 0,27 | 0,27 |
| Croatia | 2,13 | 1,94 | 1,76 | 1,56 | 1,35 | 1,16 | 0,97 | 0,76 | 0,71 | 0,76 | 0,73 |
| Cyprus | 0,29 | 0,34 | 0,38 | 0,45 | 0,48 | 0,47 | 0,49 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,39 | 0,39 |
| Czech Republic | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 |
| Denmark | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| Estonia | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| Finland | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| France | 0,44 | 0,44 | 0,46 | 0,47 | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,44 | 0,43 | 0,42 | 0,40 | 0,39 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,45 | 0,43 | 0,46 | 0,50 |
| Hungary | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,72 | 0,70 | 0,66 | 0,64 | 0,60 | 0,56 | 0,52 | 0,50 | 0,46 | 0,42 | 0,38 |
| Latvia | 0,22 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 |
| Lithuania | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,27 | 0,28 | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,26 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,15 | 0,13 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 0,42 | 0,43 | NA | 0,40 | 0,38 | 0,40 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,27 |
| Netherlands | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | NA | NA | NA | 0,14 | 0,13 |
| Poland | 0,20 | - | 0,22 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,27 | 0,34 | 0,32 | 0,26 | 0,29 | 0,38 |
| Portugal | 0,05 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,16 |
| Romania | 0,14 | 0,39 | 0,47 | 0,40 | 0,43 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,41 | 0,45 | 0,52 | 0,50 |
| Slovak Republic | 0,48 | 0,68 | 0,57 | 0,40 | 0,35 | 0,32 | 0,25 | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Slovenia | 0,30 | 0,23 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,10 |
| Spain | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,24 | 0,29 | 0,35 | 0,30 | 0,36 | 0,40 | 0,42 |
| Sweden | 0,11 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,10 | 0,13 | 0,15 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,10 | 0,10 |
| Average | 0,32 | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,28 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 |
| Median | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,23 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,17 | 0,17 |
| Minimum | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Maximum | 2,13 | 1,94 | 1,76 | 1,56 | 1,35 | 1,16 | 0,97 | 0,76 | 0,71 | 0,76 | 0,73 |
| % of NA | 19% | 15% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.2.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Belgium** | NA | 0,39 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,36 | 0,36 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,24 | 0,23 |
| **Croatia** | 1,41 | 1,48 | 1,45 | 1,27 | 1,05 | 0,86 | 0,70 | 0,50 | NA | NA | 0,51 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,41 | 0,40 | NA | 0,28 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 |
| **Denmark** | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| **Estonia** | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| **Finland** | NA | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **France** | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,40 | 0,41 | 0,40 | 0,39 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,33 |
| **Germany** | 0,08 | NA | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| **Greece** | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,40 | 0,36 | 0,39 | NA | 0,15 | 0,10 | 0,14 | 0,17 |
| **Hungary** | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,72 | 0,69 | 0,65 | 0,63 | 0,59 | 0,56 | 0,51 | 0,49 | 0,45 | 0,41 | 0,38 |
| **Latvia** | 0,12 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,35 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,30 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,24 |
| **Malta** | 0,42 | 0,43 | 0,44 | 0,40 | 0,38 | 0,40 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,27 |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,05 |
| **Poland** | 0,08 | - | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,20 | 0,29 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 |
| **Romania** | 0,13 | 0,39 | 0,46 | 0,40 | 0,42 | 0,37 | 0,37 | 0,40 | 0,44 | 0,51 | 0,50 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | 0,43 | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,25 | 0,21 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,15 | 0,15 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,19 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,07 | 0,08 |
| **Spain** | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,19 | 0,24 | 0,27 | 0,22 | 0,28 | 0,34 | 0,36 |
| **Sweden** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Average** | 0,27 | 0,28 | 0,27 | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,18 |
| **Median** | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,12 | 0,13 |
| **Minimum** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Maximum** | 1,41 | 1,48 | 1,45 | 1,27 | 1,05 | 0,86 | 0,70 | 0,50 | 0,45 | 0,51 | 0,51 |
| **% of NA** | 33% | 26% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.2.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,055 | 0,045 | 0,041 | 0,038 | 0,036 | 0,035 | 0,033 | 0,033 | 0,035 | 0,030 | 0,037 |
| **Croatia** | 0,191 | 0,037 | 0,017 | 0,034 | 0,047 | 0,068 | 0,082 | 0,074 | 0,055 | 0,068 | 0,071 |
| **Cyprus** | 0,093 | 0,103 | 0,104 | 0,112 | 0,104 | 0,106 | 0,108 | 0,119 | 0,127 | 0,103 | 0,109 |
| **Czech Republic** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,049 | 0,049 | 0,054 | 0,047 | 0,035 | 0,024 | 0,022 | 0,026 | 0,034 | 0,039 | 0,048 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 0,041 | 0,041 | 0,042 | 0,043 | 0,043 | 0,044 | 0,046 | 0,045 | 0,045 | 0,042 | 0,041 |
| **Germany** | 0,069 | NA | 0,061 | 0,063 | 0,065 | 0,069 | 0,070 | 0,066 | 0,064 | 0,060 | 0,057 |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,437 | 0,403 | 0,393 | 0,339 | NA | 0,266 | 0,299 | 0,327 | 0,323 | 0,318 |
| **Hungary** | 0,004 | 0,005 | 0,004 | 0,005 | 0,005 | 0,006 | 0,004 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,005 | 0,009 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | 0,099 | 0,095 | 0,073 | 0,050 | 0,034 | 0,026 | 0,035 | 0,025 | 0,029 | 0,029 | 0,033 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,057 | 0,070 | 0,110 | 0,121 | 0,132 | 0,139 | 0,137 | 0,111 | 0,101 | 0,084 | 0,066 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,030 | 0,030 | 0,027 | 0,025 | 0,026 | 0,025 | 0,026 | 0,037 | 0,028 | 0,026 | 0,029 |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 0,085 | 0,084 | 0,088 | 0,085 | 0,085 | 0,080 | NA | NA | NA | 0,084 | 0,079 |
| **Poland** | 0,050 | - | 0,067 | 0,072 | 0,069 | 0,072 | 0,074 | 0,070 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,061 | 0,059 | 0,063 | 0,073 | 0,084 | 0,088 | 0,091 | 0,095 | 0,103 | 0,116 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,039 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | 0,049 | 0,045 | 0,046 | 0,045 | 0,045 | 0,049 | 0,073 | 0,076 | 0,078 | 0,061 | 0,056 |
| **Sweden** | 0,085 | 0,110 | 0,124 | 0,133 | 0,076 | 0,108 | 0,120 | 0,081 | 0,091 | 0,072 | 0,068 |
| **Average** | 0,064 | 0,081 | 0,078 | 0,078 | 0,071 | 0,058 | 0,074 | 0,072 | 0,077 | 0,075 | 0,076 |
| **Median** | 0,055 | 0,049 | 0,059 | 0,050 | 0,047 | 0,059 | 0,071 | 0,068 | 0,055 | 0,061 | 0,057 |
| **Minimum** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,005 | 0,009 |
| **Maximum** | 0,191 | 0,437 | 0,403 | 0,393 | 0,339 | 0,139 | 0,266 | 0,299 | 0,327 | 0,323 | 0,318 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 33% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: n 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.3.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,26 | 0,28 | 0,26 | 0,28 | 0,26 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Bulgaria | 0,89 | 0,84 | 0,84 | 0,83 | 0,82 | 0,86 | 0,82 | 0,81 | 0,78 | 0,80 | 0,81 |
| Croatia | 2,08 | 1,99 | 1,91 | 1,66 | 1,60 | 1,53 | 1,43 | 1,59 | 1,47 | 1,22 | 1,32 |
| Cyprus | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,05 | 0,09 |
| Czech Republic | 0,90 | 0,81 | 0,80 | 0,65 | 0,60 | 0,56 | 0,50 | 0,48 | 0,48 | 0,44 | 0,56 |
| Denmark | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| Estonia | 0,35 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,32 | 0,29 | 0,31 | 0,34 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,33 |
| Finland | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| France | 0,43 | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,41 | 0,39 | 0,39 | 0,30 | 0,36 | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,33 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,27 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,33 |
| Hungary | 0,53 | 0,48 | 0,52 | 0,50 | 0,49 | 0,41 | 0,34 | 0,35 | 0,32 | 0,34 | 0,33 |
| Ireland | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Italy | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,16 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,16 |
| Latvia | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,29 | 0,28 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,22 | 0,19 |
| Lithuania | 0,81 | 0,88 | 0,81 | 0,74 | 0,66 | 0,61 | 0,56 | 0,59 | 0,53 | 0,43 | 0,44 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 0,18 | 0,17 | NA | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,14 | 0,11 | 0,16 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,18 |
| Netherlands | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| Poland | 0,59 | - | 0,61 | 0,60 | 0,59 | 0,63 | 0,47 | 0,55 | 0,48 | 0,56 | 0,65 |
| Portugal | 0,18 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,19 | 0,22 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,24 |
| Romania | 0,64 | 0,99 | 1,04 | 1,05 | 1,02 | 0,98 | 0,88 | 1,04 | 0,99 | 0,88 | 0,86 |
| Slovak Republic | 1,62 | 1,62 | 1,25 | 0,86 | 0,78 | 0,63 | 0,50 | 0,43 | 0,46 | 0,42 | 0,37 |
| Slovenia | 1,08 | 1,00 | 0,90 | 0,80 | 0,71 | 0,64 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,50 | 0,48 | 0,47 |
| Spain | 0,33 | 0,36 | 0,40 | 0,41 | 0,44 | 0,47 | 0,37 | 0,50 | 0,49 | 0,42 | 0,53 |
| Sweden | 0,43 | 0,41 | 0,51 | 0,56 | 0,62 | 0,62 | 0,60 | 0,58 | 0,53 | 0,56 | 0,59 |
| Average | 0,54 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,47 | 0,45 | 0,43 | 0,38 | 0,40 | 0,39 | 0,36 | 0,38 |
| Median | 0,38 | 0,36 | 0,40 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,30 | 0,34 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,33 |
| Minimum | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Maximum | 2,08 | 1,99 | 1,91 | 1,66 | 1,60 | 1,53 | 1,43 | 1,59 | 1,47 | 1,22 | 1,32 |
| % of NA | 15% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.3.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - incoming 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,14 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,15 |
| Belgium | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,60 | 0,62 |
| Croatia | 1,24 | 1,25 | 1,20 | 1,01 | 0,92 | 0,85 | 0,73 | 0,93 | NA | NA | 0,78 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,10 | 0,10 | NA | 0,06 |
| Czech Republic | 0,86 | 0,76 | 0,75 | 0,60 | 0,55 | 0,51 | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,44 | 0,44 | 0,56 |
| Denmark | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| Estonia | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,11 |
| Finland | NA | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| France | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,32 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,28 | 0,20 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,23 |
| Germany | 0,13 | NA | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Greece | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,17 | 0,19 | 0,21 | 0,22 | NA | 0,09 | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,15 |
| Hungary | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,12 | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Ireland | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Italy | 0,22 | 0,19 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,15 |
| Latvia | 0,26 | 0,28 | 0,29 | 0,27 | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,14 |
| Lithuania | 0,50 | 0,52 | 0,51 | 0,50 | 0,45 | 0,41 | 0,39 | 0,36 | 0,32 | 0,30 | 0,28 |
| Luxembourg | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Malta | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,19 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,14 | 0,11 | 0,16 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,18 |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,05 |
| Poland | 0,36 | - | 0,37 | 0,37 | 0,37 | 0,40 | 0,29 | 0,34 | 0,35 | 0,43 | 0,51 |
| Portugal | NA | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,19 |
| Romania | 0,63 | 0,97 | 1,03 | 1,04 | 1,00 | 0,97 | 0,87 | 1,03 | 0,98 | 0,87 | 0,85 |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | 0,64 | 0,51 | 0,47 | 0,39 | 0,29 | 0,24 | 0,28 | 0,26 | 0,25 |
| Slovenia | 0,63 | 0,58 | 0,52 | 0,45 | 0,41 | 0,36 | 0,31 | 0,31 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,29 |
| Spain | 0,28 | 0,31 | 0,34 | 0,36 | 0,38 | 0,39 | 0,31 | 0,43 | 0,44 | 0,37 | 0,47 |
| Sweden | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Average | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,28 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,25 |
| Median | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Minimum | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Maximum | 1,24 | 1,25 | 1,20 | 1,04 | 1,00 | 0,97 | 0,87 | 1,03 | 0,98 | 0,87 | 0,85 |
| % of NA | 26% | 22% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.3.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - incoming 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NA* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,24 | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,21 | *0,21* | *0,18* | *0,20* | 0,19 | 0,20 | 0,19 |
| **Croatia** | 0,04 | 0,08 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,15 | *0,16* | *0,14* | *0,14* | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,13 |
| **Cyprus** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | *0,03* | *0,02* | *0,03* | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 |
| **Czech Republic** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,10 | *0,08* | *0,09* | *0,11* | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,13 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | *0,05* | *0,04* | *0,05* | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Germany** | 0,09 | NA | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | *0,06* | *0,05* | *0,05* | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,18 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,18 | *NA* | *0,17* | *0,17* | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,17 |
| **Hungary** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | *0,02* | *0,01* | *0,00* | 0,00 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | 0,10 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | *0,06* | *0,05* | *0,05* | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,14 | 0,20 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,14 | *0,13* | *0,12* | *0,15* | 0,16 | 0,09 | 0,11 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | *0,03* | *0,04* | *0,04* | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,06 | *0,06* | *0,05* | *0,06* | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,07 |
| **Poland** | 0,05 | - | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | *0,04* | *0,04* | *0,07* | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | *0,04* | *0,04* | *0,05* | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | *0,00* | *0,00* | *0,00* | 0,04 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | *0,09* | *0,07* | *0,07* | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| **Sweden** | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,34 | 0,39 | 0,45 | *0,43* | *0,40* | *0,37* | 0,32 | 0,34 | 0,36 |
| **Average** | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| **Median** | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,34 | 0,39 | 0,45 | 0,43 | 0,40 | 0,37 | 0,32 | 0,34 | 0,36 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 33% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.4.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,32 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,26 | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,27 |
| **Belgium** | NA | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,20 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,21 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,91 | 0,86 | 0,84 | 0,83 | 0,80 | 0,83 | 0,78 | 0,80 | 0,81 | 0,80 | 0,79 |
| **Croatia** | 2,28 | 2,18 | 2,13 | 1,89 | 1,80 | 1,72 | 1,67 | 1,64 | 1,42 | 1,24 | 1,25 |
| **Cyprus** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,04 | 0,13 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,91 | 0,82 | 0,81 | 0,67 | 0,61 | 0,57 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,48 | 0,45 | 0,52 |
| **Denmark** | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 |
| **Estonia** | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,34 | 0,32 | 0,28 | 0,30 | 0,32 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,31 |
| **Finland** | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **France** | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,41 | 0,42 | 0,40 | 0,39 | 0,31 | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,34 | 0,33 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,24 | 0,29 | 0,27 | 0,29 |
| **Hungary** | 0,54 | 0,49 | 0,52 | 0,49 | 0,51 | 0,43 | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,32 | 0,34 | 0,34 |
| **Ireland** | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Italy** | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,19 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,19 |
| **Latvia** | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,31 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,20 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,81 | 0,83 | 0,81 | 0,71 | 0,68 | 0,64 | 0,63 | 0,60 | 0,55 | 0,46 | 0,41 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | 0,16 | 0,16 | NA | 0,17 | 0,13 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,23 | 0,23 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 |
| **Poland** | 0,58 | - | 0,59 | 0,59 | 0,57 | 0,57 | 0,48 | 0,52 | 0,45 | 0,47 | 0,57 |
| **Portugal** | 0,18 | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,23 |
| **Romania** | 0,43 | 0,91 | 1,11 | 1,03 | 1,07 | 0,98 | 0,85 | 1,00 | 0,92 | 0,90 | 0,86 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1,42 | 1,58 | 1,43 | 1,04 | 0,81 | 0,70 | 0,53 | 0,47 | 0,46 | 0,42 | 0,39 |
| **Slovenia** | 1,14 | 1,03 | 0,91 | 0,84 | 0,74 | 0,65 | 0,59 | 0,52 | 0,49 | 0,47 | 0,46 |
| **Spain** | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,39 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,43 | 0,44 | 0,41 | 0,42 |
| **Sweden** | 0,41 | 0,40 | 0,50 | 0,61 | 0,59 | 0,60 | 0,64 | 0,57 | 0,55 | 0,56 | 0,59 |
| **Average** | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,55 | 0,49 | 0,46 | 0,44 | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,38 | 0,36 | 0,37 |
| **Median** | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,39 | 0,37 | 0,35 | 0,34 | 0,31 | 0,32 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,31 |
| **Minimum** | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | 2,28 | 2,18 | 2,13 | 1,89 | 1,80 | 1,72 | 1,67 | 1,64 | 1,42 | 1,24 | 1,25 |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.4.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - resolved 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,16 |
| **Belgium** | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,20 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,21 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,61 | 0,61 |
| **Croatia** | 1,19 | 1,30 | 1,39 | 1,23 | 1,11 | 1,02 | 0,94 | 0,92 | NA | NA | 0,73 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,10 | 0,09 | NA | 0,07 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,87 | 0,77 | 0,76 | 0,62 | 0,56 | 0,53 | 0,46 | 0,46 | 0,44 | 0,45 | 0,52 |
| **Denmark** | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 |
| **Estonia** | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 |
| **Finland** | NA | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **France** | 0,31 | 0,31 | 0,31 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,21 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,24 | 0,23 |
| **Germany** | 0,13 | NA | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,11 |
| **Greece** | 0,25 | 0,22 | 0,13 | 0,22 | 0,20 | 0,22 | NA | 0,09 | 0,12 | 0,09 | 0,12 |
| **Hungary** | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,13 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,09 |
| **Ireland** | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Italy** | 0,26 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,17 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,18 |
| **Latvia** | 0,26 | 0,30 | 0,28 | 0,28 | 0,24 | 0,22 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,15 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,51 | 0,51 | 0,52 | 0,47 | 0,48 | 0,43 | 0,43 | 0,37 | 0,33 | 0,30 | 0,28 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,19 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,17 |
| **Malta** | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,20 | 0,17 | 0,13 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,23 | 0,23 |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,06 |
| **Poland** | 0,35 | - | 0,36 | 0,36 | 0,35 | 0,36 | 0,31 | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,34 | 0,42 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,19 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| **Romania** | 0,42 | 0,90 | 1,10 | 1,01 | 1,06 | 0,97 | 0,84 | 0,99 | 0,91 | 0,89 | 0,85 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | 0,81 | 0,59 | 0,49 | 0,43 | 0,33 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,26 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,66 | 0,59 | 0,52 | 0,48 | 0,43 | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,28 | 0,28 |
| **Spain** | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,34 | 0,33 | 0,33 | 0,36 | 0,36 | 0,37 | 0,37 | 0,35 | 0,37 |
| **Sweden** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Average** | 0,33 | 0,34 | 0,36 | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,24 |
| **Median** | 0,26 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,18 |
| **Minimum** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | 1,19 | 1,30 | 1,39 | 1,23 | 1,11 | 1,02 | 0,94 | 0,99 | 0,91 | 0,89 | 0,85 |
| **% of NA** | 26% | 22% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.4.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - resolved 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,25 | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,18 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,18 |
| **Croatia** | 0,20 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,13 |
| **Cyprus** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,06 |
| **Czech Republic** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,12 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Germany** | 0,08 | NA | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,21 | 0,16 | 0,24 | 0,20 | NA | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,17 |
| **Hungary** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,12 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,14 | NA | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,16 | 0,18 | 0,11 | 0,09 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Poland** | 0,04 | - | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,03 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Sweden** | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,33 | 0,44 | 0,41 | 0,42 | 0,43 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,36 |
| **Average** | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| **Median** | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,33 | 0,44 | 0,41 | 0,42 | 0,43 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,36 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 33% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.5.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,39 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,35 | 0,33 |
| Bulgaria | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,23 | 0,27 | 0,28 | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,29 |
| Croatia | 1,92 | 1,75 | 1,54 | 1,34 | 1,15 | 0,97 | 0,73 | 0,71 | 0,76 | 0,73 | 0,80 |
| Cyprus | 0,34 | 0,38 | 0,43 | 0,48 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,53 | 0,54 | 0,55 | 0,41 | 0,35 |
| Czech Republic | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,11 |
| Denmark | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Estonia | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,14 |
| Finland | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| France | 0,47 | 0,46 | 0,47 | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,45 | 0,43 | 0,41 | 0,40 | 0,39 | 0,38 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,61 | 0,48 | 0,45 | 0,50 | 0,54 |
| Hungary | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,68 | 0,66 | 0,64 | 0,60 | 0,56 | 0,51 | 0,50 | 0,46 | 0,42 | 0,38 | 0,35 |
| Latvia | 0,22 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 |
| Lithuania | 0,22 | 0,27 | 0,28 | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,26 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,15 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 0,44 | 0,44 | NA | 0,38 | 0,41 | 0,38 | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,32 | 0,27 | 0,21 |
| Netherlands | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,12 |
| Poland | 0,21 | - | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,28 | 0,33 | 0,34 | 0,35 | 0,28 | 0,37 | 0,46 |
| Portugal | 0,05 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,17 |
| Romania | 0,35 | 0,46 | 0,40 | 0,43 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,41 | 0,45 | 0,52 | 0,50 | 0,50 |
| Slovak Republic | 0,68 | 0,71 | 0,40 | 0,35 | 0,32 | 0,25 | 0,21 | 0,18 | 0,22 | 0,18 | 0,16 |
| Slovenia | 0,23 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,10 | 0,11 |
| Spain | 0,19 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,24 | 0,30 | 0,35 | 0,30 | 0,36 | 0,41 | 0,42 | 0,53 |
| Sweden | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,15 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 |
| Average | 0,32 | 0,33 | 0,29 | 0,28 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 |
| Median | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,16 |
| Minimum | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Maximum | 1,92 | 1,75 | 1,54 | 1,34 | 1,15 | 0,97 | 0,73 | 0,71 | 0,76 | 0,73 | 0,80 |
| % of NA | 19% | 15% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.5.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Belgium** | NA | 0,39 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,35 | 0,33 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,23 | 0,24 |
| **Croatia** | 1,46 | 1,43 | 1,25 | 1,04 | 0,85 | 0,69 | 0,48 | 0,51 | NA | NA | 0,56 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,41 | 0,42 | NA | 0,27 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,11 |
| **Denmark** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Estonia** | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Finland** | NA | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **France** | 0,41 | 0,40 | 0,41 | 0,40 | 0,39 | 0,38 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,33 |
| **Germany** | 0,08 | NA | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,09 |
| **Greece** | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,40 | 0,38 | 0,37 | 0,38 | 0,33 | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,17 | 0,21 |
| **Hungary** | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,68 | 0,65 | 0,63 | 0,59 | 0,55 | 0,50 | 0,49 | 0,45 | 0,41 | 0,37 | 0,34 |
| **Latvia** | 0,11 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,38 | 0,37 | 0,34 | 0,30 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 |
| **Malta** | 0,44 | 0,44 | 0,43 | 0,38 | 0,41 | 0,38 | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,32 | 0,27 | 0,21 |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,05 |
| **Poland** | 0,09 | - | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,20 | 0,29 | 0,38 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Romania** | 0,34 | 0,46 | 0,39 | 0,42 | 0,37 | 0,37 | 0,40 | 0,44 | 0,52 | 0,50 | 0,50 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,25 | 0,21 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,14 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Spain** | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,19 | 0,25 | 0,27 | 0,22 | 0,28 | 0,35 | 0,37 | 0,47 |
| **Sweden** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Average** | 0,28 | 0,28 | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,19 |
| **Median** | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,13 |
| **Minimum** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Maximum** | 1,46 | 1,43 | 1,25 | 1,04 | 0,85 | 0,69 | 0,49 | 0,51 | 0,52 | 0,50 | 0,56 |
| **% of NA** | 33% | 26% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.5.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Bulgaria | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| Croatia | 0,04 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,05 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 |
| Cyprus | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,08 |
| Czech Republic | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| France | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Germany | 0,07 | NA | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Greece | NA | 0,40 | 0,39 | 0,33 | 0,31 | NA | 0,27 | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,32 | 0,32 |
| Hungary | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Latvia | 0,10 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Lithuania | 0,07 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,13 | NA | 0,14 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,09 |
| Luxembourg | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 |
| Poland | 0,06 | - | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,10 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Portugal | NA | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,04 | NAP | NAP |
| Slovenia | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Spain | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Sweden | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,08 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Average** | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Median** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Maximum** | 0,11 | 0,40 | 0,39 | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,14 | 0,27 | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,32 | 0,32 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 33% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.4.6.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

| States | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | NA | NA | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,148 | 0,139 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,029 | 0,035 | 0,060 | 0,065 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,002 |
| Finland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,017 | 0,197 | 0,200 |
| Hungary | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,307 | 0,273 | 0,249 | 0,224 | 0,227 | 0,205 | 0,171 | 0,147 | 0,150 |
| Latvia | 0,000 | NA | 0,008 | NA | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,003 |
| Lithuania | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 0,360 | 0,159 | 0,187 | 0,197 | 0,176 | 0,247 | 0,226 | 0,190 | 0,239 |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,009 |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 0,002 | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,009 | 0,011 | 0,011 | 0,010 | 0,010 |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,011 | 0,013 | 0,013 | 0,006 | 0,005 |
| Slovenia | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | 0,022 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,005 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| Average | 0,077 | 0,055 | 0,050 | 0,054 | 0,047 | 0,051 | 0,040 | 0,055 | 0,055 |
| Median | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,001 | 0,006 | 0,006 | 0,004 | 0,005 |
| Minimum | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Maximum | 0,360 | 0,273 | 0,249 | 0,224 | 0,227 | 0,247 | 0,226 | 0,197 | 0,239 |
| % of NA | 67% | 70% | 67% | 70% | 67% | 63% | 56% | 48% | 44% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.6.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

| States | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,148 | 0,139 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,221 | 0,152 | 0,109 | 0,061 | 0,026 | 0,024 | NA | NA | 0,055 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| Finland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,004 | 0,017 | 0,012 | 0,011 |
| Hungary | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,306 | 0,272 | 0,249 | 0,223 | 0,227 | 0,205 | 0,170 | 0,147 | 0,150 |
| Latvia | 0,000 | NA | 0,005 | NA | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,002 |
| Lithuania | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 0,360 | 0,159 | 0,187 | 0,197 | 0,176 | 0,247 | 0,226 | 0,190 | 0,239 |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,004 |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 0,002 | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,009 | 0,011 | 0,011 | 0,010 | 0,010 |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,011 | 0,013 | 0,011 | 0,006 | 0,005 |
| Slovenia | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Average | 0,099 | 0,073 | 0,062 | 0,061 | 0,041 | 0,042 | 0,040 | 0,040 | 0,041 |
| Median | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,003 | 0,002 | 0,001 | 0,003 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,004 |
| Minimum | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Maximum | 0,360 | 0,272 | 0,249 | 0,223 | 0,227 | 0,247 | 0,226 | 0,190 | 0,239 |
| % of NA | 67% | 70% | 67% | 70% | 59% | 56% | 59% | 52% | 44% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.4.6.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)**

| States | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,000 | NA | NA | 0,001 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Denmark** | NA | NAP | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,185 | 0,189 |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,000 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Italy** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | 0,000 | NA | 0,003 | NA | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,005 |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,018 | 0,032 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Portugal** | NA | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,002 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 0,022 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,004 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| **Average** | 0,006 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,003 | 0,004 | 0,001 | 0,032 | 0,022 |
| **Median** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| **Minimum** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| **Maximum** | 0,022 | 0,001 | 0,003 | 0,004 | 0,018 | 0,032 | 0,002 | 0,185 | 0,189 |
| **% of NA** | 52% | 56% | 56% | 59% | 44% | 41% | 44% | 41% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | 33% | 33% | 30% | 26% | 30% | 30% | 33% | 37% | 33% |

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

# Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases

## Table 3.5.1.1: Clearance rate for second instance other than criminal cases in 2024 (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** | **101%** | **102%** | 100% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Belgium** | **115%** | **115%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **98%** | **99%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **94%** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **95%** | **93%** | 97% | 98% | 89% | 89% | 96% | NAP | 84% | **96%** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **148%** | **116%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **220%** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **94%** | **94%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0% |
| **Denmark** | **97%** | **97%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **95%** | **104%** | 92% | 92% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **90%** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **101%** | **104%** | 96% | 96% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | **100%** | **101%** | 102% | 102% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **98%** | 100% |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **126%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **102%** | 104% |
| **Greece** | **88%** | **76%** | 117% | 121% | 81% | 79% | 100% | 0% | 113% | **98%** | 79% |
| **Hungary** | **101%** | **101%** | 101% | 101% | 97% | NAP | 97% | 97% | 102% | **102%** | 90% |
| **Ireland** | **79%** | **79%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **121%** | **121%** | 126% | 126% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **105%** | **105%** | 104% | 108% | 100% | 100% | NAP | NAP | NAP | **106%** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **95%** | **99%** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **82%** | 99% |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **95%** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **115%** | NA |
| **Malta** | **128%** | **128%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **109%** | **107%** | 0% | 0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **111%** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **87%** | **82%** | 96% | 95% | 102% | NAP | 102% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 113% |
| **Portugal** | **95%** | **97%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **86%** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **100%** | **100%** | 103% | 115% | 93% | 93% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **106%** | **104%** | 111% | 111% | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **98%** | **98%** | 98% | 98% | 101% | 100% | 107% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | **79%** | **78%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **90%** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **100%** | **104%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **98%** | 102% |
| **Average** | **101%** | **101%** | 96% | 97% | 95% | *92%* | *100%* | *49%* | 99% | **106%** | **86%** |
| **Median** | **100%** | **101%** | 100% | 101% | 97% | *93%* | *100%* | *49%* | 102% | **98%** | **99%** |
| **Minimum** | **79%** | **76%** | 0% | 0% | 81% | *79%* | *96%* | *0%* | 84% | **82%** | **0%** |
| **Maximum** | **148%** | **128%** | 126% | 126% | 102% | *100%* | *107%* | *97%* | 113% | **220%** | **113%** |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | 0% | 19% | 22% | 19% | *15%* | *19%* | *15%* | 22% | **11%** | **11%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 0% | 30% | 30% | 56% | *67%* | *63%* | *78%* | 67% | **33%** | **59%** |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.5.1.2: Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases in 2024

**(Q097)**

| 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** | **76** | **84** | 63 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Belgium** | **584** | **584** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | **133** | **143** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **98** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **234** | **282** | 153 | 141 | 238 | 253 | 27 | NAP | 263 | **215** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **1001** | **1426** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **489** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **80** | **80** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 |
| **Denmark** | **196** | **196** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **162** | **163** | 138 | 138 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **184** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **172** | **201** | 105 | 105 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | **426** | **527** | 383 | 383 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **339** | 73 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **306** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **474** | 169 |
| **Greece** | **681** | **666** | 205 | 195 | 514 | 596 | 0 | 0 | 68 | **704** | 298 |
| **Hungary** | **74** | **112** | 48 | 48 | 58 | NAP | 58 | 59 | 28 | **136** | 118 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **670** | **691** | 188 | 188 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **153** | **132** | 40 | 26 | 58 | 58 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **242** | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | **135** | **82** | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **350** | 39 |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | **527** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | **224** | NA |
| **Malta** | **322** | **322** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **329** | **301** | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **349** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **297** | **334** | 135 | 134 | 194 | NAP | 194 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 221 |
| **Portugal** | **274** | **94** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1045** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **213** | **213** | 187 | 47 | 336 | 336 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **147** | **193** | 58 | 58 | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **87** | **108** | 56 | 58 | 31 | 37 | 6 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | **455** | **459** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **428** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **64** | **85** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **75** | 40 |
| **Average** | **290** | **320** | 126 | 117 | 204 | *256* | *57* | *29* | 120 | **357** | **120** |
| **Median** | **205** | **207** | 120 | 105 | 194 | *253* | *27* | *29* | 68 | **339** | **96** |
| **Minimum** | **64** | **80** | 0 | 0 | 31 | *37* | *0* | *0* | 28 | **75** | **0** |
| **Maximum** | **1 001** | **1 426** | 383 | 383 | 514 | *596* | *194* | *59* | 263 | **1 045** | **298** |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **4%** | 19% | 19% | 19% | *15%* | *19%* | *15%* | 22% | **11%** | **11%** |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 30% | 33% | 56% | *67%* | *63%* | *78%* | 67% | **33%** | **59%** |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.5.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of second instance total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
(Q097)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 100% | 100% | 101% | 100% | 101% | 100% | 102% | 96% | 102% | 98% | 101% |
| Belgium | NA | 105% | 110% | 110% | 104% | 110% | 104% | 105% | 109% | 104% | 115% |
| Bulgaria | 102% | 103% | 101% | 100% | 98% | 96% | 95% | 99% | 103% | 101% | 98% |
| Croatia | 110% | 110% | 111% | 114% | 112% | 112% | 117% | 103% | 97% | 102% | 95% |
| Cyprus | 51% | 54% | 50% | 67% | 87% | 87% | 77% | 92% | 85% | 73% | 148% |
| Czech Republic | 101% | 102% | 102% | 104% | 102% | 103% | 100% | 103% | 100% | 102% | 94% |
| Denmark | 104% | 109% | 109% | 105% | 96% | 94% | 98% | 102% | 101% | 91% | 97% |
| Estonia | 104% | 98% | 105% | 101% | 100% | 98% | 99% | 92% | 97% | 99% | 95% |
| Finland | 98% | 100% | 118% | 97% | 106% | 96% | 104% | 96% | 101% | 103% | 101% |
| France | 95% | 96% | 96% | 103% | 103% | 101% | 103% | 105% | 105% | 104% | 100% |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 89% | 94% | 89% | 88% |
| Hungary | 103% | 102% | 99% | 98% | 104% | 105% | 105% | 101% | 102% | 99% | 101% |
| Ireland | 75% | 84% | 82% | 66% | 75% | 93% | 105% | 77% | 91% | 85% | 79% |
| Italy | 119% | 120% | 110% | 116% | 118% | 128% | 113% | 122% | 124% | 125% | 121% |
| Latvia | 100% | 101% | 104% | 108% | 105% | 98% | 110% | 101% | 97% | 99% | 105% |
| Lithuania | 100% | 95% | 100% | 96% | 103% | 104% | 112% | 102% | 105% | 105% | 95% |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 87% | 96% | NA | 118% | 80% | 112% | 130% | 122% | 96% | 111% | 128% |
| Netherlands | 106% | 95% | 100% | 102% | 106% | 102% | 110% | 96% | 96% | 106% | 109% |
| Poland | 98% | - | 97% | 98% | 96% | 90% | 101% | 95% | 95% | 84% | 87% |
| Portugal | 102% | 105% | 96% | 95% | 97% | 100% | 104% | 99% | 93% | 95% | 95% |
| Romania | 67% | 93% | 106% | 97% | 105% | 100% | 97% | 96% | 93% | 102% | 100% |
| Slovak Republic | 88% | 98% | 114% | 121% | 104% | 111% | 108% | 108% | 99% | 101% | 106% |
| Slovenia | 106% | 103% | 100% | 105% | 104% | 103% | 111% | 98% | 97% | 97% | 98% |
| Spain | 106% | 96% | 98% | 93% | 87% | 89% | 113% | 88% | 90% | 96% | 79% |
| Sweden | 94% | 98% | 99% | 109% | 95% | 97% | 106% | 98% | 104% | 100% | 100% |
| Average | 96% | 98% | 100% | 101% | 100% | 101% | 105% | 99% | 99% | 99% | 101% |
| Median | 100% | 100% | 101% | 102% | 102% | 100% | 105% | 99% | 97% | 100% | 100% |
| Minimum | 51% | 54% | 50% | 66% | 75% | 87% | 77% | 77% | 85% | 73% | 79% |
| Maximum | 119% | 120% | 118% | 121% | 118% | 128% | 130% | 122% | 124% | 125% | 148% |
| % of NA | 15% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.5.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of second instance total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
(Q097)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 66 | 69 | 66 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 79 | 72 | 79 | 76 |
| Belgium | NA | 541 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 673 | 584 |
| Bulgaria | 82 | 78 | 76 | 78 | 88 | 100 | 127 | 127 | 124 | 121 | 133 |
| Croatia | 308 | 292 | 264 | 258 | 234 | 205 | 159 | 157 | 195 | 216 | 234 |
| Cyprus | 2446 | 2767 | 2920 | 2810 | 2126 | 1953 | 2176 | 1693 | 1847 | 4186 | 1001 |
| Czech Republic | 74 | 76 | 70 | 73 | 74 | 67 | 78 | 67 | 69 | 64 | 80 |
| Denmark | 170 | 166 | 141 | 136 | 168 | 193 | 180 | 176 | 185 | 220 | 196 |
| Estonia | 103 | 113 | 95 | 93 | 96 | 108 | 104 | 132 | 151 | 154 | 162 |
| Finland | 186 | 185 | 138 | 189 | 162 | 188 | 180 | 199 | 197 | 179 | 172 |
| France | 422 | 418 | 426 | 402 | 409 | 415 | 509 | 399 | 422 | 417 | 426 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 735 | 561 | 679 | 681 |
| Hungary | 91 | 86 | 84 | 94 | 80 | 75 | 71 | 68 | 69 | 76 | 74 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 941 | 959 | 945 | 855 | 827 | 759 | 981 | 777 | 718 | 672 | 670 |
| Latvia | 216 | 163 | 145 | 111 | 118 | 138 | 124 | 134 | 155 | 160 | 153 |
| Lithuania | 99 | 118 | 124 | 158 | 154 | 151 | 112 | 110 | 101 | 104 | 135 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 1010 | 973 | NA | 796 | 1120 | 875 | 838 | 567 | 563 | 427 | 322 |
| Netherlands | 341 | 379 | 348 | 389 | 408 | 427 | 422 | 407 | 434 | 370 | 329 |
| Poland | 130 | - | 151 | 157 | 178 | 213 | 255 | 248 | 231 | 290 | 297 |
| Portugal | 93 | 168 | 198 | 208 | 224 | 223 | 244 | 234 | 250 | 272 | 274 |
| Romania | 297 | 184 | 131 | 153 | 128 | 139 | 174 | 164 | 207 | 204 | 213 |
| Slovak Republic | 174 | 163 | 102 | 124 | 143 | 130 | 145 | 140 | 179 | 156 | 147 |
| Slovenia | 75 | 73 | 81 | 71 | 66 | 65 | 35 | 49 | 63 | 79 | 87 |
| Spain | 200 | 212 | 199 | 231 | 282 | 300 | 260 | 305 | 340 | 381 | 455 |
| Sweden | 123 | 134 | 116 | 63 | 83 | 94 | 66 | 81 | 68 | 67 | 64 |
| Average | 348 | 378 | 325 | 342 | 329 | 313 | 332 | 306 | 313 | 427 | 290 |
| Median | 172 | 167 | 138 | 155 | 158 | 169 | 167 | 164 | 195 | 210 | 205 |
| Minimum | 66 | 69 | 66 | 63 | 66 | 65 | 35 | 49 | 63 | 64 | 64 |
| Maximum | 2446 | 2767 | 2920 | 2810 | 2126 | 1953 | 2176 | 1693 | 1847 | 4186 | 1001 |
| % of NA | 19% | 15% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.5.3.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of second instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
(Q097)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 102% | 94% | 102% | 98% | 102% |
| Belgium | 103% | 105% | 110% | 110% | 104% | 110% | 104% | 105% | 109% | 104% | 115% |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 102% | 99% |
| Croatia | 96% | 104% | 116% | 122% | 122% | 119% | 129% | 98% | NA | NA | 93% |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 100% | 87% | NA | 116% |
| Czech Republic | 102% | 102% | 102% | 103% | 102% | 103% | 100% | 104% | 99% | 102% | 94% |
| Denmark | 104% | 109% | 109% | 105% | 96% | 94% | 98% | 102% | 101% | 91% | 97% |
| Estonia | 107% | 100% | 106% | 97% | 97% | 97% | 102% | 90% | 98% | 105% | 104% |
| Finland | NA | 101% | 119% | 95% | 107% | 97% | 104% | 95% | 102% | 102% | 104% |
| France | 93% | 95% | 95% | 104% | 105% | 102% | 105% | 106% | 106% | 106% | 101% |
| Germany | 100% | NA | 101% | 102% | 99% | 85% | 103% | 85% | 94% | 109% | 126% |
| Greece | 102% | 93% | 75% | 113% | 97% | 101% | NA | 102% | 79% | 72% | 76% |
| Hungary | 111% | 102% | 100% | 99% | 106% | 110% | 107% | 99% | 102% | 103% | 101% |
| Ireland | 75% | 84% | 82% | 66% | 75% | 93% | 105% | 77% | 91% | 85% | 79% |
| Italy | 119% | 122% | 111% | 117% | 120% | 131% | 115% | 123% | 126% | 126% | 121% |
| Latvia | 101% | 107% | 96% | 103% | 104% | 99% | 108% | 103% | 96% | 100% | 105% |
| Lithuania | 102% | 99% | 101% | 96% | 107% | 105% | 111% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 99% |
| Luxembourg | 87% | 100% | 106% | 118% | 115% | 103% | 105% | 98% | 104% | 97% | 95% |
| Malta | 87% | 96% | 106% | 118% | 80% | 112% | 130% | 122% | 96% | 111% | 128% |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 107% |
| Poland | 97% | - | 96% | 97% | 96% | 90% | 105% | 97% | 91% | 79% | 82% |
| Portugal | NA | 95% | 97% | 99% | 102% | 102% | 108% | 102% | 96% | 101% | 97% |
| Romania | 67% | 93% | 106% | 97% | 105% | 100% | 97% | 96% | 93% | 102% | 100% |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | 125% | 116% | 105% | 111% | 116% | 112% | 95% | 100% | 104% |
| Slovenia | 106% | 102% | 100% | 105% | 105% | 105% | 112% | 97% | 94% | 97% | 98% |
| Spain | 105% | 96% | 98% | 92% | 87% | 93% | 117% | 86% | 85% | 94% | 78% |
| Sweden | 106% | 102% | 103% | 98% | 102% | 95% | 96% | 101% | 102% | 99% | 104% |
| Average | 99% | 100% | 103% | 103% | 101% | 103% | 108% | 100% | 98% | 100% | 101% |
| Median | 102% | 101% | 102% | 103% | 104% | 102% | 105% | 100% | 97% | 101% | 101% |
| Minimum | 67% | 84% | 75% | 66% | 75% | 85% | 96% | 77% | 79% | 72% | 76% |
| Maximum | 119% | 122% | 125% | 122% | 122% | 131% | 130% | 123% | 126% | 126% | 128% |
| % of NA | 26% | 22% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.5.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of second instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
(Q097)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 77 | 96 | 85 | 87 | 84 |
| Belgium | NA | 541 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 673 | 584 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 138 | 143 |
| Croatia | 448 | 401 | 328 | 310 | 280 | 248 | 184 | 205 | NA | NA | 282 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1481 | 1736 | NA | 1426 |
| Czech Republic | 73 | 74 | 69 | 74 | 75 | 68 | 79 | 66 | 70 | 64 | 80 |
| Denmark | 170 | 166 | 141 | 136 | 168 | 193 | 180 | 176 | 185 | 220 | 196 |
| Estonia | 100 | 113 | 95 | 111 | 119 | 130 | 120 | 166 | 172 | 169 | 163 |
| Finland | NA | 206 | 150 | 212 | 177 | 205 | 210 | 222 | 218 | 211 | 201 |
| France | 477 | 476 | 487 | 464 | 466 | 481 | 607 | 466 | 489 | 507 | 527 |
| Germany | 233 | NA | 245 | 254 | 262 | 299 | 265 | 362 | 391 | 406 | 306 |
| Greece | 509 | 588 | 1149 | 640 | 662 | 638 | NA | 610 | 422 | 673 | 666 |
| Hungary | 114 | 123 | 121 | 133 | 112 | 105 | 116 | 116 | 106 | 107 | 112 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 959 | 1005 | 993 | 893 | 863 | 791 | 1026 | 817 | 753 | 703 | 691 |
| Latvia | 160 | 102 | 124 | 100 | 104 | 119 | 118 | 117 | 140 | 134 | 132 |
| Lithuania | 97 | 104 | 103 | 130 | 107 | 100 | 66 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 82 |
| Luxembourg | 722 | 601 | 553 | 466 | 467 | 488 | 497 | 501 | 464 | 497 | 527 |
| Malta | 1010 | 973 | 783 | 796 | 1120 | 875 | 838 | 567 | 563 | 427 | 322 |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 301 |
| Poland | 89 | - | 105 | 119 | 137 | 175 | 188 | 187 | 232 | 312 | 334 |
| Portugal | NA | 106 | 114 | 111 | 107 | 104 | 99 | 89 | 95 | 91 | 94 |
| Romania | 299 | 185 | 131 | 152 | 128 | 139 | 174 | 164 | 207 | 204 | 213 |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | 121 | 168 | 186 | 175 | 177 | 180 | 206 | 203 | 193 |
| Slovenia | 84 | 86 | 97 | 89 | 82 | 73 | 40 | 59 | 82 | 97 | 108 |
| Spain | 178 | 194 | 181 | 216 | 271 | 279 | 227 | 280 | 343 | 379 | 459 |
| Sweden | 106 | 107 | 100 | 109 | 96 | 117 | 128 | 111 | 101 | 108 | 85 |
| Average | 324 | 324 | 295 | 271 | 285 | 276 | 258 | 309 | 324 | 282 | 320 |
| Median | 174 | 185 | 131 | 152 | 168 | 175 | 177 | 180 | 207 | 204 | 207 |
| Minimum | 73 | 74 | 69 | 74 | 75 | 68 | 40 | 59 | 70 | 64 | 80 |
| Maximum | 1010 | 1005 | 1149 | 893 | 1120 | 875 | 1026 | 1481 | 1736 | 703 | 1426 |
| % of NA | 33% | 26% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 4% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.5.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of second instance administrative cases 2014 - 2024
(Q097)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Bulgaria | 104% | 102% | 102% | 101% | 101% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 102% | 97% | 94% |
| Croatia | 454% | 124% | 86% | 90% | 86% | 91% | 108% | 116% | 91% | 98% | 96% |
| Cyprus | 61% | 89% | 190% | 140% | 84% | 88% | 69% | 60% | 76% | 43% | 220% |
| Czech Republic | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 100% | 95% | 106% | 108% | 111% | 103% | 95% | 92% | 94% | 92% | 90% |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| France | 100% | 100% | 98% | 100% | 97% | 96% | 102% | 100% | 105% | 102% | 98% |
| Germany | 93% | NA | 96% | 96% | 94% | 98% | 107% | 102% | 111% | 108% | 102% |
| Greece | NA | 122% | 107% | 138% | 114% | NA | 98% | 83% | 107% | 103% | 98% |
| Hungary | 99% | 102% | 97% | 99% | 97% | 106% | 146% | 131% | 225% | 81% | 102% |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Latvia | 101% | 136% | 137% | 129% | 107% | 91% | 120% | 93% | 100% | 93% | 106% |
| Lithuania | 91% | 80% | 94% | 93% | NA | 101% | 122% | 105% | 110% | 119% | 82% |
| Luxembourg | 101% | 104% | 102% | 97% | 103% | 96% | 73% | 124% | 103% | 92% | 115% |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | 101% | 93% | 103% | 99% | 108% | 100% | 119% | 93% | 85% | 108% | 111% |
| Poland | 84% | - | 89% | 108% | 93% | 97% | 110% | 64% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Portugal | NA | 107% | 88% | 76% | 74% | 90% | 92% | 89% | 78% | 71% | 86% |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 111% | 90% | 92% | 500% | 250% | 0% | - | 0% | 94% | NAP | NAP |
| Slovenia | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Spain | 110% | 100% | 100% | 98% | 92% | 72% | 94% | 96% | 130% | 112% | 90% |
| Sweden | 90% | 97% | 97% | 114% | 93% | 97% | 110% | 97% | 106% | 101% | 98% |
| Average | 120% | 103% | 105% | 129% | 107% | 89% | 104% | 91% | 107% | 95% | 106% |
| Median | 100% | 100% | 98% | 100% | 97% | 96% | 104% | 96% | 103% | 98% | 98% |
| Minimum | 61% | 80% | 86% | 76% | 74% | 0% | 69% | 0% | 76% | 43% | 82% |
| Maximum | 454% | 136% | 190% | 500% | 250% | 106% | 146% | 131% | 225% | 119% | 220% |
| % of NA | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 33% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.5.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of second instance administrative cases 2014 - 2024
(Q097)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Bulgaria | 65 | 70 | 62 | 62 | 59 | 57 | 64 | 61 | 57 | 69 | 98 |
| Croatia | 68 | 62 | 119 | 153 | 195 | 210 | 165 | 122 | 191 | 215 | 215 |
| Cyprus | 2890 | 2741 | 2522 | 1975 | 2156 | 1724 | 2688 | 3132 | 2310 | 5429 | 489 |
| Czech Republic | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 143 | 154 | 130 | 102 | 81 | 92 | 105 | 122 | 152 | 177 | 184 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| France | 334 | 329 | 341 | 334 | 327 | 329 | 362 | 328 | 329 | 321 | 339 |
| Germany | 320 | NA | 452 | 430 | 443 | 427 | 419 | 456 | 460 | 468 | 474 |
| Greece | NA | 683 | 915 | 509 | 564 | NA | 599 | 841 | 661 | 703 | 704 |
| Hungary | 94 | 87 | 83 | 91 | 91 | 64 | 4 | 48 | 0 | 189 | 136 |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Latvia | 371 | 277 | 210 | 152 | 169 | 215 | 158 | 223 | 215 | 282 | 242 |
| Lithuania | 204 | 252 | 295 | 352 | NA | 375 | 282 | 240 | 170 | 218 | 350 |
| Luxembourg | 175 | 202 | 228 | 211 | 222 | 285 | 421 | 225 | 228 | 288 | 224 |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | 411 | 427 | 348 | 444 | 437 | 476 | 465 | 460 | 488 | 416 | 349 |
| Poland | 537 | - | 607 | 502 | 537 | 625 | 618 | 778 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Portugal | NA | 573 | 714 | 842 | 1016 | 849 | 877 | 836 | 1064 | 1200 | 1045 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 110 | 154 | 299 | 292 | 73 | - | 0 | 0 | 431 | NAP | NAP |
| Slovenia | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Spain | 332 | 321 | 319 | 329 | 355 | 418 | 452 | 450 | 325 | 391 | 428 |
| Sweden | 178 | 188 | 148 | 63 | 96 | 106 | 68 | 92 | 77 | 72 | 75 |
| Average | 415 | 435 | 458 | 403 | 426 | 417 | 456 | 495 | 447 | 696 | 357 |
| Median | 204 | 252 | 299 | 329 | 275 | 329 | 362 | 240 | 277 | 288 | 339 |
| Minimum | 65 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 59 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 75 |
| Maximum | 2890 | 2741 | 2522 | 1975 | 2156 | 1724 | 2688 | 3132 | 2310 | 5429 | 1045 |
| % of NA | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 33% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

# Variations of second instance other than criminal cases by case categories

## Table 3.6.1: Second instance courts, variation of incoming other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percentage (Q97)

| States | Variations 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| Austria | -14,1% | NA | NAP | -4,7% | -10,2% | NAP |
| Belgium | NA | -25,4% | NAP | -2,4% | -2,4% | NAP |
| Bulgaria | -18,8% | NA | -28,8% | 1,7% | 2,8% | -1,7% |
| Croatia | -41,8% | -42,5% | 182,6% | 8,6% | NA | 8,8% |
| Cyprus | -3,6% | NA | 41,7% | 85,3% | NA | 52,7% |
| Czech Republic | -35,5% | -32,6% | NAP | 27,7% | 27,7% | NAP |
| Denmark | -9,7% | -9,7% | NA | 11,3% | 11,3% | NA |
| Estonia | -1,1% | -27,3% | 10,7% | 11,3% | -2,7% | 23,1% |
| Finland | -33,8% | NA | NAP | 3,8% | -9,5% | NAP |
| France | -20,2% | -29,4% | 5,6% | 1,5% | 0,4% | -0,2% |
| Germany | NA | -27,8% | -49,0% | NA | -8,2% | 3,2% |
| Greece | NA | -41,4% | NA | 9,5% | 14,3% | 7,2% |
| Hungary | -39,1% | -51,9% | 15,0% | -2,0% | -6,9% | 4,5% |
| Ireland | -31,4% | -31,4% | NA | -8,0% | -8,0% | NA |
| Italy | -31,9% | -32,8% | NAP | -5,3% | -3,1% | NAP |
| Latvia | -52,7% | -48,6% | -58,7% | -11,3% | -12,8% | -6,2% |
| Lithuania | -46,5% | -45,0% | -20,9% | 1,0% | -5,9% | 15,9% |
| Luxembourg | NA | -3,3% | -33,9% | NA | 0,2% | -14,8% |
| Malta | 30,5% | 30,5% | NA | -10,2% | -10,2% | NA |
| Netherlands | -19,0% | NA | -3,1% | -0,5% | NA | 4,8% |
| Poland | 7,9% | 38,3% | NAP | 16,0% | 18,6% | NAP |
| Portugal | 40,4% | NA | NA | 4,0% | 4,9% | 0,6% |
| Romania | 15,7% | 16,0% | NAP | -2,6% | -2,7% | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | -77,3% | NA | NAP | -12,5% | -6,8% | NAP |
| Slovenia | -54,7% | -52,8% | NAP | -1,6% | -2,8% | NAP |
| Spain | 71,8% | 77,6% | 35,9% | 27,7% | 28,1% | 24,7% |
| Sweden | 47,4% | 12,4% | 54,7% | 5,4% | 2,5% | 6,6% |
| Average | -13,8% | -16,4% | 11,7% | 6,1% | 0,8% | 8,6% |
| Median | -19,0% | -28,6% | 5,6% | 1,5% | -2,7% | 4,8% |
| Minimum | -77,3% | -52,8% | -58,7% | -12,5% | -12,8% | -14,8% |
| Maximum | 71,8% | 77,6% | 182,6% | 85,3% | 28,1% | 52,7% |
| % of NA | 15% | 26% | 19% | 7% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.6.2: Second instance courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q97)**

| States | Variations 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | -13,4% | NA | NAP | -1,2% | -6,2% | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NA | -16,2% | NAP | 8,1% | 8,1% | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | -22,4% | NA | -35,9% | -1,5% | -0,5% | -4,9% |
| **Croatia** | -49,8% | -44,1% | -40,2% | 0,9% | NA | 7,1% |
| **Cyprus** | 182,4% | NA | 409,1% | 273,9% | NA | 688,7% |
| **Czech Republic** | -40,2% | -37,8% | NAP | 16,7% | 16,7% | NAP |
| **Denmark** | -16,0% | -16,0% | NA | 17,7% | 17,7% | NA |
| **Estonia** | -9,1% | -29,4% | 0,4% | 7,2% | -3,7% | 21,6% |
| **Finland** | -31,9% | NA | NAP | 1,5% | -8,2% | NAP |
| **France** | -15,4% | -23,9% | 3,7% | -2,4% | -4,2% | -3,5% |
| **Germany** | NA | -9,0% | -44,0% | NA | 6,1% | -2,7% |
| **Greece** | NA | -56,1% | NA | 7,6% | 21,5% | 1,3% |
| **Hungary** | -40,3% | -56,2% | 19,3% | -0,3% | -8,7% | 31,2% |
| **Ireland** | -27,4% | -27,4% | NA | -13,9% | -13,9% | NA |
| **Italy** | -30,5% | -31,8% | NAP | -8,3% | -6,7% | NAP |
| **Latvia** | -50,3% | -46,9% | -56,6% | -6,0% | -9,0% | 7,2% |
| **Lithuania** | -49,3% | -46,7% | -28,6% | -9,1% | -8,5% | -19,8% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 5,7% | -24,6% | NA | -2,0% | 6,5% |
| **Malta** | 91,2% | 91,2% | NA | 3,0% | 3,0% | NA |
| **Netherlands** | -16,2% | NA | 6,4% | 2,8% | NA | 7,6% |
| **Poland** | -4,6% | 16,9% | NAP | 20,0% | 22,6% | NAP |
| **Portugal** | 31,3% | NA | NA | 4,4% | 1,0% | 21,6% |
| **Romania** | 72,8% | 74,5% | NAP | -4,3% | -4,4% | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | -72,5% | NA | NAP | -7,4% | -2,8% | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | -58,3% | -56,6% | NAP | -0,4% | -1,8% | NAP |
| **Spain** | 28,8% | 31,7% | 11,2% | 5,4% | 6,2% | 0,3% |
| **Sweden** | 56,3% | 10,5% | 70,2% | 5,6% | 7,7% | 3,9% |
| **Average** | -3,7% | -13,4% | 22,3% | 12,8% | 1,3% | 51,1% |
| **Median** | -16,2% | -25,7% | 0,4% | 1,5% | -1,9% | 6,5% |
| **Minimum** | -72,5% | -56,6% | -56,6% | -13,9% | -13,9% | -19,8% |
| **Maximum** | 182,4% | 91,2% | 409,1% | 273,9% | 22,6% | 688,7% |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 26% | 19% | 7% | 11% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

## Table 3.6.3: Second instance courts, variation of pending 31 Dec. other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percentage (Q97)

| States | Variations 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | -1,6% | NA | NAP | -5,5% | -9,2% | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NAP | -6,2% | -6,2% | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | 24,8% | NA | -2,6% | 7,5% | 3,2% | 34,6% |
| **Croatia** | -61,8% | -64,8% | 89,5% | 9,6% | NA | 7,2% |
| **Cyprus** | 15,6% | NA | -13,8% | -10,6% | NA | -28,9% |
| **Czech Republic** | -35,9% | -31,9% | NAP | 44,5% | 44,5% | NAP |
| **Denmark** | -3,0% | -3,0% | NA | 4,8% | 4,8% | NA |
| **Estonia** | 42,7% | 15,4% | 29,3% | 12,3% | -7,3% | 26,4% |
| **Finland** | -36,8% | NA | NAP | -2,1% | -12,4% | NAP |
| **France** | -14,6% | -15,8% | 5,1% | -0,1% | -0,3% | 1,8% |
| **Germany** | NA | 19,6% | -16,9% | NA | -19,9% | -1,5% |
| **Greece** | NA | -42,5% | NA | 8,0% | 20,3% | 1,3% |
| **Hungary** | -51,5% | -56,8% | 72,7% | -3,1% | -4,2% | -5,3% |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | -50,5% | -50,9% | NAP | -8,7% | -8,3% | NAP |
| **Latvia** | -64,7% | -56,2% | -71,7% | -10,1% | -10,8% | -8,1% |
| **Lithuania** | -31,3% | -54,9% | 22,5% | 17,9% | 5,9% | 29,1% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | -22,8% | -3,6% | NA | 3,9% | -17,3% |
| **Malta** | -39,1% | -39,1% | NA | -22,4% | -22,4% | NA |
| **Netherlands** | -19,1% | NA | -9,6% | -8,8% | NA | -9,6% |
| **Poland** | 118,3% | 339,9% | NAP | 22,6% | 31,6% | NAP |
| **Portugal** | 286,1% | NA | NA | 5,3% | 3,7% | 5,9% |
| **Romania** | 23,8% | 24,4% | NAP | -0,3% | -0,2% | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | -76,8% | NA | NAP | -13,0% | -7,4% | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | -51,1% | -44,1% | NAP | 10,5% | 9,2% | NAP |
| **Spain** | 192,7% | 239,0% | 43,5% | 26,0% | 28,5% | 9,6% |
| **Sweden** | -19,4% | -11,3% | -28,4% | -0,3% | -15,1% | 8,1% |
| **Average** | 6,7% | 8,0% | 8,9% | 3,2% | 1,4% | 3,6% |
| **Median** | -19,3% | -27,4% | -2,6% | -0,2% | -0,3% | 1,8% |
| **Minimum** | -76,8% | -64,8% | -71,7% | -22,4% | -22,4% | -28,9% |
| **Maximum** | 286,1% | 339,9% | 89,5% | 44,5% | 44,5% | 34,6% |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 33% | 19% | 11% | 15% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

## Table 3.6.4: Second instance courts, variation of Clearance rate of other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percent points (Q97)

| States | Variations 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| Austria | +0,7 | NA | NAP | +3,53 | +4,46 | NAP |
| Belgium | NA | +12,68 | NAP | +11,18 | +11,18 | NAP |
| Bulgaria | -4,6 | NA | -10,45 | -3,21 | -3,28 | -3,17 |
| Croatia | -15,1 | -2,67 | -358,06 | -7,26 | NA | -1,53 |
| Cyprus | +97,4 | NA | +158,50 | +74,63 | NA | +177,09 |
| Czech Republic | -7,3 | -7,80 | NAP | -8,78 | -8,78 | NAP |
| Denmark | -7,3 | -7,31 | NA | +5,27 | +5,27 | NA |
| Estonia | -8,4 | -3,06 | -9,26 | -3,60 | -1,02 | -1,16 |
| Finland | +2,9 | NA | NAP | -2,29 | +1,49 | NAP |
| France | +5,7 | +7,32 | -1,82 | -4,03 | -4,91 | -3,34 |
| Germany | NA | +26,12 | +9,17 | NA | +17,00 | -6,13 |
| Greece | NA | -25,70 | NA | -1,60 | +4,54 | -5,72 |
| Hungary | -2,0 | -9,98 | +3,60 | +1,80 | -1,99 | +20,75 |
| Ireland | +4,3 | +4,31 | NA | -5,49 | -5,49 | NA |
| Italy | +2,4 | +1,79 | NAP | -4,05 | -4,67 | NAP |
| Latvia | +5,1 | +3,31 | +5,06 | +5,99 | +4,42 | +13,23 |
| Lithuania | -5,4 | -3,33 | -8,81 | -10,51 | -2,77 | -36,57 |
| Luxembourg | NA | +8,09 | +14,21 | NA | -2,13 | +22,93 |
| Malta | +40,5 | +40,52 | NA | +16,38 | +16,38 | NA |
| Netherlands | +3,7 | NA | +9,93 | +3,48 | NA | +2,95 |
| Poland | -11,4 | -14,96 | NAP | +2,93 | +2,69 | NAP |
| Portugal | -6,6 | NA | NA | +0,35 | -3,75 | +14,88 |
| Romania | +33,1 | +33,61 | NAP | -1,81 | -1,82 | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | +18,7 | NA | NAP | +5,88 | +4,28 | NAP |
| Slovenia | -8,3 | -8,51 | NAP | +1,13 | +1,02 | NAP |
| Spain | -26,5 | -27,19 | -19,93 | -16,81 | -16,14 | -21,86 |
| Sweden | +5,7 | -1,74 | +8,97 | +0,14 | +5,03 | -2,53 |
| Average | 5,1 | 1,3 | -15,3 | 2,5 | 0,9 | 11,3 |
| Median | 0,7 | -2,2 | 3,6 | 0,1 | 0,0 | -1,5 |
| Minimum | -26,5 | -27,2 | -358,1 | -16,8 | -16,1 | -36,6 |
| Maximum | 97,4 | 40,5 | 158,5 | 74,6 | 17,0 | 177,1 |
| % of NA | 15% | 26% | 19% | 7% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

## Table 3.6.5: Second instance courts, variation of Disposition time for other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percentage (Q97)

| States | Variations 2014 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| Austria | 13,7% | NA | NAP | -4,3% | -3,2% | NAP |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NAP | -13,2% | -13,2% | NAP |
| Bulgaria | 60,9% | NA | 52,0% | 9,2% | 3,7% | 41,6% |
| Croatia | -23,9% | -37,1% | 216,7% | 8,6% | NA | 0,1% |
| Cyprus | -59,1% | NA | -83,1% | -76,1% | NA | -91,0% |
| Czech Republic | 7,2% | 9,6% | NAP | 23,8% | 23,8% | NAP |
| Denmark | 15,5% | 15,5% | NA | -10,9% | -10,9% | NA |
| Estonia | 57,0% | 63,5% | 28,8% | 4,7% | -3,8% | 3,9% |
| Finland | -7,3% | NA | NAP | -3,5% | -4,6% | NAP |
| France | 1,0% | 10,6% | 1,4% | 2,3% | 4,1% | 5,5% |
| Germany | NA | 31,4% | 48,3% | NA | -24,5% | 1,2% |
| Greece | NA | 31,0% | NA | 0,4% | -1,0% | 0,1% |
| Hungary | -18,7% | -1,4% | 44,8% | -2,8% | 5,0% | -27,8% |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | -28,8% | -28,0% | NAP | -0,4% | -1,7% | NAP |
| Latvia | -29,0% | -17,5% | -34,8% | -4,3% | -2,0% | -14,2% |
| Lithuania | 35,6% | -15,3% | 71,5% | 29,7% | 15,7% | 60,9% |
| Luxembourg | NA | -27,0% | 27,8% | NA | 6,1% | -22,4% |
| Malta | -68,1% | -68,1% | NA | -24,6% | -24,6% | NA |
| Netherlands | -3,5% | NA | -15,1% | -11,2% | NA | -16,0% |
| Poland | 128,8% | 276,3% | NAP | 2,2% | 7,3% | NAP |
| Portugal | 194,1% | NA | NA | 0,9% | 2,7% | -12,9% |
| Romania | -28,4% | -28,7% | NAP | 4,2% | 4,3% | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | -15,8% | NA | NAP | -6,1% | -4,8% | NAP |
| Slovenia | 17,2% | 28,9% | NAP | 11,0% | 11,2% | NAP |
| Spain | 127,2% | 157,3% | 29,1% | 19,5% | 21,1% | 9,3% |
| Sweden | -48,4% | -19,8% | -57,9% | -5,6% | -21,2% | 4,0% |
| Average | 14,9% | 21,2% | 25,3% | -1,9% | -0,5% | -3,8% |
| Median | -1,3% | 4,1% | 28,8% | 0,0% | -1,0% | 0,1% |
| Minimum | -68,1% | -68,1% | -83,1% | -76,1% | -24,6% | -91,0% |
| Maximum | 194,1% | 276,3% | 216,7% | 29,7% | 23,8% | 60,9% |
| % of NA | 19% | 33% | 19% | 11% | 15% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 33% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

# Supreme court other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status

## Table 3.7.1.1a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2024

### 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** | **691** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **3 187** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **1 812** | **452** | 27 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 27 | **1 309** | 24 |
| **Bulgaria** | **8 811** | **4 958** | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **3 853** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **5 436** | **5 027** | 292 | 244 | 44 | 44 | NAP | NAP | 4 | **117** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **1 069** | **677** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **390** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **4 111** | **1 689** | 38 | 38 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **2 384** | 0 |
| **Denmark** | **113** | **113** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **52** | **29** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **23** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **2 290** | **307** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 827** | 156 |
| **France** | **25 305** | **19 985** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **5 238** | 82 |
| **Germany** | **10 463** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **3 203** | 805 |
| **Greece** | **33 156** | **2 921** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **30 235** | NAP |
| **Hungary** | **897** | **553** | 25 | 23 | 2 | NAP | 2 | 0 | 0 | **239** | 80 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **110 094** | **94 421** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **15 241** | 432 |
| **Latvia** | **691** | **313** | 0 | NAP | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | 0 | **378** | 0 |
| **Lithuania** | **314** | **297** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 17 |
| **Luxembourg** | **89** | **89** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **1 262** | **314** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **948** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **NA** | **9 395** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **37 697** | 1 461 |
| **Portugal** | **1 307** | **594** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **713** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **27 153** | **11 378** | 39 | 6 | 33 | 33 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **15 736** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **3 928** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 690** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **449** | **330** | 28 | 26 | 2 | 2 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **91** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **38 116** | **28 076** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **10 040** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **3 225** | **107** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 903** | 1 215 |
| **Average** | **12 180** | **7 944** | 56 | 56 | 16 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 8 | **6 202** | **388** |
| **Median** | **2 290** | **594** | 28 | 25 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 2 | **1 865** | **82** |
| **Minimum** | **52** | **29** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | **23** | **0** |
| **Maximum** | **110 094** | **94 421** | 292 | 244 | 44 | 44 | 2 | 0 | 27 | **37 697** | **1 461** |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **11%** | **22%** | 22% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | **48%** | 56% | 67% | 70% | 81% | 81% | 70% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.1.1b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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** | **0,008** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,035** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **0,015** | **0,004** | 0,000 | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | 0,000 | **0,011** | 0,000 |
| **Bulgaria** | **0,137** | **0,077** | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,060** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **0,141** | **0,130** | 0,008 | 0,006 | 0,001 | *0,001* | *NAP* | *NAP* | 0,000 | **0,003** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0,111** | **0,070** | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | **0,040** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,038** | **0,015** | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,022** | 0,000 |
| **Denmark** | **0,002** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0,004** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,002** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **0,041** | **0,005** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,032** | 0,003 |
| **France** | **0,037** | **0,029** | NA | NA | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,008** | 0,000 |
| **Germany** | **0,013** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | **0,004** | 0,001 |
| **Greece** | **0,319** | **0,028** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,291** | NAP |
| **Hungary** | **0,009** | **0,006** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | *NAP* | *0,000* | *0,000* | 0,000 | **0,003** | 0,001 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **0,187** | **0,160** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,026** | 0,001 |
| **Latvia** | **0,037** | **0,017** | 0,000 | NAP | 0,000 | *0,000* | *NAP* | *NAP* | 0,000 | **0,020** | 0,000 |
| **Lithuania** | **0,011** | **0,010** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NAP** | 0,001 |
| **Luxembourg** | **0,013** | **0,013** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **0,007** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,005** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **NA** | **0,025** | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | **0,100** | 0,004 |
| **Portugal** | **0,012** | **0,006** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,007** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **0,143** | **0,060** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | *0,000* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,083** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,072** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,031** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **0,021** | **0,015** | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | *0,000* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,004** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **0,078** | **0,057** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,020** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,030** | **0,001** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **0,018** | 0,011 |
| **Average** | **0,064** | **0,032** | **0,001** | 0,001 | 0,000 | *0,000* | *0,000* | *0,000* | 0,000 | **0,037** | **0,002** |
| **Median** | **0,037** | **0,015** | **0,000** | 0,000 | 0,000 | *0,000* | *0,000* | *0,000* | 0,000 | **0,020** | **0,001** |
| **Minimum** | **0,002** | **0,001** | **0,000** | 0,000 | 0,000 | *0,000* | *0,000* | *0,000* | 0,000 | **0,002** | **0,000** |
| **Maximum** | **0,319** | **0,160** | **0,008** | 0,006 | 0,001 | *0,001* | *0,000* | *0,000* | 0,000 | **0,291** | **0,011** |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **11%** | **22%** | 22% | 15% | *15%* | *15%* | *15%* | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | **48%** | 56% | 67% | *70%* | *81%* | *81%* | 70% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.1.2a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - incoming in 2024

### 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** | **2 224** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **6 714** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **1 364** | **425** | 208 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 208 | **717** | 14 |
| **Bulgaria** | **20 258** | **7 630** | 205 | 205 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **12 423** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **7 870** | **7 269** | 558 | 458 | 79 | 79 | NAP | NAP | 21 | **43** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **365** | **331** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **35** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **7 190** | **3 929** | 198 | 198 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **3 063** | 0 |
| **Denmark** | **350** | **350** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **152** | **94** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **58** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **4 046** | **591** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **3 319** | 136 |
| **France** | **22 891** | **13 104** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **9 528** | 259 |
| **Germany** | **11 276** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **5 254** | 1 306 |
| **Greece** | **11 475** | **2 536** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **8 939** | NAP |
| **Hungary** | **4 033** | **1 676** | 431 | 384 | 36 | NAP | 27 | 9 | 11 | **1 708** | 218 |
| **Ireland** | **172** | **172** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **38 002** | **26 502** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **11 192** | 308 |
| **Latvia** | **1 452** | **816** | 11 | NAP | 11 | 10 | NAP | NAP | 1 | **625** | 0 |
| **Lithuania** | **323** | **233** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 90 |
| **Luxembourg** | **78** | **78** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **1 405** | **347** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 058** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **NA** | **10 453** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **23 985** | 2 304 |
| **Portugal** | **3 381** | **2 482** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **899** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **37 165** | **14 652** | 300 | 53 | 247 | 247 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **22 213** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **4 133** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 150** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **1 982** | **1 495** | 73 | 65 | 8 | 8 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **414** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **30 766** | **17 123** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **13 643** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **12 714** | **253** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **7 543** | 4 918 |
| **Average** | **9 285** | **4 782** | **248** | 227 | 76 | 86 | 27 | 9 | 60 | **6 115** | **868** |
| **Median** | **4 040** | **1 586** | **207** | 202 | 36 | 45 | 27 | 9 | 16 | **3 191** | **218** |
| **Minimum** | **78** | **78** | **11** | 53 | 8 | 8 | 27 | 9 | 1 | **35** | **0** |
| **Maximum** | **38 002** | **26 502** | **558** | 458 | 247 | 247 | 27 | 9 | 208 | **23 985** | **4 918** |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **7%** | **22%** | 22% | 15% | *15%* | *15%* | *15%* | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | **48%** | 56% | 67% | *70%* | *81%* | *81%* | 70% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.1.2b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - incoming cases in 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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** | **0,024** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,073** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **0,012** | **0,004** | 0,002 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,002 | **0,006** | 0,000 |
| **Bulgaria** | **0,315** | **0,119** | 0,003 | 0,003 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,193** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **0,204** | **0,188** | 0,014 | 0,012 | 0,002 | 0,002 | NAP | NAP | 0,001 | **0,001** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0,038** | **0,034** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,004** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,066** | **0,036** | 0,002 | 0,002 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,028** | 0,000 |
| **Denmark** | **0,006** | **0,006** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0,011** | **0,007** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,004** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **0,072** | **0,010** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,059** | 0,002 |
| **France** | **0,033** | **0,019** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,014** | 0,000 |
| **Germany** | **0,013** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,006** | 0,002 |
| **Greece** | **0,110** | **0,024** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,086** | NAP |
| **Hungary** | **0,042** | **0,018** | 0,005 | 0,004 | 0,000 | NAP | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | **0,018** | 0,002 |
| **Ireland** | **0,003** | **0,003** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **0,064** | **0,045** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,019** | 0,001 |
| **Latvia** | **0,078** | **0,044** | 0,001 | NAP | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP | 0,000 | **0,034** | 0,000 |
| **Lithuania** | **0,011** | **0,008** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 0,003 |
| **Luxembourg** | **0,011** | **0,011** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **0,008** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,006** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **NA** | **0,028** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,064** | 0,006 |
| **Portugal** | **0,031** | **0,023** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,008** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **0,195** | **0,077** | 0,002 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,117** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,076** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,021** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **0,093** | **0,070** | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,019** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **0,063** | **0,035** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,028** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,120** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,071** | 0,046 |
| **Average** | **0,070** | **0,035** | **0,004** | 0,004 | 0,001 | *0,001* | *0,000* | *0,000* | 0,001 | **0,040** | **0,006** |
| **Median** | **0,052** | **0,024** | **0,002** | 0,003 | 0,001 | *0,001* | *0,000* | *0,000* | 0,000 | **0,020** | **0,002** |
| **Minimum** | **0,003** | **0,002** | **0,001** | 0,000 | 0,000 | *0,000* | *0,000* | *0,000* | 0,000 | **0,001** | **0,000** |
| **Maximum** | **0,315** | **0,188** | **0,014** | 0,012 | 0,002 | *0,002* | *0,000* | *0,000* | 0,002 | **0,193** | **0,046** |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **7%** | **22%** | 22% | 15% | *15%* | *15%* | *15%* | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | **48%** | 56% | 67% | *70%* | *81%* | *81%* | 70% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.1.3a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - resolved cases in 2024

### 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** | **2 206** | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | **6 890** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **1 398** | **403** | 181 | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | 181 | **799** | 15 |
| **Bulgaria** | **21 832** | **8 115** | 205 | 205 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **13 512** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **9 283** | **8 621** | 603 | 511 | 73 | *73* | *NAP* | *NAP* | 19 | **59** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **785** | **542** | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | **242** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **7 736** | **4 000** | 189 | 189 | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **3 547** | 0 |
| **Denmark** | **364** | **364** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **143** | **92** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **51** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **4 604** | **628** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **3 747** | 229 |
| **France** | **24 186** | **14 165** | NA | NA | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **9 763** | 258 |
| **Germany** | **12 882** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | **5 427** | 1 588 |
| **Greece** | **20 422** | **2 914** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **17 508** | NAP |
| **Hungary** | **3 989** | **1 706** | 413 | 379 | 23 | *NAP* | *20* | *3* | 11 | **1 650** | 220 |
| **Ireland** | **188** | **188** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **47 476** | **33 784** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **13 193** | 499 |
| **Latvia** | **1 473** | **871** | 10 | NAP | 10 | *10* | *NAP* | *NAP* | 0 | **592** | 0 |
| **Lithuania** | **333** | **243** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NAP** | 90 |
| **Luxembourg** | **85** | **85** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **1 353** | **352** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **1 001** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **NA** | **10 473** | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | **26 835** | 2 032 |
| **Portugal** | **3 545** | **2 574** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **971** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **41 095** | **16 679** | 306 | 49 | 257 | *260* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **24 110** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **4 900** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **1 770** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **2 005** | **1 517** | 81 | 71 | 10 | *10* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **407** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **29 089** | **14 832** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **14 257** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **13 110** | **229** | NAP | NAP | NAP | *NAP* | *NAP* | *NAP* | NAP | **8 175** | 4 706 |
| **Average** | **10 512** | **5 233** | **249** | 234 | 75 | *88* | *20* | *3* | 53 | **7 023** | **876** |
| **Median** | **4 297** | **1 612** | **197** | 197 | 23 | *42* | *20* | *3* | 15 | **3 647** | **229** |
| **Minimum** | **85** | **85** | **10** | 49 | 10 | *10* | *20* | *3* | 0 | **51** | **0** |
| **Maximum** | **47 476** | **33 784** | **603** | 511 | 257 | *260* | *20* | *3* | 181 | **26 835** | **4 706** |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **7%** | **22%** | 22% | 15% | *15%* | *15%* | *15%* | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | **48%** | 56% | 67% | *70%* | *81%* | *81%* | 70% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.1.3b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - resolved cases per 100 inhabitants in 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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** | **0,024** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,075** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **0,012** | **0,003** | 0,002 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,002 | **0,007** | 0,000 |
| **Bulgaria** | **0,339** | **0,126** | 0,003 | 0,003 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,210** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **0,240** | **0,223** | 0,016 | 0,013 | 0,002 | 0,002 | NAP | NAP | 0,000 | **0,002** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0,081** | **0,056** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,025** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,071** | **0,037** | 0,002 | 0,002 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,033** | 0,000 |
| **Denmark** | **0,006** | **0,006** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0,010** | **0,007** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,004** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **0,082** | **0,011** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,066** | 0,004 |
| **France** | **0,035** | **0,021** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,014** | 0,000 |
| **Germany** | **0,015** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,006** | 0,002 |
| **Greece** | **0,196** | **0,028** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,168** | NAP |
| **Hungary** | **0,042** | **0,018** | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,000 | NAP | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | **0,017** | 0,002 |
| **Ireland** | **0,003** | **0,003** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **0,081** | **0,057** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,022** | 0,001 |
| **Latvia** | **0,079** | **0,047** | 0,001 | NAP | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP | 0,000 | **0,032** | 0,000 |
| **Lithuania** | **0,012** | **0,008** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 0,003 |
| **Luxembourg** | **0,012** | **0,012** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **0,007** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,006** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **NA** | **0,028** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,071** | 0,005 |
| **Portugal** | **0,033** | **0,024** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,009** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **0,216** | **0,088** | 0,002 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,127** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,090** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,033** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **0,094** | **0,071** | 0,004 | 0,003 | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,019** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **0,059** | **0,030** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,029** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,124** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,077** | 0,044 |
| **Average** | **0,081** | **0,039** | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | **0,048** | **0,006** |
| **Median** | **0,065** | **0,024** | 0,002 | 0,003 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | **0,027** | **0,002** |
| **Minimum** | **0,003** | **0,002** | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | **0,002** | **0,000** |
| **Maximum** | **0,339** | **0,223** | 0,016 | 0,013 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,002 | **0,210** | **0,044** |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **7%** | 22% | 22% | 15% | *15%* | *15%* | *15%* | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | 48% | 56% | 67% | *70%* | *81%* | *81%* | 70% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.1.4a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024

### 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** | **709** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **3 011** | **NA** |
| **Belgium** | **1 765** | **474** | 54 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 54 | **1 214** | **23** |
| **Bulgaria** | **7 237** | **4 473** | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **2 764** | **NAP** |
| **Croatia** | **4 033** | **3 683** | 249 | 193 | 50 | 50 | NAP | NAP | 6 | **101** | **NAP** |
| **Cyprus** | **649** | **466** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **183** | **NA** |
| **Czech Republic** | **3 565** | **1 618** | 47 | 47 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 900** | **0** |
| **Denmark** | **99** | **99** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | **NAP** |
| **Estonia** | **61** | **31** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **30** | **NAP** |
| **Finland** | **1 735** | **272** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 399** | **64** |
| **France** | **24 010** | **18 924** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **5 003** | **83** |
| **Germany** | **8 857** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **3 030** | **523** |
| **Greece** | **24 209** | **2 543** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **21 666** | **NAP** |
| **Hungary** | **941** | **523** | 43 | 28 | 15 | NAP | 9 | 6 | 0 | **297** | **78** |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | **NAP** |
| **Italy** | **100 620** | **87 139** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **13 240** | **241** |
| **Latvia** | **670** | **258** | 1 | NAP | 1 | 0 | NAP | NAP | 1 | **411** | **0** |
| **Lithuania** | **304** | **287** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | **17** |
| **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** | **1 314** | **309** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 005** | **NAP** |
| **Poland** | **NA** | **9 375** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **34 847** | **1 733** |
| **Portugal** | **1 143** | **502** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **641** | **NAP** |
| **Romania** | **23 223** | **9 351** | 33 | 10 | 23 | 20 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **13 839** | **NAP** |
| **Slovak Republic** | **3 253** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 071** | **NAP** |
| **Slovenia** | **426** | **308** | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **98** | **NAP** |
| **Spain** | **39 755** | **30 497** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **9 258** | **NAP** |
| **Sweden** | **2 829** | **131** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **1 271** | **1 427** |
| **Average** | **10 903** | **7 481** | 56 | 50 | 18 | 18 | 9 | 6 | 15 | **5 285** | **381** |
| **Median** | **1 765** | **502** | 38 | 24 | 15 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 4 | **1 335** | **78** |
| **Minimum** | **61** | **31** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | **30** | **0** |
| **Maximum** | **100 620** | **87 139** | 249 | 193 | 50 | 50 | 9 | 6 | 54 | **34 847** | **1 733** |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **11%** | 22% | 22% | 15% | *15%* | *15%* | *15%* | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | 48% | 56% | 67% | *70%* | *81%* | *81%* | 70% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.1.4b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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** | **0,008** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,033** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **0,015** | **0,004** | 0,000 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,000 | **0,010** | 0,000 |
| **Bulgaria** | **0,112** | **0,069** | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,043** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **0,104** | **0,095** | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP | 0,000 | **0,003** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0,067** | **0,048** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,019** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,033** | **0,015** | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,017** | 0,000 |
| **Denmark** | **0,002** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0,004** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,002** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **0,031** | **0,005** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,025** | 0,001 |
| **France** | **0,035** | **0,028** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,007** | 0,000 |
| **Germany** | **0,011** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,004** | 0,001 |
| **Greece** | **0,233** | **0,024** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,208** | NAP |
| **Hungary** | **0,010** | **0,005** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | **0,003** | 0,001 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **0,171** | **0,148** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,022** | 0,000 |
| **Latvia** | **0,036** | **0,014** | 0,000 | NAP | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | NAP | 0,000 | **0,022** | 0,000 |
| **Lithuania** | **0,011** | **0,010** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 0,001 |
| **Luxembourg** | **0,012** | **0,012** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **0,007** | **0,002** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,006** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **NA** | **0,025** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **0,093** | 0,005 |
| **Portugal** | **0,011** | **0,005** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,006** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **0,122** | **0,049** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,073** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,060** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,020** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **0,020** | **0,014** | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,005** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **0,081** | **0,062** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,019** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,027** | **0,001** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **0,012** | 0,013 |
| **Average** | **0,053** | **0,028** | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | **0,030** | **0,002** |
| **Median** | **0,031** | **0,014** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | **0,018** | **0,001** |
| **Minimum** | **0,002** | **0,001** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | **0,002** | **0,000** |
| **Maximum** | **0,233** | **0,148** | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | **0,208** | **0,013** |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **11%** | 22% | 22% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | 48% | 56% | 67% | 70% | 81% | 81% | 70% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.1.5: Supreme court civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - pending more than 2 years in 2024

**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% | 265 | 8,8% |
| **Belgium** | 84 | 17,7% | 256 | 21,1% |
| **Bulgaria** | 129 | 2,9% | 70 | 2,5% |
| **Croatia** | 513 | 13,9% | 52 | 51,5% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | 1 078 | 5,7% | 747 | 14,9% |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 45 707 | 52,5% | 2 491 | 18,8% |
| **Latvia** | 7 | 2,7% | 31 | 7,5% |
| **Lithuania** | 1 | 0,3% | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | 8 290 | 23,8% |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 421 | 4,5% | 262 | 1,9% |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | 66 | 6,2% |
| **Slovenia** | 10 | 3,2% | 13 | 13,3% |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 0 | 0,0% | 5 | 0,4% |
| **Average** | **3 996** | **8,6%** | **965** | **13,1%** |
| **Median** | **47** | **3,1%** | **70** | **8,8%** |
| **Minimum** | **0** | **0,0%** | **0** | **0,0%** |
| **Maximum** | **45 707** | **52,5%** | **8 290** | **51,5%** |
| **% of NA** | **48%** | **48%** | **44%** | **44%** |
| **% of NAP** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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**.**

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Evolution of Supreme court other than criminal cases for total, civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases

## Table 3.7.2.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,14 |
| **Croatia** | 0,27 | 0,35 | 0,42 | 0,40 | 0,41 | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,22 | 0,14 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,12 | 0,11 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Denmark** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Estonia** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 |
| **Finland** | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **France** | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | NA | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Greece** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,32 |
| **Hungary** | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NA | 0,00 | NA | 0,00 | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,19 |
| **Latvia** | 0,11 | 0,13 | NA | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| **Romania** | 0,69 | 0,42 | 0,20 | 0,17 | 0,22 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,14 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,17 | 0,22 | 0,24 | 0,15 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,05 | 0,08 | 0,07 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Spain** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Sweden** | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Average** | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Median** | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,69 | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,40 | 0,41 | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,22 | 0,32 |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

## Table 3.7.2.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Belgium** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,27 | 0,21 | 0,13 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,10 | 0,07 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Denmark** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Estonia** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Finland** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **France** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | NA | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Germany** | 0,00 | 0,01 | NA | 0,01 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA | 0,03 |
| **Hungary** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NA | 0,00 | NA | 0,00 | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,16 |
| **Latvia** | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,08 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Poland** | 0,01 | - | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,03 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Romania** | 0,46 | 0,26 | 0,10 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 |
| **Spain** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Sweden** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Average** | 0,06 | | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **Median** | 0,01 | | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,46 | | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,27 | 0,21 | 0,16 |
| **% of NA** | 33% | | 22% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

## Table 3.7.2.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Belgium** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,03 | 0,04 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,01 | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Finland** | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **France** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Germany** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,29 |
| **Hungary** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Latvia** | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | NA | NA | NA | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Romania** | 0,23 | 0,16 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,16 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | NAP | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Spain** | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Sweden** | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Average** | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 |
| **Median** | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,23 | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,29 |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 15% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 22% | 26% | 19% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 11% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.3.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2014 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,03 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | 0,08 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,38 | 0,08 | 0,33 | 0,33 | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,31 | 0,31 | 0,31 |
| **Croatia** | 0,19 | 0,08 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,21 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,20 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | 0,08 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,02 | 0,04 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Denmark** | 0,00 | 0,08 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 |
| **Estonia** | 0,02 | 0,08 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Finland** | 0,11 | 0,08 | 0,11 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 |
| **France** | 0,05 | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **Germany** | NA | 0,08 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Greece** | 0,02 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | NA | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,11 |
| **Hungary** | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Ireland** | 0,01 | 0,08 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Italy** | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Latvia** | 0,14 | 0,08 | NA | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,03 | 0,08 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 0,08 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| **Malta** | NAP | 0,08 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 0,01 | 0,08 | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Poland** | NA | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 0,02 | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Romania** | 0,71 | 0,08 | 0,30 | 0,49 | 0,40 | 0,31 | 0,26 | 0,27 | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,20 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,33 | 0,08 | 0,25 | 0,17 | 0,14 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,13 | 0,08 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 |
| **Spain** | 0,03 | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Sweden** | 0,12 | 0,08 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| **Average** | 0,12 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Median** | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,08 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,71 | 0,08 | 0,33 | 0,49 | 0,40 | 0,33 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,31 | 0,31 | 0,31 |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 0% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 0% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

## Table 3.7.3.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - incoming 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Belgium** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,14 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,19 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,01 | 0,03 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Denmark** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 |
| **Estonia** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Finland** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **France** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Germany** | 0,01 | 0,01 | NA | 0,01 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,02 |
| **Hungary** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Ireland** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Italy** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Latvia** | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Poland** | 0,02 | - | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Romania** | 0,35 | 0,18 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | 0,14 | 0,10 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Spain** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Sweden** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Average** | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Median** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,35 | 0,18 | 0,12 | 0,14 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,19 |
| **% of NA** | 30% | 22% | 22% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

## Table 3.7.3.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - incoming 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 0,049 | 0,066 | 0,077 | 0,078 | 0,071 | 0,067 | 0,059 | 0,068 | 0,073 |
| **Belgium** | 0,006 | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,005 | 0,005 | 0,007 | 0,007 | 0,006 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,224 | 0,209 | 0,209 | 0,213 | 0,227 | 0,217 | 0,203 | 0,188 | 0,191 | 0,196 | 0,193 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,001 | 0,004 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,001 | 0,004 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,025 | NA | 0,031 | 0,037 | 0,039 | 0,040 | 0,038 | 0,038 | 0,032 | 0,031 | 0,028 |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,008 | 0,007 | 0,008 | 0,006 | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,005 | 0,003 | 0,004 |
| **Finland** | 0,077 | 0,079 | 0,087 | 0,116 | 0,112 | 0,111 | 0,094 | 0,074 | 0,067 | 0,064 | 0,059 |
| **France** | 0,018 | 0,013 | 0,014 | 0,015 | 0,014 | 0,015 | 0,015 | 0,017 | 0,014 | 0,014 | 0,014 |
| **Germany** | 0,009 | 0,008 | 0,008 | 0,008 | 0,007 | 0,007 | 0,007 | 0,006 | 0,007 | 0,006 | 0,006 |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 0,043 | 0,034 | 0,034 | 0,033 | 0,031 | 0,034 | 0,028 | 0,029 | 0,086 |
| **Hungary** | 0,022 | 0,021 | 0,021 | 0,019 | 0,023 | 0,022 | 0,032 | 0,046 | 0,024 | 0,015 | 0,018 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,018 | 0,018 | 0,019 | 0,015 | 0,019 | 0,020 | 0,019 | 0,021 | 0,019 | 0,019 | 0,019 |
| **Latvia** | 0,058 | 0,062 | 0,057 | 0,051 | 0,044 | 0,044 | 0,044 | 0,038 | 0,033 | 0,031 | 0,034 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 0,006 | NA | NA | NA | 0,005 | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,007 | 0,005 | 0,007 | 0,006 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | 0,049 | 0,046 | 0,053 | NA | NA | NA | 0,062 | 0,052 | 0,064 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,014 | 0,013 | 0,013 | 0,010 | 0,011 | 0,010 | 0,011 | 0,011 | 0,008 | 0,008 |
| **Romania** | 0,362 | 0,218 | 0,182 | 0,386 | 0,223 | 0,155 | 0,132 | 0,148 | 0,132 | 0,130 | 0,117 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,092 | 0,088 | 0,067 | 0,038 | 0,040 | 0,036 | 0,033 | 0,016 | NAP | 0,024 | 0,021 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,046 | 0,039 | 0,043 | 0,034 | 0,018 | 0,017 | 0,017 | 0,019 | 0,018 | 0,019 | 0,019 |
| **Spain** | 0,013 | 0,019 | 0,020 | 0,019 | 0,021 | 0,021 | 0,020 | 0,022 | 0,024 | 0,024 | 0,028 |
| **Sweden** | 0,072 | 0,075 | 0,070 | 0,075 | 0,068 | 0,069 | 0,072 | 0,074 | 0,073 | 0,077 | 0,071 |
| **Average** | 0,066 | 0,058 | 0,052 | 0,063 | 0,052 | 0,048 | 0,043 | 0,042 | 0,041 | 0,037 | 0,040 |
| **Median** | 0,023 | 0,021 | 0,043 | 0,034 | 0,028 | 0,022 | 0,026 | 0,021 | 0,024 | 0,021 | 0,020 |
| **Minimum** | 0,006 | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,001 | 0,004 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| **Maximum** | 0,362 | 0,218 | 0,209 | 0,386 | 0,227 | 0,217 | 0,203 | 0,188 | 0,191 | 0,196 | 0,193 |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 15% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 22% | 26% | 19% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 11% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.4.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,37 | 0,34 | 0,32 | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,36 | 0,32 | 0,29 | 0,30 | 0,32 | 0,34 |
| **Croatia** | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,22 | 0,19 | 0,23 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,23 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,05 | 0,08 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 |
| **Denmark** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 |
| **Estonia** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Finland** | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,13 | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **France** | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 |
| **Greece** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | NA | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,20 |
| **Hungary** | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Ireland** | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Italy** | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Latvia** | 0,12 | 0,15 | NA | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 0,01 | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **Romania** | 1,03 | 0,62 | 0,34 | 0,43 | 0,41 | 0,31 | 0,27 | 0,28 | 0,25 | 0,23 | 0,22 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,28 | 0,36 | 0,34 | 0,23 | 0,16 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 |
| **Spain** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| **Sweden** | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| **Average** | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 |
| **Median** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,07 |
| **Minimum** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 1,03 | 0,62 | 0,34 | 0,43 | 0,41 | 0,36 | 0,32 | 0,29 | 0,30 | 0,32 | 0,34 |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Netherlands**: The number of resolved cases includes only cases finalised by a judge decision, while cases closed differently (e.g. withdrawn, discarded upon objection and alike) are not included

## Table 3.7.4.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - resolved 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Belgium** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,13 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,18 | 0,21 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,22 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,04 | 0,06 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Denmark** | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 |
| **Estonia** | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Finland** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **France** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Germany** | 0,01 | 0,01 | NA | 0,01 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,03 |
| **Hungary** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Ireland** | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Italy** | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Latvia** | 0,07 | 0,09 | 0,12 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Poland** | 0,02 | - | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Romania** | 0,58 | 0,34 | 0,14 | 0,11 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | 0,17 | 0,11 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Spain** | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Sweden** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Average** | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Median** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,58 | 0,34 | 0,14 | 0,17 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,18 | 0,21 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,22 |
| **% of NA** | 26% | 22% | 22% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Netherlands**: The number of resolved cases includes only cases finalised by a judge decision, while cases closed differently (e.g. withdrawn, discarded upon objection and alike) are not included

## Table 3.7.4.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - resolved 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 0,053 | 0,062 | 0,077 | 0,072 | 0,071 | 0,065 | 0,066 | 0,070 | 0,075 |
| **Belgium** | 0,007 | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,004 | 0,003 | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,007 | 0,006 | 0,007 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,213 | 0,200 | 0,198 | 0,224 | 0,228 | 0,248 | 0,223 | 0,188 | 0,183 | 0,203 | 0,210 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,003 | 0,002 | 0,002 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,015 | 0,025 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,026 | NA | 0,028 | 0,033 | 0,033 | 0,036 | 0,035 | 0,036 | 0,036 | 0,036 | 0,033 |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,008 | 0,007 | 0,007 | 0,006 | 0,006 | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,006 | 0,004 | 0,005 | 0,004 |
| **Finland** | 0,078 | 0,073 | 0,098 | 0,120 | 0,107 | 0,111 | 0,097 | 0,092 | 0,068 | 0,068 | 0,066 |
| **France** | 0,018 | 0,014 | 0,014 | 0,015 | 0,014 | 0,015 | 0,014 | 0,017 | 0,014 | 0,014 | 0,014 |
| **Germany** | 0,009 | 0,009 | 0,009 | 0,008 | 0,007 | 0,007 | 0,007 | 0,007 | 0,007 | 0,007 | 0,006 |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 0,056 | 0,046 | 0,036 | 0,035 | 0,037 | 0,032 | 0,033 | 0,033 | 0,168 |
| **Hungary** | 0,023 | 0,020 | 0,021 | 0,018 | 0,020 | 0,026 | 0,035 | 0,044 | 0,027 | 0,015 | 0,017 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,017 | 0,016 | 0,018 | 0,017 | 0,021 | 0,022 | 0,022 | 0,022 | 0,027 | 0,025 | 0,022 |
| **Latvia** | 0,049 | 0,054 | 0,052 | 0,045 | 0,040 | 0,050 | 0,050 | 0,045 | 0,039 | 0,037 | 0,032 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 0,006 | NA | NA | NA | 0,005 | 0,005 | 0,005 | 0,005 | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,006 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | 0,044 | 0,050 | 0,049 | NA | NA | NA | 0,058 | 0,054 | 0,071 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,013 | 0,012 | 0,014 | 0,010 | 0,010 | 0,012 | 0,012 | 0,011 | 0,009 | 0,009 |
| **Romania** | 0,448 | 0,274 | 0,192 | 0,322 | 0,274 | 0,155 | 0,140 | 0,153 | 0,143 | 0,139 | 0,127 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,072 | 0,074 | 0,072 | 0,062 | 0,047 | 0,040 | 0,033 | 0,016 | NAP | 0,034 | 0,033 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,037 | 0,038 | 0,043 | 0,039 | 0,025 | 0,021 | 0,017 | 0,019 | 0,019 | 0,020 | 0,019 |
| **Spain** | 0,012 | 0,013 | 0,012 | 0,020 | 0,030 | 0,026 | 0,018 | 0,025 | 0,021 | 0,024 | 0,029 |
| **Sweden** | 0,081 | 0,076 | 0,069 | 0,071 | 0,075 | 0,069 | 0,069 | 0,072 | 0,074 | 0,077 | 0,077 |
| **Average** | 0,069 | 0,059 | 0,053 | 0,062 | 0,055 | 0,050 | 0,045 | 0,043 | 0,042 | 0,041 | 0,048 |
| **Median** | 0,025 | 0,020 | 0,043 | 0,039 | 0,031 | 0,026 | 0,027 | 0,024 | 0,027 | 0,024 | 0,027 |
| **Minimum** | 0,006 | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,004 | 0,003 | 0,004 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,003 | 0,002 | 0,002 |
| **Maximum** | 0,448 | 0,274 | 0,198 | 0,322 | 0,274 | 0,248 | 0,223 | 0,188 | 0,183 | 0,203 | 0,210 |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 15% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 22% | 26% | 19% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 11% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Netherlands:** The number of resolved cases includes only cases finalised by a judge decision, while cases closed differently (e.g. withdrawn, discarded upon objection and alike) are not included

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.5.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,11 |
| **Croatia** | 0,35 | 0,42 | 0,40 | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,22 | 0,14 | 0,10 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,09 | 0,07 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **Denmark** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Estonia** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Finland** | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **France** | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Greece** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,23 |
| **Hungary** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,17 |
| **Latvia** | 0,13 | 0,12 | NA | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Romania** | 0,37 | 0,20 | 0,16 | 0,22 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,12 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,22 | 0,24 | 0,15 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,07 | 0,06 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Spain** | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Sweden** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Average** | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| **Median** | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,37 | 0,42 | 0,40 | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,33 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,22 | 0,19 | 0,23 |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

## Table 3.7.5.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Belgium** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,07 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,28 | 0,26 | 0,21 | 0,13 | 0,10 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,07 | 0,05 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| **Denmark** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Estonia** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Finland** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 |
| **France** | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Germany** | 0,01 | 0,00 | NA | 0,01 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA | 0,02 |
| **Hungary** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,15 |
| **Latvia** | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Poland** | 0,01 | - | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 |
| **Romania** | 0,23 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| **Spain** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| **Sweden** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Average** | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Median** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,23 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,28 | 0,26 | 0,21 | 0,16 | 0,15 |
| **% of NA** | 33% | 26% | 22% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

## Table 3.7.5.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Belgium** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,04 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,01 | 0,02 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,01 | NA | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Finland** | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **France** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Germany** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,21 |
| **Hungary** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Latvia** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | NA | NA | NA | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,09 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Romania** | 0,14 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,16 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,07 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | NAP | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Spain** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Sweden** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| **Average** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Median** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,14 | 0,11 | 0,14 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,21 |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 15% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 22% | 26% | 19% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 11% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: IIn 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.6.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

| States | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NA | NA | 0,0006 | 0,0011 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,0019 | 0,0019 | NA | 0,0038 | 0,0029 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,0031 | 0,0044 | 0,0031 |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,1401 | 0,1504 | 0,0924 | 0,0432 | 0,0151 |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Estonia | NAP | 0 | NAP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Finland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,0027 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | 0,0799 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,0010 | NA |
| Hungary | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | NA | NA | 0,1111 | 0,1063 | 0,1186 | 0,1125 | 0,1038 | 0,0952 | 0,0819 |
| Latvia | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,0072 | 0,0092 | 0,0067 | 0,0034 | 0,0020 |
| Lithuania | 0,0000 | 0,0002 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0001 | 0,0001 | 0,0001 | 0,0001 | 0,0000 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 0,0077 | 0,0074 | 0,0049 | 0,0049 | 0,0046 | 0,0109 | 0,0065 | 0,0038 | 0,0036 |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,0040 | 0,0086 | 0,0010 | 0,0023 | 0,0017 |
| Slovenia | 0,0004 | 0,0022 | 0,0004 | 0,0014 | 0,0015 | 0,0010 | 0,0012 | 0,0010 | 0,0011 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | 0,0002 | 0,0000 | 0,0001 | 0,0000 | 0,0002 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0001 | 0,0000 |
| Average | 0,0017 | 0,0016 | 0,0246 | 0,0142 | 0,0278 | 0,0295 | 0,0215 | 0,0132 | 0,0095 |
| Median | 0,0002 | 0,0001 | 0,0005 | 0,0005 | 0,0030 | 0,0053 | 0,0022 | 0,0029 | 0,0024 |
| Minimum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maximum | 0,0077 | 0,0074 | 0,1111 | 0,1063 | 0,1401 | 0,1504 | 0,1038 | 0,0952 | 0,0819 |
| % of NA | 70% | 70% | 59% | 63% | 56% | 56% | 56% | 52% | 48% |
| % of NAP | 11% | 7% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% |

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.7.6.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

| States | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,136 | 0,141 | 0,087 | 0,039 | 0,013 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Estonia** | NAP | 0,000 | NAP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,001 | 0,002 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,087 | 0,090 | 0,089 | 0,087 | 0,097 | 0,094 | 0,090 | 0,084 | 0,078 |
| **Latvia** | 0,026 | NA | NA | NA | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 0,006 | 0,006 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,001 | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| **Average** | 0,017 | 0,014 | 0,015 | 0,013 | 0,024 | 0,022 | 0,015 | 0,011 | 0,008 |
| **Median** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| **Minimum** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 0,087 | 0,090 | 0,089 | 0,087 | 0,136 | 0,141 | 0,090 | 0,084 | 0,078 |
| **% of NA** | 63% | 67% | 67% | 67% | 56% | 52% | 48% | 52% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | 11% | 7% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% |

## Table 3.7.6.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)**

| States | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,004 | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,003 |
| **Belgium** | NAP | 0,000 | NA | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,002 | 0,003 | 0,002 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,007 | 0,004 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,001 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,001 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | NAP | 0 | NAP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | NA | NA | 0,001 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 0,080 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Italy** | NA | NA | 0,022 | 0,019 | 0,021 | 0,018 | 0,013 | 0,008 | 0,004 |
| **Latvia** | 0,000 | NA | NA | NA | 0,007 | 0,009 | 0,006 | 0,003 | 0,002 |
| **Lithuania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,028 | 0,022 |
| **Portugal** | NA | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,002 | 0,009 | 0,005 | 0,002 | 0,001 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,003 | 0,006 | NAP | 0,002 | 0,001 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,000 | 0,002 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,001 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 0,00014 | 0,00003 | 0,00004 | 0,00001 | 0,00016 | 0,00003 | 0,00001 | 0,00014 | 0,00005 |
| **Average** | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,013 | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,004 | 0,003 | 0,004 | 0,003 |
| **Median** | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,001 |
| **Minimum** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 0,007 | 0,004 | 0,080 | 0,019 | 0,021 | 0,018 | 0,013 | 0,028 | 0,022 |
| **% of NA** | 44% | 44% | 52% | 44% | 41% | 41% | 44% | 41% | 44% |
| **% of NAP** | 30% | 26% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 7% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic**: In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

# Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court other than criminal cases

## Table 3.8.1.1: Clearance rate for Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2024 (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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | 99% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 103% | NA |
| **Belgium** | 102% | 95% | 87% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 87% | 111% | 107% |
| **Bulgaria** | 108% | 106% | 100% | 100% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 109% | NAP |
| **Croatia** | 118% | 119% | 108% | 112% | 92% | 92% | NAP | NAP | 90% | 137% | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | 215% | 164% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 691% | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 108% | 102% | 95% | 95% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 116% | 0% |
| **Denmark** | 104% | 104% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Estonia** | 94% | 98% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 88% | NAP |
| **Finland** | 114% | 106% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 113% | 168% |
| **France** | 106% | 108% | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 102% | 100% |
| **Germany** | 114% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 103% | 122% |
| **Greece** | 178% | 115% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 196% | NAP |
| **Hungary** | 99% | 102% | 96% | 99% | 64% | NAP | 74% | 33% | 100% | 97% | 101% |
| **Ireland** | 109% | 109% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | 125% | 127% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 118% | 162% |
| **Latvia** | 101% | 107% | 91% | NAP | 91% | 100% | NAP | NAP | 0% | 95% | 0% |
| **Lithuania** | 103% | 104% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 100% |
| **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** | 96% | 101% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 95% | NAP |
| **Poland** | NA | 100% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 112% | 88% |
| **Portugal** | 105% | 104% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 108% | NAP |
| **Romania** | 111% | 114% | 102% | 92% | 104% | 105% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 109% | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 119% | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 154% | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | 101% | 101% | 111% | 109% | 125% | 125% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 98% | NAP |
| **Spain** | 95% | 87% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 105% | NAP |
| **Sweden** | 103% | 91% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 108% | 96% |
| **Average** | 114% | 107% | 99% | 101% | 95% | 106% | 74% | 33% | 69% | 139% | 95% |
| **Median** | 107% | 104% | 98% | 99% | 92% | 103% | 74% | 33% | 89% | 108% | 100% |
| **Minimum** | 94% | 87% | 87% | 92% | 64% | 92% | 74% | 33% | 0% | 88% | 0% |
| **Maximum** | 215% | 164% | 111% | 112% | 125% | 125% | 74% | 33% | 100% | 691% | 168% |
| **% of NA** | **7%** | **7%** | 22% | 22% | 15% | *15%* | *15%* | *15%* | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | 48% | 56% | 67% | *70%* | *81%* | *81%* | 70% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Netherlands:** The number of resolved cases includes only cases finalised by a judge decision, while cases closed differently (e.g. withdrawn, discarded upon objection and alike) are not included

**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 3.8.1.2: Disposition time for Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2024

**(Q099)**

| 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** | **NA** | **117** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **160** | NA |
| **Belgium** | **461** | **429** | 109 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 109 | **555** | 560 |
| **Bulgaria** | **121** | **201** | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **75** | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **159** | **156** | 151 | 138 | 250 | 250 | NAP | NAP | 115 | **625** | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **302** | **314** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **276** | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **168** | **148** | 91 | 91 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **196** | 0 |
| **Denmark** | **99** | **99** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **156** | **123** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **215** | NAP |
| **Finland** | **138** | **158** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **136** | 102 |
| **France** | **362** | **488** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **187** | 117 |
| **Germany** | **251** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **204** | 120 |
| **Greece** | **433** | **319** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **452** | NAP |
| **Hungary** | **86** | **112** | 38 | 27 | 238 | NAP | 164 | 730 | 0 | **66** | 129 |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NA** | NAP |
| **Italy** | **774** | **941** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **366** | 176 |
| **Latvia** | **166** | **108** | 37 | NAP | 37 | 0 | NAP | NAP |  | **253** | 0 |
| **Lithuania** | **333** | **431** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | 69 |
| **Luxembourg** | **352** | **352** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **NAP** | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **354** | **320** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **366** | NAP |
| **Poland** | **NA** | **327** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | **474** | 311 |
| **Portugal** | **118** | **71** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **241** | NAP |
| **Romania** | **206** | **205** | 39 | 74 | 33 | 28 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **210** | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **242** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **221** | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **78** | **74** | 90 | 103 | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | **88** | NAP |
| **Spain** | **499** | **750** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **237** | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **79** | **209** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | **57** | 111 |
| **Average** | **258** | **281** | 69 | 72 | 111 | *70* | *164* | *730* | 75 | **257** | **154** |
| **Median** | **206** | **205** | 65 | 83 | 37 | *14* | *164* | *730* | 109 | **218** | **117** |
| **Minimum** | **78** | **71** | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0* | *164* | *730* | 0 | **57** | **0** |
| **Maximum** | **774** | **941** | 151 | 138 | 250 | *250* | *164* | *730* | 115 | **625** | **560** |
| **Nb of values** | **27** | **27** | 27 | 27 | 27 | *27* | *27* | *27* | 26 | **27** | **27** |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | **11%** | 22% | 22% | 15% | *15%* | *15%* | *15%* | 15% | **7%** | **7%** |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | 48% | 56% | 67% | *70%* | *81%* | *81%* | 73% | **11%** | **52%** |

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Netherlands:** The number of resolved cases includes only cases finalised by a judge decision, while cases closed differently (e.g. withdrawn, discarded upon objection and alike) are not included

**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 3.8.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of Supreme court total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
**(Q099)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 93% | 104% | 107% | 96% | 100% | 93% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | 104% | 110% | 104% | 79% | 91% | 91% | 102% | 95% | 94% | 102% |
| **Bulgaria** | 97% | 98% | 96% | 103% | 99% | 109% | 108% | 96% | 97% | 101% | 108% |
| **Croatia** | 60% | 65% | 114% | 115% | 137% | 116% | 120% | 112% | 135% | 151% | 118% |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 349% | 215% |
| **Czech Republic** | 98% | 100% | 95% | 96% | 99% | 101% | 101% | 99% | 105% | 109% | 108% |
| **Denmark** | 132% | 120% | 93% | 110% | 92% | 90% | 105% | 95% | 102% | 112% | 104% |
| **Estonia** | 102% | 101% | 94% | 108% | 97% | 106% | 87% | 97% | 92% | 115% | 94% |
| **Finland** | 100% | 96% | 111% | 105% | 98% | 101% | 103% | 118% | 103% | 105% | 114% |
| **France** | 96% | 94% | 103% | 94% | 115% | 102% | 101% | 103% | 99% | 101% | 106% |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | 100% | 103% | 100% | 101% | 100% | 101% | 95% | 98% | 114% |
| **Greece** | 104% | 77% | 106% | 128% | 102% | 102% | NA | 90% | 107% | 98% | 178% |
| **Hungary** | 105% | 98% | 89% | 93% | 104% | 116% | 118% | 99% | 112% | 105% | 99% |
| **Ireland** | 152% | 481% | 190% | 123% | 90% | 106% | 130% | 110% | 117% | 84% | 109% |
| **Italy** | 94% | 88% | 93% | 101% | 93% | 92% | 97% | 123% | 128% | 137% | 125% |
| **Latvia** | 85% | 112% | NA | 104% | 98% | 108% | 118% | 108% | 111% | 110% | 101% |
| **Lithuania** | 85% | 123% | 98% | 96% | 112% | 87% | 85% | 95% | 111% | 123% | 103% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 90% | 100% | 78% | 95% | 96% | 100% | 126% | 136% | 73% | 109% |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 93% | NA | NA | NA | 91% | 81% | 96% | 74% | 87% | 69% | 96% |
| **Poland** | NA | - | 94% | 108% | 92% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 101% | 96% | 98% | 104% | 99% | 93% | 98% | 103% | 102% | 110% | 105% |
| **Romania** | 144% | 155% | 113% | 89% | 104% | 100% | 105% | 106% | 110% | 106% | 111% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 85% | 94% | 136% | 130% | 118% | 108% | 93% | 91% | 116% | 110% | 119% |
| **Slovenia** | 100% | 103% | 102% | 102% | 111% | 113% | 108% | 99% | 101% | 99% | 101% |
| **Spain** | 83% | 73% | 73% | 90% | 109% | 100% | 81% | 90% | 90% | 97% | 95% |
| **Sweden** | 109% | 103% | 102% | 97% | 107% | 99% | 97% | 97% | 100% | 99% | 103% |
| **Average** | 101% | 117% | 105% | 103% | 102% | 100% | 102% | 101% | 107% | 115% | 114% |
| **Median** | 98% | 99% | 100% | 103% | 99% | 101% | 101% | 99% | 103% | 105% | 107% |
| **Minimum** | 60% | 65% | 73% | 78% | 79% | 81% | 81% | 74% | 87% | 69% | 94% |
| **Maximum** | 152% | 481% | 190% | 130% | 137% | 116% | 130% | 126% | 136% | 349% | 215% |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Netherlands:** The number of resolved cases includes only cases finalised by a judge decision, while cases closed differently (e.g. withdrawn, discarded upon objection and alike) are not included

**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:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.8.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of Supreme court total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024 (Q099)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 145 | 110 | 127 | 134 | 118 | 152 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Belgium | NA | 342 | 351 | 347 | 486 | 458 | 472 | 362 | 445 | 476 | 461 |
| Bulgaria | 132 | 147 | 177 | 149 | 154 | 117 | 120 | 152 | 168 | 153 | 121 |
| Croatia | 1129 | 1169 | 666 | 717 | 553 | 677 | 594 | 455 | 333 | 212 | 159 |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 587 | 302 |
| Czech Republic | 184 | 180 | 181 | 185 | 207 | 206 | 219 | 231 | 213 | 176 | 168 |
| Denmark | 187 | 151 | 207 | 170 | 187 | 219 | 257 | 248 | 329 | 176 | 99 |
| Estonia | 110 | 111 | 147 | 105 | 112 | 100 | 187 | 184 | 196 | 116 | 156 |
| Finland | 289 | 318 | 213 | 165 | 195 | 190 | 204 | 159 | 194 | 177 | 138 |
| France | 333 | 408 | 324 | 376 | 295 | 322 | 378 | 331 | 373 | 380 | 362 |
| Germany | NA | NA | 244 | 232 | 253 | 247 | 237 | 258 | 293 | 308 | 251 |
| Greece | 402 | 540 | 900 | 767 | 926 | 938 | NA | 967 | 883 | 1009 | 433 |
| Hungary | 136 | 156 | 184 | 213 | 205 | 160 | 92 | 85 | 73 | 82 | 86 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | 219 | 226 | 275 | 171 | NA | 205 | 142 | 251 | NA |
| Italy | 1192 | 1335 | 1294 | 1206 | 1124 | 1119 | 1247 | 911 | 858 | 813 | 774 |
| Latvia | 399 | 286 | NA | 239 | 280 | 254 | 184 | 191 | 182 | 149 | 166 |
| Lithuania | 230 | 108 | 157 | 192 | 142 | 236 | 320 | 365 | 339 | 289 | 333 |
| Luxembourg | NA | 287 | 276 | 398 | 408 | 358 | 368 | 312 | 216 | 427 | 352 |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | 306 | 405 | 370 | 425 | 371 | 437 | 354 |
| Poland | NA | - | 461 | 398 | 461 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 66 | 139 | 142 | 122 | 136 | 167 | 183 | 154 | 156 | 125 | 118 |
| Romania | 132 | 120 | 179 | 186 | 181 | 239 | 259 | 231 | 226 | 222 | 206 |
| Slovak Republic | 286 | 248 | 160 | 150 | 177 | 221 | 297 | 457 | 276 | 297 | 242 |
| Slovenia | 182 | 167 | 162 | 164 | 125 | 83 | 71 | 79 | 78 | 80 | 78 |
| Spain | 479 | 574 | 645 | 559 | 390 | 420 | 635 | 531 | 537 | 530 | 499 |
| Sweden | 94 | 85 | 84 | 96 | 67 | 71 | 81 | 88 | 88 | 92 | 79 |
| Average | 321 | 332 | 326 | 312 | 310 | 314 | 323 | 321 | 303 | 315 | 258 |
| Median | 187 | 180 | 207 | 202 | 207 | 229 | 257 | 248 | 226 | 237 | 206 |
| Minimum | 66 | 85 | 84 | 96 | 67 | 71 | 71 | 79 | 73 | 80 | 78 |
| Maximum | 1192 | 1335 | 1294 | 1206 | 1124 | 1119 | 1247 | 967 | 883 | 1009 | 774 |
| % of NA | 22% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 15% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Netherlands:** The number of resolved cases includes only cases finalised by a judge decision, while cases closed differently (e.g. withdrawn, discarded upon objection and alike) are not included

## Table 3.8.3.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
**(Q099)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 104% | 93% | 108% | 102% | 99% |
| **Belgium** | 107% | 107% | 111% | 102% | 96% | 89% | 97% | 115% | 104% | 97% | 95% |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | 97% | 101% | 96% | 98% | 103% | 89% | 98% | 98% | 106% |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 123% | 116% | 134% | 152% | 119% |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 275% | 164% |
| **Czech Republic** | 96% | 101% | 98% | 101% | 110% | 110% | 108% | 102% | 100% | 103% | 102% |
| **Denmark** | 132% | 120% | 93% | 110% | 92% | 90% | 105% | 95% | 102% | 112% | 104% |
| **Estonia** | 98% | 105% | 93% | 107% | 98% | 101% | 84% | 90% | 99% | 104% | 98% |
| **Finland** | 93% | 103% | 107% | 115% | 108% | 97% | 108% | 92% | 106% | 97% | 106% |
| **France** | 92% | 88% | 105% | 90% | 123% | 102% | 105% | 104% | 98% | 101% | 108% |
| **Germany** | 97% | 102% | NA | 109% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 119% | 95% | 95% | NA | NA | NA | NA | 115% |
| **Hungary** | 102% | 96% | 86% | 88% | 110% | 111% | 132% | 104% | 112% | 106% | 102% |
| **Ireland** | 152% | 481% | 190% | 123% | 90% | 106% | 130% | 110% | 117% | 84% | 109% |
| **Italy** | 93% | 87% | 92% | 100% | 88% | 85% | 89% | 130% | 122% | 141% | 127% |
| **Latvia** | 85% | 129% | 146% | 95% | 108% | 104% | 121% | 100% | 107% | 105% | 107% |
| **Lithuania** | 83% | 128% | 95% | 97% | 115% | 83% | 82% | 103% | 105% | 126% | 104% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 90% | 100% | 78% | 95% | 96% | 100% | 126% | 136% | 73% | 109% |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 100% | 84% | 90% | 93% | 107% | 119% | 101% |
| **Poland** | 94% | - | 104% | 108% | 88% | 98% | 126% | 66% | 75% | 86% | 100% |
| **Portugal** | NA | 100% | 99% | 104% | 98% | 95% | 89% | 100% | 103% | 105% | 104% |
| **Romania** | 166% | 190% | 126% | 109% | 80% | 101% | 105% | 109% | 112% | 106% | 114% |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | 122% | 117% | 106% | 90% | 90% | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 111% | 106% | 102% | 97% | 106% | 111% | 111% | 98% | 101% | 98% | 101% |
| **Spain** | 77% | 78% | 84% | 79% | 82% | 80% | 75% | 74% | 89% | 96% | 87% |
| **Sweden** | 99% | 105% | 106% | 110% | 96% | 108% | 101% | 95% | 101% | 93% | 91% |
| **Average** | 105% | 129% | 107% | 103% | 100% | 98% | 103% | 100% | 106% | 112% | 107% |
| **Median** | 97% | 104% | 100% | 103% | 97% | 98% | 104% | 100% | 105% | 103% | 104% |
| **Minimum** | 77% | 78% | 84% | 78% | 80% | 80% | 75% | 66% | 75% | 73% | 87% |
| **Maximum** | 166% | 481% | 190% | 123% | 123% | 111% | 132% | 130% | 136% | 275% | 164% |
| **% of NA** | 30% | 22% | 22% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and **final instance court.** In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Netherlands:** The number of resolved cases includes only cases finalised by a judge decision, while cases closed differently (e.g. withdrawn, discarded upon objection and alike) are not included

**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:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.8.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
**(Q099)**

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 118 | 153 | 102 | 111 | 117 |
| **Belgium** | 480 | 482 | 464 | 414 | 473 | 545 | 504 | 394 | 378 | 394 | 429 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | 172 | 161 | 184 | 190 | 205 | 247 | 237 | 249 | 201 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 586 | 450 | 334 | 211 | 156 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 683 | 314 |
| **Czech Republic** | 201 | 178 | 179 | 171 | 167 | 151 | 143 | 149 | 149 | 140 | 148 |
| **Denmark** | 187 | 151 | 207 | 170 | 187 | 219 | 257 | 248 | 329 | 176 | 99 |
| **Estonia** | 114 | 88 | 132 | 85 | 66 | 72 | 172 | 209 | 148 | 104 | 123 |
| **Finland** | 224 | 219 | 165 | 132 | 131 | 163 | 127 | 173 | 151 | 178 | 158 |
| **France** | 425 | 516 | 376 | 469 | 337 | 402 | 485 | 442 | 487 | 510 | 488 |
| **Germany** | 358 | 349 | NA | 261 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 279 | 331 | 352 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 319 |
| **Hungary** | 158 | 181 | 203 | 246 | 229 | 232 | 155 | 151 | 115 | 108 | 112 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | 219 | 226 | 256 | 171 | NA | 205 | 142 | 251 | NA |
| **Italy** | 1316 | 1469 | 1442 | 1299 | 1266 | 1302 | 1526 | 1002 | 1063 | 1003 | 941 |
| **Latvia** | 559 | 329 | 153 | 206 | 204 | 187 | 115 | 144 | 138 | 114 | 108 |
| **Lithuania** | 268 | 133 | 184 | 218 | 160 | 284 | 389 | 403 | 451 | 329 | 431 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 287 | 276 | 398 | 408 | 358 | 368 | 312 | 216 | 427 | 352 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 320 | 459 | 427 | 450 | 371 | 287 | 320 |
| **Poland** | 187 | - | 180 | 158 | 250 | 234 | 156 | 261 | 361 | 386 | 327 |
| **Portugal** | NA | 58 | 58 | 44 | 49 | 70 | 126 | 106 | 98 | 77 | 71 |
| **Romania** | 143 | 102 | 170 | 193 | 246 | 215 | 242 | 217 | 216 | 234 | 205 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | 104 | 127 | 172 | 249 | 344 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 167 | 146 | 150 | 164 | 119 | 78 | 59 | 74 | 73 | 78 | 74 |
| **Spain** | 496 | 541 | 513 | 604 | 608 | 681 | 888 | 826 | 691 | 691 | 750 |
| **Sweden** | 159 | 139 | 112 | 98 | 117 | 96 | 127 | 134 | 124 | 150 | 209 |
| **Average** | 340 | 316 | 282 | 277 | 283 | 301 | 337 | 308 | 290 | 300 | 281 |
| **Median** | 212 | 181 | 180 | 199 | 216 | 217 | 224 | 247 | 216 | 234 | 205 |
| **Minimum** | 114 | 58 | 58 | 44 | 49 | 70 | 59 | 74 | 73 | 77 | 71 |
| **Maximum** | 1316 | 1469 | 1442 | 1299 | 1266 | 1302 | 1526 | 1002 | 1063 | 1003 | 941 |
| **% of NA** | 33% | 26% | 22% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Netherlands:** The number of resolved cases includes only cases finalised by a judge decision, while cases closed differently (e.g. withdrawn, discarded upon objection and alike) are not included

**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:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.8.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of Supreme court administrative cases 2014 - 2024 (Q099)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NAP | NAP | 109% | 94% | 100% | 92% | 100% | 97% | 110% | 103% | 103% |
| Belgium | 113% | 101% | 107% | 109% | 81% | 95% | 82% | 79% | 91% | 91% | 111% |
| Bulgaria | 95% | 96% | 95% | 105% | 100% | 114% | 110% | 100% | 96% | 104% | 109% |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 144% | 27% | 323% | 246% | 137% |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1158% | 691% |
| Czech Republic | 102% | NA | 91% | 88% | 85% | 91% | 94% | 95% | 113% | 117% | 116% |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 110% | 95% | 96% | 110% | 95% | 117% | 92% | 108% | 85% | 138% | 88% |
| Finland | 102% | 93% | 112% | 104% | 95% | 100% | 103% | 124% | 101% | 107% | 113% |
| France | 101% | 109% | 100% | 103% | 100% | 101% | 96% | 103% | 102% | 102% | 102% |
| Germany | 100% | 107% | 107% | 100% | 98% | 103% | 106% | 110% | 98% | 105% | 103% |
| Greece | NA | NA | 130% | 133% | 107% | 107% | 118% | 93% | 115% | 113% | 196% |
| Hungary | 108% | 96% | 99% | 96% | 90% | 118% | 109% | 98% | 115% | 105% | 97% |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 96% | 89% | 96% | 107% | 108% | 113% | 117% | 107% | 145% | 129% | 118% |
| Latvia | 84% | 86% | 92% | 89% | 90% | 113% | 114% | 121% | 117% | 119% | 95% |
| Lithuania | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Luxembourg | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | 98% | NA | NA | NA | 87% | 80% | 99% | 68% | 80% | 54% | 95% |
| Poland | NA | - | 89% | 108% | 93% | NA | NA | NA | 93% | 105% | 112% |
| Portugal | NA | 89% | 96% | 104% | 100% | 88% | 120% | 108% | 99% | 125% | 108% |
| Romania | 124% | 126% | 105% | 83% | 123% | 100% | 106% | 103% | 108% | 107% | 109% |
| Slovak Republic | 79% | 84% | 108% | 162% | 120% | 111% | 99% | 96% | NAP | 141% | 154% |
| Slovenia | 79% | 98% | 101% | 115% | 139% | 126% | 100% | 101% | 103% | 104% | 98% |
| Spain | 93% | 67% | 60% | 103% | 142% | 126% | 89% | 116% | 91% | 99% | 105% |
| Sweden | 112% | 101% | 99% | 95% | 110% | 101% | 97% | 97% | 102% | 100% | 108% |
| Average | 100% | 96% | 100% | 106% | 103% | 105% | 105% | 98% | 114% | 162% | 139% |
| Median | 101% | 96% | 99% | 104% | 100% | 103% | 102% | 100% | 102% | 106% | 108% |
| Minimum | 79% | 67% | 60% | 83% | 81% | 80% | 82% | 27% | 80% | 54% | 88% |
| Maximum | 124% | 126% | 130% | 162% | 142% | 126% | 144% | 124% | 323% | 1158% | 691% |
| % of NA | 19% | 15% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| % of NAP | 22% | 26% | 19% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 11% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.8.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of Supreme court administrative cases 2014 - 2024
(Q099)

| States | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NAP | NAP | 138 | 147 | 119 | 157 | 176 | 212 | 182 | 172 | 160 |
| Belgium | 148 | 159 | 176 | 195 | 316 | 299 | 415 | 501 | 589 | 654 | 555 |
| Bulgaria | 133 | 159 | 181 | 143 | 141 | 84 | 83 | 103 | 127 | 102 | 75 |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 928 | 1895 | 439 | 667 | 625 |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 336 | 276 |
| Czech Republic | 156 | NA | 176 | 200 | 262 | 271 | 302 | 318 | 279 | 222 | 196 |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 126 | 162 | 173 | 150 | 207 | 147 | 204 | 150 | 265 | 135 | 215 |
| Finland | 312 | 358 | 225 | 169 | 207 | 197 | 214 | 154 | 203 | 174 | 136 |
| France | 185 | 206 | 207 | 184 | 200 | 188 | 221 | 175 | 200 | 195 | 187 |
| Germany | 206 | 185 | 172 | 198 | 228 | 219 | 197 | 213 | 229 | 209 | 204 |
| Greece | NA | NA | 893 | 1014 | 1265 | 1283 | 1107 | 1324 | 1239 | 1232 | 452 |
| Hungary | 129 | 169 | 168 | 201 | 228 | 116 | 58 | 55 | 43 | 59 | 66 |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 886 | 1003 | 971 | 950 | 792 | 694 | 667 | 645 | 416 | 381 | 366 |
| Latvia | 189 | 231 | 270 | 359 | 459 | 327 | 286 | 254 | 241 | 201 | 253 |
| Lithuania | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Luxembourg | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | 299 | 382 | 344 | 414 | 370 | 529 | 366 |
| Poland | NA | - | 607 | 504 | 535 | NA | NA | NA | 647 | 659 | 474 |
| Portugal | NA | 299 | 322 | 272 | 364 | 431 | 291 | 261 | 300 | 258 | 241 |
| Romania | 117 | 142 | 185 | 184 | 149 | 264 | 276 | 244 | 234 | 217 | 210 |
| Slovak Republic | 311 | 371 | 354 | 275 | 297 | 314 | 388 | 828 | NAP | 330 | 221 |
| Slovenia | 220 | 220 | 188 | 159 | 152 | 103 | 122 | 109 | 97 | 79 | 88 |
| Spain | 458 | 614 | 854 | 515 | 233 | 196 | 350 | 238 | 321 | 320 | 237 |
| Sweden | 92 | 94 | 105 | 122 | 82 | 83 | 94 | 99 | 90 | 86 | 57 |
| Average | 245 | 291 | 335 | 313 | 327 | 303 | 336 | 410 | 326 | 328 | 257 |
| Median | 185 | 206 | 188 | 198 | 231 | 219 | 281 | 241 | 253 | 220 | 218 |
| Minimum | 92 | 94 | 105 | 122 | 82 | 83 | 58 | 55 | 43 | 59 | 57 |
| Maximum | 886 | 1003 | 971 | 1014 | 1265 | 1283 | 1107 | 1895 | 1239 | 1232 | 625 |
| % of NA | 22% | 15% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| % of NAP | 22% | 26% | 19% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 11% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Malta:** has a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. 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.

**Slovak Republic:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Variations of Supreme court other than criminal cases by case categories

## Table 3.9.1: Supreme courts, variation of incoming other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percentage (Q99)

| States | Variations incoming 2016 - 2024 | | | Variations incoming 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| Austria | NA | NA | 58,0% | NA | -0,6% | 7,2% |
| Belgium | 1,0% | -47,7% | 33,3% | -7,2% | -1,8% | -10,3% |
| Bulgaria | -13,6% | -11,3% | -16,3% | -0,1% | 2,3% | -1,7% |
| Croatia | -1,2% | NA | NA | 27,3% | 26,6% | 65,4% |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 153,5% | 150,8% | 191,7% |
| Czech Republic | -27,6% | -35,2% | -5,6% | -8,2% | -8,2% | -8,3% |
| Denmark | 41,1% | 41,1% | NA | 67,5% | 67,5% | NA |
| Estonia | -46,7% | -48,9% | -42,6% | 9,4% | 0,0% | 28,9% |
| Finland | -34,7% | -40,8% | -30,6% | -10,0% | -8,9% | -7,0% |
| France | -23,7% | -35,8% | -1,0% | -4,5% | -7,6% | -0,5% |
| Germany | -27,7% | NA | -22,2% | -10,5% | NA | -1,4% |
| Greece | 73,9% | NA | 91,2% | 111,4% | NA | 195,2% |
| Hungary | -42,9% | -49,2% | -15,9% | 6,2% | -5,4% | 21,3% |
| Ireland | 4,9% | 4,9% | NA | -1,7% | -1,7% | NA |
| Italy | -7,5% | -9,5% | -1,9% | 5,7% | 9,1% | -0,7% |
| Latvia | NA | -48,0% | -44,0% | -5,4% | -14,2% | 8,3% |
| Lithuania | -54,4% | -59,5% | NAP | 0,6% | -10,7% | NAP |
| Luxembourg | -27,1% | -27,1% | NAP | -25,0% | -25,0% | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | -8,5% | 3,9% | -12,0% |
| Poland | NA | 25,1% | 26,6% | NA | 1,6% | 23,1% |
| Portugal | -16,9% | -9,7% | -31,9% | -2,4% | -6,5% | 11,3% |
| Romania | -35,9% | -33,7% | -37,8% | -11,3% | -12,8% | -10,3% |
| Slovak Republic | -69,3% | NA | -68,4% | -8,1% | NA | -13,3% |
| Slovenia | -27,1% | -17,3% | -53,4% | -4,3% | -5,2% | 2,7% |
| Spain | 54,2% | 60,8% | 46,6% | 13,9% | 10,5% | 18,5% |
| Sweden | 12,6% | -27,1% | 7,9% | -1,7% | -9,6% | -6,7% |
| Average | -12,8% | -19,4% | -5,7% | 11,9% | 6,7% | 22,8% |
| Median | -23,7% | -27,1% | -15,9% | -2,0% | -1,8% | 1,1% |
| Minimum | -69,3% | -59,5% | -68,4% | -25,0% | -25,0% | -13,3% |
| Maximum | 73,9% | 60,8% | 91,2% | 153,5% | 150,8% | 195,2% |
| % of NA | 15% | 22% | 15% | 7% | 11% | 7% |
| % of NAP | 7% | 7% | 15% | 4% | 4% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.9.2: Supreme court, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percentage (Q99)

| States | Variations 2016 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| Austria | NA | NA | 48,4% | NA | -3,3% | 7,3% |
| Belgium | -5,7% | -55,5% | 38,2% | 0,7% | -3,8% | 9,6% |
| Bulgaria | -2,9% | -3,3% | -4,1% | 6,3% | 11,5% | 3,3% |
| Croatia | 2,4% | NA | NA | -0,8% | -0,9% | -7,8% |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 56,4% | 49,3% | 74,1% |
| Czech Republic | -18,4% | -33,0% | 20,1% | -9,2% | -9,2% | -9,4% |
| Denmark | 57,6% | 57,6% | NA | 54,9% | 54,9% | NA |
| Estonia | -46,8% | -46,5% | -47,4% | -10,6% | -6,1% | -17,7% |
| Finland | -33,3% | -41,1% | -30,4% | -2,4% | -0,2% | -2,3% |
| France | -22,0% | -33,8% | 1,6% | -0,5% | -1,0% | 0,2% |
| Germany | -17,8% | NA | -24,6% | 3,9% | NA | -2,9% |
| Greece | 192,7% | NA | 187,8% | 283,7% | NA | 413,9% |
| Hungary | -36,8% | -40,0% | -17,9% | -0,3% | -8,9% | 11,6% |
| Ireland | -39,5% | -39,5% | NA | 27,9% | 27,9% | NA |
| Italy | 23,7% | 25,4% | 20,1% | -3,9% | -1,7% | -9,6% |
| Latvia | NA | -61,8% | -42,4% | -13,1% | -12,7% | -13,6% |
| Lithuania | -51,9% | -55,8% | NAP | -15,9% | -26,4% | NAP |
| Luxembourg | -20,6% | -20,6% | NAP | 11,8% | 11,8% | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | 28,5% | -11,8% | 53,1% |
| Poland | NA | 20,1% | 59,5% | NA | 17,8% | 30,9% |
| Portugal | -11,4% | -5,6% | -23,8% | -6,9% | -8,1% | -3,8% |
| Romania | -37,6% | -40,1% | -36,0% | -7,8% | -6,0% | -8,8% |
| Slovak Republic | -73,2% | NA | -54,8% | -0,9% | NA | -5,2% |
| Slovenia | -27,6% | -17,9% | -54,6% | -2,5% | -2,3% | -2,6% |
| Spain | 100,6% | 66,8% | 154,2% | 10,6% | 0,0% | 24,5% |
| Sweden | 14,3% | -37,9% | 18,4% | 2,3% | -12,3% | 0,8% |
| Average | -2,6% | -19,1% | 11,2% | 17,2% | 2,5% | 24,8% |
| Median | -18,4% | -33,8% | -4,1% | -0,4% | -2,3% | -1,1% |
| Minimum | -73,2% | -61,8% | -54,8% | -15,9% | -26,4% | -17,7% |
| Maximum | 192,7% | 66,8% | 187,8% | 283,7% | 54,9% | 413,9% |
| % of NA | 15% | 22% | 15% | 7% | 11% | 7% |
| % of NAP | 7% | 7% | 15% | 4% | 4% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.9.3: Supreme court, variation of pending 31st Dec. other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q99)**

| States | Variations pending 31 Dec. 2016 - 2024 | | | Variations pending 31 Dec. 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | 71,5% | NA | 2,6% | -0,5% |
| **Belgium** | 23,6% | -58,8% | 336,7% | -2,5% | 4,9% | -7,0% |
| **Bulgaria** | -33,8% | 13,2% | -60,4% | -16,1% | -9,8% | -24,5% |
| **Croatia** | -75,6% | NA | NA | -25,8% | -26,7% | -13,7% |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | -19,6% | -31,4% | 43,0% |
| **Czech Republic** | -24,0% | -44,8% | 33,6% | -13,3% | -4,3% | -20,3% |
| **Denmark** | -24,4% | -24,4% | NA | -12,4% | -12,4% | NA |
| **Estonia** | -43,5% | -50,0% | -34,8% | 19,6% | 10,7% | 30,4% |
| **Finland** | -57,0% | -43,6% | -57,8% | -24,1% | -11,4% | -23,3% |
| **France** | -12,7% | -14,2% | -8,4% | -5,1% | -5,4% | -3,9% |
| **Germany** | -15,5% | NA | -10,7% | -15,3% | NA | -5,3% |
| **Greece** | 40,8% | NA | 45,5% | 64,5% | NA | 88,3% |
| **Hungary** | -70,5% | -66,9% | -67,9% | 4,9% | -5,4% | 24,3% |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | -26,1% | -18,1% | -54,7% | -8,5% | -7,7% | -13,0% |
| **Latvia** | NA | -73,0% | -45,9% | -3,0% | -17,6% | 8,7% |
| **Lithuania** | 2,0% | 3,2% | NAP | -3,2% | -3,4% | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | 1,2% | 1,2% | NAP | -7,9% | -7,9% | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | 4,1% | -1,6% | 6,0% |
| **Poland** | NA | 118,3% | 24,5% | NA | -0,1% | -5,8% |
| **Portugal** | -26,7% | 15,1% | -42,9% | -12,5% | -15,5% | -10,1% |
| **Romania** | -27,9% | -28,0% | -27,6% | -14,5% | -17,8% | -12,1% |
| **Slovak Republic** | -59,3% | NA | -71,9% | -19,0% | NA | -36,6% |
| **Slovenia** | -65,4% | -59,4% | -78,8% | -5,1% | -6,7% | 7,7% |
| **Spain** | 55,2% | 144,2% | -29,5% | 4,2% | 8,5% | -7,8% |
| **Sweden** | 6,8% | 15,9% | -36,0% | -12,3% | 22,4% | -33,3% |
| **Average** | -21,6% | -9,4% | -6,1% | -5,3% | -6,2% | -0,4% |
| **Median** | -25,2% | -21,3% | -34,8% | -8,5% | -6,0% | -6,4% |
| **Minimum** | -75,6% | -73,0% | -78,8% | -25,8% | -31,4% | -36,6% |
| **Maximum** | 55,2% | 144,2% | 336,7% | 64,5% | 22,4% | 88,3% |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 26% | 15% | 11% | 15% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 15% | 4% | 4% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.9.4: Supreme court, variation of Clearance rate of other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percent points (Q99)**

| States | Variations of Clearence Rate 2016 - 2024 | | | Variations of Clearence Rate 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | -6,6 | NA | -2,8 | +0,0 |
| **Belgium** | -7,4 | -16,6 | +4,0 | +8,1 | -1,9 | +20,2 |
| **Bulgaria** | +11,9 | +8,9 | +13,8 | +6,5 | +8,8 | +5,2 |
| **Croatia** | +4,1 | NA | NA | -33,4 | -32,9 | -108,9 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | -133,5 | -111,3 | -466,9 |
| **Czech Republic** | +12,2 | +3,4 | +24,8 | -1,3 | -1,1 | -1,3 |
| **Denmark** | +10,9 | +10,9 | NA | -8,4 | -8,4 | NA |
| **Estonia** | -0,3 | +4,4 | -8,1 | -21,0 | -6,4 | -49,8 |
| **Finland** | +2,3 | -0,4 | +0,4 | +8,9 | +9,3 | +5,4 |
| **France** | +2,4 | +3,2 | +2,6 | +4,3 | +7,2 | +0,7 |
| **Germany** | +13,8 | NA | -3,3 | +15,8 | NA | -1,6 |
| **Greece** | +72,2 | NA | +65,7 | +79,9 | NA | +83,3 |
| **Hungary** | +9,6 | +15,7 | -2,4 | -6,5 | -3,9 | -8,4 |
| **Ireland** | -80,3 | -80,3 | NA | +25,3 | +25,3 | NA |
| **Italy** | +31,6 | +35,4 | +21,6 | -12,4 | -14,0 | -11,5 |
| **Latvia** | NA | -38,8 | +2,7 | -9,0 | +1,8 | -24,0 |
| **Lithuania** | +5,5 | +8,8 | NAP | -20,3 | -22,1 | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | +9,0 | +9,0 | NAP | +35,9 | +35,9 | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | +27,7 | -18,0 | +40,2 |
| **Poland** | NA | -4,2 | +23,1 | NA | +13,8 | +6,7 |
| **Portugal** | +6,5 | +4,4 | +11,6 | -5,1 | -1,8 | -16,9 |
| **Romania** | -2,9 | -12,2 | +3,1 | +4,3 | +8,3 | +1,8 |
| **Slovak Republic** | -17,2 | NA | +46,3 | +8,6 | NA | +13,1 |
| **Slovenia** | -0,7 | -0,7 | -2,6 | +1,9 | +3,0 | -5,4 |
| **Spain** | +21,9 | +3,1 | +44,2 | -2,8 | -9,1 | +5,0 |
| **Sweden** | +1,5 | -15,8 | +9,6 | +4,0 | -2,7 | +8,1 |
| **Average** | +5,1 | -3,3 | +13,2 | -0,9 | -5,3 | -23,0 |
| **Median** | +5,5 | +3,2 | +4,0 | +2,9 | -1,9 | +0,4 |
| **Minimum** | -80,3 | -80,3 | -8,1 | -133,5 | -111,3 | -466,9 |
| **Maximum** | +72,2 | +35,4 | +65,7 | +79,9 | +35,9 | +83,3 |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 22% | 15% | 7% | 11% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 15% | 4% | 4% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

## Table 3.9.5: Supreme court, variation of Disposition Time for other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q99)**

| States | Variations of Disposition Time 2016 - 2024 | | | Variations of Disposition Time 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases | Total number of other than criminal law cases | Civil (and commercial) litigious cases | Administrative law cases |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | 15,5% | NA | 6,1% | -7,3% |
| **Belgium** | 31,1% | -7,4% | 215,9% | -3,2% | 9,0% | -15,2% |
| **Bulgaria** | -31,8% | 17,0% | -58,7% | -21,0% | -19,1% | -26,9% |
| **Croatia** | -76,2% | NA | NA | -25,2% | -26,1% | -6,4% |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | -48,6% | -54,0% | -17,9% |
| **Czech Republic** | -6,8% | -17,6% | 11,3% | -4,5% | 5,4% | -12,0% |
| **Denmark** | -52,0% | -52,0% | NA | -43,4% | -43,4% | NA |
| **Estonia** | 6,2% | -6,5% | 24,0% | 33,8% | 17,9% | 58,6% |
| **Finland** | -35,5% | -4,2% | -39,5% | -22,2% | -11,3% | -21,5% |
| **France** | 11,8% | 29,6% | -9,9% | -4,6% | -4,4% | -4,0% |
| **Germany** | 2,7% | NA | 18,5% | -18,5% | NA | -2,4% |
| **Greece** | -51,9% | NA | -49,4% | -57,1% | NA | -63,4% |
| **Hungary** | -53,3% | -44,8% | -60,9% | 5,2% | 3,8% | 11,4% |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | -40,2% | -34,7% | -62,3% | -4,8% | -6,1% | -3,8% |
| **Latvia** | NA | -29,4% | -6,2% | 11,6% | -5,6% | 25,8% |
| **Lithuania** | 112,0% | 133,7% | NAP | 15,1% | 31,2% | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | 27,4% | 27,4% | NAP | -17,6% | -17,6% | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | -19,0% | 11,5% | -30,7% |
| **Poland** | NA | 81,8% | -21,9% | NA | -15,3% | -28,0% |
| **Portugal** | -17,2% | 22,0% | -25,1% | -6,0% | -8,1% | -6,6% |
| **Romania** | 15,4% | 20,3% | 13,1% | -7,3% | -12,6% | -3,5% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 51,7% | NA | -37,7% | -18,3% | NA | -33,2% |
| **Slovenia** | -52,2% | -50,6% | -53,4% | -2,7% | -4,5% | 10,6% |
| **Spain** | -22,6% | 46,4% | -72,2% | -5,8% | 8,6% | -25,9% |
| **Sweden** | -6,6% | 86,8% | -46,0% | -14,3% | 39,5% | -33,8% |
| **Average** | -9,4% | 12,1% | -12,9% | -12,1% | -4,3% | -10,7% |
| **Median** | -12,0% | 6,4% | -25,1% | -7,3% | -5,0% | -9,6% |
| **Minimum** | -76,2% | -52,0% | -72,2% | -57,1% | -54,0% | -63,4% |
| **Maximum** | 112,0% | 133,7% | 215,9% | 33,8% | 39,5% | 58,6% |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 26% | 15% | 11% | 15% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 15% | 4% | 4% | 11% |

**Hungary:** In 2021-2022, the Supreme Court handled administrative cases at second instance level. As of March 2022, second-instance jurisdiction returned to the Budapest-Capital Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court for relevant cases only.

**Slovak Republic:** In 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court was established. As of 2023, cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court are counted as highest-instance cases.

# European Comission templates for first instance data on other than criminal cases

## Table 3.10.1 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance of other than criminal cases**, from 2014 to 2024 (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 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | NA | 53 | 57 | 59 | 57 | 59 | 63 | 61 | 62 | 58 | 57 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 156 | 153 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 78 | 78 | 84 | 83 | 91 | 93 | 107 | 91 | 99 | 92 | 90 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 134 | 132 | 117 | 114 | 102 | 130 | 120 | 120 | 96 | 112 | 95 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 903 | 839 | 862 | 1 118 | 737 | 882 | 1 087 | 947 | 761 | 605 | 709 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 157 | 164 | 155 | 163 | 162 | 158 | 170 | 159 | 148 | 136 | 142 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 19 | 17 | 21 | 22 | 24 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 23 | 19 |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 33 | 39 | 40 | 24 | 30 | 32 | 25 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 31 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 103 | 111 | 113 | 118 | 86 | 105 | 97 | 88 | 103 | 114 | 135 |
| **France** | *10* | 304 | 304 | 312 | 300 | 381 | 388 | 554 | 440 | 297 | 310 | 341 |
| **Germany** | *5* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | *8* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 664 | 634 | 642 | 638 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 63 | 59 | 57 | 63 | 63 | 69 | 80 | 65 | 63 | 62 | 63 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | *12* | 377 | 393 | 387 | 399 | 373 | 367 | 471 | 381 | 358 | 347 | 373 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 179 | 38 | 33 | 29 | 28 | 25 | 28 | 30 | 34 | 32 | 41 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 54 | 50 | 41 | 44 | 53 | 52 | 68 | 65 | 68 | 66 | 70 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 158 | 158 | 183 | 198 | 233 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 558 | 447 | 446 | 331 | 322 | 344 | 414 | 350 | 404 | 404 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 91 | 87 | 83 | 83 | 80 | 80 | 91 | 76 | 82 | 82 | 80 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 55 | - | 85 | 73 | 82 | 111 | 110 | 107 | 100 | 92 | 104 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | *23* | 148 | 154 | 154 | 161 | 154 | 152 | 186 | 160 | 171 | 228 | 192 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 231 | 240 | 98 | 107 | 111 | 135 | 87 | 83 | 81 | 75 | 74 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 102 | 82 | 72 | 65 | 61 | 56 | 69 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 52 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 242 | 238 | 227 | 258 | 276 | 274 | 349 | 265 | 282 | 337 | 325 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 133 | 126 | 133 | 151 | 152 | 138 | 123 | 117 | 123 | 108 | 106 |

$$*CEPEJ\ Calculated\ Disposition\ Time\ (days) = \frac{Number\ of\ pending\ cases\ at\ the\ end\ of\ a\ period}{Number\ of\ resolved\ cases\ in\ a\ period} \times 365$$

## Table 3.10.2 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases, from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)

| States / Entities | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | 130 | 131 | 133 | 141 | 138 | 137 | 156 | 135 | 142 | 141 | 132 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | NA | 87 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 246 | 246 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 186 | 189 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 380 | 391 | 364 | 387 | 374 | 488 | 655 | 559 | 410 | 533 | 465 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 682 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 163 | 159 | 153 | 157 | 149 | 140 | 165 | 141 | 134 | 126 | 126 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 177 | 174 | 176 | 172 | 207 | 222 | 190 | 238 | 268 | 265 | 250 |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 125 | 136 | 139 | 140 | 143 | 147 | 135 | 146 | 158 | 196 | 185 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 289 | 332 | 252 | 258 | 273 | 280 | 300 | 305 | 327 | 349 | 464 |
| **France** | *10* | 348 | 346 | 353 | 341 | 420 | 432 | 637 | 495 | 333 | 354 | 434 |
| **Germany** | *5* | 198 | 190 | 196 | 204 | 220 | 217 | 237 | 231 | 241 | 249 | 232 |
| **Greece** | *8* | 330 | 378 | 610 | 479 | 559 | 637 | NA | 728 | 746 | 771 | 737 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 144 | 159 | 159 | 181 | 151 | 152 | 165 | 145 | 134 | 135 | 140 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | *12* | 532 | 527 | 514 | 548 | 527 | 532 | 674 | 560 | 540 | 511 | 584 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 255 | 238 | 217 | 208 | 236 | 213 | 239 | 216 | 209 | 204 | 244 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 97 | 96 | 88 | 85 | 84 | 87 | 117 | 106 | 116 | 120 | 127 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | 103 | 86 | 91 | 108 | 123 | 139 | 161 | 154 | 182 | 221 | 251 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 536 | 445 | 432 | 435 | 440 | 465 | 550 | 529 | 491 | 454 | 491 |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 132 | 115 | 121 | 124 | 110 | 110 | 127 | NA | NA | NA | 124 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 203 | - | 225 | 232 | 273 | 270 | 317 | 330 | 362 | 357 | 360 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | 315 | 289 | 250 | 229 | 200 | 280 | 253 | 238 | 267 | 263 |
| **Romania** | *23* | 146 | 154 | 153 | 167 | 157 | 152 | 168 | 150 | 160 | 218 | 180 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 524 | 401 | 130 | 171 | 157 | 170 | 204 | 206 | 168 | 173 | 151 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 270 | 277 | 280 | 292 | 283 | 281 | 350 | 309 | 337 | 344 | 355 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 318 | 325 | 282 | 329 | 362 | 353 | 468 | 344 | 359 | 444 | 423 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 157 | 152 | 164 | 159 | 166 | 167 | 161 | 148 | 152 | 157 | 150 |

$$*CEPEJ\ Calculated\ Disposition\ Time\ (days) = \frac{Number\ of\ \ pending\ cases\ at\ the\ end\ of\ a\ period}{Number\ of\ resolved\ cases\ in\ a\ period} \times 365$$

## Table 3.10.3 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance administrative law cases, from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)

| States / Entities | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | NAP | NAP | 380 | 446 | 449 | 440 | 388 | 312 | 285 | 313 | 327 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | 625 | 444 | 429 | 497 | 370 | 418 | 399 | 235 | 288 | 360 | 370 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 124 | 122 | 108 | 116 | 112 | 107 | 124 | 125 | 129 | 121 | 129 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 426 | 413 | 319 | 258 | 197 | 187 | 179 | 166 | 143 | 221 | 268 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 1 775 | 1 391 | 1 582 | 2 162 | 487 | 495 | 863 | 844 | 461 | 380 | 788 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 415 | 437 | 421 | 408 | 412 | 356 | 317 | 265 | 225 | 212 | 202 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 141 | 117 | 108 | 108 | 119 | 136 | 142 | 162 | 166 | 167 | 137 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 280 | 271 | 279 | 255 | 235 | 254 | 274 | 296 | 281 | 263 | 268 |
| **France** | *10* | 305 | 313 | 314 | 290 | 285 | 284 | 333 | 299 | 314 | 322 | 301 |
| **Germany** | *5* | 367 | 349 | 375 | 421 | 435 | 397 | 426 | 422 | 408 | 391 | 389 |
| **Greece** | *8* | NA | 964 | 1 086 | 735 | 601 | NA | 551 | 595 | 464 | 439 | 445 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 148 | 110 | 109 | 116 | 109 | 103 | 110 | 103 | 125 | 120 | 131 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | *12* | 984 | 1 008 | 925 | 887 | 889 | 821 | 862 | 756 | 574 | 595 | 483 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 155 | 200 | 228 | 249 | 248 | 225 | 220 | 256 | 200 | 205 | 210 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 310 | 236 | 72 | 76 | 129 | 96 | 112 | 106 | 79 | 64 | 140 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 513 | 524 | 528 | 479 | 720 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 1 408 | 495 | 1 464 | 1 147 | 1 057 | 839 | 924 | 1 356 | 1 081 | 1 350 | 1 681 |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 171 | 168 | 178 | 165 | 200 | 215 | 304 | 265 | 257 | 267 | 246 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 139 | - | 143 | 121 | 118 | 123 | 150 | 151 | 163 | 130 | 134 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | 989 | 911 | 988 | 928 | 846 | 847 | 792 | 747 | 597 | 861 |
| **Romania** | *23* | 179 | 170 | 170 | 114 | 117 | 138 | 690 | 293 | 321 | 387 | 410 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 397 | 374 | 203 | 317 | 401 | 518 | 585 | 679 | 648 | 1 040 | 860 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 112 | 122 | 282 | 448 | 406 | 516 | 443 | 546 | 540 | 627 | 570 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 361 | 317 | 312 | 322 | 331 | 338 | 406 | 352 | 369 | 414 | 386 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 114 | 105 | 115 | 147 | 146 | 125 | 107 | 102 | 107 | 83 | 81 |

**Greece:** In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

**Portugal:** In 2024, there was a significant increase in applications for the authorisation or renewal of residence permits, which led to a noticable decline in the Clearance Rate. As a result, the number of pending cases and the Disposition Time increased considerably.

**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 3.10.4 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) of first instance total of other than criminal cases**, from 2014 to 2024 (Q21)

*** 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 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | NA | 100% | 100% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 101% | 100% |
| **Belgium** | *1* | NA | NA | 102% | NA | 108% | 101% | 98% | 105% | 102% | 98% | 102% |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 102% | 99% | 99% | 97% | 98% | 99% | 101% | 101% | 100% | 101% | 99% |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 103% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 105% | 93% | 104% | 97% | 104% | 97% | 103% |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 88% | 90% | 106% | 113% | 125% | 98% | 88% | 81% | 101% | 118% | 125% |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 97% | 102% | 105% | 101% | 102% | 101% | 98% | 103% | 102% | 102% | 101% |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 101% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 101% |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 98% | 140% | 98% | 104% | 101% | 100% | 101% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 101% |
| **Finland** | *26* | 102% | 99% | 98% | 96% | 106% | 95% | 105% | 102% | 99% | 95% | 93% |
| **France** | *10* | 95% | 98% | 98% | 104% | 96% | 99% | 94% | 105% | 97% | 93% | 95% |
| **Germany** | *5* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | *8* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 91% | 101% | 98% | 87% |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 103% | 101% | 102% | 99% | 106% | 101% | 98% | 104% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| **Ireland** | *7* | 73% | 77% | 76% | 82% | 79% | 75% | 56% | 75% | 84% | 81% | 83% |
| **Italy** | *12* | 109% | 112% | 105% | 103% | 103% | 103% | 103% | 107% | 106% | 106% | 97% |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 100% | 101% | 101% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 99% | 101% | 97% |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 99% | 100% | 102% | 102% | 101% | 101% | 97% | 101% | 99% | 100% | 99% |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | NA | NA | 102% | 99% | 96% | 93% | 95% | 99% | 98% | 96% | 90% |
| **Malta** | *18* | 102% | 111% | 107% | 96% | 97% | 91% | 91% | 89% | 87% | 89% | NA |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 99% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 101% | 100% | 98% | 103% | 98% | 100% | 100% |
| **Poland** | *21* | 102% | - | 93% | 101% | 99% | 90% | 104% | 102% | 103% | 102% | 98% |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | *23* | 111% | 106% | 101% | 99% | 104% | 100% | 97% | 102% | 96% | 87% | 99% |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 102% | 105% | 106% | 109% | 111% | 91% | 113% | 100% | 101% | 105% | 102% |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 104% | 107% | 106% | 104% | 102% | 102% | 99% | 102% | 101% | 100% | 100% |
| **Spain** | *9* | 101% | 100% | 105% | 94% | 92% | 94% | 90% | 102% | 96% | 87% | 89% |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 103% | 103% | 96% | 93% | 97% | 100% | 102% | 103% | 103% | 102% | 99% |

**Ireland:** CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

$$* \, CEPEJ \; Clearance \; Rate \; (\%) = \frac{Resolved \; cases \; in \; a \; period}{Incoming \; Cases \; in \; a \; period} \times 100$$

**Table 3.10.5 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)**

| States / Entities | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | 103% | 102% | 102% | 99% | 101% | 100% | 100% | 104% | 101% | 98% | 100% |
| **Belgium** | *1* | 98% | 99% | 102% | 112% | 112% | 101% | 99% | 106% | 102% | 98% | 105% |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 102% | 97% |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 113% | 107% | 118% | 109% | 112% | 87% | 85% | 81% | 145% | 103% | 112% |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 156% |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 105% | 107% | 110% | 101% | 102% | 101% | 98% | 103% | 102% | 101% | 100% |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 102% | 102% | 101% | 102% | 95% | 92% | 111% | 98% | 93% | 93% | 99% |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 104% | 102% | 98% | 99% | 101% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 91% | 110% |
| **Finland** | *26* | 105% | 94% | 125% | 111% | 102% | 100% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 89% | 75% |
| **France** | *10* | 94% | 98% | 99% | 103% | 96% | 100% | 93% | 107% | 103% | 96% | 95% |
| **Germany** | *5* | 100% | 102% | 103% | 101% | 97% | 99% | 98% | 105% | 104% | 97% | 100% |
| **Greece** | *8* | 113% | 102% | 99% | 96% | 86% | 86% | NA | 82% | 93% | 92% | 81% |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 104% | 99% | 98% | 96% | 116% | 104% | 100% | 106% | 104% | 100% | 99% |
| **Ireland** | *7* | 56% | 63% | 59% | 73% | 63% | 63% | 51% | 72% | 71% | 72% | 72% |
| **Italy** | *12* | 119% | 120% | 113% | 106% | 103% | 104% | 104% | 109% | 104% | 110% | 95% |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 98% | 109% | 107% | 119% | 103% | 102% | 96% | 103% | 99% | 100% | 90% |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 97% | 102% | 98% | 102% | 104% | 101% | 94% | 101% | 99% | 100% | 100% |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | 97% | 105% | 100% | 96% | 93% | 88% | 93% | 99% | 98% | 93% | 93% |
| **Malta** | *18* | 101% | 107% | 107% | 97% | 93% | 92% | 91% | 78% | 87% | 95% | 94% |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 99% | 100% | 101% | 99% | 101% | 100% | 100% | NA | NA | NA | 102% |
| **Poland** | *21* | 99% | - | 99% | 94% | 92% | 99% | 105% | 103% | 98% | 95% | 94% |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | 116% | 112% | 113% | 109% | 105% | 98% | 102% | 103% | 96% | 97% |
| **Romania** | *23* | 109% | 105% | 102% | 99% | 103% | 100% | 100% | 102% | 96% | 86% | 99% |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 92% | 133% | 132% | 129% | 131% | 110% | 100% | 104% | 108% | 105% | 108% |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 109% | 105% | 106% | 108% | 110% | 109% | 101% | 107% | 102% | 101% | 96% |
| **Spain** | *9* | 98% | 95% | 103% | 88% | 87% | 94% | 86% | 102% | 98% | 84% | 82% |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 104% | 104% | 99% | 100% | 97% | 97% | 103% | 103% | 102% | 97% | 98% |

**Ireland:** CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

$$* \, CEPEJ \; Clearance \; Rate \; (\%) = \frac{Resolved \; cases \; in \; a \; period}{Incoming \; Cases \; in \; a \; period} \times 100$$

## Table 3.10.6 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) for first instance administrative cases, from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)

| States / Entities | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | NAP | NAP | 91% | 80% | 90% | 111% | 126% | 125% | 112% | 100% | 96% |
| **Belgium** | *1* | 88% | 117% | 121% | 101% | 119% | 112% | 108% | 131% | 97% | 81% | 86% |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 101% | 99% | 104% | 95% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 101% | 101% | 97% |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 86% | 93% | 109% | 126% | 116% | 109% | 107% | 102% | 107% | 87% | 90% |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 103% | 120% | 113% | 74% | 219% | 170% | 84% | 46% | 88% | 110% | 78% |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 91% | 92% | 80% | 92% | 88% | 107% | 113% | 119% | 126% | 111% | 105% |
| **Denmark** | *4* | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 90% | 105% | 106% | 99% | 100% | 94% | 92% | 90% | 99% | 95% | 100% |
| **Finland** | *26* | 97% | 102% | 79% | 107% | 112% | 100% | 99% | 102% | 104% | 105% | 97% |
| **France** | *10* | 96% | 98% | 99% | 102% | 98% | 97% | 95% | 97% | 96% | 94% | 94% |
| **Germany** | *5* | 100% | 103% | 92% | 84% | 97% | 109% | 110% | 110% | 114% | 109% | 99% |
| **Greece** | *8* | NA | 183% | 148% | 166% | 164% | NA | 163% | 130% | 127% | 121% | 112% |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 92% | 105% | 100% | 102% | 102% | 103% | 89% | 108% | 98% | 101% | 99% |
| **Ireland** | *7* | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | *12* | 156% | 142% | 153% | 156% | 136% | 131% | 136% | 125% | 134% | 121% | 125% |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 144% | 106% | 95% | 100% | 105% | 105% | 107% | 93% | 107% | 109% | 99% |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 89% | 100% | 144% | 113% | 88% | 105% | 97% | 98% | 98% | 105% | 90% |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | 94% | 91% | 98% | 94% | 86% | 75% | 87% | 92% | 92% | 98% | 60% |
| **Malta** | *18* | 149% | 411% | 114% | 147% | 91% | 121% | 106% | 70% | 95% | 78% | 60% |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 99% | 103% | 95% | 105% | 95% | 94% | 86% | 108% | 99% | 88% | 93% |
| **Poland** | *21* | 97% | - | 103% | 107% | 105% | 99% | 95% | 93% | 99% | 110% | 102% |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | 80% | 112% | 105% | 111% | 106% | 126% | 107% | 112% | 120% | 48% |
| **Romania** | *23* | 161% | 133% | 92% | 102% | 118% | 100% | 48% | 105% | 97% | 92% | 91% |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 125% | 124% | 112% | 118% | 96% | 81% | 87% | 80% | 93% | 74% | 93% |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 103% | 101% | 87% | 67% | 91% | 89% | 107% | 95% | 98% | 92% | 92% |
| **Spain** | *9* | 113% | 117% | 112% | 104% | 100% | 92% | 99% | 99% | 97% | 95% | 103% |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 103% | 104% | 94% | 90% | 97% | 102% | 102% | 103% | 103% | 105% | 100% |

**Portugal:** In 2024, there was a significant increase in applications for the authorisation or renewal of residence permits, which led to a noticable decline in the Clearance Rate. As a result, the number of pending cases and the Disposition Time increased considerably.

$$* \, CEPEJ \; Clearance \; Rate \; (\%) = \frac{Resolved \; cases \; in \; a \; period}{Incoming \; Cases \; in \; a \; period} \times 100$$

## Table 3.10.7 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (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 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | NA | 5,5 | 5,8 | 5,9 | 5,8 | 5,8 | 6,0 | 5,8 | 5,9 | 5,6 | 5,6 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4,0 | 4,3 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,1 | 1,2 | 1,3 | 1,4 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,4 | 1,3 | 1,4 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 8,4 | 7,9 | 7,5 | 7,2 | 6,3 | 8,2 | 7,5 | 8,6 | 7,3 | 7,6 | 6,9 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 6,1 | 7,2 | 6,0 | 6,2 | 6,0 | 5,5 | 6,3 | 6,6 | 6,5 | 5,8 | 5,1 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 3,8 | 4,9 | 4,4 | 4,3 | 4,0 | 3,9 | 4,0 | 3,8 | 3,5 | 3,3 | 3,3 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 2,1 | 2,1 | 2,3 | 2,4 | 2,6 | 2,5 | 2,3 | 2,2 | 2,3 | 2,5 | 2,1 |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 1,6 | 2,7 | 2,7 | 1,4 | 1,8 | 2,0 | 1,6 | 1,8 | 1,9 | 1,8 | 2,0 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 2,3 | 2,4 | 2,5 | 2,8 | 2,3 | 2,6 | 2,4 | 2,2 | 2,3 | 2,7 | 3,5 |
| **France** | *10* | 2,7 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,7 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 3,0 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 3,0 | 3,5 |
| **Germany** | *5* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | *8* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4,0 | 3,5 | 3,6 | 4,4 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,3 | 1,4 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | *12* | 7,4 | 6,9 | 6,7 | 6,4 | 6,1 | 5,9 | 6,0 | 5,7 | 5,4 | 5,1 | 5,5 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 1,8 | 1,6 | 1,5 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,8 | 1,7 | 2,2 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 1,6 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,2 | 1,1 | 1,0 | 1,3 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 1,0 | 1,1 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 2,4 | 2,1 | 1,9 | 2,0 | 2,1 | 2,3 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 2,5 | 2,5 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,7 | 1,6 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,6 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,4 | 1,4 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 4,0 | - | 6,1 | 6,0 | 6,3 | 9,8 | 8,7 | 8,2 | 7,5 | 7,0 | 7,6 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | *23* | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,0 | 3,0 | 3,3 | 3,1 | 3,4 | 4,6 | 4,7 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 7,3 | 6,8 | 4,9 | 5,0 | 3,7 | 5,0 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,2 | 2,6 | 2,3 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 12,2 | 9,3 | 7,2 | 5,9 | 5,3 | 4,7 | 4,9 | 4,3 | 4,1 | 4,1 | 4,1 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 3,1 | 3,1 | 2,8 | 3,0 | 3,4 | 3,7 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 4,4 | 5,1 | 5,9 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,8 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,7 |

## Table 3.10.8 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1=Q01)

| States / Entities | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | NA | 1,6 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3,8 | 4,1 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,0 | 1,1 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 4,6 | 4,4 | 3,8 | 3,6 | 3,3 | 3,7 | 4,2 | 5,2 | 4,1 | 4,1 | 3,8 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3,7 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 2,1 | 1,8 | 1,4 | 1,5 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,2 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,6 |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 0,5 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,7 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,2 |
| **France** | *10* | 2,4 | 2,4 | 2,4 | 2,4 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 2,6 | 2,4 | 1,8 | 2,0 | 2,5 |
| **Germany** | *5* | 1,0 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,9 |
| **Greece** | *8* | 2,3 | 2,2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 2,6 | 2,9 | NA | 2,8 | 2,5 | 2,7 | 3,4 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,9 | 0,7 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | *12* | 4,5 | 4,4 | 4,1 | 3,9 | 3,8 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,6 | 3,4 | 3,3 | 3,5 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 1,6 | 1,4 | 1,3 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 0,9 | 1,0 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 1,1 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,6 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 2,2 | 2,0 | 1,8 | 1,9 | 2,0 | 2,1 | 2,0 | 2,1 | 2,4 | 2,2 | 2,3 |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 0,4 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 | NA | NA | NA | 0,2 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 1,8 | - | 1,9 | 2,1 | 2,4 | 2,4 | 2,3 | 2,2 | 2,3 | 2,4 | 2,6 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | 3,1 | 2,7 | 2,3 | 2,0 | 1,8 | 1,9 | 1,8 | 1,7 | 1,7 | 1,8 |
| **Romania** | *23* | 3,0 | 3,0 | 2,9 | 3,0 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,7 | 3,0 | 4,0 | 4,1 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 3,7 | 3,0 | 1,7 | 2,1 | 1,3 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,7 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 2,3 | 2,2 | 2,0 | 1,9 | 1,7 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,3 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 1,8 | 2,0 | 1,7 | 2,0 | 2,3 | 2,5 | 2,8 | 2,7 | 2,8 | 3,2 | 3,9 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,3 |

**Table 3.10.9 (EC): Number of first instance administrative cases pending on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1-Q21)**

| States / Entities | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | NAP | NAP | 0,6 | 0,8 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,6 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,3 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,7 | 0,5 | 0,6 | 1,3 | 1,4 | 1,3 | 1,4 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 |
| **France** | *10* | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,4 |
| **Germany** | *5* | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,9 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,7 |
| **Greece** | *8* | NA | 2,4 | 2,2 | 1,9 | 1,5 | NA | 1,0 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,7 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | *12* | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,2 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 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 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,5 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 0,1 | - | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,8 |
| **Romania** | *23* | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,5 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 |

## Table 3.10.10 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (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 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | NA | 37,8 | 37,6 | 36,7 | 37,0 | 36,2 | 35,0 | 34,7 | 34,8 | 35,2 | 35,6 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | NA | NA | 8,7 | 4,4 | 9,3 | 8,6 | 8,6 | 8,4 | 8,3 | 9,5 | 10,0 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 4,4 | 4,8 | 4,8 | 5,6 | 5,4 | 5,4 | 4,5 | 5,1 | 5,0 | 5,1 | 5,7 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 22,2 | 21,6 | 23,2 | 22,9 | 21,7 | 24,6 | 22,1 | 26,8 | 26,3 | 25,8 | 25,9 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 2,8 | 3,5 | 2,4 | 1,8 | 2,4 | 2,3 | 2,4 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 3,0 | 2,1 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 9,1 | 10,8 | 9,8 | 9,5 | 8,8 | 9,0 | 8,7 | 8,6 | 8,6 | 8,8 | 8,3 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 40,4 | 45,4 | 38,8 | 39,5 | 39,2 | 49,3 | 47,5 | 46,1 | 48,7 | 40,3 | 40,1 |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 18,1 | 18,0 | 24,7 | 20,3 | 22,6 | 22,7 | 23,4 | 24,3 | 24,1 | 24,0 | 23,1 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 8,1 | 8,1 | 8,2 | 9,0 | 9,1 | 9,5 | 8,5 | 8,8 | 8,2 | 9,2 | 10,1 |
| **France** | *10* | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,2 | 2,8 | 2,7 | 2,1 | 2,2 | 3,6 | 3,9 | 4,0 |
| **Germany** | *5* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | *8* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2,4 | 2,0 | 2,1 | 2,9 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 8,6 | 9,2 | 8,9 | 8,6 | 7,5 | 6,8 | 6,4 | 6,4 | 6,8 | 7,1 | 7,2 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | 5,4 | 5,3 | 5,0 | 4,7 | 4,6 | 4,7 | 3,6 | 2,7 | 3,6 | 3,7 | 3,7 |
| **Italy** | *12* | 6,6 | 5,7 | 6,0 | 5,7 | 5,8 | 5,7 | 4,5 | 5,1 | 5,2 | 5,1 | 5,5 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 3,6 | 15,7 | 16,2 | 16,4 | 16,5 | 18,7 | 19,3 | 18,3 | 19,6 | 18,9 | 20,5 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 10,7 | 11,1 | 11,7 | 9,5 | 7,5 | 7,2 | 7,0 | 6,6 | 6,5 | 6,3 | 6,3 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | NA | NA | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,9 | 2,3 | 2,1 | 2,0 | 1,8 | 1,8 | 2,0 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 1,5 | 1,6 | 1,5 | 2,3 | 2,5 | 2,6 | 2,1 | 2,6 | 2,6 | 2,5 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 7,5 | 7,4 | 7,3 | 7,2 | 6,9 | 7,0 | 6,4 | 6,2 | 6,1 | 6,1 | 6,2 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 26,0 | - | 28,0 | 30,3 | 28,6 | 35,6 | 27,6 | 27,6 | 26,8 | 27,1 | 27,4 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | *23* | 7,3 | 7,3 | 7,5 | 7,5 | 7,0 | 7,3 | 6,7 | 7,0 | 7,6 | 8,5 | 9,1 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 11,3 | 9,9 | 17,0 | 15,7 | 10,9 | 14,7 | 12,4 | 14,5 | 14,4 | 12,0 | 11,3 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 42,3 | 38,8 | 34,4 | 32,2 | 30,7 | 30,1 | 26,2 | 28,5 | 27,4 | 27,1 | 28,7 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 4,6 | 4,8 | 4,2 | 4,6 | 4,9 | 5,3 | 4,9 | 5,6 | 5,9 | 6,4 | 7,5 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 2,0 | 1,9 | 2,3 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 2,7 | 2,7 | 2,6 | 2,3 | 2,4 | 2,6 |

## Table 3.10.11 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2014

| States / Entities | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | 1,1 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,9 | 0,9 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | 6,7 | 6,8 | 6,4 | 1,9 | 6,7 | 6,1 | 6,1 | 5,9 | 5,7 | 5,8 | 5,8 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2,0 | 2,2 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 3,9 | 3,8 | 3,3 | 3,1 | 2,9 | 3,2 | 2,7 | 4,2 | 2,5 | 2,7 | 2,7 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,3 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 4,6 | 3,8 | 3,1 | 3,4 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 2,9 | 3,0 | 2,9 | 3,1 | 3,2 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,8 | 0,9 | 0,9 |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 1,3 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,4 | 1,4 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,2 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| **France** | *10* | 2,6 | 2,6 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 2,2 | 2,1 | 1,6 | 1,7 | 2,0 | 2,1 | 2,2 |
| **Germany** | *5* | 1,8 | 1,7 | 1,6 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,3 | 1,2 | 1,3 | 1,3 |
| **Greece** | *8* | 2,2 | 2,1 | 1,4 | 1,9 | 2,0 | 1,9 | NA | 1,7 | 1,3 | 1,4 | 2,1 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,9 | 1,8 | 1,4 | 1,4 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,2 | 1,3 | 1,3 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | 3,1 | 3,0 | 2,7 | 2,7 | 2,7 | 2,7 | 2,7 | 2,1 | 2,0 | 2,1 | 2,2 |
| **Italy** | *12* | 2,6 | 2,5 | 2,6 | 2,5 | 2,6 | 2,4 | 1,9 | 2,1 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 2,3 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 2,3 | 2,0 | 2,0 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,6 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,6 | 1,6 | 1,8 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 4,0 | 3,6 | 4,4 | 4,1 | 3,6 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,1 | 2,9 | 2,8 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,9 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,6 | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,4 | 1,9 | 2,0 | 1,9 | 1,8 |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 1,0 | 1,0 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,7 | NA | NA | NA | 0,7 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 3,2 | - | 3,1 | 3,5 | 3,4 | 3,3 | 2,5 | 2,4 | 2,3 | 2,6 | 2,8 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | 3,1 | 3,0 | 2,9 | 2,9 | 3,1 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 2,5 | 2,6 |
| **Romania** | *23* | 6,9 | 6,8 | 6,8 | 6,6 | 6,4 | 6,7 | 6,1 | 6,4 | 7,0 | 7,8 | 8,4 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 2,8 | 2,1 | 3,7 | 3,5 | 2,3 | 2,1 | 2,0 | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,7 | 1,6 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 2,9 | 2,8 | 2,5 | 2,2 | 2,0 | 1,8 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,4 | 1,4 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 2,2 | 2,3 | 2,1 | 2,5 | 2,7 | 2,7 | 2,5 | 2,8 | 2,9 | 3,1 | 4,1 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 0,7 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,7 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,7 |

**Table 3.10.12 (EC): Number of first instance administrative incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q91)**

| States / Entities | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | NAP | NAP | 0,6 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,6 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 0,5 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,4 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 1,2 | 1,3 | 1,1 | 0,8 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,7 | 0,5 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 |
| **France** | *10* | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,5 |
| **Germany** | *5* | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,9 | 1,0 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,7 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,7 |
| **Greece** | *8* | NA | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,6 | NA | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | *12* | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,5 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,6 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,7 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,7 | 0,8 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 0,2 | - | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | NA | 0,3 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,7 |
| **Romania** | *23* | 0,4 | 0,3 | 0,6 | 0,7 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,3 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 1,1 | 1,0 | 1,4 | 1,6 | 1,6 | 1,7 | 1,8 | 1,7 | 1,4 | 1,5 | 1,6 |

# First instance criminal cases by case category and by case status

## Table 3.11.1a: First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

### 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** | **21 606** | 4 873 | 7 959 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **36 224** | 16 064 | 20 160 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **19 856** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **122 763** | 31 459 | 78 817 | 12 487 |
| **Cyprus** | **54 422** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | **9 843** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **36 354** | 18 770 | 17 584 | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **1 372** | 430 | 530 | 412 |
| **Finland** | **30 456** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **NA** | 233 097 | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | **NA** | 248 998 | 101 080 | NA |
| **Greece** | **173 523** | 537 | 172 650 | 336 |
| **Hungary** | **46 148** | 24 696 | 21 452 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | **901 488** | 829 542 | 71 946 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **4 498** | 3 356 | 931 | 211 |
| **Lithuania** | **3 009** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | **19 860** | 142 | 19 718 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **59 282** | 30 722 | 28 560 | NAP |
| **Poland** | **375 593** | 170 373 | 84 207 | 121 013 |
| **Portugal** | **47 374** | 42 612 | 3 217 | 1 545 |
| **Romania** | **118 121** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **23 904** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **30 852** | 11 179 | 10 364 | 9 309 |
| **Spain** | **484 391** | 327 444 | 156 947 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **46 364** | 29 042 | 1 680 | 15 642 |
| **Average** | **115 970** | 112 408 | 46 930 | 20 119 |
| **Median** | **36 354** | 26 869 | 20 160 | 5 427 |
| **Minimum** | **1 372** | 142 | 530 | 211 |
| **Maximum** | **901 488** | 829 542 | 172 650 | 121 013 |
| **% of NA** | **15%** | 30% | 33% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 4% | 44% |

**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 3.11.1b: First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

### 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 | 0,23 | 0,05 | 0,09 | NAP |
| Belgium | 0,31 | 0,14 | 0,17 | NA |
| Bulgaria | 0,31 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 3,18 | 0,81 | 2,04 | 0,32 |
| Cyprus | 5,63 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Czech Republic | 0,09 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 0,61 | 0,31 | 0,29 | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,10 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| Finland | 0,54 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | NA | 0,34 | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | 0,30 | 0,12 | NA |
| Greece | 1,67 | 0,01 | 1,66 | 0,00 |
| Hungary | 0,48 | 0,26 | 0,22 | NAP |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Italy | 1,53 | 1,41 | 0,12 | NAP |
| Latvia | 0,24 | 0,18 | 0,05 | 0,01 |
| Lithuania | 0,10 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 3,46 | 0,02 | 3,43 | NA |
| Netherlands | 0,33 | 0,17 | 0,16 | NAP |
| Poland | 1,00 | 0,45 | 0,22 | 0,32 |
| Portugal | 0,44 | 0,40 | 0,03 | 0,01 |
| Romania | 0,62 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,44 | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 1,45 | 0,52 | 0,49 | 0,44 |
| Spain | 0,99 | 0,67 | 0,32 | NAP |
| Sweden | 0,44 | 0,27 | 0,02 | 0,15 |
| **Average** | 1,05 | 0,35 | 0,56 | 0,16 |
| **Median** | 0,48 | 0,29 | 0,17 | 0,09 |
| **Minimum** | 0,09 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 5,63 | 1,41 | 3,43 | 0,44 |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 30% | 33% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 4% | 4% | 44% |

**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 3.11.2a: First instance criminal cases - incoming in 2024

### 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** | **72 426** | 24 069 | 27 295 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **183 035** | 43 271 | 139 764 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **129 305** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **197 738** | 18 764 | 113 629 | 65 345 |
| **Cyprus** | **74 173** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | **64 432** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **138 539** | 17 212 | 121 327 | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **15 752** | 3 114 | 4 699 | 7 939 |
| **Finland** | **68 998** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **905 798** | 557 753 | 348 045 | 16 759 |
| **Germany** | **1 056 244** | 575 974 | 331 144 | 149 126 |
| **Greece** | **256 610** | 1 192 | 251 420 | 3 998 |
| **Hungary** | **385 833** | 131 525 | 254 308 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **370 796** | 19 944 | 350 852 | NAP |
| **Italy** | **1 075 119** | 973 681 | 101 438 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **11 237** | 6 548 | 3 029 | 1 660 |
| **Lithuania** | **15 472** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | NA | NA | 3 120 |
| **Malta** | **16 120** | 85 | 16 035 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **305 205** | 159 141 | 146 064 | NAP |
| **Poland** | **1 942 241** | 335 572 | 339 693 | 1 266 976 |
| **Portugal** | **76 113** | 60 339 | 8 114 | 7 660 |
| **Romania** | **391 353** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **64 935** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **75 380** | 9 025 | 23 299 | 43 056 |
| **Spain** | **858 585** | 361 383 | 497 202 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **137 799** | 74 107 | 10 257 | 53 435 |
| **Average** | **341 894** | 177 510 | 162 506 | 147 189 |
| **Median** | **138 169** | 43 271 | 121 327 | 16 759 |
| **Minimum** | **11 237** | 85 | 3 029 | 1 660 |
| **Maximum** | **1 942 241** | 973 681 | 497 202 | 1 266 976 |
| **% of NA** | **4%** | 26% | 26% | 15% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 4% | 44% |

**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.

**France:** "Other criminal cases" encompass investigation procedures that are not included in the total because they are already considered in other two categories.

**Ireland:** The incoming criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than by case.

## Table 3.11.2b: First instance criminal cases - incoming in 2024

### 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** | **0,79** | 0,26 | 0,30 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **1,55** | 0,37 | 1,18 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **2,01** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **5,11** | 0,49 | 2,94 | 1,69 |
| **Cyprus** | **7,68** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,59** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **2,31** | 0,29 | 2,02 | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **1,15** | 0,23 | 0,34 | 0,58 |
| **Finland** | **1,22** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **1,32** | 0,81 | 0,51 | 0,02 |
| **Germany** | **1,26** | 0,69 | 0,40 | 0,18 |
| **Greece** | **2,47** | 0,01 | 2,42 | 0,04 |
| **Hungary** | **4,04** | 1,38 | 2,67 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **6,82** | 0,37 | 6,45 | NAP |
| **Italy** | **1,82** | 1,65 | 0,17 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **0,61** | 0,35 | 0,16 | 0,09 |
| **Lithuania** | **0,54** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | NA | NA | 0,46 |
| **Malta** | **2,81** | 0,01 | 2,79 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **1,69** | 0,88 | 0,81 | NAP |
| **Poland** | **5,17** | 0,89 | 0,90 | 3,37 |
| **Portugal** | **0,71** | 0,56 | 0,08 | 0,07 |
| **Romania** | **2,06** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **1,20** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **3,54** | 0,42 | 1,09 | 2,02 |
| **Spain** | **1,75** | 0,74 | 1,01 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **1,30** | 0,70 | 0,10 | 0,50 |
| **Average** | **2,37** | 0,58 | 1,39 | 0,82 |
| **Median** | **1,72** | 0,49 | 0,90 | 0,46 |
| **Minimum** | **0,54** | 0,01 | 0,08 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | **7,68** | 1,65 | 6,45 | 3,37 |
| **% of NA** | **4%** | 26% | 26% | 15% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 4% | 44% |

**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.

**France:** "Other criminal cases" encompass investigation procedures that are not included in the total because they are already considered in other two categories.

**Ireland:** The incoming criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than by case.

## Table 3.11.3a: First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2024

### 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** | **72 528** | 23 785 | 27 282 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **189 569** | 41 086 | 148 483 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **129 382** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **199 956** | 18 574 | 117 446 | 63 936 |
| **Cyprus** | **71 772** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | **64 384** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **148 342** | 24 126 | 124 216 | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **15 557** | 3 089 | 4 611 | 7 857 |
| **Finland** | **65 634** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **913 806** | 576 763 | 337 043 | 14 828 |
| **Germany** | **NA** | 572 262 | 334 184 | NA |
| **Greece** | **165 614** | 694 | 161 112 | 3 808 |
| **Hungary** | **379 038** | 130 878 | 248 160 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **334 223** | 24 436 | 309 787 | NAP |
| **Italy** | **1 069 748** | 968 022 | 101 726 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **10 340** | 5 766 | 2 906 | 1 668 |
| **Lithuania** | **15 237** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **14 805** | 4 408 | 8 062 | 2 335 |
| **Malta** | **10 636** | 19 | 10 617 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **277 005** | 162 558 | 114 447 | NAP |
| **Poland** | **1 945 380** | 340 683 | 341 146 | 1 263 551 |
| **Portugal** | **74 555** | 59 768 | 7 530 | 7 257 |
| **Romania** | **387 386** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **64 735** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **73 021** | 8 169 | 22 650 | 42 202 |
| **Spain** | **834 270** | 332 520 | 501 750 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **136 362** | 74 815 | 10 139 | 51 408 |
| **Average** | **294 742** | 168 621 | 146 665 | 145 885 |
| **Median** | **132 872** | 32 761 | 115 947 | 11 343 |
| **Minimum** | **10 340** | 19 | 2 906 | 1 668 |
| **Maximum** | **1 945 380** | 968 022 | 501 750 | 1 263 551 |
| **% of NA** | **4%** | 22% | 22% | 19% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 4% | 44% |

**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.

**France:** "Other criminal cases" encompass investigation procedures that are not included in the total because they are already considered in other two categories.

**Ireland:** The resolved criminal cases are generally counted by penalty imposed rather than by case.

## Table 3.11.3b: First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2024

### 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 | 0,79 | 0,26 | 0,30 | NAP |
| Belgium | 1,60 | 0,35 | 1,26 | NA |
| Bulgaria | 2,01 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 5,17 | 0,48 | 3,04 | 1,65 |
| Cyprus | 7,43 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Czech Republic | 0,59 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 2,48 | 0,40 | 2,07 | NAP |
| Estonia | 1,13 | 0,22 | 0,34 | 0,57 |
| Finland | 1,16 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 1,33 | 0,84 | 0,49 | 0,02 |
| Germany | NA | 0,68 | 0,40 | NA |
| Greece | 1,59 | 0,01 | 1,55 | 0,04 |
| Hungary | 3,97 | 1,37 | 2,60 | NAP |
| Ireland | 6,14 | 0,45 | 5,69 | NAP |
| Italy | 1,82 | 1,64 | 0,17 | NAP |
| Latvia | 0,56 | 0,31 | 0,16 | 0,09 |
| Lithuania | 0,53 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 2,17 | 0,65 | 1,18 | 0,34 |
| Malta | 1,85 | 0,00 | 1,85 | NA |
| Netherlands | 1,54 | 0,90 | 0,63 | NAP |
| Poland | 5,18 | 0,91 | 0,91 | 3,36 |
| Portugal | 0,69 | 0,56 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| Romania | 2,04 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 1,19 | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 3,43 | 0,38 | 1,06 | 1,98 |
| Spain | 1,70 | 0,68 | 1,02 | NAP |
| Sweden | 1,29 | 0,71 | 0,10 | 0,49 |
| **Average** | 2,28 | 0,59 | 1,24 | 0,86 |
| **Median** | 1,65 | 0,52 | 0,97 | 0,41 |
| **Minimum** | 0,53 | 0,00 | 0,07 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | 7,43 | 1,64 | 5,69 | 3,36 |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 22% | 22% | 19% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 4% | 4% | 44% |

**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.

**France:** "Other criminal cases" encompass investigation procedures that are not included in the total because they are already considered in other two categories.

**Ireland:** The resolved criminal cases are generally counted by penalty imposed rather than by case.

## Table 3.11.4a: First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024

### 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** | **21 504** | 5 157 | 7 972 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **29 690** | 18 249 | 11 441 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **19 779** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **122 802** | 32 137 | 76 781 | 13 884 |
| **Cyprus** | **56 823** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | **9 891** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **26 551** | 11 856 | 14 695 | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **1 491** | 445 | 559 | 487 |
| **Finland** | **33 821** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **NA** | 214 087 | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | **NA** | 252 675 | 97 949 | NA |
| **Greece** | **264 519** | 1 035 | 262 958 | 526 |
| **Hungary** | **52 943** | 25 343 | 27 600 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | **906 859** | 835 201 | 71 658 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **5 395** | 4 138 | 1 054 | 203 |
| **Lithuania** | **3 244** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | **25 107** | 207 | 24 900 | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **87 482** | 27 305 | 60 177 | NAP |
| **Poland** | **372 454** | 165 262 | 82 754 | 124 438 |
| **Portugal** | **48 932** | 43 183 | 3 801 | 1 948 |
| **Romania** | **122 088** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **24 104** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **33 209** | 12 035 | 11 013 | 10 161 |
| **Spain** | **513 989** | 358 132 | 155 857 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **47 801** | 28 334 | 1 798 | 17 669 |
| **Average** | **123 064** | 113 043 | 53 704 | 21 165 |
| **Median** | **33 821** | 26 324 | 24 900 | 6 055 |
| **Minimum** | **1 491** | 207 | 559 | 203 |
| **Maximum** | **906 859** | 835 201 | 262 958 | 124 438 |
| **% of NA** | **15%** | 30% | 33% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 4% | 44% |

**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 3.11.4b: First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024

### 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 | 0,23 | 0,06 | 0,09 | NAP |
| Belgium | 0,25 | 0,15 | 0,10 | NA |
| Bulgaria | 0,31 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 3,18 | 0,83 | 1,99 | 0,36 |
| Cyprus | 5,88 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Czech Republic | 0,09 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 0,44 | 0,20 | 0,25 | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,11 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Finland | 0,60 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | NA | 0,31 | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | 0,30 | 0,12 | NA |
| Greece | 2,54 | 0,01 | 2,53 | 0,01 |
| Hungary | 0,55 | 0,27 | 0,29 | NAP |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Italy | 1,54 | 1,42 | 0,12 | NAP |
| Latvia | 0,29 | 0,22 | 0,06 | 0,01 |
| Lithuania | 0,11 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 4,37 | 0,04 | 4,34 | NA |
| Netherlands | 0,48 | 0,15 | 0,33 | NAP |
| Poland | 0,99 | 0,44 | 0,22 | 0,33 |
| Portugal | 0,46 | 0,40 | 0,04 | 0,02 |
| Romania | 0,64 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,44 | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 1,56 | 0,56 | 0,52 | 0,48 |
| Spain | 1,05 | 0,73 | 0,32 | NAP |
| Sweden | 0,45 | 0,27 | 0,02 | 0,17 |
| Average | 1,16 | 0,36 | 0,67 | 0,18 |
| Median | 0,48 | 0,27 | 0,22 | 0,10 |
| Minimum | 0,09 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,01 |
| Maximum | 5,88 | 1,42 | 4,34 | 0,48 |
| % of NA | 15% | 30% | 33% | 26% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 4% | 44% |

**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 3.11.5: First instance criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2024

**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 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** | **550** | **2,6%** | 161 | 3,1% | 255 | 3,2% | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **14 513** | **48,9%** | 3 808 | 20,9% | 10 705 | 93,6% | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **22 547** | **18,4%** | 13 898 | 43,2% | 7 330 | 9,5% | 1 319 | 9,5% |
| **Cyprus** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | **477** | **4,8%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | **35** | **2,3%** | 22 | 4,9% | 1 | 0,2% | 12 | 2,5% |
| **Finland** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | **4 051** | **1,5%** | 5 | 0,5% | 4 012 | 1,5% | 34 | 6,5% |
| **Hungary** | **1 729** | **3,3%** | 1 729 | 6,8% | 0 | 0,0% | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | **NA** | **NA** | 208 800 | 25,0% | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **786** | **14,6%** | 752 | 18,2% | 29 | 2,8% | 5 | 2,5% |
| **Lithuania** | **211** | **6,5%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **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** | **14 574** | **29,8%** | 13 710 | 31,7% | 417 | 11,0% | 447 | 22,9% |
| **Romania** | **5 498** | **4,5%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **1 535** | **6,4%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **4 904** | **14,8%** | 3 784 | 31,4% | 433 | 3,9% | 687 | 6,8% |
| **Spain** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **2 770** | **5,8%** | 1 887 | 6,7% | 12 | 0,7% | 871 | 4,9% |
| **Average** | **5 299** | **11,7%** | 22 596 | 17,5% | 2 319 | 12,6% | 482 | 7,9% |
| **Median** | **2 250** | **6,1%** | 1 887 | 18,2% | 336 | 3,0% | 447 | 6,5% |
| **Minimum** | **35** | **1,5%** | 5 | 0,5% | 0 | 0,0% | 5 | 2,5% |
| **Maximum** | **22 547** | **48,9%** | 208 800 | 43,2% | 10 705 | 93,6% | 1 319 | 22,9% |
| **% of NA** | **48%** | **48%** | 52% | 52% | 56% | 56% | 30% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 44% | 44% |

**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.

# Evolution of first instance total of criminal cases, severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases

## Table 3.12.1: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,26 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,23 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | 0,30 | 0,31 |
| Bulgaria | 0,31 | 0,34 | 0,36 | 0,33 | 0,31 |
| Croatia | 2,04 | 2,73 | 3,14 | 3,00 | 3,18 |
| Cyprus | 5,10 | 5,48 | 4,66 | 6,25 | 5,63 |
| Czech Republic | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Denmark | 0,33 | 0,46 | 0,53 | 0,61 | 0,61 |
| Estonia | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,10 |
| Finland | 0,37 | 0,51 | 0,52 | 0,50 | 0,54 |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 0,22 | 0,32 | 1,09 | 1,67 |
| Hungary | 0,43 | 0,54 | 0,53 | 0,47 | 0,48 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 2,01 | 2,10 | 1,98 | 1,80 | 1,53 |
| Latvia | 0,31 | 0,33 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 |
| Lithuania | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,10 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 2,31 | 3,08 | 3,04 | 2,93 | 3,46 |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | 0,34 | 0,33 |
| Poland | 0,98 | 1,08 | 1,06 | 1,02 | 1,00 |
| Portugal | 0,40 | 0,43 | 0,43 | 0,42 | 0,44 |
| Romania | 0,56 | 0,56 | 0,53 | 0,58 | 0,62 |
| Slovak Republic | 0,41 | 0,41 | 0,43 | 0,44 | 0,44 |
| Slovenia | 1,37 | 1,51 | 1,48 | 1,40 | 1,45 |
| Spain | 0,76 | 0,85 | 0,82 | 0,86 | 0,99 |
| Sweden | 0,41 | 0,45 | 0,45 | 0,44 | 0,44 |
| Average | 0,94 | 1,03 | 1,01 | 1,03 | 1,05 |
| Median | 0,41 | 0,46 | 0,52 | 0,47 | 0,48 |
| Minimum | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Maximum | 5,10 | 5,48 | 4,66 | 6,25 | 5,63 |
| % of NA | 26% | 22% | 22% | 15% | 15% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.12.2: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | 0,13 | 0,14 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 0,67 | 0,76 | 0,81 | 0,80 | 0,81 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 0,17 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,31 | 0,31 |
| **Estonia** | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | 0,40 | NA | 0,34 |
| **Germany** | 0,30 | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,30 |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,00 | 0,001 | 0,006 | 0,005 |
| **Hungary** | 0,21 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,26 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 1,85 | 1,92 | 1,82 | 1,66 | 1,41 |
| **Latvia** | 0,21 | 0,29 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | 0,19 | 0,17 |
| **Poland** | 0,45 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,47 | 0,45 |
| **Portugal** | 0,37 | 0,40 | 0,39 | 0,38 | 0,40 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0,43 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,51 | 0,52 |
| **Spain** | 0,54 | 0,58 | 0,59 | 0,61 | 0,67 |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | 0,28 | 0,27 |
| **Average** | 0,44 | 0,45 | 0,41 | 0,36 | 0,35 |
| **Median** | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,28 | 0,29 |
| **Minimum** | 0,04 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Maximum** | 1,85 | 1,92 | 1,82 | 1,66 | 1,41 |
| **% of NA** | 48% | 44% | 37% | 33% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

## Table 3.12.3: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | 0,17 | 0,17 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 1,11 | 1,70 | 2,02 | 1,90 | 2,04 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,16 | 0,22 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,29 |
| Estonia | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,12 |
| Greece | NA | 0,22 | 0,32 | 1,08 | 1,66 |
| Hungary | 0,22 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,23 | 0,22 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,12 |
| Latvia | 0,10 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | 3,02 | 2,91 | 3,43 |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | 0,15 | 0,16 |
| Poland | 0,21 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,23 | 0,22 |
| Portugal | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,59 | 0,58 | 0,58 | 0,52 | 0,49 |
| Spain | 0,22 | 0,26 | 0,23 | 0,25 | 0,32 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Average** | 0,26 | 0,31 | 0,53 | 0,48 | 0,56 |
| **Median** | 0,16 | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,17 | 0,17 |
| **Minimum** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | 1,11 | 1,70 | 3,02 | 2,91 | 3,43 |
| **% of NA** | 48% | 44% | 41% | 33% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.12.4: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,75 | 0,73 | 0,75 | 0,79 | 0,79 |
| **Belgium** | 1,66 | 2,01 | 1,83 | 1,65 | 1,55 |
| **Bulgaria** | 1,88 | 1,92 | 1,93 | 2,04 | 2,01 |
| **Croatia** | 4,87 | 5,16 | 4,82 | 4,86 | 5,11 |
| **Cyprus** | 6,62 | 6,29 | 8,88 | 7,70 | 7,68 |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,61 | 0,59 | 0,60 | 0,62 | 0,59 |
| **Denmark** | 2,79 | 2,37 | 2,59 | 2,71 | 2,31 |
| **Estonia** | 1,53 | 1,46 | 1,32 | 1,19 | 1,15 |
| **Finland** | 1,03 | 1,27 | 1,16 | 1,24 | 1,22 |
| **France** | 1,43 | NA | 1,44 | 1,42 | 1,32 |
| **Germany** | 1,43 | 1,36 | 1,28 | 1,28 | 1,26 |
| **Greece** | NA | 1,58 | 2,48 | 1,91 | 2,47 |
| **Hungary** | 3,65 | 4,46 | 3,82 | 3,88 | 4,04 |
| **Ireland** | 7,24 | 7,33 | 6,99 | 6,54 | 6,82 |
| **Italy** | 1,76 | 1,91 | 1,87 | 1,88 | 1,82 |
| **Latvia** | 0,79 | 0,51 | 0,47 | 0,50 | 0,61 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,62 | 0,55 | 0,54 | 0,53 | 0,54 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | 2,15 | 2,25 | 2,37 | 2,43 | 2,81 |
| **Netherlands** | 1,28 | 1,45 | 1,46 | 1,43 | 1,69 |
| **Poland** | 4,87 | 5,32 | 5,37 | 5,34 | 5,17 |
| **Portugal** | 0,62 | 0,72 | 0,75 | 0,74 | 0,71 |
| **Romania** | 1,78 | 1,90 | 1,92 | 1,96 | 2,06 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1,21 | 1,15 | 1,20 | 1,21 | 1,20 |
| **Slovenia** | 3,48 | 3,43 | 3,43 | 3,47 | 3,54 |
| **Spain** | 1,32 | 1,52 | 1,59 | 1,64 | 1,75 |
| **Sweden** | 1,16 | 1,17 | 1,16 | 1,20 | 1,30 |
| **Average** | 2,26 | 2,34 | 2,39 | 2,31 | 2,37 |
| **Median** | 1,53 | 1,58 | 1,71 | 1,64 | 1,72 |
| **Minimum** | 0,61 | 0,51 | 0,47 | 0,50 | 0,54 |
| **Maximum** | 7,24 | 7,33 | 8,88 | 7,70 | 7,68 |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

**Ireland:** The incoming criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

## Table 3.12.5: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,26 |
| Belgium | 0,29 | 0,35 | 0,37 | 0,37 | 0,37 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,44 | 0,48 | 0,46 | 0,44 | 0,49 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,46 | 0,38 | 0,40 | 0,49 | 0,29 |
| Estonia | 0,39 | 0,36 | 0,29 | 0,25 | 0,23 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | 0,74 | 0,82 | 0,81 | 0,82 | 0,81 |
| Germany | 0,77 | 0,70 | 0,68 | 0,70 | 0,69 |
| Greece | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Hungary | 1,27 | 1,35 | 1,37 | 1,37 | 1,38 |
| Ireland | 0,43 | 0,43 | 0,41 | 0,37 | 0,37 |
| Italy | 1,56 | 1,71 | 1,69 | 1,70 | 1,65 |
| Latvia | 0,44 | 0,35 | 0,24 | 0,26 | 0,35 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Netherlands | 0,91 | 0,96 | 0,86 | 0,88 | 0,88 |
| Poland | 0,92 | 1,00 | 0,98 | 0,95 | 0,89 |
| Portugal | 0,50 | 0,57 | 0,59 | 0,59 | 0,56 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,45 | 0,42 | 0,41 | 0,41 | 0,42 |
| Spain | 0,53 | 0,65 | 0,68 | 0,67 | 0,74 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | 0,65 | 0,70 |
| Average | 0,65 | 0,63 | 0,58 | 0,59 | 0,58 |
| Median | 0,48 | 0,48 | 0,44 | 0,49 | 0,49 |
| Minimum | 0,25 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Maximum | 1,56 | 1,71 | 1,69 | 1,70 | 1,65 |
| % of NA | 33% | 30% | 26% | 26% | 26% |
| % of NAP | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

**Ireland:** The incoming criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

## Table 3.12.6: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,27 | 0,24 | 0,27 | 0,30 | 0,30 |
| **Belgium** | 1,37 | 1,66 | 1,47 | 1,29 | 1,18 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 3,14 | 3,30 | 2,95 | 2,94 | 2,94 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 2,33 | 1,99 | 2,19 | 2,22 | 2,02 |
| **Estonia** | 0,45 | 0,41 | 0,38 | 0,36 | 0,34 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | 0,69 | 0,67 | 0,63 | 0,60 | 0,51 |
| **Germany** | 0,47 | 0,48 | 0,43 | 0,41 | 0,40 |
| **Greece** | NA | 1,54 | 2,43 | 1,83 | 2,42 |
| **Hungary** | 2,38 | 3,11 | 2,45 | 2,51 | 2,67 |
| **Ireland** | 7,68 | 6,90 | 6,58 | 6,17 | 6,45 |
| **Italy** | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,17 |
| **Latvia** | 0,35 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,16 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | 2,36 | 2,42 | 2,79 |
| **Netherlands** | 0,37 | 0,49 | 0,60 | 0,54 | 0,81 |
| **Poland** | 0,87 | 0,95 | 1,00 | 0,92 | 0,90 |
| **Portugal** | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 1,33 | 1,32 | 1,24 | 1,14 | 1,09 |
| **Spain** | 0,79 | 0,87 | 0,92 | 0,96 | 1,01 |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| **Average** | 1,42 | 1,43 | 1,46 | 1,32 | 1,39 |
| **Median** | 0,74 | 0,87 | 0,96 | 0,92 | 0,90 |
| **Minimum** | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,08 |
| **Maximum** | 7,68 | 6,90 | 6,58 | 6,17 | 6,45 |
| **% of NA** | 33% | 30% | 26% | 26% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

**Ireland:** The incoming criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

## Table 3.12.7: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,73 | 0,74 | 0,76 | 0,80 | 0,79 |
| Belgium | 1,57 | 2,00 | 1,84 | 1,65 | 1,60 |
| Bulgaria | 1,85 | 1,92 | 1,96 | 2,05 | 2,01 |
| Croatia | 4,29 | 4,80 | 5,16 | 4,75 | 5,17 |
| Cyprus | 6,27 | 7,02 | 7,19 | 8,14 | 7,43 |
| Czech Republic | 0,61 | 0,61 | 0,61 | 0,63 | 0,59 |
| Denmark | 2,66 | 2,29 | 2,57 | 2,63 | 2,48 |
| Estonia | 1,53 | 1,45 | 1,30 | 1,21 | 1,13 |
| Finland | 0,92 | 1,24 | 1,16 | 1,18 | 1,16 |
| France | 1,31 | NA | 1,37 | 1,38 | 1,33 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 1,06 | 1,74 | 1,33 | 1,59 |
| Hungary | 3,55 | 4,48 | 3,89 | 3,87 | 3,97 |
| Ireland | 4,50 | 5,54 | 5,65 | 6,00 | 6,14 |
| Italy | 1,60 | 1,92 | 1,95 | 2,08 | 1,82 |
| Latvia | 0,72 | 0,55 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,56 |
| Lithuania | 0,60 | 0,56 | 0,54 | 0,53 | 0,53 |
| Luxembourg | 2,18 | 2,21 | 2,12 | 2,15 | 2,17 |
| Malta | 1,42 | 1,98 | 2,20 | 1,80 | 1,85 |
| Netherlands | 1,22 | 1,46 | 1,40 | 1,44 | 1,54 |
| Poland | 4,78 | 5,35 | 5,41 | 5,36 | 5,18 |
| Portugal | 0,58 | 0,71 | 0,75 | 0,71 | 0,69 |
| Romania | 1,79 | 1,92 | 1,87 | 1,92 | 2,04 |
| Slovak Republic | 1,21 | 1,14 | 1,19 | 1,20 | 1,19 |
| Slovenia | 3,34 | 3,45 | 3,51 | 3,42 | 3,43 |
| Spain | 1,25 | 1,57 | 1,57 | 1,53 | 1,70 |
| Sweden | 1,11 | 1,17 | 1,17 | 1,20 | 1,29 |
| Average | 2,06 | 2,28 | 2,28 | 2,29 | 2,28 |
| Median | 1,53 | 1,92 | 1,79 | 1,59 | 1,65 |
| Minimum | 0,58 | 0,55 | 0,49 | 0,49 | 0,53 |
| Maximum | 6,27 | 7,02 | 7,19 | 8,14 | 7,43 |
| % of NA | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

**Ireland:** The resolved criminal cases are generally counted by penalty imposed rather than by case.

## Table 3.12.8: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,26 |
| Belgium | 0,30 | 0,35 | 0,36 | 0,36 | 0,35 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,39 | 0,44 | 0,47 | 0,43 | 0,48 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,39 | 0,37 | 0,37 | 0,44 | 0,40 |
| Estonia | 0,38 | 0,35 | 0,30 | 0,25 | 0,22 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | 0,73 | NA | 0,81 | 0,83 | 0,84 |
| Germany | 0,76 | 0,72 | 0,68 | 0,69 | 0,68 |
| Greece | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Hungary | 1,24 | 1,35 | 1,37 | 1,35 | 1,37 |
| Ireland | 0,35 | 0,37 | 0,47 | 0,50 | 0,45 |
| Italy | 1,41 | 1,70 | 1,75 | 1,88 | 1,64 |
| Latvia | 0,42 | 0,39 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,31 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,67 | 0,73 | 0,68 | 0,63 | 0,65 |
| Malta | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| Netherlands | 0,91 | 0,95 | 0,86 | 0,90 | 0,90 |
| Poland | 0,87 | 1,00 | 1,01 | 0,97 | 0,91 |
| Portugal | 0,47 | 0,57 | 0,60 | 0,57 | 0,56 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,36 | 0,42 | 0,43 | 0,40 | 0,38 |
| Spain | 0,49 | 0,66 | 0,67 | 0,62 | 0,68 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | 0,68 | 0,71 |
| **Average** | 0,61 | 0,63 | 0,60 | 0,60 | 0,59 |
| **Median** | 0,47 | 0,44 | 0,47 | 0,53 | 0,52 |
| **Minimum** | 0,25 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 1,41 | 1,70 | 1,75 | 1,88 | 1,64 |
| **% of NA** | 30% | 30% | 22% | 22% | 22% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.12.9: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,27 | 0,30 | 0,30 |
| Belgium | 1,27 | 1,65 | 1,48 | 1,29 | 1,26 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 2,61 | 3,01 | 3,28 | 2,87 | 3,04 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 2,27 | 1,93 | 2,20 | 2,19 | 2,07 |
| Estonia | 0,45 | 0,41 | 0,37 | 0,36 | 0,34 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | 0,58 | 0,57 | 0,56 | 0,54 | 0,49 |
| Germany | 0,46 | 0,48 | 0,42 | 0,42 | 0,40 |
| Greece | NA | 1,04 | 1,70 | 1,25 | 1,55 |
| Hungary | 2,31 | 3,12 | 2,51 | 2,51 | 2,60 |
| Ireland | 3,91 | 5,16 | 5,18 | 5,50 | 5,69 |
| Italy | 0,19 | 0,22 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,17 |
| Latvia | 0,30 | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,16 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 1,26 | 1,22 | 1,18 | 1,22 | 1,18 |
| Malta | NA | NA | 2,19 | 1,80 | 1,85 |
| Netherlands | 0,31 | 0,50 | 0,55 | 0,54 | 0,63 |
| Poland | 0,84 | 0,95 | 1,00 | 0,92 | 0,91 |
| Portugal | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,07 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 1,34 | 1,31 | 1,30 | 1,18 | 1,06 |
| Spain | 0,76 | 0,91 | 0,90 | 0,91 | 1,02 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| Average | 1,13 | 1,28 | 1,34 | 1,21 | 1,24 |
| Median | 0,76 | 0,93 | 1,00 | 0,91 | 0,97 |
| Minimum | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,07 |
| Maximum | 3,91 | 5,16 | 5,18 | 5,50 | 5,69 |
| % of NA | 30% | 26% | 22% | 22% | 22% |
| % of NAP | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

**Ireland:** The resolved criminal cases are generally counted by penalty imposed rather than by case.

## Table 3.12.10: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,23 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | 0,31 | 0,25 |
| Bulgaria | 0,34 | 0,34 | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,31 |
| Croatia | 2,62 | 3,12 | 3,00 | 3,19 | 3,18 |
| Cyprus | 5,45 | 4,74 | 6,34 | 5,82 | 5,88 |
| Czech Republic | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Denmark | 0,46 | 0,53 | 0,54 | 0,62 | 0,44 |
| Estonia | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,10 | 0,11 |
| Finland | 0,48 | 0,54 | 0,52 | 0,56 | 0,60 |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 0,36 | 1,06 | 1,67 | 2,54 |
| Hungary | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,47 | 0,48 | 0,55 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 2,18 | 2,09 | 1,90 | 1,60 | 1,54 |
| Latvia | 0,38 | 0,29 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,29 |
| Lithuania | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,11 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 3,09 | 3,06 | 3,17 | 3,52 | 4,37 |
| Netherlands | 0,46 | 0,40 | 0,34 | 0,33 | 0,48 |
| Poland | 1,07 | 1,05 | 1,01 | 1,00 | 0,99 |
| Portugal | 0,44 | 0,44 | 0,43 | 0,45 | 0,46 |
| Romania | 0,55 | 0,53 | 0,58 | 0,62 | 0,64 |
| Slovak Republic | 0,41 | 0,43 | 0,44 | 0,44 | 0,44 |
| Slovenia | 1,51 | 1,49 | 1,40 | 1,45 | 1,56 |
| Spain | 0,85 | 0,83 | 0,87 | 1,00 | 1,05 |
| Sweden | 0,45 | 0,45 | 0,44 | 0,44 | 0,45 |
| Average | 1,04 | 0,99 | 1,08 | 1,07 | 1,16 |
| Median | 0,46 | 0,49 | 0,50 | 0,48 | 0,48 |
| Minimum | 0,12 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Maximum | 5,45 | 4,74 | 6,34 | 5,82 | 5,88 |
| % of NA | 22% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

**Ireland:** The resolved criminal cases are generally counted by penalty imposed rather than by case.

## Table 3.12.11: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | 0,14 | 0,15 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,73 | 0,80 | 0,80 | 0,82 | 0,83 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,27 | 0,32 | 0,20 |
| Estonia | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | 0,41 | NA | 0,31 |
| Germany | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,30 |
| Greece | NA | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Hungary | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,26 | 0,27 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 1,99 | 1,93 | 1,75 | 1,48 | 1,42 |
| Latvia | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,22 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,04 |
| Netherlands | 0,32 | 0,27 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,15 |
| Poland | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,47 | 0,45 | 0,44 |
| Portugal | 0,41 | 0,40 | 0,39 | 0,40 | 0,40 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,52 | 0,53 | 0,56 |
| Spain | 0,58 | 0,60 | 0,62 | 0,67 | 0,73 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | 0,25 | 0,27 |
| **Average** | 0,48 | 0,44 | 0,39 | 0,36 | 0,36 |
| **Median** | 0,32 | 0,28 | 0,28 | 0,26 | 0,27 |
| **Minimum** | 0,05 | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Maximum** | 1,99 | 1,93 | 1,75 | 1,48 | 1,42 |
| **% of NA** | 44% | 41% | 33% | 33% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.12.12: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | 0,17 | 0,10 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 1,63 | 2,01 | 1,90 | 2,05 | 1,99 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,22 | 0,28 | 0,27 | 0,30 | 0,25 |
| Estonia | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| Greece | NA | 0,34 | 1,05 | 1,66 | 2,53 |
| Hungary | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,29 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,12 |
| Latvia | 0,14 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | 3,15 | 3,50 | 4,34 |
| Netherlands | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,33 |
| Poland | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,22 |
| Portugal | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,57 | 0,59 | 0,53 | 0,49 | 0,52 |
| Spain | 0,26 | 0,23 | 0,26 | 0,32 | 0,32 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Average | 0,31 | 0,33 | 0,55 | 0,56 | 0,67 |
| Median | 0,18 | 0,20 | 0,23 | 0,17 | 0,22 |
| Minimum | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Maximum | 1,63 | 2,01 | 3,15 | 3,50 | 4,34 |
| % of NA | 44% | 41% | 37% | 33% | 33% |
| % of NAP | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.12.13: Evolution of the first instance total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | NA | 0,60 | 0,55 | 0,60 | 0,58 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,19 | 0,10 | 0,06 | 0,04 |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 | 0,02 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Latvia** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 |
| **Romania** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Slovenia** | 0,20 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,23 | 0,23 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Average** | 0,05 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| **Median** | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| **Minimum** | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,20 | 0,60 | 0,55 | 0,60 | 0,58 |
| **% of NA** | **63%** | **56%** | 56% | 48% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | **0%** | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.12.14: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,0023 | 0,0020 | 0,0018 | 0,0016 | 0,0018 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | 0,0255 | 0,0322 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 0,3593 | 0,3944 | 0,3181 | 0,3500 | 0,3595 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,0021 | 0,0021 | 0,0022 | 0,0023 | 0,0016 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,0002 | 0,0003 | 0,0002 | 0,0000 |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | 0,0138 | 0,0181 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,6900 | 0,7034 | 0,5946 | 0,4400 | 0,3543 |
| **Latvia** | 0,0474 | 0,0519 | 0,0334 | 0,0360 | 0,0405 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 0,1497 | 0,1494 | 0,1379 | 0,1301 | 0,1275 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0,1528 | 0,1735 | 0,1625 | 0,1757 | 0,1776 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,0178 |
| **Average** | 0,2005 | 0,1846 | 0,1563 | 0,1175 | 0,1028 |
| **Median** | 0,1497 | 0,1007 | 0,0856 | 0,0307 | 0,0322 |
| **Minimum** | 0,0021 | 0,0002 | 0,0003 | 0,0002 | 0,0000 |
| **Maximum** | 0,6900 | 0,7034 | 0,5946 | 0,4400 | 0,3595 |
| **% of NA** | **67%** | **63%** | 63% | 59% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | **7%** | **7%** | 7% | 4% | 7% |

## Table 3.12.15: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,0045 | 0,0040 | 0,0035 | 0,0031 | 0,0028 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | 0,0938 | 0,0905 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | NA | 0,1650 | 0,2064 | 0,2196 | 0,1896 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0,0014 | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0001 | 0,0001 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,1889 | 0,0963 | 0,0591 | 0,0386 |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Latvia** | 0,0008 | 0,0005 | 0,0002 | 0,0008 | 0,0016 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 0,0008 | 0,0017 | 0,0017 | 0,0019 | 0,0039 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0,0247 | 0,0164 | 0,0198 | 0,0210 | 0,0203 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,0001 |
| **Average** | 0,0065 | 0,0538 | 0,0469 | 0,0444 | 0,0347 |
| **Median** | 0,0014 | 0,0040 | 0,0035 | 0,0031 | 0,0033 |
| **Minimum** | 0,0008 | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| **Maximum** | 0,0247 | 0,1889 | 0,2064 | 0,2196 | 0,1896 |
| **% of NA** | **74%** | **67%** | 67% | 63% | 56% |
| **% of NAP** | **7%** | **7%** | 7% | 4% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

# Clearance rate and Disposition time for first instance criminal cases

## Table 3.13.1: Clearance rate (%) of first instance criminal cases in 2024 (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 | 100,1% | 98,8% | 100,0% | NAP |
| Belgium | 103,6% | 95,0% | 106,2% | NA |
| Bulgaria | 100,1% | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 101,1% | 99,0% | 103,4% | 97,8% |
| Cyprus | 96,8% | NA | NA | NAP |
| Czech Republic | 99,9% | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 107,1% | 140,2% | 102,4% | NAP |
| Estonia | 98,8% | 99,2% | 98,1% | 99,0% |
| Finland | 95,1% | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 100,9% | 103,4% | 96,8% | 88,5% |
| Germany | NA | 99,4% | 100,9% | NA |
| Greece | 64,5% | 58,2% | 64,1% | 95,2% |
| Hungary | 98,2% | 99,5% | 97,6% | NAP |
| Ireland | 90,1% | 122,5% | 88,3% | NAP |
| Italy | 99,5% | 99,4% | 100,3% | NAP |
| Latvia | 92,0% | 88,1% | 95,9% | 100,5% |
| Lithuania | 98,5% | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | 74,8% |
| Malta | 66,0% | 22,4% | 66,2% | NA |
| Netherlands | 90,8% | 102,1% | 78,4% | NAP |
| Poland | 100,2% | 101,5% | 100,4% | 99,7% |
| Portugal | 98,0% | 99,1% | 92,8% | 94,7% |
| Romania | 99,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 99,7% | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 96,9% | 90,5% | 97,2% | 98,0% |
| Spain | 97,2% | 92,0% | 100,9% | NAP |
| Sweden | 99,0% | 101,0% | 98,8% | 96,2% |
| Average | 95,7% | 95,3% | 94,1% | 94,5% |
| Median | 98,8% | 99,2% | 98,1% | 97,0% |
| Minimum | 64,5% | 22,4% | 64,1% | 74,8% |
| Maximum | 107,1% | 140,2% | 106,2% | 100,5% |
| % of NA | 7% | 26% | 26% | 19% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 4% | 44% |

## Table 3.13.2: Disposition time (in days) of first instance criminal cases in 2024 (Q94)

| States | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Other criminal cases |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 108 | 79 | 107 | NAP |
| Belgium | 57 | 162 | 28 | NA |
| Bulgaria | 56 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 224 | 632 | 239 | 79 |
| Cyprus | 289 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Czech Republic | 56 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 65 | 179 | 43 | NAP |
| Estonia | 35 | 53 | 44 | 23 |
| Finland | 188 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | NA | 135 | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | 161 | 107 | NA |
| Greece | 583 | 544 | 596 | 50 |
| Hungary | 51 | 71 | 41 | NAP |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Italy | 309 | 315 | 257 | NAP |
| Latvia | 190 | 262 | 132 | 44 |
| Lithuania | 78 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 862 | 3977 | 856 | NA |
| Netherlands | 115 | 61 | 192 | NAP |
| Poland | 70 | 177 | 89 | 36 |
| Portugal | 240 | 264 | 184 | 98 |
| Romania | 115 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 136 | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 166 | 538 | 177 | 88 |
| Spain | 225 | 393 | 113 | NAP |
| Sweden | 128 | 138 | 65 | 125 |
| Average | 189 | 452 | 192 | 68 |
| Median | 128 | 178 | 113 | 65 |
| Minimum | 35 | 53 | 28 | 23 |
| Maximum | 862 | 3 977 | 856 | 125 |
| % of NA | 15% | 30% | 33% | 26% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 4% | 44% |

## Table 3.13.3: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 98,2% | 100,3% | 101,3% | 101,8% | 100,1% |
| Belgium | 94,7% | 99,7% | 100,1% | 99,6% | 103,6% |
| Bulgaria | 98,4% | 99,9% | 101,8% | 100,9% | 100,1% |
| Croatia | 88,1% | 93,0% | 107,1% | 97,7% | 101,1% |
| Cyprus | 94,7% | 111,7% | 81,0% | 105,7% | 96,8% |
| Czech Republic | 100,2% | 103,2% | 101,1% | 100,5% | 99,9% |
| Denmark | 95,2% | 96,7% | 99,5% | 96,9% | 107,1% |
| Estonia | 100,0% | 99,4% | 98,6% | 101,2% | 98,8% |
| Finland | 89,3% | 97,5% | 100,0% | 95,1% | 95,1% |
| France | 91,3% | NA | 94,7% | 97,1% | 100,9% |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 67,2% | 70,2% | 69,4% | 64,5% |
| Hungary | 97,3% | 100,3% | 101,6% | 99,7% | 98,2% |
| Ireland | 62,1% | 75,5% | 80,9% | 91,8% | 90,1% |
| Italy | 90,7% | 100,5% | 104,5% | 110,7% | 99,5% |
| Latvia | 91,2% | 107,7% | 103,0% | 98,2% | 92,0% |
| Lithuania | 97,4% | 100,7% | 100,9% | 100,7% | 98,5% |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 66,0% | 87,7% | 92,8% | 74,1% | 66,0% |
| Netherlands | 95,2% | 100,1% | 96,1% | 100,6% | 90,8% |
| Poland | 98,0% | 100,5% | 100,8% | 100,4% | 100,2% |
| Portugal | 93,5% | 99,3% | 99,4% | 96,3% | 98,0% |
| Romania | 100,2% | 101,2% | 97,5% | 98,1% | 99,0% |
| Slovak Republic | 99,9% | 99,0% | 99,2% | 99,6% | 99,7% |
| Slovenia | 96,0% | 100,6% | 102,3% | 98,4% | 96,9% |
| Spain | 95,1% | 103,1% | 98,6% | 93,4% | 97,2% |
| Sweden | 96,0% | 99,7% | 100,7% | 100,1% | 99,0% |
| **Average** | 92,9% | 97,7% | 97,4% | 97,1% | 95,7% |
| **Median** | 95,2% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 99,6% | 98,8% |
| **Minimum** | 62,1% | 67,2% | 70,2% | 69,4% | 64,5% |
| **Maximum** | 100,2% | 111,7% | 107,1% | 110,7% | 107,1% |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.13.4: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 133 | 131 | 120 | 107 | 108 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | 68 | 57 |
| **Bulgaria** | 66 | 65 | 61 | 55 | 56 |
| **Croatia** | 223 | 238 | 212 | 245 | 224 |
| **Cyprus** | 317 | 246 | 322 | 261 | 289 |
| **Czech Republic** | 72 | 62 | 56 | 53 | 56 |
| **Denmark** | 64 | 85 | 77 | 85 | 65 |
| **Estonia** | 30 | 31 | 36 | 30 | 35 |
| **Finland** | 189 | 160 | 164 | 173 | 188 |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 123 | 223 | 460 | 583 |
| **Hungary** | 54 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 51 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 498 | 399 | 355 | 281 | 309 |
| **Latvia** | 192 | 192 | 171 | 180 | 190 |
| **Lithuania** | 73 | 76 | 73 | 72 | 78 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | 792 | 566 | 527 | 713 | 862 |
| **Netherlands** | 139 | 100 | 89 | 84 | 115 |
| **Poland** | 82 | 72 | 68 | 68 | 70 |
| **Portugal** | 280 | 224 | 211 | 230 | 240 |
| **Romania** | 113 | 102 | 114 | 118 | 115 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 125 | 136 | 133 | 134 | 136 |
| **Slovenia** | 165 | 158 | 146 | 155 | 166 |
| **Spain** | 247 | 194 | 203 | 238 | 225 |
| **Sweden** | 149 | 142 | 138 | 134 | 128 |
| **Average** | 191 | 161 | 161 | 174 | 189 |
| **Median** | 139 | 134 | 136 | 134 | 128 |
| **Minimum** | 30 | 31 | 36 | 30 | 35 |
| **Maximum** | 792 | 566 | 527 | 713 | 862 |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.13.5: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 100,7% | 101,0% | 99,3% | 101,7% | 98,8% |
| **Belgium** | 104,5% | 100,0% | 97,8% | 98,3% | 95,0% |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 87,9% | 91,4% | 101,8% | 97,7% | 99,0% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 84,2% | 97,0% | 93,8% | 89,7% | 140,2% |
| **Estonia** | 98,2% | 98,7% | 100,9% | 103,1% | 99,2% |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | 98,5% | NA | 99,6% | 101,4% | 103,4% |
| **Germany** | 98,2% | 102,8% | 99,6% | 99,2% | 99,4% |
| **Greece** | NA | 77,7% | 55,6% | 55,9% | 58,2% |
| **Hungary** | 97,9% | 100,1% | 100,2% | 98,7% | 99,5% |
| **Ireland** | 82,2% | 87,1% | 114,3% | 135,3% | 122,5% |
| **Italy** | 90,5% | 99,6% | 103,7% | 111,1% | 99,4% |
| **Latvia** | 94,6% | 112,1% | 104,7% | 97,2% | 88,1% |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | 38,5% | 38,1% | 22,4% |
| **Netherlands** | 99,6% | 98,8% | 99,7% | 101,8% | 102,1% |
| **Poland** | 95,0% | 100,3% | 103,3% | 102,1% | 101,5% |
| **Portugal** | 93,0% | 99,9% | 100,3% | 96,3% | 99,1% |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 79,0% | 99,2% | 104,1% | 96,8% | 90,5% |
| **Spain** | 94,2% | 101,0% | 98,9% | 92,6% | 92,0% |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | 103,9% | 101,0% |
| **Average** | 93,6% | 97,9% | 95,3% | 95,8% | 95,3% |
| **Median** | 94,8% | 99,8% | 99,9% | 98,7% | 99,2% |
| **Minimum** | 79,0% | 77,7% | 38,5% | 38,1% | 22,4% |
| **Maximum** | 104,5% | 112,1% | 114,3% | 135,3% | 140,2% |
| **% of NA** | 33% | 33% | 26% | 26% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.13.6: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 88 | 86 | 85 | 76 | 79 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | 138 | 162 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 679 | 668 | 626 | 690 | 632 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 226 | 246 | 265 | 261 | 179 |
| **Estonia** | 46 | 50 | 52 | 45 | 53 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | 184 | NA | 135 |
| **Germany** | 150 | 148 | 156 | 155 | 161 |
| **Greece** | NA | 73 | 366 | 732 | 544 |
| **Hungary** | 70 | 65 | 64 | 69 | 71 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 517 | 414 | 366 | 286 | 315 |
| **Latvia** | 207 | 228 | 243 | 261 | 262 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | 2506 | 2160 | 3977 |
| **Netherlands** | 130 | 104 | 80 | 69 | 61 |
| **Poland** | 209 | 182 | 170 | 170 | 177 |
| **Portugal** | 317 | 254 | 239 | 260 | 264 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 540 | 464 | 441 | 484 | 538 |
| **Spain** | 430 | 331 | 336 | 395 | 393 |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | 136 | 138 |
| **Average** | 278 | 237 | 386 | 376 | 452 |
| **Median** | 209 | 205 | 241 | 260 | 178 |
| **Minimum** | 46 | 50 | 52 | 45 | 53 |
| **Maximum** | 679 | 668 | 2506 | 2160 | 3977 |
| **% of NA** | 44% | 41% | 33% | 33% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.13.7: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 98,0% | 105,7% | 97,7% | 100,5% | 100,0% |
| **Belgium** | 92,6% | 99,6% | 100,7% | 100,0% | 106,2% |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 83,2% | 91,2% | 110,9% | 97,4% | 103,4% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 97,4% | 96,7% | 100,5% | 98,5% | 102,4% |
| **Estonia** | 99,6% | 99,0% | 95,4% | 99,7% | 98,1% |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | 83,7% | 85,1% | 88,5% | 91,2% | 96,8% |
| **Germany** | 97,7% | 99,9% | 99,1% | 103,2% | 100,9% |
| **Greece** | NA | 67,4% | 69,9% | 68,5% | 64,1% |
| **Hungary** | 96,9% | 100,4% | 102,5% | 100,2% | 97,6% |
| **Ireland** | 50,9% | 74,8% | 78,8% | 89,2% | 88,3% |
| **Italy** | 92,1% | 107,5% | 112,1% | 106,8% | 100,3% |
| **Latvia** | 86,8% | 98,1% | 105,2% | 95,9% | 95,9% |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | 93,0% | 74,3% | 66,2% |
| **Netherlands** | 84,5% | 102,7% | 90,9% | 98,6% | 78,4% |
| **Poland** | 97,4% | 100,5% | 99,9% | 100,3% | 100,4% |
| **Portugal** | 89,5% | 95,1% | 93,5% | 94,4% | 92,8% |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 101,0% | 99,2% | 104,6% | 103,2% | 97,2% |
| **Spain** | 95,7% | 104,6% | 98,4% | 94,0% | 100,9% |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | 106,2% | 98,8% |
| **Average** | 90,4% | 95,7% | 96,8% | 95,9% | 94,1% |
| **Median** | 94,1% | 99,2% | 98,7% | 98,6% | 98,1% |
| **Minimum** | 50,9% | 67,4% | 69,9% | 68,5% | 64,1% |
| **Maximum** | 101,0% | 107,5% | 112,1% | 106,8% | 106,2% |
| **% of NA** | 33% | 30% | 26% | 26% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

## Table 3.13.8: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 134 | 119 | 122 | 105 | 107 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | 49 | 28 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 227 | 244 | 212 | 261 | 239 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 36 | 54 | 45 | 50 | 43 |
| Estonia | 35 | 34 | 47 | 40 | 44 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 113 | 109 | 111 | 103 | 107 |
| Greece | NA | 121 | 226 | 482 | 596 |
| Hungary | 46 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 41 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 356 | 282 | 257 | 238 | 257 |
| Latvia | 172 | 102 | 120 | 139 | 132 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | 524 | 710 | 856 |
| Netherlands | 164 | 91 | 102 | 108 | 192 |
| Poland | 98 | 85 | 83 | 89 | 89 |
| Portugal | 196 | 144 | 142 | 176 | 184 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 157 | 163 | 148 | 151 | 177 |
| Spain | 127 | 94 | 104 | 130 | 113 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | 63 | 65 |
| **Average** | 143 | 120 | 152 | 172 | 192 |
| **Median** | 134 | 106 | 120 | 108 | 113 |
| **Minimum** | 35 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 28 |
| **Maximum** | 356 | 282 | 524 | 710 | 856 |
| **% of NA** | 44% | 41% | 37% | 33% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data. Additionally, 2024 amendments of the Greek Criminal Code and Criminal Code Procedure affected the classification and volume of criminal cases.

# Variations for first instance criminal cases

## Table 3.14.1: First instance courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q94)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | 8,5% | 9,6% | 11,6% | 0,4% | 4,9% | -1,0% |
| **Belgium** | -4,2% | 29,0% | -11,3% | -5,8% | 0,5% | -7,6% |
| **Bulgaria** | -0,7% | NA | NA | -1,5% | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 0,6% | 4,6% | -10,3% | 5,5% | 10,2% | 0,2% |
| **Cyprus** | 25,1% | NA | NA | 3,2% | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | -1,1% | NA | NA | -5,2% | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | -15,0% | -36,0% | -10,8% | -13,9% | -41,4% | -7,8% |
| **Estonia** | -22,8% | -40,2% | -21,1% | -3,3% | -7,6% | -3,6% |
| **Finland** | 21,2% | NA | NA | -1,2% | NA | NA |
| **France** | -6,2% | 12,1% | -25,7% | -6,7% | -0,8% | -14,8% |
| **Germany** | -11,1% | -10,0% | -15,3% | -2,9% | -2,5% | -4,3% |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 29,1% | 21,8% | 31,8% |
| **Hungary** | 6,9% | 5,1% | 7,9% | 3,8% | 0,1% | 5,8% |
| **Ireland** | 2,8% | -6,5% | -8,3% | 6,2% | 1,9% | 6,4% |
| **Italy** | 3,1% | 5,6% | -15,7% | -2,8% | -2,7% | -4,5% |
| **Latvia** | -25,2% | -22,0% | -54,3% | 20,2% | 35,4% | 18,0% |
| **Lithuania** | -10,2% | NA | NA | 1,4% | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | 45,4% | NA | NA | 17,5% | 34,9% | 17,4% |
| **Netherlands** | 36,4% | -0,2% | 127,3% | 19,1% | 0,3% | 49,5% |
| **Poland** | 4,3% | -4,5% | 2,7% | -3,3% | -6,2% | -1,5% |
| **Portugal** | 20,0% | 16,7% | 83,7% | -3,1% | -3,5% | 14,4% |
| **Romania** | 14,5% | NAP | NAP | 4,7% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | -1,4% | NA | NA | -1,0% | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 2,7% | -5,5% | -16,7% | 2,2% | 3,7% | -4,0% |
| **Spain** | 37,6% | 45,3% | 32,5% | 7,9% | 10,6% | 6,0% |
| **Sweden** | 14,9% | NA | NA | 9,2% | 7,3% | 12,5% |
| **Average** | 5,8% | 0,2% | 4,8% | 3,1% | 3,5% | 5,9% |
| **Median** | 2,8% | 2,2% | -10,5% | 0,9% | 0,5% | 0,2% |
| **Minimum** | -25,2% | -40,2% | -54,3% | -13,9% | -41,4% | -14,8% |
| **Maximum** | 45,4% | 45,3% | 127,3% | 29,1% | 35,4% | 49,5% |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 37% | 37% | 4% | 26% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.14.2: First instance courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q94)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | 10,6% | 7,5% | 13,8% | -1,2% | 2,0% | -1,5% |
| **Belgium** | 4,8% | 17,3% | 1,8% | -2,1% | -2,9% | -1,8% |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,9% | NA | NA | -2,3% | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 15,5% | 17,8% | 11,5% | 9,2% | 11,6% | 6,4% |
| **Cyprus** | 27,8% | NA | NA | -5,5% | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | -1,3% | NA | NA | -5,7% | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | -4,3% | 6,5% | -6,2% | -4,9% | -8,3% | -4,2% |
| **Estonia** | -23,7% | -39,6% | -22,2% | -5,6% | -11,1% | -5,2% |
| **Finland** | 29,1% | NA | NA | -1,2% | NA | NA |
| **France** | 3,6% | 17,7% | -14,0% | -3,0% | 1,2% | -9,5% |
| **Germany** | NA | -9,0% | -12,5% | NA | -2,4% | -6,5% |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 20,0% | 26,9% | 23,3% |
| **Hungary** | 8,0% | 6,9% | 8,6% | 2,3% | 0,9% | 3,0% |
| **Ireland** | 49,2% | 39,4% | 59,0% | 4,3% | -7,7% | 5,3% |
| **Italy** | 13,1% | 15,9% | -8,2% | -12,6% | -12,9% | -10,3% |
| **Latvia** | -24,5% | -27,4% | -49,5% | 12,6% | 22,7% | 18,0% |
| **Lithuania** | -9,2% | NA | NA | -0,8% | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | 6,8% | 3,2% | 0,8% | 2,4% | 4,8% | -1,4% |
| **Malta** | 45,3% | NA | NA | 4,6% | -20,8% | 4,7% |
| **Netherlands** | 30,0% | 2,3% | 110,9% | 7,5% | 0,7% | 18,8% |
| **Poland** | 6,5% | 2,1% | 5,8% | -3,5% | -6,7% | -1,4% |
| **Portugal** | 25,7% | 24,3% | 90,5% | -1,5% | -0,7% | 12,4% |
| **Romania** | 13,1% | NAP | NAP | 5,6% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | -1,6% | NA | NA | -0,9% | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 3,7% | 8,3% | -19,8% | 0,6% | -3,0% | -9,6% |
| **Spain** | 40,6% | 41,9% | 39,8% | 12,3% | 10,0% | 13,9% |
| **Sweden** | 18,4% | NA | NA | 8,0% | 4,3% | 4,8% |
| **Average** | 11,5% | 7,9% | 12,4% | 1,5% | 0,4% | 3,0% |
| **Median** | 8,0% | 7,5% | 1,8% | -0,9% | 0,0% | 0,8% |
| **Minimum** | -24,5% | -39,6% | -49,5% | -12,6% | -20,8% | -10,3% |
| **Maximum** | 49,2% | 41,9% | 110,9% | 20,0% | 26,9% | 23,3% |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 33% | 33% | 4% | 22% | 22% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.14.3: First instance courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percentage (Q94)

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| Austria | -10,3% | -3,0% | -9,1% | -0,5% | 5,8% | 0,2% |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | -18,0% | 13,8% | -43,2% |
| Bulgaria | -15,0% | NA | NA | -0,3% | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 16,2% | 9,5% | 17,0% | 0,0% | 2,2% | -2,6% |
| Cyprus | 16,4% | NA | NA | 4,6% | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | -23,2% | NA | NA | 0,5% | NA | NA |
| Denmark | -1,6% | -15,4% | 13,4% | -27,3% | -37,0% | -17,0% |
| Estonia | -11,7% | -30,7% | -2,6% | 8,7% | 3,0% | 5,5% |
| Finland | 28,5% | NA | NA | 7,1% | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | -2,3% | -17,0% | NA | 1,5% | -3,1% |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | 51,9% | -5,7% | 52,3% |
| Hungary | 1,1% | 8,3% | -4,8% | 14,7% | 2,6% | 28,7% |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | -29,7% | -29,3% | -33,8% | -3,9% | -4,0% | -3,3% |
| Latvia | -25,3% | -8,1% | -61,2% | 18,8% | 23,2% | 12,1% |
| Lithuania | -3,3% | NA | NA | 7,8% | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 58,1% | NA | NA | 26,4% | 45,8% | 26,3% |
| Netherlands | 7,9% | -51,8% | 146,4% | 47,6% | -11,1% | 110,7% |
| Poland | -9,3% | -13,6% | -4,8% | -0,8% | -3,0% | -1,7% |
| Portugal | 7,5% | 3,3% | 79,5% | 2,7% | 0,9% | 17,5% |
| Romania | 15,3% | NAP | NAP | 3,4% | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 7,1% | NA | NA | 0,8% | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 4,4% | 7,7% | -9,2% | 7,5% | 7,6% | 6,3% |
| Spain | 28,2% | 29,8% | 24,9% | 6,1% | 9,3% | -0,7% |
| Sweden | 1,8% | NA | NA | 3,1% | 5,8% | 7,8% |
| Average | 3,0% | -7,4% | 10,7% | 7,0% | 3,6% | 11,5% |
| Median | 1,8% | -3,0% | -4,8% | 3,4% | 2,6% | 5,5% |
| Minimum | -29,7% | -51,8% | -61,2% | -27,3% | -37,0% | -43,2% |
| Maximum | 58,1% | 29,8% | 146,4% | 51,9% | 45,8% | 110,7% |
| % of NA | 22% | 48% | 48% | 15% | 33% | 33% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.14.4: First instance courts, variation of the Clearance Rate of criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage points (Q94)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | +2,0 | -1,9 | +1,9 | -1,6 | -2,9 | -0,5 |
| **Belgium** | +8,9 | -9,5 | +13,7 | +4,0 | -3,3 | +6,2 |
| **Bulgaria** | +1,7 | NA | NA | -0,8 | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | +13,0 | +11,1 | +20,1 | +3,4 | +1,3 | +6,0 |
| **Cyprus** | +2,1 | NA | NA | -8,9 | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | -0,3 | NA | NA | -0,5 | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | +11,9 | +55,9 | +5,0 | +10,2 | +50,5 | +3,9 |
| **Estonia** | -1,2 | +1,0 | -1,4 | -2,4 | -3,9 | -1,6 |
| **Finland** | +5,8 | NA | NA | +0,0 | NA | NA |
| **France** | +9,5 | +4,9 | +13,1 | +3,8 | +2,0 | +5,6 |
| **Germany** | NA | +1,1 | +3,2 | NA | +0,1 | -2,3 |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | -4,9 | +2,3 | -4,4 |
| **Hungary** | +1,0 | +1,6 | +0,7 | -1,4 | +0,8 | -2,6 |
| **Ireland** | +28,0 | +40,3 | +37,4 | -1,6 | -12,8 | -0,9 |
| **Italy** | +8,8 | +8,9 | +8,2 | -11,1 | -11,6 | -6,5 |
| **Latvia** | +0,8 | -6,6 | +9,1 | -6,2 | -9,2 | -0,0 |
| **Lithuania** | +1,1 | NA | NA | -2,2 | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | -0,1 | NA | NA | -8,1 | -15,7 | -8,1 |
| **Netherlands** | -4,5 | +2,6 | -6,1 | -9,8 | +0,3 | -20,2 |
| **Poland** | +2,1 | +6,5 | +3,0 | -0,2 | -0,6 | +0,1 |
| **Portugal** | +4,5 | +6,1 | +3,3 | +1,6 | +2,8 | -1,6 |
| **Romania** | -1,2 | NAP | NAP | +0,9 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | -0,2 | NA | NA | +0,1 | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | +0,9 | +11,5 | -3,7 | -1,6 | -6,3 | -6,0 |
| **Spain** | +2,1 | -2,2 | +5,2 | +3,8 | -0,5 | +7,0 |
| **Sweden** | +2,9 | NA | NA | -1,1 | -3,0 | -7,3 |
| **Average** | +4,1 | +8,2 | +7,0 | -1,4 | -0,5 | -1,8 |
| **Median** | +2,0 | +3,7 | +4,2 | -1,1 | -0,6 | -1,6 |
| **Minimum** | -4,5 | -9,5 | -6,1 | -11,1 | -15,7 | -20,2 |
| **Maximum** | +28,0 | +55,9 | +37,4 | +10,2 | +50,5 | +7,0 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 37% | 37% | 7% | 26% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.14.5: First instance courts, variation of the Disposition Time criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q94)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | -18,9% | -9,8% | -20,1% | 0,7% | 3,8% | 1,7% |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | -16,2% | 17,3% | -42,2% |
| **Bulgaria** | -15,8% | NA | NA | 2,0% | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 0,6% | -7,0% | 4,9% | -8,4% | -8,5% | -8,4% |
| **Cyprus** | -9,0% | NA | NA | 10,8% | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | -22,2% | NA | NA | 6,5% | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 2,9% | -20,6% | 20,9% | -23,6% | -31,3% | -13,3% |
| **Estonia** | 15,7% | 14,8% | 25,2% | 15,1% | 15,9% | 11,2% |
| **Finland** | -0,5% | NA | NA | 8,4% | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | 7,4% | -5,1% | NA | 4,0% | 3,6% |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 26,6% | -25,6% | 23,5% |
| **Hungary** | -6,4% | 1,3% | -12,3% | 12,2% | 1,7% | 24,9% |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | -37,9% | -39,1% | -27,8% | 10,0% | 10,2% | 7,8% |
| **Latvia** | -1,0% | 26,6% | -23,2% | 5,5% | 0,4% | -5,0% |
| **Lithuania** | 6,5% | NA | NA | 8,7% | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | 8,8% | NA | NA | 20,8% | 84,1% | 20,6% |
| **Netherlands** | -17,0% | -52,9% | 16,9% | 37,3% | -11,7% | 77,3% |
| **Poland** | -14,8% | -15,3% | -10,1% | 2,8% | 4,0% | -0,3% |
| **Portugal** | -14,5% | -16,9% | -5,8% | 4,2% | 1,6% | 4,5% |
| **Romania** | 2,0% | NAP | NAP | -2,2% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 8,9% | NA | NA | 1,8% | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0,6% | -0,5% | 13,2% | 6,9% | 11,0% | 17,5% |
| **Spain** | -8,8% | -8,6% | -10,7% | -5,5% | -0,6% | -12,8% |
| **Sweden** | -14,0% | NA | NA | -4,5% | 1,5% | 2,9% |
| **Average** | -6,4% | -9,3% | -2,6% | 5,2% | 4,6% | 6,7% |
| **Median** | -6,4% | -8,6% | -5,8% | 5,5% | 1,7% | 3,6% |
| **Minimum** | -37,9% | -52,9% | -27,8% | -23,6% | -31,3% | -42,2% |
| **Maximum** | 15,7% | 26,6% | 25,2% | 37,3% | 84,1% | 77,3% |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 48% | 48% | 15% | 33% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

# Second instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status

## Table 3.15.1a: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

### 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** | **1 666** | 884 | 782 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **10 020** | 6 453 | 3 567 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **1 641** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **19 963** | 5 180 | 14 688 | 95 |
| **Cyprus** | **303** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **1 548** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **3 584** | 3 584 | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **139** | 75 | 5 | 59 |
| **Finland** | **3 040** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **37 604** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | **NA** | 20 927 | 1 089 | NA |
| **Greece** | **31 449** | 24 044 | 6 042 | 1 363 |
| **Hungary** | **4 668** | 4 647 | 21 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | **222 384** | 219 632 | 2 752 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **998** | 773 | 195 | 30 |
| **Lithuania** | **679** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Malta** | **480** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **20 953** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | **28 696** | 15 712 | 1 104 | 11 880 |
| **Portugal** | **2 917** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | **7 830** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **1 235** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **987** | 404 | 562 | 21 |
| **Spain** | **10 090** | 7 661 | 2 429 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **5 946** | 5 306 | 126 | 514 |
| **Average** | **17 451** | 22 520 | 2 566 | 1 995 |
| **Median** | **3 312** | 5 243 | 1 089 | 95 |
| **Minimum** | **139** | 75 | 5 | 21 |
| **Maximum** | **222 384** | 219 632 | 14 688 | 11 880 |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | 44% | 44% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Austria:** The total number of Second 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.15.1b: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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 | 0,08 | 0,05 | 0,03 | NA |
| Bulgaria | 0,03 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 0,52 | 0,13 | 0,38 | 0,0025 |
| Cyprus | 0,03 | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | 0,01 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 0,06 | 0,06 | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,0043 |
| Finland | 0,05 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 0,05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | 0,03 | 0,00 | NA |
| Greece | 0,30 | 0,23 | 0,06 | 0,0131 |
| Hungary | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,00 | NAP |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Italy | 0,38 | 0,37 | 0,00 | NAP |
| Latvia | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,01 | 0,0016 |
| Lithuania | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Malta | 0,08 | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | 0,12 | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,00 | 0,0316 |
| Portugal | 0,03 | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 0,04 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,05 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,0010 |
| Spain | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,00 | NAP |
| Sweden | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,00 | 0,0049 |
| **Average** | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,0084 |
| **Median** | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,00 | 0,0043 |
| **Minimum** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,0010 |
| **Maximum** | 0,52 | 0,37 | 0,38 | 0,0316 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 44% | 44% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Austria:** The total number of Second 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.15.2a: Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2024
### 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** | **10 182** | 6 707 | 3 475 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **21 785** | 7 421 | 14 364 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **11 022** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **25 492** | 11 252 | 12 606 | 1 634 |
| **Cyprus** | **348** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **19 652** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **6 043** | 6 043 | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **1 493** | 271 | 160 | 1 062 |
| **Finland** | **5 824** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **38 141** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | **52 847** | 43 474 | 9 158 | 215 |
| **Greece** | **34 332** | 22 725 | 11 136 | 471 |
| **Hungary** | **35 803** | 35 326 | 477 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **16 425** | 3 194 | 13 231 | NAP |
| **Italy** | **84 789** | 82 351 | 2 438 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **2 505** | 1 634 | 688 | 183 |
| **Lithuania** | **3 802** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **489** | 436 | 53 | NAP |
| **Malta** | **468** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **25 521** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | **190 001** | 48 809 | 5 865 | 135 327 |
| **Portugal** | **10 617** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | **25 727** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **8 855** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **6 985** | 4 462 | 2 187 | 336 |
| **Spain** | **54 617** | 38 527 | 16 090 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **15 921** | 14 696 | 624 | 601 |
| **Average** | **26 285** | 20 458 | 6 170 | 17 479 |
| **Median** | **15 921** | 9 337 | 3 475 | 536 |
| **Minimum** | **348** | 271 | 53 | 183 |
| **Maximum** | **190 001** | 82 351 | 16 090 | 135 327 |
| **% of NA** | **0%** | 37% | 37% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Austria:** The total number of Second 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.15.2b: Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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 | 0,18 | 0,06 | 0,12 | NA |
| Bulgaria | 0,17 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 0,66 | 0,29 | 0,33 | 0,0423 |
| Cyprus | 0,04 | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | 0,18 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 0,10 | 0,10 | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,11 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,0773 |
| Finland | 0,10 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 0,06 | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,01 | 0,0003 |
| Greece | 0,33 | 0,22 | 0,11 | 0,0045 |
| Hungary | 0,38 | 0,37 | 0,01 | NAP |
| Ireland | 0,30 | 0,06 | 0,24 | NAP |
| Italy | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,00 | NAP |
| Latvia | 0,13 | 0,09 | 0,04 | 0,0099 |
| Lithuania | 0,13 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,01 | NAP |
| Malta | 0,08 | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | 0,14 | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,51 | 0,13 | 0,02 | 0,3603 |
| Portugal | 0,10 | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 0,14 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,16 | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,33 | 0,21 | 0,10 | 0,0158 |
| Spain | 0,11 | 0,08 | 0,03 | NAP |
| Sweden | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,01 | 0,0057 |
| Average | 0,18 | 0,13 | 0,07 | 0,0645 |
| Median | 0,14 | 0,09 | 0,03 | 0,0128 |
| Minimum | 0,04 | 0,02 | 0,00 | 0,0003 |
| Maximum | 0,66 | 0,37 | 0,33 | 0,3603 |
| % of NA | 0% | 37% | 37% | 30% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Austria:** The total number of Second 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.15.3a: Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2024

### 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** | **10 390** | 6 796 | 3 594 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **21 605** | 7 403 | 14 202 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **10 845** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **25 564** | 10 247 | 13 684 | 1 633 |
| **Cyprus** | **244** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **19 655** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **5 697** | 5 697 | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **1 513** | 293 | 155 | 1 065 |
| **Finland** | **5 569** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **33 405** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | **NA** | 42 876 | 9 274 | NA |
| **Greece** | **17 890** | 10 675 | 6 781 | 434 |
| **Hungary** | **35 339** | 34 854 | 485 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **18 386** | 2 014 | 16 372 | NAP |
| **Italy** | **115 948** | 113 061 | 2 887 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **2 322** | 1 459 | 671 | 192 |
| **Lithuania** | **3 810** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **447** | 396 | 51 | NAP |
| **Malta** | **409** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **26 205** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | **188 905** | 48 126 | 5 742 | 135 037 |
| **Portugal** | **10 785** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | **25 626** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **8 900** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **7 027** | 4 480 | 2 197 | 350 |
| **Spain** | **52 754** | 37 433 | 15 321 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **16 124** | 14 503 | 658 | 963 |
| **Average** | **25 591** | 21 270 | 6 138 | 19 953 |
| **Median** | **13 485** | 8 825 | 3 594 | 963 |
| **Minimum** | **244** | 293 | 51 | 192 |
| **Maximum** | **188 905** | 113 061 | 16 372 | 135 037 |
| **% of NA** | **4%** | 37% | 37% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Austria:** The total number of Second 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.15.3b: Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2024

**Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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** | **0,18** | 0,06 | 0,12 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **0,17** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **0,66** | 0,27 | 0,35 | 0,04 |
| **Cyprus** | **0,03** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **0,18** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **0,10** | 0,10 | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0,11** | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,08 |
| **Finland** | **0,10** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **0,05** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | **NA** | 0,05 | 0,01 | NA |
| **Greece** | **0,17** | 0,10 | 0,07 | 0,00 |
| **Hungary** | **0,37** | 0,37 | 0,01 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **0,34** | 0,04 | 0,30 | NAP |
| **Italy** | **0,20** | 0,19 | 0,00 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **0,13** | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,01 |
| **Lithuania** | **0,13** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **0,07** | 0,06 | 0,01 | NAP |
| **Malta** | **0,07** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **0,15** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | **0,50** | 0,13 | 0,02 | 0,36 |
| **Portugal** | **0,10** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | **0,13** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **0,16** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **0,33** | 0,21 | 0,10 | 0,02 |
| **Spain** | **0,11** | 0,08 | 0,03 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **0,15** | 0,14 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Average** | **0,18** | 0,12 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| **Median** | **0,14** | 0,09 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Minimum** | **0,03** | 0,02 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | **0,66** | 0,37 | 0,35 | 0,36 |
| **% of NA** | **4%** | 37% | 37% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Austria:** The total number of Second 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.15.4a: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024

### 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** | **1 458** | 795 | 663 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **10 200** | 6 471 | 3 729 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **1 818** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **19 891** | 6 185 | 13 610 | 96 |
| **Cyprus** | **407** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **1 545** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **3 930** | 3 930 | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **119** | 53 | 10 | 56 |
| **Finland** | **3 295** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **42 340** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | **NA** | 21 513 | 971 | NA |
| **Greece** | **47 891** | 36 094 | 10 397 | 1 400 |
| **Hungary** | **5 132** | 5 119 | 13 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | **191 225** | 188 922 | 2 303 | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **1 181** | 948 | 212 | 21 |
| **Lithuania** | **671** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **NA** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Malta** | **540** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | **20 269** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | **29 792** | 16 395 | 1 227 | 12 170 |
| **Portugal** | **2 749** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | **7 931** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **1 190** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **945** | 386 | 552 | 7 |
| **Spain** | **11 292** | 8 527 | 2 765 | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **5 743** | 5 499 | 92 | 152 |
| **Average** | **17 148** | 21 488 | 2 811 | 1 986 |
| **Median** | **3 613** | 5 842 | 971 | 96 |
| **Minimum** | **119** | 53 | 10 | 7 |
| **Maximum** | **191 225** | 188 922 | 13 610 | 12 170 |
| **% of NA** | **11%** | 44% | 44% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | **0%** | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Austria:** The total number of Second 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.

**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

## Table 3.15.4b: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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 | 0,09 | 0,05 | 0,03 | NA |
| Bulgaria | 0,03 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 0,51 | 0,16 | 0,35 | 0,002 |
| Cyprus | 0,04 | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | 0,01 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 0,07 | 0,07 | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,004 |
| Finland | 0,06 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 0,06 | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | 0,03 | 0,00 | NA |
| Greece | 0,46 | 0,35 | 0,10 | 0,013 |
| Hungary | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,00 | NAP |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Italy | 0,32 | 0,32 | 0,00 | NAP |
| Latvia | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,01 | 0,001 |
| Lithuania | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Malta | 0,09 | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | 0,11 | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,08 | 0,04 | 0,00 | 0,032 |
| Portugal | 0,03 | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 0,04 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,04 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,000 |
| Spain | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | NAP |
| Sweden | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,00 | 0,001 |
| Average | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,04 | 0,008 |
| Median | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,01 | 0,002 |
| Minimum | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,000 |
| Maximum | 0,51 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,032 |
| % of NA | 11% | 44% | 44% | 33% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Austria:** The total number of Second 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.15.5: Second instance criminal cases - pending for more than 2 years in 2024

**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** | **0** | **0,0%** | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **1 813** | **17,8%** | 1 393 | 21,5% | 420 | 11,3% | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Croatia** | **2 912** | **14,6%** | 699 | 11,3% | 2 213 | 16,3% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Cyprus** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **11** | **0,7%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **NAP** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **0** | **0,0%** | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Finland** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | **357** | **0,7%** | 227 | 0,6% | 130 | 1,3% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Hungary** | **6** | **0,1%** | 6 | 0,1% | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | **85 698** | **44,8%** | 85 372 | 45,2% | 326 | 14,2% | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | **40** | **3,4%** | 38 | 4,0% | 2 | 0,9% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Lithuania** | **5** | **0,7%** | 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** | **2 541** | **12,5%** | 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** | **153** | **1,9%** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **22** | **1,8%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | **0** | **0,0%** | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Spain** | **NA** | **NA** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **62** | **1,1%** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Average** | **6 241** | **6,7%** | 9 748 | 9,2% | 386 | 5,5% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Median** | **40** | **1,1%** | 38 | 0,6% | 66 | 1,1% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Minimum** | **0** | **0,0%** | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **Maximum** | **85 698** | **44,8%** | 85 372 | 45,2% | 2 213 | 16,3% | 0 | 0,0% |
| **% of NA** | **41%** | **41%** | 59% | 59% | 63% | 63% | 44% | 44% |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | **4%** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 37% | 37% |

**Austria:** The total number of Second 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.

**Malta:** 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.

# Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases, severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases

## Table 3.16.1: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,07 | NA | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| Bulgaria | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Croatia | 0,34 | 0,37 | 0,45 | 0,51 | 0,52 |
| Cyprus | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Czech Republic | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Denmark | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| Estonia | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Finland | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| France | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,19 | 0,30 |
| Hungary | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,45 | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,42 | 0,38 |
| Latvia | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Lithuania | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 0,16 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,08 |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| Poland | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| Portugal | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Romania | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Slovak Republic | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Slovenia | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| Spain | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Sweden | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| Average | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Median | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Minimum | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Maximum | 0,45 | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,51 | 0,52 |
| % of NA | 22% | 15% | 19% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 3.16.2: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,10 | 0,13 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| Estonia | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 |
| Greece | NA | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,15 | 0,23 |
| Hungary | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | 0,01 | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,44 | 0,45 | 0,44 | 0,42 | 0,37 |
| Latvia | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Spain | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,05 |
| **Average** | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| **Median** | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| **Minimum** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Maximum** | 0,44 | 0,45 | 0,44 | 0,42 | 0,37 |
| **% of NA** | 48% | 44% | 41% | 48% | 44% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Ireland:** The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

## Table 3.16.3: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,0075 | 0,0074 | 0,0071 | 0,0061 | 0,0085 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,0029 | NA | 0,0274 | 0,0302 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,2802 | 0,3134 | 0,3701 | 0,4057 | 0,3799 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,0008 | 0,0005 | 0,0006 | 0,0008 | 0,0004 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,0019 | 0,0015 | 0,0015 | 0,0014 | 0,0013 |
| Greece | NA | 0,0182 | 0,0193 | 0,0383 | 0,0581 |
| Hungary | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0003 | 0,0002 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,0078 | 0,0064 | 0,0055 | 0,0055 | 0,0047 |
| Latvia | 0,0106 | 0,0091 | 0,0091 | 0,0120 | 0,0105 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,0030 | 0,0031 | 0,0033 | 0,0028 | 0,0029 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,0049 | 0,0015 | 0,0234 | 0,0274 | 0,0264 |
| Spain | 0,0053 | 0,0045 | 0,0064 | 0,0055 | 0,0049 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,0012 |
| Average | 0,0322 | 0,0307 | 0,0406 | 0,0444 | 0,0407 |
| Median | 0,0051 | 0,0038 | 0,0064 | 0,0058 | 0,0049 |
| Minimum | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0003 | 0,0002 |
| Maximum | 0,2802 | 0,3134 | 0,3701 | 0,4057 | 0,3799 |
| % of NA | 52% | 44% | 48% | 48% | 44% |
| % of NAP | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% |

## Table 3.16.4: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 |
| Belgium | 0,23 | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Bulgaria | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,17 |
| Croatia | 0,56 | 0,65 | 0,70 | 0,63 | 0,66 |
| Cyprus | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,01 | 0,04 |
| Czech Republic | 0,21 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Denmark | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 |
| Estonia | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,11 |
| Finland | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 |
| France | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Germany | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Greece | 0,17 | 0,26 | 0,36 | 0,27 | 0,33 |
| Hungary | 0,34 | 0,38 | 0,39 | 0,38 | 0,38 |
| Ireland | 0,25 | 0,31 | 0,33 | 0,33 | 0,30 |
| Italy | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,17 | 0,14 |
| Latvia | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 |
| Lithuania | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,13 |
| Luxembourg | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,07 |
| Malta | 0,06 | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| Netherlands | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 |
| Poland | 0,45 | 0,51 | 0,51 | 0,51 | 0,51 |
| Portugal | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| Romania | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,14 |
| Slovak Republic | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 |
| Slovenia | 0,22 | 0,30 | 0,30 | 0,32 | 0,33 |
| Spain | 0,09 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,11 |
| Sweden | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,15 |
| Average | 0,17 | 0,19 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Median | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 |
| Minimum | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,01 | 0,04 |
| Maximum | 0,56 | 0,65 | 0,70 | 0,63 | 0,66 |
| % of NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Ireland:** The incoming criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than by case.

## Table 3.16.5: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| Belgium | 0,14 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,21 | 0,24 | 0,27 | 0,28 | 0,29 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,10 | 0,10 |
| Estonia | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Greece | NA | 0,15 | 0,24 | 0,16 | 0,22 |
| Hungary | 0,34 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,37 | 0,37 |
| Ireland | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| Italy | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,14 |
| Latvia | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,13 | 0,13 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,17 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,21 |
| Spain | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,14 |
| **Average** | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,13 |
| **Median** | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,08 | 0,09 |
| **Minimum** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | 0,34 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,37 | 0,37 |
| **% of NA** | 37% | 37% | 37% | 41% | 37% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Ireland:** The incoming criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than by case.

## Table 3.16.6: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Belgium | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,33 | 0,38 | 0,39 | 0,31 | 0,33 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Greece | NA | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,09 | 0,11 |
| Hungary | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 |
| Ireland | 0,22 | 0,28 | 0,30 | 0,28 | 0,24 |
| Italy | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 |
| Latvia | 0,07 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,05 | 0,12 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,10 |
| Spain | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 |
| Average | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,07 |
| Median | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Minimum | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| Maximum | 0,33 | 0,38 | 0,39 | 0,31 | 0,33 |
| % of NA | 41% | 37% | 37% | 41% | 37% |
| % of NAP | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Ireland:** The incoming criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than by case.

## Table 3.16.7: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 |
| Belgium | 0,23 | 0,27 | 0,27 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Bulgaria | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,17 |
| Croatia | 0,76 | 0,58 | 0,64 | 0,62 | 0,66 |
| Cyprus | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,01 | 0,03 |
| Czech Republic | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Denmark | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 |
| Estonia | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,11 |
| Finland | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| France | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 0,19 | 0,16 | 0,23 | 0,16 | 0,17 |
| Hungary | 0,35 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,37 |
| Ireland | 0,27 | 0,30 | 0,34 | 0,33 | 0,34 |
| Italy | 0,14 | 0,18 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,20 |
| Latvia | 0,15 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,13 |
| Lithuania | 0,16 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,13 |
| Luxembourg | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| Malta | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,12 | 0,07 |
| Netherlands | 0,15 | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,15 |
| Poland | 0,45 | 0,50 | 0,51 | 0,51 | 0,50 |
| Portugal | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| Romania | 0,11 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 |
| Slovak Republic | 0,17 | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 |
| Slovenia | 0,23 | 0,28 | 0,30 | 0,32 | 0,33 |
| Spain | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,11 |
| Sweden | 0,10 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,15 |
| Average | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,19 | 0,18 | 0,18 |
| Median | 0,15 | 0,15 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,14 |
| Minimum | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,01 | 0,03 |
| Maximum | 0,76 | 0,58 | 0,64 | 0,62 | 0,66 |
| % of NA | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Ireland:** The resolved criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than by case.

## Table 3.16.8: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| Belgium | 0,14 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,24 | 0,25 | 0,27 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 | 0,10 |
| Estonia | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Greece | NA | 0,09 | 0,13 | 0,08 | 0,10 |
| Hungary | 0,35 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,37 |
| Ireland | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Italy | 0,14 | 0,18 | 0,20 | 0,21 | 0,19 |
| Latvia | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,08 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,10 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 | 0,13 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,17 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,18 | 0,21 |
| Spain | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,14 |
| **Average** | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,13 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| **Median** | 0,10 | 0,09 | 0,10 | 0,08 | 0,09 |
| **Minimum** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,02 |
| **Maximum** | 0,35 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,38 | 0,37 |
| **% of NA** | 37% | 37% | 37% | 41% | 37% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Ireland:** The resolved criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

## Table 3.16.9: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Belgium | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,31 | 0,33 | 0,35 | 0,34 | 0,35 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Greece | NA | 0,06 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 |
| Hungary | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Ireland | 0,23 | 0,27 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,30 |
| Italy | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 |
| Latvia | 0,08 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,05 | 0,09 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,10 |
| Spain | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 |
| Average | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 |
| Median | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Minimum | 0,00 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 |
| Maximum | 0,31 | 0,33 | 0,35 | 0,34 | 0,35 |
| % of NA | 41% | 37% | 37% | 41% | 37% |
| % of NAP | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Ireland:** The resolved criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

## Table 3.16.10: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,08 | NA | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Bulgaria | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Croatia | 0,36 | 0,44 | 0,51 | 0,52 | 0,51 |
| Cyprus | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 |
| Czech Republic | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Denmark | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,07 |
| Estonia | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Finland | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| France | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,06 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 0,06 | 0,18 | 0,30 | 0,46 |
| Hungary | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,43 | 0,38 | 0,32 |
| Latvia | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 |
| Lithuania | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 0,13 | 0,14 | 0,15 | 0,09 | 0,09 |
| Netherlands | 0,14 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,11 |
| Poland | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 |
| Portugal | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Romania | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Slovak Republic | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Slovenia | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 |
| Spain | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Sweden | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,05 |
| Average | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,09 | 0,10 |
| Median | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Minimum | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Maximum | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,51 | 0,52 | 0,51 |
| % of NA | 19% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.16.11: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,10 | 0,13 | 0,16 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,06 | 0,07 |
| Estonia | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,03 |
| Greece | NA | 0,04 | 0,15 | 0,23 | 0,35 |
| Hungary | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,46 | 0,44 | 0,42 | 0,37 | 0,32 |
| Latvia | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,02 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Spain | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,05 |
| **Average** | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,09 |
| **Median** | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,05 |
| **Minimum** | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 |
| **Maximum** | 0,46 | 0,44 | 0,42 | 0,37 | 0,35 |
| **% of NA** | 48% | 44% | 44% | 48% | 44% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.16.12: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,00 | NA | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 0,30 | 0,37 | 0,41 | 0,38 | 0,35 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,0007 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 0,001 | 0,002 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 |
| Greece | NA | 0,02 | 0,04 | 0,06 | 0,10 |
| Hungary | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0003 | 0,0002 | 0,0001 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,004 |
| Latvia | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,003 | 0,003 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,002 | 0,023 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Spain | 0,005 | 0,007 | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,01 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 |
| **Average** | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| **Median** | 0,004 | 0,006 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Minimum** | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0003 | 0,0002 | 0,0001 |
| **Maximum** | 0,30 | 0,37 | 0,41 | 0,38 | 0,35 |
| **% of NA** | 52% | 44% | 48% | 48% | 44% |
| **% of NAP** | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.16.13: Evolution of the second instance total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,00001 | 0,00001 | 0,00003 | 0,00003 | 0,00000 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Croatia | NA | 0,04 | 0,03 | 0,05 | 0,08 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | 0,0003 | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0002 | 0,0001 |
| Denmark | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Finland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 0,01 | 0,00 | 0,004 | 0,003 |
| Hungary | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,15 |
| Latvia | 0,0011 | 0,0003 | 0,0005 | 0,0005 | 0,0022 |
| Lithuania | 0,0003 | 0,0006 | 0,0004 | 0,0002 | 0,0002 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,01 |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 0,0006 | 0,0006 | 0,0006 | 0,0007 | 0,0008 |
| Slovak Republic | 0,0001 | 0,0003 | 0,0002 | 0,0003 | 0,0004 |
| Slovenia | 0,0001 | 0,0001 | 0,0000 | 0,00000 | 0 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | 0,0004 | 0,0005 | 0,0006 | 0,0007 | 0,0006 |
| Average | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| Median | 0,0003 | 0,0004 | 0,0005 | 0,0004 | 0,0006 |
| Minimum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maximum | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,15 |
| % of NA | 63% | 56% | 56% | 48% | 41% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.16.14: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 0,00001 | 0,00001 | 0,00001 | 0,00003 | 0,00000 |
| **Belgium** | NA | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 | 0,01 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 0,003 | 0,002 | 0,003 | 0,006 | 0,02 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Estonia** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,00 | 0,002 | 0,002 | 0,002 |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | 0,00 | 0,00006 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,14 |
| **Latvia** | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,0005 | 0,0005 | 0,0020 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,0001 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Average** | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,02 |
| **Median** | 0,0001 | 0,0012 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,0020 |
| **Minimum** | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,19 | 0,17 | 0,14 |
| **% of NA** | 67% | 63% | 63% | 63% | 59% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% |

## Table 3.16.15: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,00002 | 0 |
| Belgium | NA | 0,0011 | 0,001 | 0,003 | 0,0036 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | NA | 0,0334 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,06 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 0,0024 | 0,000 | 0,0019 | 0,001 |
| Hungary | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,001 | 0,0006 | 0,0006 |
| Latvia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 0,0001 | 0,0001 | 0,0000 | 0,00005 | 0 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Average | 0,0003 | 0,0048 | 0,0042 | 0,0061 | 0,0078 |
| Median | 0 | 0 | 0,0002 | 0,0003 | 0 |
| Minimum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maximum | 0,0014 | 0,0334 | 0,0313 | 0,0428 | 0,0572 |
| % of NA | 70% | 59% | 59% | 63% | 63% |
| % of NAP | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% |

# Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance criminal cases

## Table 3.17.1: Clearance rate (%) of second instance criminal cases in 2024 (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 | 102,0% | 101,3% | 103,4% | NAP |
| Belgium | 99,2% | 99,8% | 98,9% | NA |
| Bulgaria | 98,4% | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 100,3% | 91,1% | 108,6% | 99,9% |
| Cyprus | 70,1% | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | 100,0% | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 94,3% | 94,3% | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 101,3% | 108,1% | 96,9% | 100,3% |
| Finland | 95,6% | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 87,6% | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | 98,6% | 101,3% | NA |
| Greece | 52,1% | 47,0% | 60,9% | 92,1% |
| Hungary | 98,7% | 98,7% | 101,7% | NAP |
| Ireland | 111,9% | 63,1% | 123,7% | NAP |
| Italy | 136,7% | 137,3% | 118,4% | NAP |
| Latvia | 92,7% | 89,3% | 97,5% | 104,9% |
| Lithuania | 100,2% | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 91,4% | 90,8% | 96,2% | NAP |
| Malta | 87,4% | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | 102,7% | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 99,4% | 98,6% | 97,9% | 99,8% |
| Portugal | 101,6% | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 99,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 100,5% | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 100,6% | 100,4% | 100,5% | 104,2% |
| Spain | 96,6% | 97,2% | 95,2% | NAP |
| Sweden | 101,3% | 98,7% | 105,4% | 160,2% |
| Average | 97,0% | 94,6% | 100,4% | 108,8% |
| Median | 99,5% | 98,6% | 100,5% | 100,3% |
| Minimum | 52,1% | 47,0% | 60,9% | 92,1% |
| Maximum | 136,7% | 137,3% | 123,7% | 160,2% |
| % of NA | 4% | 37% | 37% | 33% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Malta:** 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 3.17.2: Disposition time (in days) of second instance criminal cases in 2024 (Q98)

| States | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Other criminal cases |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 51 | 43 | 67 | NAP |
| Belgium | 172 | 319 | 96 | NA |
| Bulgaria | 61 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Croatia | 284 | 220 | 363 | 21 |
| Cyprus | 609 | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | 29 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 252 | 252 | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 29 | 66 | 24 | 19 |
| Finland | 216 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 463 | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | 183 | 38 | NA |
| Greece | 977 | 1234 | 560 | 1 177 |
| Hungary | 53 | 54 | 10 | NAP |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Italy | 602 | 610 | 291 | NAP |
| Latvia | 186 | 237 | 115 | 40 |
| Lithuania | 64 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| Malta | 482 | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | 282 | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 58 | 124 | 78 | 33 |
| Portugal | 93 | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | 113 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 49 | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 49 | 31 | 92 | 7 |
| Spain | 78 | 83 | 66 | NAP |
| Sweden | 130 | 138 | 51 | 58 |
| Average | 224 | 257 | 142 | 194 |
| Median | 121 | 161 | 78 | 33 |
| Minimum | 29 | 31 | 10 | 7 |
| Maximum | 977 | 1 234 | 560 | 1 177 |
| % of NA | 11% | 44% | 44% | 33% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 7% | 41% |

**Malta:** 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 3.17.3: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the second instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 99,5% | 101,1% | 100,1% | 97,4% | 102,0% |
| Belgium | 100,6% | 100,7% | 101,2% | 97,7% | 99,2% |
| Bulgaria | 99,2% | 98,5% | 100,4% | 101,7% | 98,4% |
| Croatia | 136,9% | 89,8% | 91,2% | 99,1% | 100,3% |
| Cyprus | 108,4% | 105,8% | 92,8% | 73,5% | 70,1% |
| Czech Republic | 98,5% | 101,0% | 100,8% | 100,4% | 100,0% |
| Denmark | 97,6% | 98,1% | 87,6% | 93,8% | 94,3% |
| Estonia | 99,4% | 99,5% | 100,7% | 99,9% | 101,3% |
| Finland | 104,5% | 94,5% | 98,7% | 97,9% | 95,6% |
| France | 102,4% | 94,7% | 95,3% | 93,5% | 87,6% |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 108,9% | 60,5% | 64,1% | 58,5% | 52,1% |
| Hungary | 102,4% | 100,0% | 99,0% | 100,7% | 98,7% |
| Ireland | 108,8% | 97,5% | 102,9% | 100,2% | 111,9% |
| Italy | 93,8% | 107,5% | 112,5% | 127,7% | 136,7% |
| Latvia | 101,4% | 97,6% | 92,6% | 87,5% | 92,7% |
| Lithuania | 98,9% | 100,6% | 102,1% | 100,4% | 100,2% |
| Luxembourg | 109,8% | 114,1% | 87,4% | 114,1% | 91,4% |
| Malta | 148,9% | 94,6% | 90,6% | 145,8% | 87,4% |
| Netherlands | 94,5% | 109,0% | 100,0% | 101,4% | 102,7% |
| Poland | 99,0% | 99,6% | 100,2% | 100,1% | 99,4% |
| Portugal | 101,3% | 98,5% | 95,9% | 101,4% | 101,6% |
| Romania | 99,2% | 95,6% | 99,8% | 102,7% | 99,6% |
| Slovak Republic | 99,7% | 99,7% | 99,1% | 99,8% | 100,5% |
| Slovenia | 105,5% | 91,1% | 100,0% | 99,1% | 100,6% |
| Spain | 103,0% | 95,6% | 98,9% | 101,6% | 96,6% |
| Sweden | 92,5% | 92,5% | 97,8% | 96,6% | 101,3% |
| Average | 104,4% | 97,6% | 96,6% | 99,7% | 97,0% |
| Median | 101,0% | 98,5% | 99,0% | 100,0% | 99,5% |
| Minimum | 92,5% | 60,5% | 64,1% | 58,5% | 52,1% |
| Maximum | 148,9% | 114,1% | 112,5% | 145,8% | 136,7% |
| % of NA | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Malta:** 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 3.17.4: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the second instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 55 | 51 | 54 | 63 | 51 |
| Belgium | NA | 105 | NA | 176 | 172 |
| Bulgaria | 56 | 63 | 66 | 55 | 61 |
| Croatia | 171 | 276 | 295 | 303 | 284 |
| Cyprus | 347 | 354 | 344 | 1140 | 609 |
| Czech Republic | 34 | 31 | 29 | 28 | 29 |
| Denmark | 141 | 143 | 202 | 230 | 252 |
| Estonia | 27 | 29 | 29 | 31 | 29 |
| Finland | 182 | 197 | 198 | 212 | 216 |
| France | 399 | 342 | 366 | 385 | 463 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 144 | 294 | 694 | 977 |
| Hungary | 48 | 45 | 49 | 47 | 53 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 1167 | 897 | 750 | 645 | 602 |
| Latvia | 81 | 99 | 135 | 168 | 186 |
| Lithuania | 67 | 66 | 59 | 55 | 64 |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | 545 | 542 | 551 | 266 | 482 |
| Netherlands | 348 | 272 | 295 | 291 | 282 |
| Poland | 61 | 56 | 54 | 54 | 58 |
| Portugal | 142 | 137 | 146 | 106 | 93 |
| Romania | 122 | 128 | 123 | 111 | 113 |
| Slovak Republic | 45 | 50 | 52 | 51 | 49 |
| Slovenia | 26 | 58 | 54 | 54 | 49 |
| Spain | 59 | 67 | 71 | 69 | 78 |
| Sweden | 156 | 169 | 154 | 154 | 130 |
| Average | 194 | 180 | 190 | 225 | 224 |
| Median | 101 | 117 | 135 | 133 | 121 |
| Minimum | 26 | 29 | 29 | 28 | 29 |
| Maximum | 1167 | 897 | 750 | 1140 | 977 |
| % of NA | 19% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.17.5: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the second instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 99,2% | 101,5% | 98,7% | 99,5% | 101,3% |
| Belgium | 100,7% | 104,4% | 99,9% | 97,6% | 99,8% |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 102,8% | 95,0% | 90,5% | 89,1% | 91,1% |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 97,6% | 98,1% | 87,6% | 93,8% | 94,3% |
| Estonia | 99,3% | 99,6% | 100,9% | 97,2% | 108,1% |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 100,4% | 101,7% | 98,3% | 98,1% | 98,6% |
| Greece | NA | 56,2% | 54,3% | 48,4% | 47,0% |
| Hungary | 102,4% | 100,0% | 99,0% | 100,7% | 98,7% |
| Ireland | 122,3% | 101,0% | 92,6% | 69,0% | 63,1% |
| Italy | 92,7% | 107,3% | 112,9% | 128,1% | 137,3% |
| Latvia | 100,6% | 96,9% | 89,8% | 78,5% | 89,3% |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 106,4% | 110,4% | 86,4% | 113,6% | 90,8% |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 98,9% | 98,4% | 99,1% | 100,0% | 98,6% |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 99,7% | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 105,5% | 96,9% | 102,3% | 98,3% | 100,4% |
| Spain | 103,1% | 96,0% | 97,9% | 101,5% | 97,2% |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 98,7% |
| Average | 102,1% | 97,6% | 94,0% | 94,2% | 94,6% |
| Median | 100,6% | 99,6% | 98,3% | 98,1% | 98,6% |
| Minimum | 92,7% | 56,2% | 54,3% | 48,4% | 47,0% |
| Maximum | 122,3% | 110,4% | 112,9% | 128,1% | 137,3% |
| % of NA | 37% | 37% | 37% | 41% | 37% |
| % of NAP | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 3.17.6: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the second instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 48 | 42 | 49 | 50 | 43 |
| Belgium | NA | 331 | 353 | 351 | 319 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 96 | 118 | 158 | 200 | 220 |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 141 | 143 | 202 | 230 | 252 |
| Estonia | 27 | 29 | 29 | 85 | 66 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 168 | 162 | 178 | 177 | 183 |
| Greece | NA | 168 | 410 | 1122 | 1234 |
| Hungary | 48 | 45 | 49 | 47 | 54 |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 1196 | 913 | 760 | 654 | 610 |
| Latvia | 119 | 119 | 179 | 233 | 237 |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 132 | 113 | 113 | 114 | 124 |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 45 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 33 | 44 | 34 | 39 | 31 |
| Spain | 60 | 69 | 77 | 73 | 83 |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 138 |
| **Average** | 176 | 177 | 199 | 260 | 257 |
| **Median** | 78 | 118 | 158 | 177 | 161 |
| **Minimum** | 27 | 29 | 29 | 39 | 31 |
| **Maximum** | 1196 | 913 | 760 | 1122 | 1234 |
| **% of NA** | 48% | 44% | 44% | 48% | 44% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 3.17.7: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 100,2% | 100,4% | 102,9% | 93,5% | 103,4% |
| Belgium | 100,4% | 100,2% | 103,5% | 97,7% | 98,9% |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 93,8% | 85,8% | 90,7% | 107,8% | 108,6% |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 102,5% | 99,3% | 98,0% | 103,6% | 96,9% |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Germany | 102,8% | 99,9% | 100,5% | 101,2% | 101,3% |
| Greece | NA | 64,1% | 83,9% | 77,8% | 60,9% |
| Hungary | 98,9% | 100,2% | 99,0% | 101,7% | 101,7% |
| Ireland | 107,1% | 97,2% | 104,4% | 105,9% | 123,7% |
| Italy | 129,5% | 111,1% | 98,8% | 114,4% | 118,4% |
| Latvia | 102,2% | 98,8% | 94,4% | 104,1% | 97,5% |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 138,6% | 146,2% | 95,6% | 118,2% | 96,2% |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 99,2% | 98,7% | 103,4% | 99,4% | 97,9% |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 107,4% | 81,2% | 96,3% | 100,8% | 100,5% |
| Spain | 102,7% | 94,9% | 101,1% | 101,9% | 95,2% |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 105,4% |
| **Average** | 106,6% | 98,4% | 98,0% | 102,0% | 100,4% |
| **Median** | 102,5% | 99,0% | 98,9% | 101,8% | 100,5% |
| **Minimum** | 93,8% | 64,1% | 83,9% | 77,8% | 60,9% |
| **Maximum** | 138,6% | 146,2% | 104,4% | 118,2% | 123,7% |
| **% of NA** | 41% | 37% | 37% | 41% | 37% |
| **% of NAP** | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 3.17.8: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 70 | 69 | 62 | 89 | 67 |
| **Belgium** | NA | 9 | NA | 92 | 96 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 356 | 407 | 423 | 413 | 363 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | 21 | 21 | 28 | 10 | 24 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | 35 | 38 | 38 | 37 | 38 |
| **Greece** | NA | 129 | 146 | 307 | 560 |
| **Hungary** | 23 | 15 | 13 | 16 | 10 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 435 | 376 | 369 | 303 | 291 |
| **Latvia** | 44 | 68 | 94 | 97 | 115 |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | 100 | 82 | 69 | 73 | 78 |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 11 | 91 | 93 | 80 | 92 |
| **Spain** | 57 | 64 | 57 | 62 | 66 |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 51 |
| **Average** | 115 | 114 | 127 | 131 | 142 |
| **Median** | 50 | 69 | 69 | 84 | 78 |
| **Minimum** | 11 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 10 |
| **Maximum** | 435 | 407 | 423 | 413 | 560 |
| **% of NA** | 52% | 44% | 48% | 48% | 44% |
| **% of NAP** | 11% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 second instance criminal cases

## Table 3.18.1: Second instance courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percentage (Q98)

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| Austria | -0,3% | -0,7% | 0,3% | 2,6% | 3,5% | 0,9% |
| Belgium | -17,8% | -55,1% | 44,1% | 2,5% | 8,0% | 0,0% |
| Bulgaria | -2,2% | NA | NA | 3,7% | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 13,1% | 34,8% | -5,0% | 5,1% | 5,8% | 4,6% |
| Cyprus | 39,8% | NA | NA | 163,6% | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | -10,5% | NA | NA | -2,0% | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 0,7% | 0,7% | NAP | 0,0% | 0,0% | NAP |
| Estonia | -25,1% | -85,5% | 34,5% | -12,2% | -24,3% | -4,8% |
| Finland | 19,4% | NA | NA | 8,8% | NA | NA |
| France | 0,9% | NA | NA | -11,1% | NA | NA |
| Germany | -8,7% | -3,4% | -28,2% | -3,6% | -0,9% | -14,9% |
| Greece | 86,8% | NA | NA | 21,5% | 40,5% | 20,4% |
| Hungary | 6,3% | 5,9% | 37,1% | -1,0% | -1,0% | -0,2% |
| Ireland | 34,5% | 127,3% | 22,4% | -7,6% | 16,5% | -12,0% |
| Italy | -7,1% | -7,3% | -2,4% | -14,2% | -14,1% | -18,0% |
| Latvia | -8,4% | 21,6% | -50,6% | 1,3% | 5,9% | -2,0% |
| Lithuania | -14,9% | NA | NA | -15,9% | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 17,0% | 16,6% | 20,5% | 15,1% | 14,4% | 20,5% |
| Malta | 50,5% | NA | NA | 3,5% | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | -5,4% | NA | NA | -1,6% | NA | NA |
| Poland | 10,4% | 20,9% | 34,7% | -1,4% | -3,1% | 5,0% |
| Portugal | 21,0% | NA | NA | 7,6% | NA | NA |
| Romania | 15,7% | NAP | NAP | 2,8% | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | -2,5% | NA | NA | -0,4% | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 51,9% | 35,3% | 123,4% | 2,8% | 14,4% | -14,0% |
| Spain | 23,9% | 25,2% | 20,7% | 7,1% | 4,6% | 13,8% |
| Sweden | 47,9% | NA | NA | 9,2% | NA | NA |
| Average | 12,5% | 9,7% | 19,3% | 6,9% | 4,7% | -0,1% |
| Median | 6,3% | 11,3% | 20,7% | 2,5% | 4,6% | -0,1% |
| Minimum | -25,1% | -85,5% | -50,6% | -15,9% | -24,3% | -18,0% |
| Maximum | 86,8% | 127,3% | 123,4% | 163,6% | 40,5% | 20,5% |
| % of NA | 0% | 44% | 44% | 0% | 41% | 41% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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: Second instance courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percentage (Q98)

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| Austria | 2,2% | 1,4% | 3,5% | 7,4% | 5,3% | 11,6% |
| Belgium | -18,9% | -55,5% | 41,8% | 4,1% | 10,3% | 1,1% |
| Bulgaria | -2,9% | NA | NA | 0,3% | NA | NA |
| Croatia | -17,2% | 19,4% | 9,9% | 6,4% | 8,2% | 5,3% |
| Cyprus | -9,6% | NA | NA | 151,5% | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | -9,1% | NA | NA | -2,4% | NA | NA |
| Denmark | -2,7% | -2,7% | NAP | 0,4% | 0,4% | NAP |
| Estonia | -23,7% | -84,2% | 27,0% | -10,9% | -15,8% | -10,9% |
| Finland | 9,3% | NA | NA | 6,3% | NA | NA |
| France | -13,7% | NA | NA | -16,7% | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | -5,1% | -29,3% | NA | -0,4% | -14,8% |
| Greece | -10,6% | NA | NA | 8,2% | 36,4% | -5,7% |
| Hungary | 2,4% | 2,0% | 41,0% | -3,0% | -3,0% | -0,2% |
| Ireland | 38,3% | 17,2% | 41,5% | 3,3% | 6,4% | 2,9% |
| Italy | 35,4% | 37,3% | -10,8% | -8,2% | -8,0% | -15,1% |
| Latvia | -16,3% | 7,9% | -52,8% | 7,3% | 20,5% | -8,2% |
| Lithuania | -13,8% | NA | NA | -16,0% | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | -2,6% | -0,5% | -16,4% | -7,8% | -8,5% | -1,9% |
| Malta | -11,7% | NA | NA | -37,9% | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | 2,8% | NA | NA | -0,3% | NA | NA |
| Poland | 10,9% | 20,5% | 33,0% | -2,0% | -4,4% | 3,4% |
| Portugal | 21,3% | NA | NA | 7,8% | NA | NA |
| Romania | 16,2% | NAP | NAP | -0,2% | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | -1,7% | NA | NA | 0,3% | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 44,8% | 28,8% | 109,0% | 4,3% | 16,8% | -14,3% |
| Spain | 16,2% | 18,0% | 12,0% | 1,9% | 0,2% | 6,3% |
| Sweden | 61,9% | NA | NA | 14,4% | NA | NA |
| Average | 4,1% | 0,3% | 16,1% | 4,6% | 4,3% | -2,9% |
| Median | -2,2% | 5,0% | 12,0% | 0,4% | 0,4% | -1,1% |
| Minimum | -23,7% | -84,2% | -52,8% | -37,9% | -15,8% | -15,1% |
| Maximum | 61,9% | 37,3% | 109,0% | 151,5% | 36,4% | 11,6% |
| % of NA | 4% | 44% | 44% | 4% | 41% | 41% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 3.18.3: Second instance courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

in percentage (Q98)

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| Austria | -5,0% | -8,9% | 0,3% | -12,5% | -10,1% | -15,2% |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | 1,9% | 0,3% | 4,8% |
| Bulgaria | 6,6% | NA | NA | 10,8% | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 37,7% | 174,9% | 12,2% | -0,4% | 19,4% | -7,3% |
| Cyprus | 58,4% | NA | NA | 34,3% | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | -22,4% | NA | NA | -0,2% | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 74,1% | 74,1% | NAP | 10,0% | 10,0% | NAP |
| Estonia | -18,5% | -61,9% | 42,9% | -17,9% | -34,6% | 100,0% |
| Finland | 29,6% | NA | NA | 8,4% | NA | NA |
| France | -0,1% | NA | NA | 0,1% | NA | NA |
| Germany | NA | 3,4% | -22,1% | NA | 2,8% | -10,8% |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | 52,3% | 50,1% | 72,1% |
| Hungary | 12,8% | 13,1% | -40,9% | 9,9% | 10,2% | -38,1% |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | -30,1% | -30,0% | -40,3% | -14,3% | -14,2% | -18,4% |
| Latvia | 93,0% | 114,5% | 24,7% | 18,3% | 22,6% | 8,7% |
| Lithuania | -16,9% | NA | NA | -1,2% | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Malta | -21,9% | NA | NA | 12,5% | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | -16,5% | NA | NA | -3,3% | NA | NA |
| Poland | 4,8% | 13,6% | 4,2% | 3,8% | 4,3% | 11,1% |
| Portugal | -20,6% | NA | NA | -5,8% | NA | NA |
| Romania | 7,9% | NAP | NAP | 1,3% | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 7,1% | NA | NA | -3,6% | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 169,2% | 23,7% | 1625,0% | -4,4% | -4,7% | -1,8% |
| Spain | 54,1% | 64,1% | 29,8% | 14,5% | 14,7% | 13,8% |
| Sweden | 35,2% | NA | NA | -3,4% | NA | NA |
| Average | 19,9% | 34,6% | 163,6% | 4,6% | 5,5% | 9,9% |
| Median | 6,9% | 13,6% | 8,2% | 0,7% | 4,3% | 1,5% |
| Minimum | -30,1% | -61,9% | -40,9% | -17,9% | -34,6% | -38,1% |
| Maximum | 169,2% | 174,9% | 1625,0% | 52,3% | 50,1% | 100,0% |
| % of NA | 19% | 56% | 56% | 11% | 48% | 48% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 3.18.4: Second instance courts, variation of the Clearance Rate of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage points (Q98)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | +2,5 | +2,1 | +3,2 | +4,6 | +1,8 | +10,0 |
| **Belgium** | -1,4 | -0,9 | -1,6 | +1,5 | +2,1 | +1,2 |
| **Bulgaria** | -0,8 | NA | NA | -3,3 | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | -36,6 | -11,7 | +14,8 | +1,2 | +2,0 | +0,8 |
| **Cyprus** | -38,3 | NA | NA | -3,4 | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | +1,5 | NA | NA | -0,3 | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | -3,3 | -3,3 | NAP | +0,5 | +0,5 | NAP |
| **Estonia** | +1,9 | +8,9 | -5,6 | +1,4 | +10,9 | -6,7 |
| **Finland** | -8,8 | NA | NA | -2,3 | NA | NA |
| **France** | -14,8 | NA | NA | -5,9 | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | -1,7 | -1,5 | NA | +0,5 | +0,0 |
| **Greece** | -56,8 | NA | NA | -6,4 | -1,4 | -16,9 |
| **Hungary** | -3,7 | -3,8 | +2,8 | -2,0 | -2,0 | +0,0 |
| **Ireland** | +3,1 | -59,3 | +16,7 | +11,8 | -5,9 | +17,9 |
| **Italy** | +43,0 | +44,5 | -11,1 | +9,1 | +9,2 | +4,0 |
| **Latvia** | -8,7 | -11,3 | -4,6 | +5,2 | +10,8 | -6,6 |
| **Lithuania** | +1,3 | NA | NA | -0,1 | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | -18,4 | -15,6 | -42,4 | -22,7 | -22,8 | -22,0 |
| **Malta** | -61,5 | NA | NA | -58,4 | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | +8,2 | NA | NA | +1,3 | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | +0,5 | -0,3 | -1,2 | -0,7 | -1,4 | -1,5 |
| **Portugal** | +0,3 | NA | NA | +0,2 | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | +0,4 | NAP | NAP | -3,1 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | +0,8 | NA | NA | +0,7 | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | -4,9 | -5,1 | -6,9 | +1,5 | +2,1 | -0,3 |
| **Spain** | -6,4 | -6,0 | -7,5 | -5,0 | -4,3 | -6,7 |
| **Sweden** | +8,8 | NA | NA | +4,6 | NA | NA |
| **Average** | -7,4 | -4,5 | -3,5 | -2,7 | +0,1 | -1,9 |
| **Median** | -1,1 | -3,6 | -1,6 | +0,0 | +0,5 | -0,2 |
| **Minimum** | -61,5 | -59,3 | -42,4 | -58,4 | -22,8 | -22,0 |
| **Maximum** | +43,0 | +44,5 | +16,7 | +11,8 | +10,9 | +17,9 |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 44% | 44% | 4% | 41% | 41% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 3.18.5: Second instance courts, variation of the Disposition Time of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q98)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | -7,0% | -10,2% | -3,1% | -18,5% | -14,6% | -24,0% |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | -2,1% | -9,1% | 3,7% |
| **Bulgaria** | 9,9% | NA | NA | 10,4% | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 66,2% | 130,2% | 2,1% | -6,4% | 10,4% | -12,0% |
| **Cyprus** | 75,2% | NA | NA | -46,6% | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | -14,6% | NA | NA | 2,2% | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 79,0% | 79,0% | NAP | 9,5% | 9,5% | NAP |
| **Estonia** | 6,8% | 142,1% | 12,4% | -7,8% | -22,3% | 124,5% |
| **Finland** | 18,6% | NA | NA | 2,0% | NA | NA |
| **France** | 15,9% | NA | NA | 20,2% | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | NA | 8,9% | 10,2% | NA | 3,2% | 4,7% |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 40,8% | 10,0% | 82,5% |
| **Hungary** | 10,2% | 10,8% | -58,1% | 13,3% | 13,6% | -38,0% |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | -48,4% | -49,0% | -33,1% | -6,6% | -6,8% | -3,8% |
| **Latvia** | 130,5% | 98,8% | 164,3% | 10,3% | 1,8% | 18,4% |
| **Lithuania** | -3,6% | NA | NA | 17,6% | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | -11,5% | NA | NA | 81,3% | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | -18,8% | NA | NA | -2,9% | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | -5,6% | -5,7% | -21,7% | 6,0% | 9,2% | 7,5% |
| **Portugal** | -34,5% | NA | NA | -12,6% | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | -7,1% | NAP | NAP | 1,5% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 9,0% | NA | NA | -3,9% | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 85,9% | -3,9% | 725,2% | -8,3% | -18,4% | 14,6% |
| **Spain** | 32,7% | 39,1% | 15,9% | 12,4% | 14,6% | 7,1% |
| **Sweden** | -16,5% | NA | NA | -15,6% | NA | NA |
| **Average** | 16,9% | 40,0% | 81,4% | 4,0% | 0,1% | 15,4% |
| **Median** | 7,9% | 10,8% | 6,1% | 1,7% | 3,2% | 5,9% |
| **Minimum** | -48,4% | -49,0% | -58,1% | -46,6% | -22,3% | -38,0% |
| **Maximum** | 130,5% | 142,1% | 725,2% | 81,3% | 14,6% | 124,5% |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 56% | 56% | 11% | 48% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 7% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 courts, criminal cases by case categories and by case status

## Table 3.19.1a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

### 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** | **610** | 157 | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **463** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **294** | 217 | 31 | 46 |
| **Croatia** | **67** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **155** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **47** | 47 | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **14** | 14 | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | **389** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **2 874** | 2 767 | 73 | 34 |
| **Germany** | **780** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | **673** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | **458** | 458 | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | **15 038** | 13 621 | 243 | 1 174 |
| **Latvia** | **147** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | **166** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **32** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **2 479** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | **1 415** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | **174** | 174 | NAP | NAP |
| **Romania** | **35** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **350** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **222** | 210 | 12 | NAP |
| **Spain** | **8 649** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **973** | 793 | 31 | 149 |
| **Average** | **1 460** | 1 846 | 78 | 351 |
| **Median** | **350** | 214 | 31 | 98 |
| **Minimum** | **0** | 14 | 12 | 34 |
| **Maximum** | **15 038** | 13 621 | 243 | 1 174 |
| **% of NA** | **4%** | 52% | 48% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Austria:** The total number of Supreme court,  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.

**Malta:** 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 3.19.1b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q100)

| States | Total number of criminal cases 1+2+3 | Severe criminal cases 1 | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2 | Other criminal cases 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0,007 | 0,002 | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | 0,004 | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 0,005 | 0,003 | 0,0005 | 0,0007 |
| Croatia | 0,002 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Cyprus | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA |
| Czech Republic | 0,001 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | 0,007 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,0001 | 0,00005 |
| Germany | 0,001 | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 0,006 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | 0,005 | 0,005 | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | 0,0003 | NA | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 0,026 | 0,023 | 0,0004 | 0,0020 |
| Latvia | 0,008 | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | 0,006 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,005 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | 0,014 | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,004 | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 0,002 | 0,002 | NAP | NAP |
| Romania | 0,0002 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,006 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Slovenia | 0,010 | 0,010 | 0,0006 | NAP |
| Spain | 0,018 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Sweden | 0,009 | 0,007 | 0,0003 | 0,0014 |
| **Average** | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,0003 | 0,001 |
| **Median** | 0,005 | 0,003 | 0,0004 | 0,0011 |
| **Minimum** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 0,026 | 0,023 | 0,001 | 0,002 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 48% | 44% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | 4% | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Austria:** The total number of Supreme court, 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.19.2a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - incoming in 2024

### 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** | **1 310** | 700 | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **1 798** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **1 131** | 471 | 72 | 588 |
| **Croatia** | **383** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **2** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **1 141** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **67** | 67 | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **68** | 68 | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | **935** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **7 189** | 6 778 | 174 | 237 |
| **Germany** | **3 733** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | **1 197** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | **1 659** | 1 659 | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **59** | 59 | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | **43 109** | 35 681 | 639 | 6 789 |
| **Latvia** | **556** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | **266** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **59** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **3 618** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | **4 463** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | **1 090** | 1 090 | NAP | NAP |
| **Romania** | **191** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **1 034** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **883** | 863 | 20 | NAP |
| **Spain** | **9 369** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **4 796** | 4 381 | 149 | 266 |
| **Average** | **3 466** | 4 711 | 211 | 1 970 |
| **Median** | **1 111** | 863 | 149 | 427 |
| **Minimum** | **2** | 59 | 20 | 237 |
| **Maximum** | **43 109** | 35 681 | 639 | 6 789 |
| **% of NA** | **0%** | 48% | 48% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Austria:** The total number of Supreme court,  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.

**Malta:** 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 3.19.2b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - incoming in 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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 | 0,014 | 0,008 | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | 0,015 | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 0,018 | 0,007 | 0,001 | 0,009 |
| Croatia | 0,010 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Cyprus | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA |
| Czech Republic | 0,010 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,005 | 0,005 | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | 0,017 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 0,010 | 0,010 | 0,000 | 0,0003 |
| Germany | 0,004 | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 0,012 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | 0,017 | 0,017 | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 0,073 | 0,061 | 0,001 | 0,012 |
| Latvia | 0,030 | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | 0,009 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,009 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | 0,020 | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,012 | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 0,010 | 0,010 | NAP | NAP |
| Romania | 0,001 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,019 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Slovenia | 0,041 | 0,041 | 0,001 | NAP |
| Spain | 0,019 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Sweden | 0,045 | 0,041 | 0,001 | 0,003 |
| Average | 0,016 | 0,017 | 0,001 | 0,006 |
| Median | 0,012 | 0,009 | 0,001 | 0,006 |
| Minimum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maximum | 0,073 | 0,061 | 0,001 | 0,012 |
| % of NA | 0% | 44% | 44% | 30% |
| % of NAP | 4% | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Austria:** The total number of Supreme court, 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.19.3a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - resolved in 2024

### 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** | **1 422** | 685 | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **1 803** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **1 243** | 550 | 84 | 609 |
| **Croatia** | **408** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **2** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **1 158** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **43** | 43 | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **62** | 62 | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | **913** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **7 276** | 6 889 | 158 | 229 |
| **Germany** | **3 612** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | **1 135** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | **1 637** | 1 637 | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **51** | 51 | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | **47 659** | 39 777 | 551 | 7 331 |
| **Latvia** | **532** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | **193** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **67** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **3 377** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | **4 374** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | **1 064** | 1 064 | NAP | NAP |
| **Romania** | **197** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **1 007** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **887** | 879 | 8 | NAP |
| **Spain** | **10 956** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **4 553** | 4 072 | 127 | 354 |
| **Average** | **3 678** | 5 064 | 186 | 2 131 |
| **Median** | **1 100** | 879 | 127 | 482 |
| **Minimum** | **2** | 43 | 8 | 229 |
| **Maximum** | **47 659** | 39 777 | 551 | 7 331 |
| **% of NA** | **0%** | 48% | 48% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Austria:** The total number of Supreme court,  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.

**Malta:** 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 3.19.3b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - resolved in 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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 | 0,015 | 0,007 | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | 0,015 | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 0,019 | 0,009 | 0,001 | 0,009 |
| Croatia | 0,011 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Cyprus | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | 0,011 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,005 | 0,005 | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | 0,016 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 0,011 | 0,010 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Germany | 0,004 | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 0,011 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | 0,017 | 0,017 | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 0,081 | 0,067 | 0,001 | 0,012 |
| Latvia | 0,029 | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | 0,007 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,010 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | 0,019 | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,012 | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 0,010 | 0,010 | NAP | NAP |
| Romania | 0,001 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,019 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Slovenia | 0,042 | 0,041 | 0,000 | NAP |
| Spain | 0,022 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Sweden | 0,043 | 0,038 | 0,001 | 0,003 |
| Average | 0,017 | 0,019 | 0,001 | 0,006 |
| Median | 0,011 | 0,010 | 0,001 | 0,006 |
| Minimum | 0 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Maximum | 0,081 | 0,067 | 0,001 | 0,012 |
| % of NA | 0% | 48% | 48% | 30% |
| % of NAP | 4% | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Austria:** The total number of Supreme court, 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.

**Malta:** 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 3.19.4a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024

### 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** | **498** | 172 | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | **458** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | **182** | 138 | 19 | 25 |
| **Croatia** | **42** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | **0** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | **138** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Denmark** | **71** | 71 | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | **20** | 20 | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | **411** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **France** | **2 794** | 2 663 | 89 | 42 |
| **Germany** | **901** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | **735** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | **480** | 480 | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | **NA** | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | **10 488** | 9 525 | 331 | 632 |
| **Latvia** | **171** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | **239** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | **24** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | **NAP** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | **2 720** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | **1 504** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | **200** | 200 | NAP | NAP |
| **Romania** | **29** | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | **377** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | **206** | 194 | 12 | NAP |
| **Spain** | **7 062** | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Sweden** | **1 216** | 1 102 | 53 | 61 |
| **Average** | **1 239** | 1 457 | 101 | 190 |
| **Median** | **377** | 197 | 53 | 52 |
| **Minimum** | **0** | 20 | 12 | 25 |
| **Maximum** | **10 488** | 9 525 | 331 | 632 |
| **% of NA** | **4%** | 52% | 48% | 30% |
| **% of NAP** | **4%** | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Austria:** The total number of Supreme court,  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.

**Malta:** 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 3.19.4b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024

### Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, 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 | 0,005 | 0,002 | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | 0,004 | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 0,003 | 0,002 | 0,0003 | 0,0004 |
| Croatia | 0,001 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Cyprus | 0,000 | 0 | 0 | NA |
| Czech Republic | 0,001 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0,001 | 0,001 | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | 0,007 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 0,004 | 0,004 | 0,0001 | 0,00005 |
| Germany | 0,001 | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 0,007 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | 0,005 | 0,005 | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 0,018 | 0,016 | 0,0006 | 0,0011 |
| Latvia | 0,009 | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | 0,008 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 0,004 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | 0,015 | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 0,004 | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 0,002 | 0,002 | NAP | NAP |
| Romania | 0,0002 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 0,007 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Slovenia | 0,010 | 0,009 | 0,0006 | NAP |
| Spain | 0,014 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Sweden | 0,011 | 0,010 | 0,0005 | 0,0006 |
| Average | 0,006 | 0,005 | 0,0003 | 0,0005 |
| Median | 0,004 | 0,002 | 0,0004 | 0,0005 |
| Minimum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maximum | 0,018 | 0,016 | 0,0006 | 0,0011 |
| % of NA | 4% | 48% | 44% | 30% |
| % of NAP | 4% | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Austria:** The total number of Supreme court, 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.

**Malta:** 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: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2024

### 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 | 5,0% | 0 | 0,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | 32 | 7,0% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 9 | 4,9% | 9 | 6,5% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Croatia | 1 | 2,4% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| Cyprus | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| Denmark | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| France | 59 | 2,1% | 48 | 1,8% | 0 | 0,0% | 11 | 26,2% |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0,0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Latvia | 0 | 0,0% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | 1 | 0,4% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 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 | 6,9% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 10 | 2,7% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| Slovenia | 1 | 0,5% | 1 | 0,5% | 0 | 0% | NAP | NAP |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| Sweden | 1 | 0,1% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Average | 11 | 2,5% | 10 | 1,5% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 8,7% |
| Median | 1 | 2,1% | 1 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Minimum | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Maximum | 59 | 7,0% | 48 | 6,5% | 0 | 0% | 11 | 26,2% |
| % of NA | 48% | 48% | 67% | 67% | 52% | 52% | 33% | 33% |
| % of NAP | 4% | 4% | 11% | 11% | 33% | 33% | 56% | 56% |

**Austria:** The total number of Supreme court, 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.

**Malta:** 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 courts, evolution of the absolute number of criminal cases

Note: For the cases of the Supreme courts the evolution presents the absolute numbers rather than standardised per 100 inhabitants due to low values on this instance.

## Table 3.20.1: Supreme courts, evolution of the total of criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 621 | 610 | 600 | 590 | 610 |
| **Belgium** | 380 | 301 | 390 | 465 | 463 |
| **Bulgaria** | 293 | 266 | 296 | 261 | 294 |
| **Croatia** | 724 | 704 | 274 | 113 | 67 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | 0 |
| **Czech Republic** | 183 | 150 | 147 | 140 | 155 |
| **Denmark** | 35 | 33 | 28 | 41 | 47 |
| **Estonia** | 10 | 23 | 28 | 14 | 14 |
| **Finland** | 205 | 243 | 308 | 343 | 389 |
| **France** | 3302 | 2998 | 3300 | 3178 | 2874 |
| **Germany** | 784 | 658 | 801 | 769 | 780 |
| **Greece** | NA | 16 | 680 | 882 | 673 |
| **Hungary** | 325 | 265 | 414 | 442 | 458 |
| **Ireland** | 25 | 26 | 16 | 15 | NA |
| **Italy** | 23583 | 24478 | 23735 | 18318 | 15038 |
| **Latvia** | 141 | 177 | 235 | 160 | 147 |
| **Lithuania** | 93 | 89 | 140 | 161 | 166 |
| **Luxembourg** | 39 | 31 | 31 | 26 | 32 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 2363 | 2318 | 2015 | 2183 | 2479 |
| **Poland** | 1819 | 1487 | 1372 | 1435 | 1415 |
| **Portugal** | 156 | 173 | 153 | 179 | 174 |
| **Romania** | 145 | 134 | 143 | 42 | 35 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 268 | 278 | 316 | 336 | 350 |
| **Slovenia** | 303 | 278 | 201 | 188 | 222 |
| **Spain** | 4373 | 6302 | 6379 | 7198 | 8649 |
| **Sweden** | 188 | 268 | 324 | 443 | 973 |
| **Average** | 1682 | 1692 | 1693 | 1459 | 1460 |
| **Median** | 281 | 266 | 308 | 299 | 350 |
| **Minimum** | 10 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 23583 | 24478 | 23735 | 18318 | 15038 |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Malta:** 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.

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.20.2: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 165 | 146 | 178 | 138 | 157 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 231 | 215 | 239 | 207 | 217 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 35 | 33 | 28 | 41 | 47 |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 14 | 14 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 2767 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 325 | 265 | 414 | 442 | 458 |
| **Ireland** | 25 | 26 | 16 | 15 | NA |
| **Italy** | 21261 | 21398 | 20822 | 16042 | 13621 |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 156 | 173 | 153 | 179 | 174 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 268 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 294 | 266 | 183 | 180 | 210 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 793 |
| **Average** | 2529 | 2502 | 2754 | 1726 | 1846 |
| **Median** | 231 | 173 | 181 | 159 | 214 |
| **Minimum** | 25 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 14 |
| **Maximum** | 21261 | 21398 | 20822 | 16042 | 13621 |
| **% of NA** | 41% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | 26% | 26% | 22% | 15% | 11% |

**Malta:** 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 3.20.3: Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 22 | 29 | 23 | 18 | 31 |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 73 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 16 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 510 | 550 | 479 | 365 | 243 |
| Latvia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 9 | 12 | 18 | 8 | 12 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 31 |
| Average | 180 | 152 | 173 | 98 | 78 |
| Median | 22 | 23 | 23 | 13 | 31 |
| Minimum | 9 | 12 | 18 | 0 | 12 |
| Maximum | 510 | 550 | 479 | 365 | 243 |
| % of NA | 44% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 48% |
| % of NAP | 44% | 44% | 41% | 37% | 33% |

**Malta:** 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 3.20.4: Supreme courts, evolution of the total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 1393 | 1336 | 1404 | 1340 | 1310 |
| **Belgium** | 1353 | 1698 | 1780 | 1796 | 1798 |
| **Bulgaria** | 1035 | 1141 | 1027 | 1190 | 1131 |
| **Croatia** | 2100 | 704 | 440 | 335 | 383 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | 2 |
| **Czech Republic** | 1410 | 1383 | 1207 | 1203 | 1141 |
| **Denmark** | 60 | 49 | 63 | 80 | 67 |
| **Estonia** | 101 | 81 | 136 | 61 | 68 |
| **Finland** | 833 | 889 | 921 | 908 | 935 |
| **France** | 7199 | 7360 | 7500 | 7255 | 7189 |
| **Germany** | 2984 | 3257 | 3026 | 3181 | 3733 |
| **Greece** | NA | 1323 | 1260 | 1405 | 1197 |
| **Hungary** | 1414 | 1527 | 1549 | 1577 | 1659 |
| **Ireland** | 33 | 35 | 33 | 41 | 59 |
| **Italy** | 38508 | 46298 | 45363 | 47157 | 43109 |
| **Latvia** | 686 | 662 | 558 | 505 | 556 |
| **Lithuania** | 261 | 303 | 288 | 279 | 266 |
| **Luxembourg** | 42 | 50 | 39 | 57 | 59 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 3414 | 3346 | 3174 | 3454 | 3618 |
| **Poland** | 3226 | 3915 | 4224 | 4234 | 4463 |
| **Portugal** | 959 | 986 | 1024 | 1069 | 1090 |
| **Romania** | 353 | 408 | 205 | 212 | 191 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1016 | 1099 | 942 | 986 | 1034 |
| **Slovenia** | 663 | 714 | 714 | 805 | 883 |
| **Spain** | 7506 | 8990 | 9467 | 10529 | 9369 |
| **Sweden** | 2236 | 2649 | 3184 | 4295 | 4796 |
| **Average** | 3283 | 3608 | 3581 | 3614 | 3466 |
| **Median** | 1194 | 1141 | 1027 | 1130 | 1111 |
| **Minimum** | 33 | 35 | 33 | 0 | 2 |
| **Maximum** | 38508 | 46298 | 45363 | 47157 | 43109 |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Malta:** 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.

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.20.5: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 679 | 741 | 655 | 718 | 700 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 525 | 609 | 468 | 488 | 471 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 60 | 49 | 63 | 80 | 67 |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 61 | 68 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 6778 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 1260 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 1414 | 1527 | 1549 | 1577 | 1659 |
| **Ireland** | 33 | 35 | 33 | 41 | 59 |
| **Italy** | 31695 | 38544 | 37990 | 39938 | 35681 |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 959 | 986 | 1024 | 1069 | 1090 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1016 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 622 | 671 | 650 | 777 | 863 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4381 |
| **Average** | 4111 | 4936 | 5304 | 4475 | 4711 |
| **Median** | 679 | 741 | 653 | 603 | 863 |
| **Minimum** | 33 | 35 | 33 | 0 | 59 |
| **Maximum** | 31695 | 38544 | 37990 | 39938 | 35681 |
| **% of NA** | 41% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | 26% | 26% | 22% | 15% | 11% |

**Malta:** 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 3.20.6: Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 88 | 68 | 72 | 94 | 72 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 174 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 63 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 598 | 687 | 697 | 632 | 639 |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 42 | 43 | 64 | 28 | 20 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 149 |
| **Average** | 243 | 215 | 278 | 189 | 211 |
| **Median** | 88 | 66 | 72 | 61 | 149 |
| **Minimum** | 42 | 43 | 64 | 0 | 20 |
| **Maximum** | 598 | 687 | 697 | 632 | 639 |
| **% of NA** | 44% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | 44% | 44% | 41% | 37% | 33% |

**Malta:** 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 3.20.7: Supreme courts, evolution of the total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 1428 | 1348 | 1418 | 1327 | 1422 |
| **Belgium** | 1372 | 1609 | 1704 | 1798 | 1803 |
| **Bulgaria** | 1062 | 1110 | 1062 | 1157 | 1243 |
| **Croatia** | 2120 | 1133 | 600 | 381 | 408 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | 2 |
| **Czech Republic** | 1443 | 1386 | 1214 | 1188 | 1158 |
| **Denmark** | 62 | 54 | 50 | 74 | 43 |
| **Estonia** | 88 | 62 | 134 | 61 | 62 |
| **Finland** | 778 | 800 | 856 | 849 | 913 |
| **France** | 7503 | 7382 | 7622 | 7623 | 7276 |
| **Germany** | 3110 | 3114 | 3058 | 3170 | 3612 |
| **Greece** | NA | 1162 | 1058 | 1614 | 1135 |
| **Hungary** | 1474 | 1378 | 1521 | 1561 | 1637 |
| **Ireland** | 34 | 46 | 28 | 45 | 51 |
| **Italy** | 37618 | 47040 | 50775 | 50350 | 47659 |
| **Latvia** | 650 | 604 | 633 | 518 | 532 |
| **Lithuania** | 265 | 252 | 267 | 274 | 193 |
| **Luxembourg** | 50 | 50 | 44 | 51 | 67 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 3246 | 3417 | 2849 | 2979 | 3377 |
| **Poland** | 3570 | 4018 | 4161 | 4254 | 4374 |
| **Portugal** | 942 | 1006 | 998 | 1074 | 1064 |
| **Romania** | 364 | 399 | 306 | 219 | 197 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1006 | 1061 | 922 | 972 | 1007 |
| **Slovenia** | 688 | 791 | 728 | 771 | 887 |
| **Spain** | 5577 | 8834 | 8648 | 9078 | 10956 |
| **Sweden** | 2156 | 2592 | 3065 | 3765 | 4553 |
| **Average** | 3192 | 3626 | 3749 | 3660 | 3678 |
| **Median** | 1217 | 1133 | 1058 | 1116 | 1100 |
| **Minimum** | 34 | 46 | 28 | 0 | 2 |
| **Maximum** | 37618 | 47040 | 50775 | 50350 | 47659 |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.20.8: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 698 | 709 | 695 | 699 | 685 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 541 | 584 | 500 | 478 | 550 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 62 | 54 | 50 | 74 | 43 |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 61 | 62 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 6889 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 1106 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 1474 | 1378 | 1521 | 1561 | 1637 |
| **Ireland** | 34 | 46 | 28 | 45 | 51 |
| **Italy** | 31558 | 39119 | 42765 | 42272 | 39777 |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 942 | 1006 | 998 | 1074 | 1064 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1006 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 650 | 754 | 653 | 747 | 879 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4072 |
| **Average** | 4107 | 4973 | 5901 | 4701 | 5064 |
| **Median** | 698 | 754 | 674 | 589 | 879 |
| **Minimum** | 34 | 46 | 28 | 0 | 43 |
| **Maximum** | 31558 | 39119 | 42765 | 42272 | 39777 |
| **% of NA** | 41% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | 26% | 26% | 22% | 15% | 11% |

**Malta:** 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 3.20.9: Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 81 | 74 | 77 | 81 | 84 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 158 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 56 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 558 | 758 | 811 | 754 | 551 |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 38 | 37 | 75 | 24 | 8 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 127 |
| **Average** | 226 | 231 | 321 | 215 | 186 |
| **Median** | 81 | 65 | 77 | 53 | 127 |
| **Minimum** | 38 | 37 | 75 | 0 | 8 |
| **Maximum** | 558 | 758 | 811 | 754 | 551 |
| **% of NA** | 44% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | 44% | 44% | 41% | 37% | 33% |

**Malta:** 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 3.20.10: Supreme courts, evolution of the total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 586 | 598 | 586 | 603 | 498 |
| **Belgium** | 361 | 390 | 466 | 463 | 458 |
| **Bulgaria** | 266 | 297 | 261 | 294 | 182 |
| **Croatia** | 704 | 274 | 113 | 67 | 42 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | 0 |
| **Czech Republic** | 150 | 147 | 140 | 155 | 138 |
| **Denmark** | 33 | 28 | 41 | 47 | 71 |
| **Estonia** | 23 | 42 | 30 | 14 | 20 |
| **Finland** | 260 | 332 | 373 | 402 | 411 |
| **France** | 2998 | 2976 | 3178 | 2810 | 2794 |
| **Germany** | 658 | 801 | 769 | 780 | 901 |
| **Greece** | NA | 177 | 882 | 673 | 735 |
| **Hungary** | 265 | 414 | 442 | 458 | 480 |
| **Ireland** | 24 | 15 | 21 | 16 | NA |
| **Italy** | 24473 | 23736 | 18323 | 15125 | 10488 |
| **Latvia** | 177 | 235 | 160 | 147 | 171 |
| **Lithuania** | 86 | 140 | 161 | 166 | 239 |
| **Luxembourg** | 31 | 31 | 26 | 32 | 24 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 2318 | 2015 | 2183 | 2479 | 2720 |
| **Poland** | 1475 | 1384 | 1435 | 1415 | 1504 |
| **Portugal** | 173 | 153 | 179 | 174 | 200 |
| **Romania** | 134 | 143 | 42 | 35 | 29 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 278 | 316 | 336 | 350 | 377 |
| **Slovenia** | 278 | 201 | 188 | 222 | 206 |
| **Spain** | 6302 | 6379 | 7198 | 8649 | 7062 |
| **Sweden** | 268 | 325 | 443 | 973 | 1216 |
| **Average** | 1763 | 1662 | 1519 | 1406 | 1239 |
| **Median** | 267 | 297 | 336 | 322 | 377 |
| **Minimum** | 23 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 24473 | 23736 | 18323 | 15125 | 10488 |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 3.20.11: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 146 | 178 | 138 | 157 | 172 |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 215 | 240 | 207 | 217 | 138 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 33 | 28 | 41 | 47 | 71 |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 14 | 20 |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 2663 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 154 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 265 | 414 | 442 | 458 | 480 |
| **Ireland** | 24 | 15 | 21 | 16 | NA |
| **Italy** | 21398 | 20823 | 16047 | 13708 | 9525 |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 173 | 153 | 179 | 174 | 200 |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 278 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 266 | 183 | 180 | 210 | 194 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1102 |
| **Average** | 2533 | 2465 | 2157 | 1500 | 1457 |
| **Median** | 215 | 178 | 180 | 166 | 197 |
| **Minimum** | 24 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 20 |
| **Maximum** | 21398 | 20823 | 16047 | 13708 | 9525 |
| **% of NA** | 41% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | 26% | 26% | 22% | 15% | 11% |

**Malta:** 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 3.20.12: Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 29 | 23 | 18 | 31 | 19 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 89 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 23 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 550 | 479 | 365 | 243 | 331 |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 12 | 18 | 8 | 12 | 12 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 53 |
| **Average** | 197 | 136 | 130 | 72 | 101 |
| **Median** | 29 | 23 | 18 | 22 | 53 |
| **Minimum** | 12 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 12 |
| **Maximum** | 550 | 479 | 365 | 243 | 331 |
| **% of NA** | 44% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | 44% | 44% | 41% | 37% | 33% |

**Malta:** 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 3.20.13: Supreme courts, evolution of the total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | 9 | 25 | 47 | 48 | 25 |
| **Belgium** | 61 | 1 | 9 | 18 | 32 |
| **Bulgaria** | 4 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 9 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 0 | 0 | NAP | 0 | 0 |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NA | NA | 54 | 36 | 59 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 0 | 5 | 13 | NA |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 48 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Latvia** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Lithuania** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | 7 | 9 | 10 | 10 |
| **Slovenia** | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| **Average** | 13 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 11 |
| **Median** | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| **Minimum** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 61 | 99 | 54 | 48 | 59 |
| **% of NA** | **56%** | **48%** | 44% | 44% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | **7%** | **7%** | 11% | 4% | 4% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 3.20.14: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 4 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 9 |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Estonia | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | 0 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 48 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 0 | 5 | NA | NA |
| Hungary | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Italy | 43 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Latvia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA |
| Luxembourg | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Average | 12 | 20 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| Median | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Minimum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maximum | 43 | 91 | 5 | 9 | 48 |
| % of NA | 56% | 52% | 56% | 59% | 67% |
| % of NAP | 30% | 30% | 26% | 19% | 11% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

**Malta:** 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 3.20.15:Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

### Absolute values (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Romania** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Average** | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Median** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Minimum** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% of NA** | 44% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | 44% | 44% | 41% | 37% | 33% |

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

# Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court criminal cases

## Table 3.21.1: Supreme courts, Clearance rate (%) of criminal cases in 2024 (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 | 108,5% | 97,9% | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | 100,3% | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 109,9% | 116,8% | 116,7% | 103,6% |
| Croatia | 106,5% | NA | NA | NAP |
| Cyprus | 100,0% | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | 101,5% | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 64,2% | 64,2% | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 91,2% | 91,2% | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | 97,6% | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 101,2% | 101,6% | 90,8% | 96,6% |
| Germany | 96,8% | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 94,8% | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | 98,7% | 98,7% | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | 86,4% | 86,4% | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 110,6% | 111,5% | 86,2% | 108,0% |
| Latvia | 95,7% | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | 72,6% | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 113,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | 93,3% | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 98,0% | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 97,6% | 97,6% | NAP | NAP |
| Romania | 103,1% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 97,4% | NA | NA | NAP |
| Slovenia | 100,5% | 101,9% | 40,0% | NAP |
| Spain | 116,9% | NA | NA | NAP |
| Sweden | 94,9% | 92,9% | 85,2% | 133,1% |
| Average | 98,1% | 96,4% | 83,8% | 110,3% |
| Median | 98,3% | 97,9% | 86,2% | 105,8% |
| Minimum | 64,2% | 64,2% | 40,0% | 96,6% |
| Maximum | 116,9% | 116,8% | 116,7% | 133,1% |
| % of NA | 0% | 48% | 48% | 30% |
| % of NAP | 4% | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Malta:** 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: Supreme courts, Disposition time (in days) of criminal cases in 2024 (Q100)

| States | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Other criminal cases |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 128 | 92 | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | 93 | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 53 | 92 | 83 | 15 |
| Croatia | 38 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Cyprus | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| Czech Republic | 43 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Denmark | 603 | 603 | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | 118 | 118 | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | 164 | NA | NA | NAP |
| France | 140 | 141 | 206 | 67 |
| Germany | 91 | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 236 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | 107 | 107 | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 80 | 87 | 219 | 31 |
| Latvia | 117 | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | 452 | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 131 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | 294 | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 126 | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 69 | 69 | NAP | NAP |
| Romania | 54 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 137 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Slovenia | 85 | 81 | 548 | NAP |
| Spain | 235 | NA | NA | NAP |
| Sweden | 97 | 99 | 152 | 63 |
| Average | 148 | 149 | 241 | 44 |
| Median | 117 | 95 | 206 | 47 |
| Minimum | 0 | 69 | 83 | 15 |
| Maximum | 603 | 603 | 548 | 67 |
| % of NA | 4% | 52% | 48% | 30% |
| % of NAP | 4% | 11% | 33% | 56% |

**Malta:** 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 3.21.3: Supreme courts, evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 102,5% | 100,9% | 101,0% | 99,0% | 108,5% |
| Belgium | 101,4% | 94,8% | 95,7% | 100,1% | 100,3% |
| Bulgaria | 102,6% | 97,3% | 103,4% | 97,2% | 109,9% |
| Croatia | 101,0% | 160,9% | 136,4% | 113,7% | 106,5% |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| Czech Republic | 102,3% | 100,2% | 100,6% | 98,8% | 101,5% |
| Denmark | 103,3% | 110,2% | 79,4% | 92,5% | 64,2% |
| Estonia | 87,1% | 76,5% | 98,5% | 100,0% | 91,2% |
| Finland | 93,4% | 90,0% | 92,9% | 93,5% | 97,6% |
| France | 104,2% | 100,3% | 101,6% | 105,1% | 101,2% |
| Germany | 104,2% | 95,6% | 101,1% | 99,7% | 96,8% |
| Greece | NA | 87,8% | 84,0% | 114,9% | 94,8% |
| Hungary | 104,2% | 90,2% | 98,2% | 99,0% | 98,7% |
| Ireland | 103,0% | 131,4% | 84,8% | 109,8% | 86,4% |
| Italy | 97,7% | 101,6% | 111,9% | 106,8% | 110,6% |
| Latvia | 94,8% | 91,2% | 113,4% | 102,6% | 95,7% |
| Lithuania | 101,5% | 83,2% | 92,7% | 98,2% | 72,6% |
| Luxembourg | 119,0% | 100,0% | 112,8% | 89,5% | 113,6% |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | 95,1% | 102,1% | 89,8% | 86,2% | 93,3% |
| Poland | 110,7% | 102,6% | 98,5% | 100,5% | 98,0% |
| Portugal | 98,2% | 102,0% | 97,5% | 100,5% | 97,6% |
| Romania | 103,1% | 97,8% | 149,3% | 103,3% | 103,1% |
| Slovak Republic | 99,0% | 96,5% | 97,9% | 98,6% | 97,4% |
| Slovenia | 103,8% | 110,8% | 102,0% | 95,8% | 100,5% |
| Spain | 74,3% | 98,3% | 91,3% | 86,2% | 116,9% |
| Sweden | 96,4% | 97,8% | 96,3% | 87,7% | 94,9% |
| Average | 100,1% | 100,8% | 101,2% | 95,3% | 98,1% |
| Median | 101,9% | 98,3% | 98,5% | 99,0% | 98,3% |
| Minimum | 74,3% | 76,5% | 79,4% | 0,0% | 64,2% |
| Maximum | 119,0% | 160,9% | 149,3% | 114,9% | 116,9% |
| % of NA | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Malta:** 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.

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.21.4: Supreme courts, evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 150 | 162 | 151 | 166 | 128 |
| Belgium | 96 | 88 | 100 | 94 | 93 |
| Bulgaria | 91 | 98 | 90 | 93 | 53 |
| Croatia | 121 | 88 | 69 | 64 | 38 |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | 0 |
| Czech Republic | 38 | 39 | 42 | 48 | 43 |
| Denmark | 194 | 189 | 299 | 232 | 603 |
| Estonia | 95 | 247 | 82 | 84 | 118 |
| Finland | 122 | 151 | 159 | 173 | 164 |
| France | 146 | 147 | 152 | 135 | 140 |
| Germany | 77 | 94 | 92 | 90 | 91 |
| Greece | NA | 56 | 304 | 152 | 236 |
| Hungary | 66 | 110 | 106 | 107 | 107 |
| Ireland | 258 | 119 | 274 | 130 | NA |
| Italy | 237 | 184 | 132 | 110 | 80 |
| Latvia | 99 | 142 | 92 | 104 | 117 |
| Lithuania | 118 | 203 | 220 | 221 | 452 |
| Luxembourg | 226 | 226 | 216 | 229 | 131 |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | 261 | 215 | 280 | 304 | 294 |
| Poland | 151 | 126 | 126 | 121 | 126 |
| Portugal | 67 | 56 | 65 | 59 | 69 |
| Romania | 134 | 131 | 50 | 58 | 54 |
| Slovak Republic | 101 | 109 | 133 | 131 | 137 |
| Slovenia | 147 | 93 | 94 | 105 | 85 |
| Spain | 412 | 264 | 304 | 348 | 235 |
| Sweden | 45 | 46 | 53 | 94 | 97 |
| Average | 144 | 135 | 147 | 133 | 148 |
| Median | 122 | 126 | 126 | 108 | 117 |
| Minimum | 38 | 39 | 42 | 0 | 0 |
| Maximum | 412 | 264 | 304 | 348 | 603 |
| % of NA | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| % of NAP | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% |

**Malta:** 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.

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.21.5: Supreme courts, evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 102,8% | 95,7% | 106,1% | 97,4% | 97,9% |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 103,0% | 95,9% | 106,8% | 98,0% | 116,8% |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,0% | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 103,3% | 110,2% | 79,4% | 92,5% | 64,2% |
| Estonia | NAP | NAP | NAP | 100,0% | 91,2% |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 101,6% |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 87,8% | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | 104,2% | 90,2% | 98,2% | 99,0% | 98,7% |
| Ireland | 103,0% | 131,4% | 84,8% | 109,8% | 86,4% |
| Italy | 99,6% | 101,5% | 112,6% | 105,8% | 111,5% |
| Latvia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 98,2% | 102,0% | 97,5% | 100,5% | 97,6% |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 99,0% | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 104,5% | 112,4% | 100,5% | 96,1% | 101,9% |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 92,9% |
| Average | 102,0% | 103,0% | 98,2% | 89,9% | 96,4% |
| Median | 103,0% | 101,5% | 99,3% | 98,5% | 97,9% |
| Minimum | 98,2% | 87,8% | 79,4% | 0,0% | 64,2% |
| Maximum | 104,5% | 131,4% | 112,6% | 109,8% | 116,8% |
| % of NA | 41% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 48% |
| % of NAP | 26% | 26% | 22% | 15% | 11% |

**Malta:** 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 3.21.6: Supreme courts, evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 76 | 92 | 72 | 82 | 92 |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 145 | 150 | 151 | 166 | 92 |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | 194 | 189 | 299 | 232 | 603 |
| Estonia | NAP | NAP | NAP | 84 | 118 |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 141 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 51 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | 66 | 110 | 106 | 107 | 107 |
| Ireland | 258 | 119 | 274 | 130 | NA |
| Italy | 247 | 194 | 137 | 118 | 87 |
| Latvia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 67 | 56 | 65 | 59 | 69 |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | 101 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 149 | 89 | 101 | 103 | 81 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 99 |
| Average | 145 | 117 | 151 | 108 | 149 |
| Median | 145 | 110 | 122 | 105 | 95 |
| Minimum | 66 | 51 | 65 | 0 | 69 |
| Maximum | 258 | 194 | 299 | 232 | 603 |
| % of NA | 41% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 52% |
| % of NAP | 26% | 26% | 22% | 15% | 11% |

**Malta:** 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 3.21.7: Supreme courts, evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 92,0% | 108,8% | 106,9% | 86,2% | 116,7% |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,0% | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 90,8% |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 88,9% | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 93,3% | 110,3% | 116,4% | 119,3% | 86,2% |
| Latvia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 90,5% | 86,0% | 117,2% | 85,7% | 40,0% |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 85,2% |
| **Average** | 91,9% | 98,5% | 113,5% | 72,8% | 83,8% |
| **Median** | 92,0% | 98,9% | 116,4% | 85,9% | 86,2% |
| **Minimum** | 90,5% | 86,0% | 106,9% | 0,0% | 40,0% |
| **Maximum** | 93,3% | 110,3% | 117,2% | 119,3% | 116,7% |
| **% of NA** | 44% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | 44% | 44% | 41% | 37% | 33% |

**Malta:** 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 3.21.8: Supreme courts, evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)

| States | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Belgium | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Bulgaria | 131 | 113 | 85 | 140 | 83 |
| Croatia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0 | NA |
| Czech Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Denmark | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Estonia | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Finland | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| France | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 206 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | NA | 150 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hungary | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Italy | 360 | 231 | 164 | 118 | 219 |
| Latvia | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Portugal | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Romania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Slovak Republic | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovenia | 115 | 178 | 39 | 183 | 548 |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | 152 |
| Average | 202 | 168 | 96 | 110 | 241 |
| Median | 131 | 164 | 85 | 129 | 206 |
| Minimum | 115 | 113 | 39 | 0 | 83 |
| Maximum | 360 | 231 | 164 | 183 | 548 |
| % of NA | 44% | 41% | 48% | 48% | 48% |
| % of NAP | 44% | 44% | 41% | 37% | 33% |

**Malta:** 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 courts, Variations for criminal cases

## Table 3.22.1: Supreme courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q100)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | -6,0% | 3,1% | NAP | -2,2% | -2,5% | NAP |
| **Belgium** | 32,9% | NA | NA | 0,1% | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 9,3% | -10,3% | -18,2% | -5,0% | -3,5% | -23,4% |
| **Croatia** | -81,8% | NA | NA | 14,3% | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NA | NA | | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | -19,1% | NA | NA | -5,2% | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 11,7% | 11,7% | NAP | -16,3% | -16,3% | NAP |
| **Estonia** | -32,7% | NAP | NAP | 11,5% | 11,5% | NAP |
| **Finland** | 12,2% | NA | NA | 3,0% | NA | NA |
| **France** | -0,1% | NAP | NAP | -0,9% | NAP | NAP |
| **Germany** | 25,1% | NA | NA | 17,4% | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | -14,8% | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 17,3% | 17,3% | NAP | 5,2% | 5,2% | NAP |
| **Ireland** | 78,8% | 78,8% | NAP | 43,9% | 43,9% | NAP |
| **Italy** | 11,9% | 12,6% | 6,9% | -8,6% | -10,7% | 1,1% |
| **Latvia** | -19,0% | NA | NA | 10,1% | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | 1,9% | NA | NA | -4,7% | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | 40,5% | NAP | NAP | 3,5% | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 6,0% | NA | NA | 4,7% | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | 38,3% | NA | NA | 5,4% | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 13,7% | 13,7% | NAP | 2,0% | 2,0% | NAP |
| **Romania** | -45,9% | NAP | NAP | -9,9% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1,8% | NA | NA | 4,9% | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 33,2% | 38,7% | -52,4% | 9,7% | 11,1% | -28,6% |
| **Spain** | 24,8% | NA | NA | -11,0% | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 114,5% | NA | NA | 11,7% | NA | NA |
| **Average** | 11,2% | 20,7% | -21,2% | 2,8% | 4,5% | -17,0% |
| **Median** | 11,8% | 13,1% | -18,2% | 3,0% | 2,0% | -23,4% |
| **Minimum** | -81,8% | -10,3% | -52,4% | -16,3% | -16,3% | -28,6% |
| **Maximum** | 114,5% | 78,8% | 6,9% | 43,9% | 43,9% | 1,1% |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 52% | 52% | 0% | 52% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 19% | 37% | 4% | 15% | 37% |

**Malta:** 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 of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q100)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | -0,4% | -1,9% | NAP | 7,2% | -2,0% | NAP |
| **Belgium** | 31,4% | NA | NA | 0,3% | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 17,0% | 1,7% | 3,7% | 7,4% | 15,1% | 3,7% |
| **Croatia** | -80,8% | NA | NA | 7,1% | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NA | NA | | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | -19,8% | NA | NA | -2,5% | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | -30,6% | -30,6% | NAP | -41,9% | -41,9% | NAP |
| **Estonia** | -29,5% | NAP | NAP | 1,6% | 1,6% | NAP |
| **Finland** | 17,4% | NA | NA | 7,5% | NA | NA |
| **France** | -3,0% | NAP | NAP | -4,6% | NAP | NAP |
| **Germany** | 16,1% | NA | NA | 13,9% | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | -29,7% | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 11,1% | 11,1% | NAP | 4,9% | 4,9% | NAP |
| **Ireland** | 50,0% | 50,0% | NAP | 13,3% | 13,3% | NAP |
| **Italy** | 26,7% | 26,0% | -1,3% | -5,3% | -5,9% | -26,9% |
| **Latvia** | -18,2% | NA | NA | 2,7% | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | -27,2% | NA | NA | -29,6% | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | 34,0% | NAP | NAP | 31,4% | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 4,0% | NA | NA | 13,4% | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | 22,5% | NA | NA | 2,8% | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 13,0% | 13,0% | NAP | -0,9% | -0,9% | NAP |
| **Romania** | -45,9% | NAP | NAP | -10,0% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,1% | NA | NA | 3,6% | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 28,9% | 35,2% | -78,9% | 15,0% | 17,7% | -66,7% |
| **Spain** | 96,4% | NA | NA | 20,7% | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 111,2% | NA | NA | 20,9% | NA | NA |
| **Average** | 9,4% | 13,1% | -25,5% | 2,0% | 0,2% | -30,0% |
| **Median** | 12,0% | 12,0% | -1,3% | 3,6% | 1,6% | -26,9% |
| **Minimum** | -80,8% | -30,6% | -78,9% | -41,9% | -41,9% | -66,7% |
| **Maximum** | 111,2% | 50,0% | 3,7% | 31,4% | 17,7% | 3,7% |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 52% | 52% | 0% | 52% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 19% | 37% | 4% | 15% | 37% |

**Malta:** 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 of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q100)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | -15,0% | 17,8% | NAP | -17,4% | 9,6% | NAP |
| **Belgium** | 26,9% | NA | NA | -1,1% | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | -31,6% | -35,8% | -34,5% | -38,1% | -36,4% | -38,7% |
| **Croatia** | -94,0% | NA | NA | -37,3% | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NA | NA | | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | -8,0% | NA | NA | -11,0% | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 115,2% | 115,2% | NAP | 51,1% | 51,1% | NAP |
| **Estonia** | -13,0% | NAP | NAP | 42,9% | 42,9% | NAP |
| **Finland** | 58,1% | NA | NA | 2,2% | NA | NA |
| **France** | -6,8% | NAP | NAP | -0,6% | NAP | NAP |
| **Germany** | 36,9% | NA | NA | 15,5% | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 9,2% | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 81,1% | 81,1% | NAP | 4,8% | 4,8% | NAP |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | -57,1% | -55,5% | -39,8% | -30,7% | -30,5% | 36,2% |
| **Latvia** | -3,4% | NA | NA | 16,3% | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | 177,9% | NA | NA | 44,0% | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | -22,6% | NAP | NAP | -25,0% | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 17,3% | NA | NA | 9,7% | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | 2,0% | NA | NA | 6,3% | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 15,6% | 15,6% | NAP | 14,9% | 14,9% | NAP |
| **Romania** | -78,4% | NAP | NAP | -17,1% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 35,6% | NA | NA | 7,7% | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | -25,9% | -27,1% | 0,0% | -7,2% | -7,6% | 0,0% |
| **Spain** | 12,1% | NA | NA | -18,3% | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 353,7% | NA | NA | 25,0% | NA | NA |
| **Average** | 25,1% | 15,9% | -24,8% | 1,9% | 6,1% | -0,8% |
| **Median** | 2,0% | 15,6% | -34,5% | 3,5% | 7,2% | 0,0% |
| **Minimum** | -94,0% | -55,5% | -39,8% | -38,1% | -36,4% | -38,7% |
| **Maximum** | 353,7% | 115,2% | 0,0% | 51,1% | 51,1% | 36,2% |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 56% | 52% | 4% | 56% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 19% | 37% | 4% | 15% | 37% |

**Malta:** 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.

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

## Table 3.22.4: Supreme courts, variation of the Clearance Rate of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage points (Q100)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | +6,0 | -4,9 | NAP | +9,5 | +0,5 | NAP |
| **Belgium** | -1,1 | NA | NA | +0,2 | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | +7,3 | +13,7 | +24,6 | +12,7 | +18,8 | +30,5 |
| **Croatia** | +5,6 | NA | NA | -7,2 | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NA | NA | +100,0 | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | -0,9 | NA | NA | +2,7 | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | -39,2 | -39,2 | NAP | -28,3 | -28,3 | NAP |
| **Estonia** | +4,0 | NAP | NAP | -8,8 | -8,8 | NAP |
| **Finland** | +4,2 | NA | NA | +4,1 | NA | NA |
| **France** | -3,0 | NAP | NAP | -3,9 | NAP | NAP |
| **Germany** | -7,5 | NA | NA | -2,9 | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | -20,1 | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | -5,6 | -5,6 | NAP | -0,3 | -0,3 | NAP |
| **Ireland** | -16,6 | -16,6 | NAP | -23,3 | -23,3 | NAP |
| **Italy** | +12,9 | +11,9 | -7,1 | +3,8 | +5,6 | -33,1 |
| **Latvia** | +0,9 | NA | NA | -6,9 | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | -29,0 | NA | NA | -25,7 | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | -5,5 | NAP | NAP | +24,1 | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | -1,7 | NA | NA | +7,1 | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | -12,7 | NA | NA | -2,5 | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | -0,6 | -0,6 | NAP | -2,9 | -2,9 | NAP |
| **Romania** | +0,0 | NAP | NAP | -0,2 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | -1,6 | NA | NA | -1,2 | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | -3,3 | -2,6 | -50,5 | +4,7 | +5,7 | -45,7 |
| **Spain** | +42,6 | NA | NA | +30,7 | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | -1,5 | NA | NA | +7,3 | NA | NA |
| **Average** | -1,9 | -5,5 | -11,0 | +2,8 | -3,7 | -16,1 |
| **Median** | -1,3 | -3,8 | -7,1 | -0,2 | -0,3 | -33,1 |
| **Minimum** | -39,2 | -39,2 | -50,5 | -28,3 | -28,3 | -45,7 |
| **Maximum** | +42,6 | +13,7 | +24,6 | +100,0 | +18,8 | +30,5 |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 52% | 52% | 0% | 52% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 19% | 37% | 4% | 15% | 37% |

**Malta:** 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 3.22.5: Supreme courts, variation of the Disposition Time of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**in percentage (Q100)**

| States | Variations 2020 - 2024 | | | Variations 2023 - 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | Total number of criminal law cases | Severe criminal cases | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases |
| **Austria** | -14,7% | 20,0% | NAP | -22,9% | 11,8% | NAP |
| **Belgium** | -3,5% | NA | NA | -1,4% | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | -41,5% | -36,9% | -36,8% | -42,4% | -44,7% | -40,9% |
| **Croatia** | -69,0% | NA | NA | -41,5% | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NA | NA | | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 14,6% | NA | NA | -8,7% | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 210,2% | 210,2% | NAP | 160,0% | 160,0% | NAP |
| **Estonia** | 23,4% | NAP | NAP | 40,6% | 40,6% | NAP |
| **Finland** | 34,7% | NA | NA | -4,9% | NA | NA |
| **France** | -3,9% | NAP | NAP | 4,2% | NAP | NAP |
| **Germany** | 17,9% | NA | NA | 1,4% | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | 55,3% | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 63,1% | 63,1% | NAP | -0,1% | -0,1% | NAP |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Italy** | -66,2% | -64,7% | -39,1% | -26,7% | -26,2% | 86,4% |
| **Latvia** | 18,0% | NA | NA | 13,3% | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | 281,6% | NA | NA | 104,4% | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | -42,2% | NAP | NAP | -42,9% | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 12,8% | NA | NA | -3,2% | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | -16,8% | NA | NA | 3,4% | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 2,4% | 2,4% | NAP | 16,0% | 16,0% | NAP |
| **Romania** | -60,0% | NAP | NAP | -7,9% | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 35,5% | NA | NA | 4,0% | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | -42,5% | -46,1% | 375,0% | -19,3% | -21,5% | 200,0% |
| **Spain** | -43,0% | NA | NA | -32,3% | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 114,9% | NA | NA | 3,3% | NA | NA |
| **Average** | 18,5% | 21,2% | 99,7% | 6,3% | 17,0% | 81,8% |
| **Median** | 2,4% | 2,4% | -36,8% | -0,7% | 5,9% | 86,4% |
| **Minimum** | -69,0% | -64,7% | -39,1% | -42,9% | -44,7% | -40,9% |
| **Maximum** | 281,6% | 210,2% | 375,0% | 160,0% | 160,0% | 200,0% |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 56% | 52% | 4% | 56% | 52% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 19% | 37% | 4% | 15% | 37% |

**Malta:** 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.

**Greece:** The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated for 2022 data and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

# 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.*

**Austria**

**Q091 (2024):** 2.2. Registry cases (2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3) and 2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases: there is no known explanation for the reduction in cases. A connection to the Covid-19 pandemic is possible, but not certain. We just know that a lot of cases were resolved in 2023, but have no specific reason for this. It might be normal fluctuation.

**Q091 (2023):** Starting from 2022, "non-litigious family matters" are taken into consideration in the category "general civil non-litigious cases", while before they were communicated in "other".
Discrepancy (2.2.2.) is due to an above-average completion rate in 2023. The reason for this is unknown.
**Q091 (2022):** Starting from 2022, "non-litigious family matters" are taken into consideration in the category "general civil non-litigious cases", while before they were communicated in "other".
**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.

**Q092 (2014):** For the year 2014, this category has been extended to the enforcement cases.

**Q094 (General Comment):** We cannot differentiate between severe criminal cases and misdemeanours within the administrative cases. So while in administrative criminal law deprivation of liberty is hardly ever used, it is still possible to use it in a sentence. It is also an alternative way of a sentence in case the person is not able to pay the fine.
However, the administrative courts are apparently not able to separate their data according to the type of sentence they pass (even though prison sentences are so rare and one might think this is easy).

**Q094 (2024):** The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for criminal courts. However, the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

**Q094 (2023):** "The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for 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 (2022):** Non litigious family matters in the second instance have always been represented within the category of "non-litigious cases".
**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 (2024):** On the one hand, the table shows that there was a decline in the number of cases completed in 2022 and 2023 compared to previous years, although this only corresponded to a correspondingly lower number of cases in 2022. This ultimately resulted in the increase in the number of pending cases taken over in 2024.
In 2023, however, there was a significant decrease in the number of pending cases taken over compared to previous years. The sharp increase from 2023 to 2024 is therefore somewhat put into perspective when looking at the average of the previous years. By the end of 2024, the number of pending cases had returned to the level of previous years (2020 to 2022). Overall, therefore, there appears to be a fluctuation and not a sustained (negative) trend. We are not aware of any reasons for this fluctuation.

**Q098 (2023):** 2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year): One reason is that the number in the year before was comparatively not high. Also, the discrepancy is not that high when you look at the average in the last 6 years, which was about 685. The number of new cases however in 2023 was higher than 2022, still the number or resolved cases only sank a little. Otherwise we have no concrete reasons.
**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 (2024):** Administrative Law Cases: The number of 3187 pending administrative cases on 1 January ref. year corresponds to 3026 procedures adopted from previous years and 161 procedures completed in previous years and reopened in the reference year.

**Q099 (2023):** Administrative Law Cases: The number of 3185 pending administrative cases on 1 January ref. year corresponds to 2985 procedures adopted from previous years and 200 procedures completed in previous years and reopened in the reference year.
1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: The numbers are lower because more cases have been closed (obviously), other reasons as to why more cases have been able to get closed in 2023 are not known to the competent department.

**Q099 (2022):** Administrative Law Cases: The number of 3547 pending administrative cases on 1 January ref. year corresponds to 3392 procedures adopted from previous years and 155 procedures completed in previous years and reopened in the reference year.
**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 (2024):** The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.
The change in the number of pending administrative offence proceedings that are more than two years old compared to the previous year can be explained by the positive decline in lengthy proceedings.

**Q100 (2023):** The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.
1. Severe criminal cases: Same answer as in Q 99. The amount is lower, because less cases have been pending and therefore small changes have more impact relatively.

**Q100 (2022):** The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q091 (2024):** Q 91 “1. Civil (and commercial) litigation cases" - the discrepancy between the number of cases pending on January 1, 2024 and the number of cases pending on December 31, 2023, is due to a data cleanup operation: some cases had been temporarily excluded from the statistics pending verification by the clerks of the courts concerned.
Data for “youth” cases are only partially available, with only the number of incoming cases available (1 443 in 2024). As a result, “youth” civil litigation is not included in the table. Labor courts: data on “collective debt settlement” cases are not available for 2024 due to their migration to a new ICT program (JustRestart). As a result, they are not included in the table.
Concerning administrative cases (= sum of the figures for the Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, and the Flemish administrative courts -Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen): it should be noted that the last figure 1 330 (Cases pending for more than 2 years) only concerns the Council of State.
For the Council of State, the figures are as follows: 4 725; 2 549; 2 461; 4 774 and 1 330; for the Aliens Litigation Council: 13 935; 23 159 (a ruling may close several cases, hence the lack of complete horizontal consistency); 19 579; 17 509 and NA (for the last column).

**Q091 (2023):** For category 2 (non-litigious matters): there was a sharp increase in the number of cases filed electronically in 2023. This increase is linked to legislative changes (Act of 23 March 2019 introducing the new Code of Companies and Associations and containing various provisions’; effective from 1 May 2019; requiring amendment of the bylaws of ASBLs. Companies began complying with this requirement from September 2023, as the deadline was 1 January 2024. A large number of requests for amendments are currently being processed by the registry, as not all companies have yet finalised the necessary changes.
For administrative cases (= sum of 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): it should be noted that the last figure 1 546 (see last column ‘Cases pending for more than 2...’) only concerns the Council of State. Thus, for the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat), the figures are as follows: 4 521; 2 499; 2 049; 4 662 and 1 546; for the Aliens Litigation Council (Conseil du Contentieux des Etrangers): 9 584; 20 892 (one judgment may close several cases); 16 539; 13 935 and NA (for the last column). For administrative cases, the increase concerns cases brought before the Aliens Litigation Council (not those brought before the Council of State). This is due to an influx of applications before this court for the year 2023.

**Q091 (2022):** As concerns administrative matters, the total number of cases includes figures for the Council of State, the Alien Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen. However, the figure of 1392 (in the last column 'Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court') only concerns the Council of State. Thus data can be broken down as follows: for the Council of State: 4 425 (pending at the beginning of 2022); 2 214 (incoming); 1 996 (resolved); 4 523 (pending at the end of 2022) and 1 392 (pending for more than 2 years); for the Alien Litigation Council : 9 273 (pending at the beginning of 2022);16 456 (incoming; a judgment may close different cases hence there is a lack of horizontal conistency);16 139 (resolved); 9 584 (pending at the end of 2022) and NA.

**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".

**Q094 (2024):** It should be mentioned that cases dealt with by juvenile courts - “protectional (non-civil) cases” - are not included in the table. Due to technical reasons, only data on incoming such cases are currently available (10 178).
Cases heard by the investigation judge (Chambre du conseil) are not included in the table in order to avoid double counting the same criminal cases.

**Q094 (2023):** It should be noted that data on cases of the juvenile court are not included in the table. Due to technical reasons only figures for incoming cases (10 078) are currently available.
Point 3 “Other criminal cases”: there were 7 580 cases pending before the Investigation Court (Chambre du Conseil) on 1 January 2023; 17 191 incoming cases; 16 031 resolved cases; 8 740 cases pending at 31/12; 2 286 cases pending for more than 2 years. These figures are not included in the table, so as not to count the same cases twice.

**Q094 (2022):** Also to be noted: 9 398 for cases related to juvenile protection (only the category 'incoming cases' is available), not accounted for in the table. Point 3: Other criminal cases: the figure of 15 309 corresponds to cases before the Council Chamber (this figure is not included in the total of incoming criminal cases because data on resolved cases are not available). The figures for pending and resolved criminal 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):** Number of second instance cases: cases brought before appelate courts, labour courts and cases on appeal against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts (civil cases).
**Q097 (2022):** Appellate court (Civil Matters): Cases pending as of 01/01/2022 = 28525; cases pending as of 31/12/2022 = 27375; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date on which the case is brought before the courts at second instance = 11578. Labor court: cases pending as of 01/01/2022 = 5461; cases pending as of 31/12//2022 = 5294; Cases pending for more than two years from the date on which the case is brought before the second instance courts = 1416. Source: datawarehouse (data extraction date: August,1st,2023).
**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 Court of Appeal (criminal matters).
“Minor criminal cases”: appeals against decisions of Police courts brought before first instance criminal courts (the latter act as second instance courts in respect of Police courts’ first instance cases).

Youth protection cases: included under “minor criminal cases”.
“Other criminal cases”: since the last cycle, this category includes cases dealt with by the investigation judges (Chambre de mise en accusation). The latter is involved in the judicial investigation oversight, supervises pre-trial detention in particular, and decides on referral to the trial judge.

**Q098 (2024):** 2024 data on “youth cases” are as follows: 361; 1 585; 1 601; 345; 135; they are included in the table under ”minor criminal cases”.
“Other criminal cases”: cases dealt with by the investigation judges (Chambre de mise en accusation) are not included in the table to avoid double counting the same criminal cases (2024 data: pending on 1 Jan.: 2 718, incoming: 12 813, resolved: 12 497, pending on 31 Dec.: 3 034, pending for more than 2 years: 1 269). Source: data warehouse (date of data extraction: 06/25/2025
There is no specific explanation for the significant increase in the number of minor criminal cases pending for more than two years.

**Q098 (2023):** Youth cases: pending on 1 January 2023: 363; incoming cases: 1 578; resolved cases: 1 583; pending cases on 31 December 2023: 358; pending cases older than 2 years: 130.
“Other criminal cases”: data of the Investigation Court (Chambre de mise en accusation): pending on 1 January 2023: 2515; incoming cases: 12462; resolved cases: 12259, pending on 31 December 2023: 2718; pending cases for more than 2 years: 1149. Source: datawarehouse (data extraction date: 14/07/2024). These figures are not included in the table, so as not to count the same cases twice (consistency with Q 94).
There is no particular explanation for the significant increase in the number of minor criminal cases pending for more than two years.

**Q098 (2022):** Court of Appeal (criminal matters): Totals: Pending cases on 1/01/2022 = 6610; pending cases on 31/12/2022 = 6677; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date when the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 1436. Severe criminal cases (involving criminal and social offences): Pending cases on 1/01/2022 = 6304; pending cases on 31/12 /2022 = 6311; Cases pending for more than two years from the date when the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 1307. Cases related to juvenile protection: Pending cases on 1/01/2022 = 306 ;pending on 31/12/2022 = 366 ;Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date when the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 129. Source: datawarehouse(data extraction date :l/l8 /20l22). Other criminal cases = data concerning the Chamber of indictments (pre-trial stage).

**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):** The category of “administrative law cases” includes certain civil and social cases before the Court of Cassation, all tax cases before the Court of Cassation, and cassation cases before the Council of State.

**Q099 (2024):** The same methodology as in the last cycle is followed concerning the category of “administrative law cases,” which includes certain civil and social cases before the Court of Cassation, all tax cases before the Court of Cassation, and cassation cases before the Council of State. Concerning resolved administrative cases, for the Council of State the total of 505 resolved cases includes final judgments and orders of non-admission (342 + 163). There is no particular explanation regarding the observed variations in the number of cases.

**Q099 (2023):** Same methodology as last cycle.
Of the cases completed under “3. Administrative cases” (total 729 = 305 + 424), as far as the Council of State is concerned, it should be pointed out that the figure of 424 includes final judgments and non-admission orders (224 + 200).
No particular factor should be noted in the increase in administrative cases pending for more than 2 years.

**Q099 (2022):** The category "2.3 Other non-litigious cases" contains cases G (applications for legal assistance) brought before/dealt with by the Court of Cassation.
The category "4. Other cases" contains cases D (disciplinary matters) brought before/dealt with by the Court of Cassation.
For “administrative cases”, a new methodology has been adapted to comply with CEPEJ's definition for “an administrative case” (i.e., disputes between citizens and any public authority at local, regional or national level). Under previous cycles only cases dealt with by the Council of State were counted under point ”3.Administrative cases". For 2022, the category "3. Administrative cases" includes: 1) cases dealt with by the Council of State; 2) administrative cases dealt with by the Court of Cassation, namely a part of the C cases (civil cases): a considerable proportion of S cases - social affairs and all F cases - tax cases.
The number of resolved administrative cases before the Council of State (total 763 = 353 + 410) includes final judgments and orders refusing leave to appeal (189+221).

**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 criminal law cases (P register) of the Court of Cassation.
Source: Hof van Cassatie van België - Cour de cassation de Belgique - Kassationshof von Belgien
Justitiepaleis - Poelaertplein 1 - 1000 Brussel
Palais de Justice – Place Poelaert 1 – 1000 Brussels
**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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q091 (General Comment):** Proceedings related to registration in the Business and Land Registers (items 2.2.1 and item 2.2.2.) are heard by the Registry Agency at the Ministry of Justice, therefore the answers submitted for item 2.2. are NAP, as they refer to data on cases and/or proceedings that are not heard by the Bulgarian court system and, respectively, are not collected by the Supreme Judicial Council. The SJC also does not collect information on registration of associations and foundations, since according to the Non-profit Legal Persons Act, they are carried out in a register maintained by the Registry Agency and, respectively, RA is competent to provide data on them.
"Civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases" include only data available at the Supreme Judicial Council on the number of cases heard at first instance in district courts, initiated upon an application for issuing an order for the execution of a monetary obligation under Art. 410 and Art. 417 of the Civil Procedure Code – the so-called Order for payment cases and cases for divorce by mutual consent.

**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.

**Q093 (General Comment):** .

**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.
"Total criminal cases" includes all criminal cases - criminal cases of a general nature, criminal cases of a private nature, cases of exemption from criminal liability with the imposition of an administrative penalty in accordance with Art. 78a of the Criminal Code, private criminal cases, interrogation and administrative-criminal cases heard by the first instance courts.

**Q094 (2022):** "Total criminal cases" includes all criminal cases - criminal cases of a general nature, criminal cases of a private nature, cases of exemption from criminal liability with the imposition of an administrative penalty in accordance with Art. 78a of the Criminal Code, private criminal cases, interrogation and administrative-criminal cases heard by the first instance courts.

**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):** In Bulgaria registry cases are not resolved by the courts. They are under the competence of the Registry agency where is the property register, the commercial register and register of non-profit legal entities, the BULSTAD register and the Register of the Property Relations between spouses.

**Q097 (2024):** "Administrative law cases": the amount of pending appeal cases (3157) at the end of the year is the sum of the pending cases of all 28 administrative courts in the Republic of Bulgaria. The data show that the highest ratio of pending cases to the cases subject to consideration, as well as the ratio of pending cases at the end of the year to the total number of pending cases from the courts, are demonstrated by Administrative Court-Haskovo with 37% and 6% respectively, Administrative Court-Lovech (34% and 4%), Administrative Court-Ruse (32% and 5%), Administrative Court-Blagoevgrad (25% and 7%). After reviewing the data from these courts in the annual reports for 2024 that are publicly available on their websites, it was found that their pendency is due to the fact that for the large part of the appeal cases, the proceedings have been suspended to wait for the CJEU decision on a preliminary ruling and because most of the cases were submitted in the last quarter of 2024 that led to the objective impossibility of concluding them by the end of the year. The situation should be construed against the background of data on the number of incoming cases and the number of administrative judges (Q46-2), as well as the extremely accessible administrative justice in 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.
**Q098 (2022):** "Total criminal cases" include all criminal cases ofsecond instance - criminal cases of a general nature and criminal cases of a private nature (common offences and offences subject to private prosecution), cases of release from penal responsibility with imposing of administrative punishment in accordance with Art. 78a of the Criminal Code, private criminal cases, interrogations, and administrative-criminal cases.

**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.

**Q099 (2024):** The significant decrease in administrative cases pending for more than two years is due to the upward trend in cases resolved by the Supreme Administrative Court, which we have observed since 2022.

**Q099 (2023):** "Civil litigious cases pending for more than 2 years": the observed increase of more than 20% is due to: an increase in the number of interpretative cases, necessitating the suspension of court proceedings pending interpretative decisions; suspension of court proceedings due to preliminary ruling requests to the CJEU; suspension of court proceedings pending CJEU rulings; sending a case to a lower instance and delayed proceedings there; - the factual and legal complexity of the cases.
The increase in the number of administrative cases pending for more than 2 years by 38% between 2022 and 2023 (from 101 to 139) is because all of these 38 cases are suspended until the Supreme Court pronounces interpretative decisions.

**Q099 (2022):** "Civil litigious cases" - the reasons for the higher number of pending cases at the beginning of 2022 compared to 2021 are twofold: the large increase in case filings in 2021 and the critical staffing of the court, leading to a high backlog at the end of 2021. 1. The number of pending cases on 1 January 2022 is 845 more than on 1 January 2021, as the number of cases filed in 2021 is 1105 more than in 2020. As a result of the amendments to the Civil Procedure Law, access to cassation appeals has been expanded from the beginning of 2020 in cases related to consumer disputes, which in turn determined the increase in the number of cassation cases in the Civil Division and the Commercial Division. 2. In 2021 the Court is not sufficiently staffed due to the delay in the competitions for the appointment of judges in the Supreme Court of Cassation, as well as due to the retirement of judges in 2021 - 3 judges in the Civil Division and 1 judge in the Commercial Division.
"Administrative cases"/SAC/:Regarding the increase in the number of pending cases at the end of the reporting period (2022) and the higher number of cases initiated, compared to the number of cases completed, is explained, on the one hand, by the unevenness of the initiated cases by matter in the different divisions of the SAC, and, on the other hand - by the complexity and volume of the cases handled by some divisions (e.g. tax, customs, cases under the Management of Resources from the European Funds under Shared Management Act , public procurement, elections, etc.); the need for in-depth knowledge of European law, including requests for preliminary rulings to the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). The problem with the pending cases till issuance of interpretative decisions or rulings of CJEU continues to be relevant, as all such cases are suspended and that respectively results in delays in their consideration and further strains the schedule. In particular, an analysis of the factually and legally complex tax cases shows that the one-month time limit for court decisions is not optimal. The complexity of this type of cases and the need for direct application of Community law suggest another reasonable time-limit for the panel to issue its ruling. Furthermore, it should be stressed that in parallel with the judicial activity during the year under review, General meetings of First and Second Chambers of the SAC on interpretative cases for unification of the case law were held on a monthly basis. Joint meetings of the SCC and the SAC on joint interpretative cases were also conducted regularly. On the other hand, the decrease in the number of initiated cases during the reporting period is also due to undertaken legislative changes concerning jurisdiction. Last but not the least, in 2022, there was still a high incidence of COVID-19 among the judges and staff of the SAC, which further led to delay in the administration of justice of the court.

**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 (2024):** 1. 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.
2. In comparison the data from 2024 with those from 2023 it is ascertain that there is more than 20% difference in seven of the indicators which are marked at the chart with a comment.
With indicator “Pending cases on 1 January for the referent year – Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” it is marked the highest increase as a percentage (72.22%). The numbers in this indicator are small, respectively also the difference as an absolute amount is small, but it recalculates in a big percentage difference. In the particular case this difference is due to slightly increase number during 2023 of the incoming cases qualified as ”Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” representing the natural dynamic of the incomings during the years.
With indicator “Pending cases on 1 January for the referent year – Other criminal cases” there is difference of 10 cases but because of the low level of this indicator it recalculates in a big percentage difference (27.78%).
The same circumstance is valid regarding the indicator “Incoming cases – Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” – a slightly decrease of number of the incoming cases from this type during the referent year converts in difference of -23.40%.
The rest four indicators, where there is difference more than 20%, refers to the pending cases for all types to 31.12.2024 – “Pending cases on 31 December of the referent year – Severe criminal cases” (-36.41%), “Pending cases on 31 December of the referent year – Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” (-38.71%), “Pending cases on 31 December of the referent year – Other criminal cases” (-45.65%) and “Pending cases on 31 December of the referent year – Total of criminal cases” (-38.10%). The differences are due to, on one hand of the slightly decrease of the incoming of all types of cases and on the other hand, of the increase number of the magistrates at the Criminal College at the Supreme Court of Cassation that to 31.12.2023 is 28, and to 31.12.2024 is 30, which increased the number of decided cases of all categories.

**Q100 (2023):** 1. 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.
2. A comparison of the 2023 data with the 2022 data reveals a greater than 20% difference for seven of the indicators noted in the table with comments. For four of the seven indicators ("Pending Cases on January 1 – Misdemeanour and/or Minor Criminal Cases," "Incoming Cases – Misdemeanour and/or Minor Criminal Cases", "Pending Cases on December 31 – Misdemeanour and/or Minor Criminal Cases" and "Pending Cases on December 31 – Other Criminal Cases"), the obvious reason is that the numbers in all indicators are small, accordingly the differences are small in absolute value, and do not reflect a significant change in the performance of the Criminal Division of the Supreme Court of Cassation, but translate into a large percentage difference. For example, in the indicator "Pending Cases on December 31 – Misdemeanour and/or Minor Criminal Cases" a difference of 13 counts translates into a 72.22% difference.
There is also a significant difference in the indicators "Incoming cases – Other criminal cases" and "Resolved cases – Other criminal cases" in absolute value. It is due to the 15.87% increase in the total number of the filings in the Criminal Division in 2023 compared to 2022. This increase is greatest in cases for crimes classified as "Other" – 24.85%, which, in turn, leads to an increase in the number of cases decided in this category.
The increase in the number of cases filed for crimes classified as "Other" is due to the natural dynamics of the filings over the years, which is unpredictable within a narrow range. In the indicator "Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court" a large increase is reported – by 125%, but since the numbers are small (4 counts for 2022 and 9 counts for 2023), the reasons for this increase are not systematic, but rather related to the specifics of the each one of the cases. In 4 of the cases, judgments were rendered in early 2024, 1 case was suspended due to the illness of the defendant, and 2 cases could not proceed due to failure to receive information from a country in South America regarding the death of the defendant. The specific circumstances set out above indicate that the lengthy pendency of a substantial proportion of the cases referred to in this indicator is due to objective reasons.

**Q100 (2022):** 1. 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.
2. A comparison of the 2022 data with the 2021 data reveals a greater than 20% difference for five of the indicators noted in the table with comments. For four of the five indicators, the obvious reason is that the numbers for all indicators are small, so the differences are small in absolute value and do not reflect a significant change in the performance of the Criminal Division of the Supreme Court of Cassation, but are recalculated into a large percentage difference.
For example in one indicator – "Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court", a difference of 1 case is converted into a 20% difference. Only the indicator – "Incoming cases – Severe criminal cases" has a significant difference in absolute value. It is due to the reduction by 10% in the total number of admissions to the Criminal Division of the Supreme Court of Cassation in 2022 compared to 2021. This decrease is entirely in severe criminal cases – 23.15%, while in cases for minor crimes and in other cases the number almost does not change and even increases slightly (by 5.88% and 4.96%, respectively). The decrease is due to the natural dynamics of admissions over the years, which is unpredictable within a narrow range.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q091 (2024):** The Statistical Review of Court Operations for 2024 has also been updated to reflect the revised number of 36,411 in section 2.2.1, "Non-litigious land registry cases - Pending cases on January 1st of the reference year."
Although the number of cases in 2024 was roughly the same as the previous year, the courts' efficiency improved, as evidenced by the higher number of cases resolved and, as a result, a smaller number of unresolved cases at the end of 2024 (unlike in 2023, when courts were unable to process cases fully due to the strike of public and civil servants).
During 2023, the courts were unable to process the incoming caseload in its entirety, leading to an increase in the number of pending cases at the end of 2023 and continuing into 2024. This trend has persisted throughout 2024. For Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - In the course of case resolution activities, a greater number of cases older than two years were addressed, resulting in a reduction of 77 unresolved cases of this category compared to 2023.
3. Administrative law cases - During 2023, the courts were unable to process the incoming caseload in its entirety, leading to an increase in the number of pending cases at the end of 2023 and continuing into 2024. This trend has persisted throughout 2024. For Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - In the course of case resolution activities, a greater number of cases older than two years were addressed, resulting in a reduction of 77 unresolved cases of this category compared to 2023.
With regard to land registry cases — which account for nearly half of the total inflow of court cases in the Republic of Croatia — it is particularly important to emphasize the scope and volume of these data. The data are obtained exclusively through the Joint Information System of Land Registers and Cadastre (ZIS). The reliability and consistency of data concerning the work of 109 land registry departments largely depend on the timeliness and completeness of updates within the system itself. It is therefore likely that horizontal inconsistencies primarily arise for this reason.
Discrepancies in comparison with data from the previous year can be further explained by the extraordinary circumstances that affected court operations during 2023. Owing to the strike of court clerks and judges, there was a temporary suspension in the receipt and processing of cases, which resulted in a decline in activity. In 2024, following the resumption of regular operations, an increase was recorded both in the number of incoming and resolved cases, which is also reflected in the overall indicators. This increase should therefore not be interpreted solely as a result of structural changes in court operations, but also as compensation for the reduced level of activity in the previous period.

**Q091 (2023):** According to the comment of the previous period: „In 2022, the number of incoming Civil (and commercial) litigious cases dropped because of the unique situation from the previous cycle of a significant number of incoming collective labour cases from the public sector workers (more than 60.000 incoming cases). As a result of the characteristics of the previous period and, civil servants and employees' strike in 2023. the decrease is documented in the following categories: Pending cases on January 1 ref. year - 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases decreased by 20.92% and and Resolved cases decreased by 22.79%.
Q91.3 - The increase in incoming cases is due to the cases brought against the City of Zagreb in response to the cancellation of one of the social programs. We believe that this increase is extraordinary in this period.

**Q091 (2022):** In 2022, the number of incoming Civil (and commercial) litigious cases dropped because of the unique situation from the previous cycle of a significant number of incoming collective labour cases from the public sector workers (more than 60.000 incoming cases). Since they were resolved in 2022, this has led also to a significant increase in the number of resolved cases.
Regarding General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, as this includes enforcement cases which have had legislative changes during 2021, a new type of case has been recorded in courts by the end of 2021, which now seems to be a permanent increase in both incoming cases and resolved cases (up from an average of 40.000 cases received and resolved every year prior to 2021 to about 60.000 cases in 2021 and 90.000 cases in 2022. These are all cases of small value that are very quick to resolve.
For non-litigious registry cases, there is a slightly bigger horizontal inconsistency due to additional corrections from the sides of courts after the official published data.

**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).

**Q092 (General Comment):** The category “civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases” encompasses all non-litigious cases that are not stated in the different categories.
**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.

**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.
**Q094 (2024):** Due to the strike of court clerks and judges, there was a disruption in the receipt and resolution of cases, which resulted in a temporary decline in activity. In 2024, with the resumption of regular operations, an increase was recorded both in the number of incoming and resolved cases, which is also reflected in the overall indicators. This increase therefore does not indicate structural changes in court operations, but rather compensation for the reduced level of activity in the previous period.

**Q094 (2023):** Horizontal inconsistency corresponds to 2.62% of corrections to the "e-spis" system during a year.

**Q094 (2022):** The data for 2022 in “Other criminal cases” include only the execution of sanctions (imprisonment), investigation actions of a judge and cases connected to procedural matters. In this cycle, the number of other criminal cases decreased because we aligned our methodology with CEPEJ reporting and excluded some of the case types which in previous cycles were included. This is due to the fact that data for misdemeanour cases came from a separate case management system in the previous cycles (prior to 2020), and it was not possible to exclude those cases which do not fit any of the above categories.

**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 (2024):** Some data from this table for 2023 were not reported as they were unavailable at the time of questionnaire completion due to technical issues in the information system. The corrected data for 2023 were submitted together with the 2024 figures.
Regarding the number of unresolved cases older than two years, discrepancies exist because data for 2023 were not available.
Concerning non-litigious land registry cases, as previously mentioned, the 2023 strike and reduced court productivity resulted in increased backlogs, reflected in the higher number of unresolved cases at the end of 2023 and the beginning of 2024.
Although first-instance courts resolved more cases in 2023, this led to an increase in pending cases at the appellate level. Since courts were unable to process the incoming caseload, the overall number of pending cases increased.
A similar situation applies to non-litigious business registry cases.

**Q097 (2023):** The result of a three-month strike is a 71.55% increase in the total number of non-criminal law cases (1+2+3+4) - Pending cases older than two years from the date the case was filed in second instance court. The County Courts had the biggest increase in second-instance civil litigation (the High Commercial Court decreased such cases from 155 to 101, while the County Courts increased them from 1,092 to 1,991 cases).
2.2.1. Non-litigious Land Registry cases - the 2023 civil servants strike resulted in a decreased number of resolved cases and increased number of pending cases on 31 December.

**Q097 (2022):** Regarding second instance „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases", starting with early 2022, all the cases have been classified as „appeal on sentence" type of cases, instead of „enforcement cases", „family law cases", „labour law cases" or any other case type available in the court management system database, as it was in the previous cycles. Because of that, we are unable to differentiate between second instance litigious cases and second instance non-litigious cases (or any of the other types of cases for that matter). For „Other non-litigious cases", the reason for no available data is the same as regarding "General non-litigious cases", as those types of cases that would have been in the category of „Other non-litigious cases" according to the classification by the courts in the previous years, are also categorised as a generic „appeal case". As regards registry cases, there is no specific reason for the decrease in the number of resolved cases, as the number of incoming cases is roughly the same as last year (around 1.700 incoming cases). Regarding administrative cases, there is no specific reason for the decrease in the number of resolved cases, as the number of incoming cases is roughly the same as last year (around 5.500 incoming cases).

**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 th

e 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.

**Q098 (General Comment):** Due to the peculiarity of the Croatian legal system explained within the frame of question 94, the category “severe criminal cases” subsumes criminal cases under the jurisdiction of the 2nd instance county courts, while the category “misdemeanours and/or minor criminal cases” encompasses cases under the jurisdiction of the 2nd instance misdemeanour courts and the High Misdemeanour Court. Croatian legislation distinguishes misdemeanours and criminal offences. Misdemeanour Act prescribes that misdemeanours and misdemeanour legal sanctions can be proscribed solely for those behaviours that violate or threaten public order, social discipline and social values guaranteed and protected by the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia, international law and the laws whose protection is not possible without misdemeanour legal sanction, and their protection is not achieved with criminal coercion. The above shows that misdemeanours are certain behaviours that deserve sanction, but which by its severity and consequences do not deserve criminal liability.
Since the Criminal code does not strictly classify the categories of severe and minor criminal offences, we are not able to classify as misdemeanour/minor all offences for which it is not possible to pronounce a sentence of deprivation of liberty, and classify as severe offences all offences punishable by a deprivation of liberty
According to this, in the category “severe criminal cases” there are criminal cases under the jurisdiction of the 2nd instance county courts, while in the category “misdemeanours and/or minor criminal cases” there are cases under the jurisdiction of the 2nd instance misdemeanour courts and High Misdemeanour Court.

**Q098 (2023):** The increase in the number of criminal law cases in second instance courts (appeal) is due to the County Courts not resolving more cases than they received in either 2022 or 2023. This has resulted in an increase in the number of pending cases, with a clearance rate of 91% in 2022 and 89% in 2023. The strike has resulted in an increase in pending cases that have been in the second instance court for more than two years.

**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).
**Q099 (2024):** Considering that the Supreme Court has achieved very positive results in recent years (resolution rates ranging from 115% to 150%), the positive trend continued in 2024. Consequently, the number of unresolved cases has decreased. The incoming caseload in 2024 increased compared to 2023, as the inflow was reduced in 2023 due to the strike. Thus, in terms of incoming cases, the Supreme Court returned to the average levels observed over the past three years.

**Q099 (2023):** For several years, the Supreme Court has seen a decrease in the number of pending cases at the beginning and end of the year, as well as a decrease in the number of Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court.
**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 (2024):** Due to the Supreme Court's consistently high productivity, there was a notable reduction in the number of unresolved cases during 2023, which continued further into 2024.
**Q100 (2022):** The Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia distinguishes only if the case is civil or criminal, but does not classify case types in specific categories beyond that classification. The main classification in the Case management system is based on the instance of the procedure in the sense that there are some instances when the Supreme Court acts as a second instance appelate court. When the criminal procedure is regarding a very serious criminal offense (charges for which the jail sentence is more than 10 years), the County courts act as a first instance court, and all appeals are decided upon by the Supreme Court as a second instance court. In that sense, the classification of cases of the Supreme Court in the Case management system distinguishes only those cases which are from the position of the second instance or from the position of the third instance court. Since the recently established High Criminal Court of the Republic of Croatia has overtaken the role of the appelate court for the County courts in aforementioned instances, the Supreme Court has retained only the competency of a third instance court in criminal cases, but the cases are still distinguished in the same classification as before.

**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.

**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 (2024):** 1. Total of other than criminal cases:
There was an increase of cases filled before the new civil procedures rules were entered into force in September 2023. Pre-action protocols, set by the new rules, essentially refer to several rules and procedures that need to be followed by the parties before any action in Court and encourage a sufficient negotiation between the parties in order to achieve an out of court settlement which reduced the number of cases filed. This has led to many insurance cases being settled.
A new law was enacted establishing an out-of-court, fast-track procedure for the sale (foreclosure) of mortgaged immovable property
3. Administrative cases: Incoming cases decrease: this was due to the rejection of asylum to economic immigrants. Every appeal that is filed is formally registered and proceeds to trial, the only preliminary checks that are conducted, concern administrative details such as the applicant's name/address and so on. The observed 22% decrease in incoming cases is likely linked to external factors, such as a reduction in the number of new asylum applications or a slower rate of decisions, made by the Cyprus Asylum Service, which directly affects the number of appeals submitted to the Court
Resolved cases decrease: the court now has to go into the subject matter of the case. Since 2023 the profile and nationality of filed cases have shifted significantly. The Court's backlog has transitioned from being primarily composed of applicants from South and Southeast Asia, to a predominance of cases from Sub-Saharan Africa. Previously decision making was comparatively faster, as many of the appeals from Asian applicants involved largely unfounded or purely financial claims. The newer composition however, tends to have more complex and substantive cases, as is evident by the increased rate in positive decisions, requiring a deeper examination. While this has led to longer processing times, the overall backlog has remained relatively stable, after an initial increase, owing to a concurrent reduction in the overall numbers of appeals filed.

**Q091 (2023):** The courts have jurisdiction to deal with non litigious cases, however we do not have data on the number of such cases
**Q091 (2022):** The total number of resolved cases has increased as there was an increase in the number of judges. Administrative law cases include the cases filled at the Administrative court of international protection.

**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.

**Q093 (General Comment):** In Cyprus the number of cases presented in Q91 includes military court cases, rent tribunal cases, labour court cases and admiralty cases.
**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 (2024):** other criminal cases include cases before the military court.
**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):** As of the 1st of July 2023 the Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court were re - established. Also an Appeal Court was also created. Appeals filed after 2018 were transferred to the Appeal Court. Civil and Criminal appeals filed between 2013-2017 remained at the Supreme Court whereas administrative appeals are brought before the Supreme Constitutional Court.
**Q097 (2024):** The reference date for the previous cycle was 1st of July 2023 when the Court of Appeal was established, which explains the variatons not necessarily reflecting a real surge in caseload or efficiency.
**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):** As of the 1st of July 2023 the Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court were re - established. Also an Appeal Court was also created. Appeals filed after 2018 were transferred to the Appeal Court. Civil and Criminal appeals filed between 2013-2017 remained at the Supreme Court whereas administrative appeals are brought before the Supreme Constitutional Court.
**Q098 (2024):** The reference date for the previous cycle was 1st of July 2023 when the Court of Appeal was established, which explains the variatons not necessarily reflecting a real surge in caseload or efficiency.
**Q098 (2023):** On July 2023 an Appeal Court was established and any appeals filed after 2018 are tried by the Appeal court whereas any cases filed between 2013 -2017 (backlog) are dealt by the Supreme Court. The Supreme court acts no as a third tier last instance court only for legal issues.
**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):** On 1st of July 2023 an Appeal Court was established therefore a third tier system was created. The re established Supreme Court and Supreme Constitutional Court are now the the highest Courts. It is possible for a non litigious case to be brought before the Supreme Court however this is very rare.
Following a reference from the Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court adjudicates on appeals against decisions of first instance civil and criminal courts, including courts of specialised jurisdiction, on points of utmost public interest or of general public importance or on the consistency of law on conflicting or contrasting decisions of the Court of Appeal.
With the leave of the Court, the Supreme Court decides, at third and last instance, on applications filed, by the Attorney-General or by a party, provided that civil or criminal appeal proceedings on points of law preceded in the court below.
The Supreme constitutional Court deals with references of the President of the Republic on the constitutionality of Law. It also hears cases involving constitutional issues and acts as a third and last tier in administrative matters.

**Q099 (2024):** Civil and commercial litigious cases: The variations could be explained by the following:
- New jurisdictions were exercised by the supreme courts
- More cases were tried - the reference date for the previous cycle was 1st of July when the SC and the SCC were established
Administrative cases: in April 2024 250 administrative cases and 10 cases on cases of administrative court of international protection were transferred to the Supreme Constitutional Court and they were considered as pending at the start of the year.

**Q099 (2023):** The numbers in the table represent the cases pending on the 1st of July.

**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):** .

**Q100 (2023):** The supreme court has jurisdiction to hear criminal cases at a third level. There were no incoming or pending cases on the 1st of July 2023.

**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

**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 (2024):** There was a methodology change in 2023 and insolvency cases had been moved to category litigous cases. Also change was made for pending insolvency cases. It now only involves cases before the court decision about insolvency.
2.2. Registry cases (2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3) - 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 - All – 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 (2023):** There was a methodology change in 2023 and insolvency cases had been moved to category litigous cases. Also change was made for pending insolvency cases. It now only involves cases before the court decision about insolvency.
2.2. Registry cases and 2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry 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.
2.3. Other non-litigious cases (pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year) - 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 (2022):** Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: In general, the number pending cases in Czech republic is decreasing, which can be seen in the table.
Administrative law cases: There is a significant and steady decrease in law administrative cases in last years. Thanks to the decreasing number of incoming cases and thanks to the increasing of the number of judges, the pending cases are rapidly decreasing.

**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.

**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. 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).

**Q097 (2022):** Other cases are insolvency and incidency 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.
**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.
**Q099 (General Comment):** 4. Other cases: change in methodology in 2023 (to comply with the CEPEJ methodology), namely insolvency cases (and incidency cases) were moved to 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Q099 (2023):** 2. Non litigious cases (2.1+2.2+2.3) and 2.1. General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases - the number of cases is relatively small. And small number of cases means higher variance and thus the discrepancies can easily appear.
4. Other cases - Change in methodolgy, namely insolvency cases (and incidency cases) were moved to 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Q099 (2022):** Administrative cases: The Supreme court is overburdened and has trouble resolving its cases thus the number of pending cases grow quite quickly. It is connected to growth in the number of administrative first-instance cases in previous years and growing tendency to file an appeal to the Supreme Administrative Court.
Other cases: Includes insolvency cases. The changes are the result of changes in second-instance agenda.

**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.

**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"

**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. Administrative courts do not exist in Denmark, and administrative cases are initially dealt outside courts by court-like bodies, like appeal boards, committees, or councils. The number of “administrative law cases” which are litigious and go to courts 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.
Administrative law cases:
1. What is included in “administrative law cases” and what is the distinguishment between litigious and non-litigious administrative law cases; and what are non-litigious administrative case in Denmark. It is challenging to provide a clear answer for Denmark. Due to the way data is collected within the Danish Court Administration, it is unfortunately not possible to distinguish between the specific types of cases included under administrative law cases. The courts indicate whether a case is of an administrative nature, however, administrative cases occur across almost all categories within civil cases. Consequently, it is difficult to state unequivocally which types of cases they most appropriately belong to. 2. The approximate number of administrative law cases that are litigious and go to court, and their part of the overall “civil litigious cases
In the period from 2023-2025 the number of civil cases in Denmark was 181.064, and out of those, 10.947 was of administrative nature. Furthermore, approximately 6 percent of all civil cases over the past three years have been classified as administrative law cases. Cases concerning forced removal often fall within the scope of administrative law, however, such cases represent only about 2 percent of the total civil caseload. The two other categories with a notable share of administrative law cases are “general civil cases” and cases under “the simplified procedure”. Both of these categories are quite extensive in terms of volume as well as broad in their classification, meaning that administrative law cases constitute only a relatively small proportion within them. 3. The composition of the bodies such as appeal boards and committees Denmark has a well-developed system of specialized complaints boards that serve as administrative appeal bodies for decisions made by public authorities. These boards, such as Ankestyrelsen and the Consumer Complaints Board, provide citizens with accessible and cost-effective avenues to challenge administrative decisions. Denmark has over 80 complaints boards and committees across various sectors. They generally consist of a chairperson – often a judge or legal expert – and a mix of legally trained members and specialists relevant to the board’s area. Membership terms are typically four years. The exact composition varies by board: for example, the Consumer Complaints Board includes a chair (judge), vice-chairs, and representatives of consumer and business interests, while the Patient Complaints Board combines judges and health professionals. Appointments are usually made by ministries or local authorities, often based on nominations from relevant organizations.

**Q091 (2024):** 2. Non litigious cases (2.1+2.2+2.3) + 2.1. General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases (Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year): The lower number of registry cases is due to changes in the activity of mortgage bonds etc., which among other things depends on the number of housing transactions and restructuring of mortgage loans.
2.2.1. Non litigious land registry cases: we no longer register the pending cases for land registry as the system has been digitalized which means the processing time has decreased to an extent where it does not make sense to register.
4. Other cases: Notary services are increasing substantially with the advent of advance care directives in Denmark
Administrative law cases: changed from NAP to NA since Denmark does have administrative cases in courts, but they cannot be counted exactly.

**Q091 (2023):** The lower number of registry cases is due to changes in the activity of mortgage bonds etc., which among other things depends on the number of housing transactions and restructuring of mortgage loans.
Regarding 2.2.1 – we no longer register the pending cases for land registry as the system has been digitalized which means the processing time has decreased to an extent where it does not make sense to register.

**Q091 (2022):** The number of administrative litigious cases that go to courts in 2022 are estimated at 2600 which is 5,5% of the total number of incoming civil and commercial litigious cases in Denmark. They can not be easily separated from the other civil and commercial cases.
In 2022 there was still an aftermath of the unusual situation of the Covid-19 related to the periods with clos-ing down the society, including the courts. It has 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 in-coming cases with very large figures. 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 regula-tions/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.

**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.
**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 (2024):** There is a general incongruence in data due to faulty 2023 data, where second instance cases were mistakenly included.
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year (Total, 1 and 2) +1. Severe criminal cases (incoming):The substantial difference between incoming and resolved cases is partly due to the prosecution services being short-staffed and accruing case piles over the course of 2024, and partly due to the courts undertaking special efforts to reduce case piles.
The decrease in incoming severe criminal cases in 2024 can be attributed to the police and prosecution services having accrued a substantial case load surplus. They are not currently staffed to be attend court dates to the degree that is needed, and so a bottleneck effect has caused the number of cases being submitted to the courts to plummet. A three-year agreement to grant funding to the police and prosecution services is currently (as of fall 2025) in negotiations at state-level, after which the number of cases is expected to rise to previous levels.
Another, lesser factor of the drop in case numbers is the change to Danish procedural law implemented in 2024, where the threshold for whenever a case demanded lay judges was increased. The Danish Court Administration define severe criminal cases by whether lay judges are assigned or not. Fewer cases with lay judges equal fewer severe criminal cases in our data model.

**Q094 (2023):** The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19. Compared with data from 2022 the pending cases from 1/1/2023 appears higher. This is mainly due to late registration, where more pending cases can appear in the current extraction compared to when the CEPEJ data from 2022 was extracted. It's also partly due to a new method of calculation with more accurate data than previously. The number of pending cases from 1/1/2023 is the same as the number of pending cases from 31/12/2022 in our database. The Danish Courts are currently in the process of transitioning to a new registration system for criminal case types and certain non-litigious case types, so a period of adjustment was to be expected

**Q094 (2022):** In 2022 the courts are still dealing with a high number of pending cases in the aftermath of the situation with covid-19.
**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.

**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.
Administrative law cases: 1. What is included in “administrative law cases” and what is the distinguishment between litigious and non-litigious administrative law cases; and what are non-litigious administrative case in Denmark. It is challenging to provide a clear answer for Denmark. Due to the way data is collected within the Danish Court Administration, it is unfortunately not possible to distinguish between the specific types of cases included under administrative law cases. The courts indicate whether a case is of an administrative nature, however, administrative cases occur across almost all categories within civil cases. Consequently, it is difficult to state unequivocally which types of cases they most appropriately belong to. 2. The approximate number of administrative law cases that are litigious and go to court, and their part of the overall “civil litigious cases
In the period from 2023-2025 the number of civil cases in Denmark was 181.064, and out of those, 10.947 was of administrative nature. Furthermore, approximately 6 percent of all civil cases over the past three years have been classified as administrative law cases. Cases concerning forced removal often fall within the scope of administrative law, however, such cases represent only about 2 percent of the total civil caseload. The two other categories with a notable share of administrative law cases are “general civil cases” and cases under “the simplified procedure”. Both of these categories are quite extensive in terms of volume as well as broad in their classification, meaning that administrative law cases constitute only a relatively small proportion within them. 3. The composition of the bodies such as appeal boards and committees Denmark has a well-developed system of specialized complaints boards that serve as administrative appeal bodies for decisions made by public authorities. These boards, such as Ankestyrelsen and the Consumer Complaints Board, provide citizens with accessible and cost-effective avenues to challenge administrative decisions. Denmark has over 80 complaints boards and committees across various sectors. They generally consist of a chairperson – often a judge or legal expert – and a mix of legally trained members and specialists relevant to the board’s area. Membership terms are typically four years. The exact composition varies by board: for example, the Consumer Complaints Board includes a chair (judge), vice-chairs, and representatives of consumer and business interests, while the Patient Complaints Board combines judges and health professionals. Appointments are usually made by ministries or local authorities, often based on nominations from relevant organizations.

**Q097 (2024):** Administrative law cases: changed from NAP to NA since Denmark does have administrative cases in courts, but they cannot be counted exactly.
**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's an issue from a severe case in the district or a case that is not severe. Then the whole case may afterward be appealed to one of the two High Courts when the district courts have come to a final judgment. The lower number of cases in 2023 is due to a large increase in case processing time for the second instance courts. The increase contrasts with the first instance courts as well as the highest instance courts where the case processing time has also increased, but to a much lesser extent.

**Q098 (2024):** All criminal cases at the second instance courts are considered severe.

**Q098 (2023):** All criminal cases at the second instance courts are considered severe.
The lower number of cases is due to a large increase in case processing time for the second instance courts. The increase contrasts with the first instance courts as well as the highest instance courts where the case processing time has also increased, but to a much lesser extent.
**Q098 (2022):** All criminal cases at 2nd instance are considered severe as they would otherwise not become 2nd instance criminal cases. Due to periods of lock downs because of the situation with covid-19, the courts have still a lot of pending cases.

**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):** The number of incoming cases corresponds only to the number of admissible cases (excluding cases declared inadmissible which number is not available)
Administrative law cases: 1. What is included in “administrative law cases” and what is the distinguishment between litigious and non-litigious administrative law cases; and what are non-litigious administrative case in Denmark. It is challenging to provide a clear answer for Denmark. Due to the way data is collected within the Danish Court Administration, it is unfortunately not possible to distinguish between the specific types of cases included under administrative law cases. The courts indicate whether a case is of an administrative nature, however, administrative cases occur across almost all categories within civil cases. Consequently, it is difficult to state unequivocally which types of cases they most appropriately belong to. 2. The approximate number of administrative law cases that are litigious and go to court, and their part of the overall “civil litigious cases
In the period from 2023-2025 the number of civil cases in Denmark was 181.064, and out of those, 10.947 was of administrative nature. Furthermore, approximately 6 percent of all civil cases over the past three years have been classified as administrative law cases. Cases concerning forced removal often fall within the scope of administrative law, however, such cases represent only about 2 percent of the total civil caseload. The two other categories with a notable share of administrative law cases are “general civil cases” and cases under “the simplified procedure”. Both of these categories are quite extensive in terms of volume as well as broad in their classification, meaning that administrative law cases constitute only a relatively small proportion within them. 3. The composition of the bodies such as appeal boards and committees Denmark has a well-developed system of specialized complaints boards that serve as administrative appeal bodies for decisions made by public authorities. These boards, such as Ankestyrelsen and the Consumer Complaints Board, provide citizens with accessible and cost-effective avenues to challenge administrative decisions. Denmark has over 80 complaints boards and committees across various sectors. They generally consist of a chairperson – often a judge or legal expert – and a mix of legally trained members and specialists relevant to the board’s area. Membership terms are typically four years. The exact composition varies by board: for example, the Consumer Complaints Board includes a chair (judge), vice-chairs, and representatives of consumer and business interests, while the Patient Complaints Board combines judges and health professionals. Appointments are usually made by ministries or local authorities, often based on nominations from relevant organizations.

**Q099 (2024):** The nature of Supreme Court cases means that case flow numbers may vary drastically year to year.
Total of other than criminal law cases (1+2+3+4) + 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: Faulty reporting on 2023 data. The 2023 was updated on 24/11/2025 by the CEPEJ Secretariate.
Supreme Court has experienced a substantial rise in civil appeals the last few years
Administrative law cases: changed from NAP to NA since Denmark does have administrative cases in courts, but they cannot be counted exactly.

**Q099 (2023):** The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19. Furthermore, we have filtered a certain type of case from the data. The original number of 615 was due to the right for civilians to file a case online, which one citizen has done close to 400 times in 2023. The court is obliged to count and consider every case, however this has affected the data in a misleading way regarding incoming cases. The current figures are from the official statistics from 2023, where the misleading cases are also filtered out for a more fair picture of the number of actual cases in 2023.
The number of cases can be found in our key data from 2023 on our website www.domstol.dk
**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):** The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19.
**Q100 (2024):** All criminal cases at the highest instance court are considered severe. The nature of Supreme Court cases means that case flow numbers may vary drastically year to year.
**Q100 (2023):** The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19.
**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.

**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 (2024):** The workload of judges handling civil cases has increased.

**Q091 (2023):** no comment provided

**Q091 (2022):** No comment could be provided on the variations in the caseflow between 2020 and 2022.

**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”.

**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.

**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 (2024):** Overall workload has risen, but output has fallen.

**Q097 (2022):** "Administrative law cases": there are problems that have been dealt with but no results can be observed yet. Above all there were many vacancies in civil departments and that has had an effect in administrative too.

**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”.

**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 (2024):** The number of criminal cases has increased

**Q098 (2023):** Other cases are matters of preliminary proceedings and enforcement proceedings.

**Q098 (2022):** In recent years, there has been a (wide-ranging) generational change among judges in Estonia, which has led to a temporary drop in performance. especially in the district courts.
**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 (2024):** Total of other than criminal law cases (1+2+3+4) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year - The query was made at a different time, which explains the smaller number.
3. Administrative law cases - Overall increase in workload
**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 (2024):** Total of criminal law cases (1+2+3) and 1. Severe criminal cases Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year - Overall increase in workload
**Q100 (2023):** The Supreme court data only includes severe criminal cases.

**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.

**Finland**

**Q091 (General Comment):** The pending cases older than two years are not collected in Finland. 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. 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.

**Q091 (2024):** These explanations apply to questions 91, 97 ja 99 together. There may be several reasons for the increase of the case amounts. Firstly, in the last round, the reports had been taken on the 31 of December and now they have been taken in August. There can be significant changes in a half a year. At this stage, it is no longer possible to provide the data from 31 of December. Secondly, there has been an increase on the first instance case amounts. One explanation is the growth of summary civil cases.

**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.

**Q092 (General Comment):** The number includes cases dealt in the summary proceedings, divorce cases and petitions. Summary civil cases are undisputed civil cases that are decided by a district court in summary procedure, in other words in the written procedure. Such cases include undisputed debt collection cases, such as cases concerning unpaid rents, consumer credits and phone and electricity bills, as well as undisputed cases concerning evictions, restoration of possession or a disrupted circumstance. Summary proceedings can be initiated at a district court with an application for a summons that contains less information than what is required for other civil proceedings. The prerequisite for using the less detailed application for a summons is that the plaintiff, i.e. the creditor, has stated that to his or her knowledge the matter is not under dispute.
Enforcement cases: The enforcement authorities have the competence to decide on enforcement cases, not the courts. Cases mentioned here are appeals of enforcement measures to the district courts.
Requests for a change of name are handled in the Digital and Population Data Services Agency, not in the courts.

**Q093 (General Comment):** The land courts deal with disputes and appeals arising from surveying operations. The most common case types are the divisions, parcellings and encumbrances referred to in the Surveying Act, as well as the procedures under the Expropriation Act and the Private Roads Act. The procedure is very similar to the civil procedure in a district court. Land court cases are dealt with by the District Courts of South Savo, East Uusimaa, Kanta-Häme, Lapland, Oulu, Ostrobothnia, North Savo, and Southwest Finland. The land court, which acts as a separate department of the district court, has a district judge specialising in these matters as chairperson and a land court engineer and two lay members in the main proceedings. The decisions of a land court can be appealed against to the Supreme Court.
All matters concerning insolvency are classified as matters of petition, which means that they require court involvement. These matters are therefore not categorised as civil cases, i.e. dispositive matters between the parties. But, these matters can of course turn out to be litigious in the sense that there are conflicting opinions about the outcome, and the court must decide upon these after a more or less regular trial proceeding. Not all cases become litigious and the court may rule on insolvency/bankruptcy when the legal merits are met. In Finland we tend to define these as two-or-more-party disputes that may be concluded in agreement of the parties (dispositive) and the court is bound by the agreement. The indispositive cases are characterised by the “official principle” which means that only the court can decide the outcome after proceedings are initiated. The indispositive cases also tend to have different rules regarding the costs of the trial than regular civil cases. As a special court, the task of the labour court is to process and resolve disputes concerning collective agreements, as well as disputes based on the laws on collective agreements and collective agreements, defined in more detail in the law on proceedings in the labour court. Most of the time, the question is about the correct content or interpretation of the said agreements, or violations of agreements or labour and collective agreement laws and the resulting sanctions. In addition, the labour court, as an appellate court, resolves appeals against the decisions of the board for confirmation of the general bindingness of the collective agreement and appeals against the decisions issued by the labour council in certain exemption cases. The Labor Court is the only competent court in the above-mentioned matters. Its judgments cannot be appealed but are final and immediately enforceable. Note: The labour court therefore does not deal with all labor law disputes. Disputes arising from the employment contract between the employer and the employee are dealt with in the relevant district court, the decision of which, under certain conditions, has the right of appeal to the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court.

**Q094 (General Comment):** The cases are not statistically catecorised in severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor cases in Finland.
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 january 2023 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.

**Q094 (2024):** The growth of cases is linked to a large so-called Vastaamo criminal case which has an exceptionally large group of plaintiffs.
**Q094 (2023):** 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. 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.

**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 (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. 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.

**Q097 (2024):** See comment to Q91.
The trend of a growth of summary civil cases that is seen already at the first instance courts also reaches the second instance courts.

**Q097 (2022):** In previous years, military court cases of the second instance have been erroneously registered under Other civil cases, so in this statistical year, the before mentioned cases have been registered as criminal cases. Similarly, this question has previously included cases that have come in for consideration in the second instance courts as first instance cases. Since the first instance cases previously had their own procedure, from which it was not easy to determine whether the case concerned criminal or civil case, they were therefore registered in the group "Other cases". In this statistical year, it has been possible to find out whether they belong to criminal or civil cases and thus have been taken into account to the statistics according to the breakdown. In addition, "Other cases" have included cases related to releasing a prisoner serving a life sentence, which are also no longer counted in this group, because these are processed as separate applications and are not civil or criminal matters.

**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.
**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. 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.

**Q099 (2024):** Other cases include information on insurance matters, land rights matters, application matters, and pardon matters.
The Supreme Court received a smaller amount of cases but still solved a similar amount of cases which lead to the decrease of pending cases.
**Q099 (2022):** Administrative law cases: In the Supreme Administrative Court, there has been exceptionally high number of cases concerning international protection since 2017 and now as the number of incoming cases of this case category has decreased, the numbers have settled. This also corresponds to the decrease in the number of resolved cases, because the synergistic benefits of large number of cases with common features have decreased and the extra personnel resources reserved for clearing the backlog have been given up. Other factors that could have influenced the development are the increased court fees starting from 2016, as well as the change in the role of the Supreme Administrative Court in 2020, when the leave to appeal system became the main rule in appeals (previously it was an exception that was widely applied to different groups of cases from the possibility of direct appeal).

**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 (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.

**France**

**Q091 (General Comment):** Non-litigious cases relating to the commercial register are handled by the registry of the Commercial Court. These registries are charges and their activities do not fall within the remit of the Ministry of Justice.

**Q091 (2024):** Civil justice: following a change in methodology for calculating the case stock, the number of pending cases as of January 1, 2024 differs from the number of pending cases as of December 31, 2023 (provided in the 2024 questionnaire, based on an estimate). The data provided last year was based on estimates. We now have, from an annual survey, the total stock of the first instance court. We then categorised this stock (litigious cases, non-litigious cases, and other cases), based on the distribution observed for resolved cases.
The data provided this year is based on input from the courts' software, which allows us to categorise these cases accurately according to their different types.
However, this change in methodology results in a significant downward revision of the "other cases" stock and a significant upward revision of the "civil litigious cases" stock (the assumption we had based our estimate on was incorrect).
Following the 2021 divorce reform, and to avoid a break in the series, an estimate is used for 2024 (for litigious civil cases and non-litigious civil cases) based on 2019 data.
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stock of "civil and commercial litigious cases" at the beginning and end of the year does not include cases related to political electoral disputes. These cases represent 0.2% of the resolved cases in 2024.
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stock of "non-litigious civil cases" at the beginning and end of the year does not include prior attempts at conciliation. These cases represent 0.1% of the resolved cases in 2024.
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stock of "other cases" at the beginning and end of the year does not include cases (excluding consumer law) before the local court and wage garnishments. These cases represent 2.1% of the resolved cases in 2024 (respectively 0.4% and 1.7%).
For administrative courts:
Since 2024, cases from the National asylum court (Cour nationale du droit d'asile) are included in the number of first-instance administrative cases. The raw data for the CNDA is as follows:
•Pending cases on 1 Jan. = 26 132
•Incoming cases = 56 497
•Resolved cases = 61 593
•Pending cases on 31 Dec. = 22 194
•Pending cases for more than 2 years = 199
The 2024 data do not include those from the Paid parking court (Tribunal du stationnement payant). For your information, the raw data for these cases is:
•Pending cases on 1 Jan. = 224,637
•Incoming cases = 202 111
•Resolved cases = 146 267
•Pending cases on 31 Dec. = 281 392
•Pending cases for more than 2 years = 165 469
The data regarding pending cases before the Paid parking court excludes cases categorized as "automatic withdrawal of action". If, after the deadline given to the claimant to regularise their application, no regularisation occurs, the case is not processed and is rejected without a decision (inadmissibility due to incomplete documentation).

**Q091 (2023):** Source(s) for SSER data: exploitation of the General Civil Register, of the survey related to Administrative Activities and Statement 4 of the former "tribunaux d'instance", and the survey Annual Civilian Indicators.
Note: Following the 2021 divorce reform, and in order to avoid a break in series, an estimate is used for 2023 (civil litigious cases and civil non-litigious cases);
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stocks of "civil and commercial litigious cases" at the beginning and end of the year do not include cases relating to political electoral disputes. In 2023, these cases represent 0% of resolved cases;
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stocks of "civil non-litigious cases" at the beginning and end of the year do not include prior attempts at conciliation. In 2023, these cases represent 0.1% of resolved cases;
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stocks of "other cases" at the beginning and end of the year do not include applications (out of the scope of the Consumer Code) before the local court and seizures of earnings. In 2023, these cases represent 2.2% of resolved cases (0.4% and 1.8% respectively);
Due to the use of different sources to calculate pending, incoming and resolved cases, and the lack of data reporting explained above, the number of pending cases at the end of the year does not correspond to the result of (pending cases at the beginning of the year + incoming cases) – resolved cases (horizontal consistency).
The stock of non-litigious cases as of 1 January 2023 has been revised compared to the stock as of 31 December 2022 (provided in the previous evaluation cycle).
Civil litigious cases: general litigious cases before ordinary courts, local courts and courts for rural leases, family cases, cases relating to sales, agricultural work accidents, proceedings relating to companies in difficulty (safeguard, receivership and judicial liquidation) before the "tribunal judiciaire" and the commercial court, cases of "juges aux orders", the liberty and detention judge (detention of foreigners and compulsory hospitalization) and the social division of the "tribunal judiciaire", ordinary procedures before the labour tribunal, litigious cases before the commercial court, cases relating to the protection of adults, cases relating to political electoral disputes.

**Q091 (2022):** Source: Ministry of Justice/SG/SEM/SDSE, General Civil Registry; Council of State.
Following a change in methodology, the "civil (and commercial) litigious cases" now include: general litigation cases before the judicial tribunal, local court and "tribunaux paritaires des beaux ruraux", family matters, sales-related cases, agricultural work accidents cases, proceedings related to companies in difficulty (safeguarding, reorganization and judicial liquidation) before the judicial tribunal and commercial court , judge's orders matters, liberty and detention judge matters (detention of foreigners and involuntary hospitalization), as well as social division proceedings before the judicial tribunal; ordinary procedures before the labor courts; litigious cases before commercial courts; protection of adults' cases as well as political electoral disputes.

Following the 2021 divorce reform in order to avoid any disruption in series continuity, an estimate is used for 2022 (civil litigious and non-litigious cases).

Due to lack of data, the number of pending cases at the beginning and the end of 2022 related to political electoral disputes is not included in the number of pending civil litigious cases. These represent 0.6% of the resolved case-load in 2022. The same applies to attempts at conciliation. These represent 0.6%of completed case load in 2022. Due to the lack of data, the number of pending "other cases" at the beginning and end of the refernce year do not include applications (excluding the Consumer Code) before the local court and seizures on remuneration. In 2022, these cases accounted for 8.3% of resolved cases (1.7% and 6.6% respectively). The lack of data on pending cases for the enumerated case types explains the lack of horizontal consistency in the table.

**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 hea

lth 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).
4°) The orders of March and November 2020 allowed the interim relief judge to rule without a hearing, in addition to the cases provided for in article L. 522-3 of the Code of Administrative Justice.
Many courts have indicated that they have dispensed with a hearing. The dispensation of a hearing was most frequently applied in the case of summary proceedings for suspension. In the case of interim relief, this dispensation was applied in a more measured way.
Finally, summary proceedings other than suspension and liberty have been exempted from a hearing in many jurisdictions.
5°) The possibility for the administrative courts of appeal to rule by order without a hearing on applications for a stay of execution was little applied, since only 3 CAA indicated that they had applied it.
6°) In matters of DALO-Injunction, the possibility of ruling by order was used by 12 courts and, for almost all of these courts, for more than 60% of the cases judged during the same period.
II - The courts made very little use of the derogation provisions relating to the composition of the trial panels. In fact, no court made use of the possibility of completing a panel of judges with the participation of an honorary magistrate from another court. Only one administrative court requested the participation of a judge from another court (one judge came to assist for a period of three months).
III - The provisions allowing heads of court to appoint advisers to rule by order under the conditions set out in article R. 222-13 of the CJA were hardly used: only two administrative courts applied them. One head of court had appointed one or more advisers but no order was made by this magistrate or these magistrates. Another head of court indicated that the designated magistrate(s) signed more than 200 orders. In total, it appears that the measures provided for have been used very differently depending on the measure taken into account. Video hearings and the new rules for summary proceedings have opened up possibilities, with provisions that can be seen as having been the medium for experimentation. "

**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 (General Comment):** Other non-litigious civil cases include the following: divorce by mutual consent, legal separation, change of matrimonial regime, applications relating to parental authority, adoption, medically assisted procreation, incapacity of a minor, inheritance, compensation for violation of privacy, change of name, civil status, nationality, the operation of a group and the discipline of notaries and ministerial officers.
**Q092 (2014):** In 2014, the category civil cases (and commercial) non-litigious are also included in non-litigious cases relating to enforcement.
**Q094 (2024):** Source(s): SSER, frame-survey of prosecution services and Cassiopée statistical file (serious offenses: crimes and felonies); Minos statistical file (minor offenses = infractions, excluding the catgeory C5).
**Q094 (2023):** Source(s): SSER, survey of public prosecutors and Cassiopée statistical file (serious offences: crimes and offences); Cassiopée statistical file (minor offences = fines, with the exception of 5th class offences).
In order to be able to distinguish, as requested, the cases that have gone through the investigation (arrived and completed), the volumes indicated in the category "Other criminal cases" are already contained in the 2 previous categories. The total is therefore not equal to the sum of the 3 volumes but to the sum of lines 1 and 2.

**Q094 (2022):** Source: Ministry of Justice/SG/SEM/SDSE, Cassiopeia statistical file.

With regard to "pending cases", it is not possible to provide this information as the data on the pending cases before police courts ('Minor Offences') are not available.

Furthermore, the line 'Total number' does not correspond to 1+2+3 but rather to 1+2. Indeed, in accordance with the request from CEPEJ, cases falling under the Investigating Judge have been classified under '3. Other Criminal Cases'. These are provided for indicative purposes only and should not be added to the other two categories so as to avoid duplication (which may fall within either minor or major offences depending on how each case proceeds).

**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 (General Comment):** Civil litigious cases: general litigation cases before the Court of appeal and civil cases from the special minors' chamber (educational assistance).
Special minors' chamber: these are educational assistance cases, handled in the first instance by the juvenile court judge and on appeal by the special minors' chamber. Although this chamber predominantly deals with criminal cases, these are indeed civil cases.
Civil non-litigious cases: non-litigious cases before the courts of appeal, such as divorces and separations by mutual consent, approvals of agreements to change the matrimonial regime, civil status matters (declaratory judgments, corrections and annulments of civil status records, and changes to gender records), adoption requests (both simple and full), and succession matters (vacant or unclaimed successions, sealing of assets, and disputes regarding the sealing process), as well as cases concerning the incapacity of minors (opening of guardianship, appeals against decisions of guardianship bodies, emancipation, authorization of an act or appointment of an ad hoc administrator in legal administration, control of an act in high-risk situations), preventive procedures for companies in difficulty (conciliation procedures and ad hoc mandate), preliminary conciliation attempts before the civil court and the local court, and procedures for amicable settlements in agricultural matters, SCI, and associations.
Other cases: Summary proceedings, requests, and special procedures before the Court of appeal, and the civil party in expropriation cases.
Summary proceedings (référé): these are emergency procedures that allow the judge, while respecting the principle of adversarial proceedings, to issue temporary but swift measures aimed at preserving the applicant’s rights (urgent measures without dispute, conservatory or restoration measures even if contested, pre-litigation expertise, or an uncontested provision payment).
The summary procedure takes place before the trial and does not provide a final resolution of the dispute; the defendant is summoned, and the decision rendered is only provisional.
Requests: this refers to a method of initiating legal proceedings, used for disputes where the claim amount does not exceed €5,000 or for disputes specified by law (e.g., guardianship cases, etc.).
Special procedure: these are specific procedures before the Court of appeal, mainly involving appeals on decisions related to the detention of foreigners and involuntary hospitalisation (86% of decisions in 2024), disputes regarding the amount and collection of lawyer's fees (8%), and claims for compensation due to provisional detention (2%).

**Q097 (2023):** Source(s) SSER: exploitation of the General Civil Directory
Civil litigious cases: general litigation cases before the Court of Appeal and civil cases of the Special Chamber for Minors (educational assistance).
Special Chamber for Minors: these are cases of educational assistance, dealt with in the first instance by the juvenile judge and on appeal by the Special Chamber for Minors. Although the majority of cases within the competence of this chamber are criminal cases, educational assistance cases are civil cases.
Civil non-litigious cases: non-litigious cases before the courts of appeal, i.e., divorces and legal separations by mutual consent, homologation of agreements for the change of matrimonial regime, cases relating to civil status (declaratory judgment, rectification and annulment of a civil status certificate and modification of the designation of sex), adoption applications (simple and plenary) and inheritance (vacant or unclaimed succession, sealing and contestation of seals) as well as cases of incapacity of a minor (opening of a guardianship, appeal against a decision of a guardianship body, emancipation, authorisation of an act or appointment of an ad hoc administrator in the context of a legal administration, control of an act in high-risk situations), preventive procedures for companies in difficulty (conciliation procedure and ad hoc mandate), prior attempts at conciliation before the first instance court and the local court and amicable settlement procedures in agricultural, SCI and association matters.
Other cases: summary proceedings, petitions, special proceedings before the Court of Appeal and civil parties to expropriations.
Interim measures (“référé”): these are emergency procedures allowing the judge, in respect of the adversarial debate, to order provisional but rapid measures aimed at preserving the rights of the plaintiff (urgent measure without dispute, precautionary or restoration measure even if disputed, expert opinion before litigation on the merits, payment of a provisional payment that is not seriously contestable). The summary proceedings take place before any trial on the merits and do not definitively settle the dispute, the defendant is summoned, and the decision rendered is only provisional in nature;
Applications (“requêtes”): this is a method of referral to the courts, which can be used for disputes for which the amount of the request does not exceed €5000 or for disputes specified by law (e.g. guardianship, etc.);
Special procedures: These are special procedures before the Court of Appeal, mainly appeals against decisions of the liberty and detention judge in matters of detention of foreigners and forced hospitalization (85% of decisions in 2023), disputes concerning the amount and recovery of lawyers' fees (8%) and claims for compensation for pre-trial detention (2%).

**Q097 (2022):** Sources: Ministry of Justice/SG/SEM/SDSE, General Civil Directory; Council of State.

Following a change in methodology, "litigious civil (and commercial) cases" now include: general litigation cases before the court of appeal and civil cases from the special chamber for minors (educational assistance).

As a result of a change in methodology, "non-litigious civil cases" correspond to non-litigious matters before the courts of appeal, namely: divorces and separations by mutual consent, approvals of agreements regarding changes in matrimonial regimes, matters relating to civil status (declaratory judgment, rectification and annulment of an act related to civil status, and modification of gender designation), adoption requests (simple and full), successions (vacant or unclaimed succession, affixing seals and contestation related to seals), as well as matters concerning minor's incapacity (initiation of guardianship proceedings, appeals against decisions made by guardianship authorities, emancipation, authorization for an act or appointment of an ad hoc administrator within the framework of legal administration, control over an act under risky circumstances), preventive procedures for companies facing difficulties, (conciliation procedure and ad hoc mandate), preliminary conciliation attempts before judicial tribunals and local courts, amicable settlement procedures in agricultural matters, non-trading property company and associations.

Following a change in methodology,"other cases" now encompass: interim measures ("référés"), petitions and specific procedures before the court of appeal as well as claims arising from expropriation. Below is a description of these types of proceedings: 1) Interim Measures ("Référés"): These are procedural steps that allow judges to order swift provisional measures aimed at preserving the rights of applicants (urgent measures without dispute; conservatory or restorative measure even if contested). Although these decisions are rendered without confrontation between parties they nonetheless pertain to disputes involving plaintiffs vs defendants. 2) Special Chamber for Minors: this involves educational assistance cases handled initially by juvenile judges with appeals being heard by this specialized chamber. While predominantly dealing with criminal cases this pertains specifically to civil issues. 3) Specific Procedures: these involve particular procedures before the court of appeal primarily consisting of challenges against rulings made by the "jujes des libertés et de la détention" on detention orders pertaining to foreigners' retention and forced hospitalization (83% -2022); disputes regarding lawyers’ fees amount and recovery (9%) ; petitions seeking compensation due to pretrial detention (2%). The lack of horizontal consistency in the table stems from missing data reports for certain specific categories of cases (see comment of Q91).

**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).
4°) The orders of March and November 2020 allowed the interim relief judge to rule without a hearing, in addition to the cases provided for in article L. 522-3 of the Code of Administrative Justice.
Many courts have indicated that they have dispensed with a hearing. The dispensation of a hearing was most frequently applied in the case of summary proceedings for suspension. In the case of interim relief, this dispensation was applied in a more measured way. Finally, many jurisdictions did not hold a hearing for summary proceedings other than suspension and liberty.
5°) The possibility for the administrative courts of appeal to rule by order without a hearing on applications for a stay of execution was little used, since only 3 CAA indicated that they had used it.
6°) In matters of DALO-Injunction, the possibility of ruling by order was used by 12 courts and, for almost all of these courts, for more than 60% of the cases judged during the same period.
II - The courts made very little use of the derogation provisions relating to the composition of the trial panels. In fact, no court made use of the possibility of completing a panel of judges with the participation of an honorary magistrate from another court. Only one administrative court requested the participation of a judge from another court (one judge came to assist for a period of three months).
III - The provisions allowing heads of court to appoint advisers to rule by order under the conditions set out in article R. 222-13 of the CJA were hardly used: only two administrative courts applied them. One head of court had appointed one or more advisers but no order was made by this magistrate or these magistrates. Another head of court indicated that the designated magistrate(s) signed more than 200 orders. In total, it appears that the measures provided for have been used very differently depending on the measure taken into account. Video hearings and the new rules for summary proceedings have opened up possibilities, with provisions that can be seen as having been the medium for experimentation. "

**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.
**Q098 (General Comment):** Cases are not categorised by type of offenses but by court chamber (criminal, investigation, sentence enforcement), which prevents us from providing the number of criminal cases by type of offense.
In terms of horizontal consistency, discrepancies may be noted due to difficulties in recording cases as a result of the change in digital criminal applications within the appeal courts. This is a transitional situation due to an improvement in digital tools.

**Q098 (2024):** Source(s): SSER, frame-survey of prosecution services. Differences between the number of pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023 and the number of pending cases on 1 Jan. 2024 may be observed due to the difficulties in recording cases resulting from the change of criminal applications within the courts of appeal.
**Q098 (2023):** Source(s): SSER, Public Prosecutor's Executives Survey.
**Q098 (2022):** Please note that for the year 2022, data regarding the criminal appeals chambers are not available. Consequently, it is not possible to provide the total volume of criminal cases at second instance. Furthermore, cases are not categorized by type of offense but by chamber (criminal, investigative, enforcement).
**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 (General Comment):** In non-litigious civil matters, an appeal to the Court of Cassation is possible, yet the statistics provided by the Court do not allow for their specific identification. Consequently, these non-litigious civil cases are grouped together with litigious civil cases.
**Q099 (2024):** "Other cases": QPC, requests for opinions, and other applications filed as the main matter.
"Civil litigious cases pending for more than 2 years": the numbers are small and affect the percentage changes. For administrative justice, the discrepancies noted between the number of pending cases on Dec. 31, 2023, and Jan. 1, 2024, are explained by updates to the Council of State's databases.
**Q099 (2022):** The category 'other' encompasses additional requests, such as advisory requests, priority questions of constitutionality, and petitions concerning the appointment of experts or mediators.

Source: Council of State / Court of Cassation
**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 man

ner. 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).
4°) The orders of March and November 2020 allowed the interim relief judge to rule without a hearing, in addition to the cases provided for in article L. 522-3 of the Code of Administrative Justice.
Many courts have indicated that they have dispensed with a hearing. The dispensation of a hearing was most frequently applied in the case of summary proceedings for suspension. In the case of interim relief, this dispensation was applied in a more measured way.
Finally, many jurisdictions did not hold a hearing for summary proceedings other than suspension and liberty.
5°) The possibility for the administrative courts of appeal to rule by order without a hearing on applications for a stay of execution was little used, since only 3 CAA indicated that they had used it.
6°) In matters of DALO-Injunction, the possibility of ruling by order was used by 12 courts and, for almost all of these courts, for more than 60% of the cases judged during the same period.
II - The courts made very little use of the derogation provisions relating to the composition of the trial panels. In fact, no court made use of the possibility of completing a panel of judges with the participation of an honorary magistrate from another court. Only one administrative court requested the participation of a judge from another court (one judge came to assist for a period of three months).
III - The provisions allowing heads of court to appoint advisers to rule by order under the conditions set out in article R. 222-13 of the CJA were hardly used: only two administrative courts applied them. One head of court had appointed one or more advisers but no order was made by this magistrate or these magistrates. Another head of court indicated that the designated magistrate(s) signed more than 200 orders. In total, it appears that the measures provided for have been used very differently depending on the measure taken into account. Video hearings and the new rules for summary proceedings have opened up possibilities, with provisions that can be seen as having been the medium for experimentation. "

**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 "severe 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.

**Q100 (2024):**
“Severe criminal cases / Minor criminal cases”: in the absence of statistical means to distinguish between appeals in cases that may or may not result in a prison sentence, appeals concerning the activity of the police court, which deals with petty offenses, have been classified under the category of minor offenses;
“Other criminal cases”: QPC, requests for opinions, and other petitions filed as main actions.
“Total number of criminal cases”: this number includes all criminal cases submitted to the Court of cassation.

**Q100 (2023):** No other data are available

**Q100 (2022):** The statistical system does not allow for distinguishing between appeals related to severe and minor offenses. The number of pending cases includes the enforcement litigation which was not taken into consideration for the previous years (2020 and 2021). The category "other criminal cases" encompasses requests for opinions, priority questions of constitutionality, and principal petitions.
Source: Court of Cassation.

**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.

**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 federal states, 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 surveys" 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 (2024):** "Non-litigious civil cases" represent non-litigious enforcement cases.
"Non-litigious business registry cases" represent - 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
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the administrative, social and finance courts
"Other cases" include family cases at the local courts and cases at the labour courts (family matters are not assigned to the category civil cases, because they are subject to a different procedural law).
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 (2023):** "Non-litigious civil cases" represent non-litigious enforcement cases.
"Non-litigious business registry cases" represent - 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
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the administrative, social and finance courts
"Other cases" include family cases at the local courts and cases at the labour courts (family matters are not assigned to the category civil cases, because they are subject to a different procedural law).
Land registry and business registry cases: One federal state could not yet submit numbers for 2023. The federal state's 2022 data was used to calculate the total.

**Q091 (2022):** "Non-litigous civil cases" represent non-litigous enforcement cases.
"Non-litigious business registry cases" represent - 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
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the administrative, social and finance courts
"Other cases" include family cases at the local courts and cases at the labour courts (family matters are not assigned to the category civil cases, because they are subject to a different procedural law). Discrepancies in comparison with the 2020 cycle: There has been a general decrease in incoming and resolved litigous civil cases als well as non-litigous civil cases (enforcement cases). No specific reason could be identified for this development.
Regarding pending "other cases", additional data on pending guardianship cases at the family courts has become available. Until 2021, only the number of incoming and resolved guardianship cases was available. These figures were included in the total of incoming and resolved "other cases" in previous years. The number of pending cases at 1 Jan. and 31 Dec did not include guardianship cases, because their their number was unknown. This year for the first time, pending guardianship cases were inculded in other cases pending on 1. Jan and 31. Dec. They amount to 118 751 pending cases on 1 Jan and 128 580 pending cases on 31 Dec.

**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.

**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.

**Q094 (General Comment):** General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section: please refer to the general comment Q 91
The category “severe criminal cases” includes criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” subsumes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.
“Other cases” include:
-proceedings 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 - 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
Only the number of incoming cases is available for "other criminal cases", because with regard to data collection through the "monthly surveys" these cases fall into the category “other caseload” (please refer to general comment Q91);
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court: please refer to the general comment Q 91;
Horizontal inconsistencies: Please refer to the general comment Q 91

**Q094 (2024):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes 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 (2023):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes 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 (2022):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes 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 (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: please refer to the general comment Q 91
Horizonal inconsistencies:
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 (2024):** Civil (and commercial) litigious cases include second instance civil cases at the regional courts and higher regional courts.
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the higher administrative courts and regional social courts.
"Other cases" include cases at the regional labour courts and second instance family matters at the higher regional courts.

**Q097 (2023):** Civil (and commercial) litigious cases include second instance civil cases at the regional courts and higher regional courts.
The number of incoming cases has decreased significantly compared to 2022 and is now back to the level of before 2019. The increased number of incoming cases in 2019 till 2022 was most likely a result of the flood of lawsuits brought against car manufacturers in connection with the "diesel emission scandal".
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the higher administrative courts and regional social courts.
"Other cases" include cases at the regional labour courts and second instance family matters at the higher regional courts.
"Other cases" - discrepancy between pending cases on 31st Dec. 2022 and 1st Jan. 2023:
A high discrepancy orrurs with regard to second instance labour law cases. The reason for this is that one federal state's data on pending second instance labour law cases is missing in the official statistic.

**Q097 (2022):** Civil (and commercial) litigious cases include second instance civil cases at the regional courts and higher regional courts. There was a rise in pending cases (1. January and 31 December) compared to the 2020 cycle as well as a decrease in resolved cases. This is most likely a result of the flood of lawsuits brought against car manufracturers in connection with the "diesel emission scandal". For example, the higher regional court of Stuttgart, where a large car manufracturer has its main offices, has seen a rise in pending cases (1 January) of more than 100% compared to 2020.
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the higher administrative courts and regional social courts.
"Other cases" include cases at the regional labour courts and second instance family matters at the higher regional courts.

**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.

**Q098 (General Comment):** General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section: please refer to the general comment Q 91
Horizonal inconsistencies:
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 (2024):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts. "Other" includes 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.

**Q098 (2023):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts. "Other" includes 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.

**Q098 (2022):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts. "Other" includes 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. Discrepancies in comparison with the last cycle:
The decrease in resolved severe criminal cases can mostly be attributed to second instance cases at the regional courts. No special reason could be identified for this development.
The decrease in pending minor criminal cases on 1 January is caused by the fact, the number of pending cases on 1 January 2020 higher than usual. No specific reason could be identified for this deviation or for the deviation of "other than criminal cases".

**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).

**Q099 (General Comment):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases.

**Q099 (2024):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases. The caseflow of all litigious and non-litigious other than criminal cases (including family matters) at the Federal Court of Justice 2024 was as follows: 6455 cases pending on 1 Jan.; 4761 incoming cases; 5867 resolved cases; 5304 cases pending on 31 Dec.
The total of other than criminal law cases is the total of administrative law cases (no. 3), other cases (no. 4) and the cases at the Federal Court of Justice mentioned above.
Administrative law cases include cases at the Federal Administrative Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court
Other Cases represent labour law cases at the Federal Labour Court.
Discrepancy of pending cases on 31 Dec compared to 2023: The dicrepancy is due to the fact that there were more resolved than incoming cases. The annual report of the Federal Labour Court does not mention any specific reason for this development.

**Q099 (2023):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases. The case-flow of all litigious and non-litigious other than criminal cases (including family matters) at the Federal Court of Justice 2023 was as follows:
5886 cases pending on 1 Jan.; 5897 incoming cases; 5328 resolved cases; 6455 cases pending on 31 Dec.
The total of other than criminal law cases is the total of administrative law cases (no. 3), other cases (no. 4) and the cases at the Federal Court of Justice mentioned above.
Administrative law cases include cases at the Federal Administrative Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court
Other Cases represent labour law cases at the Federal Labour Court.

**Q099 (2022):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases. The case-flow of all litigious and non-litigious other than criminal cases (including family matters) at the Federal Court of Justice 2022 was as follows:
5275 cases pending on 1 Jan.; 6624 incoming cases; 6013 resolved cases; 5886 cases pending on 31 Dec.
The total of other than criminal law cases is the total of administrative law cases (no. 3), other cases (no. 4) and the cases at the Federal Court of Justice mentioned above.
Adminstrative law cases include cases at the Federal Administrative Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court
Discrepancy of "other cases":
Other Cases represent labour law cases at the Federal Labour Court. The annual report of the Federal Labour Cort does not provide an explanation for the general decrease in cases.

**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.

**Q100 (General Comment):** In alignment with the categorisation of cases in questions 94 and 98, “severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts. In the annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice, criminal proceedings according to criminal laws and regulatory fine proceedings are not reported separately.

**Q100 (2024):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". 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 of the Federal Court of Justice (including antitrust panel).

**Q100 (2023):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". 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 of the Federal Court of Justice (including antitrust panel).

**Q100 (2022):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". 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 of the Federal Court of Justice (including antitrust panel).

**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.

**Greece**

**Q091 (2024):** Independent Department of Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat).
pending cases at the beginning of the period show a significant increase compared to 2023. This is due to the implementation of Law 5108/2024 on the consolidation of first instance jurisdiction. According to the aforementioned law, as of September 16, 2024, the Magistrates' Courts were abolished, but their caseload (incoming and pending cases) was transferred to the respective Courts of First Instance with which the former Magistrates' Courts were merged. As an example, we mention the case of the Athens Court of First Instance, the largest court in Greece in terms of case load, where in the third quarter of 2024, before the Law 5108/2024 was implemented, 18,956 civil law cases were filed, while in the fourth quarter of 2024, when the aforementioned law was implemented, the number of cases filed rose to 36,278 (a percentage change of 91%).

**Q091 (2023):** Other cases:This increase compared to 2022 is obviously due to the normalisation of the functioning of the courts following the lifting of the restrictive measures imposed due to Covid19, which restricted the functioning of the civil courts in particular.
"Civil litigious cases pending for more than two years": During the Covid-19 pandemic period, which was declared by the WHO on 11/03/2020, the prevention and management measures for the virus were implemented in Greece on 11 March. These measures also affected the functioning of the courts and civil courts, as most cases, especially civil cases, were suspended. The measures were fully implemented on 15 March 2022, when the functioning of the courts gradually started to normalise. During this period, judicial officers were given the opportunity and time to process cases that had been backlogged during the previous period. This resulted in a reduction in the number of pending cases in civil and criminal courts, which is reflected in the statistics for the year 2023.

**Q091 (2022):** The data has been provided by the office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data, such as the training of staff and the creation of an instructional manual guide with definitions and instructions. These measures were intended to help collecting more reliable data from both small and large courts and prosecution services and eliminate the standard errors in judicial statistics. As our methodology is developing, discrepancies in data can be observed. Besides, as regards “Other cases”, it should be mentioned that some types of cases that were previously included in this category, are now distributed in the other case-categories in the table.

**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.
**Q093 (General Comment):** Obviously, when we refer to appeals, we do not include their discussion before the court, but their filing as a civil remedy, which in the case of the Greek procedural system is filed, and in some cases even discussed in the courts of first instance.
Payment orders are included in "other" because there is only one field "other cases" on the JastSTat platform where the cases listed in table 93 are entered collectively. In the future we will try to transfer the payment orders to category 2.1 in the new JastStat platform.

**Q094 (General Comment):** The category "other criminal cases" includes cases relating to pre-trial matters, imposition of criminal sanctions, commutation of sentences, granting of suspension, community service.
**Q094 (2024):** Independent Department of Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat).
The observed fluctuations in criminal cases can be partly explained by the legislative reforms introduced by Law 5090/2024, which amended the Greek Criminal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure. These reforms included the reinstatement of public prosecution for selected misdemeanors, the strengthening of the prosecution of domestic violence and organized crime. These changes may have affected the classification, volume, and speed of processing of criminal cases, resulting in deviations that are considered expected and explainable. Additional factors affecting statistics are: • transitional provisions: some changes were implemented gradually until July 1, 2024; • reclassification of offenses: changes in the classification of acts as misdemeanors or felonies; • revision of competences: transfer of competences from prosecutors to judicial councils for certain acts.

**Q094 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
The variations in the numbers should be construed in the light of the pandemic contexte. In the year 2022, courts were, even for part of the year, under a restricted regime due to the measures implemented in Greece to contain the Covid-19 pandemic. This gave the judges the opportunity, alongside new cases, to deal with cases that had already been heard. At the same time, however, due to the courts not being fully operational, the number of cases to be pending increased at the end of 2022, which were transferred for adjudication in 2023, when the courts were fully operational and consequently the flow of judgments was limited.
Moreover, it should be considered that there were 3 consecutive elections in Greece in 2023, which resulted in the suspension of the courts for about 3 months in total.
Obviously this increase is due to the full normalization of the operation of the courts after the lifting of the restrictions on their operation that had been put in place to deal with the Covid 19 pandemic, which came into full effect in 2022 (note that the judicial year in Greece runs from September to July, usually)

**Q094 (2022):** It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data. The content of the categories of criminal cases in the table are the same as for the previous evaluation cycle, but the services now monitor and record these cases better so discrepancies in data can be observed. This is especially the case for the Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases.

**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 (2024):** Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat).
Concerning the increased number of incoming and especially resolved civil litigious cases at the appeal level, it should be noted that he implementation of the new judicial map in Greece (Law 5134/2024) introduced structural changes that affected the distribution and classification of civil cases, as jurisdictional adjustments led to the transfer of certain case types to lower courts.

**Q097 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
"Civil litigious cases": in 2022 and because of the partial closure of the courts, cases were arriving for a second-degree trial but not being heard. Cases not heard in 2022 were postponed to 2023. We believe that this, combined with the simultaneous full operation of the courts, resulted in a reduction in the percentage of cases ultimately resolved in the appellate courts and a concomitant increase in Disposition Time.
Concerning the decrease in the number of civil litigious cases pending for more than 2 years, it should be recalled that during the Covid-19 pandemic period, which was declared by the WHO on 11/03/2020, the prevention and management measures for the virus were implemented in Greece on 11 March. These measures also affected the functioning of the courts and civil courts, as most cases, especially civil cases, were suspended. The measures were fully implemented on 15 March 2022, when the functioning of the courts gradually started to normalise. During this period, judicial officers were given the opportunity and time to process cases that had been backlogged during the previous period. This resulted in a reduction in the number of pending cases in civil and criminal courts, which is reflected in the statistics for the year 2023.

**Q097 (2022):** The data has been provided by the office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data, such as the training of staff and the creation of an instructional manual guide with definitions and instructions. These measures were intended to help collecting more reliable data from both small and large courts and prosecution services and eliminate the standard errors in judicial statistics. As our methodology is developing, discrepancies in data can be observed. Besides, as regards “Other cases”, it should be mentioned that some types of cases that were previously included in this category, are now distributed in the other case-categories in the table.

**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.

**Q098 (2024):** Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat)

**Q098 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
The observed variations in the figures should be construed in the light of the pandemic context. In the year 2022, courts were, even for part of the year, under a restricted regime due to the measures implemented in Greece to contain the Covid-19 pandemic. This gave the judges the opportunity, alongside new cases, to deal with cases that had already been heard. At the same time, however, due to the courts not being fully operational, the number of cases to be pending increased at the end of 2022, which were transferred for adjudication in 2023, when the courts were fully operational and consequently the flow of judgments was limited. Moreover, it should be considered that there were 3 consecutive elections in Greece in 2023, which resulted in the suspension of the courts for about 3 months in total.

**Q098 (2022):** The data has been provided by the office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data. The content of the categories of criminal cases in the table are the same as for the previous evaluation cycle, but the services now monitor and record these cases better so discrepancies in data can be observed. This is especially the case for the Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases.

**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 (General Comment):** After relevant communication with the IT department of the Supreme Court, it was clarified to us that "Due to changes in the OSDYPP of the Supreme Court, it is no longer possible to calculate Pending cases older than 2 years.
**Q099 (2024):** Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat)
Starting from 2024, cases dealt with by the Court of Audit are also included within the category "administrative law cases" together with cases dealt with by the Council of State.
**Q099 (2023):** For the reference year (2023) the data on the total of non-criminal cases dealt with by the Supreme court :2 728 pending at the beginning of 2023, 2 399 incoming, 1 915 resolved and 3 212 pending at the end of 2023,103 pending older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court.
**Q099 (2022):** It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data, such as the training of staff and the creation of an instructional manual guide with definitions and instructions. These measures were intended to help collecting more reliable data from both small and large courts and prosecution services and eliminate the standard errors in judicial statistics. As our methodology is developing, discrepancies in data can be observed. Besides, as regards "Other cases", it should be mentioned that some types of cases that were previously included in this category, are now distributed in the other case-categories in the table.
**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 (General Comment):** After relevant communication with the IT department of the Supreme Court, it was clarified to us that "Due to changes in the OSDYPP of the Supreme Court, it is no longer possible to calculate Pending cases older than 2 years.

**Q100 (2024):** Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat)

**Q100 (2022):** It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data. The content of the categories of criminal cases in the table are the same as for the previous evaluation cycle, but the services now monitor and record these cases better so discrepancies in data can be observed. This is especially the case for the Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal 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.

**Hungary**

**Q091 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
2.2. The reason for the change is the modification of the data specified in point 2.2.2.
2.2.2. The number of cases that remained pending at the beginning of the year was summarized, amounting to 20,159 cases in 2024 and 26,634 cases in 2023.
3. The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value based on the data compared to the previous year. (57 cases)
4. Labour cases as well as insolvency cases were consolidated. The number of pending cases at the beginning of the year was 46.83% higher in 2024 (26,813 cases) compared to the previous year (18,261 cases).

**Q091 (2023):** Discrepancy explanation regarding point "4. Other cases":
Due to emergency measures in 2020/2021, certain involuntary cancellation procedures were suspended by law, leading to a decline in their numbers. With the resumption of these procedures in 2022 – since they were mostly continued as insolvency cases - the number of incoming procedures has significantly increased.

**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.

**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 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
Total: The difference is due to the change explained in the subpoints, which has affected the overall result as well.
1. At the end of 2023, there were 1,322 cases pending for more than two years, which increased by 30.79% to 1,729 cases by the end of 2024.
2. With regard to misdemeanour cases, at the end of 2024 there were 27,600 pending cases, which is 28.66% more compared to the previous year.

**Q094 (2022):** As misdemeanour cases have very strict deadlines, the number of resolved cases strongly correlates with the number of incoming cases. The decrease of incoming cases may be a result of the end of the pandemic as misdemeanours in connection with it "disappeared" as well.
**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.

**Q097 (2024):** Other cases: insolvency cases, labour cases.
Discrepancy explanation:
Total: The difference is due to the change explained in the subpoints, which has affected the overall result as well.
1. The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value (at the end of 2023 5 cases, at the end of 2024 7 cases).
2.2. (2.2.2. and 2.2.3.), 2.3., 3., 4. We have verified the data, and they correspond to our records.
3. Administrative law cases pending for more than 2 years - There is currently no such case within the court system; therefore, the number is 0.

**Q097 (2023):** Discrepancy explanation regarding point "2.2. Registry cases" and "2.2.2. Non-litigious business registry":
The change in the data described in point 2.2.2. can also be explained with the same reasons mentioned in question 091 point 4., which also affects the data in point 2.2.
Discrepancy explanation regarding point "3. Administrative law cases":
In administrative law cases the 2022 data exclusively included regional court cases, which had concluded by the end of 2022. Due to jurisdictional changes, the current data displays regional court of appeal 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 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
Total: The difference is due to the change explained in the subpoints, which has affected the overall result as well.
1. The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value. At the end of 2024, there were 6 cases, while a year earlier there were 4 cases.
2. The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value. At the beginning of 2024, there were 13 pending cases, which is 38.1% fewer compared to 2023 (21 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 (2024):** Other cases: insolvency cases, labour cases
Discrepancy explanation concerning point 1. (civil litigious cases) and 2. (non-litigious cases):
The reason for the discrepancy between the data in the report and the data submitted in the previous year is not caused by a change in the legal environment, but rather the caseload in 2024, over which the Supreme Court has no influence.
Discrepancy explanation concerning point 3. (administrative law cases):
The differences indicated under Point 3 are explained solely by the changing nature and variability of the number of cases received. Unlike in previous years, there were no changes in legislation that would have affected the aforementioned data.

**Q099 (2023):** Discrepancy explanation concerning point 1. (civil litigious cases) and 2. (non-litigious cases)
The discrepancies reported by the CEPEJ in the context of the questionnaire for the EU Justice Scoreboard can be explained as follows.
Firstly, it should be noted that the procedural rules affecting the caseload have not changed in 2023, and consequently the explanation for the 2022 divergencies remains valid. (The decrease in the number of the so-called general civil litigious and non-litigious cases is due to several reasons. The most significant of these is the year-on-year decrease in the number of legal actions filed under the new Code of Civil Procedure, which entered into force on 1 January 2018. This is due, among others, to the increased role of diversionary procedures in the resolution of private disputes, such as mediation and the tripling of the threshold below which a property claim can be enforced by means of the issuing of a payment order by a notary public, i.e. in the framework of an out-of-court non-litigious procedure.)
This leads to the further conclusion that the decline in the number of new cases on a national level has led to an acceleration of case completions at all court levels, with the result that the number of completed cases is higher than that of newly received cases. The inevitable consequence of the foregoing is the trend of a fall in the number of cases pending at the end of the year. This explains why the number of 877 civil (and commercial) court proceedings pending on 1 January 2022 fell to 653 at the end of the same year, the latter figure being the starting number on 1 January 2023. (In the year 2022, the Curia received 1 846 new cases and completed 2 070 cases.) The same trend continued in the year 2023. (In 2023, the Curia received 1 772 new cases and completed 1 872 cases, as a result of which the number of pending cases decreased to 553 by the end of that year.)
Secondly, the vast majority of the cases under point 2.1, which make up the bulk of the data on non litigious proceedings [93 percent (359:385)], are cases concerning the designation of a court, typically referred to the Curia for the exclusion of a court. In this group of cases, the caseload is completely unpredictable and may, in some cases, be significantly different from the reference period due to the large number of proceedings initiated by a litigant.
For cases under point 2.2 and within subpoints 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and likewise for cases under 2.3, the caseload is extremely low (the Curia cannot even hear a case under subpoint 2.2.1) due to the rules of jurisdiction applicable to the Curia as the country's supreme judicial forum. The cases falling under the above categories represent – in respect of the newly received cases – only 10 percent (39:385) of all non-litigious cases. Given the small number of cases received, the minimal numerical discrepancy entails a relatively large percentage difference. In reality, therefore, there is no significant change in the caseload behind the relatively large percentage difference. In concrete terms, this means that in 2023 there were only 13 fewer cases in these case groups compared to the previous year. When assessing these figures, it should be noted that less than 2 percent of the 2 170 cases (Source: Curia Yearbook 2023) dealt with by the Civil Chamber of the Curia, not counting the 147 labour cases also dealt with by the Civil Chamber, are cases under points 2.2 and 2.3.
Discrepancy explanation concerning point 3. (administrative law cases):
The scoreboard, based on 2023 data, showed that the

number of cases pending, received and terminated on 1 January 2023 and the number of cases pending on 31 December 2023 decreased compared to the data provided in the previous year. The reason is that, in 2022, the performance of the adjudicative function of the Curia and its activity in the field of creating uniformed case law was affected by a legislative change. In 2021, the Curia was given competence to hear appeals, as a court of second instance, in administrative disputes, making the Curia a general court of second instance with jurisdiction over administrative cases throughout Hungary. In addition, the Curia also continued to act as a court of cassation. By the Autumn of 2021, the Curia had become the most overloaded court in the country. With the aim of reducing the Curia's caseload, the Parliament enacted Act no. CXXXIV of 2021, which provided that the regional appellate courts should be included in the second instance adjudication of administrative cases. As a result of the legislative change, effective from 1 March 2022, the Regional Appellate Court of Budapest, which has an Administrative Chamber, is to act as a general court of second instance in administrative cases. As the Curia has not transferred any of its pending administrative cases, the reduction of its caseload has been carried out gradually, in a so-called ascending order. The reduction of the caseload due to the legislative change was first shown in the data for 2023.

**Q099 (2022):** The justification for the changes is related to the fact that in the year 2021, the Curia's remedial powers – due to a law amendment effective from April 1, 2020 – extended to the second instance adjudication of legal disputes in public administrative cases, thus the Curia became the general court of second instance with nationwide jurisdiction in administrative matters. In addition, the Curia continued to operate as a review court, if the conditions for review as specified in the Act on Administrative Procedures were fulfilled in the given case. By the autumn of 2021, the Curia faced the highest workload throughout the country.
To stop the above trend, which has become critical, the legislator adopted Act CXXXIV of 2021 in which the legislator provided for that the level of regional courts of appeal should be involved in the second instance adjudication of administrative case. As a result of the amendment, effective as of 1 March 2022, the levels of judicial forums hearing administrative cases have changed. High courts having an administrative chamber will be general courts of first instance in administrative matters. The Curia has original jurisdiction in exceptional cases set out by law. Regional courts of appeal having an administrative chamber will be general courts of second instance. Thus, the abovementioned Act has provided for that it falls within the responsibilities of regional courts of appeal to hear cases at the ordinary appeal stage, and it has also provided for exclusive geographical jurisdiction, which means that the Act has reinstituted the second instance (appellate) jurisdiction of Budapest Capital Regional Court of Appeal in administrative matters.
The decrease in the number of the so-called general civil litigious and non-litigious cases can be traced back to several reasons. The most significant of these is that under the scope of the new Civil Procedure Code, which entered into force on January 1, 2018, the number of lawsuits is decreasing every year. Among other things, this is related to the fact that litigation diversion procedures, such as mediation, play a greater role than before in the settlement of private law disputes, and the value limit below which a property claim can be enforced with a payment order before a notary, i.e., in an out-of-court, non-litigation procedure, has tripled. As a result of all this, the timeliness indicators of the lower courts have improved continuously in recent years, which means that the number of protracted, more difficult decisions that can be challenged before the Curia as the highest court is decreasing.
The number of completions is basically determined by the volume of cases received, and although they show a decrease compared to the previous year, they significantly exceed the number of cases received, even though the number of judges handling such cases has decreased due to retirement.
We do not consider it justified to examine the reduction in the number of received and completed cases in so-called general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases by itself. In relation to the case groups indicated for the so-called general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, the number of cases received and completed changes continuously every year, which make up a fraction of all cases received by the Curia. Comparing the 2022 data with the 2020 data, it can be seen that in the indicated case group, fewer such cases were received in 2020 than in the current year, so the number of civil non-litigious cases received in 2021 was different from the average. Taking into accou

nt the general rules of statistics, the highlighting of some data may result in inadequate conclusions.
Our data collection methodology has not changed from the previous cycles. It is therefore recommended that we keep the data as it is, otherwise, the data provided will not be comparable with those of previous years.

**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.

**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 (2024):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases. As such, administrative cases are included in the figure for Civil (and Commercial) litigious cases.
**Q091 (2023):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases. As such, administrative cases are included in the figure for Civil (and Commercial) litigious cases.
**Q091 (2022):** The COVID pandemic had an effect on the courts' ability to deal with incoming business in 2020 especially, which explains the discrepancies with number of court cases in 2022.

**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.

**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.
We cannot provide data per case. Where there is more than one penalty imposed in respect of an offence, for example a fine, imprisonment and disqualification, a separate order would be made in respect of each penalty. However, if a case is dismissed or struck out, only one order is made. Our system records by outcome and as there may be more than one outcome in any one offence, it may appear that the figures for resolved cases are higher than those for incoming.
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 (2022):** The COVID pandemic had an effect on the courts' ability to deal with incoming business in 2020 especially, which explains the discrepancies with number of resolved cases in 2022. Regarding severe criminal cases both the Circuit Criminal Courts and Central Criminal Courts showed an increase in resolved cases (offences) in 2022. Resolved cases are cases where orders are made. There may be more than one order made in some cases which is why the figure for resolved cases is higher than that for incoming cases.

**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.
**Q097 (General Comment):** Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Q097 (2024):** Administrative cases are included as Civil (and commercial) litigious.

**Q097 (2023):** 3. Administrative law cases- We have given the response as NA as we do not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases. They are included in the figure for 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 (2023):** It is difficult to identify the precise reasons for an increase in incoming criminal cases in the appellate courts in 2023 due to the wide range of factors that may have been at play. For incoming criminal cases, these may include, but are not limited to, an increase in business in the first instance courts, the resumption of regular court activity following the Covid-19 pandemic, the appointment of 24 additional judges throughout 2023, additional Gardai resources, a potential increase in decisions to prosecute by the DPP, and the growing population of the state.

**Q098 (2022):** In 2020, the year in which the covid pandemic had its greatest effect on court business, the number of criminal appeals particularly in minor criminal cases was much lower than usual.

**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.
For pending cases, the Court Service record resolved cases as cases where an order is made. As there may be more than one order made in respect any case this can cause difficulty in accurately calculating figures for pending cases.

**Q099 (2024):** The increase in resolved cases in 2024 reflects a return to typical levels following the temporary reduction in 2023, which was impacted by the Supreme Court's involvement in reference to the Court by the President of Ireland of the Judicial Appointments Commission Bill 2023 under Article 26 of the Irish Constitution.
Civil and commercial litigious cases: Statistics for civil proceedings are recorded by cases received and cases resolved throughout the year. While some cases are formally discontinued either by order of the court or by formal notification (for example by filing a notice of discontinuance to the court, the majority of civil cases are settled between the parties, with or without court approval or are not pursued further by the plaintiff without notification by the plaintiff to the court. Most cases do not proceed to trial. It is therefore not possible to provide accurate figures for pending cases in most instances. While in previous cycles we provided the figure for pending civil and criminal cases in the Supreme Court this is no longer provided to ensure consistency with the other court jurisdictions.
The new case management system (UCMS) became operational in 2023 in the Central Office of the High Court. UCMS is being extended to all court offices and over the coming years the Courts Service will work to consolidate data processing and reporting for all case types in each jurisdiction.

**Q099 (2023):** Other cases in this instance are the appointments of Commissioners for Oaths and Notaries Public

**Q099 (2022):** There was an increase in 2022 over 2020.

**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 (General Comment):** For pending cases, the Court Service record resolved cases as cases where an order is made. As there may be more than one order made in respect any case this can cause difficulty in accurately calculating figures for pending cases.

**Q100 (2024):** We are not in a position to explain the reasons behind such increase, given the wide range of factors that may have been at play. For incoming criminal cases, these may include, but are not limited to, an increase in business in the first instance courts, additional Gardai resources, a potential increase in decisions to prosecute by the DPP, and the growing population of the state

While in previous cycles we provided the figure for pending civil and criminal cases in the Supreme Court this is no longer provided to ensure consistency with the other court jurisdictions.

In criminal matters, cases are counted by offence, not by case/defendant. Resolved cases are recorded as cases where an order is made. As there may be more than one penalty imposed in respect of an offence and a separate order made in respect of each penalty, the figures for resolved cases can appear to be higher than those for incoming cases and can cause challenges in calculating pending case figures.

While in previous cycles we provided the figure for pending civil and criminal cases in the Supreme Court this is no longer provided to ensure consistency with the other court jurisdictions. The new case management system (UCMS) became operational in 2023 in the Central Office of the High Court. UCMS is being extended to all court offices and over the coming years the Courts Service will work to consolidate data processing and reporting for all case types in each jurisdiction.

**Q100 (2022):** The number of cases pending in the Supreme Court has decreased between 2020 and 2022.

**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.

**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. In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has undertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html
The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 40% in the civil sector by June 2026 (all three instances together). More specifically, the targets for reducing the civil backlog in the First Instance Courts are: - Intermediate disposal target to be achieved by 31.12.2024: 95% reduction of civil cases registered (filed) until 31/12/2016 and still pending as of 31/12/2019 (baseline); - Final disposal target to be achieved by 30.06.2026: 90% reduction of civil proceedings registered (filed) from 01/01/2017 to 31/12/2022 and still pending as of 31/12/2022 (baseline).

**Q091 (2022):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has undertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html

**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.

**Q092 (General Comment):** Non-litigious cases include -amongst others- divorce and separation by mutual consent, change of divorce/separation conditions, judicial interdiction and incapacitation, hereditament, some family-related procedures, etc. Under this category also fall the following: order for payment procedures, proceedings for validation of eviction, precautionary proceedings and proprietary measures.
**Q093 (2014):** In the ambit of the 2014 exercise, the category “other” encompasses the number of enforcement cases.

**Q094 (General Comment):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has undertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogeing/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together).

**Q094 (2022):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has undertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html

**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. In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has udertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 40% in the civil sector by June 2026 (all three instances together). More specifically, the targets for reducing the civil backlog in the First Instance Courts are: - Intermediate disposal target to be achieved by 31.12.2024: 95% reduction of civil cases registered (filed) until 31/12/2016 and still pending as of 31/12/2019 (baseline); - Final disposal target to be achieved by 30.06.2026: 90% reduction of civil proceedings registered (filed) from 01/01/2017 to 31/12/2022 and still pending as of 31/12/2022 (baseline). The targets for reducing the civil backlog in the Courts of Appeal are: - Intermediate disposal target to be achieved by 31.12.2024: 95% reduction of civil cases registered (filed) until 31/12/2017 and still pending as of 31/12/2019 (baseline); - Final disposal target to be achieved by 30.06.2026: 90% reduction of civil proceedings registered (filed) from 01/01/2018 to 31/12/2022 and still pending as of 31/12/2022 (baseline). A monitoring system is in place and a detailed dashboard is available at https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx

**Q097 (2024):** The reduction is due to legislative reforms affecting this category.

**Q097 (2022):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has udertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html
The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 40% in the civil sector and 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together) .
More specifically a reduction of the civil backlog by 65% in first instance courts and 55% in appeal courts by the end of 2024; by 90% in first instance courts and appeal courts by June 2026. As far as the civil cases, such targets relate exclusively to litigious cases.
A monitoring system is in place and a detailed dashboard is available at
https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx

**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 the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has udertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogeing/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html The main goal in the criminal sector is a general reduction of the disposition time by 25% by June 2026 (all three instances together). A monitoring system is in place and a detailed dashboard is available at
https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx

**Q098 (2023):** 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 (2022):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has udertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at
https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html
The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 40% in the civil sector and 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together) .
More specifically a reduction of the civil backlog by 65% in first instance courts and 55% in appeal courts by the end of 2024; by 90% in first instance courts and appeal courts by June 2026. As far as the civil cases, such targets relate exclusively to litigious cases.
A monitoring system is in place and a detailed dashboard is available at
https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx

**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 (2024):** "Other cases" refers to residual cases dealt by the Supreme Court, such as cases regarding the competence or jurisdiction of the courts and correction of material errors.

**Q099 (2023):** In 2023, a reduction in the backlog of administrative cases has been achieved, as required by the targets of the Recovery Fund.
**Q099 (2022):** Within the framework of the National Plan for Recovery and Resilience (PNRR), Italy has taken a number of measures to reduce both disposition times and backlogs. The main objective is an overall reduction of 40% in the civil sector and 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together). More information on the reform is available at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html.
A monitoring system is also in place and a detailed dashboard is available at https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx.

**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.

**Q100 (General Comment):** "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. "Other cases" may relate to procedures pending in first or second istances (jurisdiction or competence conflicts between other courts), or pending in other countries (rogatory or capture instances); "Other cases" may also relate to decisions regarding the execution of imposed punishments (for example regarding the end or a change (home detenction) of the imprisonment), or to the correction of material errors on Highest Court's sentences.

**Q100 (2024):** "Other cases" may relate to procedures pending in first or second istances (jurisdiction or competence conflicts between other courts), or pending in other countries (rogatory or capture instances). "Other cases" may also relate to decisions regarding the execution of imposed punishments (for example regarding the end or a change -home detenction- of the imprisonment), or the correction of material errors on Highest Court's sentences.

**Q100 (2022):** Within the framework of the National Plan for Recovery and Resilience (PNRR), Italy has taken a number of measures to reduce both disposition times and backlogs. The main objective is an overall reduction of 40% in the civil sector and 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together). More information on the reform is available at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html.
A monitoring system is also in place and a detailed dashboard is available at https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx.

**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.

**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. In 2022 the increase in the balance of pending cases is related to changes in data collection, more specifically, from 2023 it is possible to determine the number of unfinished cases in non-litigious land registry cases.
In the spring of 2023, the Court Administration made improvements to the statistical data recording system, which prevented the collection of incomplete data related to the reorganization of the courts in previous periods. For these reasons, previously published data may differ and not be comparable.
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 business registry cases" are not defined in the Civil Code and are not within the competence of courts in the first instance. "Non-litigious land registry cases" is one of the cases which are one of the functions of district (city) courts in accordance with the Land Register Law. Examination of the Land Register matters shall be under the jurisdiction of district (city) courts.
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 (2024):** The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of cases, and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial procedure.
Incoming cases of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, e.g. uncontested payment orders, request for a change of name, non-litigious enforcement cases etc. - In 2024, a significant +31.67% increase was observed in the number cases of uncontested enforcement of obligations and cases of enforcement of Obligations according to warning procedures and cases of voluntary sale of immovable property at auction through the court. This trend was likely influenced by amendments to the Civil Procedure Law adopted on 5 October 2023, which entered into force on 2 November. These amendments enhanced procedural efficiency, clarified the application process, and expanded the scope of the procedure. As a result, the warning procedure became more attractive to creditors, particularly financial institutions and utility service providers. In addition to legal changes, the increase was also driven by economic factors—such as payment delays and inflationary pressures on household budgets—as well as the availability of digital tools that simplified the submission and processing of applications.
Pending cases on 31 Dec. of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, e.g. uncontested payment orders, request for a change of name, non-litigious enforcement cases etc. (if possible without administrative law cases, see category 3; without registry cases and other cases, see categories 2.2 and 2.3) - In 2024, there was a significant increase in the number of pending cases, particularly in the category of "debt enforcement under the warning procedure", where the number of unresolved cases rose by more than 60%. This increase is primarily attributed to two key factors: sharp rise in the number of initiated cases – In 2024, a substantial increase in the volume of cases was observed in this category and decrease in the number of judges specializing in this type of case. This has led to a backlog of cases and a slower pace of proceedings.
Pending cases on 31 Dec. Total - Due to the substantial increase in applications under the warning procedure, which falls under non-litigious civil matters, the courts of first instance experienced a backlog that significantly contributed to the rise in the total volume of pending cases across all civil case categories.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - Data indicates that the most significant growth occurred in administrative cases, where the number rose from 10 to 36 cases. A second notable increase in long-pending cases was observed in the group of litigious civil cases. Within this group, the highest number of unresolved cases older than two years was recorded in: insolvency proceedings – 552 cases and claims for debt recovery and damages – 361 cases.

**Q091 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. The timely consideration of cases as one of its priorities, also following the guidelines for the consideration of cases approved by the Council of Justice. This has affected the changes in the number of resolved cases and, accordingly, the number of pending cases and pending cases older than 2 years.
The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of first instance courts both in 2022 and 2023, with the merging of cases, and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial procedure.
Every year from 2019, significant increase in the number of received non-litigious civil cases has been observed. Mainly, it is due to the amendments to the Civil procedure law, which entered into forced in the end of 2021, which made it easier to submit applications for enforcement of obligations according to warning procedures, these changes contributed to the increase in the number of non-litigious cases received. Civil Procedure Law determines that the judge shall, within seven days take a decision.
The pending cases in the end of the 2022 were high, therefore also the pending cases on 01.01.2023. are higher, but during the year the ratio between received and resolved cases are balanced, because of the short case review period, which contributes that the number of received and completed cases is similar.

**Q091 (2022):** In 2022 the increase in the balance of pending cases is related to changes in data collection, more specifically, from 2023 it is possible to determine the number of unfinished cases in non-litigious land registry cases.
The number of pending cases on Jan. and on 31.Dec. is higher than 2020 year due high number of pending non-litigious cases. Every year from 2019, significant increase in the number of non-litigious civil cases has been observed. Compared to the 2020, the number of incoming cases and resolved cases increased significantly. The increase of incoming cases and resolved cases of non-litigious civil cases affected increase of pending cases. In the end of 2021, amendments to the Civil Procedure Law entered into force, which made it easier to submit applications for enforcement of obligations according to warning procedures, these changes contributed to the increase in the number of non-litigious cases received. Civil Procedure Law determines that the judge shall, within seven days take a decision The short case review period contributes to that the number of received and completed cases is similar.
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 (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.

**Q094 (General Comment):** 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.
Other criminal cases include execution of a sentence, cases on penal order of the prosecutor, cases on determination of compulsory measures of a medical nature.

**Q094 (2024):** Other criminal cases include execution of a sentence, cases on penal order of the prosecutor, cases on determination of compulsory measures of a medical nature. The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of cases, and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial procedure.
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year, In 2024, noticeable reduction in the backlog of other criminal cases was observed at the beginning of the year, with a discrepancy ratio of -32.80%, indicating a significant drop in pending cases compared to the previous period. This decrease is largely attributed to a decline in the number of cases involving prosecutor's penal orders.
Incoming cases. In 2024, compared to 2023, there was a significant increase in the number of criminal cases, particularly in categories involving severe offences. The most notable growth was observed in the following groups: criminal offences in road traffic safety: +128.25%, criminal offences against family and minors: +67.16%, criminal offences against the judiciary: +45.87%, criminal offences against public safety and order: +27.35%, criminal offences against property: +17.97%. This trend reflects a growing burden on the judicial system, especially in areas related to public safety, vulnerable groups, and traffic-related violations.
Resolved cases. In 2024, first instance courts saw an increase in the number of resolved criminal cases, with 5,766 cases adjudicated across key categories such as offences against property, traffic safety, and public order. This rise is directly linked to the high volume of incoming cases (6,548), particularly in severe criminal matters. Pending cases. The increase in the number of criminal cases received in 2024 had a direct impact on the volume of pending cases.
By the end of the year, the number of unresolved cases had grown. It should be noted that over the past two years, there has been a consistent rise in criminal case volume, which has had a negative effect on the clearance rate (CR%) across all first instance courts.

**Q094 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. The increase in the number of pending cases (older than 2 years) could be related that in the courts the court hearings in -person were restored, lifting the restrictions of Covid, when cases were mostly adjudicated in written procedure. The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of first instance courts both in 2022 and 2023, with the merging of cases, and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial procedure.

**Q094 (2022):** The decrease in the number of resolved cases is related to the drop in the number of cases received in the courts of first instance.
Decrease of pending cases on 1 Jan is related to the decrease of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases. In the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming and resolved of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal 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 misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases.
In 2022 the increase in the number of pending cases at the end of the year is related to changes in data collection systems` audit, more specifically, for misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases. Severe criminal cases, which are assessed according to the Latvian Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure Law, are decreasing each year. The tendency of the decrease in the number of criminal cases has been observed for a longer period of time. The reduction of severe criminal cases can be explained by changes in legislation. (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 2019.
The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly decreased. The decrease in cases is due to the lifting of restrictions, which were related to limiting the spread of Covid-19. The reduction of pending cases also is related to the court reform, 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. Starting from 2022, data on "other criminal cases" are also collected and inserted in the table.

**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.

**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” because such type of cases are not defined in the Civil Code. Accordingly, the reply in their respect is NAP. The “non-litigious land registry cases” are dealt with by the regional courts in second instance and they are within the competence of the first and second (appeal) instance.

**Q097 (2024):** Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court. The increase in the number of pending cases in administrative proceedings (older than 2 years) contributed to the overall growth in this group of cases. It should be noted that the rise in the number of pending administrative cases older than two years cannot be attributed to the court's capacity, but rather to the nature and complexity of these types of cases.

**Q097 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. The timely consideration of cases as one of its priorities, also following the guidelines for the consideration of cases approved by the Council of Justice. This has affected the changes in the number of resolved cases and, accordingly, the number of pending cases and pending cases older than 2 years.
The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of cases and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial process.

**Q097 (2022):** Data on incoming, resolved non-litigious civil cases in appeal court decreased in 2022, but the changes cannot be explained.
It should be mentionned that the statistical system has been improved which affected the 2022 data. Moreover, 2020 and 2021 data have been updated according to the same methodology of presentation of data as for 2022 data. The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly decreased. The decrease in cases is due to the lifting of restrictions, which were related to limiting the spread of Covid-19. The reduction of pending cases (pending more than 2 years) is related to a interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending criminal cases.

**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.

**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.

**Q098 (2024):** Other criminal cases include enforcement proceedings that are subject to appellate review.
Over the period from 2022 to 2024, second-instance courts in Latvia have encountered increasing challenges in the adjudication of criminal cases. A notable rise in the backlog of cases has been observed both at the beginning and at the end of the reporting period. Furthermore, there has been a growing number of cases that remain unresolved for more than two years, indicating systemic delays in the judicial process.
The most critical situation is evident in the Riga Regional Court — the largest regional court in Latvia — where the difficulties are particularly pronounced. These challenges are primarily attributed to a reduction in the number of judges and a significant increase in the volume of cases referred from first-instance courts.

**Q098 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. Decrease of incoming cases of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases is mainly due to the changes in the legal acts, in the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming and resolved of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases significantly.
Severe Criminal cases and other criminal cases: the increase in the number of pending cases could be related that in the courts the court hearings in -person were restored, lifting the restrictions of Covid, when cases were mostly adjudicated in written procedure. The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of cases and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial process.

**Q098 (2022):** Decrease of incoming and resolved cases is mainly related to the impact of decrease of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases. In the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming and resolved of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal 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. As the number of cases in the courts of first instance decreases, the number of cases in the regional courts also decreases. This is the main reason for decrease of incoming and resolved misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases. Of course, there is also a decrease in the number of serious criminal cases, which is related to the overall decrease in criminal cases in the courts of first instance.
The number of pending cases on 31.Dec. has increased due to a limited capacity of the largest appeal court (Rigas apgabaltiesa (The Riga Regional court)): the number of judges in the Board of criminal cases has decreased and some serious criminal cases were completed. The Riga Regional Court is the largest appeal court in Latvia. This court has the largest amount of work and the workload of the judge compared to other appeal courts.
The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly decreased. The decrease in cases is explained:
- due to the lifting of restrictions, which were related to limiting the spread of Covid-19;
- due 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 (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 (2024):** On 1 January of the reference year, a decrease of 22% in pending administrative law cases was observed. This is related to the fact that in 2023, the Supreme court placed increased focus on reducing the backlog of cases, including temporarily reallocating one senator’s position to administrative cases. However, in 2024, the reallocation of the judicial position was cancelled, and by the end of 2024, the case backlog returned to its previous level.

**Q099 (2023):** The number of cases is as indicated. The Supreme Court has set the timely consideration of cases as one of its priorities, also following the guidelines for the consideration of cases approved by the Council of Justice. This has affected the changes in the number of resolved cases and, accordingly, the number of pending cases.
The number of remaining administrative cases is affected by the decrease in the number of incoming cases, as well as measures to improve the speed of processing cases.

**Q099 (2022):** Number of incoming cases have diminished in general, therefore all indicators have been affected. For small numbers of cases, the indicator shows an impact although in general there is none.
**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.

**Q100 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. The Supreme Court has set the timely consideration of cases as one of its priorities, also following the guidelines for the consideration of cases approved by the Council of Justice. This has affected the changes in the number of resolved cases and, accordingly, the number of pending cases.
**Q100 (2022):** Several judges have retired and new judges have started to work at the Supreme Court. This has made an impact on the case flow. Year 2021 the case flow was slow. Year 2022 the number of resolved cases allowed to diminish the backlog.

**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

**Lithuania**

**Q091 (2024):** In 2024, Lithuanian district, regional (first instance) and regional administrative courts1
received 193,215 cases and examined 191,417
cases were examined (in 2023, 189,922 cases were received and 190,789 cases were examined; in 2022, 193,001 cases were received and 191,729 cases were examined).
In 2024, the number of cases received by Lithuanian district, regional (first instance) and regional administrative courts increased by 1.7% compared to 2023, while the number of cases examined increased by 0.3%.
increased by 1.7%, the number of cases examined increased by 0.3% compared to 2022, and the number of cases received and examined remained almost unchanged.
The number of cases received and examined by the courts was influenced by changes in civil cases – the number of civil cases received increased by 5% compared to 2023.
On the other hand, in 2024, the number of civil cases received and examined by courts regarding the issuance of court permits continued to decline (by 10%) compared to
2023 (2,485 cases in 2024, 2,756 cases in 2023) . This change was caused by the amendments to the Civil Code of the Republic of Lithuania
and related laws that came into force on January 1, 2023, related to the abandonment of functions not typical of courts2
. The amendments transferred some of the functions of district courts
not related to the resolution of legal disputes to notaries (approval of the mutual consent of spouses to divorce and separation when the spouses have no minor children; court permits for transactions involving real estate that is family property and other court permits) and bailiffs (regarding the renewal of missed deadlines for the submission of enforcement documents for execution).
In 2024, compared to 2023, the number of pending cases increased. At the end of the year, the backlog of unresolved cases in district, regional (first instance) and regional administrative courts amounted to 31,387 cases (29,432 cases in 2023 and 29,266 cases in 2022). In 2024, the backlog of cases
was 7% higher than in 2023 and 2022.
Among the most frequently examined categories of administrative cases, it was noted that in 2024 there was a significant decrease in cases concerning tax legal relations, most of which involved requests for local fees related to municipal waste collection and management, as well as debt recovery. There was also a slight decrease in cases concerning financial support from national, European Union, and foreign institutions, along with environmental protection. By contrast, there was a notable increase in the number of cases concerning the legal status of foreigners and asylum, as well as a growing trend in cases related to construction, the enforcement of penalties, and conditions of detention. Therefore, it can be concluded that the 23% decrease in incoming administrative cases in 2024, together with the 34% decrease in resolved cases within the same category, can be explained by the fact that the decline in cases concerning tax legal relations was significantly greater than the rise in cases related to the legal status of foreigners and asylum, as well as construction matters.
In 2024 contrary to the previous cycles, several subcategories were marked as "NAP" instead of "NA", because those categories do not exist in the system ("NAP").

**Q091 (2023):** In 2023, compared to 2022, there was a significant increase in debt cases - compared to 2022, the number of cases in this category in 2023 increased by almost 10 thousand. This could be due to a general increase in the number of debtors. There were also an increasing trend of cases related to the protection of property rights. However, there has been a significant decrease in family law cases, namely - due to divorce by mutual consent of both spouses. This decrease could have been influenced by the fact that due to the aforementioned changes in legal regulation from the 1st January 2023, divorce by mutual consent of both spouses, when the spouses do not have minor children, was referred to notaries for non-judicial decision.
Among the most frequently examined categories of administrative cases, it has been noticed that the number of cases related to tax legal relations increases every year (most of them are cases related to debt recovery requests for local fees for municipal waste collection and management), the number of environmental protection cases is increasing slightly. However, as the flow of illegal migration has decreased, the number of asylum cases has decreased significantly. Also, the downward trend in cases regarding execution of sentences and conditions of detention continues to be seen.
The balance of unexamined administrative cases was influenced by the lack of judges, court staff (judge assistants, secretaries of court hearings), as well as in 2022 there was a significant increase in the number of cases regarding the issuance of a court order (regarding debt recovery requests for the local fee for the collection and management of municipal waste), therefore the usual examination of administrative cases according to the general rules of procedure was disrupted, and the duration of the examination of other cases was extended.

**Q091 (2022):** 2.1. The duration of court hearings is influenced by the number of new cases received at the court and the number of working judges who hear these cases (judge workload), the type or type of the case and its complexity, the cases specified in the law when the hearing must be postponed (e.g. by a party to the proceedings disease etc.). It should be noted that in 2022, 705 judges worked in Lithuanian courts (of which 2 judges were appointed for 2 years), 786 judge positions, that is, 81 positions were not filled, which could lead to a larger balance of unexamined cases at the end of the year. It is noteworthy that in 2022 compared to 2021, the number of civil cases examined in district and district courts (first instance) increased by 1.7%.
3. A significant change in received and examined administrative cases compared to 2021 was due to an increase in the number of administrative cases due to the issuance of a court order, when waste system administrators, due to the increased number of debtors, go to court with requests for the local fee for the collection and management of municipal waste, debt recovery, as well as there has been a significant increase in asylum cases due to the illegal migration crisis in the country.
For 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.
Other cases: In 2022, compared to 2021, the number of cases of administrative offenses examined in district courts decreased significantly - by 65% compared to 2020. – decreased by as much as 76%. These changes were caused by changes to the Code of Administrative Offenses, which entered into force in 2021-07-01 and in which certain cases of administrative offenses were transferred from district courts to be examined by non-judicial institutions.

**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.

**Q094 (2022):** Protracted proceedings in criminal cases are caused by the non-appearance of the parties to the proceedings or their representatives at the court session, the request of the parties to the proceedings to postpone the proceedings and the collection of additional evidence. It can be concluded that the protracted examination of criminal cases is also usually determined by circumstances depending on the actions of the participants in the process.
There were 57 criminal cases (64 in 2021, 72 in 2020), the examination of which lasted longer than 5 years. In the last few years, there has been a trend towards a decrease in the number of criminal cases examined at the first instance in first insance courts, the examination of which lasted longer than 5 years.

**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.

**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 (2023):** 3. In 2023, significantly fewer administrative law cases were received:
regarding the legal status of foreigners - 454 cases (in 2022 - 1583)
asylum - 90 cases (in 2022 - 1237)
tax legal relations - 136 cases (in 2022 - 300);
regarding the judgements of debt for the local municipal waste collection and management fee - 75 (in 2022 - 234);
on conditions of execution of sentences and detention - 167 (in 2022 - 262);
complaints of persons serving a prison sentence regarding compensation for inadequate prison conditions - 157 (in 2022 - 230).
In 2023, compared to 2022, the duration of consideration of administrative cases examined by the appellate instance regarding decisions increased by 70 days, but compared to 2021, it decreased by 50 days.
In 2023, the duration of consideration of administrative cases examined by the appellate instance regarding rulings in the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania also lengthened - compared to 2022 extended by 7 days, and compared to 2021 - in 5 days. It should be noted that in 2022 (compared to 2021), the significantly shortened duration of hearing cases could be influenced by the fact that in 2022 March 31 by the resolution of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, 3 judges from the Supreme Court of Lithuania and 2 judges from the Court of Appeal of Lithuania were transferred to the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania temporarily (for a period of 3 months) due to the extremely increased number of pending legal status and asylum cases related to the influx of foreigners (illegal migrants) in Lithuania. Meanwhile, the longer duration of the hearings in 2023 compared to 2022 could have been influenced by the fact that, after the transfer period, the aforementioned judges returned to work in the courts from which they were temporarily transferred.

**Q097 (2022):** 3. in 2021 the duration of the review of decisions of administrative cases at the appellate instance was significantly shortened (more than 130 days compared to 2020), this fact led to a smaller balance of unexamined cases at the beginning of 2022. 3.1. The significant change in administrative cases received and examined by the second instance, compared to 2021, was caused by an increase in complaints regarding the decisions made by the court of first instance regarding debt collection of local fees for the collection and management of municipal waste, as well as complaints regarding asylum requests related to illegal migration to Lithuania.
3.2. The duration of the review of decisions by the appeal instance of administrative cases was significantly reduced (120 days compared to 2021 and 253 days compared to 2020), which led to a smaller balance of unexamined cases at the end of 2022. In 2022, compared to 2021, more complaints about decisions made in courts were examined, as well as accordingly, the ratio of examined complaints and amended or annulled decisions slightly increased.

**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 administrative offences cases.

**Q099 (2024):** We apologize, it was mistakenly marked "NA" when it should have been "NAP".

**Q099 (2023):** jurisdictional cases and administrative offences cases.

**Q099 (2022):** The Supreme Court of Lithuania hears only those cassation requests that have been selected as meeting the requirements of the law by a special panel of three judges of the Civil Cases Division. Only those cases that are significant in terms of the interpretation and application of equal law come before this court. The judges of the Supreme Court of Lithuania can devote more time and attention to the most important cases in the state. In addition, this ensures the promptness of the court process.
in the Supreme Court of Lithuania in 2022 the duration of civil cases was shortened by 2 days, but the longer duration of cases was also influenced by the fact that not all the posts of judges were filled in this court.

**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 (2022):** In the Supreme Court of Lithuania, not all the posts of judges were filled, which led to a longer duration of hearing cases.
**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q091 (General Comment):** To date, it is not possible to provide information on pending cases older than 2 years.

**Q091 (2024):** 1. Pending cases 'other than criminal': the 21.56% increase in the total number of pending cases 'other than criminal' at the end of the reference year is explained by the rise in pending administrative cases. This increase can be detailed as follows: the 51% rise in pending cases is due to the increase in incoming cases. In 2024, a series of litigation led to the opening of 641 cases at the administrative court. These cases, not yet resolved, are counted as pending at the end of 2024.
2. Number of incoming/resolved general non-litigious civil (and commercial) cases: this figure corresponds to European payment orders and payment ordinances issued by the two district courts. The increase in these cases observed between 2022 and 2023 continued in 2024 and can be explained on one hand by the natural fluctuation of these figures, and on the other hand, we assume the increase is related to the economic development of various sectors (notably construction). However, no detailed analysis has been conducted on this matter.
3.Administrative cases:
- The 64% increase in incoming cases in 2024 is explained by the filing of a series of litigation, which led to the immediate opening of 641 cases at the administrative court.
- The 51% increase in pending cases is explained by the rise in incoming cases. In 2024, a series of litigation led to the opening of 641 cases at the administrative court. These cases, not yet resolved, are counted as pending at the end of 2024.

**Q091 (2023):** The number of incoming/resolved non-contentious general civil (and commercial) cases corresponds to European payment orders and payment orders issued by the two district courts. The increase observed between 2022 and 2023 in these cases can be explained on the one hand, by the natural fluctuation of these figures, while on the other hand, we assume that the increase is linked to the economic development of various sectors (particularly construction). However, no detailed analysis has been carried out on this subject.
**Q091 (2022):** The decrease in the number of non-litigious cases brought before the courts can be attributed to a legislative change in 2021, which raised the jurisdictional threshold from €10,000 to €15,000 in favour of the justices of the peace (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/loi/2021/07/15/a541/jo). This change has resulted in a reduction in both new cases filed and cases concluded by the courts, as certain matters that would have traditionally been brought before the courts are now within the competence of justices of the peace since 2021.

**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.

**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.

**Q094 (General Comment):** We have classified as minor criminal cases all cases concluded by penal order in the magistrate's court or district court. Serious offenses encompass all cases concluded by a first-instance judgment in the police, correctional or criminal courts.

The figures listed under 'other cases' correspond to those cases which were referred to the investigating department.

Regarding the unavailability of pending and incoming cases: Due to the specific organization of workflow between courts and public prosecution services, files are only transferred to courts shortly before a hearing date, and if a case is not heard on that scheduled date, it is then returned to the public prosecution service until a new hearing date. Thus, there are - with few exceptions - no pending cases before criminal courts over an extended period, and the number of incoming cases is more or less equal to the number of resolved ones.

**Q094 (2024):** 3. Other criminal cases: The opening of an investigation by the examining judge at the court follows a request from the Public Prosecutor's Office. There are two types of investigations: judicial information requests concerning offenses or crimes, and 'mini-investigations' based on Article 24-1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP) (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/code/procedure_penale/20201221#art_24-1).

The year 2023 was marked by a very high number of cases opened at the prosecutor's offices regarding cybercrime (phishing), for which investigations under Article 24-1 of the CCP were initiated. In addition, the investigation chambers were increasingly involved in financial and economic cases.

'Mini-investigations' allow, in cases defined by law, prosecutors to request that the examining judge order an investigative measure without opening a full preparatory investigation. The increase in 'mini-investigations', which allow cases to be processed more quickly than 'classic' investigations, explains the rise in cases closed by the investigation chambers.

**Q094 (2023):** 3. Other criminal cases: The opening of an investigation by the investigating judge at the Tribunal is based on an indictment issued by the Public Prosecutor. There are two types of investigation: judicial inquiries into misdemeanours or felonies and 'mini-investigations' based on article 24-1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/code/procedure_penale/20201221#art_24-1). The year 2023 was marked by a very large number of cases opened by public prosecutors' offices relating to cybercrime (phishing) for which investigations based on article 24-1 of the CCP were opened. In addition, the investigating offices were called upon more and more in financial and economic cases. Mini-investigations' allow prosecutors, in cases defined by law, to request the investigating judge to order an investigative measure without opening a preparatory investigation. The increase in 'mini-investigations', which allow cases to be removed from the investigating office more quickly than 'traditional' investigations, explains the rise in the number of cases closed by investigating offices.

**Q094 (2022):** Among the minor criminal cases, we have included all cases concluded by criminal order in the police court or district court. Serious offenses encompass all cases concluded by judgment at first instance in the police, correctional or criminal court.

The figures recorded under 'other cases' correspond to matters referred to the investigating judge's 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.

**Q097 (2022):** Administrative resolved cases: While the number of cases concluded by the Administrative Court has increased by almost 34%, it turns out that this variation was primarily recorded between 2020 and 2021, and commented upon during the assessment of the 2021 data. Between 2021 and 2022, there is a decrease of -6% in the number of resolved cases.

Administrative pending cases on December 31st reference year: The decline in pending cases between 2020 and 2022 is indeed significant, dropping from 240 to 174 cases. However, when compared to the figures provided in 2021, administrative cases have only decreased by -4%, reducing from `182` to `174` the pending cases before the Administrative Court.

**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.

**Q098 (2024):** The 20% increase in the number of appeals against decisions made in first instance by the police courts (which correspond to new cases in second instance at the district court level) corresponds to an increase of 9 appeals between 2023 and 2024. Given that the absolute numbers are low, they are very sensitive to variations. The number of incoming cases depends on the appeals filed, over which the court has no influence, and which in turn depends, among other things, on the number of decisions made at the first instance level.

The observed increase in the number of incoming cases on appeal before the district courts could be explained by a change in the financial stakes for individuals judged in first instance by the justices of the peace. By the law of 21 September 2023 (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/loi/2023/09/21/a679/jo
) amending the law of 14 February 1955 concerning the regulation of traffic on all public roads (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/loi/1955/02/14/n3/jo
), the maximum fines in cases brought before the justices of the peace were changed from 250€ to 1 000€ (Art. 7 of the law of 14 February 1955). Indeed, the increase in the amount of fines, as well as the possibility of combining several offenses, can lead to significant penalties. This situation is likely to encourage more individuals to contest decisions rendered in first instance.

**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):** Given the small size of Luxembourg, the number of cases handled by the Supreme Court is, in absolute terms, limited. Therefore, even the smallest variation in absolute numbers is likely to produce a significant effect in statistical or percentage terms, without necessarily implying a substantial or structural impact on the Court's activity.

There is no possibility of appeal by way of cassation against the decisions of the Administrative Court of Appeal.

**Q099 (2024):** Civil and Commercial Cases: The increase in pending cases at the beginning of the year compared to the beginning of the previous year can be explained by the difference between incoming cases in 2023 and the decisions rendered in 2023.

While the number of incoming cases decreased by 25% between 2023 and 2024, it should be noted that in 2023 there had been an increase in incoming cases compared to previous years. The commentary provided in previous years remains valid. The number of incoming cases depends on the appeals filed, over which the Court has no influence, and which in turn depends, among other things, on the number of decisions made at other instances. Legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.

**Q099 (2023):** While the number of new cases rose by 37% between 2022 and 2023, it should be noted that in 2022 there was a drop in new cases compared with previous years. In 2020, new cases amounted to 108 and even 116 in 2019. The number of new cases depends on the number of appeals lodged over which the Court has no influence and which depends, among other things, on the number of decisions taken on the level of other instances. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period. At the Court of Cassation, the same magistrates deal with criminal and non-criminal cases. In 2023, there was an increase in the number of resolved criminal cases (in particular applications for judicial review of decisions of the Council Chamber, which are not included in the figures provided). This increase in resolved criminal cases means that the magistrates of the Court of Cassation have had less time to deal with non-criminal cases. In addition, during 2023, there were certain fluctuations in the composition of the Court of Cassation, resulting in the partial/temporary unavailability of certain magistrates, which may have had an impact on the number of resolved cases.
The increase in pending cases is explained by the increase in new cases in 2023 and the decrease in decisions taken in 2022 and 2023.

**Q099 (2022):** In civil (and commercial) litigious cases, it should be noted that for incoming cases, although the relative variation of -29.63% in figures between 2020 and 2022 is significant, compared to 2021, the number has decreased from 82 to 76 cases, representing an -11% change. The comment provided last year remains relevant. The number of incoming cases depends on appeals filed over which the Court has no influence and is, among other factors, a function of decisions made at other levels. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.

Furthermore, the decrease in pending cases as of December 31st can be attributed to the decrease in incoming cases in 2022 since the number of decisions made remained stable between 2020 and 2022.

**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):** Given the small size of Luxembourg, the number of cases handled by the Supreme Court is, in absolute terms, limited. Therefore, even the smallest variation in absolute numbers is likely to produce a significant effect in statistical or percentage terms, without necessarily implying a substantial or structural impact on the Court's activity.

The Court of Cassation conducts a review of legality, independent of the severity of the offense. Pending cases are now detailed separately between criminal and civil/commercial matters, providing this additional information for the first time.

**Q100 (2024):** The increase in pending cases at the beginning of the year compared to the beginning of the previous year can be explained by the difference between incoming cases in 2023 and the decisions rendered in 2023.

Resolved Cases: Two factors can explain the 31% increase in resolved cases at the Court of Cassation. On the one hand, the number of judges at the Court of Cassation increased by one in 2023 (see question 46). Following certain changes in the Court's composition, including retirements, this new composition in 2024 made it possible to render a higher number of decisions. On the other hand, there was an increase in decisions dismissing appeals for failure to prosecute, concerning cases in which a party filed an appeal but did not submit a brief, allowing these cases to be resolved more quickly.

Pending Cases on 31 December of the Reference Year: The number of pending cases decreased by 25%, which corresponds in absolute terms to a difference of 8 pending cases. This is explained by the fact that more cases were resolved than incoming cases were filed in 2024.

**Q100 (2023):** The number of new cases depends on the number of appeals lodged over which the Court has no influence and which depends, among other things, on the number of decisions taken by other instances. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.
The number of pending cases has increased by 23%, which in absolute terms corresponds to a difference of 6 pending cases, with pending cases increasing from 26 to 32, due to a higher number of new cases than completed cases. Comment 2022: Pending cases at 1 January refer to data provided in 2021. This decrease was explained as follows: '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'.

**Q100 (2022):** Pending cases as of 1st January refer to the data provided in 2021. This decrease had been explained as follows: 'The decrease in pending cases can be attributed to the decrease in incoming cases in 2020, as the number of decisions made remained stable between 2018 and 2020.

**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.
"

**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.
The horizontal inconsistencies are due to the current CMS that still relies heavily on the input of the deputy registrars and clerks working with the judiciary.

**Q091 (2024):** The non-litigious data have not been submitted this year and hence there is a discrepancy in the total incoming and resolved cases of 'other than criminal' cases.
3. Administrative cases: The increase in the pending cases for more than 2 years reflects the increase in the pending caseload which resulted from a decrease in the overall efficiency of this court.

**Q091 (2023):** The pending caseload of the General Non-Litigious (Sec 2.1) has increased as a result of a decrease in the resolved caseload.

**Q091 (2022):** In 2022, there was an overall increase in the caseload of the civil courts when compared to the previous evaluation, primarily because this data reflects the normal caseload following the Covid-19 pandemic. Having said this, during this year there was also one specific 1st instance court that has registered an exponential increase in the incoming caseload as a result of legislative issues. This increase in the incoming caseload was reflected in a modest increase in the resolved caseload, but had a more pronounced effect on the pending caseload.
The data provided for 'pending over 2 years' for the civil and commercial civil cases is missing the aged caseload of the Court of Notarial Acts.

**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.
**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).
The horizontal inconsistencies are due to the current CMS that still relies heavily on the input of the deputy registrars and clerks working with the judiciary.

**Q094 (2023):** The increase in the number of incoming severe criminal cases results from the increase in the number of criminal court halls, which enable twice as many 'juries' to be held and more 'pending' cases to be brought to trial (in this court, the system is a bit different from other cases. Trials are brought forward when it is their turn, so the fact that the court administration increased the halls, enables more trials to be opened). In addition, the improvement in the efficiency of the Office of the Attorney General, the chief prosecutor, has resulted in more bills of indictment to be issued.
The increase in the number of halls also reflected in an increase in the number of resolved cases within this category.

**Q094 (2022):** 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.

**Q097 (General Comment):** 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).

**Q097 (2024):** Pending cases on 31 December 2024 - Following legislative amendments, the efficiency of this court improved as a result of faster case processing time. These procedural enhancements can be found in Act XXXII of 2021 of the Laws of Malta, Justice Reform (Civil Procedure) Act, available in English at this link: https://legislation.mt/eli/act/2021/32/eng Pending cases for more than 2 years - Most of the cases taking long to resolve relate to cases filed prior to the legislative change. Hence the high ratio of pending cases over 2 years old.

**Q097 (2022):** The increase in the incoming caseload at 1st Instance has reflected intself in an increase in the incoming caseload at the 2nd Instance across all courts. Moreover, in one particular court, the incoming caseload has increased twofold due to a legal provision that facilitates the filing of specific cases.
The number of resolved cases has increased across all 2nd Instance courts and underscores the efforts of the judiciary to address the burgeoning caseload.

**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.

**Q098 (2024):** The efficiency of these courts in 2023 was very high and hence there was a reduction in the pending caseload. Throughout 2024, there was a registered decrease in the number of resolved cases

**Q098 (2022):** There was a registered increase in incoming cases across all courts.

**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.

**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

**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.
Regarding the unavailability of the number of pending cases at the beginning of the year, since the Netherlands do not officially measure it, it is not provided.

**Q091 (2023):** Incoming administrative law cases increased significantly in 2023, compared to the year before. Not only 'regular' administrative law cases increased, but cases regarding foreigners/asylumseekers, and tax cases as well. See also chapter 6.1 of the Annual Report of the Council for the Judiciary:
https://www.rechtspraak.nl/SiteCollectionDocuments/Jaarverslag%20Rechtspraak%202023.pdf

**Q091 (2022):** 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 as of 2022.

**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 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.

**Q094 (2024):** The increase in misdemeanour cases is due to an increase in minor traffic offences, in part due to the activity of so-called 'no cure, no pay'-bureaus.
**Q094 (2022):** Increase in Category 1 - This is due to a technical change in registration, where it was found that some 14.500 cases were effectively resolved (from a legal standpoint) but had remained ‘open’ in the administration. This has lead to a decrease of the number of pending cases. Increase in Category 2 - These cases are both minor criminal offences and also traffic fine cases (so-called WAHV- or Mulder-cases). The latter group shows the main increase. Possibly the increase is due to numbers being low in 2020 and 2021 as a result of Corona, and increased mobility since then

**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):** We were able to make an approximation 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 samewe have used this approximation).
**Q097 (2024):** This year, we were able to provide data for 1. Civil litigious cases and 2. Non litigious cases.
-As far as we know, it is possible to have non-litigious cases in second instance.
-We have made an approximation (the best way we are able to at this time), where we arrive at 100% litigious cases and 0% non-litigious cases. Thus, we have filled in 0 for those cases.

**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):** The number of resolved cases presented in the table includes both cases that are resolved with the decision of a judge and cases that were not resolved with the decision of a judge. These are: Cases in which the appeal in cassation has been withdrawn or annulled, cases that have been administratively resolved by the clerk, cases in which the processing of the appeal in cassation has been suspended, and cases that have been discharged upon objection. The number of cases not resolved by the decision of a judge has also been included in the comment for clarification. Before 2024, these numbers were not included in the number of resolved cases, but they were included in the number of pending cases on Dec 31. 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 no 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.

**Q099 (2024):** We have included cases that were not resolved with the decision of a judge, see the general comment for an explanation of what types of conclusions these are. It is important to note that these numbers were not included last year, so numbers this year may not be perfectly comparable to last year (we have added the numbers here below as well). 1: Civil cases, number of cases that are not resolved with the decision of a judge: 17 3: Administrative cases, number of cases that are not resolved with the decision of a judge: 324

**Q099 (2023):** See also the General comment regarding potential discrepancies in the formula for horizontal consistency. 1: Civil cases, number of cases that are not resolved with the decision of a judge: 31
3: Administrative cases, number of cases that are not resolved with the decision of a judge: 384.

**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 Supreme Court.
The number of resolved cases presented in the table includes both cases that are resolved with the decision of a judge and cases that were not resolved with the decision of a judge. These are: Cases in which the appeal in cassation has been withdrawn or annulled, cases that have been administratively resolved by the clerk, cases in which the processing of the appeal in cassation has been suspended, and cases that have been discharged upon objection. The number of cases not resolved by the decision of a judge has also been included in the comment for clarification. Before 2024, these numbers were not included in the number of resolved cases, but they were included in the number of pending cases on Dec 31.

**Q100 (2024):** We have included cases that were not resolved with the decision of a judge, see the general comment for an explanation of what types of conclusions these are. It is important to note that these numbers were not included last year, so numbers this year may not be perfectly comparable to last year (we have added the numbers here below as well). Number of cases that are not resolved by the decision of a judge: 142.

**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).

**Poland**

**Q091 (General Comment):** The attention should be drawn on the fact that it is not excluded to notice horizontal inconsistencies due to omissions or mistakes in statistical information generated by courts as well as to structural changes within the court system. As for the category “civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, it includes as well litigious family and labour (employment) cases. Besides, it encompasses also some types of cases decided under chapter II of the Civil Proceedings Code that concern non-litigious cases (such as distribution of inherited assets, separation of common property, demarcation of the real estate) which nature in fact is litigious because of the opposite interests of the parties and contradictory ways of presenting their arguments.

**Q091 (2022):** * Administrative law cases - In 2022, the number of incoming administrative cases decreased compared to the previous year. The number of incoming complaints about the inaction of public administration bodies and the protracted conduct of proceedings by these bodies also decreased. The decrease in the receipt of such complaints in 2022 was 30.2% compared to 2021. This may be indicative of the catching up of public administration activities caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Data for the next years will show whether the downward trend will continue.

**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.

**Q092 (General Comment):** The category of civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases (including non-litigious family cases) covers all the rest of cases decided under chapter II of the Civil Proceedings Code which are non-litigious cases (such as ascertainment of the acquisition of an inheritance, cases connected with birth, marriage and death records, declaration of dead, adoption as well as summary and injunction proceedings in money payment cases).

**Q093 (General Comment):** The category “other” includes first of all social security cases and cases related to the application of correctional and educational measures as required in juvenile cases and execution of guardianship or tutoring.

**Q094 (2024):** 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 cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).

**Q094 (2023):** 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 cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).

**Q094 (2022):** 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 cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).
Cases under the Criminal Procedure Code and the Misdemeanours Code, which are presented as 'other criminal cases', are preliminary or follow-up proceedings.

**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.
**Q097 (General Comment):** The category „Other cases” includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others.
Starting from 2022, administrative cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court are presented in the frame of question 99 (last instance) and are no more within the scope of Q97.

**Q097 (2024):** The category „Other cases” includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others.
With regard to the reasons for the increase in the impact of second-instance cases in 2024 compared to 2023, it should first be pointed out that this year was another year of an increase in the impact of civil cases concerning claims from contracts denominated/indexed to the Swiss franc to appellate courts, which translated into an overall increase in the impact of civil and commercial cases in appellate courts. In most courts of appeal, civil and commercial cases are heard in the same division, and therefore the increase in the influence of one category of cases also has a negative impact on the hearing of cases of the other category. While in 2023 95,925 civil and commercial cases were submitted to the courts of appeal, in 2024 the impact of such cases amounted to 121,326 (an increase of 26.4%). It should be emphasized that this increase in influence has continued since 2020. For comparison, in 2019, the total impact of civil and commercial cases on the courts of appeal was 54,959. Thus, in 5 years, the (annual) impact of civil and commercial cases on the courts of appeal has more than doubled.
An analysis of the results of the courts' work in the main category of civil procedural cases ACa confirmed that in 2024 compared to 2023, there was an increase in the impact and settlement of the above-mentioned cases in the courts of appeal, as well as, despite the great judicial effort undertaken, an increase in residuals. In 2024, the impact of category ACa amounted to 53,220 compared to 45,704 in 2023 (i.e. an increase of 16.4%), the settlement amounted to 26,041 compared to 22,729 in 2023 (i.e. an increase of 14.6%), and the remainder at the end of 2024 increased to 75,565 compared to 48,386 at the end of 2023 (i.e. an increase of 56.2%).
It should be noted that in 2024, the courts of appeal received 56,281 cases concerning claims arising from bank agreements denominated or indexed to the Swiss franc with the symbol 049cf (the so-called Swiss franc cases), which was due to an increase in settlements in regional courts of first instance, as well as favorable case law for bank customers formed after the resolution of the Supreme Court of 25 April 2024 in the case no. III CZP 25/22 as well as previous judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 2023. The handling of Swiss franc cases in the courts of appeal amounted to 16,641 and increased by 31.4% compared to 2023, but the improvement in handling was insufficient to control the impact (38,732 cases were received; the degree of control of the influence was 43.0%), which resulted in the accumulation of the remaining Swiss franc cases for the following year. At the same time, it should be added that in 2024, the number of civil judges in the courts of appeal was reduced: the limit of judges on the last day of the statistical period was 277.0 compared to 295.0 in 2023.
In 2024, there was also a sharp increase in the impact of ACz appeal cases to the courts of appeal, which was a consequence of the amendment to the Code of Civil Procedure by the Act of 9 March 2023 amending the Act – Code of Civil Procedure and certain other acts: 41,755 cases were received compared to 25,282 cases in 2023 (an increase of 65.2%), which also resulted in an increase in the workload of judges.
Similarly, in the case of regional courts hearing appeals against district court judgments in the second instance, there was a significant increase in the impact of appeal cases Cz: 49,441 cases were rec

eived compared to 38,696 in 2023 (an increase of 27.8%). The impact of Ca's civil litigation cases amounted to 78,522 in 2024 and increased slightly - by 2.2%. However, the limit of judges as of the last day of the statistical period in the second instance was reduced from 509.6 to 497.1, which had an adverse effect on the number of settlements and resulted in an increase in the remainder of category Ca by 9.2% to 51,605.
With regard to the number of appeal cases, it should be noted that the increase in the impact was not associated with an increase in the number of cases that was adequate to the needs, although an increase in the number of resolved cases should be noticed. These data show the enormous effort put into the judges to minimize the effects of the growing influence, which was impossible to control, with the existing human resources. A larger scale of growth in settlements is already very difficult to achieve with the existing human resources, while the improvement of the staffing is hindered due to the suspension of announcements of vacancies for judicial positions from the end of 2023, due to the activities of the National Council of the Judiciary, formed in accordance with the provisions of the Act of 8 December 2017 amending the Act on the National Council of the Judiciary and certain other acts. The resulting staff shortages and their impact on the results obtained cannot be fully eliminated by supervisory activities.
With regard to appellate cases in regional courts, they were also affected by personnel problems related to the suspension of announcements of vacant judicial positions and the delegation of judges from regional courts to courts of appeal. In part, these deficiencies are made up for by the secondment of district court judges to regional courts.
In addition, both in regional courts and in courts of appeal, there is a need to consult experts in appeal cases. In the Annual Information on the Activities of Courts Operating in the Area of Appeals for 2024 and in letters addressed to the Ministry of Justice, the presidents of the courts pointed to increasing problems with the availability of experts, the quality of the opinions prepared and the lengthening deadlines for preparing opinions, often exceeding one year. In addition, the presidents of the courts of appeal reported problems with staffing in the group of court clerks and clerks, as well as the rotation of assistant staff, which also made it difficult to reduce the residue.
The extension of the time for examining appellate cases and the deterioration in the efficiency of proceedings in both regional courts and courts of appeal was also caused by an amendment to the Code of Civil Procedure, as a result of which from 7 November 2019 the inter-instance proceedings, including the examination of formal deficiencies and their supplementation, are conducted by the court of second instance, and not by the court of first instance, as before.
In appellate cases concerning bankruptcy and restructuring cases (regional courts), the efficiency of their examination was negatively affected by the imperfections of the ICT system of the National Register of Debtors, in which these proceedings are conducted.
Finally, the courts pointed to the increasing degree of complexity of cases, which also did not favor a greater increase in the number of cases handled.

**Q097 (2023):** The category „Other cases” includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others.
I will explain the differences in the data during the quality control and to specific questions from analysts. The increased inflow and the remaining number of civil and commercial cases (Q97, civil) for subsequent reporting periods is to some extent due to the increased inflow of civil cases concerning claims from banking contracts denominated /indexed to the Swiss franc (cases with the symbol 049 cf) in the second instance of common courts. The number of so-called “franc”cases received significantly exceeds the number of cases settled, which results in an increase in the number of cases remaining to be settled in subsequent statistical periods.

**Q097 (2022):** According to the available data for civil, commercial and labour and social security cases at second instance for 2022. - taking 2021 as a benchmark: In courts of appeal :
(a) In civil and commercial cases, including in the AGa category in 2022, the number of cases settled actually decreased slightly (by 1.0%), with a total increase in settlements in ACa+AGa cases of 7.5% compared to 2021. Thus, overall in civil and commercial appellate cases, the number of settlements in the appellate courts has increased. Despite the increase in settlements, the impact of ACa+AGa cases (65.6%) was not brought under control, due to its drastic increase of 51.9% compared to 2021. (cases involving franking credits).
- In 2022, there was a slight decrease in the handling of ACz (by 1.9%) and AGz (by 2.4%) complaint cases, which can be explained by a decrease in the impact of these categories of cases by 7.3% and 4.9%, respectively, compared to 2021. The impact of ACz cases was controlled at 100.6% and AGz cases at 101.9%;
Thus, in AGa cases, the reason for the decrease in handling (by only 1%) was a drastic increase in the impact of ACa cases (by 64.5%), while the handling of ACa and AGa cases combined increased, so there is no basis for further explanation. In AGz cases, the decrease in disposals should be linked to the decrease in receipts. The decrease in the handling of cases has not impeded the control of the impact of the cases, so there are no grounds for further explanation. b) In labour and social security cases, the total number of cases disposed of in 2022 decreased (by 17%), of which the number of cases disposed of in the APa category decreased by 9.6%, which was due to a 14.8% decrease in the number of cases received in this category, as 104.9% of the cases received were managed, while in the AUa category, the number of cases disposed of decreased by 18.1% (from 21,360 to 17,500 cases) in relation to 2021, This was partly attributable to the 4.9% decrease in receipts, but above all to the inability to handle a larger number of homogeneous AUa cases, as was the case in 2021 regarding the pension amount of women from the so-called "1953 vintage", which were handled in large numbers in 2021. in connection with new decisions of the pension authority, issued on the basis of the provisions of the Act of 19 June 2020 amending the Act on pensions from the Social Insurance Fund (Journal of Laws of 2020, item 1222) implementing the judgment of the Constitutional Tribunal of 6 March 2019. P 20/16. It should be emphasised that the disposition of this type of cases in 2021 was atypically high (in both appellate and district courts) and significantly higher than in 2020, when it amounted to 12 929 cases in appellate courts. Moreover, in 2021, proceedings were discontinued in 6 923 cases in this category, while in 2022, only 1 193 cases were discontinued. only 1 193 cases of this category were discontinued, which resulted in a decrease in the total number of cases handled in the labour and social security division and the inability to control the impact in 2022. (93,6%); - in 2022, the handling of grievance cases in the AUz cat. decreased by 28.9% (from 3,611 to 2,565), which was also due to the decrease in the inflow of cases in this category (by 27.43%) in relation to 2021, as the inflow in this category of cases was contained. In the APz category, the 16.41% decrease in the number of cases settled in 2022 (from 201 to 168 cases) was also due to a 19.40% decrease in the inflow of cases in this category (from 201 to 162 cases) in relation to 2021.
In reg

ional courts:
(a) in civil appellate cases Ca the number of civil cases settled in 2022.decreased in comparison to 2021 only minimally by 0.01% (by 6 cases), so there are no grounds for further clarification;
- in complaint cases Cz at second instance, the number of cases handled in 2022 decreased by 10.60% (from 37,565 to 33,581) compared to 2021, as a result of a 17.48% decrease in receipts (from 36,190 to 29,863).It should be emphasised that, despite the decrease in settlements, receipts in this category were controlled by 112.4% and the backlog was reduced by 38.49% compared to the end of 2021;(b) in Ga commercial appeal cases, the number of cases disposed of fell by 13.4%, as a result of a 19.8% decrease in receipts. It should be emphasised that despite the decrease in disposals, receipts were controlled by 113.3% and the backlog was reduced by 17.5% compared to the end of 2021.
- in Gz grievance cases, the number of cases handled fell by 13.1%, as a result of a 9.9% decrease in receipts. It should be emphasised that, despite the decrease in disposals, receipts were controlled by 102.2% and the backlog was reduced by 9.3% compared to the end of 2021.
c) in labour and social security cases, the number of cases disposed of in 2022 - in Ua appellate cases, the number of civil cases disposed of in 2022 compared to 2021 increased by 1.5% and requires no explanation, while in Pa category cases, the number of cases disposed of compared to 2021 decreased slightly by 2.5% (from 4,775 to 4,656), which was due to a 3.4% decrease in receipts in this category, while receipts were only slightly (97.9%) unmanaged;
- in grievance cases, the number of cases disposed of in the A&E category fell by 15.67% (from 1,557 to 1,313 cases), as a result of a 19.43% decrease in the number of cases disposed of in this category in relation to 2021, while the impact was contained; in the Uz category, the number of cases disposed of in 2022 decreased only slightly by 6 cases (from 459 to 453 cases), which does not require detailed explanation. In cases, Ga and Gz, Cz and Pz, the decrease in handling should be attributed to a decrease in receipts.The decrease in disposals did not prevent the impact of cases from being brought under control, so there are no grounds for further explanation. With regard to the courts of second instance, it should also be pointed out that the transfer of the duty to conduct inter-institutional proceedings to the courts of second instance has resulted in an increased workload for the judges sitting in these divisions. In addition, the Covid-19 pandemic has reduced the ability to conduct court proceedings efficiently and has resulted in a backlog of judges' dockets, which is increasing due to the increase in influence. This is coupled with a sharp increase in the impact of cases in the appellate courts, including in particular an increase in the impact of franking cases referred to the appellate courts.

**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 (2022):** Serious criminal cases include all offences under the Penal Code, the Fiscal Penal Code and offences under other laws. Misdemeanours are cases conducted under the Misdemeanours Code.
The category "Other cases" includes other cases conducted in the criminal courts that are not directly related to serious criminal cases or misdemeanours (mainly cases conducted under the Criminal Procedure Code and the Misdemeanours Code).

**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).

**Q099 (General Comment):** 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. Starting from 2022, administrative cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court are presented in the frame of question 99 (last instance) and are no more within the scope of Q97.

**Q099 (2024):** *other cases = Statistics of the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber (which deals with the Public law cases, inter alia cases originated from the extraordinary complaints or appeals against resolutions of the National Council of the Judiciary, competition and consumer protection cases, cases concerning the regulation of energy, telecommunications and postal services, rail transport, as well as the regulation of the water and sewage market, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings or cases concerning the retirement of a judge of the Supreme Court, etc.)
Statistics of the Professional Liability Chamber (which deals with the disciplinary cases or cases of lifting of the judicial and prosecutor immunity).
Compared to previous years, in the year under review (2024), the number of concluded proceedings in the Supreme Court increased. This is particularly visible in the Civil Chamber, where a total of 7,766 cases were resolved in 2024 (in 2023 – 6,308 cases, in 2022 – 5,785 cases). More cases than in 2023 were also resolved in the Labor and Social Security Chamber (in 2024 – 2,707, in 2023 – 2,580). The upward trend is also visible in the Criminal Chamber of the Supreme Court, where 4,374 cases were resolved in 2024. In 2023, this number amounted to 4,254 cases (an increase of 3%). Despite the positive change consisting in the increase in the number of resolved cases, this did not always result in a reduction of the judicial backlog.
In the case of the Civil Chamber of the Supreme Court, in which, despite a 23% increase in the percentage of cases resolved, the number of cases remaining to be resolved from the previous period decreased slightly. At the end of 2023, it amounted to 7,230 cases, and at the end of 2024 – 7,162 cases. This trend results from the very high inflow of new cases to the Civil Chamber, which has been continuing since 2022 (in 2024 – 6,316 cases, in 2023 – 6,424 cases, in 2022 – 6,951 cases), which, given the vacancy of 1/3 of adjudicating positions, cannot be effectively eliminated even with the maximum effort of the judges adjudicating in this Chamber.
The number of cases that were not resolved in the reporting period increased slightly in the case of the Labor and Social Insurance Chamber. It amounted to 2,213 at the end of 2024, while at the end of 2023 it was 2,165. However, it should be noted that this Chamber, like the Civil Chamber, is affected by the greatest staff shortages, and the inflow of cases to the Labor and Social Insurance Chamber was slightly higher in 2024 than in 2023 (a total of 71 cases, i.e. an increase of 2.6%).
The number of backlogged cases also increased in the case of the Criminal Chamber. While in 2023 the backlogged caseload was 1,415 cases, at the end of 2024 this number amounted to 1,504 cases. In this case too, this was related to the increase in the number of cases filed with the Criminal Chamber (4,463 cases in 2024 compared to 4,234 cases in 2023). It is worth emphasizing, however, that the increase in backlogged cases does not apply to cassation appeals heard in the Criminal Chamber, which is the core of its adjudicative activity. The issue of the inflow of cases and their resolution is very specific in the case of the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs. While in 2023 a total of 5,151 cases were filed with this Chamber, in 2024 it was only 1,561 cases. However, this discrepancy results from the fact that 2023 was the year in which elections to the Sejm of the Republic of Poland and the Senate of the Republic of Poland were held, as well

as a nationwide referendum. In connection with the above, as in the case of previous years in which elections or a referendum were held, the vast majority of cases filed with the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs concerned referendum and election protests (in 2023, 3,576). Deducting this category of cases, it should be stated that the inflow from 2024 was at a lower level than in 2023, when it was 1,795 cases. The number of resolved cases was also lower. In 2024, it was at the level of 1,352 cases, and in 2023 – 1,606 cases (after deducting 3,545 resolved election cases).
The year 2024 was the second full year of operation of the Professional Liability Chamber of the Supreme Court, which was established on 15 July 2022. In the reporting year, 680 rulings were issued in the Professional Liability Chamber, which is slightly less than in 2023 (716 rulings).

**Q099 (2023):** Other cases" include the statistics of the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber and Professional Liability Chamber of the Supreme Court.
Statistics of the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber (which deals with the Public law cases, inter alia cases originated from the extraordinary complaints or appeals against resolutions of the National Council of the Judiciary, competition and consumer protection cases, cases concerning the regulation of energy, telecommunications and postal services, rail transport, as well as the regulation of the water and sewage market, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings or cases concerning the retirement of a judge of the Supreme Court, etc.).
Statistics of the Professional Liability Chamber (which deals with the disciplinary cases or cases of lifting of the judicial and prosecutor immunity).
Compared to previous years, the number of cases pending as of 31 December of the reference year has increased, but it should be noted that the overall number of cases filed with the Supreme Court has increased significantly.
The Supreme Court still does not have all the positions provided for by law filled, which, combined with the growing inflow of cases from year to year, results in an increase in cases to be heard.
However, it should be noted that - even taking into account the above problems - the number of cases handled by the Supreme Court is growing from year to year:
6,308 cases were handled in the Civil Chamber (compared to 5,785 cases handled in 2022);
2,580 cases were handled in the Labor and Social Security Chamber (compared to 2,286 cases handled in 2022).
4,254 cases were handled in the Criminal Chamber (compared to 4,161 cases handled in 2022).
In the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs, 5,151 cases were resolved (compared to 1,617 cases resolved in 2022). However, it should be noted that such a significant increase is dictated by the consideration of electoral cases by this Chamber in connection with the elections to the Sejm and Senate of the Republic of Poland held in the autumn of 2023. The receipt of such cases in 2023 alone is 3,576 compared to 11 cases received in 2022.

**Q099 (2022):** Compared to previous years, the number of pending cases on 31 December of the reference year has increased, but it should be noted that the number of incoming cases has increased significantly.
In the Civil Chamber, for example, the number of incoming cases doubled compared to the cases received in 2020 (4360 incoming cases in 2020, while 8176 incoming cases in 2023).
Another factor that significantly affects the statistics of case recognition is the new measure introduced by the amendment to the Supreme Court Act of 9 June 2022, which entered into force on 15 July 2022 - the motion to examine the fulfilment of the requirements of independence and impartiality of a Supreme Court judge, taking into account the circumstances of his or her appointment and his or her post-appointment. Article 29(6) of the Supreme Court Act, which provides an additional procedural guarantee for the parties, on the other hand affects the length of the proceedings before the Supreme Court. It can be noted that this measure is widely used by the parties, which can be particularly observed in disciplinary proceedings. Furthermore, it has an impact on other Chambers of the Supreme Court, including the Civil Chamber.
It should also be noted that the Supreme Court has not had all of its legally stipulated Supreme Court judge positions filled for years (as at 31 December 2021, 90 of the 125 positions stipulated in Section 2 of the Supreme Court Rules were filled), which, combined with the increasing number of incoming cases each year, has resulted in an increasing number of pending cases.
Even taking the abovementioned problems into account, it should be noted that the number of cases decided by the Supreme Court is increasing year-on-year.
In the Civil Chamber, 5785 resolved cases (compered to 4926 resolved cases in 2021);
In the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber, 1617 resolved cases (compered to 1120 resolved cases in 2021);
In the Criminal Chamber, 4161 resolved cases (compered to 4003 resolved cases in 2021);
Only the Labour and Social Security Law Chamber has recorded a slight decrease in the number of resolved cases - 2286 in 2022 (compered to 2299 resolved cases in 2021).
*3 administrative law cases: in 2022,the lifting of restrictions on court activity due to the declared epidemic state in Poland has increased the number of cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court.

**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.
**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.

**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 (2024):** 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 take non by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2024 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2024: 345538; Incoming cases: 135188; Resolved cases: 138880; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024: 341846. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2024, 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 1 Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 29,611. The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 9388. The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 15,595. The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 23,404. In what concerns this type of cases, in 2024 there were 79,784 new cases and 38,643 completed cases. However, of these totals, only 79,058 new cases and 37,917 completed cases corresponded to real movements of the beginning and end of cases. The remaining 726 cases refer to cases that were internally transferred between units.
The very significant increase in the number of new, completed and pending cases in 2024 is largely due to the increase in urgent administrative cases. This increase was due to the very high number of applications for authorisation or renewal of the residence permit that were lodged with the Lisbon Administrative Court during 2024.

**Q091 (2023):** 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 take non by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2023 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2023: 359238; Incoming cases: 130392; Resolved cases: 142531; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023: 347099. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2023, 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 1 Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 34769. The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 10584. The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 15745. The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 29608. In what concerns this type of cases, in 2023 there were 25,607 new cases and 30,669 completed cases. However, of these totals, only 25,018 new cases and 30,080 completed cases corresponded to real movements of the beginning and end of cases. The remaining 589 cases refer to cases that were internally transferred between units.

**Q091 (2022):** 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 take non by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2022 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2022: 394367; Incoming cases: 108036; Resolved cases: 140946; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2022: 361457. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2022, 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 1 Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 38089. The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 11619. The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 14888. The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. That correspond only to tax cases is 34820. In what concerns this type of cases, in 2022 there were 24,212 new cases and 27,051 completed cases. However, of these totals, only 23,483 new cases and 26,322 completed cases corresponded to real movements of the beginning and end of cases. The remaining 729 cases refer to cases that were internally transferred between units.

**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 ent

ities), 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.

**Q094 (2024):** 2. The data is correct. The number of cases pending for more than two years has indeed increased compared to the previous year.
3. The data is correct. The increase in the number of pending cases as at 31 December 2024 is related to the fact that in 2024 the number of cases closed was lower than the number of cases filed.

**Q094 (2022):** In our view, the increase in the number of incoming and outgoing cases in 2022 compared to 2020 reflects the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic and the resulting lockdown, which had an impact on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.
3. "Other criminal cases" - cases involving procedural types provided for in criminal law, which do not fall into the "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" categories. These are, for example, cases relating to "legal accumulation", "interrogation of foreigners", "judicial expulsion", "compulsory internment" and "habeas corpus".

**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.

**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 (2024):** 97.3 The decrease in figures compared to 2023 is justified by the fact that in 2023 the figures were unusually high. In 2023, Decree-Law No. 74-B/2023 of 28 August came into force, which provided for the specialisation of the central administrative courts and their establishment by Order 281-A/2023 of 13 September. As a result of the creation of these specialised sections, the number of cases filed and concluded in the central administrative courts in 2023 was unusually high, due to internal transfers between the organisational units of these courts. In short, the figures for 2024 are in line with those for the years prior to 2023, which was, for the reasons mentioned above, a year with unusually high figures.
Last February, the number of cases heard by the Lisbon Court of Appeal between 2015 and 2023 was changed as a result of a correction made by the court. Following these corrections, the data for 2023 were changed from those originally submitted to the CEPEJ questionnaire last year. For this reason, the figures for cases pending as of December 31, 2023, do not match the figures for January 1, 2024.

**Q097 (2023):** In 2023, Decree-Law 74-B/2023 of 28 August came into force, which led to the specialisation of the central administrative courts and their installation by Order 281-A/2023 of 13 September. As a result of the creation of these specialised chambers, 11 745 cases were internally transferred between the organic units of these courts.

**Q097 (2022):** total: The increase in the number of cases filed in 2022 compared to 2020 reflects, from our point of view, the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent lockdown, which had an impact on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.
1.The drop in the number of pending cases in 2022 compared to 2020 is related to the fact that in the period from 2020 to 2022 the number of cases completed was higher than the number of cases received.

**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 (2024):** The data for 2024 is correct. Last February, the number of cases heard by the Lisbon Court of Appeal between 2015 and 2023 was amended as a result of a correction made by the court. Following these corrections, the data for 2023 were amended, meaning that the number of cases pending in 2023 were corrected compared to those submitted to the CEPEJ questionnaire last year. As such, the differences between the data for 2023 and 2024 will now be smaller. For reference, the figures in the first column (Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year) for 2023 are now 3070 and those in the fourth column (Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year) are now 2917.

**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 (2024):** 99.3 - We confirm the decrease in the number of cases pending before the Supreme Administrative Court (STA) in 2024 compared to 2023. In 2023, new legislation redistributed powers between the Central Administrative Courts and the Tax Litigation Section of the STA.
In fact, until 2023, the Tax Litigation Section of the STA had jurisdiction to hear appeals against decisions on the merits of tax courts.
However, in 2023, following the entry into force of Decree-Law No. 74-B/2023 of 28 August, the scope of jurisdiction of the aforementioned Section of the STA was restricted, with that Section now only hearing appeals against decisions on the merits of tax courts (based exclusively on matters of law, whenever the value of the case exceeds the jurisdiction of the central administrative courts and the value of the award exceeds half the jurisdiction of the court to which the appeal is made). Since 2023, fewer cases have been filed with the Tax Litigation Section of the STA as a result of this legislative amendment, and there may have been a tendency for judges to focus on resolving pending cases from then on, which would explain the decline in pending cases in 2024.

**Q099 (2022):** 1 - 1st column
The increase in the number of pending cases on January 1, 2022 compared to January 1, 2020 is related to the fact that in the period from 2020 to 2021 the number of incoming cases was higher than the number of outgoing cases. In our view, this behavior reflects the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic and the resulting lockdown, which had an impact on the functioning of the courts in 2020 and 2021, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.
3 - 1st column
The decrease in the number of cases pending on January 1, 2022 compared to January 1, 2020 is related to the fact that in the period 2020 to 2021 the number of cases closed was higher than the number of cases admitted.

**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.

**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 (2024):** In 2024, the number of civil cases resolved was higher than in 2023, which means that the year-end stock remains constant, given that the number of new cases registered in 2024 was also higher than in 2023.
2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases: The 2024 decline was operational and systemic — driven by digital transformation, staffing shortages, and temporary disruptions. In mid-2024, ONRC temporarily suspended both its online portal and front-office services to migrate to a new integrated digital system. The transition caused significant delays, reduced processing capacity, and a backlog of pending applications. The Registry faced an acute lack of registrars authorized to perform the legal verification of filings. This led the Government to adopt Emergency Ordinance No. 109/2024, allowing temporary re-assignment of legal advisers and managerial staff to perform registration duties. With the corrective measures already in place, a progressive recovery of registration volumes is anticipated in 2025, once the Trade Registry's new systems and personnel reach full capacity.

**Q091 (2023):** 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.
2. The variations could be attributed to a human resources issue: due to a wave of retirements among magistrates following recent legislative changes, the number of active judges has dropped by nearly 15% over three years. This reduction has slowed case resolution rates, which have not kept up with the annual increase in new cases, resulting in a steady rise in year-end backlogs.
2.1 - With the rising trend in new cases and the settlement rate still lagging behind new case inflows, year-end case backlogs, including cases older than three years, are likely to increase annually. However, given the low numbers involved (e.g., 412 cases in 2023 and 276 in 2022), these figures lack statistical significance and cannot be seen as indicators of broader socio-legal trends.

**Q091 (2022):** There are no explanations for the discrepancies, as for volumes of cases in the order of hundreds no conclusions can be drawn regarding statistical trends.
**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.

**Q092 (General Comment):** Divorce with the consent of the parties, granting of legal personality, modification of the constitutive acts of legal persons, requests related to unions, non-litigious requests (civil, litigation with professionals, minors and family).

**Q093 (General Comment):** NAP

**Q094 (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.

**Q094 (2024):** 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 stock at the beginning of 2024 was higher than that at the beginning of 2023, which is one of the possible explanations for the fact that the stock of year-end files older than 2 years has this increase.

**Q094 (2023):** 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 (2022):** Due to the large number of magistrates retiring in 2022, the number of solved cases decreased, as a result the stock of files at the end of the year increased, while the number of newly entered cases followed an upward trend compared to the previous reporting cycle.

**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.

**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.

**Q099 (2023):** Concerning variations in the category 'pending for more than 2 years', they cannot be considered as consequences of any socio-legal phenomenon ocurring in 2023.
**Q099 (2022):** There are no explanations for the discrepances, anyway for volumes of cases in the order of hundreds no conclusions can be drawn regarding statistical trends.
**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.

**Q100 (2022):** according to the application for statistics

**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.

**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 (2024):** Registry cases and non litigious business registry cases- The decrease in the number of resolved cases can be attributed to several factors, such as the involvement of notaries in the registration of changes in commercial companies (the percentage of persons who process their changes through a notary rather than through a court has been increasing month by month). This results in a lower inflow of new cases to the courts; however, it is also necessary to assess the allocation of the "complexity" or "problematic nature" of cases between courts and notaries. At the same time, within their activities the courts continue to "clean up" the Business Register, i.e. identifying companies that have failed to fulfil statutory obligations in the past (for example, the obligation to convert their registered capital from Slovak crowns to euros).

**Q091 (2023):** TBE

**Q091 (2022):** Discrepancy between the pending cases on 31 Dec. 2021 and the pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year in the line 1. and Total is due to an administrative error caused by the court. In the rest lines, there is no discrepancy between the pending cases on 31 Dec. 2021 and the pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year (compared with the previous year).
A significant increase in the Business registry cases category in 2022 (comparing incoming and resolved to 2020) is related to legislative changes to Act no. 530/2003 Coll. on the Commercial Register. The amendment to the law - included the birth-number among the recorded data with the aim of unambiguously identifying natural persons registered in the business register. In the case that it was not possible to add this data automatically from other reference sources into the the business register, it had to be added based on a court proposal submitted by September 30, 2022 (increase in incoming cases).
Other discrepancies are reflection either of the submission activity of the public (incoming cases) or productivity of the judicial system itself - in resolved cases.

**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.

**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 (2022):** Among "Other criminal cases" it is possible to include, for example, motions regarding the expungement of a conviction, motions regarding the imposition of protective measures and the execution of detention, motions related to custody and the execution of a sentence, motions for conditional release, motions related to probation and mediation, requests from domestic and foreign authorities in criminal cases, motions that are decided in preliminary proceedings, etc.
Other discrepancies are reflection either of the submission activity of the prosecutors or productivity of the judicial system (judicial staff) in resolved cases.

**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 (General Comment):** The decrease in the number of new cases can be attributed to an improved ability to resolve matters already at first instance, as several procedural steps exist to facilitate reaching a solution before a case proceeds to the second instance. Furthermore, the involvement of notaries and their ability to engage in informal communication with clients results in first-instance courts receiving applications that can be accepted without dispute.

**Q097 (2024):** Non-litigious cases: The decrease in the number of new cases can be attributed to an improved ability to resolve matters already at first instance, as several procedural steps exist to facilitate reaching a solution before a case proceeds to the second instance. Furthermore, the involvement of notaries and their ability to engage in informal communication with clients results in first-instance courts receiving applications that can be accepted without dispute.

**Q097 (2023):** Starting 2023 - according to the CEPEJ methodology Administrative cases are reported in Q99

**Q097 (2022):** The decline in litigious and non-litigious cases has been gradual since 2017. This phenomenon was not analysed in more detail. The decrease may be caused by the impact of the activity of courts of first instance as well as the behaviour of participants in court proceedings - a lower number of appeals.
There is some small amount of non-litigious registry cases, but they can not be monitored separately, they are part of the bigger group.
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. The Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic acts as second instance court in the administrative cases.
Source: https://www.nssud.sk/web_object/stat_2022.pdf

**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.

**Q098 (2022):** In the line "Total" of the table in Q 98 are data for all court registers in the criminal appeal agenda. Among the category “Other criminal cases” are included for example cases in which the appeals court decides on jurisdictional disputes, objections of bias, on complaints for inaction and other complaints filed after the filing of the indictment, etc.
Sources: Analytical center, Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic.

**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 fluctuation in the number of cases can be attributed to the judicial reform, as new administrative courts were established. Consequently, the judicial system is in the process of stabilization, which may have affected both the timing of the filing of applications to the courts and their processing.

**Q099 (2024):** 3. Administrative law cases: The fluctuation in the number of cases can be attributed to the judicial reform, as new administrative courts were established. Consequently, the judicial system is in the process of stabilization, which may have affected both the timing of the filing of applications to the courts and their processing.

**Q099 (2023):** As of 2023, administrative law cases treated by the Supreme Administrative Court are reported in Q99, as required by the CEPEJ methodology of data presentation.
**Q099 (2022):** The collected statistical data for the Supreme Court do not distinguish the litigious and non-litigious cases. Information delivered by the Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic available on internet https://www.nsud.sk/data/att/f59/688231.22d3e0.pdf. The new Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic took over the Administrative law cases from the Supreme Court .
Data for new Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic are not mentioned in the table, since the table is only for the Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic.
The data for new Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic in 2022 were:
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year - 2106
Incoming cases - 2015
Resolved cases - 1889
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year - 2232
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court - 103
Source: https://www.nssud.sk/web_object/stat_2022.pdf

**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.
**Q100 (General Comment):** The collected statistical data does not distinguish between the two types of criminal offences.

**Q100 (2022):** Information delivered by Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic available on internet https://www.nsud.sk/data/att/f59/688231.22d3e0.pdf
**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

**Slovenia**

**Q091 (General Comment):** Category 1.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, 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, 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 (2024):** Discrepancies: 2.2.2. (Incoming cases): please note small absolute number of cases.

**Q091 (2023):** Other cases - Pending cases older than 2 years: While most of cases in this category are resolved within few months, some of them are on-hold due to the fact that the party died mid-process and inheritance procedure has to take place to continue; or party is under insolvency proceedings; or there are delays with serving of court writings to parties in other countries.

**Q091 (2022):** 2.2. Registry cases and 2.2.2. Land Registry cases - Pending cases on 31 Dec – increase by 123%/143%: 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 end of 2020 decreased. In 2022, it returned to usual level. 2.2.2. Bussines Registry cases – Pending cases older than 2 years – increase by 300%: Please note the small number of cases (4 cases in 2022), compared to incoming/resolved cases (approx 43.000 per year).
3. Administrative cases – Pending cases older than 2 years – increase by 149%:
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.
4. Other cases – Pending cases on 31 Dec – decrease by 46%:
Due to the limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics in 2020, the number of pending cases was unusually high. In 2022 it returned to usual level. 4. Other cases – Pending cases older than 2 years - increase by 86%:
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). This is automated and fast procedure (average duration is between 1 and 2 months), however some of those cases could not be completed due to legal reasons (e.g. waiting for inheritance cases regarding parties to finish). Please note the small number of cases (approx. 100 cases), compared to incoming/resolved cases (approx 120.000 per year).

**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.
**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.

**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.

**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, legal aid between national courts at local and district courts, international legal aid 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'."

**Q094 (General Comment):** 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.
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,
cases of the out-of-hearing senate,
clemency procedures at local and district courts,
legal aid between national courts in criminal matters,
international legal aid in criminal matters,
cases of decisions to permit interventions within human rights and freedoms,
legal aid between courts 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,
compliance detention,
various criminal matters at local and district courts and in minor offences at local courts.
Regarding criminal investigations at district courts: Slovenia has a system where the state public prosecutor requests 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 accusatory act is filed, a criminal trial (i.e. deliberating on the responsibility and sanctioning of the offender) begins.
Regarding setting a task for the good of the community or the local community: A request for prison sentence or fine to be replaced by a task for the good of the community can be filed after the finality of the main court decision and is decided upon in a separate proceedings.

**Q094 (2024):** Criminal investigation cases (reported under Other criminal cases): 2.435 incoming cases; 2.089 resolved cases in 2024.
Criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings (reported under Other criminal cases): 607 incoming cases, 631 resolved cases in 2024.
Discrepancies: 3. (Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year): The number of "international legal aid in minor offences" increased significantly (by 88%; from 1.215 to 2.288) because some countries have raised the fines for certain offences, which are now being enforced by the Slovenian court based on EU regulations (number of such incoming cases increased by 46%). In addition, the competent Slovenian court is facing a shortage of judicial staff. These are two main reasons for the increase in unresolved cases.

**Q094 (2023):** Criminal investigation cases (reported under Other criminal cases): 2.266 incoming cases; 2.335 resolved cases in 2023.
Criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings (reported under Other criminal cases): 593 incoming cases, 458 resolved cases in 2023.
Discrepancy to 2022 data in 3. Other criminal cases (Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year): The increase is notable in 1) legal aid between national courts in criminal matters and international legal aid in criminal matters (34% of pending cases) and 2) criminal investigation (15% of pending cases). In 2023 both aforementioned types of cases saw increase in incoming cases and resolved cases, resulting in 87% and 97% CR respectively.

**Q094 (2022):** In 2022, approx. 25-30% of pending cases and 6-7% of incoming/resolved cases were criminal investigation cases (see general comment).
1. Severe criminal cases - Pending cases older than 2 years – increase by 39%;
3. Other cases - Pending cases older than 2 years – increase by 25%:
Factors contributing to this increase are: increased complexity of cases (cases with multiple offenders, cases with offenders in detention, need for experts, international element), trouble finding and serving court documents to foreign offenders and victims, non-responsiveness of parties, delays due to international legal aid, limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics in 2020 and 2021 and lack of candidates for new judges at district courts.

**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).

**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 (2024):** Discrepancies:
2.2 and 2.2.2: please note small (absolute) number of cases.

**Q097 (2023):** Discrepancies to 2022 data: Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year – increase by 23% - 35%: in 2022, a slight decrease in number of incoming and resolved cases is observable. Clearance rate was slightly below 100%. In 2022, the number of second instance judges decreased by 7% (mostly due to retirement) which resulted in decreased number of resolved cases. Please note the ratio between pending and incoming/resolved cases is approx. 1:5 (a slight decrease in % of resolved cases will reflect in higher % increase in pending cases).

**Q097 (2022):** Pending cases on 1 Jan. (all categories) - decrease by approx. 35-50%: In 2021, the number of pending cases decreased by approx. 50% due to effects of Covid-19 pandemics in 2020. In 2022, the number increased again (by approx 20%). For (land) registry cases (2.2. and 2.2.1) please note small (absolute) number of cases.
Incoming cases (2.2 and 2.2.2) – decrease by 21% and 36%: please note small (absolute) number of cases.
Resolved cases (2.2. and 2.2.2 ) - decrease by 21% and 35%: please note small (absolute) number of cases and low disposition time (number of resolved cases is highly dependant on number of new cases).
Pending cases on 31 Dec. (all categories) – increase by 50% - 90%: in reporting period a slight decrease in number of incoming cases and more significant decrease in number of resolved cases is observable (especially in 2021). Clearance rate was slightly below 100%. Please note the ratio between pending and incoming/resolved cases is approx 1:5 (a slight decrease in % of resolved cases will reflect in higher % increase in pending cases). The decrease in the number of resolved cases in 2021 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.). In 2022, the number of second instance judges decreasd by 7% (mostly due to retirement) which resulted in decreased number of resolved cases.

**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.

**Q098 (General Comment):** For explanation on severe criminal cases and minor offences please see comment to Q94. Figures for severe criminal law cases at the second instance include: - appeals in criminal cases (Kp), Figures for minor offences cases at the highest instance include: - appeals in minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PRp-obp), - appeals in minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PRp-zsv), - apppeals in procedures for cancellation of validity of the driver's licence according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVDp).
Figures for other cases at the highest instance include: - appeals in cases for setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnkp),
- appeals in substitution of imprisonment cases (Prnzp)
- appeals in compliance detention cases (PRuzp),
- various criminal and misdemnour cases in higher courts (cases not fitting in the categories above) (Kr, Prr).
For general explanation on types of cases, see Q94.

**Q098 (2024):** Discrepancies: 3. please note small (absolute) number of cases.

**Q098 (2022):** Discrepancies (to 2020 data) – 2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (also reflected in Total):
An increase is due to two factors: 1) Until 2020, the appeal in minor offences in regular court procedures – request for judicial protection was limited (depending on the criteria – sanction) by the Minor Offences Act. 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 and 2022; 2) 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). Pending cases older than 2 years: plase note small (absolute) number of cases.

**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).

**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.
The reported data includes cases concerning extraordinary legal remedies (the Supreme Court in its capacity ass the court of final instance) and cases subject to the separate procedure for manifest inadmissibility.

**Q099 (2024):** Discrepancies: please note small (absolute) number of cases.

**Q099 (2022):** Total of other than criminal law cases/1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan. - decrease: A trend of decrease of pending cases is observable.
Total of other than criminal law cases/1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases/3. Administrative cases - Pending cases older than 2 years - decrease: Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.
2. Non litigious cases (all discrepancies): Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.
2.2 Registry cases (all discrepancies): Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.

**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 cases Please 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.

**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 (2024):** Discrepancies: please note small (absolute) number of cases.

**Q100 (2022):** Total of criminal law cases/ 1. Severe criminal cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan/ Pending cases on 31 Dec – decrease by approx. 30-40%: In last 5 years, number of incoming and resolved cases was relatively stable. Clearance rate has been above 100% since 2020. In 2021, the number of resolved cases increased (by 15%; clearance rate 111%), hence the decrease in pending cases.
2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (all discrepancies): Plese note the small (absolute) number of 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).

**Spain**

**Q091 (2024):** The data has been obtained using the same criteria as in previous years and follows the trend published by the General Council of the Judiciary.
In relation to the increase in incoming civil (and commercial) litigious cases, a specific rise in the number of summary proceedings (juicios verbales) can be observed. The reform introduced by Royal Decree-Law 6/2023 expanded the scope of summary proceedings (juicios verbales) not only by increasing the monetary threshold from €6,000 to €15,000, but also by incorporating new subject matters that must now be processed under this simplified procedure. These include individual actions related to general contractual conditions, claims for amounts by homeowners’ associations, and actions for the division of jointly owned property.

**Q091 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain’s rates.

**Q091 (2022):** There are increases of incoming and resolved cases compared to the number of cases in 2020. It should be taken into account that information from 2020 represents the year of the pandemic. The recovery of normal work increased the number of cases, incoming and resolved.
**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.

**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.

**Q094 (2024):** The data has been obtained using the same criteria as in previous years and follows the trend published by the General Council of the Judiciary.
**Q094 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain’s rates.

**Q094 (2022):** There are increases of incoming and resolved cases compared to the number of cases in 2020. It should be taken into account that information from 2020 represents the year of the pandemic. The recovery of normal work increased the number of cases, incoming and resolved.
**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.

**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 (2024):** The data is calculated using the same criteria as in previous years.
When a court identifies inaccuracies in its statistical reporting, it may regularize the data in its Statistical Bulletin by replacing the incorrect figure with one that reflects the actual situation, even if it diverges from previously reported values. Such regularizations are a recognized source of horizontal inconsistencies
In relation to the increase in incoming civil (and commercial) litigious cases, a significant rise in the number of appeals can be observed.

**Q097 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain's rates.

**Q097 (2022):** 2020 was a year marked by the pandemic, the reduction of work in judicial bodies, despite digitalization, and by mobility restriction measures. The increase in the pace of work in 2022 is logical and it explains the increase in the number of incoming civil (and commercial) litigious cases. The reduced clearance rate has been due to the increase in appeals against judgements in ordinary trials related to floor clauses (cláusulas suelo); clause that a specific financial institution can include in a variable interest mortgage loan contract and that establishes the minimum interest rate that customers will pay.

**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.
**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 (2023):** .

**Q098 (2022):** 2020 was a year marked by the pandemic, the reduction of work in judicial bodies, despite digitalization, and by mobility restriction measures. The increase in the pace of work in 2022 is logical and it explains the increase of incoming and resolved cases compared to 2020.
**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.

**Q099 (2024):** The data are calculated using the same criteria as in previous years.

**Q099 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain's rates.

**Q099 (2022):** 2020 was a year marked by the pandemic, the reduction of work in judicial bodies, despite digitalization, and by mobility restriction measures. The increase in the pace of work in 2022 is logical and it explains the increase of incoming and resolved cases compared to 2020.

**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.

**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.

**Q100 (2024):** The data are calculated using the same criteria as in previous years.
When a court identifies inaccuracies in its statistical reporting, it may regularize the data in its Statistical Bulletin by replacing the incorrect figure with one that reflects the actual situation, even if it diverges from previously reported values. Such regularizations are a recognized source of horizontal inconsistencies

**Q100 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain's rates.

**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.

# 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 091

**Austria**

**Q091 (2024):** 2.2. Registry cases (2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3) and 2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases: there is no known explanation for the reduction in cases. A connection to the Covid-19 pandemic is possible, but not certain. We just know that a lot of cases were resolved in 2023, but have no specific reason for this. It might be normal fluctuation.

**Q091 (2023):** Starting from 2022, "non-litigious family matters" are taken into consideration in the category "general civil non-litigious cases", while before they were communicated in "other".
Discrepancy (2.2.2.) is due to an above-average completion rate in 2023. The reason for this is unknown.

**Q091 (2022):** Starting from 2022, "non-litigious family matters" are taken into consideration in the category "general civil non-litigious cases", while before they were communicated in "other".

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q091 (2024):** Q 91 “1. Civil (and commercial) litigation cases" - the discrepancy between the number of cases pending on January 1, 2024 and the number of cases pending on December 31, 2023, is due to a data cleanup operation: some cases had been temporarily excluded from the statistics pending verification by the clerks of the courts concerned.
Data for “youth” cases are only partially available, with only the number of incoming cases available (1 443 in 2024). As a result, “youth” civil litigation is not included in the table. Labor courts: data on “collective debt settlement” cases are not available for 2024 due to their migration to a new ICT program (JustRestart). As a result, they are not included in the table.
Concerning administrative cases (= sum of the figures for the Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, and the Flemish administrative courts -Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen): it should be noted that the last figure 1 330 (Cases pending for more than 2 years) only concerns the Council of State.
For the Council of State, the figures are as follows: 4 725; 2 549; 2 461; 4 774 and 1 330; for the Aliens Litigation Council: 13 935; 23 159 (a ruling may close several cases, hence the lack of complete horizontal consistency); 19 579; 17 509 and NA (for the last column).

**Q091 (2023):** For category 2 (non-litigious matters): there was a sharp increase in the number of cases filed electronically in 2023. This increase is linked to legislative changes (Act of 23 March 2019 introducing the new Code of Companies and Associations and containing various provisions’; effective from 1 May 2019; requiring amendment of the bylaws of ASBLs. Companies began complying with this requirement from September 2023, as the deadline was 1 January 2024. A large number of requests for amendments are currently being processed by the registry, as not all companies have yet finalised the necessary changes.
For administrative cases (= sum of 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): it should be noted that the last figure 1 546 (see last column ‘Cases pending for more than 2...’) only concerns the Council of State. Thus, for the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat), the figures are as follows: 4 521; 2 499; 2 049; 4 662 and 1 546; for the Aliens Litigation Council (Conseil du Contentieux des Etrangers): 9 584; 20 892 (one judgment may close several cases); 16 539; 13 935 and NA (for the last column). For administrative cases, the increase concerns cases brought before the Aliens Litigation Council (not those brought before the Council of State). This is due to an influx of applications before this court for the year 2023.

**Q091 (2022):** As concerns administrative matters, the total number of cases includes figures for the Council of State, the Alien Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen. However, the figure of 1392 (in the last column 'Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court') only concerns the Council of State. Thus data can be broken down as follows: for the Council of State: 4 425 (pending at the beginning of 2022); 2 214 (incoming); 1 996 (resolved); 4 523 (pending at the end of 2022) and 1 392 (pending for more than 2 years); for the Alien Litigation Council : 9 273 (pending at the beginning of 2022);16 456 (incoming; a judgment may close different cases hence there is a lack of horizontal conistency);16 139 (resolved); 9 584 (pending at the end of 2022) and NA.

**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".

**Bulgaria**

**Q091 (General Comment):** Proceedings related to registration in the Business and Land Registers (items 2.2.1 and item 2.2.2.) are heard by the Registry Agency at the Ministry of Justice, therefore the answers submitted for item 2.2. are NAP, as they refer to data on cases and/or proceedings that are not heard by the Bulgarian court system and, respectively, are not collected by the Supreme Judicial Council. The SJC also does not collect information on registration of associations and foundations, since according to the Non-profit Legal Persons Act, they are carried out in a register maintained by the Registry Agency and, respectively, RA is competent to provide data on them.
"Civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases" include only data available at the Supreme Judicial Council on the number of cases heard at first instance in district courts, initiated upon an application for issuing an order for the execution of a monetary obligation under Art. 410 and Art. 417 of the Civil Procedure Code – the so-called Order for payment cases and cases for divorce by mutual consent.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q091 (2024):** The Statistical Review of Court Operations for 2024 has also been updated to reflect the revised number of 36,411 in section 2.2.1, "Non-litigious land registry cases - Pending cases on January 1st of the reference year."
Although the number of cases in 2024 was roughly the same as the previous year, the courts' efficiency improved, as evidenced by the higher number of cases resolved and, as a result, a smaller number of unresolved cases at the end of 2024 (unlike in 2023, when courts were unable to process cases fully due to the strike of public and civil servants).
During 2023, the courts were unable to process the incoming caseload in its entirety, leading to an increase in the number of pending cases at the end of 2023 and continuing into 2024. This trend has persisted throughout 2024. For Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - In the course of case resolution activities, a greater number of cases older than two years were addressed, resulting in a reduction of 77 unresolved cases of this category compared to 2023.
3. Administrative law cases - During 2023, the courts were unable to process the incoming caseload in its entirety, leading to an increase in the number of pending cases at the end of 2023 and continuing into 2024. This trend has persisted throughout 2024. For Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - In the course of case resolution activities, a greater number of cases older than two years were addressed, resulting in a reduction of 77 unresolved cases of this category compared to 2023.
With regard to land registry cases — which account for nearly half of the total inflow of court cases in the Republic of Croatia — it is particularly important to emphasize the scope and volume of these data. The data are obtained exclusively through the Joint Information System of Land Registers and Cadastre (ZIS). The reliability and consistency of data concerning the work of 109 land registry departments largely depend on the timeliness and completeness of updates within the system itself. It is therefore likely that horizontal inconsistencies primarily arise for this reason.
Discrepancies in comparison with data from the previous year can be further explained by the extraordinary circumstances that affected court operations during 2023. Owing to the strike of court clerks and judges, there was a temporary suspension in the receipt and processing of cases, which resulted in a decline in activity. In 2024, following the resumption of regular operations, an increase was recorded both in the number of incoming and resolved cases, which is also reflected in the overall indicators. This increase should therefore not be interpreted solely as a result of structural changes in court operations, but also as compensation for the reduced level of activity in the previous period.

**Q091 (2023):** According to the comment of the previous period: „In 2022, the number of incoming Civil (and commercial) litigious cases dropped because of the unique situation from the previous cycle of a significant number of incoming collective labour cases from the public sector workers (more than 60.000 incoming cases). As a result of the characteristics of the previous period and, civil servants and employees' strike in 2023. the decrease is documented in the following categories: Pending cases on January 1 ref. year - 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases decreased by 20.92% and and Resolved cases decreased by 22.79%.
Q91.3 - The increase in incoming cases is due to the cases brought against the City of Zagreb in response to the cancellation of one of the social programs. We believe that this increase is extraordinary in this period.

**Q091 (2022):** In 2022, the number of incoming Civil (and commercial) litigious cases dropped because of the unique situation from the previous cycle of a significant number of incoming collective labour cases from the public sector workers (more than 60.000 incoming cases). Since they were resolved in 2022, this has led also to a significant increase in the number of resolved cases.
Regarding General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, as this includes enforcement cases which have had legislative changes during 2021, a new type of case has been recorded in courts by the end of 2021, which now seems to be a permanent increase in both incoming cases and resolved cases (up from an average of 40.000 cases received and resolved every year prior to 2021 to about 60.000 cases in 2021 and 90.000 cases in 2022. These are all cases of small value that are very quick to resolve.
For non-litigious registry cases, there is a slightly bigger horizontal inconsistency due to additional corrections from the sides of courts after the official published data.

**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).

**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 (2024):** 1. Total of other than criminal cases:
There was an increase of cases filled before the new civil procedures rules were entered into force in September 2023.
Pre-action protocols, set by the new rules, essentially refer to several rules and procedures that need to be followed by the parties before any action in Court and encourage a sufficient negotiation between the parties in order to achieve an out of court settlement which reduced the number of cases filed. This has led to many insurance cases being settled.
A new law was enacted establishing an out-of-court, fast-track procedure for the sale (foreclosure) of mortgaged immovable property
3. Administrative cases: Incoming cases decrease: this was due to the rejection of asylum to economic immigrants. Every appeal that is filed is formally registered and proceeds to trial, the only preliminary checks that are conducted, concern administrative details such as the applicant’s name/address and so on. The observed 22% decrease in incoming cases is likely linked to external factors, such as a reduction in the number of new asylum applications or a slower rate of decisions, made by the Cyprus Asylum Service, which directly affects the number of appeals submitted to the Court
Resolved cases decrease: the court now has to go into the subject matter of the case. Since 2023 the profile and nationality of filed cases have shifted significantly. The Court’s backlog has transitioned from being primarily composed of applicants from South and Southeast Asia, to a predominance of cases from Sub-Saharan Africa. Previously decision making was comparatively faster, as many of the appeals from Asian applicants involved largely unfounded or purely financial claims. The newer composition however, tends to have more complex and substantive cases, as is evident by the increased rate in positive decisions, requiring a deeper examination. While this has led to longer processing times, the overall backlog has remained relatively stable, after an initial increase, owing to a concurrent reduction in the overall numbers of appeals filed.

**Q091 (2023):** The courts have jurisdiction to deal with non litigious cases, however we do not have data on the number of such cases

**Q091 (2022):** The total number of resolved cases has increased as there was an increase in the number of judges.
Administrative law cases include the cases filled at the Administrative court of international protection.

**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.

**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 (2024):** There was a methodology change in 2023 and insolvency cases had been moved to category litigous cases. Also change was made for pending insolvency cases. It now only involves cases before the court decision about insolvency.
2.2. Registry cases (2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3) - 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 - All – 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 (2023):** There was a methodology change in 2023 and insolvency cases had been moved to category litigous cases. Also change was made for pending insolvency cases. It now only involves cases before the court decision about insolvency.
2.2. Registry cases and 2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry 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.
2.3. Other non-litigious cases (pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year) - 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 (2022):** Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: In general, the number pending cases in Czech republic is decreasing, which can be seen in the table.
Administrative law cases: There is a significant and steady decrease in law administrative cases in last years. Thanks to the decreasing number of incoming cases and thanks to the increasing of the number of judges, the pending cases are rapidly decreasing.

**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.

**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. Administrative courts do not exist in Denmark, and administrative cases are initially dealt outside courts by court-like bodies, like appeal boards, committees, or councils. The number of “administrative law cases” which are litigious and go to courts 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.
Administrative law cases:
1. What is included in “administrative law cases” and what is the distinguishment between litigious and non-litigious administrative law cases; and what are non-litigious administrative case in Denmark. It is challenging to provide a clear answer for Denmark. Due to the way data is collected within the Danish Court Administration, it is unfortunately not possible to distinguish between the specific types of cases included under administrative law cases. The courts indicate whether a case is of an administrative nature, however, administrative cases occur across almost all categories within civil cases. Consequently, it is difficult to state unequivocally which types of cases they most appropriately belong to. 2. The approximate number of administrative law cases that are litigious and go to court, and their part of the overall “civil litigious cases
In the period from 2023-2025 the number of civil cases in Denmark was 181.064, and out of those, 10.947 was of administrative nature. Furthermore, approximately 6 percent of all civil cases over the past three years have been classified as administrative law cases. Cases concerning forced removal often fall within the scope of administrative law, however, such cases represent only about 2 percent of the total civil caseload. The two other categories with a notable share of administrative law cases are “general civil cases” and cases under “the simplified procedure”. Both of these categories are quite extensive in terms of volume as well as broad in their classification, meaning that administrative law cases constitute only a relatively small proportion within them. 3. The composition of the bodies such as appeal boards and committees Denmark has a well-developed system of specialized complaints boards that serve as administrative appeal bodies for decisions made by public authorities. These boards, such as Ankestyrelsen and the Consumer Complaints Board, provide citizens with accessible and cost-effective avenues to challenge administrative decisions. Denmark has over 80 complaints boards and committees across various sectors. They generally consist of a chairperson – often a judge or legal expert – and a mix of legally trained members and specialists relevant to the board’s area. Membership terms are typically four years. The exact composition varies by board: for example, the Consumer Complaints Board includes a chair (judge), vice-chairs, and representatives of consumer and business interests, while the Patient Complaints Board combines judges and health professionals. Appointments are usually made by ministries or local authorities, often based on nominations from relevant organizations.

**Q091 (2024):** 2. Non litigious cases (2.1+2.2+2.3) + 2.1. General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases (Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year): The lower number of registry cases is due to changes in the activity of mortgage bonds etc., which among other things depends on the number of housing transactions and restructuring of mortgage loans.
2.2.1. Non litigious land registry cases: we no longer register the pending cases for land registry as the system has been digitalized which means the processing time has decreased to an extent where it does not make sense to register.
4. Other cases: Notary services are increasing substantially with the advent of advance care directives in Denmark
Administrative law cases: changed from NAP to NA since Denmark does have administrative cases in courts, but they cannot be counted exactly.

**Q091 (2023):** The lower number of registry cases is due to changes in the activity of mortgage bonds etc., which among other things depends on the number of housing transactions and restructuring of mortgage loans.
Regarding 2.2.1 – we no longer register the pending cases for land registry as the system has been digitalized which means the processing time has decreased to an extent where it does not make sense to register.

**Q091 (2022):** The number of administrative litigious cases that go to courts in 2022 are estimated at 2600 which is 5,5% of the total number of incoming civil and commercial litigious cases in Denmark. They can not be easily separated from the other civil and commercial cases.
In 2022 there was still an aftermath of the unusual situation of the Covid-19 related to the periods with clos-ing down the society, including the courts. It has 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 in-coming cases with very large figures. 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 regula-tions/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.

**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.

**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 (2024):** The workload of judges handling civil cases has increased.

**Q091 (2023):** no comment provided

**Q091 (2022):** No comment could be provided on the variations in the caseflow between 2020 and 2022.

**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”.

**Finland**

**Q091 (General Comment):** The pending cases older than two years are not collected in Finland. 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. 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.

**Q091 (2024):** These explanations apply to questions 91, 97 ja 99 together. There may be several reasons for the increase of the case amounts. Firstly, in the last round, the reports had been taken on the 31 of December and now they have been taken in August. There can be significant changes in a half a year. At this stage, it is no longer possible to provide the data from 31 of December. Secondly, there has been an increase on the first instance case amounts. One explanation is the growth of summary civil cases.

**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.

**France**

**Q091 (General Comment):** Non-litigious cases relating to the commercial register are handled by the registry of the Commercial Court. These registries are charges and their activities do not fall within the remit of the Ministry of Justice.

**Q091 (2024):** Civil justice: following a change in methodology for calculating the case stock, the number of pending cases as of January 1, 2024 differs from the number of pending cases as of December 31, 2023 (provided in the 2024 questionnaire, based on an estimate). The data provided last year was based on estimates. We now have, from an annual survey, the total stock of the first instance court. We then categorised this stock (litigious cases, non-litigious cases, and other cases), based on the distribution observed for resolved cases. The data provided this year is based on input from the courts' software, which allows us to categorise these cases accurately according to their different types.
However, this change in methodology results in a significant downward revision of the "other cases" stock and a significant upward revision of the "civil litigious cases" stock (the assumption we had based our estimate on was incorrect).
Following the 2021 divorce reform, and to avoid a break in the series, an estimate is used for 2024 (for litigious civil cases and non-litigious civil cases) based on 2019 data.
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stock of "civil and commercial litigious cases" at the beginning and end of the year does not include cases related to political electoral disputes. These cases represent 0.2% of the resolved cases in 2024.
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stock of "non-litigious civil cases" at the beginning and end of the year does not include prior attempts at conciliation. These cases represent 0.1% of the resolved cases in 2024.
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stock of "other cases" at the beginning and end of the year does not include cases (excluding consumer law) before the local court and wage garnishments. These cases represent 2.1% of the resolved cases in 2024 (respectively 0.4% and 1.7%).
For administrative courts:
Since 2024, cases from the National asylum court (Cour nationale du droit d'asile) are included in the number of first-instance administrative cases. The raw data for the CNDA is as follows:
•Pending cases on 1 Jan. = 26 132
•Incoming cases = 56 497
•Resolved cases = 61 593
•Pending cases on 31 Dec. = 22 194
•Pending cases for more than 2 years = 199
The 2024 data do not include those from the Paid parking court (Tribunal du stationnement payant). For your information, the raw data for these cases is:
•Pending cases on 1 Jan. = 224,637
•Incoming cases = 202 111
•Resolved cases = 146 267
•Pending cases on 31 Dec. = 281 392
•Pending cases for more than 2 years = 165 469
The data regarding pending cases before the Paid parking court excludes cases categorized as "automatic withdrawal of action". If, after the deadline given to the claimant to regularise their application, no regularisation occurs, the case is not processed and is rejected without a decision (inadmissibility due to incomplete documentation).

**Q091 (2023):** Source(s) for SSER data: exploitation of the General Civil Register, of the survey related to Administrative Activities and Statement 4 of the former "tribunaux d'instance", and the survey Annual Civilian Indicators.
Note: Following the 2021 divorce reform, and in order to avoid a break in series, an estimate is used for 2023 (civil litigious cases and civil non-litigious cases);
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stocks of "civil and commercial litigious cases" at the beginning and end of the year do not include cases relating to political electoral disputes. In 2023, these cases represent 0% of resolved cases;
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stocks of "civil non-litigious cases" at the beginning and end of the year do not include prior attempts at conciliation. In 2023, these cases represent 0.1% of resolved cases;
Due to the lack of data reporting, the stocks of "other cases" at the beginning and end of the year do not include applications (out of the scope of the Consumer Code) before the local court and seizures of earnings. In 2023, these cases represent 2.2% of resolved cases (0.4% and 1.8% respectively);
Due to the use of different sources to calculate pending, incoming and resolved cases, and the lack of data reporting explained above, the number of pending cases at the end of the year does not correspond to the result of (pending cases at the beginning of the year + incoming cases) – resolved cases (horizontal consistency).
The stock of non-litigious cases as of 1 January 2023 has been revised compared to the stock as of 31 December 2022 (provided in the previous evaluation cycle).
Civil litigious cases: general litigious cases before ordinary courts, local courts and courts for rural leases, family cases, cases relating to sales, agricultural work accidents, proceedings relating to companies in difficulty (safeguard, receivership and judicial liquidation) before the "tribunal judiciaire" and the commercial court, cases of "juges aux orders", the liberty and detention judge (detention of foreigners and compulsory hospitalization) and the social division of the "tribunal judiciaire", ordinary procedures before the labour tribunal, litigious cases before the commercial court, cases relating to the protection of adults, cases relating to political electoral disputes.

**Q091 (2022):** Source: Ministry of Justice/SG/SEM/SDSE, General Civil Registry; Council of State.
Following a change in methodology, the "civil (and commercial) litigious cases" now include: general litigation cases before the judicial tribunal, local court and "tribunaux paritaires des beaux ruraux", family matters, sales-related cases, agricultural work accidents cases, proceedings related to companies in difficulty (safeguarding, reorganization and judicial liquidation) before the judicial tribunal and commercial court , judge's orders matters, liberty and detention judge matters (detention of foreigners and involuntary hospitalization), as well as social division proceedings before the judicial tribunal; ordinary procedures before the labor courts; litigious cases before commercial courts; protection of adults' cases as well as political electoral disputes.

Following the 2021 divorce reform in order to avoid any disruption in series continuity, an estimate is used for 2022 (civil litigious and non-litigious cases).

Due to lack of data, the number of pending cases at the beginning and the end of 2022 related to political electoral disputes is not included in the number of pending civil litigious cases. These represent 0.6% of the resolved case-load in 2022. The same applies to attempts at conciliation. These represent 0.6%of completed case load in 2022. Due to the lack of data, the number of pending "other cases" at the beginning and end of the refernce year do not include applications (excluding the Consumer Code) before the local court and seizures on remuneration. In 2022, these cases accounted for 8.3% of resolved cases (1.7% and 6.6% respectively). The lack of data on pending cases for the enumerated case types explains the lack of horizontal consistency in the table.

**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 hea

lth 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).
4°) The orders of March and November 2020 allowed the interim relief judge to rule without a hearing, in addition to the cases provided for in article L. 522-3 of the Code of Administrative Justice.
Many courts have indicated that they have dispensed with a hearing. The dispensation of a hearing was most frequently applied in the case of summary proceedings for suspension. In the case of interim relief, this dispensation was applied in a more measured way.
Finally, summary proceedings other than suspension and liberty have been exempted from a hearing in many jurisdictions.
5°) The possibility for the administrative courts of appeal to rule by order without a hearing on applications for a stay of execution was little applied, since only 3 CAA indicated that they had applied it.
6°) In matters of DALO-Injunction, the possibility of ruling by order was used by 12 courts and, for almost all of these courts, for more than 60% of the cases judged during the same period.
II - The courts made very little use of the derogation provisions relating to the composition of the trial panels. In fact, no court made use of the possibility of completing a panel of judges with the participation of an honorary magistrate from another court. Only one administrative court requested the participation of a judge from another court (one judge came to assist for a period of three months).
III - The provisions allowing heads of court to appoint advisers to rule by order under the conditions set out in article R. 222-13 of the CJA were hardly used: only two administrative courts applied them. One head of court had appointed one or more advisers but no order was made by this magistrate or these magistrates. Another head of court indicated that the designated magistrate(s) signed more than 200 orders. In total, it appears that the measures provided for have been used very differently depending on the measure taken into account.
Video hearings and the new rules for summary proceedings have opened up possibilities, with provisions that can be seen as having been the medium for experimentation. "

**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.

**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 federal states, 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 surveys" 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 (2024):** "Non-litigious civil cases" represent non-litigious enforcement cases.
"Non-litigious business registry cases" represent - 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
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the administrative, social and finance courts
"Other cases" include family cases at the local courts and cases at the labour courts (family matters are not assigned to the category civil cases, because they are subject to a different procedural law).
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 (2023):** "Non-litigious civil cases" represent non-litigious enforcement cases.
"Non-litigious business registry cases" represent - 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
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the administrative, social and finance courts
"Other cases" include family cases at the local courts and cases at the labour courts (family matters are not assigned to the category civil cases, because they are subject to a different procedural law).
Land registry and business registry cases: One federal state could not yet submit numbers for 2023. The federal state's 2022 data was used to calculate the total.

**Q091 (2022):** "Non-litigous civil cases" represent non-litigous enforcement cases.
"Non-litigious business registry cases" represent - 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
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the administrative, social and finance courts
"Other cases" include family cases at the local courts and cases at the labour courts (family matters are not assigned to the category civil cases, because they are subject to a different procedural law). Discrepancies in comparison with the 2020 cycle:
There has been a general decrease in incoming and resolved litigous civil cases als well as non-litigous civil cases (enforcement cases). No specific reason could be identified for this development.
Regarding pending "other cases", additional data on pending guardianship cases at the family courts has become available. Until 2021, only the number of incoming and resolved guardianship cases was available. These figures were included in the total of incoming and resolved "other cases" in previous years. The number of pending cases at 1 Jan. and 31 Dec did not include guardianship cases, because their their number was unknown. This year for the first time, pending guardianship cases were inculded in other cases pending on 1. Jan and 31. Dec. They amount to 118 751 pending cases on 1 Jan and 128 580 pending cases on 31 Dec.

**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.

**Greece**

**Q091 (2024):** Independent Department of Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat).
pending cases at the beginning of the period show a significant increase compared to 2023. This is due to the implementation of Law 5108/2024 on the consolidation of first instance jurisdiction. According to the aforementioned law, as of September 16, 2024, the Magistrates' Courts were abolished, but their caseload (incoming and pending cases) was transferred to the respective Courts of First Instance with which the former Magistrates' Courts were merged. As an example, we mention the case of the Athens Court of First Instance, the largest court in Greece in terms of case load, where in the third quarter of 2024, before the Law 5108/2024 was implemented, 18,956 civil law cases were filed, while in the fourth quarter of 2024, when the aforementioned law was implemented, the number of cases filed rose to 36,278 (a percentage change of 91%).

**Q091 (2023):** Other cases:This increase compared to 2022 is obviously due to the normalisation of the functioning of the courts following the lifting of the restrictive measures imposed due to Covid19, which restricted the functioning of the civil courts in particular.
"Civil litigious cases pending for more than two years": During the Covid-19 pandemic period, which was declared by the WHO on 11/03/2020, the prevention and management measures for the virus were implemented in Greece on 11 March. These measures also affected the functioning of the courts and civil courts, as most cases, especially civil cases, were suspended. The measures were fully implemented on 15 March 2022, when the functioning of the courts gradually started to normalise. During this period, judicial officers were given the opportunity and time to process cases that had been backlogged during the previous period. This resulted in a reduction in the number of pending cases in civil and criminal courts, which is reflected in the statistics for the year 2023.

**Q091 (2022):** The data has been provided by the office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data, such as the training of staff and the creation of an instructional manual guide with definitions and instructions. These measures were intended to help collecting more reliable data from both small and large courts and prosecution services and eliminate the standard errors in judicial statistics. As our methodology is developing, discrepancies in data can be observed. Besides, as regards “Other cases”, it should be mentioned that some types of cases that were previously included in this category, are now distributed in the other case-categories in the table.

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q091 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
2.2. The reason for the change is the modification of the data specified in point 2.2.2.
2.2.2. The number of cases that remained pending at the beginning of the year was summarized, amounting to 20,159 cases in 2024 and 26,634 cases in 2023.
3. The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value based on the data compared to the previous year. (57 cases)
4. Labour cases as well as insolvency cases were consolidated. The number of pending cases at the beginning of the year was 46.83% higher in 2024 (26,813 cases) compared to the previous year (18,261 cases).

**Q091 (2023):** Discrepancy explanation regarding point "4. Other cases":
Due to emergency measures in 2020/2021, certain involuntary cancellation procedures were suspended by law, leading to a decline in their numbers. With the resumption of these procedures in 2022 – since they were mostly continued as insolvency cases - the number of incoming procedures has significantly increased.

**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.

**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 (2024):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases. As such, administrative cases are included in the figure for Civil (and Commercial) litigious cases.

**Q091 (2023):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases. As such, administrative cases are included in the figure for Civil (and Commercial) litigious cases.

**Q091 (2022):** The COVID pandemic had an effect on the courts' ability to deal with incoming business in 2020 especially, which explains the discrepancies with number of court cases in 2022.

**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.

**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. In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has undertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at
https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html
The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 40% in the civil sector by June 2026 (all three instances together). More specifically, the targets for reducing the civil backlog in the First Instance Courts are: - Intermediate disposal target to be achieved by 31.12.2024: 95% reduction of civil cases registered (filed) until 31/12/2016 and still pending as of 31/12/2019 (baseline); - Final disposal target to be achieved by 30.06.2026: 90% reduction of civil proceedings registered (filed) from 01/01/2017 to 31/12/2022 and still pending as of 31/12/2022 (baseline).

**Q091 (2022):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has undertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at
https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html

**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.

**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. In 2022 the increase in the balance of pending cases is related to changes in data collection, more specifically, from 2023 it is possible to determine the number of unfinished cases in non-litigious land registry cases.
In the spring of 2023, the Court Administration made improvements to the statistical data recording system, which prevented the collection of incomplete data related to the reorganization of the courts in previous periods. For these reasons, previously published data may differ and not be comparable.
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 business registry cases" are not defined in the Civil Code and are not within the competence of courts in the first instance. "Non-litigious land registry cases" is one of the cases which are one of the functions of district (city) courts in accordance with the Land Register Law. Examination of the Land Register matters shall be under the jurisdiction of district (city) courts.
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 (2024):** The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of cases, and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial procedure.
Incoming cases of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, e.g. uncontested payment orders, request for a change of name, non-litigious enforcement cases etc. - In 2024, a significant +31.67% increase was observed in the number cases of uncontested enforcement of obligations and cases of enforcement of Obligations according to warning procedures and cases of voluntary sale of immovable property at auction through the court. This trend was likely influenced by amendments to the Civil Procedure Law adopted on 5 October 2023, which entered into force on 2 November. These amendments enhanced procedural efficiency, clarified the application process, and expanded the scope of the procedure. As a result, the warning procedure became more attractive to creditors, particularly financial institutions and utility service providers. In addition to legal changes, the increase was also driven by economic factors—such as payment delays and inflationary pressures on household budgets—as well as the availability of digital tools that simplified the submission and processing of applications.
Pending cases on 31 Dec. of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, e.g. uncontested payment orders, request for a change of name, non-litigious enforcement cases etc. (if possible without administrative law cases, see category 3; without registry cases and other cases, see categories 2.2 and 2.3) - In 2024, there was a significant increase in the number of pending cases, particularly in the category of "debt enforcement under the warning procedure", where the number of unresolved cases rose by more than 60%. This increase is primarily attributed to two key factors: sharp rise in the number of initiated cases – In 2024, a substantial increase in the volume of cases was observed in this category and decrease in the number of judges specializing in this type of case. This has led to a backlog of cases and a slower pace of proceedings.
Pending cases on 31 Dec. Total - Due to the substantial increase in applications under the warning procedure, which falls under non-litigious civil matters, the courts of first instance experienced a backlog that significantly contributed to the rise in the total volume of pending cases across all civil case categories.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - Data indicates that the most significant growth occurred in administrative cases, where the number rose from 10 to 36 cases. A second notable increase in long-pending cases was observed in the group of litigious civil cases. Within this group, the highest number of unresolved cases older than two years was recorded in: insolvency proceedings – 552 cases and claims for debt recovery and damages – 361 cases.

**Q091 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. The timely consideration of cases as one of its priorities, also following the guidelines for the consideration of cases approved by the Council of Justice. This has affected the changes in the number of resolved cases and, accordingly, the number of pending cases and pending cases older than 2 years.
The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of first instance courts both in 2022 and 2023, with the merging of cases, and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial procedure.
Every year from 2019, significant increase in the number of received non-litigious civil cases has been observed. Mainly, it is due to the amendments to the Civil procedure law, which entered into forced in the end of 2021, which made it easier to submit applications for enforcement of obligations according to warning procedures, these changes contributed to the increase in the number of non-litigious cases received. Civil Procedure Law determines that the judge shall, within seven days take a decision. The pending cases in the end of the 2022 were high, therefore also the pending cases on 01.01.2023. are higher, but during the year the ratio between received and resolved cases are balanced, because of the short case review period, which contributes that the number of received and completed cases is similar.

**Q091 (2022):** In 2022 the increase in the balance of pending cases is related to changes in data collection, more specifically, from 2023 it is possible to determine the number of unfinished cases in non-litigious land registry cases.
The number of pending cases on Jan. and on 31.Dec. is higher than 2020 year due high number of pending non-litigious cases. Every year from 2019, significant increase in the number of non-litigious civil cases has been observed. Compared to the 2020, the number of incoming cases and resolved cases increased significantly. The increase of incoming cases and resolved cases of non-litigious civil cases affected increase of pending cases. In the end of 2021, amendments to the Civil Procedure Law entered into force, which made it easier to submit applications for enforcement of obligations according to warning procedures, these changes contributed to the increase in the number of non-litigious cases received. Civil Procedure Law determines that the judge shall, within seven days take a decision The short case review period contributes to that the number of received and completed cases is similar.
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 (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.

**Lithuania**

**Q091 (2024):** In 2024, Lithuanian district, regional (first instance) and regional administrative courts1
received 193,215 cases and examined 191,417
cases were examined (in 2023, 189,922 cases were received and 190,789 cases were examined; in 2022, 193,001 cases were received and 191,729 cases were examined).
In 2024, the number of cases received by Lithuanian district, regional (first instance) and regional administrative courts increased by 1.7% compared to 2023, while the number of cases examined increased by 0.3%.
increased by 1.7%, the number of cases examined increased by 0.3% compared to 2022, and the number of cases received and examined remained almost unchanged.
The number of cases received and examined by the courts was influenced by changes in civil cases – the number of civil cases received increased by 5% compared to 2023.
On the other hand, in 2024, the number of civil cases received and examined by courts regarding the issuance of court permits continued to decline (by 10%) compared to
2023 (2,485 cases in 2024, 2,756 cases in 2023) . This change was caused by the amendments to the Civil Code of the Republic of Lithuania
and related laws that came into force on January 1, 2023, related to the abandonment of functions not typical of courts2
. The amendments transferred some of the functions of district courts
not related to the resolution of legal disputes to notaries (approval of the mutual consent of spouses to divorce and separation
when the spouses have no minor children; court permits for transactions involving real estate that is family property and other court permits) and bailiffs (regarding the renewal of missed deadlines for the submission of enforcement documents for execution).
In 2024, compared to 2023, the number of pending cases increased. At the end of the year, the backlog of unresolved cases in district, regional (first instance) and regional administrative courts amounted to 31,387 cases (29,432 cases in 2023 and 29,266 cases in 2022). In 2024, the backlog of cases
was 7% higher than in 2023 and 2022.
Among the most frequently examined categories of administrative cases, it was noted that in 2024 there was a significant decrease in cases concerning tax legal relations, most of which involved requests for local fees related to municipal waste collection and management, as well as debt recovery. There was also a slight decrease in cases concerning financial support from national, European Union, and foreign institutions, along with environmental protection. By contrast, there was a notable increase in the number of cases concerning the legal status of foreigners and asylum, as well as a growing trend in cases related to construction, the enforcement of penalties, and conditions of detention. Therefore, it can be concluded that the 23% decrease in incoming administrative cases in 2024, together with the 34% decrease in resolved cases within the same category, can be explained by the fact that the decline in cases concerning tax legal relations was significantly greater than the rise in cases related to the legal status of foreigners and asylum, as well as construction matters.
In 2024 contrary to the previous cycles, several subcategories were marked as "NAP" instead of "NA", because those categories do not exist in the system ("NAP").

**Q091 (2023):** In 2023, compared to 2022, there was a significant increase in debt cases - compared to 2022, the number of cases in this category in 2023 increased by almost 10 thousand. This could be due to a general increase in the number of debtors. There were also an increasing trend of cases related to the protection of property rights. However, there has been a significant decrease in family law cases, namely - due to divorce by mutual consent of both spouses. This decrease could have been influenced by the fact that due to the aforementioned changes in legal regulation from the 1st January 2023, divorce by mutual consent of both spouses, when the spouses do not have minor children, was referred to notaries for non-judicial decision.
Among the most frequently examined categories of administrative cases, it has been noticed that the number of cases related to tax legal relations increases every year (most of them are cases related to debt recovery requests for local fees for municipal waste collection and management), the number of environmental protection cases is increasing slightly. However, as the flow of illegal migration has decreased, the number of asylum cases has decreased significantly. Also, the downward trend in cases regarding execution of sentences and conditions of detention continues to be seen.
The balance of unexamined administrative cases was influenced by the lack of judges, court staff (judge assistants, secretaries of court hearings), as well as in 2022 there was a significant increase in the number of cases regarding the issuance of a court order (regarding debt recovery requests for the local fee for the collection and management of municipal waste), therefore the usual examination of administrative cases according to the general rules of procedure was disrupted, and the duration of the examination of other cases was extended.

**Q091 (2022):** 2.1. The duration of court hearings is influenced by the number of new cases received at the court and the number of working judges who hear these cases (judge workload), the type or type of the case and its complexity, the cases specified in the law when the hearing must be postponed (e.g. by a party to the proceedings disease etc.). It should be noted that in 2022, 705 judges worked in Lithuanian courts (of which 2 judges were appointed for 2 years), 786 judge positions, that is, 81 positions were not filled, which could lead to a larger balance of unexamined cases at the end of the year. It is noteworthy that in 2022 compared to 2021, the number of civil cases examined in district and district courts (first instance) increased by 1.7%.
3. A significant change in received and examined administrative cases compared to 2021 was due to an increase in the number of administrative cases due to the issuance of a court order, when waste system administrators, due to the increased number of debtors, go to court with requests for the local fee for the collection and management of municipal waste, debt recovery, as well as there has been a significant increase in asylum cases due to the illegal migration crisis in the country.
For 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.
Other cases: In 2022, compared to 2021, the number of cases of administrative offenses examined in district courts decreased significantly - by 65% compared to 2020. – decreased by as much as 76%. These changes were caused by changes to the Code of Administrative Offenses, which entered into force in 2021-07-01 and in which certain cases of administrative offenses were transferred from district courts to be examined by non-judicial institutions.

**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q091 (General Comment):** To date, it is not possible to provide information on pending cases older than 2 years.

**Q091 (2024):** 1. Pending cases ‘other than criminal’: the 21.56% increase in the total number of pending cases ‘other than criminal’ at the end of the reference year is explained by the rise in pending administrative cases. This increase can be detailed as follows: the 51% rise in pending cases is due to the increase in incoming cases. In 2024, a series of litigation led to the opening of 641 cases at the administrative court. These cases, not yet resolved, are counted as pending at the end of 2024.
2. Number of incoming/resolved general non-litigious civil (and commercial) cases: this figure corresponds to European payment orders and payment ordinances issued by the two district courts. The increase in these cases observed between 2022 and 2023 continued in 2024 and can be explained on one hand by the natural fluctuation of these figures, and on the other hand, we assume the increase is related to the economic development of various sectors (notably construction). However, no detailed analysis has been conducted on this matter.
3.Administrative cases:
- The 64% increase in incoming cases in 2024 is explained by the filing of a series of litigation, which led to the immediate opening of 641 cases at the administrative court.
- The 51% increase in pending cases is explained by the rise in incoming cases. In 2024, a series of litigation led to the opening of 641 cases at the administrative court. These cases, not yet resolved, are counted as pending at the end of 2024.

**Q091 (2023):** The number of incoming/resolved non-contentious general civil (and commercial) cases corresponds to European payment orders and payment orders issued by the two district courts. The increase observed between 2022 and 2023 in these cases can be explained on the one hand, by the natural fluctuation of these figures, while on the other hand, we assume that the increase is linked to the economic development of various sectors (particularly construction). However, no detailed analysis has been carried out on this subject.

**Q091 (2022):** The decrease in the number of non-litigious cases brought before the courts can be attributed to a legislative change in 2021, which raised the jurisdictional threshold from €10,000 to €15,000 in favour of the justices of the peace (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/loi/2021/07/15/a541/jo). This change has resulted in a reduction in both new cases filed and cases concluded by the courts, as certain matters that would have traditionally been brought before the courts are now within the competence of justices of the peace since 2021.

**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.

**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.
The horizontal inconsistencies are due to the current CMS that still relies heavily on the input of the deputy registrars and clerks working with the judiciary.

**Q091 (2024):** The non-litigious data have not been submitted this year and hence there is a discrepancy in the total incoming and resolved cases of 'other than criminal' cases.
3. Administrative cases: The increase in the pending cases for more than 2 years reflects the increase in the pending caseload which resulted from a decrease in the overall efficiency of this court.

**Q091 (2023):** The pending caseload of the General Non-Litigious (Sec 2.1) has increased as a result of a decrease in the resolved caseload.

**Q091 (2022):** In 2022, there was an overall increase in the caseload of the civil courts when compared to the previous evaluation, primarily because this data reflects the normal caseload following the Covid-19 pandemic. Having said this, during this year there was also one specific 1st instance court that has registered an exponential increase in the incoming caseload as a result of legislative issues. This increase in the incoming caseload was reflected in a modest increase in the resolved caseload, but had a more pronounced effect on the pending caseload.
The data provided for 'pending over 2 years' for the civil and commercial civil cases is missing the aged caseload of the Court of Notarial Acts.

**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.

**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.
Regarding the unavailability of the number of pending cases at the beginning of the year, since the Netherlands do not officially measure it, it is not provided.

**Q091 (2023):** Incoming administrative law cases increased significantly in 2023, compared to the year before. Not only 'regular' administrative law cases increased, but cases regarding foreigners/asylumseekers, and tax cases as well. See also chapter 6.1 of the Annual Report of the Council for the Judiciary:
https://www.rechtspraak.nl/SiteCollectionDocuments/Jaarverslag%20Rechtspraak%202023.pdf

**Q091 (2022):** 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 as of 2022.

**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.

**Poland**

**Q091 (General Comment):** The attention should be drawn on the fact that it is not excluded to notice horizontal inconsistencies due to omissions or mistakes in statistical information generated by courts as well as to structural changes within the court system. As for the category “civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, it includes as well litigious family and labour (employment) cases. Besides, it encompasses also some types of cases decided under chapter II of the Civil Proceedings Code that concern non-litigious cases (such as distribution of inherited assets, separation of common property, demarcation of the real estate) which nature in fact is litigious because of the opposite interests of the parties and contradictory ways of presenting their arguments.

**Q091 (2022):** * Administrative law cases - In 2022, the number of incoming administrative cases decreased compared to the previous year. The number of incoming complaints about the inaction of public administration bodies and the protracted conduct of proceedings by these bodies also decreased. The decrease in the receipt of such complaints in 2022 was 30.2% compared to 2021. This may be indicative of the catching up of public administration activities caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Data for the next years will show whether the downward trend will continue.

**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.

**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 (2024):** 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 take non by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2024 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2024: 345538; Incoming cases: 135188; Resolved cases: 138880; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024: 341846. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2024, 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 1 Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 29,611. The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 9388. The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 15,595. The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 23,404. In what concerns this type of cases, in 2024 there were 79,784 new cases and 38,643 completed cases. However, of these totals, only 79,058 new cases and 37,917 completed cases corresponded to real movements of the beginning and end of cases. The remaining 726 cases refer to cases that were internally transferred between units.
The very significant increase in the number of new, completed and pending cases in 2024 is largely due to the increase in urgent administrative cases. This increase was due to the very high number of applications for authorisation or renewal of the residence permit that were lodged with the Lisbon Administrative Court during 2024.

**Q091 (2023):** 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 take non by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2023 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2023: 359238; Incoming cases: 130392; Resolved cases: 142531; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023: 347099. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2023, 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 1 Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 34769. The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 10584. The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 15745. The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 29608. In what concerns this type of cases, in 2023 there were 25,607 new cases and 30,669 completed cases. However, of these totals, only 25,018 new cases and 30,080 completed cases corresponded to real movements of the beginning and end of cases. The remaining 589 cases refer to cases that were internally transferred between units.

**Q091 (2022):** 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 take non by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2022 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2022: 394367; Incoming cases: 108036; Resolved cases: 140946; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2022: 361457. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2022, 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 1 Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 38089. The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 11619. The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 14888. The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. That correspond only to tax cases is 34820. In what concerns this type of cases, in 2022 there were 24,212 new cases and 27,051 completed cases. However, of these totals, only 23,483 new cases and 26,322 completed cases corresponded to real movements of the beginning and end of cases. The remaining 729 cases refer to cases that were internally transferred between units.

**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 ent

ities), 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.

**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 (2024):** In 2024, the number of civil cases resolved was higher than in 2023, which means that the year-end stock remains constant, given that the number of new cases registered in 2024 was also higher than in 2023.
2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases: The 2024 decline was operational and systemic — driven by digital transformation, staffing shortages, and temporary disruptions. In mid-2024, ONRC temporarily suspended both its online portal and front-office services to migrate to a new integrated digital system. The transition caused significant delays, reduced processing capacity, and a backlog of pending applications. The Registry faced an acute lack of registrars authorized to perform the legal verification of filings. This led the Government to adopt Emergency Ordinance No. 109/2024, allowing temporary re-assignment of legal advisers and managerial staff to perform registration duties. With the corrective measures already in place, a progressive recovery of registration volumes is anticipated in 2025, once the Trade Registry’s new systems and personnel reach full capacity.

**Q091 (2023):** 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.
2. The variations could be attributed to a human resources issue: due to a wave of retirements among magistrates following recent legislative changes, the number of active judges has dropped by nearly 15% over three years. This reduction has slowed case resolution rates, which have not kept up with the annual increase in new cases, resulting in a steady rise in year-end backlogs.
2.1 - With the rising trend in new cases and the settlement rate still lagging behind new case inflows, year-end case backlogs, including cases older than three years, are likely to increase annually. However, given the low numbers involved (e.g., 412 cases in 2023 and 276 in 2022), these figures lack statistical significance and cannot be seen as indicators of broader socio-legal trends.

**Q091 (2022):** There are no explanations for the discrepancies, as for volumes of cases in the order of hundreds no conclusions can be drawn regarding statistical trends.

**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.

**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 (2024):** Registry cases and non litigious business registry cases- The decrease in the number of resolved cases can be attributed to several factors, such as the involvement of notaries in the registration of changes in commercial companies (the percentage of persons who process their changes through a notary rather than through a court has been increasing month by month). This results in a lower inflow of new cases to the courts; however, it is also necessary to assess the allocation of the "complexity" or "problematic nature" of cases between courts and notaries. At the same time, within their activities the courts continue to "clean up" the Business Register, i.e. identifying companies that have failed to fulfil statutory obligations in the past (for example, the obligation to convert their registered capital from Slovak crowns to euros).

**Q091 (2023):** TBE

**Q091 (2022):** Discrepancy between the pending cases on 31 Dec. 2021 and the pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year in the line 1. and Total is due to an administrative error caused by the court. In the rest lines, there is no discrepancy between the pending cases on 31 Dec. 2021 and the pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year (compared with the previous year).
A significant increase in the Business registry cases category in 2022 (comparing incoming and resolved to 2020) is related to legislative changes to Act no. 530/2003 Coll. on the Commercial Register. The amendment to the law - included the birth-number among the recorded data with the aim of unambiguously identifying natural persons registered in the business register. In the case that it was not possible to add this data automatically from other reference sources into the the business register, it had to be added based on a court proposal submitted by September 30, 2022 (increase in incoming cases).
Other discrepancies are reflection either of the submission activity of the public (incoming cases) or productivity of the judicial system itself - in resolved cases.

**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.

**Slovenia**

**Q091 (General Comment):** Category 1.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, 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, 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 (2024):** Discrepancies: 2.2.2. (Incoming cases): please note small absolute number of cases.

**Q091 (2023):** Other cases - Pending cases older than 2 years: While most of cases in this category are resolved within few months, some of them are on-hold due to the fact that the party died mid-process and inheritance procedure has to take place to continue; or party is under insolvency proceedings; or there are delays with serving of court writings to parties in other countries.

**Q091 (2022):** 2.2. Registry cases and 2.2.2. Land Registry cases - Pending cases on 31 Dec – increase by 123%/143%: 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 end of 2020 decreased. In 2022, it returned to usual level. 2.2.2. Bussines Registry cases – Pending cases older than 2 years – increase by 300%: Please note the small number of cases (4 cases in 2022), compared to incoming/resolved cases (approx 43.000 per year).
3. Administrative cases – Pending cases older than 2 years – increase by 149%:
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.
4. Other cases – Pending cases on 31 Dec – decrease by 46%:
Due to the limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics in 2020, the number of pending cases was unusually high. In 2022 it returned to usual level. 4. Other cases – Pending cases older than 2 years - increase by 86%:
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). This is automated and fast procedure (average duration is between 1 and 2 months), however some of those cases could not be completed due to legal reasons (e.g. waiting for inheritance cases regarding parties to finish). Please note the small number of cases (approx. 100 cases), compared to incoming/resolved cases (approx 120.000 per year).

**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.

**Spain**

**Q091 (2024):** The data has been obtained using the same criteria as in previous years and follows the trend published by the General Council of the Judiciary.
In relation to the increase in incoming civil (and commercial) litigious cases, a specific rise in the number of summary proceedings (juicios verbales) can be observed. The reform introduced by Royal Decree-Law 6/2023 expanded the scope of summary proceedings (juicios verbales) not only by increasing the monetary threshold from €6,000 to €15,000, but also by incorporating new subject matters that must now be processed under this simplified procedure. These include individual actions related to general contractual conditions, claims for amounts by homeowners' associations, and actions for the division of jointly owned property.

**Q091 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain's rates.

**Q091 (2022):** There are increases of incoming and resolved cases compared to the number of cases in 2020. It should be taken into account that information from 2020 represents the year of the pandemic. The recovery of normal work increased the number of cases, incoming and resolved.

**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.

### Question 092

**Austria**

**Q092 (2014):** For the year 2014, this category has been extended to the enforcement cases.

**Croatia**

**Q092 (General Comment):** The category "civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases" encompasses all non-litigious cases that are not stated in the different categories.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**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.

**Denmark**

**Q092 (General Comment):** Paternity, adoption, guardianship and others in the same category; cases under inquisitorial procedures.

**Finland**

**Q092 (General Comment):** The number includes cases dealt in the summary proceedings, divorce cases and petitions. Summary civil cases are undisputed civil cases that are decided by a district court in summary procedure, in other words in the written procedure. Such cases include undisputed debt collection cases, such as cases concerning unpaid rents, consumer credits and phone and electricity bills, as well as undisputed cases concerning evictions, restoration of possession or a disrupted circumstance. Summary proceedings can be initiated at a district court with an application for a summons that contains less information than what is required for other civil proceedings. The prerequisite for using the less detailed application for a summons is that the plaintiff, i.e. the creditor, has stated that to his or her knowledge the matter is not under dispute.
Enforcement cases: The enforcement authorities have the competence to decide on enforcement cases, not the courts. Cases mentioned here are appeals of enforcement measures to the district courts.
Requests for a change of name are handled in the Digital and Population Data Services Agency, not in the courts.

**France**

**Q092 (General Comment):** Other non-litigious civil cases include the following: divorce by mutual consent, legal separation, change of matrimonial regime, applications relating to parental authority, adoption, medically assisted procreation, incapacity of a minor, inheritance, compensation for violation of privacy, change of name, civil status, nationality, the operation of a group and the discipline of notaries and ministerial officers.

**Q092 (2014):** In 2014, the category civil cases (and commercial) non-litigious are also included in non-litigious cases relating to enforcement.

**Ireland**

**Q092 (2014):** Starting 2014 the category: "Appointment of care representatives" was added to the "Civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases"

**Italy**

**Q092 (General Comment):** Non-litigious cases include -amongst others- divorce and separation by mutual consent, change of divorce/separation conditions, judicial interdiction and incapacitation, hereditament, some family-related procedures, etc. Under this category also fall the following: order for payment procedures, proceedings for validation of eviction, precautionary proceedings and proprietary measures.

**Lithuania**

**Q092 (2014):** For 2013 and 2014, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes court orders.

**Luxembourg**

**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.

**Malta**

**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.

**Poland**

**Q092 (General Comment):** The category of civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases (including non-litigious family cases) covers all the rest of cases decided under chapter II of the Civil Proceedings Code which are non-litigious cases (such as ascertainment of the acquisition of an inheritance, cases connected with birth, marriage and death records, declaration of dead, adoption as well as summary and injunction proceedings in money payment cases).

**Romania**

**Q092 (General Comment):** Divorce with the consent of the parties, granting of legal personality, modification of the constitutive acts of legal persons, requests related to unions, non-litigious requests (civil, litigation with professionals, minors and family).

**Slovak Republic**

**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).

**Slovenia**

**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.

**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.

**Spain**

**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.

## Question 093

**Bulgaria**

**Q093 (General Comment):** .

**Croatia**

**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.

**Cyprus**

**Q093 (General Comment):** In Cyprus the number of cases presented in Q91 includes military court cases, rent tribunal cases, labour court cases and admiralty cases.

**Czech Republic**

**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.

**Denmark**

**Q093 (General Comment):** Estate after a deceased person, notary, insolvency cases not included under 2.2.2. above.

**Finland**

**Q093 (General Comment):** The land courts deal with disputes and appeals arising from surveying operations. The most common case types are the divisions, parcellings and encumbrances referred to in the Surveying Act, as well as the procedures under the Expropriation Act and the Private Roads Act. The procedure is very similar to the civil procedure in a district court. Land court cases are dealt with by the District Courts of South Savo, East Uusimaa, Kanta-Häme, Lapland, Oulu, Ostrobothnia, North Savo, and Southwest Finland. The land court, which acts as a separate department of the district court, has a district judge specialising in these matters as chairperson and a land court engineer and two lay members in the main proceedings. The decisions of a land court can be appealed against to the Supreme Court.
All matters concerning insolvency are classified as matters of petition, which means that they require court involvement. These matters are therefore not categorised as civil cases, i.e. dispositive matters between the parties. But, these matters can of course turn out to be litigious in the sense that there are conflicting opinions about the outcome, and the court must decide upon these after a more or less regular trial proceeding. Not all cases become litigious and the court may rule on insolvency/bankruptcy when the legal merits are met. In Finland we tend to define these as two-or-more-party disputes that may be concluded in agreement of the parties (dispositive) and the court is bound by the agreement. The indispositive cases are characterised by the “official principle” which means that only the court can decide the outcome after proceedings are initiated. The indispositive cases also tend to have different rules regarding the costs of the trial than regular civil cases. As a special court, the task of the labour court is to process and resolve disputes concerning collective agreements, as well as disputes based on the laws on collective agreements and collective agreements, defined in more detail in the law on proceedings in the labour court. Most of the time, the question is about the correct content or interpretation of the said agreements, or violations of agreements or labour and collective agreement laws and the resulting sanctions. In addition, the labour court, as an appellate court, resolves appeals against the decisions of the board for confirmation of the general bindingness of the collective agreement and appeals against the decisions issued by the labour council in certain exemption cases. The Labor Court is the only competent court in the above-mentioned matters. Its judgments cannot be appealed but are final and immediately enforceable. Note: The labour court therefore does not deal with all labor law disputes. Disputes arising from the employment contract between the employer and the employee are dealt with in the relevant district court, the decision of which, under certain conditions, has the right of appeal to the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court.

**Germany**

**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.

**Greece**

**Q093 (General Comment):** Obviously, when we refer to appeals, we do not include their discussion before the court, but their filing as a civil remedy, which in the case of the Greek procedural system is filed, and in some cases even discussed in the courts of first instance. Payment orders are included in "other" because there is only one field "other cases" on the JastSTat platform where the cases listed in table 93 are entered collectively. In the future we will try to transfer the payment orders to category 2.1 in the new JastStat platform.

**Ireland**

**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.

**Italy**

**Q093 (2014):** In the ambit of the 2014 exercise, the category “other” encompasses the number of enforcement cases.

**Poland**

**Q093 (General Comment):** The category “other” includes first of all social security cases and cases related to the application of correctional and educational measures as required in juvenile cases and execution of guardianship or tutoring.

**Romania**

**Q093 (General Comment):** NAP

**Slovak Republic**

**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.

**Slovenia**

**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, legal aid between national courts at local and district courts, international legal aid 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'."

## Question 094

**Austria**

**Q094 (General Comment):** We cannot differentiate between severe criminal cases and misdemeanours within the administrative cases. So while in administrative criminal law deprivation of liberty is hardly ever used, it is still possible to use it in a sentence. It is also an alternative way of a sentence in case the person is not able to pay the fine.
However, the administrative courts are apparently not able to separate their data according to the type of sentence they pass (even though prison sentences are so rare and one might think this is easy).

**Q094 (2024):** The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for criminal courts. However, the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

**Q094 (2023):** “The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for 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

**Belgium**

**Q094 (2024):** It should be mentioned that cases dealt with by juvenile courts - “protectional (non-civil) cases” - are not included in the table. Due to technical reasons, only data on incoming such cases are currently available (10 178).
Cases heard by the investigation judge (Chambre du conseil) are not included in the table in order to avoid double counting the same criminal cases.

**Q094 (2023):** It should be noted that data on cases of the juvenile court are not included in the table. Due to technical reasons only figures for incoming cases (10 078) are currently available.
Point 3 “Other criminal cases”: there were 7 580 cases pending before the Investigation Court (Chambre du Conseil) on 1 January 2023; 17 191 incoming cases; 16 031 resolved cases; 8 740 cases pending at 31/12; 2 286 cases pending for more than 2 years. These figures are not included in the table, so as not to count the same cases twice.

**Q094 (2022):** Also to be noted: 9 398 for cases related to juvenile protection (only the category 'incoming cases' is available), not accounted for in the table. Point 3: Other criminal cases: the figure of 15 309 corresponds to cases before the Council Chamber (this figure is not included in the total of incoming criminal cases because data on resolved cases are not available). The figures for pending and resolved criminal 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.

**Bulgaria**

**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.
"Total criminal cases" includes all criminal cases - criminal cases of a general nature, criminal cases of a private nature, cases of exemption from criminal liability with the imposition of an administrative penalty in accordance with Art. 78a of the Criminal Code, private criminal cases, interrogation and administrative-criminal cases heard by the first instance courts.

**Q094 (2022):** "Total criminal cases" includes all criminal cases - criminal cases of a general nature, criminal cases of a private nature, cases of exemption from criminal liability with the imposition of an administrative penalty in accordance with Art. 78a of the Criminal Code, private criminal cases, interrogation and administrative-criminal cases heard by the first instance courts.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q094 (2024):** Due to the strike of court clerks and judges, there was a disruption in the receipt and resolution of cases, which resulted in a temporary decline in activity. In 2024, with the resumption of regular operations, an increase was recorded both in the number of incoming and resolved cases, which is also reflected in the overall indicators. This increase therefore does not indicate structural changes in court operations, but rather compensation for the reduced level of activity in the previous period.

**Q094 (2023):** Horizontal inconsistency corresponds to 2.62% of corrections to the "e-spis" system during a year.

**Q094 (2022):** The data for 2022 in “Other criminal cases” include only the execution of sanctions (imprisonment), investigation actions of a judge and cases connected to procedural matters. In this cycle, the number of other criminal cases decreased because we aligned our methodology with CEPEJ reporting and excluded some of the case types which in previous cycles were included. This is due to the fact that data for misdemeanour cases came from a separate case management system in the previous cycles (prior to 2020), and it was not possible to exclude those cases which do not fit any of the above categories.

**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.

**Cyprus**

**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 (2024):** other criminal cases include cases before the military court.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**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.

**Denmark**

**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 (2024):** There is a general incongruence in data due to faulty 2023 data, where second instance cases were mistakenly included. Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year (Total, 1 and 2) +1. Severe criminal cases (incoming):The substantial difference between incoming and resolved cases is partly due to the prosecution services being short-staffed and accruing case piles over the course of 2024, and partly due to the courts undertaking special efforts to reduce case piles.
The decrease in incoming severe criminal cases in 2024 can be attributed to the police and prosecution services having accrued a substantial case load surplus. They are not currently staffed to be attend court dates to the degree that is needed, and so a bottleneck effect has caused the number of cases being submitted to the courts to plummet. A three-year agreement to grant funding to the police and prosecution services is currently (as of fall 2025) in negotiations at state-level, after which the number of cases is expected to rise to previous levels.
Another, lesser factor of the drop in case numbers is the change to Danish procedural law implemented in 2024, where the threshold for whenever a case demanded lay judges was increased. The Danish Court Administration define severe criminal cases by whether lay judges are assigned or not. Fewer cases with lay judges equal fewer severe criminal cases in our data model.

**Q094 (2023):** The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19. Compared with data from 2022 the pending cases from 1/1/2023 appears higher. This is mainly due to late registration, where more pending cases can appear in the current extraction compared to when the CEPEJ data from 2022 was extracted. It's also partly due to a new method of calculation with more accurate data than previously. The number of pending cases from 1/1/2023 is the same as the number of pending cases from 31/12/2022 in our database. The Danish Courts are currently in the process of transitioning to a new registration system for criminal case types and certain non-litigious case types, so a period of adjustment was to be expected

**Q094 (2022):** In 2022 the courts are still dealing with a high number of pending cases in the aftermath of the situation with covid-19.

**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.

**Estonia**

**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.

**Finland**

**Q094 (General Comment):** The cases are not statistically catecorised in severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor cases in Finland.
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 january 2023 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.

**Q094 (2024):** The growth of cases is linked to a large so-called Vastaamo criminal case which has an exceptionally large group of plaintiffs.

**Q094 (2023):** 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. 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.

**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.

**France**

**Q094 (2024):** Source(s): SSER, frame-survey of prosecution services and Cassiopée statistical file (serious offenses: crimes and felonies); Minos statistical file (minor offenses = infractions, excluding the catgeory C5).

**Q094 (2023):** Source(s): SSER, survey of public prosecutors and Cassiopée statistical file (serious offences: crimes and offences); Cassiopée statistical file (minor offences = fines, with the exception of 5th class offences).
In order to be able to distinguish, as requested, the cases that have gone through the investigation (arrived and completed), the volumes indicated in the category "Other criminal cases" are already contained in the 2 previous categories. The total is therefore not equal to the sum of the 3 volumes but to the sum of lines 1 and 2.

**Q094 (2022):** Source: Ministry of Justice/SG/SEM/SDSE, Cassiopeia statistical file.

With regard to "pending cases", it is not possible to provide this information as the data on the pending cases before police courts ('Minor Offences') are not available.

Furthermore, the line 'Total number' does not correspond to 1+2+3 but rather to 1+2. Indeed, in accordance with the request from CEPEJ, cases falling under the Investigating Judge have been classified under '3. Other Criminal Cases'. These are provided for indicative purposes only and should not be added to the other two categories so as to avoid duplication (which may fall within either minor or major offences depending on how each case proceeds).

**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.

**Germany**

**Q094 (General Comment):** General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section: please refer to the general comment Q 91
The category “severe criminal cases” includes criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” subsumes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.
“Other cases” include:
-proceedings 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 - 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
Only the number of incoming cases is available for "other criminal cases", because with regard to data collection through the "monthly surveys" these cases fall into the category “other caseload” (please refer to general comment Q91);
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court: please refer to the general comment Q 91;
Horizontal inconsistencies: Please refer to the general comment Q 91

**Q094 (2024):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes 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 (2023):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes 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 (2022):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes 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 (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).

**Greece**

**Q094 (General Comment):** The category "other criminal cases" includes cases relating to pre-trial matters, imposition of criminal sanctions, commutation of sentences, granting of suspension, community service.

**Q094 (2024):** Independent Department of Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat).
The observed fluctuations in criminal cases can be partly explained by the legislative reforms introduced by Law 5090/2024, which amended the Greek Criminal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure. These reforms included the reinstatement of public prosecution for selected misdemeanors, the strengthening of the prosecution of domestic violence and organized crime. These changes may have affected the classification, volume, and speed of processing of criminal cases, resulting in deviations that are considered expected and explainable. Additional factors affecting statistics are: • transitional provisions: some changes were implemented gradually until July 1, 2024; • reclassification of offenses: changes in the classification of acts as misdemeanors or felonies; • revision of competences: transfer of competences from prosecutors to judicial councils for certain acts.

**Q094 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
The variations in the numbers should be construed in the light of the pandemic contexte. In the year 2022, courts were, even for part of the year, under a restricted regime due to the measures implemented in Greece to contain the Covid-19 pandemic. This gave the judges the opportunity, alongside new cases, to deal with cases that had already been heard. At the same time, however, due to the courts not being fully operational, the number of cases to be pending increased at the end of 2022, which were transferred for adjudication in 2023, when the courts were fully operational and consequently the flow of judgments was limited.
Moreover, it should be considered that there were 3 consecutive elections in Greece in 2023, which resulted in the suspension of the courts for about 3 months in total.
Obviously this increase is due to the full normalization of the operation of the courts after the lifting of the restrictions on their operation that had been put in place to deal with the Covid 19 pandemic, which came into full effect in 2022 (note that the judicial year in Greece runs from September to July, usually)

**Q094 (2022):** It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data. The content of the categories of criminal cases in the table are the same as for the previous evaluation cycle, but the services now monitor and record these cases better so discrepancies in data can be observed. This is especially the case for the Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases.

**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

**Hungary**

**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 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
Total: The difference is due to the change explained in the subpoints, which has affected the overall result as well.
1. At the end of 2023, there were 1,322 cases pending for more than two years, which increased by 30.79% to 1,729 cases by the end of 2024.
2. With regard to misdemeanour cases, at the end of 2024 there were 27,600 pending cases, which is 28.66% more compared to the previous year.

**Q094 (2022):** As misdemeanour cases have very strict deadlines, the number of resolved cases strongly correlates with the number of incoming cases. The decrease of incoming cases may be a result of the end of the pandemic as misdemeanours in connection with it "disappeared" as well.

**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.

**Ireland**

**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.
We cannot provide data per case. Where there is more than one penalty imposed in respect of an offence, for example a fine, imprisonment and disqualification, a separate order would be made in respect of each penalty. However, if a case is dismissed or struck out, only one order is made. Our system records by outcome and as there may be more than one outcome in any one offence, it may appear that the figures for resolved cases are higher than those for incoming.
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 (2022):** The COVID pandemic had an effect on the courts' ability to deal with incoming business in 2020 especially, which explains the discrepancies with number of resolved cases in 2022. Regarding severe criminal cases both the Circuit Criminal Courts and Central Criminal Courts showed an increase in resolved cases (offences) in 2022. Resolved cases are cases where orders are made. There may be more than one order made in some cases which is why the figure for resolved cases is higher than that for incoming cases.

**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.

**Italy**

**Q094 (General Comment):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has undertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogeing/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together).

**Q094 (2022):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has undertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q094 (General Comment):** 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.
Other criminal cases include execution of a sentence, cases on penal order of the prosecutor, cases on determination of compulsory measures of a medical nature.

**Q094 (2024):** Other criminal cases include execution of a sentence, cases on penal order of the prosecutor, cases on determination of compulsory measures of a medical nature. The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of cases, and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial procedure.
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year, In 2024, noticeable reduction in the backlog of other criminal cases was observed at the beginning of the year, with a discrepancy ratio of -32.80%, indicating a significant drop in pending cases compared to the previous period. This decrease is largely attributed to a decline in the number of cases involving prosecutor's penal orders.
Incoming cases. In 2024, compared to 2023, there was a significant increase in the number of criminal cases, particularly in categories involving severe offences. The most notable growth was observed in the following groups: criminal offences in road traffic safety: +128.25%, criminal offences against family and minors: +67.16%, criminal offences against the judiciary: +45.87%, criminal offences against public safety and order: +27.35%, criminal offences against property: +17.97%. This trend reflects a growing burden on the judicial system, especially in areas related to public safety, vulnerable groups, and traffic-related violations.
Resolved cases. In 2024, first instance courts saw an increase in the number of resolved criminal cases, with 5,766 cases adjudicated across key categories such as offences against property, traffic safety, and public order. This rise is directly linked to the high volume of incoming cases (6,548), particularly in severe criminal matters. Pending cases. The increase in the number of criminal cases received in 2024 had a direct impact on the volume of pending cases.
By the end of the year, the number of unresolved cases had grown. It should be noted that over the past two years, there has been a consistent rise in criminal case volume, which has had a negative effect on the clearance rate (CR%) across all first instance courts.

**Q094 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. The increase in the number of pending cases (older than 2 years) could be related that in the courts the court hearings in -person were restored, lifting the restrictions of Covid, when cases were mostly adjudicated in written procedure. The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of first instance courts both in 2022 and 2023, with the merging of cases, and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial procedure.

**Q094 (2022):** The decrease in the number of resolved cases is related to the drop in the number of cases received in the courts of first instance.
Decrease of pending cases on 1 Jan is related to the decrease of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases. In the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming and resolved of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal 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 misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases.
In 2022 the increase in the number of pending cases at the end of the year is related to changes in data collection systems` audit, more specifically, for misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases. Severe criminal cases, which are assessed according to the Latvian Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure Law, are decreasing each year. The tendency of the decrease in the number of criminal cases has been observed for a longer period of time. The reduction of severe criminal cases can be explained by changes in legislation. (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 2019.
The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly decreased. The decrease in cases is due to the lifting of restrictions, which were related to limiting the spread of Covid-19. The reduction of pending cases also is related to the court reform, 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. Starting from 2022, data on "other criminal cases" are also collected and inserted in the table.

**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.

**Lithuania**

**Q094 (2022):** Protracted proceedings in criminal cases are caused by the non-appearance of the parties to the proceedings or their representatives at the court session, the request of the parties to the proceedings to postpone the proceedings and the collection of additional evidence. It can be concluded that the protracted examination of criminal cases is also usually determined by circumstances depending on the actions of the participants in the process.
There were 57 criminal cases (64 in 2021, 72 in 2020), the examination of which lasted longer than 5 years. In the last few years, there has been a trend towards a decrease in the number of criminal cases examined at the first instance in first insance courts, the examination of which lasted longer than 5 years.

**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q094 (General Comment):** We have classified as minor criminal cases all cases concluded by penal order in the magistrate's court or district court. Serious offenses encompass all cases concluded by a first-instance judgment in the police, correctional or criminal courts.

The figures listed under 'other cases' correspond to those cases which were referred to the investigating department.

Regarding the unavailability of pending and incoming cases: Due to the specific organization of workflow between courts and public prosecution services, files are only transferred to courts shortly before a hearing date, and if a case is not heard on that scheduled date, it is then returned to the public prosecution service until a new hearing date. Thus, there are - with few exceptions - no pending cases before criminal courts over an extended period, and the number of incoming cases is more or less equal to the number of resolved ones.

**Q094 (2024):** 3. Other criminal cases: The opening of an investigation by the examining judge at the court follows a request from the Public Prosecutor’s Office. There are two types of investigations: judicial information requests concerning offenses or crimes, and ‘mini-investigations’ based on Article 24-1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP) (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/code/procedure_penale/20201221#art_24-1).

The year 2023 was marked by a very high number of cases opened at the prosecutor’s offices regarding cybercrime (phishing), for which investigations under Article 24-1 of the CCP were initiated. In addition, the investigation chambers were increasingly involved in financial and economic cases.

‘Mini-investigations’ allow, in cases defined by law, prosecutors to request that the examining judge order an investigative measure without opening a full preparatory investigation. The increase in ‘mini-investigations’, which allow cases to be processed more quickly than ‘classic’ investigations, explains the rise in cases closed by the investigation chambers.

**Q094 (2023):** 3. Other criminal cases: The opening of an investigation by the investigating judge at the Tribunal is based on an indictment issued by the Public Prosecutor. There are two types of investigation: judicial inquiries into misdemeanours or felonies and 'mini-investigations' based on article 24-1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/code/procedure_penale/20201221#art_24-1). The year 2023 was marked by a very large number of cases opened by public prosecutors' offices relating to cybercrime (phishing) for which investigations based on article 24-1 of the CCP were opened. In addition, the investigating offices were called upon more and more in financial and economic cases. Mini-investigations' allow prosecutors, in cases defined by law, to request the investigating judge to order an investigative measure without opening a preparatory investigation. The increase in 'mini-investigations', which allow cases to be removed from the investigating office more quickly than 'traditional' investigations, explains the rise in the number of cases closed by investigating offices.

**Q094 (2022):** Among the minor criminal cases, we have included all cases concluded by criminal order in the police court or district court. Serious offenses encompass all cases concluded by judgment at first instance in the police, correctional or criminal court.

The figures recorded under 'other cases' correspond to matters referred to the investigating judge's 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.

**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).
The horizontal inconsistencies are due to the current CMS that still relies heavily on the input of the deputy registrars and clerks working with the judiciary.

**Q094 (2023):** The increase in the number of incoming severe criminal cases results from the increase in the number of criminal court halls, which enable twice as many 'juries' to be held and more 'pending' cases to be brought to trial (in this court, the system is a bit different from other cases. Trials are brought forward when it is their turn, so the fact that the court administration increased the halls, enables more trials to be opened). In addition, the improvement in the efficiency of the Office of the Attorney General, the chief prosecutor, has resulted in more bills of indictment to be issued.
The increase in the number of halls also reflected in an increase in the number of resolved cases within this category.

**Q094 (2022):** 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.

**Netherlands**

**Q094 (General Comment):** 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.

**Q094 (2024):** The increase in misdemeanour cases is due to an increase in minor traffic offences, in part due to the activity of so-called 'no cure, no pay'-bureaus.

**Q094 (2022):** Increase in Category 1 - This is due to a technical change in registration, where it was found that some 14.500 cases were effectively resolved (from a legal standpoint) but had remained ‘open’ in the administration. This has lead to a decrease of the number of pending cases. Increase in Category 2 - These cases are both minor criminal offences and also traffic fine cases (so-called WAHV- or Mulder-cases). The latter group shows the main increase. Possibly the increase is due to numbers being low in 2020 and 2021 as a result of Corona, and increased mobility since then

**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.

**Poland**

**Q094 (2024):** 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 cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).

**Q094 (2023):** 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 cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).

**Q094 (2022):** 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 cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).
Cases under the Criminal Procedure Code and the Misdemeanours Code, which are presented as 'other criminal cases', are preliminary or follow-up proceedings.

**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.

**Portugal**

**Q094 (2024):** 2. The data is correct. The number of cases pending for more than two years has indeed increased compared to the previous year.
3. The data is correct. The increase in the number of pending cases as at 31 December 2024 is related to the fact that in 2024 the number of cases closed was lower than the number of cases filed.

**Q094 (2022):** In our view, the increase in the number of incoming and outgoing cases in 2022 compared to 2020 reflects the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic and the resulting lockdown, which had an impact on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.
3. "Other criminal cases" - cases involving procedural types provided for in criminal law, which do not fall into the "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" categories. These are, for example, cases relating to "legal accumulation", "interrogation of foreigners", "judicial expulsion", "compulsory internment" and "habeas corpus".

**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.

**Romania**

**Q094 (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.

**Q094 (2024):** 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 stock at the beginning of 2024 was higher than that at the beginning of 2023, which is one of the possible explanations for the fact that the stock of year-end files older than 2 years has this increase.

**Q094 (2023):** 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.

**Slovak Republic**

**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 (2022):** Among "Other criminal cases" it is possible to include, for example, motions regarding the expungement of a conviction, motions regarding the imposition of protective measures and the execution of detention, motions related to custody and the execution of a sentence, motions for conditional release, motions related to probation and mediation, requests from domestic and foreign authorities in criminal cases, motions that are decided in preliminary proceedings, etc.
Other discrepancies are reflection either of the submission activity of the prosecutors or productivity of the judicial system (judicial staff) in resolved cases.

**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.

**Slovenia**

**Q094 (General Comment):** 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.
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,
cases of the out-of-hearing senate,
clemency procedures at local and district courts,
legal aid between national courts in criminal matters,
international legal aid in criminal matters,
cases of decisions to permit interventions within human rights and freedoms,
legal aid between courts 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,
compliance detention,
various criminal matters at local and district courts and in minor offences at local courts.
Regarding criminal investigations at district courts: Slovenia has a system where the state public prosecutor requests 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 accusatory act is filed, a criminal trial (i.e. deliberating on the responsibility and sanctioning of the offender) begins.
Regarding setting a task for the good of the community or the local community: A request for prison sentence or fine to be replaced by a task for the good of the community can be filed after the finality of the main court decision and is decided upon in a separate proceedings.
Regarding compliance detention: In minor offences cases, if the fine is not paid in due time, a compliance detention (to comply with paying the fine) is ordered. The proposal is decided upon by a local court according to the domicile of the offender. Compliance detention

**Q094 (2024):** Criminal investigation cases (reported under Other criminal cases): 2.435 incoming cases; 2.089 resolved cases in 2024.
Criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings (reported under Other criminal cases): 607 incoming cases, 631 resolved cases in 2024.
Discrepancies: 3. (Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year): The number of "international legal aid in minor offences" increased significantly (by 88%; from 1.215 to 2.288) because some countries have raised the fines for certain offences, which are now being enforced by the Slovenian court based on EU regulations (number of such incoming cases increased by 46%). In addition, the competent Slovenian court is facing a shortage of judicial staff. These are two main reasons for the increase in unresolved cases.

**Q094 (2023):** Criminal investigation cases (reported under Other criminal cases): 2.266 incoming cases; 2.335 resolved cases in 2023.
Criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings (reported under Other criminal cases): 593 incoming cases, 458 resolved cases in 2023.
Discrepancy to 2022 data in 3. Other criminal cases (Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year): The increase is notable in 1) legal aid between national courts in criminal matters and international legal aid in criminal matters (34% of pending cases) and 2) criminal investigation (15% of pending cases). In 2023 both aforementioned types of cases saw increase in incoming cases and resolved cases, resulting in 87% and 97% CR respectively.

**Q094 (2022):** In 2022, approx. 25-30% of pending cases and 6-7% of incoming/resolved cases were criminal investigation cases (see general comment).
1. Severe criminal cases - Pending cases older than 2 years – increase by 39%;
3. Other cases - Pending cases older than 2 years – increase by 25%:
Factors contributing to this increase are: increased complexity of cases (cases with multiple offenders, cases with offenders in detention, need for experts, international element), trouble finding and serving court documents to foreign offenders and victims, non-responsiveness of parties, delays due to international legal aid, limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics in 2020 and 2021 and lack of candidates for new judges at district courts.

**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).

**Spain**

**Q094 (2024):** The data has been obtained using the same criteria as in previous years and follows the trend published by the General Council of the Judiciary.

**Q094 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain’s rates.

**Q094 (2022):** There are increases of incoming and resolved cases compared to the number of cases in 2020. It should be taken into account that information from 2020 represents the year of the pandemic. The recovery of normal work increased the number of cases, incoming and resolved.

**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.

## Question 097

**Austria**

**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 (2022):** Non litigious family matters in the second instance have always been represented within the category of "non-litigious cases".

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q097 (General Comment):** Number of second instance cases: cases brought before appelate courts, labour courts and cases on appeal against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts (civil cases).

**Q097 (2022):** Appellate court (Civil Matters): Cases pending as of 01/01/2022 = 28525; cases pending as of 31/12/2022 = 27375; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date on which the case is brought before the courts at second instance = 11578. Labor court: cases pending as of 01/01/2022 = 5461; cases pending as of 31/12//2022 = 5294; Cases pending for more than two years from the date on which the case is brought before the second instance courts = 1416.  Source: datawarehouse (data extraction date: August,1st,2023).

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q097 (General Comment):** In Bulgaria registry cases are not resolved by the courts. They are under the competence of the Registry agency where is the property register, the commercial register and register of non-profit legal entities, the BULSTAD register and the Register of the Property Relations between spouses.

**Q097 (2024):** "Administrative law cases": the amount of pending appeal cases (3157) at the end of the year is the sum of the pending cases of all 28 administrative courts in the Republic of Bulgaria. The data show that the highest ratio of pending cases to the cases subject to consideration, as well as the ratio of pending cases at the end of the year to the total number of pending cases from the courts, are demonstrated by Administrative Court-Haskovo with 37% and 6% respectively, Administrative Court-Lovech (34% and 4%), Administrative Court-Ruse (32% and 5%), Administrative Court-Blagoevgrad (25% and 7%). After reviewing the data from these courts in the annual reports for 2024 that are publicly available on their websites, it was found that their pendency is due to the fact that for the large part of the appeal cases, the proceedings have been suspended to wait for the CJEU decision on a preliminary ruling and because most of the cases were submitted in the last quarter of 2024 that led to the objective impossibility of concluding them by the end of the year. The situation should be construed against the background of data on the number of incoming cases and the number of administrative judges (Q46-2), as well as the extremely accessible administrative justice in 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.

**Croatia**

**Q097 (2024):** Some data from this table for 2023 were not reported as they were unavailable at the time of questionnaire completion due to technical issues in the information system. The corrected data for 2023 were submitted together with the 2024 figures.
Regarding the number of unresolved cases older than two years, discrepancies exist because data for 2023 were not available.
Concerning non-litigious land registry cases, as previously mentioned, the 2023 strike and reduced court productivity resulted in increased backlogs, reflected in the higher number of unresolved cases at the end of 2023 and the beginning of 2024. Although first-instance courts resolved more cases in 2023, this led to an increase in pending cases at the appellate level. Since courts were unable to process the incoming caseload, the overall number of pending cases increased.
A similar situation applies to non-litigious business registry cases.

**Q097 (2023):** The result of a three-month strike is a 71.55% increase in the total number of non-criminal law cases (1+2+3+4) - Pending cases older than two years from the date the case was filed in second instance court. The County Courts had the biggest increase in second-instance civil litigation (the High Commercial Court decreased such cases from 155 to 101, while the County Courts increased them from 1,092 to 1,991 cases).
2.2.1. Non-litigious Land Registry cases - the 2023 civil servants strike resulted in a decreased number of resolved cases and increased number of pending cases on 31 December.

**Q097 (2022):** Regarding second instance „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases", starting with early 2022, all the cases have been classified as „appeal on sentence" type of cases, instead of „enforcement cases", „family law cases", „labour law cases" or any other case type available in the court management system database, as it was in the previous cycles. Because of that, we are unable to differentiate between second instance litigious cases and second instance non-litigious cases (or any of the other types of cases for that matter). For „Other non-litigious cases", the reason for no available data is the same as regarding "General non-litigious cases", as those types of cases that would have been in the category of „Other non-litigious cases" according to the classification by the courts in the previous years, are also categorised as a generic „appeal case". As regards registry cases, there is no specific reason for the decrease in the number of resolved cases, as the number of incoming cases is roughly the same as last year (around 1.700 incoming cases). Regarding administrative cases, there is no specific reason for the decrease in the number of resolved cases, as the number of incoming cases is roughly the same as last year (around 5.500 incoming cases).

**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 th

e 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.

**Cyprus**

**Q097 (General Comment):** As of the 1st of July 2023 the Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court were re - established. Also an Appeal Court was also created. Appeals filed after 2018 were transferred to the Appeal Court. Civil and Criminal appeals filed between 2013-2017 remained at the Supreme Court whereas administrative appeals are brought before the Supreme Constitutional Court.

**Q097 (2024):** The reference date for the previous cycle was 1st of July 2023 when the Court of Appeal was established, which explains the variatons not necessarily reflecting a real surge in caseload or efficiency.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**Q097 (General Comment):** It is noteworthy that the methodology of presentation of data has been changed since the 2014 exercise. 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).

**Q097 (2022):** Other cases are insolvency and incidency 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.

**Denmark**

**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.
Administrative law cases: 1. What is included in “administrative law cases” and what is the distinguishment between litigious and non-litigious administrative law cases; and what are non-litigious administrative case in Denmark. It is challenging to provide a clear answer for Denmark. Due to the way data is collected within the Danish Court Administration, it is unfortunately not possible to distinguish between the specific types of cases included under administrative law cases. The courts indicate whether a case is of an administrative nature, however, administrative cases occur across almost all categories within civil cases. Consequently, it is difficult to state unequivocally which types of cases they most appropriately belong to. 2. The approximate number of administrative law cases that are litigious and go to court, and their part of the overall “civil litigious cases
In the period from 2023-2025 the number of civil cases in Denmark was 181.064, and out of those, 10.947 was of administrative nature. Furthermore, approximately 6 percent of all civil cases over the past three years have been classified as administrative law cases. Cases concerning forced removal often fall within the scope of administrative law, however, such cases represent only about 2 percent of the total civil caseload. The two other categories with a notable share of administrative law cases are “general civil cases” and cases under “the simplified procedure”. Both of these categories are quite extensive in terms of volume as well as broad in their classification, meaning that administrative law cases constitute only a relatively small proportion within them. 3. The composition of the bodies such as appeal boards and committees Denmark has a well-developed system of specialized complaints boards that serve as administrative appeal bodies for decisions made by public authorities. These boards, such as Ankestyrelsen and the Consumer Complaints Board, provide citizens with accessible and cost-effective avenues to challenge administrative decisions. Denmark has over 80 complaints boards and committees across various sectors. They generally consist of a chairperson – often a judge or legal expert – and a mix of legally trained members and specialists relevant to the board’s area. Membership terms are typically four years. The exact composition varies by board: for example, the Consumer Complaints Board includes a chair (judge), vice-chairs, and representatives of consumer and business interests, while the Patient Complaints Board combines judges and health professionals. Appointments are usually made by ministries or local authorities, often based on nominations from relevant organizations.

**Q097 (2024):** Administrative law cases: changed from NAP to NA since Denmark does have administrative cases in courts, but they cannot be counted exactly.

**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.

**Estonia**

**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 (2024):** Overall workload has risen, but output has fallen.

**Q097 (2022):** "Administrative law cases": there are problems that have been dealt with but no results can be observed yet. Above all there were many vacancies in civil departments and that has had an effect in administrative too.

**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".

**Finland**

**Q097 (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. 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.

**Q097 (2024):** See comment to Q91.
The trend of a growth of summary civil cases that is seen already at the first instance courts also reaches the second instance courts.

**Q097 (2022):** In previous years, military court cases of the second instance have been erroneously registered under Other civil cases, so in this statistical year, the before mentioned cases have been registered as criminal cases. Similarly, this question has previously included cases that have come in for consideration in the second instance courts as first instance cases. Since the first instance cases previously had their own procedure, from which it was not easy to determine whether the case concerned criminal or civil case, they were therefore registered in the group "Other cases". In this statistical year, it has been possible to find out whether they belong to criminal or civil cases and thus have been taken into account to the statistics according to the breakdown. In addition, "Other cases" have included cases related to releasing a prisoner serving a life sentence, which are also no longer counted in this group, because these are processed as separate applications and are not civil or criminal matters.

**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.

**France**

**Q097 (General Comment):** Civil litigious cases: general litigation cases before the Court of appeal and civil cases from the special minors' chamber (educational assistance).
Special minors' chamber: these are educational assistance cases, handled in the first instance by the juvenile court judge and on appeal by the special minors' chamber. Although this chamber predominantly deals with criminal cases, these are indeed civil cases.
Civil non-litigious cases: non-litigious cases before the courts of appeal, such as divorces and separations by mutual consent, approvals of agreements to change the matrimonial regime, civil status matters (declaratory judgments, corrections and annulments of civil status records, and changes to gender records), adoption requests (both simple and full), and succession matters (vacant or unclaimed successions, sealing of assets, and disputes regarding the sealing process), as well as cases concerning the incapacity of minors (opening of guardianship, appeals against decisions of guardianship bodies, emancipation, authorization of an act or appointment of an ad hoc administrator in legal administration, control of an act in high-risk situations), preventive procedures for companies in difficulty (conciliation procedures and ad hoc mandate), preliminary conciliation attempts before the civil court and the local court, and procedures for amicable settlements in agricultural matters, SCI, and associations.
Other cases: Summary proceedings, requests, and special procedures before the Court of appeal, and the civil party in expropriation cases.
Summary proceedings (référé): these are emergency procedures that allow the judge, while respecting the principle of adversarial proceedings, to issue temporary but swift measures aimed at preserving the applicant’s rights (urgent measures without dispute, conservatory or restoration measures even if contested, pre-litigation expertise, or an uncontested provision payment).
The summary procedure takes place before the trial and does not provide a final resolution of the dispute; the defendant is summoned, and the decision rendered is only provisional.
Requests: this refers to a method of initiating legal proceedings, used for disputes where the claim amount does not exceed €5,000 or for disputes specified by law (e.g., guardianship cases, etc.).
Special procedure: these are specific procedures before the Court of appeal, mainly involving appeals on decisions related to the detention of foreigners and involuntary hospitalisation (86% of decisions in 2024), disputes regarding the amount and collection of lawyer's fees (8%), and claims for compensation due to provisional detention (2%).

**Q097 (2023):** Source(s) SSER: exploitation of the General Civil Directory
Civil litigious cases: general litigation cases before the Court of Appeal and civil cases of the Special Chamber for Minors (educational assistance).
Special Chamber for Minors: these are cases of educational assistance, dealt with in the first instance by the juvenile judge and on appeal by the Special Chamber for Minors. Although the majority of cases within the competence of this chamber are criminal cases, educational assistance cases are civil cases.
Civil non-litigious cases: non-litigious cases before the courts of appeal, i.e., divorces and legal separations by mutual consent, homologation of agreements for the change of matrimonial regime, cases relating to civil status (declaratory judgment, rectification and annulment of a civil status certificate and modification of the designation of sex), adoption applications (simple and plenary) and inheritance (vacant or unclaimed succession, sealing and contestation of seals) as well as cases of incapacity of a minor (opening of a guardianship, appeal against a decision of a guardianship body, emancipation, authorisation of an act or appointment of an ad hoc administrator in the context of a legal administration, control of an act in high-risk situations), preventive procedures for companies in difficulty (conciliation procedure and ad hoc mandate), prior attempts at conciliation before the first instance court and the local court and amicable settlement procedures in agricultural, SCI and association matters.
Other cases: summary proceedings, petitions, special proceedings before the Court of Appeal and civil parties to expropriations.
Interim measures (“référé”): these are emergency procedures allowing the judge, in respect of the adversarial debate, to order provisional but rapid measures aimed at preserving the rights of the plaintiff (urgent measure without dispute, precautionary or restoration measure even if disputed, expert opinion before litigation on the merits, payment of a provisional payment that is not seriously contestable). The summary proceedings take place before any trial on the merits and do not definitively settle the dispute, the defendant is summoned, and the decision rendered is only provisional in nature;
Applications (“requêtes”): this is a method of referral to the courts, which can be used for disputes for which the amount of the request does not exceed €5000 or for disputes specified by law (e.g. guardianship, etc.);
Special procedures: These are special procedures before the Court of Appeal, mainly appeals against decisions of the liberty and detention judge in matters of detention of foreigners and forced hospitalization (85% of decisions in 2023), disputes concerning the amount and recovery of lawyers' fees (8%) and claims for compensation for pre-trial detention (2%).

**Q097 (2022):** Sources: Ministry of Justice/SG/SEM/SDSE, General Civil Directory; Council of State.

Following a change in methodology, "litigious civil (and commercial) cases" now include: general litigation cases before the court of appeal and civil cases from the special chamber for minors (educational assistance).

As a result of a change in methodology, "non-litigious civil cases" correspond to non-litigious matters before the courts of appeal, namely: divorces and separations by mutual consent, approvals of agreements regarding changes in matrimonial regimes, matters relating to civil status (declaratory judgment, rectification and annulment of an act related to civil status, and modification of gender designation), adoption requests (simple and full), successions (vacant or unclaimed succession, affixing seals and contestation related to seals), as well as matters concerning minor's incapacity (initiation of guardianship proceedings, appeals against decisions made by guardianship authorities, emancipation, authorization for an act or appointment of an ad hoc administrator within the framework of legal administration, control over an act under risky circumstances), preventive procedures for companies facing difficulties, (conciliation procedure and ad hoc mandate), preliminary conciliation attempts before judicial tribunals and local courts, amicable settlement procedures in agricultural matters, non-trading property company and associations.

Following a change in methodology,"other cases" now encompass: interim measures ("référés"), petitions and specific procedures before the court of appeal as well as claims arising from expropriation. Below is a description of these types of proceedings: 1) Interim Measures ("Référés"): These are procedural steps that allow judges to order swift provisional measures aimed at preserving the rights of applicants (urgent measures without dispute; conservatory or restorative measure even if contested). Although these decisions are rendered without confrontation between parties they nonetheless pertain to disputes involving plaintiffs vs defendants. 2) Special Chamber for Minors: this involves educational assistance cases handled initially by juvenile judges with appeals being heard by this specialized chamber. While predominantly dealing with criminal cases this pertains specifically to civil issues. 3) Specific Procedures: these involve particular procedures before the court of appeal primarily consisting of challenges against rulings made by the "jujes des libertés et de la détention" on detention orders pertaining to foreigners' retention and forced hospitalization (83% -2022); disputes regarding lawyers' fees amount and recovery (9%) ; petitions seeking compensation due to pretrial detention (2%). The lack of horizontal consistency in the table stems from missing data reports for certain specific categories of cases (see comment of Q91).

**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).
4°) The orders of March and November 2020 allowed the interim relief judge to rule without a hearing, in addition to the cases provided for in article L. 522-3 of the Code of Administrative Justice.
Many courts have indicated that they have dispensed with a hearing. The dispensation of a hearing was most frequently applied in the case of summary proceedings for suspension. In the case of interim relief, this dispensation was applied in a more measured way.
Finally, many jurisdictions did not hold a hearing for summary proceedings other than suspension and liberty.
5°) The possibility for the administrative courts of appeal to rule by order without a hearing on applications for a stay of execution was little used, since only 3 CAA indicated that they had used it.
6°) In matters of DALO-Injunction, the possibility of ruling by order was used by 12 courts and, for almost all of these courts, for more than 60% of the cases judged during the same period.
II - The courts made very little use of the derogation provisions relating to the composition of the trial panels. In fact, no court made use of the possibility of completing a panel of judges with the participation of an honorary magistrate from another court. Only one administrative court requested the participation of a judge from another court (one judge came to assist for a period of three months).
III - The provisions allowing heads of court to appoint advisers to rule by order under the conditions set out in article R. 222-13 of the CJA were hardly used: only two administrative courts applied them. One head of court had appointed one or more advisers but no order was made by this magistrate or these magistrates. Another head of court indicated that the designated magistrate(s) signed more than 200 orders. In total, it appears that the measures provided for have been used very differently depending on the measure taken into account.
Video hearings and the new rules for summary proceedings have opened up possibilities, with provisions that can be seen as having been the medium for experimentation. "

**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.

**Germany**

**Q097 (General Comment):** General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section: please refer to the general comment Q 91
Horizonal inconsistencies:
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 (2024):** Civil (and commercial) litigious cases include second instance civil cases at the regional courts and higher regional courts.
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the higher administrative courts and regional social courts.
"Other cases" include cases at the regional labour courts and second instance family matters at the higher regional courts.

**Q097 (2023):** Civil (and commercial) litigious cases include second instance civil cases at the regional courts and higher regional courts.
The number of incoming cases has decreased significantly compared to 2022 and is now back to the level of before 2019. The increased number of incoming cases in 2019 till 2022 was most likely a result of the flood of lawsuits brought against car manufacturers in connection with the "diesel emission scandal".
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the higher administrative courts and regional social courts.
"Other cases" include cases at the regional labour courts and second instance family matters at the higher regional courts.
"Other cases" - discrepancy between pending cases on 31st Dec. 2022 and 1st Jan. 2023:
A high discrepancy orrurs with regard to second instance labour law cases. The reason for this is that one federal state's data on pending second instance labour law cases is missing in the official statistic.

**Q097 (2022):** Civil (and commercial) litigious cases include second instance civil cases at the regional courts and higher regional courts.
There was a rise in pending cases (1. January and 31 December) compared to the 2020 cycle as well as a decrease in resolved cases. This is most likely a result of the flood of lawsuits brought against car manufracturers in connection with the "diesel emission scandal". For example, the higher regional court of Stuttgart, where a large car manufracturer has its main offices, has seen a rise in pending cases (1 January) of more than 100% compared to 2020.
"Administrative law cases" include cases at the higher administrative courts and regional social courts.
"Other cases" include cases at the regional labour courts and second instance family matters at the higher regional courts.

**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.

**Greece**

**Q097 (2024):** Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat).
Concerning the increased number of incoming and especially resolved civil litigious cases at the appeal level, it should be noted that he implementation of the new judicial map in Greece (Law 5134/2024) introduced structural changes that affected the distribution and classification of civil cases, as jurisdictional adjustments led to the transfer of certain case types to lower courts.

**Q097 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
“Civil litigious cases”: in 2022 and because of the partial closure of the courts, cases were arriving for a second-degree trial but not being heard. Cases not heard in 2022 were postponed to 2023. We believe that this, combined with the simultaneous full operation of the courts, resulted in a reduction in the percentage of cases ultimately resolved in the appellate courts and a concomitant increase in Disposition Time.
Concerning the decrease in the number of civil litigious cases pending for more than 2 years, it should be recalled that during the Covid-19 pandemic period, which was declared by the WHO on 11/03/2020, the prevention and management measures for the virus were implemented in Greece on 11 March. These measures also affected the functioning of the courts and civil courts, as most cases, especially civil cases, were suspended. The measures were fully implemented on 15 March 2022, when the functioning of the courts gradually started to normalise. During this period, judicial officers were given the opportunity and time to process cases that had been backlogged during the previous period. This resulted in a reduction in the number of pending cases in civil and criminal courts, which is reflected in the statistics for the year 2023.

**Q097 (2022):** The data has been provided by the office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data, such as the training of staff and the creation of an instructional manual guide with definitions and instructions. These measures were intended to help collecting more reliable data from both small and large courts and prosecution services and eliminate the standard errors in judicial statistics. As our methodology is developing, discrepancies in data can be observed. Besides, as regards “Other cases”, it should be mentioned that some types of cases that were previously included in this category, are now distributed in the other case-categories in the table.

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q097 (2024):** Other cases: insolvency cases, labour cases.
Discrepancy explanation:
Total: The difference is due to the change explained in the subpoints, which has affected the overall result as well.
1. The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value (at the end of 2023 5 cases, at the end of 2024 7 cases).
2.2. (2.2.2. and 2.2.3.), 2.3., 3., 4. We have verified the data, and they correspond to our records.
3. Administrative law cases pending for more than 2 years - There is currently no such case within the court system; therefore, the number is 0.

**Q097 (2023):** Discrepancy explanation regarding point "2.2. Registry cases" and "2.2.2. Non-litigious business registry":
The change in the data described in point 2.2.2. can also be explained with the same reasons mentioned in question 091 point 4., which also affects the data in point 2.2.
Discrepancy explanation regarding point "3. Administrative law cases":
In administrative law cases the 2022 data exclusively included regional court cases, which had concluded by the end of 2022. Due to jurisdictional changes, the current data displays regional court of appeal 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.

**Ireland**

**Q097 (General Comment):** Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Q097 (2024):** Administrative cases are included as Civil (and commercial) litigious.

**Q097 (2023):** 3. Administrative law cases- We have given the response as NA as we do not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases. They are included in the figure for 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.

**Italy**

**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. In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has udertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 40% in the civil sector by June 2026 (all three instances together). More specifically, the targets for reducing the civil backlog in the First Instance Courts are: - Intermediate disposal target to be achieved by 31.12.2024: 95% reduction of civil cases registered (filed) until 31/12/2016 and still pending as of 31/12/2019 (baseline); - Final disposal target to be achieved by 30.06.2026: 90% reduction of civil proceedings registered (filed) from 01/01/2017 to 31/12/2022 and still pending as of 31/12/2022 (baseline). The targets for reducing the civil backlog in the Courts of Appeal are: - Intermediate disposal target to be achieved by 31.12.2024: 95% reduction of civil cases registered (filed) until 31/12/2017 and still pending as of 31/12/2019 (baseline); - Final disposal target to be achieved by 30.06.2026: 90% reduction of civil proceedings registered (filed) from 01/01/2018 to 31/12/2022 and still pending as of 31/12/2022 (baseline). A monitoring system is in place and a detailed dashboard is available at https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx

**Q097 (2024):** The reduction is due to legislative reforms affecting this category.

**Q097 (2022):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has udertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html
The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 40% in the civil sector and 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together) .
More specifically a reduction of the civil backlog by 65% in first instance courts and 55% in appeal courts by the end of 2024; by 90% in first instance courts and appeal courts by June 2026. As far as the civil cases, such targets relate exclusively to litigious cases.
A monitoring system is in place and a detailed dashboard is available at
https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx

**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.

**Latvia**

**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” because such type of cases are not defined in the Civil Code. Accordingly, the reply in their respect is NAP. The “non-litigious land registry cases” are dealt with by the regional courts in second instance and they are within the competence of the first and second (appeal) instance.

**Q097 (2024):** Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court. The increase in the number of pending cases in administrative proceedings (older than 2 years) contributed to the overall growth in this group of cases. It should be noted that the rise in the number of pending administrative cases older than two years cannot be attributed to the court's capacity, but rather to the nature and complexity of these types of cases.

**Q097 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. The timely consideration of cases as one of its priorities, also following the guidelines for the consideration of cases approved by the Council of Justice. This has affected the changes in the number of resolved cases and, accordingly, the number of pending cases and pending cases older than 2 years.
The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of cases and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial process.

**Q097 (2022):** Data on incoming, resolved non-litigious civil cases in appeal court decreased in 2022, but the changes cannot be explained.
It should be mentionned that the statistical system has been improved which affected the 2022 data. Moreover, 2020 and 2021 data have been updated according to the same methodology of presentation of data as for 2022 data. The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly decreased. The decrease in cases is due to the lifting of restrictions, which were related to limiting the spread of Covid-19. The reduction of pending cases (pending more than 2 years) is related to a interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending criminal cases.

**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.

**Lithuania**

**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 (2023):** 3. In 2023, significantly fewer administrative law cases were received:
regarding the legal status of foreigners - 454 cases (in 2022 - 1583)
asylum - 90 cases (in 2022 - 1237)
tax legal relations - 136 cases (in 2022 - 300);
regarding the judgements of debt for the local municipal waste collection and management fee - 75 (in 2022 - 234);
on conditions of execution of sentences and detention - 167 (in 2022 - 262);
complaints of persons serving a prison sentence regarding compensation for inadequate prison conditions - 157 (in 2022 - 230).
In 2023, compared to 2022, the duration of consideration of administrative cases examined by the appellate instance regarding decisions increased by 70 days, but compared to 2021, it decreased by 50 days.
In 2023, the duration of consideration of administrative cases examined by the appellate instance regarding rulings in the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania also lengthened - compared to 2022 extended by 7 days, and compared to 2021 - in 5 days. It should be noted that in 2022 (compared to 2021), the significantly shortened duration of hearing cases could be influenced by the fact that in 2022 March 31 by the resolution of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, 3 judges from the Supreme Court of Lithuania and 2 judges from the Court of Appeal of Lithuania were transferred to the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania temporarily (for a period of 3 months) due to the extremely increased number of pending legal status and asylum cases related to the influx of foreigners (illegal migrants) in Lithuania. Meanwhile, the longer duration of the hearings in 2023 compared to 2022 could have been influenced by the fact that, after the transfer period, the aforementioned judges returned to work in the courts from which they were temporarily transferred.

**Q097 (2022):** 3. in 2021 the duration of the review of decisions of administrative cases at the appellate instance was significantly shortened (more than 130 days compared to 2020), this fact led to a smaller balance of unexamined cases at the beginning of 2022. 3.1. The significant change in administrative cases received and examined by the second instance, compared to 2021, was caused by an increase in complaints regarding the decisions made by the court of first instance regarding debt collection of local fees for the collection and management of municipal waste, as well as complaints regarding asylum requests related to illegal migration to Lithuania.
3.2. The duration of the review of decisions by the appeal instance of administrative cases was significantly reduced (120 days compared to 2021 and 253 days compared to 2020), which led to a smaller balance of unexamined cases at the end of 2022.
In 2022, compared to 2021, more complaints about decisions made in courts were examined, as well as accordingly, the ratio of examined complaints and amended or annulled decisions slightly increased.

**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).

**Luxembourg**

**Q097 (2022):** Administrative resolved cases: While the number of cases concluded by the Administrative Court has increased by almost 34%, it turns out that this variation was primarily recorded between 2020 and 2021, and commented upon during the assessment of the 2021 data. Between 2021 and 2022, there is a decrease of -6% in the number of resolved cases.

Administrative pending cases on December 31st reference year: The decline in pending cases between 2020 and 2022 is indeed significant, dropping from 240 to 174 cases. However, when compared to the figures provided in 2021, administrative cases have only decreased by -4%, reducing from `182` to `174` the pending cases before the Administrative Court.

**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.

**Malta**

**Q097 (General Comment):** 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).

**Q097 (2024):** Pending cases on 31 December 2024 - Following legislative amendments, the efficiency of this court improved as a result of faster case processing time. These procedural enhancements can be found in Act XXXII of 2021 of the Laws of Malta, Justice Reform (Civil Procedure) Act, available in English at this link: https://legislation.mt/eli/act/2021/32/eng Pending cases for more than 2 years - Most of the cases taking long to resolve relate to cases filed prior to the legislative change. Hence the high ratio of pending cases over 2 years old.

**Q097 (2022):** The increase in the incoming caseload at 1st Instance has reflected intself in an increase in the incoming caseload at the 2nd Instance across all courts. Moreover, in one particular court, the incoming caseload has increased twofold due to a legal provision that facilitates the filing of specific cases.
The number of resolved cases has increased across all 2nd Instance courts and underscores the efforts of the judiciary to address the burgeoning caseload.

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q097 (General Comment):** We were able to make an approximation 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 samewe have used this approximation).

**Q097 (2024):** This year, we were able to provide data for 1. Civil litigious cases and 2. Non litigious cases.
-As far as we know, it is possible to have non-litigious cases in second instance.
-We have made an approximation (the best way we are able to at this time), where we arrive at 100% litigious cases and 0% non-litigious cases. Thus, we have filled in 0 for those cases.

**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.

**Poland**

**Q097 (General Comment):** The category „Other cases” includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others. Starting from 2022, administrative cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court are presented in the frame of question 99 (last instance) and are no more within the scope of Q97.

**Q097 (2024):** The category „Other cases” includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others.
With regard to the reasons for the increase in the impact of second-instance cases in 2024 compared to 2023, it should first be pointed out that this year was another year of an increase in the impact of civil cases concerning claims from contracts denominated/indexed to the Swiss franc to appellate courts, which translated into an overall increase in the impact of civil and commercial cases in appellate courts. In most courts of appeal, civil and commercial cases are heard in the same division, and therefore the increase in the influence of one category of cases also has a negative impact on the hearing of cases of the other category. While in 2023 95,925 civil and commercial cases were submitted to the courts of appeal, in 2024 the impact of such cases amounted to 121,326 (an increase of 26.4%). It should be emphasized that this increase in influence has continued since 2020. For comparison, in 2019, the total impact of civil and commercial cases on the courts of appeal was 54,959. Thus, in 5 years, the (annual) impact of civil and commercial cases on the courts of appeal has more than doubled.
An analysis of the results of the courts' work in the main category of civil procedural cases ACa confirmed that in 2024 compared to 2023, there was an increase in the impact and settlement of the above-mentioned cases in the courts of appeal, as well as, despite the great judicial effort undertaken, an increase in residuals. In 2024, the impact of category ACa amounted to 53,220 compared to 45,704 in 2023 (i.e. an increase of 16.4%), the settlement amounted to 26,041 compared to 22,729 in 2023 (i.e. an increase of 14.6%), and the remainder at the end of 2024 increased to 75,565 compared to 48,386 at the end of 2023 (i.e. an increase of 56.2%).
It should be noted that in 2024, the courts of appeal received 56,281 cases concerning claims arising from bank agreements denominated or indexed to the Swiss franc with the symbol 049cf (the so-called Swiss franc cases), which was due to an increase in settlements in regional courts of first instance, as well as favorable case law for bank customers formed after the resolution of the Supreme Court of 25 April 2024 in the case no. III CZP 25/22 as well as previous judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 2023. The handling of Swiss franc cases in the courts of appeal amounted to 16,641 and increased by 31.4% compared to 2023, but the improvement in handling was insufficient to control the impact (38,732 cases were received; the degree of control of the influence was 43.0%), which resulted in the accumulation of the remaining Swiss franc cases for the following year. At the same time, it should be added that in 2024, the number of civil judges in the courts of appeal was reduced: the limit of judges on the last day of the statistical period was 277.0 compared to 295.0 in 2023.
In 2024, there was also a sharp increase in the impact of ACz appeal cases to the courts of appeal, which was a consequence of the amendment to the Code of Civil Procedure by the Act of 9 March 2023 amending the Act – Code of Civil Procedure and certain other acts: 41,755 cases were received compared to 25,282 cases in 2023 (an increase of 65.2%), which also resulted in an increase in the workload of judges.
Similarly, in the case of regional courts hearing appeals against district court judgments in the second instance, there was a significant increase in the impact of appeal cases Cz: 49,441 cases were rec

eived compared to 38,696 in 2023 (an increase of 27.8%). The impact of Ca's civil litigation cases amounted to 78,522 in 2024 and increased slightly - by 2.2%. However, the limit of judges as of the last day of the statistical period in the second instance was reduced from 509.6 to 497.1, which had an adverse effect on the number of settlements and resulted in an increase in the remainder of category Ca by 9.2% to 51,605.
With regard to the number of appeal cases, it should be noted that the increase in the impact was not associated with an increase in the number of cases that was adequate to the needs, although an increase in the number of resolved cases should be noticed. These data show the enormous effort put into the judges to minimize the effects of the growing influence, which was impossible to control, with the existing human resources. A larger scale of growth in settlements is already very difficult to achieve with the existing human resources, while the improvement of the staffing is hindered due to the suspension of announcements of vacancies for judicial positions from the end of 2023, due to the activities of the National Council of the Judiciary, formed in accordance with the provisions of the Act of 8 December 2017 amending the Act on the National Council of the Judiciary and certain other acts. The resulting staff shortages and their impact on the results obtained cannot be fully eliminated by supervisory activities.
With regard to appellate cases in regional courts, they were also affected by personnel problems related to the suspension of announcements of vacant judicial positions and the delegation of judges from regional courts to courts of appeal. In part, these deficiencies are made up for by the secondment of district court judges to regional courts.
In addition, both in regional courts and in courts of appeal, there is a need to consult experts in appeal cases. In the Annual Information on the Activities of Courts Operating in the Area of Appeals for 2024 and in letters addressed to the Ministry of Justice, the presidents of the courts pointed to increasing problems with the availability of experts, the quality of the opinions prepared and the lengthening deadlines for preparing opinions, often exceeding one year. In addition, the presidents of the courts of appeal reported problems with staffing in the group of court clerks and clerks, as well as the rotation of assistant staff, which also made it difficult to reduce the residue.
The extension of the time for examining appellate cases and the deterioration in the efficiency of proceedings in both regional courts and courts of appeal was also caused by an amendment to the Code of Civil Procedure, as a result of which from 7 November 2019 the inter-instance proceedings, including the examination of formal deficiencies and their supplementation, are conducted by the court of second instance, and not by the court of first instance, as before.
In appellate cases concerning bankruptcy and restructuring cases (regional courts), the efficiency of their examination was negatively affected by the imperfections of the ICT system of the National Register of Debtors, in which these proceedings are conducted.
Finally, the courts pointed to the increasing degree of complexity of cases, which also did not favor a greater increase in the number of cases handled.

**Q097 (2023):** The category „Other cases” includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others.
I will explain the differences in the data during the quality control and to specific questions from analysts. The increased inflow and the remaining number of civil and commercial cases (Q97, civil) for subsequent reporting periods is to some extent due to the increased inflow of civil cases concerning claims from banking contracts denominated /indexed to the Swiss franc (cases with the symbol 049 cf) in the second instance of common courts. The number of so-called “franc”cases received significantly exceeds the number of cases settled, which results in an increase in the number of cases remaining to be settled in subsequent statistical periods.

**Q097 (2022):** According to the available data for civil, commercial and labour and social security cases at second instance for 2022. - taking 2021 as a benchmark: In courts of appeal :
(a) In civil and commercial cases, including in the AGa category in 2022, the number of cases settled actually decreased slightly (by 1.0%), with a total increase in settlements in ACa+AGa cases of 7.5% compared to 2021. Thus, overall in civil and commercial appellate cases, the number of settlements in the appellate courts has increased. Despite the increase in settlements, the impact of ACa+AGa cases (65.6%) was not brought under control, due to its drastic increase of 51.9% compared to 2021. (cases involving franking credits).
- In 2022, there was a slight decrease in the handling of ACz (by 1.9%) and AGz (by 2.4%) complaint cases, which can be explained by a decrease in the impact of these categories of cases by 7.3% and 4.9%, respectively, compared to 2021. The impact of ACz cases was controlled at 100.6% and AGz cases at 101.9%;
Thus, in AGa cases, the reason for the decrease in handling (by only 1%) was a drastic increase in the impact of ACa cases (by 64.5%), while the handling of ACa and AGa cases combined increased, so there is no basis for further explanation. In AGz cases, the decrease in disposals should be linked to the decrease in receipts. The decrease in the handling of cases has not impeded the control of the impact of the cases, so there are no grounds for further explanation. b) In labour and social security cases, the total number of cases disposed of in 2022 decreased (by 17%), of which the number of cases disposed of in the APa category decreased by 9.6%, which was due to a 14.8% decrease in the number of cases received in this category, as 104.9% of the cases received were managed, while in the AUa category, the number of cases disposed of decreased by 18.1% (from 21,360 to 17,500 cases) in relation to 2021, This was partly attributable to the 4.9% decrease in receipts, but above all to the inability to handle a larger number of homogeneous AUa cases, as was the case in 2021 regarding the pension amount of women from the so-called "1953 vintage", which were handled in large numbers in 2021. in connection with new decisions of the pension authority, issued on the basis of the provisions of the Act of 19 June 2020 amending the Act on pensions from the Social Insurance Fund (Journal of Laws of 2020, item 1222) implementing the judgment of the Constitutional Tribunal of 6 March 2019. P 20/16. It should be emphasised that the disposition of this type of cases in 2021 was atypically high (in both appellate and district courts) and significantly higher than in 2020, when it amounted to 12 929 cases in appellate courts. Moreover, in 2021, proceedings were discontinued in 6 923 cases in this category, while in 2022, only 1 193 cases were discontinued. only 1 193 cases of this category were discontinued, which resulted in a decrease in the total number of cases handled in the labour and social security division and the inability to control the impact in 2022. (93,6%); - in 2022, the handling of grievance cases in the AUz cat. decreased by 28.9% (from 3,611 to 2,565), which was also due to the decrease in the inflow of cases in this category (by 27.43%) in relation to 2021, as the inflow in this category of cases was contained. In the APz category, the 16.41% decrease in the number of cases settled in 2022 (from 201 to 168 cases) was also due to a 19.40% decrease in the inflow of cases in this category (from 201 to 162 cases) in relation to 2021.
In reg

ional courts:
(a) in civil appellate cases Ca the number of civil cases settled in 2022.decreased in comparison to 2021 only minimally by 0.01% (by 6 cases), so there are no grounds for further clarification;
- in complaint cases Cz at second instance, the number of cases handled in 2022 decreased by 10.60% (from 37,565 to 33,581) compared to 2021, as a result of a 17.48% decrease in receipts (from 36,190 to 29,863).It should be emphasised that, despite the decrease in settlements, receipts in this category were controlled by 112.4% and the backlog was reduced by 38.49% compared to the end of 2021;(b) in Ga commercial appeal cases, the number of cases disposed of fell by 13.4%, as a result of a 19.8% decrease in receipts. It should be emphasised that despite the decrease in disposals, receipts were controlled by 113.3% and the backlog was reduced by 17.5% compared to the end of 2021.
- in Gz grievance cases, the number of cases handled fell by 13.1%, as a result of a 9.9% decrease in receipts. It should be emphasised that, despite the decrease in disposals, receipts were controlled by 102.2% and the backlog was reduced by 9.3% compared to the end of 2021.
c) in labour and social security cases, the number of cases disposed of in 2022 - in Ua appellate cases, the number of civil cases disposed of in 2022 compared to 2021 increased by 1.5% and requires no explanation, while in Pa category cases, the number of cases disposed of compared to 2021 decreased slightly by 2.5% (from 4,775 to 4,656), which was due to a 3.4% decrease in receipts in this category, while receipts were only slightly (97.9%) unmanaged;
- in grievance cases, the number of cases disposed of in the A&E category fell by 15.67% (from 1,557 to 1,313 cases), as a result of a 19.43% decrease in the number of cases disposed of in this category in relation to 2021, while the impact was contained; in the Uz category, the number of cases disposed of in 2022 decreased only slightly by 6 cases (from 459 to 453 cases), which does not require detailed explanation. In cases, Ga and Gz, Cz and Pz, the decrease in handling should be attributed to a decrease in receipts.The decrease in disposals did not prevent the impact of cases from being brought under control, so there are no grounds for further explanation. With regard to the courts of second instance, it should also be pointed out that the transfer of the duty to conduct inter-institutional proceedings to the courts of second instance has resulted in an increased workload for the judges sitting in these divisions. In addition, the Covid-19 pandemic has reduced the ability to conduct court proceedings efficiently and has resulted in a backlog of judges' dockets, which is increasing due to the increase in influence. This is coupled with a sharp increase in the impact of cases in the appellate courts, including in particular an increase in the impact of franking cases referred to the appellate courts.

**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.

**Portugal**

**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 (2024):** 97.3 The decrease in figures compared to 2023 is justified by the fact that in 2023 the figures were unusually high. In 2023, Decree-Law No. 74-B/2023 of 28 August came into force, which provided for the specialisation of the central administrative courts and their establishment by Order 281-A/2023 of 13 September. As a result of the creation of these specialised sections, the number of cases filed and concluded in the central administrative courts in 2023 was unusually high, due to internal transfers between the organisational units of these courts. In short, the figures for 2024 are in line with those for the years prior to 2023, which was, for the reasons mentioned above, a year with unusually high figures.
Last February, the number of cases heard by the Lisbon Court of Appeal between 2015 and 2023 was changed as a result of a correction made by the court. Following these corrections, the data for 2023 were changed from those originally submitted to the CEPEJ questionnaire last year. For this reason, the figures for cases pending as of December 31, 2023, do not match the figures for January 1, 2024.

**Q097 (2023):** In 2023, Decree-Law 74-B/2023 of 28 August came into force, which led to the specialisation of the central administrative courts and their installation by Order 281-A/2023 of 13 September. As a result of the creation of these specialised chambers, 11 745 cases were internally transferred between the organic units of these courts.

**Q097 (2022):** total: The increase in the number of cases filed in 2022 compared to 2020 reflects, from our point of view, the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent lockdown, which had an impact on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.
1.The drop in the number of pending cases in 2022 compared to 2020 is related to the fact that in the period from 2020 to 2022 the number of cases completed was higher than the number of cases received.

**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.

**Romania**

**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 (2022):** Due to the large number of magistrates retiring in 2022, the number of solved cases decreased, as a result the stock of files at the end of the year increased, while the number of newly entered cases followed an upward trend compared to the previous reporting cycle.

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q097 (General Comment):** The decrease in the number of new cases can be attributed to an improved ability to resolve matters already at first instance, as several procedural steps exist to facilitate reaching a solution before a case proceeds to the second instance. Furthermore, the involvement of notaries and their ability to engage in informal communication with clients results in first-instance courts receiving applications that can be accepted without dispute.

**Q097 (2024):** Non-litigious cases: The decrease in the number of new cases can be attributed to an improved ability to resolve matters already at first instance, as several procedural steps exist to facilitate reaching a solution before a case proceeds to the second instance. Furthermore, the involvement of notaries and their ability to engage in informal communication with clients results in first-instance courts receiving applications that can be accepted without dispute.

**Q097 (2023):** Starting 2023 - according to the CEPEJ methodology Administrative cases are reported in Q99

**Q097 (2022):** The decline in litigious and non-litigious cases has been gradual since 2017. This phenomenon was not analysed in more detail. The decrease may be caused by the impact of the activity of courts of first instance as well as the behaviour of participants in court proceedings - a lower number of appeals.
There is some small amount of non-litigious registry cases, but they can not be monitored separately, they are part of the bigger group.
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. The Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic acts as second instance court in the administrative cases.
Source: https://www.nssud.sk/web_object/stat_2022.pdf

**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.

**Slovenia**

**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 (2024):** Discrepancies:
2.2 and 2.2.2: please note small (absolute) number of cases.

**Q097 (2023):** Discrepancies to 2022 data: Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year – increase by 23% - 35%: in 2022, a slight decrease in number of incoming and resolved cases is observable. Clearance rate was slightly below 100%. In 2022, the number of second instance judges decreased by 7% (mostly due to retirement) which resulted in decreased number of resolved cases. Please note the ratio between pending and incoming/resolved cases is approx. 1:5 (a slight decrease in % of resolved cases will reflect in higher % increase in pending cases).

**Q097 (2022):** Pending cases on 1 Jan. (all categories) - decrease by approx. 35-50%: In 2021, the number of pending cases decreased by approx. 50% due to effects of Covid-19 pandemics in 2020. In 2022, the number increased again (by approx 20%). For (land) registry cases (2.2. and 2.2.1) please note small (absolute) number of cases.
Incoming cases (2.2 and 2.2.2) – decrease by 21% and 36%: please note small (absolute) number of cases.
Resolved cases (2.2. and 2.2.2 ) - decrease by 21% and 35%: please note small (absolute) number of cases and low disposition time (number of resolved cases is highly dependant on number of new cases).
Pending cases on 31 Dec. (all categories) – increase by 50% - 90%: in reporting period a slight decrease in number of incoming cases and more significant decrease in number of resolved cases is observable (especially in 2021). Clearance rate was slightly below 100%. Please note the ratio between pending and incoming/resolved cases is approx 1:5 (a slight decrease in % of resolved cases will reflect in higher % increase in pending cases). The decrease in the number of resolved cases in 2021 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.). In 2022, the number of second instance judges decreasd by 7% (mostly due to retirement) which resulted in decreased number of resolved cases.

**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.

**Spain**

**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 (2024):** The data is calculated using the same criteria as in previous years.
When a court identifies inaccuracies in its statistical reporting, it may regularize the data in its Statistical Bulletin by replacing the incorrect figure with one that reflects the actual situation, even if it diverges from previously reported values. Such regularizations are a recognized source of horizontal inconsistencies
In relation to the increase in incoming civil (and commercial) litigious cases, a significant rise in the number of appeals can be observed.

**Q097 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain’s rates.

**Q097 (2022):** 2020 was a year marked by the pandemic, the reduction of work in judicial bodies, despite digitalization, and by mobility restriction measures. The increase in the pace of work in 2022 is logical and it explains the increase in the number of incoming civil (and commercial) litigious cases. The reduced clearance rate has been due to the increase in appeals against judgements in ordinary trials related to floor clauses (cláusulas suelo); clause that a specific financial institution can include in a variable interest mortgage loan contract and that establishes the minimum interest rate that customers will pay.

**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.

### Question 098

**Austria**

**Q098 (2024):** On the one hand, the table shows that there was a decline in the number of cases completed in 2022 and 2023 compared to previous years, although this only corresponded to a correspondingly lower number of cases in 2022. This ultimately resulted in the increase in the number of pending cases taken over in 2024.
In 2023, however, there was a significant decrease in the number of pending cases taken over compared to previous years. The sharp increase from 2023 to 2024 is therefore somewhat put into perspective when looking at the average of the previous years. By the end of 2024, the number of pending cases had returned to the level of previous years (2020 to 2022). Overall, therefore, there appears to be a fluctuation and not a sustained (negative) trend. We are not aware of any reasons for this fluctuation.

**Q098 (2023):** 2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year): One reason is that the number in the year before was comparatively not high. Also, the discrepancy is not that high when you look at the average in the last 6 years, which was about 685. The number of new cases however in 2023 was higher than 2022, still the number or resolved cases only sank a little. Otherwise we have no concrete reasons.

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q098 (General Comment):** “Severe criminal cases”: cases appealed to the Court of Appeal (criminal matters).
“Minor criminal cases”: appeals against decisions of Police courts brought before first instance criminal courts (the latter act as second instance courts in respect of Police courts’ first instance cases).

Youth protection cases: included under “minor criminal cases”.
“Other criminal cases”: since the last cycle, this category includes cases dealt with by the investigation judges (Chambre de mise en accusation). The latter is involved in the judicial investigation oversight, supervises pre-trial detention in particular, and decides on referral to the trial judge.

**Q098 (2024):** 2024 data on “youth cases” are as follows: 361; 1 585; 1 601; 345; 135; they are included in the table under ”minor criminal cases”.
“Other criminal cases”: cases dealt with by the investigation judges (Chambre de mise en accusation) are not included in the table to avoid double counting the same criminal cases (2024 data: pending on 1 Jan.: 2 718, incoming: 12 813, resolved: 12 497, pending on 31 Dec.: 3 034, pending for more than 2 years: 1 269). Source: data warehouse (date of data extraction: 06/25/2025
There is no specific explanation for the significant increase in the number of minor criminal cases pending for more than two years.

**Q098 (2023):** Youth cases: pending on 1 January 2023: 363; incoming cases: 1 578; resolved cases: 1 583; pending cases on 31 December 2023: 358; pending cases older than 2 years: 130.
“Other criminal cases”: data of the Investigation Court (Chambre de mise en accusation): pending on 1 January 2023: 2515; incoming cases: 12462; resolved cases: 12259, pending on 31 December 2023: 2718; pending cases for more than 2 years: 1149. Source: datawarehouse (data extraction date: 14/07/2024). These figures are not included in the table, so as not to count the same cases twice (consistency with Q 94).
There is no particular explanation for the significant increase in the number of minor criminal cases pending for more than two years.

**Q098 (2022):** Court of Appeal (criminal matters): Totals: Pending cases on 1/01/2022 = 6610; pending cases on 31/12/2022 = 6677; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date when the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 1436. Severe criminal cases (involving criminal and social offences): Pending cases on 1/01/2022 = 6304; pending cases on 31/12 /2022 = 6311; Cases pending for more than two years from the date when the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 1307. Cases related to juvenile protection: Pending cases on 1/01/2022 = 306 ;pending on 31/12/2022 = 366 ;Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date when the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 129. Source: datawarehouse(data extraction date :l/l8 /20l22). Other criminal cases = data concerning the Chamber of indictments (pre-trial stage).

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q098 (2022):** "Total criminal cases" include all criminal cases ofsecond instance - criminal cases of a general nature and criminal cases of a private nature (common offences and offences subject to private prosecution), cases of release from penal responsibility with imposing of administrative punishment in accordance with Art. 78a of the Criminal Code, private criminal cases, interrogations, and administrative-criminal cases.

**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

**Croatia**

**Q098 (General Comment):** Due to the peculiarity of the Croatian legal system explained within the frame of question 94, the category “severe criminal cases” subsumes criminal cases under the jurisdiction of the 2nd instance county courts, while the category “misdemeanours and/or minor criminal cases” encompasses cases under the jurisdiction of the 2nd instance misdemeanour courts and the High Misdemeanour Court. Croatian legislation distinguishes misdemeanours and criminal offences. Misdemeanour Act prescribes that misdemeanours and misdemeanour legal sanctions can be proscribed solely for those behaviours that violate or threaten public order, social discipline and social values guaranteed and protected by the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia, international law and the laws whose protection is not possible without misdemeanour legal sanction, and their protection is not achieved with criminal coercion. The above shows that misdemeanours are certain behaviours that deserve sanction, but which by its severity and consequences do not deserve criminal liability.
Since the Criminal code does not strictly classify the categories of severe and minor criminal offences, we are not able to classify as misdemeanour/minor all offences for which it is not possible to pronounce a sentence of deprivation of liberty, and classify as severe offences all offences punishable by a deprivation of liberty
According to this, in the category “severe criminal cases” there are criminal cases under the jurisdiction of the 2nd instance county courts, while in the category “misdemeanours and/or minor criminal cases” there are cases under the jurisdiction of the 2nd instance misdemeanour courts and High Misdemeanour Court.

**Q098 (2023):** The increase in the number of criminal law cases in second instance courts (appeal) is due to the County Courts not resolving more cases than they received in either 2022 or 2023. This has resulted in an increase in the number of pending cases, with a clearance rate of 91% in 2022 and 89% in 2023. The strike has resulted in an increase in pending cases that have been in the second instance court for more than two years.

**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).

**Cyprus**

**Q098 (General Comment):** As of the 1st of July 2023 the Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court were re - established. Also an Appeal Court was also created. Appeals filed after 2018 were transferred to the Appeal Court. Civil and Criminal appeals filed between 2013-2017 remained at the Supreme Court whereas administrative appeals are brought before the Supreme Constitutional Court.

**Q098 (2024):** The reference date for the previous cycle was 1st of July 2023 when the Court of Appeal was established, which explains the variatons not necessarily reflecting a real surge in caseload or efficiency.

**Q098 (2023):** On July 2023 an Appeal Court was established and any appeals filed after 2018 are tried by the Appeal court whereas any cases filed between 2013 -2017 (backlog) are dealt by the Supreme Court. The Supreme court acts no as a third tier last instance court only for legal issues.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**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.

**Denmark**

**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's an issue from a severe case in the district or a case that is not severe. Then the whole case may afterward be appealed to one of the two High Courts when the district courts have come to a final judgment.
The lower number of cases in 2023 is due to a large increase in case processing time for the second instance courts. The increase contrasts with the first instance courts as well as the highest instance courts where the case processing time has also increased, but to a much lesser extent.

**Q098 (2024):** All criminal cases at the second instance courts are considered severe.

**Q098 (2023):** All criminal cases at the second instance courts are considered severe.
The lower number of cases is due to a large increase in case processing time for the second instance courts. The increase contrasts with the first instance courts as well as the highest instance courts where the case processing time has also increased, but to a much lesser extent.

**Q098 (2022):** All criminal cases at 2nd instance are considered severe as they would otherwise not become 2nd instance criminal cases. Due to periods of lock downs because of the situation with covid-19, the courts have still a lot of pending cases.

**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.

**Estonia**

**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 (2024):** The number of criminal cases has increased

**Q098 (2023):** Other cases are matters of preliminary proceedings and enforcement proceedings.

**Q098 (2022):** In recent years, there has been a (wide-ranging) generational change among judges in Estonia, which has led to a temporary drop in performance. especially in the district courts.

**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.

**Finland**

**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).

**France**

**Q098 (General Comment):** Cases are not categorised by type of offenses but by court chamber (criminal, investigation, sentence enforcement), which prevents us from providing the number of criminal cases by type of offense.
In terms of horizontal consistency, discrepancies may be noted due to difficulties in recording cases as a result of the change in digital criminal applications within the appeal courts. This is a transitional situation due to an improvement in digital tools.

**Q098 (2024):** Source(s): SSER, frame-survey of prosecution services. Differences between the number of pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023 and the number of pending cases on 1 Jan. 2024 may be observed due to the difficulties in recording cases resulting from the change of criminal applications within the courts of appeal.

**Q098 (2023):** Source(s): SSER, Public Prosecutor's Executives Survey.

**Q098 (2022):** Please note that for the year 2022, data regarding the criminal appeals chambers are not available. Consequently, it is not possible to provide the total volume of criminal cases at second instance. Furthermore, cases are not categorized by type of offense but by chamber (criminal, investigative, enforcement).

**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.
"

**Germany**

**Q098 (General Comment):** General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section: please refer to the general comment Q 91
Horizonal inconsistencies:
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 (2024):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.
"Other" includes 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.

**Q098 (2023):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.
"Other" includes 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.

**Q098 (2022):** “Severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.
"Other" includes 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. Discrepancies in comparison with the last cycle:
The decrease in resolved severe criminal cases can mostly be attributed to second instance cases at the regional courts. No special reason could be identified for this development.
The decrease in pending minor criminal cases on 1 January is caused by the fact, the number of pending cases on 1 January 2020 higher than usual. No specific reason could be identified for this deviation or for the deviation of "other than criminal cases".

**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).

**Greece**

**Q098 (2024):** Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat)

**Q098 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
The observed variations in the figures should be construed in the light of the pandemic context. In the year 2022, courts were, even for part of the year, under a restricted regime due to the measures implemented in Greece to contain the Covid-19 pandemic. This gave the judges the opportunity, alongside new cases, to deal with cases that had already been heard. At the same time, however, due to the courts not being fully operational, the number of cases to be pending increased at the end of 2022, which were transferred for adjudication in 2023, when the courts were fully operational and consequently the flow of judgments was limited. Moreover, it should be considered that there were 3 consecutive elections in Greece in 2023, which resulted in the suspension of the courts for about 3 months in total.

**Q098 (2022):** The data has been provided by the office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data. The content of the categories of criminal cases in the table are the same as for the previous evaluation cycle, but the services now monitor and record these cases better so discrepancies in data can be observed. This is especially the case for the Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases.

**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

**Hungary**

**Q098 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
Total: The difference is due to the change explained in the subpoints, which has affected the overall result as well.
1. The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value. At the end of 2024, there were 6 cases, while a year earlier there were 4 cases.
2. The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value. At the beginning of 2024, there were 13 pending cases, which is 38.1% fewer compared to 2023 (21 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.

**Ireland**

**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 (2023):** It is difficult to identify the precise reasons for an increase in incoming criminal cases in the appellate courts in 2023 due to the wide range of factors that may have been at play. For incoming criminal cases, these may include, but are not limited to, an increase in business in the first instance courts, the resumption of regular court activity following the Covid-19 pandemic, the appointment of 24 additional judges throughout 2023, additional Gardai resources, a potential increase in decisions to prosecute by the DPP, and the growing population of the state.

**Q098 (2022):** In 2020, the year in which the covid pandemic had its greatest effect on court business, the number of criminal appeals particularly in minor criminal cases was much lower than usual.

**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.

**Italy**

**Q098 (General Comment):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has udertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogeing/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html The main goal in the criminal sector is a general reduction of the disposition time by 25% by June 2026 (all three instances together). A monitoring system is in place and a detailed dashboard is available at https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx

**Q098 (2023):** 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 (2022):** In the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) Italy has udertaken a series of actions in order to reduce both disposition time and backlogs. More information about the reform can be found at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html
The main goal is a general reduction of the disposition time by 40% in the civil sector and 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together) .
More specifically a reduction of the civil backlog by 65% in first instance courts and 55% in appeal courts by the end of 2024; by 90% in first instance courts and appeal courts by June 2026. As far as the civil cases, such targets relate exclusively to litigious cases.
A monitoring system is in place and a detailed dashboard is available at https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx

**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.

**Latvia**

**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.

**Q098 (2024):** Other criminal cases include enforcement proceedings that are subject to appellate review.
Over the period from 2022 to 2024, second-instance courts in Latvia have encountered increasing challenges in the adjudication of criminal cases. A notable rise in the backlog of cases has been observed both at the beginning and at the end of the reporting period. Furthermore, there has been a growing number of cases that remain unresolved for more than two years, indicating systemic delays in the judicial process.
The most critical situation is evident in the Riga Regional Court — the largest regional court in Latvia — where the difficulties are particularly pronounced. These challenges are primarily attributed to a reduction in the number of judges and a significant increase in the volume of cases referred from first-instance courts.

**Q098 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. Decrease of incoming cases of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases is mainly due to the changes in the legal acts, in the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming and resolved of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases significantly.
Severe Criminal cases and other criminal cases: the increase in the number of pending cases could be related that in the courts the court hearings in -person were restored, lifting the restrictions of Covid, when cases were mostly adjudicated in written procedure. The inconsistency in the number of cases can be observed both with the merging of cases and with the separation of individual cases from the overall judicial process.

**Q098 (2022):** Decrease of incoming and resolved cases is mainly related to the impact of decrease of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases. In the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming and resolved of misdemeanour and / or minor criminal 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. As the number of cases in the courts of first instance decreases, the number of cases in the regional courts also decreases. This is the main reason for decrease of incoming and resolved misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases. Of course, there is also a decrease in the number of serious criminal cases, which is related to the overall decrease in criminal cases in the courts of first instance.
The number of pending cases on 31.Dec. has increased due to a limited capacity of the largest appeal court (Rigas apgabaltiesa (The Riga Regional court)): the number of judges in the Board of criminal cases has decreased and some serious criminal cases were completed. The Riga Regional Court is the largest appeal court in Latvia. This court has the largest amount of work and the workload of the judge compared to other appeal courts.
The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly decreased. The decrease in cases is explained:
- due to the lifting of restrictions, which were related to limiting the spread of Covid-19;
- due 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 (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.

**Lithuania**

**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).

**Luxembourg**

**Q098 (2024):** The 20% increase in the number of appeals against decisions made in first instance by the police courts (which correspond to new cases in second instance at the district court level) corresponds to an increase of 9 appeals between 2023 and 2024. Given that the absolute numbers are low, they are very sensitive to variations. The number of incoming cases depends on the appeals filed, over which the court has no influence, and which in turn depends, among other things, on the number of decisions made at the first instance level.

The observed increase in the number of incoming cases on appeal before the district courts could be explained by a change in the financial stakes for individuals judged in first instance by the justices of the peace. By the law of 21 September 2023 (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/loi/2023/09/21/a679/jo ) amending the law of 14 February 1955 concerning the regulation of traffic on all public roads (https://legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/loi/1955/02/14/n3/jo ), the maximum fines in cases brought before the justices of the peace were changed from 250€ to 1 000€ (Art. 7 of the law of 14 February 1955). Indeed, the increase in the amount of fines, as well as the possibility of combining several offenses, can lead to significant penalties. This situation is likely to encourage more individuals to contest decisions rendered in first instance.

**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.

**Malta**

**Q098 (2024):** The efficiency of these courts in 2023 was very high and hence there was a reduction in the pending caseload. Throughout 2024, there was a registered decrease in the number of resolved cases

**Q098 (2022):** There was a registered increase in incoming cases across all courts.

**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.

**Netherlands**

**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.

**Poland**

**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 (2022):** Serious criminal cases include all offences under the Penal Code, the Fiscal Penal Code and offences under other laws. Misdemeanours are cases conducted under the Misdemeanours Code.
The category "Other cases" includes other cases conducted in the criminal courts that are not directly related to serious criminal cases or misdemeanours (mainly cases conducted under the Criminal Procedure Code and the Misdemeanours Code).

**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).

**Portugal**

**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 (2024):** The data for 2024 is correct. Last February, the number of cases heard by the Lisbon Court of Appeal between 2015 and 2023 was amended as a result of a correction made by the court. Following these corrections, the data for 2023 were amended, meaning that the number of cases pending in 2023 were corrected compared to those submitted to the CEPEJ questionnaire last year. As such, the differences between the data for 2023 and 2024 will now be smaller. For reference, the figures in the first column (Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year) for 2023 are now 3070 and those in the fourth column (Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year) are now 2917.

**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.

**Romania**

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q098 (2022):** In the line "Total" of the table in Q 98 are data for all court registers in the criminal appeal agenda. Among the category “Other criminal cases” are included for example cases in which the appeals court decides on jurisdictional disputes, objections of bias, on complaints for inaction and other complaints filed after the filing of the indictment, etc.
Sources: Analytical center, Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic.

**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.

**Slovenia**

**Q098 (General Comment):** For explanation on severe criminal cases and minor offences please see comment to Q94. Figures for severe criminal law cases at the second instance include: appeals in criminal cases (Kp), Figures for minor offences cases at the highest instance include: appeals in minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PRp-obp), appeals in minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PRp-zsv), apppeals in procedures for cancellation of validity of the driver's licence according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVDp).
Figures for other cases at the highest instance include: appeals in cases for setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnkp),
- appeals in substitution of imprisonment cases (Prnzp)
- appeals in compliance detention cases (PRuzp),
- various criminal and misdemnour cases in higher courts (cases not fitting in the categories above) (Kr, Prr).
For general explanation on types of cases, see Q94.

**Q098 (2024):** Discrepancies: 3. please note small (absolute) number of cases.

**Q098 (2022):** Discrepancies (to 2020 data) – 2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (also reflected in Total):
An increase is due to two factors: 1) Until 2020, the appeal in minor offences in regular court procedures – request for judicial protection was limited (depending on the criteria – sanction) by the Minor Offences Act. 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 and 2022; 2) 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). Pending cases older than 2 years: plase note small (absolute) number of cases.

**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).

**Spain**

**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 (2023):** .

**Q098 (2022):** 2020 was a year marked by the pandemic, the reduction of work in judicial bodies, despite digitalization, and by mobility restriction measures. The increase in the pace of work in 2022 is logical and it explains the increase of incoming and resolved cases compared to 2020.

**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.

## Question 099

**Austria**

**Q099 (2024):** Administrative Law Cases: The number of 3187 pending administrative cases on 1 January ref. year corresponds to 3026 procedures adopted from previous years and 161 procedures completed in previous years and reopened in the reference year.

**Q099 (2023):** Administrative Law Cases: The number of 3185 pending administrative cases on 1 January ref. year corresponds to 2985 procedures adopted from previous years and 200 procedures completed in previous years and reopened in the reference year.
1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: The numbers are lower because more cases have been closed (obviously), other reasons as to why more cases have been able to get closed in 2023 are not known to the competent department.

**Q099 (2022):** Administrative Law Cases: The number of 3547 pending administrative cases on 1 January ref. year corresponds to 3392 procedures adopted from previous years and 155 procedures completed in previous years and reopened in the reference year.

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q099 (General Comment):** The category of “administrative law cases” includes certain civil and social cases before the Court of Cassation, all tax cases before the Court of Cassation, and cassation cases before the Council of State.

**Q099 (2024):** The same methodology as in the last cycle is followed concerning the category of “administrative law cases,” which includes certain civil and social cases before the Court of Cassation, all tax cases before the Court of Cassation, and cassation cases before the Council of State. Concerning resolved administrative cases, for the Council of State the total of 505 resolved cases includes final judgments and orders of non-admission (342 + 163). There is no particular explanation regarding the observed variations in the number of cases.

**Q099 (2023):** Same methodology as last cycle.
Of the cases completed under “3. Administrative cases” (total 729 = 305 + 424), as far as the Council of State is concerned, it should be pointed out that the figure of 424 includes final judgments and non-admission orders (224 + 200).
No particular factor should be noted in the increase in administrative cases pending for more than 2 years.

**Q099 (2022):** The category "2.3 Other non-litigious cases" contains cases G (applications for legal assistance) brought before/dealt with by the Court of Cassation.
The category "4. Other cases" contains cases D (disciplinary matters) brought before/dealt with by the Court of Cassation.
For “administrative cases”, a new methodology has been adapted to comply with CEPEJ's definition for “an administrative case” (i.e., disputes between citizens and any public authority at local, regional or national level). Under previous cycles only cases dealt with by the Council of State were counted under point ”3.Administrative cases". For 2022, the category "3. Administrative cases" includes: 1) cases dealt with by the Council of State; 2) administrative cases dealt with by the Court of Cassation, namely a part of the C cases (civil cases): a considerable proportion of S cases - social affairs and all F cases - tax cases.
The number of resolved administrative cases before the Council of State (total 763 = 353 + 410) includes final judgments and orders refusing leave to appeal (189+221).

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**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.

**Q099 (2024):** The significant decrease in administrative cases pending for more than two years is due to the upward trend in cases resolved by the Supreme Administrative Court, which we have observed since 2022.

**Q099 (2023):** "Civil litigious cases pending for more than 2 years": the observed increase of more than 20% is due to: an increase in the number of interpretative cases, necessitating the suspension of court proceedings pending interpretative decisions; suspension of court proceedings due to preliminary ruling requests to the CJEU; suspension of court proceedings pending CJEU rulings; sending a case to a lower instance and delayed proceedings there; - the factual and legal complexity of the cases.
The increase in the number of administrative cases pending for more than 2 years by 38% between 2022 and 2023 (from 101 to 139) is because all of these 38 cases are suspended until the Supreme Court pronounces interpretative decisions.

**Q099 (2022):** "Civil litigious cases" - the reasons for the higher number of pending cases at the beginning of 2022 compared to 2021 are twofold: the large increase in case filings in 2021 and the critical staffing of the court, leading to a high backlog at the end of 2021. 1. The number of pending cases on 1 January 2022 is 845 more than on 1 January 2021, as the number of cases filed in 2021 is 1105 more than in 2020. As a result of the amendments to the Civil Procedure Law, access to cassation appeals has been expanded from the beginning of 2020 in cases related to consumer disputes, which in turn determined the increase in the number of cassation cases in the Civil Division and the Commercial Division. 2. In 2021 the Court is not sufficiently staffed due to the delay in the competitions for the appointment of judges in the Supreme Court of Cassation, as well as due to the retirement of judges in 2021 - 3 judges in the Civil Division and 1 judge in the Commercial Division.
"Administrative cases"/SAC/:Regarding the increase in the number of pending cases at the end of the reporting period (2022) and the higher number of cases initiated, compared to the number of cases completed, is explained, on the one hand, by the unevenness of the initiated cases by matter in the different divisions of the SAC, and, on the other hand - by the complexity and volume of the cases handled by some divisions (e.g. tax, customs, cases under the Management of Resources from the European Funds under Shared Management Act , public procurement, elections, etc.); the need for in-depth knowledge of European law, including requests for preliminary rulings to the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). The problem with the pending cases till issuance of interpretative decisions or rulings of CJEU continues to be relevant, as all such cases are suspended and that respectively results in delays in their consideration and further strains the schedule. In particular, an analysis of the factually and legally complex tax cases shows that the one-month time limit for court decisions is not optimal. The complexity of this type of cases and the need for direct application of Community law suggest another reasonable time-limit for the panel to issue its ruling. Furthermore, it should be stressed that in parallel with the judicial activity during the year under review, General meetings of First and Second Chambers of the SAC on interpretative cases for unification of the case law were held on a monthly basis. Joint meetings of the SCC and the SAC on joint interpretative cases were also conducted regularly. On the other hand, the decrease in the number of initiated cases during the reporting period is also due to undertaken legislative changes concerning jurisdiction. Last but not the least, in 2022, there was still a high incidence of COVID-19 among the judges and staff of the SAC, which further led to delay in the administration of justice of the court.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q099 (2024):** Considering that the Supreme Court has achieved very positive results in recent years (resolution rates ranging from 115% to 150%), the positive trend continued in 2024. Consequently, the number of unresolved cases has decreased. The incoming caseload in 2024 increased compared to 2023, as the inflow was reduced in 2023 due to the strike. Thus, in terms of incoming cases, the Supreme Court returned to the average levels observed over the past three years.

**Q099 (2023):** For several years, the Supreme Court has seen a decrease in the number of pending cases at the beginning and end of the year, as well as a decrease in the number of Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court.

**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.

**Cyprus**

**Q099 (General Comment):** On 1st of July 2023 an Appeal Court was established therefore a third tier system was created. The re established Supreme Court and Supreme Constitutional Court are now the the highest Courts. It is possible for a non litigious case to be brought before the Supreme Court however this is very rare.
Following a reference from the Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court adjudicates on appeals against decisions of first instance civil and criminal courts, including courts of specialised jurisdiction, on points of utmost public interest or of general public importance or on the consistency of law on conflicting or contrasting decisions of the Court of Appeal.
With the leave of the Court, the Supreme Court decides, at third and last instance, on applications filed, by the Attorney-General or by a party, provided that civil or criminal appeal proceedings on points of law preceded in the court below.
The Supreme constitutional Court deals with references of the President of the Republic on the constitutionality of Law. It also hears cases involving constitutional issues and acts as a third and last tier in administrative matters.

**Q099 (2024):** Civil and commercial litigious cases: The variations could be explained by the following:
- New jurisdictions were exercised by the supreme courts
- More cases were tried - the reference date for the previous cycle was 1st of July when the SC and the SCC were established
Administrative cases: in April 2024 250 administrative cases and 10 cases on cases of administrative court of international protection were transferred to the Supreme Constitutional Court and they were considered as pending at the start of the year.

**Q099 (2023):** The numbers in the table represent the cases pending on the 1st of July.

**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

**Czech Republic**

**Q099 (General Comment):** 4. Other cases: change in methodology in 2023 (to comply with the CEPEJ methodology), namely insolvency cases (and incidency cases) were moved to 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Q099 (2023):** 2. Non litigious cases (2.1+2.2+2.3) and 2.1. General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases - the number of cases is relatively small. And small number of cases means higher variance and thus the discrepancies can easily appear.
4. Other cases - Change in methodolgy, namely insolvency cases (and incidency cases) were moved to 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

**Q099 (2022):** Administrative cases: The Supreme court is overburdened and has trouble resolving its cases thus the number of pending cases grow quite quickly. It is connected to growth in the number of administrative first-instance cases in previous years and growing tendency to file an appeal to the Supreme Administrative Court.
Other cases: Includes insolvency cases. The changes are the result of changes in second-instance agenda.

**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.

**Denmark**

**Q099 (General Comment):** The number of incoming cases corresponds only to the number of admissible cases (excluding cases declared inadmissible which number is not available)
Administrative law cases: 1. What is included in “administrative law cases” and what is the distinguishment between litigious and non-litigious administrative law cases; and what are non-litigious administrative case in Denmark. It is challenging to provide a clear answer for Denmark. Due to the way data is collected within the Danish Court Administration, it is unfortunately not possible to distinguish between the specific types of cases included under administrative law cases. The courts indicate whether a case is of an administrative nature, however, administrative cases occur across almost all categories within civil cases. Consequently, it is difficult to state unequivocally which types of cases they most appropriately belong to. 2. The approximate number of administrative law cases that are litigious and go to court, and their part of the overall “civil litigious cases
In the period from 2023-2025 the number of civil cases in Denmark was 181.064, and out of those, 10.947 was of administrative nature. Furthermore, approximately 6 percent of all civil cases over the past three years have been classified as administrative law cases. Cases concerning forced removal often fall within the scope of administrative law, however, such cases represent only about 2 percent of the total civil caseload. The two other categories with a notable share of administrative law cases are “general civil cases” and cases under “the simplified procedure”. Both of these categories are quite extensive in terms of volume as well as broad in their classification, meaning that administrative law cases constitute only a relatively small proportion within them. 3. The composition of the bodies such as appeal boards and committees Denmark has a well-developed system of specialized complaints boards that serve as administrative appeal bodies for decisions made by public authorities. These boards, such as Ankestyrelsen and the Consumer Complaints Board, provide citizens with accessible and cost-effective avenues to challenge administrative decisions. Denmark has over 80 complaints boards and committees across various sectors. They generally consist of a chairperson – often a judge or legal expert – and a mix of legally trained members and specialists relevant to the board’s area. Membership terms are typically four years. The exact composition varies by board: for example, the Consumer Complaints Board includes a chair (judge), vice-chairs, and representatives of consumer and business interests, while the Patient Complaints Board combines judges and health professionals. Appointments are usually made by ministries or local authorities, often based on nominations from relevant organizations.

**Q099 (2024):** The nature of Supreme Court cases means that case flow numbers may vary drastically year to year.
Total of other than criminal law cases (1+2+3+4) + 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: Faulty reporting on 2023 data. The 2023 was updated on 24/11/2025 by the CEPEJ Secretariate.
Supreme Court has experienced a substantial rise in civil appeals the last few years
Administrative law cases: changed from NAP to NA since Denmark does have administrative cases in courts, but they cannot be counted exactly.

**Q099 (2023):** The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19. Furthermore, we have filtered a certain type of case from the data. The original number of 615 was due to the right for civilians to file a case online, which one citizen has done close to 400 times in 2023. The court is obliged to count and consider every case, however this has affected the data in a misleading way regarding incoming cases. The current figures are from the official statistics from 2023, where the misleading cases are also filtered out for a more fair picture of the number of actual cases in 2023.
The number of cases can be found in our key data from 2023 on our website www.domstol.dk

**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.

**Estonia**

**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 (2024):** Total of other than criminal law cases (1+2+3+4) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year - The query was made at a different time, which explains the smaller number.
3. Administrative law cases - Overall increase in workload

**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.

**Finland**

**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. 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.

**Q099 (2024):** Other cases include information on insurance matters, land rights matters, application matters, and pardon matters.
The Supreme Court received a smaller amount of cases but still solved a similar amount of cases which lead to the decrease of pending cases.

**Q099 (2022):** Administrative law cases: In the Supreme Administrative Court, there has been exceptionally high number of cases concerning international protection since 2017 and now as the number of incoming cases of this case category has decreased, the numbers have settled. This also corresponds to the decrease in the number of resolved cases, because the synergistic benefits of large number of cases with common features have decreased and the extra personnel resources reserved for clearing the backlog have been given up. Other factors that could have influenced the development are the increased court fees starting from 2016, as well as the change in the role of the Supreme Administrative Court in 2020, when the leave to appeal system became the main rule in appeals (previously it was an exception that was widely applied to different groups of cases from the possibility of direct appeal).

**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.

**France**

**Q099 (General Comment):** In non-litigious civil matters, an appeal to the Court of Cassation is possible, yet the statistics provided by the Court do not allow for their specific identification. Consequently, these non-litigious civil cases are grouped together with litigious civil cases.

**Q099 (2024):** "Other cases": QPC, requests for opinions, and other applications filed as the main matter.
"Civil litigious cases pending for more than 2 years": the numbers are small and affect the percentage changes. For administrative justice, the discrepancies noted between the number of pending cases on Dec. 31, 2023, and Jan. 1, 2024, are explained by updates to the Council of State's databases.

**Q099 (2022):** The category 'other' encompasses additional requests, such as advisory requests, priority questions of constitutionality, and petitions concerning the appointment of experts or mediators.

Source: Council of State / Court of Cassation

**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 man

ner. 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).
4°) The orders of March and November 2020 allowed the interim relief judge to rule without a hearing, in addition to the cases provided for in article L. 522-3 of the Code of Administrative Justice.
Many courts have indicated that they have dispensed with a hearing. The dispensation of a hearing was most frequently applied in the case of summary proceedings for suspension. In the case of interim relief, this dispensation was applied in a more measured way.
Finally, many jurisdictions did not hold a hearing for summary proceedings other than suspension and liberty.
5°) The possibility for the administrative courts of appeal to rule by order without a hearing on applications for a stay of execution was little used, since only 3 CAA indicated that they had used it.
6°) In matters of DALO-Injunction, the possibility of ruling by order was used by 12 courts and, for almost all of these courts, for more than 60% of the cases judged during the same period.
II - The courts made very little use of the derogation provisions relating to the composition of the trial panels. In fact, no court made use of the possibility of completing a panel of judges with the participation of an honorary magistrate from another court. Only one administrative court requested the participation of a judge from another court (one judge came to assist for a period of three months).
III - The provisions allowing heads of court to appoint advisers to rule by order under the conditions set out in article R. 222-13 of the CJA were hardly used: only two administrative courts applied them. One head of court had appointed one or more advisers but no order was made by this magistrate or these magistrates. Another head of court indicated that the designated magistrate(s) signed more than 200 orders. In total, it appears that the measures provided for have been used very differently depending on the measure taken into account.
Video hearings and the new rules for summary proceedings have opened up possibilities, with provisions that can be seen as having been the medium for experimentation. "

**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.

**Germany**

**Q099 (General Comment):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases.

**Q099 (2024):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases. The caseflow of all litigious and non-litigious other than criminal cases (including family matters) at the Federal Court of Justice 2024 was as follows: 6455 cases pending on 1 Jan.; 4761 incoming cases; 5867 resolved cases; 5304 cases pending on 31 Dec.
The total of other than criminal law cases is the total of administrative law cases (no. 3), other cases (no. 4) and the cases at the Federal Court of Justice mentioned above.
Administrative law cases include cases at the Federal Administrative Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court
Other Cases represent labour law cases at the Federal Labour Court.
Discrepancy of pending cases on 31 Dec compared to 2023: The dicrepancy is due to the fact that there were more resolved than incoming cases. The annual report of the Federal Labour Court does not mention any specific reason for this development.

**Q099 (2023):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases. The case-flow of all litigious and non-litigious other than criminal cases (including family matters) at the Federal Court of Justice 2023 was as follows:
5886 cases pending on 1 Jan.; 5897 incoming cases; 5328 resolved cases; 6455 cases pending on 31 Dec.
The total of other than criminal law cases is the total of administrative law cases (no. 3), other cases (no. 4) and the cases at the Federal Court of Justice mentioned above.
Administrative law cases include cases at the Federal Administrative Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court
Other Cases represent labour law cases at the Federal Labour Court.

**Q099 (2022):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases. The case-flow of all litigious and non-litigious other than criminal cases (including family matters) at the Federal Court of Justice 2022 was as follows:
5275 cases pending on 1 Jan.; 6624 incoming cases; 6013 resolved cases; 5886 cases pending on 31 Dec.
The total of other than criminal law cases is the total of administrative law cases (no. 3), other cases (no. 4) and the cases at the Federal Court of Justice mentioned above.
Adminstrative law cases include cases at the Federal Administrative Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court
Discrepancy of "other cases":
Other Cases represent labour law cases at the Federal Labour Court. The annual report of the Federal Labour Cort does not provide an explanation for the general decrease in cases.

**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.

**Greece**

**Q099 (General Comment):** After relevant communication with the IT department of the Supreme Court, it was clarified to us that "Due to changes in the OSDYPP of the Supreme Court, it is no longer possible to calculate Pending cases older than 2 years.

**Q099 (2024):** Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat)
Starting from 2024, cases dealt with by the Court of Audit are also included within the category "administrative law cases" together with cases dealt with by the Council of State.

**Q099 (2023):** For the reference year (2023) the data on the total of non-criminal cases dealt with by the Supreme court :2 728 pending at the beginning of 2023, 2 399 incoming, 1 915 resolved and 3 212 pending at the end of 2023,103 pending older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court.

**Q099 (2022):** It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data, such as the training of staff and the creation of an instructional manual guide with definitions and instructions. These measures were intended to help collecting more reliable data from both small and large courts and prosecution services and eliminate the standard errors in judicial statistics. As our methodology is developing, discrepancies in data can be observed. Besides, as regards “Other cases”, it should be mentioned that some types of cases that were previously included in this category, are now distributed in the other case-categories in the table.

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q099 (2024):** Other cases: insolvency cases, labour cases
Discrepancy explanation concerning point 1. (civil litigious cases) and 2. (non-litigious cases):
The reason for the discrepancy between the data in the report and the data submitted in the previous year is not caused by a change in the legal environment, but rather the caseload in 2024, over which the Supreme Court has no influence.
Discrepancy explanation concerning point 3. (administrative law cases):
The differences indicated under Point 3 are explained solely by the changing nature and variability of the number of cases received. Unlike in previous years, there were no changes in legislation that would have affected the aforementioned data.

**Q099 (2023):** Discrepancy explanation concerning point 1. (civil litigious cases) and 2. (non-litigious cases)
The discrepancies reported by the CEPEJ in the context of the questionnaire for the EU Justice Scoreboard can be explained as follows. Firstly, it should be noted that the procedural rules affecting the caseload have not changed in 2023, and consequently the explanation for the 2022 divergencies remains valid. (The decrease in the number of the so-called general civil litigious and non-litigious cases is due to several reasons. The most significant of these is the year-on-year decrease in the number of legal actions filed under the new Code of Civil Procedure, which entered into force on 1 January 2018. This is due, among others, to the increased role of diversionary procedures in the resolution of private disputes, such as mediation and the tripling of the threshold below which a property claim can be enforced by means of the issuing of a payment order by a notary public, i.e. in the framework of an out-of-court non-litigious procedure.)
This leads to the further conclusion that the decline in the number of new cases on a national level has led to an acceleration of case completions at all court levels, with the result that the number of completed cases is higher than that of newly received cases. The inevitable consequence of the foregoing is the trend of a fall in the number of cases pending at the end of the year. This explains why the number of 877 civil (and commercial) court proceedings pending on 1 January 2022 fell to 653 at the end of the same year, the latter figure being the starting number on 1 January 2023. (In the year 2022, the Curia received 1 846 new cases and completed 2 070 cases.) The same trend continued in the year 2023. (In 2023, the Curia received 1 772 new cases and completed 1 872 cases, as a result of which the number of pending cases decreased to 553 by the end of that year.)
Secondly, the vast majority of the cases under point 2.1, which make up the bulk of the data on non litigious proceedings [93 percent (359:385)], are cases concerning the designation of a court, typically referred to the Curia for the exclusion of a court. In this group of cases, the caseload is completely unpredictable and may, in some cases, be significantly different from the reference period due to the large number of proceedings initiated by a litigant.
For cases under point 2.2 and within subpoints 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and likewise for cases under 2.3, the caseload is extremely low (the Curia cannot even hear a case under subpoint 2.2.1) due to the rules of jurisdiction applicable to the Curia as the country's supreme judicial forum. The cases falling under the above categories represent – in respect of the newly received cases – only 10 percent (39:385) of all non-litigious cases. Given the small number of cases received, the minimal numerical discrepancy entails a relatively large percentage difference. In reality, therefore, there is no significant change in the caseload behind the relatively large percentage difference. In concrete terms, this means that in 2023 there were only 13 fewer cases in these case groups compared to the previous year. When assessing these figures, it should be noted that less than 2 percent of the 2 170 cases (Source: Curia Yearbook 2023) dealt with by the Civil Chamber of the Curia, not counting the 147 labour cases also dealt with by the Civil Chamber, are cases under points 2.2 and 2.3.
Discrepancy explanation concerning point 3. (administrative law cases):
The scoreboard, based on 2023 data, showed that the

number of cases pending, received and terminated on 1 January 2023 and the number of cases pending on 31 December 2023 decreased compared to the data provided in the previous year. The reason is that, in 2022, the performance of the adjudicative function of the Curia and its activity in the field of creating uniformed case law was affected by a legislative change. In 2021, the Curia was given competence to hear appeals, as a court of second instance, in administrative disputes, making the Curia a general court of second instance with jurisdiction over administrative cases throughout Hungary. In addition, the Curia also continued to act as a court of cassation. By the Autumn of 2021, the Curia had become the most overloaded court in the country. With the aim of reducing the Curia's caseload, the Parliament enacted Act no. CXXXIV of 2021, which provided that the regional appellate courts should be included in the second instance adjudication of administrative cases. As a result of the legislative change, effective from 1 March 2022, the Regional Appellate Court of Budapest, which has an Administrative Chamber, is to act as a general court of second instance in administrative cases. As the Curia has not transferred any of its pending administrative cases, the reduction of its caseload has been carried out gradually, in a so-called ascending order. The reduction of the caseload due to the legislative change was first shown in the data for 2023.

**Q099 (2022):** The justification for the changes is related to the fact that in the year 2021, the Curia's remedial powers – due to a law amendment effective from April 1, 2020 – extended to the second instance adjudication of legal disputes in public administrative cases, thus the Curia became the general court of second instance with nationwide jurisdiction in administrative matters. In addition, the Curia continued to operate as a review court, if the conditions for review as specified in the Act on Administrative Procedures were fulfilled in the given case. By the autumn of 2021, the Curia faced the highest workload throughout the country.
To stop the above trend, which has become critical, the legislator adopted Act CXXXIV of 2021 in which the legislator provided for that the level of regional courts of appeal should be involved in the second instance adjudication of administrative case. As a result of the amendment, effective as of 1 March 2022, the levels of judicial forums hearing administrative cases have changed. High courts having an administrative chamber will be general courts of first instance in administrative matters. The Curia has original jurisdiction in exceptional cases set out by law. Regional courts of appeal having an administrative chamber will be general courts of second instance. Thus, the abovementioned Act has provided for that it falls within the responsibilities of regional courts of appeal to hear cases at the ordinary appeal stage, and it has also provided for exclusive geographical jurisdiction, which means that the Act has reinstituted the second instance (appellate) jurisdiction of Budapest Capital Regional Court of Appeal in administrative matters.
The decrease in the number of the so-called general civil litigious and non-litigious cases can be traced back to several reasons. The most significant of these is that under the scope of the new Civil Procedure Code, which entered into force on January 1, 2018, the number of lawsuits is decreasing every year. Among other things, this is related to the fact that litigation diversion procedures, such as mediation, play a greater role than before in the settlement of private law disputes, and the value limit below which a property claim can be enforced with a payment order before a notary, i.e., in an out-of-court, non-litigation procedure, has tripled. As a result of all this, the timeliness indicators of the lower courts have improved continuously in recent years, which means that the number of protracted, more difficult decisions that can be challenged before the Curia as the highest court is decreasing.
The number of completions is basically determined by the volume of cases received, and although they show a decrease compared to the previous year, they significantly exceed the number of cases received, even though the number of judges handling such cases has decreased due to retirement.
We do not consider it justified to examine the reduction in the number of received and completed cases in so-called general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases by itself. In relation to the case groups indicated for the so-called general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, the number of cases received and completed changes continuously every year, which make up a fraction of all cases received by the Curia. Comparing the 2022 data with the 2020 data, it can be seen that in the indicated case group, fewer such cases were received in 2020 than in the current year, so the number of civil non-litigious cases received in 2021 was different from the average. Taking into accou

nt the general rules of statistics, the highlighting of some data may result in inadequate conclusions.
Our data collection methodology has not changed from the previous cycles. It is therefore recommended that we keep the data as it is, otherwise, the data provided will not be comparable with those of previous years.

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q099 (General Comment):** Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.
For pending cases, the Court Service record resolved cases as cases where an order is made. As there may be more than one order made in respect any case this can cause difficulty in accurately calculating figures for pending cases.

**Q099 (2024):** The increase in resolved cases in 2024 reflects a return to typical levels following the temporary reduction in 2023, which was impacted by the Supreme Court's involvement in reference to the Court by the President of Ireland of the Judicial Appointments Commission Bill 2023 under Article 26 of the Irish Constitution.
Civil and commercial litigious cases: Statistics for civil proceedings are recorded by cases received and cases resolved throughout the year. While some cases are formally discontinued either by order of the court or by formal notification (for example by filing a notice of discontinuance to the court, the majority of civil cases are settled between the parties, with or without court approval or are not pursued further by the plaintiff without notification by the plaintiff to the court. Most cases do not proceed to trial. It is therefore not possible to provide accurate figures for pending cases in most instances. While in previous cycles we provided the figure for pending civil and criminal cases in the Supreme Court this is no longer provided to ensure consistency with the other court jurisdictions.
The new case management system (UCMS) became operational in 2023 in the Central Office of the High Court. UCMS is being extended to all court offices and over the coming years the Courts Service will work to consolidate data processing and reporting for all case types in each jurisdiction.

**Q099 (2023):** Other cases in this instance are the appointments of Commissioners for Oaths and Notaries Public

**Q099 (2022):** There was an increase in 2022 over 2020.

**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.

**Italy**

**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 (2024):** "Other cases" refers to residual cases dealt by the Supreme Court, such as cases regarding the competence or jurisdiction of the courts and correction of material errors.

**Q099 (2023):** In 2023, a reduction in the backlog of administrative cases has been achieved, as required by the targets of the Recovery Fund.

**Q099 (2022):** Within the framework of the National Plan for Recovery and Resilience (PNRR), Italy has taken a number of measures to reduce both disposition times and backlogs. The main objective is an overall reduction of 40% in the civil sector and 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together). More information on the reform is available at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html.
A monitoring system is also in place and a detailed dashboard is available at https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx.

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q099 (2024):** On 1 January of the reference year, a decrease of 22% in pending administrative law cases was observed. This is related to the fact that in 2023, the Supreme court placed increased focus on reducing the backlog of cases, including temporarily reallocating one senator's position to administrative cases. However, in 2024, the reallocation of the judicial position was cancelled, and by the end of 2024, the case backlog returned to its previous level.

**Q099 (2023):** The number of cases is as indicated. The Supreme Court has set the timely consideration of cases as one of its priorities, also following the guidelines for the consideration of cases approved by the Council of Justice. This has affected the changes in the number of resolved cases and, accordingly, the number of pending cases.
The number of remaining administrative cases is affected by the decrease in the number of incoming cases, as well as measures to improve the speed of processing cases.

**Q099 (2022):** Number of incoming cases have diminished in general, therefore all indicators have been affected. For small numbers of cases, the indicator shows an impact although in general there is none.

**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.

**Lithuania**

**Q099 (General Comment):** Other cases - jurisdictional cases and administrative offences cases.

**Q099 (2024):** We apologize, it was mistakenly marked "NA" when it should have been "NAP".

**Q099 (2023):** jurisdictional cases and administrative offences cases.

**Q099 (2022):** The Supreme Court of Lithuania hears only those cassation requests that have been selected as meeting the requirements of the law by a special panel of three judges of the Civil Cases Division. Only those cases that are significant in terms of the interpretation and application of equal law come before this court. The judges of the Supreme Court of Lithuania can devote more time and attention to the most important cases in the state. In addition, this ensures the promptness of the court process.
in the Supreme Court of Lithuania in 2022 the duration of civil cases was shortened by 2 days, but the longer duration of cases was also influenced by the fact that not all the posts of judges were filled in this court.

**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).

**Luxembourg**

**Q099 (General Comment):** Given the small size of Luxembourg, the number of cases handled by the Supreme Court is, in absolute terms, limited. Therefore, even the smallest variation in absolute numbers is likely to produce a significant effect in statistical or percentage terms, without necessarily implying a substantial or structural impact on the Court's activity.

There is no possibility of appeal by way of cassation against the decisions of the Administrative Court of Appeal.

**Q099 (2024):** Civil and Commercial Cases: The increase in pending cases at the beginning of the year compared to the beginning of the previous year can be explained by the difference between incoming cases in 2023 and the decisions rendered in 2023.

While the number of incoming cases decreased by 25% between 2023 and 2024, it should be noted that in 2023 there had been an increase in incoming cases compared to previous years. The commentary provided in previous years remains valid. The number of incoming cases depends on the appeals filed, over which the Court has no influence, and which in turn depends, among other things, on the number of decisions made at other instances. Legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.

**Q099 (2023):** While the number of new cases rose by 37% between 2022 and 2023, it should be noted that in 2022 there was a drop in new cases compared with previous years. In 2020, new cases amounted to 108 and even 116 in 2019. The number of new cases depends on the number of appeals lodged over which the Court has no influence and which depends, among other things, on the number of decisions taken on the level of other instances. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period. At the Court of Cassation, the same magistrates deal with criminal and non-criminal cases. In 2023, there was an increase in the number of resolved criminal cases (in particular applications for judicial review of decisions of the Council Chamber, which are not included in the figures provided). This increase in resolved criminal cases means that the magistrates of the Court of Cassation have had less time to deal with non-criminal cases. In addition, during 2023, there were certain fluctuations in the composition of the Court of Cassation, resulting in the partial/temporary unavailability of certain magistrates, which may have had an impact on the number of resolved cases.
The increase in pending cases is explained by the increase in new cases in 2023 and the decrease in decisions taken in 2022 and 2023.

**Q099 (2022):** In civil (and commercial) litigious cases, it should be noted that for incoming cases, although the relative variation of -29.63% in figures between 2020 and 2022 is significant, compared to 2021, the number has decreased from 82 to 76 cases, representing an -11% change. The comment provided last year remains relevant. The number of incoming cases depends on appeals filed over which the Court has no influence and is, among other factors, a function of decisions made at other levels. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.

Furthermore, the decrease in pending cases as of December 31st can be attributed to the decrease in incoming cases in 2022 since the number of decisions made remained stable between 2020 and 2022.

**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.

**Malta**

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q099 (General Comment):** The number of resolved cases presented in the table includes both cases that are resolved with the decision of a judge and cases that were not resolved with the decision of a judge. These are: Cases in which the appeal in cassation has been withdrawn or annulled, cases that have been administratively resolved by the clerk, cases in which the processing of the appeal in cassation has been suspended, and cases that have been discharged upon objection. The number of cases not resolved by the decision of a judge has also been included in the comment for clarification. Before 2024, these numbers were not included in the number of resolved cases, but they were included in the number of pending cases on Dec 31. 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 no 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.

**Q099 (2024):** We have included cases that were not resolved with the decision of a judge, see the general comment for an explanation of what types of conclusions these are. It is important to note that these numbers were not included last year, so numbers this year may not be perfectly comparable to last year (we have added the numbers here below as well). 1: Civil cases, number of cases that are not resolved with the decision of a judge: 17 3: Administrative cases, number of cases that are not resolved with the decision of a judge: 324

**Q099 (2023):** See also the General comment regarding potential discrepancies in the formula for horizontal consistency. 1: Civil cases, number of cases that are not resolved with the decision of a judge: 31
3: Administrative cases, number of cases that are not resolved with the decision of a judge: 384.

**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.

**Poland**

**Q099 (General Comment):** 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. Starting from 2022, administrative cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court are presented in the frame of question 99 (last instance) and are no more within the scope of Q97.

**Q099 (2024):** *other cases = Statistics of the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber (which deals with the Public law cases, inter alia cases originated from the extraordinary complaints or appeals against resolutions of the National Council of the Judiciary, competition and consumer protection cases, cases concerning the regulation of energy, telecommunications and postal services, rail transport, as well as the regulation of the water and sewage market, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings or cases concerning the retirement of a judge of the Supreme Court, etc.)
Statistics of the Professional Liability Chamber (which deals with the disciplinary cases or cases of lifting of the judicial and prosecutor immunity).
Compared to previous years, in the year under review (2024), the number of concluded proceedings in the Supreme Court increased. This is particularly visible in the Civil Chamber, where a total of 7,766 cases were resolved in 2024 (in 2023 – 6,308 cases, in 2022 – 5,785 cases). More cases than in 2023 were also resolved in the Labor and Social Security Chamber (in 2024 – 2,707, in 2023 – 2,580). The upward trend is also visible in the Criminal Chamber of the Supreme Court, where 4,374 cases were resolved in 2024. In 2023, this number amounted to 4,254 cases (an increase of 3%). Despite the positive change consisting in the increase in the number of resolved cases, this did not always result in a reduction of the judicial backlog.
In the case of the Civil Chamber of the Supreme Court, in which, despite a 23% increase in the percentage of cases resolved, the number of cases remaining to be resolved from the previous period decreased slightly. At the end of 2023, it amounted to 7,230 cases, and at the end of 2024 – 7,162 cases. This trend results from the very high inflow of new cases to the Civil Chamber, which has been continuing since 2022 (in 2024 – 6,316 cases, in 2023 – 6,424 cases, in 2022 – 6,951 cases), which, given the vacancy of 1/3 of adjudicating positions, cannot be effectively eliminated even with the maximum effort of the judges adjudicating in this Chamber.
The number of cases that were not resolved in the reporting period increased slightly in the case of the Labor and Social Insurance Chamber. It amounted to 2,213 at the end of 2024, while at the end of 2023 it was 2,165. However, it should be noted that this Chamber, like the Civil Chamber, is affected by the greatest staff shortages, and the inflow of cases to the Labor and Social Insurance Chamber was slightly higher in 2024 than in 2023 (a total of 71 cases, i.e. an increase of 2.6%).
The number of backlogged cases also increased in the case of the Criminal Chamber. While in 2023 the backlogged caseload was 1,415 cases, at the end of 2024 this number amounted to 1,504 cases. In this case too, this was related to the increase in the number of cases filed with the Criminal Chamber (4,463 cases in 2024 compared to 4,234 cases in 2023). It is worth emphasizing, however, that the increase in backlogged cases does not apply to cassation appeals heard in the Criminal Chamber, which is the core of its adjudicative activity. The issue of the inflow of cases and their resolution is very specific in the case of the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs. While in 2023 a total of 5,151 cases were filed with this Chamber, in 2024 it was only 1,561 cases. However, this discrepancy results from the fact that 2023 was the year in which elections to the Sejm of the Republic of Poland and the Senate of the Republic of Poland were held, as well as a nationwide referendum. In connection with the above, as in the case of previous years in which elections or a referendum were held, the vast majority of cases filed with the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs concerned referendum and election protests (in 2023, 3,576). Deducting this category of cases, it should be stated that the inflow from 2024 was at a lower level than in 2023, when it was 1,795 cases. The number of resolved cases was also lower. In 2024, it was at the level of 1,352 cases, and in 2023 – 1,606 cases (after deducting 3,545 resolved election cases).
The year 2024 was the second full year of operation of the Professional Liability Chamber of the Supreme Court, which was established on 15 July 2022. In the reporting year, 680 rulings were issued in the Professional Liability Chamber, which is slightly less than in 2023 (716 rulings).

**Q099 (2023):** Other cases" include the statistics of the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber and Professional Liability Chamber of the Supreme Court.
Statistics of the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber (which deals with the Public law cases, inter alia cases originated from the extraordinary complaints or appeals against resolutions of the National Council of the Judiciary, competition and consumer protection cases, cases concerning the regulation of energy, telecommunications and postal services, rail transport, as well as the regulation of the water and sewage market, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings or cases concerning the retirement of a judge of the Supreme Court, etc.).
Statistics of the Professional Liability Chamber (which deals with the disciplinary cases or cases of lifting of the judicial and prosecutor immunity).
Compared to previous years, the number of cases pending as of 31 December of the reference year has increased, but it should be noted that the overall number of cases filed with the Supreme Court has increased significantly.
The Supreme Court still does not have all the positions provided for by law filled, which, combined with the growing inflow of cases from year to year, results in an increase in cases to be heard.
However, it should be noted that - even taking into account the above problems - the number of cases handled by the Supreme Court is growing from year to year:
6,308 cases were handled in the Civil Chamber (compared to 5,785 cases handled in 2022);
2,580 cases were handled in the Labor and Social Security Chamber (compared to 2,286 cases handled in 2022).
4,254 cases were handled in the Criminal Chamber (compared to 4,161 cases handled in 2022).
In the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs, 5,151 cases were resolved (compared to 1,617 cases resolved in 2022).
However, it should be noted that such a significant increase is dictated by the consideration of electoral cases by this Chamber in connection with the elections to the Sejm and Senate of the Republic of Poland held in the autumn of 2023. The receipt of such cases in 2023 alone is 3,576 compared to 11 cases received in 2022.

**Q099 (2022):** Compared to previous years, the number of pending cases on 31 December of the reference year has increased, but it should be noted that the number of incoming cases has increased significantly.
In the Civil Chamber, for example, the number of incoming cases doubled compared to the cases received in 2020 (4360 incoming cases in 2020, while 8176 incoming cases in 2023).
Another factor that significantly affects the statistics of case recognition is the new measure introduced by the amendment to the Supreme Court Act of 9 June 2022, which entered into force on 15 July 2022 - the motion to examine the fulfilment of the requirements of independence and impartiality of a Supreme Court judge, taking into account the circumstances of his or her appointment and his or her post-appointment. Article 29(6) of the Supreme Court Act, which provides an additional procedural guarantee for the parties, on the other hand affects the length of the proceedings before the Supreme Court. It can be noted that this measure is widely used by the parties, which can be particularly observed in disciplinary proceedings. Furthermore, it has an impact on other Chambers of the Supreme Court, including the Civil Chamber.
It should also be noted that the Supreme Court has not had all of its legally stipulated Supreme Court judge positions filled for years (as at 31 December 2021, 90 of the 125 positions stipulated in Section 2 of the Supreme Court Rules were filled), which, combined with the increasing number of incoming cases each year, has resulted in an increasing number of pending cases.
Even taking the abovementioned problems into account, it should be noted that the number of cases decided by the Supreme Court is increasing year-on-year.
In the Civil Chamber, 5785 resolved cases (compered to 4926 resolved cases in 2021);
In the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber, 1617 resolved cases (compered to 1120 resolved cases in 2021);
In the Criminal Chamber, 4161 resolved cases (compered to 4003 resolved cases in 2021);
Only the Labour and Social Security Law Chamber has recorded a slight decrease in the number of resolved cases - 2286 in 2022 (compered to 2299 resolved cases in 2021).
*3 administrative law cases: in 2022,the lifting of restrictions on court activity due to the declared epidemic state in Poland has increased the number of cases handled by the Supreme Administrative Court.

**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.

**Portugal**

**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 (2024):** 99.3 - We confirm the decrease in the number of cases pending before the Supreme Administrative Court (STA) in 2024 compared to 2023. In 2023, new legislation redistributed powers between the Central Administrative Courts and the Tax Litigation Section of the STA.
In fact, until 2023, the Tax Litigation Section of the STA had jurisdiction to hear appeals against decisions on the merits of tax courts. However, in 2023, following the entry into force of Decree-Law No. 74-B/2023 of 28 August, the scope of jurisdiction of the aforementioned Section of the STA was restricted, with that Section now only hearing appeals against decisions on the merits of tax courts (based exclusively on matters of law, whenever the value of the case exceeds the jurisdiction of the central administrative courts and the value of the award exceeds half the jurisdiction of the court to which the appeal is made). Since 2023, fewer cases have been filed with the Tax Litigation Section of the STA as a result of this legislative amendment, and there may have been a tendency for judges to focus on resolving pending cases from then on, which would explain the decline in pending cases in 2024.

**Q099 (2022):** 1 - 1st column
The increase in the number of pending cases on January 1, 2022 compared to January 1, 2020 is related to the fact that in the period from 2020 to 2021 the number of incoming cases was higher than the number of outgoing cases. In our view, this behavior reflects the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic and the resulting lockdown, which had an impact on the functioning of the courts in 2020 and 2021, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.
3 - 1st column
The decrease in the number of cases pending on January 1, 2022 compared to January 1, 2020 is related to the fact that in the period 2020 to 2021 the number of cases closed was higher than the number of cases admitted.

**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.

**Romania**

**Q099 (2023):** Concerning variations in the category 'pending for more than 2 years', they cannot be considered as consequences of any socio-legal phenomenon ocurring in 2023.

**Q099 (2022):** There are no explanations for the discrepances, anyway for volumes of cases in the order of hundreds no conclusions can be drawn regarding statistical trends.

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**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 fluctuation in the number of cases can be attributed to the judicial reform, as new administrative courts were established. Consequently, the judicial system is in the process of stabilization, which may have affected both the timing of the filing of applications to the courts and their processing.

**Q099 (2024):** 3. Administrative law cases: The fluctuation in the number of cases can be attributed to the judicial reform, as new administrative courts were established. Consequently, the judicial system is in the process of stabilization, which may have affected both the timing of the filing of applications to the courts and their processing.

**Q099 (2023):** As of 2023, administrative law cases treated by the Supreme Administrative Court are reported in Q99, as required by the CEPEJ methodology of data presentation.

**Q099 (2022):** The collected statistical data for the Supreme Court do not distinguish the litigious and non-litigious cases. Information delivered by the Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic available on internet https://www.nsud.sk/data/att/f59/688231.22d3e0.pdf. The new Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic took over the Administrative law cases from the Supreme Court .
Data for new Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic are not mentioned in the table, since the table is only for the Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic.
The data for new Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic in 2022 were:
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year - 2106
Incoming cases - 2015
Resolved cases - 1889
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year - 2232
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court - 103
Source: https://www.nssud.sk/web_object/stat_2022.pdf

**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.

**Slovenia**

**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.
The reported data includes cases concerning extraordinary legal remedies (the Supreme Court in its capacity ass the court of final instance) and cases subject to the separate procedure for manifest inadmissibility.

**Q099 (2024):** Discrepancies: please note small (absolute) number of cases.

**Q099 (2022):** Total of other than criminal law cases/1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan. - decrease: A trend of decrease of pending cases is observable.
Total of other than criminal law cases/1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases/3. Administrative cases - Pending cases older than 2 years - decrease: Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.
2. Non litigious cases (all discrepancies): Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.
2.2 Registry cases (all discrepancies): Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.

**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.

**Spain**

**Q099 (2024):** The data are calculated using the same criteria as in previous years.

**Q099 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain’s rates.

**Q099 (2022):** 2020 was a year marked by the pandemic, the reduction of work in judicial bodies, despite digitalization, and by mobility restriction measures. The increase in the pace of work in 2022 is logical and it explains the increase of incoming and resolved cases compared to 2020.

**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.

### Question 100

**Austria**

**Q100 (2024):** The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.
The change in the number of pending administrative offence proceedings that are more than two years old compared to the previous year can be explained by the positive decline in lengthy proceedings.

**Q100 (2023):** The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.
1. Severe criminal cases: Same answer as in Q 99. The amount is lower, because less cases have been pending and therefore small changes have more impact relatively.

**Q100 (2022):** The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q100 (General Comment):** The total corresponds to criminal law cases (P register) of the Court of Cassation.
Source: Hof van Cassatie van België - Cour de cassation de Belgique - Kassationshof von Belgien
Justitiepaleis - Poelaertplein 1 - 1000 Brussel
Palais de Justice – Place Poelaert 1 – 1000 Brussels

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**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 (2024):** 1. 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.
2. In comparison the data from 2024 with those from 2023 it is ascertain that there is more than 20% difference in seven of the indicators which are marked at the chart with a comment.
With indicator “Pending cases on 1 January for the referent year – Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” it is marked the highest increase as a percentage (72.22%). The numbers in this indicator are small, respectively also the difference as an absolute amount is small, but it recalculates in a big percentage difference. In the particular case this difference is due to slightly increase number during 2023 of the incoming cases qualified as ”Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” representing the natural dynamic of the incomings during the years.
With indicator “Pending cases on 1 January for the referent year – Other criminal cases” there is difference of 10 cases but because of the low level of this indicator it recalculates in a big percentage difference (27.78%).
The same circumstance is valid regarding the indicator “Incoming cases – Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” – a slightly decrease of number of the incoming cases from this type during the referent year converts in difference of -23.40%.
The rest four indicators, where there is difference more than 20%, refers to the pending cases for all types to 31.12.2024 – “Pending cases on 31 December of the referent year – Severe criminal cases” (-36.41%), “Pending cases on 31 December of the referent year – Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” (-38.71%), “Pending cases on 31 December of the referent year – Other criminal cases” (-45.65%) and “Pending cases on 31 December of the referent year – Total of criminal cases” (-38.10%). The differences are due to, on one hand of the slightly decrease of the incoming of all types of cases and on the other hand, of the increase number of the magistrates at the Criminal College at the Supreme Court of Cassation that to 31.12.2023 is 28, and to 31.12.2024 is 30, which increased the number of decided cases of all categories.

**Q100 (2023):** 1. 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.
2. A comparison of the 2023 data with the 2022 data reveals a greater than 20% difference for seven of the indicators noted in the table with comments. For four of the seven indicators ("Pending Cases on January 1 – Misdemeanour and/or Minor Criminal Cases," "Incoming Cases – Misdemeanour and/or Minor Criminal Cases", "Pending Cases on December 31 – Misdemeanour and/or Minor Criminal Cases" and "Pending Cases on December 31 – Other Criminal Cases"), the obvious reason is that the numbers in all indicators are small, accordingly the differences are small in absolute value, and do not reflect a significant change in the performance of the Criminal Division of the Supreme Court of Cassation, but translate into a large percentage difference. For example, in the indicator "Pending Cases on December 31 – Misdemeanour and/or Minor Criminal Cases" a difference of 13 counts translates into a 72.22% difference.
There is also a significant difference in the indicators "Incoming cases – Other criminal cases" and "Resolved cases – Other criminal cases" in absolute value. It is due to the 15.87% increase in the total number of the filings in the Criminal Division in 2023 compared to 2022. This increase is greatest in cases for crimes classified as "Other" – 24.85%, which, in turn, leads to an increase in the number of cases decided in this category.
The increase in the number of cases filed for crimes classified as "Other" is due to the natural dynamics of the filings over the years, which is unpredictable within a narrow range. In the indicator "Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court" a large increase is reported – by 125%, but since the numbers are small (4 counts for 2022 and 9 counts for 2023), the reasons for this increase are not systematic, but rather related to the specifics of the each one of the cases. In 4 of the cases, judgments were rendered in early 2024, 1 case was suspended due to the illness of the defendant, and 2 cases could not proceed due to failure to receive information from a country in South America regarding the death of the defendant. The specific circumstances set out above indicate that the lengthy pendency of a substantial proportion of the cases referred to in this indicator is due to objective reasons.

**Q100 (2022):** 1. 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.
2. A comparison of the 2022 data with the 2021 data reveals a greater than 20% difference for five of the indicators noted in the table with comments. For four of the five indicators, the obvious reason is that the numbers for all indicators are small, so the differences are small in absolute value and do not reflect a significant change in the performance of the Criminal Division of the Supreme Court of Cassation, but are recalculated into a large percentage difference.
For example in one indicator – "Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the Supreme Court", a difference of 1 case is converted into a 20% difference. Only the indicator – "Incoming cases – Severe criminal cases" has a significant difference in absolute value. It is due to the reduction by 10% in the total number of admissions to the Criminal Division of the Supreme Court of Cassation in 2022 compared to 2021. This decrease is entirely in severe criminal cases – 23.15%, while in cases for minor crimes and in other cases the number almost does not change and even increases slightly (by 5.88% and 4.96%, respectively). The decrease is due to the natural dynamics of admissions over the years, which is unpredictable within a narrow range.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q100 (2024):** Due to the Supreme Court’s consistently high productivity, there was a notable reduction in the number of unresolved cases during 2023, which continued further into 2024.

**Q100 (2022):** The Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia distinguishes only if the case is civil or criminal, but does not classify case types in specific categories beyond that classification. The main classification in the Case management system is based on the instance of the procedure in the sense that there are some instances when the Supreme Court acts as a second instance appelate court. When the criminal procedure is regarding a very serious criminal offense (charges for which the jail sentence is more than 10 years), the County courts act as a first instance court, and all appeals are decided upon by the Supreme Court as a second instance court. In that sense, the classification of cases of the Supreme Court in the Case management system distinguishes only those cases which are from the position of the second instance or from the position of the third instance court. Since the recently established High Criminal Court of the Republic of Croatia has overtaken the role of the appelate court for the County courts in aforementioned instances, the Supreme Court has retained only the competency of a third instance court in criminal cases, but the cases are still distinguished in the same classification as before.

**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.

**Cyprus**

**Q100 (General Comment):** .

**Q100 (2023):** The supreme court has jurisdiction to hear criminal cases at a third level. There were no incoming or pending cases on the 1st of July 2023.

**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

**Czech Republic**

**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"

**Denmark**

**Q100 (General Comment):** The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19.

**Q100 (2024):** All criminal cases at the highest instance court are considered severe. The nature of Supreme Court cases means that case flow numbers may vary drastically year to year.

**Q100 (2023):** The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19.

**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.

**Estonia**

**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 (2024):** Total of criminal law cases (1+2+3) and 1. Severe criminal cases Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year - Overall increase in workload

**Q100 (2023):** The Supreme court data only includes severe criminal cases.

**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.

**Finland**

**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.

**France**

**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 "severe 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.

**Q100 (2024):**
“Severe criminal cases / Minor criminal cases”: in the absence of statistical means to distinguish between appeals in cases that may or may not result in a prison sentence, appeals concerning the activity of the police court, which deals with petty offenses, have been classified under the category of minor offenses;
“Other criminal cases”: QPC, requests for opinions, and other petitions filed as main actions.
“Total number of criminal cases”: this number includes all criminal cases submitted to the Court of cassation.

**Q100 (2023):** No other data are available

**Q100 (2022):** The statistical system does not allow for distinguishing between appeals related to severe and minor offenses. The number of pending cases includes the enforcement litigation which was not taken into consideration for the previous years (2020 and 2021). The category "other criminal cases" encompasses requests for opinions, priority questions of constitutionality, and principal petitions.
Source: Court of Cassation.

**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.

**Germany**

**Q100 (General Comment):** In alignment with the categorisation of cases in questions 94 and 98, “severe criminal cases” include criminal proceedings according to the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” includes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts. In the annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice, criminal proceedings according to criminal laws and regulatory fine proceedings are not reported separately.

**Q100 (2024):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". 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 of the Federal Court of Justice (including antitrust panel).

**Q100 (2023):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". 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 of the Federal Court of Justice (including antitrust panel).

**Q100 (2022):** The annual statistic of the Federal Court of Justice does not differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". 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 of the Federal Court of Justice (including antitrust panel).

**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.

**Greece**

**Q100 (General Comment):** After relevant communication with the IT department of the Supreme Court, it was clarified to us that "Due to changes in the OSDYPP of the Supreme Court, it is no longer possible to calculate Pending cases older than 2 years.

**Q100 (2024):** Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat)

**Q100 (2022):** It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data. The content of the categories of criminal cases in the table are the same as for the previous evaluation cycle, but the services now monitor and record these cases better so discrepancies in data can be observed. This is especially the case for the Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal 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.

**Hungary**

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q100 (General Comment):** For pending cases, the Court Service record resolved cases as cases where an order is made. As there may be more than one order made in respect any case this can cause difficulty in accurately calculating figures for pending cases.

**Q100 (2024):** We are not in a position to explain the reasons behind such increase, given the wide range of factors that may have been at play. For incoming criminal cases, these may include, but are not limited to, an increase in business in the first instance courts, additional Gardai resources, a potential increase in decisions to prosecute by the DPP, and the growing population of the state
While in previous cycles we provided the figure for pending civil and criminal cases in the Supreme Court this is no longer provided to ensure consistency with the other court jurisdictions.
In criminal matters, cases are counted by offence, not by case/defendant. Resolved cases are recorded as cases where an order is made. As there may be more than one penalty imposed in respect of an offence and a separate order made in respect of each penalty, the figures for resolved cases can appear to be higher than those for incoming cases and can cause challenges in calculating pending case figures.
While in previous cycles we provided the figure for pending civil and criminal cases in the Supreme Court this is no longer provided to ensure consistency with the other court jurisdictions. The new case management system (UCMS) became operational in 2023 in the Central Office of the High Court. UCMS is being extended to all court offices and over the coming years the Courts Service will work to consolidate data processing and reporting for all case types in each jurisdiction.

**Q100 (2022):** The number of cases pending in the Supreme Court has decreased between 2020 and 2022.

**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.

**Italy**

**Q100 (General Comment):** "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. "Other cases" may relate to procedures pending in first or second istances (jurisdiction or competence conflicts between other courts), or pending in other countries (rogatory or capture instances); "Other cases" may also relate to decisions regarding the execution of imposed punishments (for example regarding the end or a change (home detenction) of the imprisonment), or to the correction of material errors on Highest Court's sentences.

**Q100 (2024):** "Other cases" may relate to procedures pending in first or second istances (jurisdiction or competence conflicts between other courts), or pending in other countries (rogatory or capture instances). "Other cases" may also relate to decisions regarding the execution of imposed punishments (for example regarding the end or a change -home detenction- of the imprisonment), or the correction of material errors on Highest Court's sentences.

**Q100 (2022):** Within the framework of the National Plan for Recovery and Resilience (PNRR), Italy has taken a number of measures to reduce both disposition times and backlogs. The main objective is an overall reduction of 40% in the civil sector and 25% in the criminal sector by June 2026 (all three instances together). More information on the reform is available at https://www.italiadomani.gov.it/content/sogei-ng/it/en/Interventi/riforme/riforme-orizzontali/riforma-della-giustizia.html.
A monitoring system is also in place and a detailed dashboard is available at https://webstat.giustizia.it/SitePages/Monitoraggio%20PNRR.aspx.

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q100 (2023):** The pending cases on 01.01.2023. corresponds to the data on 31.12.2022. The Supreme Court has set the timely consideration of cases as one of its priorities, also following the guidelines for the consideration of cases approved by the Council of Justice. This has affected the changes in the number of resolved cases and, accordingly, the number of pending cases.

**Q100 (2022):** Several judges have retired and new judges have started to work at the Supreme Court. This has made an impact on the case flow. Year 2021 the case flow was slow. Year 2022 the number of resolved cases allowed to diminish the backlog.

**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

**Lithuania**

**Q100 (2022):** In the Supreme Court of Lithuania, not all the posts of judges were filled, which led to a longer duration of hearing cases.

**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q100 (General Comment):** Given the small size of Luxembourg, the number of cases handled by the Supreme Court is, in absolute terms, limited. Therefore, even the smallest variation in absolute numbers is likely to produce a significant effect in statistical or percentage terms, without necessarily implying a substantial or structural impact on the Court's activity.

The Court of Cassation conducts a review of legality, independent of the severity of the offense. Pending cases are now detailed separately between criminal and civil/commercial matters, providing this additional information for the first time.

**Q100 (2024):** The increase in pending cases at the beginning of the year compared to the beginning of the previous year can be explained by the difference between incoming cases in 2023 and the decisions rendered in 2023.

Resolved Cases: Two factors can explain the 31% increase in resolved cases at the Court of Cassation. On the one hand, the number of judges at the Court of Cassation increased by one in 2023 (see question 46). Following certain changes in the Court's composition, including retirements, this new composition in 2024 made it possible to render a higher number of decisions. On the other hand, there was an increase in decisions dismissing appeals for failure to prosecute, concerning cases in which a party filed an appeal but did not submit a brief, allowing these cases to be resolved more quickly.

Pending Cases on 31 December of the Reference Year: The number of pending cases decreased by 25%, which corresponds in absolute terms to a difference of 8 pending cases. This is explained by the fact that more cases were resolved than incoming cases were filed in 2024.

**Q100 (2023):** The number of new cases depends on the number of appeals lodged over which the Court has no influence and which depends, among other things, on the number of decisions taken by other instances. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.
The number of pending cases has increased by 23%, which in absolute terms corresponds to a difference of 6 pending cases, with pending cases increasing from 26 to 32, due to a higher number of new cases than completed cases. Comment 2022: Pending cases at 1 January refer to data provided in 2021. This decrease was explained as follows: ‘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’.

**Q100 (2022):** Pending cases as of 1st January refer to the data provided in 2021. This decrease had been explained as follows: 'The decrease in pending cases can be attributed to the decrease in incoming cases in 2020, as the number of decisions made remained stable between 2018 and 2020.

**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.
"

**Malta**

**Q100 (2018):** NA

**Netherlands**

**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 Supreme Court.
The number of resolved cases presented in the table includes both cases that are resolved with the decision of a judge and cases that were not resolved with the decision of a judge. These are: Cases in which the appeal in cassation has been withdrawn or annulled, cases that have been administratively resolved by the clerk, cases in which the processing of the appeal in cassation has been suspended, and cases that have been discharged upon objection. The number of cases not resolved by the decision of a judge has also been included in the comment for clarification. Before 2024, these numbers were not included in the number of resolved cases, but they were included in the number of pending cases on Dec 31.

**Q100 (2024):** We have included cases that were not resolved with the decision of a judge, see the general comment for an explanation of what types of conclusions these are. It is important to note that these numbers were not included last year, so numbers this year may not be perfectly comparable to last year (we have added the numbers here below as well). Number of cases that are not resolved by the decision of a judge: 142.

**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).

**Poland**

**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.

**Portugal**

**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.

**Romania**

**Q100 (2022):** according to the application for statistics

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q100 (General Comment):** The collected statistical data does not distinguish between the two types of criminal offences.

**Q100 (2022):** Information delivered by Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic available on internet https://www.nsud.sk/data/att/f59/688231.22d3e0.pdf

**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

**Slovenia**

**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 (2024):** Discrepancies: please note small (absolute) number of cases.

**Q100 (2022):** Total of criminal law cases/ 1. Severe criminal cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan/ Pending cases on 31 Dec – decrease by approx. 30-40%: In last 5 years, number of incoming and resolved cases was relatively stable. Clearance rate has been above 100% since 2020. In 2021, the number of resolved cases increased (by 15%; clearance rate 111%), hence the decrease in pending cases.
2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (all discrepancies): Plese note the small (absolute) number of 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).

**Spain**

**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.

**Q100 (2024):** The data are calculated using the same criteria as in previous years.
When a court identifies inaccuracies in its statistical reporting, it may regularize the data in its Statistical Bulletin by replacing the incorrect figure with one that reflects the actual situation, even if it diverges from previously reported values. Such regularizations are a recognized source of horizontal inconsistencies

**Q100 (2023):** During the first semester of 2023, Spain experienced various strikes by different groups of civil servants within the judicial and justice administration that undoubtedly had a significant impact on the CR and DT Spain's rates.

**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.

# Indicator 4: Public prosecution services - Case flow

## Table 4.1.1a: Public prosecution services: Case flow in 2024
## Absolute values (Q107 and Q109)

| States | Public prosecution services: Total number of first instance criminal cases in 2024 | | | | | | | | | | | 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 | 3.4. Cases brought to court | 4. Pending cases on 31 Dec. | |
| **Austria** | 20 611 | 504 425 | 504 499 | 417 956 | *227 475* | *111 892* | *NA* | *78 589* | 36 692 | 49 579 | 20 587 | |
| **Belgium** | 184 013 | 605 933 | 590 909 | 481 908 | *89 811* | *151 576* | *115 729* | *124 792* | 74 526 | 34 475 | 199 037 | |
| **Bulgaria** | 4 163 | 95 026 | 159 670 | 132 258 | *NAP* | *98 006* | *NAP* | *34 252* | NAP | 27 412 | 4 055 | |
| **Croatia** | 56 550 | 42 187 | 41 035 | 20 911 | *NA* | *NA* | *697* | *3 833* | NAP | 20 124 | 61 969 | |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA | |
| **Czech Republic** | 43 395 | 194 112 | 190 669 | 131 336 | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *41 140* | 2 373 | 56 960 | 46 838 | |
| **Denmark** | 32 458 | 88 608 | 149 306 | 295 933 | *90 317* | *193 023* | *9 279* | *3 314* | 51 184 | 117 073 | 57 888 | |
| **Estonia** | 2 236 | 28 345 | 6 676 | 3 153 | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | 3 033 | 2 241 | |
| **Finland** | 18 011 | 85 053 | 84 195 | 32 827 | *NAP* | *NA* | *21 977* | *10 850* | 9 | 51 359 | 18 869 | |
| **France** | NA | 4 587 883 | 4 267 972 | 3 284 780 | *2 330 037* | *751 349* | *203 394* | *NAP* | 395 953 | 587 239 | NA | |
| **Germany** | 923 455 | 5 491 712 | 5 464 278 | 4 422 030 | *NA* | *1 723 248* | *1 389 826* | *1 308 956* | 161 157 | 881 091 | 950 852 | |
| **Greece** | 245 161 | 466 501 | 512 066 | 215 912 | *116 540* | *62 498* | *3 138* | *33 736* | 2 199 | 293 955 | 238 503 | |
| **Hungary** | NA | 73 246 | 221 224 | 31 822 | *16* | *17 060* | *11 041* | *3 705* | 3 951 | 185 451 | NA | |
| **Ireland** | NA | 11 207 | NA | 3 322 | *27* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NAP | NA | NA | |
| **Italy** | 1 293 128 | 2 730 270 | 2 506 033 | 2 066 547 | *1 004 708* | *734 308* | *6 487* | *321 044* | 2 296 | 437 190 | 1 517 365 | |
| **Latvia** | 597 | 10 873 | 9 844 | 356 | *0* | *44* | *285* | *27* | 3 451 | 6 037 | 559 | |
| **Lithuania** | 25 957 | 47 195 | 43 057 | 18 194 | *1 152* | *15 735* | *1 276* | *31* | NAP | 24 863 | 25 734 | |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 71 060 | 42 269 | 28 813 | *5 124* | *6 105* | *17 471* | *113* | 1 030 | 12 426 | NA | |
| **Malta** | 19 860 | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NAP | 16 120 | 25 107 | |
| **Netherlands** | 62 256 | 206 100 | 214 500 | 65 100 | *NAP* | *40 900* | *20 600* | *3 600* | 63 200 | 86 200 | 58 734 | |
| **Poland** | 130 201 | 1 129 566 | 1 129 185 | 880 606 | *178 928* | *54 697* | *116 490* | *530 491* | 33 386 | 215 193 | 130 582 | |
| **Portugal** | 329 488 | 492 795 | 462 492 | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | 45 119 | 359 791 | |
| **Romania** | 1 145 224 | 620 619 | 602 261 | 490 560 | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | 60 590 | 51 111 | 1 163 582 | |
| **Slovak Republic** | 22 881 | 49 165 | NA | NA | *NAP* | *NA* | *NAP* | *NA* | NA | NA | 30 058 | |
| **Slovenia** | 285 991 | 65 809 | 69 744 | 58 576 | *NAP* | *55 269* | *3 307* | *NAP* | 1 650 | 8 255 | 282 922 | |
| **Spain** | NA | 2 340 440 | NAP | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NAP* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA | |
| **Sweden** | 113 490 | 448 729 | 455 609 | 240 476 | *NA* | *34 321* | *40 684* | *165 471* | 38 156 | 176 977 | 113 839 | |
| **Average** | 236 149 | 819 474 | 805 795 | 605 608 | 337 011 | 253 127 | 122 605 | 156 703 | 54 812 | 147 271 | 252 815 | |
| **Median** | 56 550 | 194 112 | 217 862 | 131 797 | 90 064 | 58 884 | 14 256 | 33 736 | 33 386 | 51 111 | 58 734 | |
| **Minimum** | 597 | 10 873 | 6 676 | 356 | 0 | 44 | 285 | 27 | 9 | 3 033 | 559 | |
| **Maximum** | 1 293 128 | 5 491 712 | 5 464 278 | 4 422 030 | 2 330 037 | 1 723 248 | 1 389 826 | 1 308 956 | 395 953 | 881 091 | 1 517 365 | |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 7% | 15% | 19% | 37% | 41% | 30% | 30% | 19% | 15% | 22% # | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 19% | 0% | 11% | 7% | 19% | 0% | 0% # | 0% |

The structure and organization of public prosecution services differ considerably among states resulting in different internal classifications of cases. For that reason, analysis based on data collected for this question should consider specific national legal framework and peculiarities related to the functioning of each state prosecution system. For example, if they include or not the suspended cases or if they count by case, perpetrator or by crime. Details are provided in the comments of the question 107.

Legend
Yes
No

**Table 4.1.1b: Public prosecution services: Case flow in 2024**
**Per 100 inhabitants (Q107 and Q109)**

| States | Public prosecution services: Total number of first instance criminal cases per 100 inhabitants in 2024 | | | | | | | | | | | 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 brought to court | 4. Pending cases on 31 Dec. | |
| **Austria** | 0,22 | 5,48 | 5,49 | 4,54 | 2,47 | 1,22 | NA | 0,85 | 0,40 | 0,54 | 0,22 | |
| **Belgium** | 1,56 | 5,12 | 5,00 | 4,08 | *0,76* | *1,28* | *0,98* | *1,06* | 0,63 | 0,29 | 1,68 | |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,06 | 1,48 | 2,48 | 2,05 | *NAP* | *1,52* | *NAP* | *0,53* | NAP | 0,43 | 0,06 | |
| **Croatia** | 1,46 | 1,09 | 1,06 | 0,54 | *NA* | *NA* | *0,02* | *0,10* | NAP | 0,52 | 1,60 | |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA | |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,40 | 1,78 | 1,75 | 1,20 | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *0,38* | 0,02 | 0,52 | 0,43 | |
| **Denmark** | 0,54 | 1,48 | 2,49 | 4,94 | *1,51* | *3,22* | *0,15* | *0,06* | 0,85 | 1,95 | 0,97 | |
| **Estonia** | 0,16 | 2,06 | 0,49 | 0,23 | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | 0,22 | 0,16 | |
| **Finland** | 0,32 | 1,51 | 1,49 | 0,58 | *NAP* | *NA* | *0,39* | *0,19* | 0,00 | 0,91 | 0,33 | |
| **France** | NA | 6,69 | 6,22 | 4,79 | *3,40* | *1,10* | *0,30* | *NAP* | 0,58 | 0,86 | NA | |
| **Germany** | 1,10 | 6,57 | 6,54 | 5,29 | *NA* | *2,06* | *1,66* | *1,57* | 0,19 | 1,05 | 1,14 | |
| **Greece** | 2,36 | 4,49 | 4,92 | 2,08 | *1,12* | *0,60* | *0,03* | *0,32* | 0,02 | 2,83 | 2,29 | |
| **Hungary** | NA | 0,77 | 2,32 | 0,33 | *0,00* | *0,18* | *0,12* | *0,04* | 0,04 | 1,94 | NA | |
| **Ireland** | NA | 0,21 | NA | 0,06 | *0,00* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NAP | NA | NA | |
| **Italy** | 2,19 | 4,63 | 4,25 | 3,51 | *1,70* | *1,25* | *0,01* | *0,54* | 0,00 | 0,74 | 2,57 | |
| **Latvia** | 0,03 | 0,59 | 0,53 | 0,02 | *0,00* | *0,00* | *0,02* | *0,00* | 0,19 | 0,33 | 0,03 | |
| **Lithuania** | 0,90 | 1,63 | 1,49 | 0,63 | *0,04* | *0,54* | *0,04* | *0,00* | NAP | 0,86 | 0,89 | |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | 10,42 | 6,20 | 4,22 | *0,75* | *0,90* | *2,56* | *0,02* | 0,15 | 1,82 | NA | |
| **Malta** | 3,46 | NA | NA | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NAP | 2,81 | 4,37 | |
| **Netherlands** | 0,35 | 1,14 | 1,19 | 0,36 | *NAP* | *0,23* | *0,11* | *0,02* | 0,35 | 0,48 | 0,33 | |
| **Poland** | 0,35 | 3,01 | 3,01 | 2,34 | *0,48* | *0,15* | *0,31* | *1,41* | 0,09 | 0,57 | 0,35 | |
| **Portugal** | 3,07 | 4,58 | 4,30 | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | NA | 0,42 | 3,35 | |
| **Romania** | 6,02 | 3,26 | 3,16 | 2,58 | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | 0,32 | 0,27 | 6,11 | |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,42 | 0,91 | NA | NA | *NAP* | *NA* | *NAP* | *NA* | NA | NA | 0,55 | |
| **Slovenia** | 13,42 | 3,09 | 3,27 | 2,75 | *NAP* | *2,59* | *0,16* | *NAP* | 0,08 | 0,39 | 13,28 | |
| **Spain** | NA | 4,77 | NAP | NA | *NA* | *NA* | *NAP* | *NA* | NA | NA | NA | |
| **Sweden** | 1,07 | 4,24 | 4,30 | 2,27 | *NA* | *0,32* | *0,38* | *1,56* | 0,36 | 1,67 | 1,08 | |
| **Average** | 1,9 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 2,2 | *1,0* | *1,1* | *0,5* | *0,5* | 0,3 | 1,0 | 2,0 | |
| **Median** | 0,9 | 3,0 | 3,1 | 2,2 | *0,8* | *1,0* | *0,2* | *0,3* | 0,2 | 0,6 | 1,0 | |
| **Minimum** | 0,0 | 0,2 | 0,5 | 0,0 | *0,0* | *0,0* | *0,0* | *0,0* | 0,0 | 0,2 | 0,0 | |
| **Maximum** | 13,4 | 10,4 | 6,5 | 5,3 | *3,4* | *3,2* | *2,6* | *1,6* | 0,9 | 2,8 | 13,3 | |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 7% | 15% | 19% | 37% | 41% | 30% | 30% | 19% | 15% | 22% | |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 19% | 0% | 11% | 7% | 19% | 0% | 0% | |

The structure and organization of public prosecution services differ considerably among states resulting in different internal classifications of cases. For that reason, analysis based on data collected for this question should consider specific national legal framework and peculiarities related to the functioning of each state prosecution system. For example, if they include or not the suspended cases or if they count by case, perpetrator or by crime. Details are provided in the comments of the question 107.

Legend
Yes
No

## Table 4.1.2: Public prosecution services: Distribution of different categories of processed cases within all processed cases in 2024 (Q107)

| States | Public prosecution services: Distribution in % of different categories of processed cases within all processed cases | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % of discontinued cases within all processed cases | *Distribution in % of different categories of dismissed cases within all dismissed cases* | | | | % of concluded cases by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor within all processed cases | % of cases brought to court 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* | | |
| **Austria** | 83% | 54% | 27% | NA | 19% | 7% | 10% |
| **Belgium** | 82% | 19% | 31% | 24% | 26% | 13% | 6% |
| **Bulgaria** | 83% | NAP | 74% | NAP | 26% | NAP | 17% |
| **Croatia** | 51% | NA | NA | 3% | 18% | NAP | 49% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 69% | NA | NA | NA | 31% | 1% | 30% |
| **Denmark** | 198% | 31% | 65% | 3% | 1% | 34% | 78% |
| **Estonia** | 47% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 45% |
| **Finland** | 39% | NAP | NA | 67% | 33% | 0% | 61% |
| **France** | 77% | 71% | 23% | 6% | NAP | 9% | 14% |
| **Germany** | 81% | NA | 39% | 31% | 30% | 3% | 16% |
| **Greece** | 42% | 54% | 29% | 1% | 16% | 0% | 57% |
| **Hungary** | 14% | 0% | 54% | 35% | 12% | 2% | 84% |
| **Ireland** | NA | 1% | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Italy** | 82% | 49% | 36% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 17% |
| **Latvia** | 4% | 0% | 12% | 80% | 8% | 35% | 61% |
| **Lithuania** | 42% | 6% | 86% | 7% | 0% | NAP | 58% |
| **Luxembourg** | 68% | 18% | 21% | 61% | 0% | 2% | 29% |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 30% | NAP | 63% | 32% | 6% | 29% | 40% |
| **Poland** | 78% | 20% | 6% | 13% | 60% | 3% | 19% |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 10% |
| **Romania** | 81% | NA | NA | NA | NA | 10% | 8% |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 84% | NAP | 94% | 6% | NAP | 2% | 12% |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 53% | NA | 14% | 17% | 69% | 8% | 39% |
| **Average** | 66% | 27% | 42% | 24% | 22% | 9% | 35% |
| **Median** | 69% | 19% | 33% | 15% | 18% | 3% | 30% |
| **Minimum** | 4% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 6% |
| **Maximum** | 198% | 71% | 94% | 80% | 69% | 35% | 84% |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 37% | 41% | 30% | 30% | 19% | 19% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 19% | 0% | 11% | 7% | 19% | 0% |

The structure and organization of public prosecution services differ considerably among states resulting in different internal classifications of cases. For that reason, analysis based on data collected for this question should consider specific national legal framework and peculiarities related to the functioning of each state prosecution system. For example, if they include or not the suspended cases or if they count by case, perpetrator or by crime. Details are provided in the comments of the question 107.

# Ratios of public prosecution cases

## Table 4.1.3: Public prosecution services: Ratio of processed cases and pending cases with incoming cases in 2024 (Q107)

| States | Public prosecution cases in 2024 | |
|---|---|---|
| | Ratio between processed and incoming cases | Ratio between Pending cases 31 Dec and incoming cases |
| **Austria** | 1,00 | 0,04 |
| **Belgium** | 0,98 | 0,33 |
| **Bulgaria** | 1,68 | 0,04 |
| **Croatia** | 0,97 | 1,47 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,98 | 0,24 |
| **Denmark** | 1,69 | 0,65 |
| **Estonia** | 0,24 | 0,08 |
| **Finland** | 0,99 | 0,22 |
| **France** | 0,93 | NA |
| **Germany** | 1,00 | 0,17 |
| **Greece** | 1,10 | 0,51 |
| **Hungary** | 3,02 | NA |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,92 | 0,56 |
| **Latvia** | 0,91 | 0,05 |
| **Lithuania** | 0,91 | 0,55 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,59 | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 1,04 | 0,28 |
| **Poland** | 1,00 | 0,12 |
| **Portugal** | 0,94 | 0,73 |
| **Romania** | 0,97 | 1,87 |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | 0,61 |
| **Slovenia** | 1,06 | 4,30 |
| **Spain** | NAP | NA |
| **Sweden** | 1,02 | 0,25 |
| **Average** | 1,09 | 0,65 |
| **Median** | 0,99 | 0,31 |
| **Minimum** | 0,24 | 0,04 |
| **Maximum** | 3,02 | 4,30 |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | 4% | 0% |

The structure and organization of public prosecution services differ considerably among states resulting in different internal classifications of cases. For that reason, analysis based on data collected for this question should consider specific national legal framework and peculiarities related to the functioning of each state prosecution system. For example, if they include or not the suspended cases or if they count by case, perpetrator or by crime. Details are provided in the comments of the question 107.

**Table 4.1.4: Public prosecution services: Evolution of the total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor between 2020 and 2024 (Q55, Q057, Q107 and Q109)**

| States | Public prosecution services: Total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor | | | | | | | | | | | | | Other persons have similar duties to those of public prosecutors in 2024 | Figures provided include traffic offence cases in 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Incoming/ received cases | | | | | Variation | | Processed cases | | | | | Variation | | |
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 | |
| **Austria** | 1 023,0 | 987,4 | 1 173,2 | 1 237,8 | 1 224,3 | 20% | -1% | 1 040,0 | 990,2 | 1 170,3 | 1 237,0 | 1 224,5 | 18% | -1% | |
| **Belgium** | 733,7 | 667,1 | 639,3 | 595,4 | 642,6 | -12% | 8% | 685,5 | 676,5 | 658,8 | 591,2 | 626,6 | -9% | 6% | |
| **Bulgaria** | 66,1 | 65,9 | 62,9 | 61,6 | 61,8 | -7% | 0% | 93,6 | 110,4 | 105,0 | 113,7 | 103,8 | 11% | -9% | |
| **Croatia** | 64,2 | 66,8 | 66,7 | 65,6 | 66,4 | 3% | 1% | 54,4 | 65,3 | 63,7 | 59,5 | 64,6 | 19% | 9% | |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| **Czech Republic** | 148,6 | 137,1 | 162,3 | 161,7 | 157,2 | 6% | -3% | 153,9 | 136,6 | 156,0 | 162,1 | 154,4 | 0% | -5% | |
| **Denmark** | NA | 254,6 | 298,1 | 280,8 | 105,2 | NA | -63% | NA | 538,4 | 588,6 | 675,0 | 177,3 | NA | -74% | |
| **Estonia** | 152,8 | 146,8 | 151,4 | 152,3 | 145,4 | -5% | -5% | 55,5 | 49,5 | 44,9 | 40,0 | 34,2 | -38% | -14% | |
| **Finland** | 234,0 | 210,5 | 192,9 | 192,4 | 180,6 | -23% | -6% | 224,4 | 209,9 | 190,9 | 195,8 | 178,8 | -20% | -9% | |
| **France** | 1 917,3 | 2 009,6 | 2 027,1 | 1 965,5 | 2 062,0 | 8% | 5% | 1 819,6 | 1 888,0 | 1 891,4 | 1 825,4 | 1 918,2 | 5% | 5% | |
| **Germany** | 804,3 | 779,7 | 804,6 | 822,0 | 784,2 | -3% | -5% | 807,6 | 774,8 | 786,5 | 812,2 | 780,3 | -3% | -4% | |
| **Greece** | NA | 609,0 | 664,9 | 699,2 | 746,4 | NA | 7% | NA | 501,9 | 715,2 | 707,3 | 819,3 | NA | 16% | |
| **Hungary** | 40,1 | 40,0 | 42,3 | 41,6 | 39,9 | -1% | -4% | 73,5 | 78,2 | 76,9 | 81,4 | 120,4 | 64% | 48% | |
| **Ireland** | 98,5 | 102,2 | 83,1 | 71,7 | 71,4 | -27% | 0% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| **Italy** | 1 103,3 | 1 149,3 | 1 192,8 | 1 240,5 | 1 254,1 | 14% | 1% | 1 096,5 | 1 117,3 | 1 154,0 | 1 189,6 | 1 151,1 | 5% | -3% | |
| **Latvia** | 27,6 | 25,7 | 23,6 | 26,3 | 29,2 | 6% | 11% | 26,6 | 24,8 | 23,0 | 23,8 | 26,4 | -1% | 11% | |
| **Lithuania** | 72,0 | 68,4 | 76,0 | 75,8 | 80,4 | 12% | 6% | 79,0 | 69,5 | 72,8 | 73,4 | 73,4 | -7% | 0% | |
| **Luxembourg** | 1 001,9 | 925,6 | 1 003,1 | 998,1 | 911,0 | -9% | -9% | 573,6 | 578,0 | 584,1 | 593,2 | 541,9 | -6% | -9% | |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| **Netherlands** | 195,7 | 191,8 | 182,8 | 174,4 | 188,6 | -4% | 8% | 189,9 | 186,6 | 182,1 | 182,1 | 196,2 | 3% | 8% | |
| **Poland** | 181,0 | 188,4 | 184,9 | 189,9 | 209,1 | 16% | 10% | 185,7 | 197,7 | 194,5 | 187,5 | 209,1 | 13% | 12% | |
| **Portugal** | 307,1 | 280,8 | 300,5 | 332,8 | 321,5 | 5% | -3% | 284,1 | NA | 282,8 | 298,4 | 301,7 | 6% | 1% | |
| **Romania** | 233,6 | 250,8 | 277,9 | 300,3 | 272,9 | 17% | -9% | 230,6 | 258,5 | 279,4 | 297,4 | 264,8 | 15% | -11% | |
| **Slovak Republic** | 62,1 | 54,4 | 55,3 | 55,7 | 48,2 | -22% | -14% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| **Slovenia** | 299,9 | 258,0 | 289,1 | 306,0 | 311,9 | 4% | 2% | 138,2 | 269,7 | 262,6 | 331,8 | 330,5 | 139% | 0% | |
| **Spain** | 723,3 | 758,2 | 775,5 | 828,2 | 832,3 | 15% | 0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | |
| **Sweden** | 476,3 | 410,2 | 362,6 | 383,7 | 328,3 | -31% | -14% | 493,2 | 421,8 | 369,2 | 385,1 | 333,3 | -32% | -13% | |
| **Average** | 433,3 | 425,5 | 443,7 | 450,4 | 443,0 | -0,9% | -3,0% | 415,3 | 435,4 | 435,4 | 447,8 | 437,8 | 9,1% | -1,7% | |
| **Median** | 233,6 | 250,8 | 277,9 | 280,8 | 209,1 | 3,5% | -0,4% | 207,2 | 258,5 | 258,5 | 271,0 | 237,0 | 4,1% | -0,7% | |
| **Minimum** | 27,6 | 25,7 | 23,6 | 26,3 | 29,2 | -31,1% | -62,5% | 26,6 | 24,8 | 24,8 | 23,0 | 26,4 | -38,3% | -73,7% | |
| **Maximum** | 1 917,3 | 2 009,6 | 2 027,1 | 1 965,5 | 2 062,0 | 19,7% | 10,9% | 1 819,6 | 1 888,0 | 1 888,0 | 1 891,4 | 1 918,2 | 139,2% | 47,9% | |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 15% | 7% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 22% | 15% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |

The structure and organization of public prosecution services differ considerably among states resulting in different internal classifications of cases. For that reason, analysis based on data collected for this question should consider specific national legal framework and peculiarities related to the functioning of each state prosecution system. For example, if they include or not the suspended cases or if they count by case, perpetrator or by crime. Details are provided in the comments of the question 107.

Legend
Yes
No

## Table 4.1.5: Public prosecution services: Evolution of the ratio of processed cases as well as pending cases with incoming cases from 2020 to 2024 (Q107)

| States | Ratio between processed and incoming cases | | | | | Variation | | Ratio between pending cases 31 Dec and incoming cases | | | | | Variation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 |
| **Austria** | 1,00 | 1,00 | 1,00 | 1,00 | 1,00 | 0% | 0% | 0,05 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | -18% | -1% |
| **Belgium** | 1,01 | 1,03 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 0,98 | -4% | -2% | 0,36 | 0,33 | 0,33 | 0,33 | 0,33 | -9% | 0% |
| **Bulgaria** | 1,68 | 1,67 | 1,84 | 1,84 | 1,68 | 0% | -9% | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 2% | -2% |
| **Croatia** | 0,98 | 0,95 | 0,91 | 0,91 | 0,97 | 0% | 7% | 1,29 | 1,32 | 1,37 | 1,37 | 1,47 | 14% | 7% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 1,00 | 0,96 | 1,00 | 1,00 | 0,98 | -1% | -2% | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,22 | 0,24 | 13% | 12% |
| **Denmark** | 2,11 | 1,97 | 2,40 | 2,40 | 1,69 | -20% | -30% | 0,27 | 0,23 | 0,14 | 0,14 | 0,65 | 144% | 363% |
| **Estonia** | 0,34 | 0,30 | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,24 | -30% | -10% | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,08 | -2% | -3% |
| **Finland** | 1,00 | 0,99 | 1,02 | 1,02 | 0,99 | -1% | -3% | 0,20 | 0,22 | 0,20 | 0,20 | 0,22 | 10% | 13% |
| **France** | 0,94 | 0,93 | 0,93 | 0,93 | 0,93 | -1% | 0% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | 0,99 | 0,98 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 1,00 | 0% | 1% | 0,15 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 0,17 | 15% | 4% |
| **Greece** | 0,82 | 1,08 | 1,01 | 1,01 | 1,10 | 33% | 9% | 0,17 | 0,59 | 0,54 | 0,54 | 0,51 | 206% | -6% |
| **Hungary** | 1,96 | 1,82 | 1,96 | 1,96 | 3,02 | 54% | 54% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 0,97 | 0,97 | 0,96 | 0,96 | 0,92 | -6% | -4% | 0,60 | 0,55 | 0,53 | 0,53 | 0,56 | -7% | 5% |
| **Latvia** | 0,97 | 0,97 | 0,91 | 0,91 | 0,91 | -6% | 0% | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | 0,05 | -4% | -6% |
| **Lithuania** | 1,02 | 0,96 | 0,97 | 0,97 | 0,91 | -10% | -6% | 0,56 | 0,55 | 0,56 | 0,56 | 0,55 | -2% | -3% |
| **Luxembourg** | 0,62 | 0,58 | 0,59 | 0,59 | 0,59 | -5% | 0% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 0,97 | 1,00 | 1,04 | 1,04 | 1,04 | 7% | 0% | 0,34 | 0,30 | 0,29 | 0,29 | 0,28 | -17% | -2% |
| **Poland** | 1,05 | 1,05 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 1,00 | -5% | 1% | 0,11 | 0,11 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 4% | -1% |
| **Portugal** | NA | 0,94 | 0,90 | 0,90 | 0,94 | NA | 5% | 0,61 | 0,61 | 0,65 | 0,65 | 0,73 | 20% | 12% |
| **Romania** | 1,03 | 1,01 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 0,97 | -6% | -2% | 1,92 | 1,85 | 1,85 | 1,85 | 1,87 | -3% | 1% |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,61 | NA | 51% |
| **Slovenia** | 1,05 | 0,91 | 1,08 | 1,08 | 1,06 | 1% | -2% | 5,58 | 4,84 | 4,63 | 4,63 | 4,30 | -23% | -7% |
| **Spain** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 1,03 | 1,02 | 1,00 | 1,00 | 1,02 | -1% | 1% | 0,23 | 0,25 | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 9% | -4% |
| **Average** | 1,07 | 1,05 | 1,08 | 1,08 | 1,09 | 0% | 0% | 0,68 | 0,65 | 0,62 | 0,62 | 0,65 | 19% | 22% |
| **Median** | 1,00 | 0,98 | 0,99 | 0,99 | 0,99 | -1% | 0% | 0,23 | 0,25 | 0,28 | 0,28 | 0,31 | 2% | 0% |
| **Minimum** | 0,34 | 0,30 | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,24 | -30% | -30% | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | -23% | -7% |
| **Maximum** | 2,11 | 1,97 | 2,40 | 2,40 | 3,02 | 54% | 54% | 5,58 | 4,84 | 4,63 | 4,63 | 4,30 | 206% | 363% |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 30% | 30% | 26% | 26% | 26% | 30% | 26% |
| **% of NAP** | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

The structure and organization of public prosecution services differ considerably among states resulting in different internal classifications of cases. For that reason, analysis based on data collected for this question should consider specific national legal framework and peculiarities related to the functioning of each state prosecution system. For example, if they include or not the suspended cases or if they count by case, perpetrator or by crime. Details are provided in the comments of the question 107.

# Evolution of the number of cases in public prosecution services

**Table 4.1.6: Public prosecution services: Evolution of the incoming/received, processed, discontinued cases, as well as cases brought to court from 2020 to 2024**
**Per 100 inhabitants (Q107)**

| States | Incoming/received cases | | | | | Variation | | Processed cases | | | | | Variation | | Discontinued cases | | | | | Variation | | Cases brought to court | | | | | Variation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 |
| **Austria** | 4,56 | 4,34 | 5,08 | 5,46 | 5,48 | 20% | 0% | 4,63 | 4,36 | 5,06 | 5,46 | 5,49 | 18% | 1% | 3,44 | 3,23 | 4,18 | 4,53 | 4,54 | 32% | 0% | 0,50 | 0,46 | 0,50 | 0,54 | 0,54 | 9% | 1% |
| **Belgium** | 5,58 | 5,30 | 4,83 | 4,86 | 5,12 | -8% | 5% | 5,21 | 5,37 | 4,97 | 4,83 | 5,00 | -4% | 3% | 2,97 | 2,95 | 4,10 | 4,02 | 4,08 | 37% | 1% | 0,41 | 0,48 | 0,31 | 0,29 | 0,29 | -29% | 0% |
| **Bulgaria** | 1,45 | 1,47 | 1,50 | 1,48 | 1,48 | 2% | 0% | 2,06 | 2,47 | 2,51 | 2,73 | 2,48 | 21% | -9% | 1,08 | 1,49 | 2,07 | 2,30 | 2,05 | 91% | -11% | 0,40 | 0,42 | 0,44 | 0,43 | 0,43 | 6% | -1% |
| **Croatia** | 0,99 | 1,06 | 1,08 | 1,07 | 1,09 | 10% | 2% | 0,84 | 1,04 | 1,03 | 0,97 | 1,06 | 27% | 10% | 0,36 | 0,44 | 0,55 | 0,50 | 0,54 | 52% | 9% | 0,46 | 0,50 | 0,48 | 0,47 | 0,52 | 14% | 10% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 1,70 | 1,61 | 1,86 | 1,85 | 1,78 | 5% | -4% | 1,76 | 1,60 | 1,79 | 1,85 | 1,75 | -1% | -6% | 0,89 | 0,91 | 0,84 | 1,29 | 1,20 | 35% | -6% | 0,53 | 0,52 | 0,53 | 0,54 | 0,52 | -1% | -4% |
| **Denmark** | 3,83 | 3,31 | 4,02 | 3,88 | 1,48 | -61% | -62% | 7,20 | 7,00 | 7,94 | 9,32 | 2,49 | -65% | -73% | 3,55 | 3,54 | 4,13 | 5,19 | 4,94 | 39% | -5% | 2,83 | 2,61 | 2,83 | 2,98 | 1,95 | -31% | -34% |
| **Estonia** | 1,94 | 1,95 | 1,93 | 2,01 | 2,06 | 6% | 3% | 0,71 | 0,66 | 0,57 | 0,53 | 0,49 | -31% | -8% | 0,29 | 0,28 | 0,26 | 0,27 | 0,23 | -22% | -14% | 0,41 | 0,38 | 0,32 | 0,26 | 0,22 | -47% | -15% |
| **Finland** | 1,65 | 1,61 | 1,53 | 1,57 | 1,51 | -8% | -4% | 1,58 | 1,60 | 1,51 | 1,59 | 1,49 | -6% | -6% | 0,47 | 0,50 | 0,59 | 0,63 | 0,58 | 25% | -7% | 1,02 | 1,02 | 0,92 | 0,97 | 0,91 | -11% | -6% |
| **France** | 6,12 | 6,37 | 6,42 | 6,88 | 6,69 | 9% | -3% | 5,81 | 5,98 | 5,99 | 6,39 | 6,22 | 7% | -3% | 4,31 | 4,41 | 4,52 | 4,94 | 4,79 | 11% | -3% | 0,79 | 0,87 | 0,86 | 0,87 | 0,86 | 9% | -2% |
| **Germany** | 5,99 | 5,92 | 6,20 | 6,58 | 6,57 | 10% | 0% | 6,02 | 5,88 | 6,06 | 6,50 | 6,54 | 9% | 1% | 3,23 | 3,16 | 3,35 | 5,23 | 5,29 | 64% | 1% | 1,16 | 1,06 | 1,06 | 1,07 | 1,05 | -9% | -2% |
| **Greece** | NA | 3,48 | 3,78 | 4,18 | 4,49 | NA | 7% | NA | 2,87 | 4,07 | 4,23 | 4,92 | NA | 16% | NA | 1,36 | 1,75 | 2,04 | 2,08 | NA | 2% | NA | 1,44 | 2,29 | 2,17 | 2,83 | NA | 30% |
| **Hungary** | 0,76 | 0,77 | 0,83 | 0,81 | 0,77 | 1% | -5% | 1,39 | 1,51 | 1,50 | 1,58 | 2,32 | 66% | 46% | 0,18 | 0,21 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,33 | 83% | 40% | 1,13 | 1,23 | 1,22 | 1,31 | 1,94 | 71% | 49% |
| **Ireland** | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,21 | -19% | -2% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,08 | 0,09 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | -27% | -8% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 4,22 | 4,35 | 4,56 | 4,56 | 4,63 | 10% | 2% | 4,20 | 4,23 | 4,41 | 4,37 | 4,25 | 1% | -3% | 2,80 | 2,84 | 3,03 | 3,65 | 3,51 | 25% | -4% | 0,73 | 0,78 | 0,77 | 0,71 | 0,74 | 1% | 5% |
| **Latvia** | 0,67 | 0,61 | 0,57 | 0,58 | 0,59 | -13% | 0% | 0,65 | 0,59 | 0,56 | 0,53 | 0,53 | -18% | 0% | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,02 | 0,02 | -77% | -9% | 0,43 | 0,32 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,33 | -24% | 36% |
| **Lithuania** | 1,66 | 1,52 | 1,60 | 1,57 | 1,63 | -2% | 4% | 1,82 | 1,54 | 1,53 | 1,52 | 1,49 | -18% | -2% | 0,88 | 0,68 | 0,69 | 0,68 | 0,63 | -29% | -8% | 0,93 | 0,86 | 0,85 | 0,84 | 0,86 | -7% | 3% |
| **Luxembourg** | 9,79 | 9,04 | 9,87 | 10,40 | 10,42 | 6% | 0% | 5,60 | 5,64 | 5,75 | 6,18 | 6,20 | 11% | 0% | 3,68 | 3,72 | 3,78 | 4,10 | 4,22 | 15% | 3% | 1,82 | 1,79 | 1,82 | 1,93 | 1,82 | 0% | -5% |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2,15 | 2,25 | 2,37 | 2,43 | 2,81 | 30% | 15% |
| **Netherlands** | 1,06 | 1,07 | 1,05 | 1,04 | 1,14 | 8% | 10% | 1,03 | 1,04 | 1,05 | 1,09 | 1,19 | 16% | 9% | 0,32 | 0,31 | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,36 | 14% | 14% | 0,43 | 0,46 | 0,45 | 0,47 | 0,48 | 10% | 1% |
| **Poland** | 2,77 | 2,92 | 2,89 | 2,96 | 3,01 | 9% | 2% | 2,84 | 3,06 | 3,05 | 2,92 | 3,01 | 6% | 3% | 1,01 | 1,07 | 2,18 | 2,22 | 2,34 | 131% | 6% | 0,72 | 0,75 | 0,73 | 0,59 | 0,57 | -20% | -3% |
| **Portugal** | 4,22 | 4,01 | 4,34 | 4,74 | 4,58 | 9% | -3% | 3,91 | NA | 4,09 | 4,25 | 4,30 | 10% | 1% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,39 | 0,44 | 0,42 | 0,43 | 0,42 | 7% | -2% |
| **Romania** | 2,98 | 3,12 | 3,23 | 3,25 | 3,26 | 9% | 0% | 2,94 | 3,22 | 3,25 | 3,22 | 3,16 | 8% | -2% | 2,31 | 2,51 | 2,55 | 2,61 | 2,58 | 12% | -1% | 0,24 | 0,27 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,27 | 13% | 6% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1,05 | 0,98 | 1,03 | 1,04 | 0,91 | -13% | -13% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,19 | 0,28 | NA | 0,18 | NA | NA | NA | 0,42 | 0,39 | 0,45 | 0,42 | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 2,93 | 2,46 | 2,83 | 2,91 | 3,09 | 5% | 6% | 1,35 | 2,57 | 2,57 | 3,16 | 3,27 | 142% | 4% | 1,84 | 2,06 | 2,08 | 2,70 | 2,75 | 50% | 2% | 0,43 | 0,40 | 0,37 | 0,39 | 0,39 | -11% | 1% |
| **Spain** | 3,89 | 4,21 | 4,32 | 4,69 | 4,77 | 23% | 2% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 4,79 | 4,45 | 4,04 | 4,07 | 4,24 | -12% | 4% | 4,96 | 4,57 | 4,12 | 4,08 | 4,30 | -13% | 5% | 1,87 | 1,76 | 2,13 | 2,10 | 2,27 | 22% | 8% | 1,93 | 1,76 | 1,59 | 1,61 | 1,67 | -13% | 4% |
| **Average** | 3,12 | 3,05 | 3,18 | 3,31 | 3,24 | 0% | -2% | 3,17 | 3,18 | 3,34 | 3,51 | 3,27 | 9% | -1% | 1,63 | 1,65 | 1,98 | 2,17 | 2,25 | 28% | 0% | 0,88 | 0,89 | 0,92 | 0,92 | 0,97 | -1% | 4% |
| **Median** | 2,85 | 2,92 | 2,89 | 2,96 | 3,01 | 6% | 0% | 2,84 | 2,87 | 3,15 | 3,19 | 3,08 | 7% | 0% | 1,05 | 1,36 | 2,08 | 2,10 | 2,17 | 25% | 0% | 0,53 | 0,64 | 0,63 | 0,57 | 0,57 | 0% | 1% |
| **Minimum** | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,21 | -61% | -62% | 0,65 | 0,59 | 0,56 | 0,53 | 0,49 | -65% | -73% | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,02 | 0,02 | -77% | -14% | 0,24 | 0,27 | 0,23 | 0,24 | 0,22 | -47% | -34% |
| **Maximum** | 9,79 | 9,04 | 9,87 | 10,40 | 10,42 | 23% | 10% | 7,20 | 7,00 | 7,94 | 9,32 | 6,54 | 142% | 46% | 4,31 | 4,41 | 4,52 | 5,23 | 5,29 | 131% | 40% | 2,83 | 2,61 | 2,83 | 2,98 | 2,83 | 71% | 49% |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 11% | 7% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 22% | 19% | 15% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 15% | 19% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

The structure and organization of public prosecution services differ considerably among states resulting in different internal classifications of cases. For that reason, analysis based on data collected for this question should consider specific national legal framework and peculiarities related to the functioning of each state prosecution system. For example, if they include or not the suspended cases or if they count by case, perpetrator or by crime. Details are provided in the comments of the question 107.

**Greece**: In 2022, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data. Consequently, comparisons with previous cycles should be made with care.

## Table 4.1.7: Public prosecution services: Evolution of the pending cases at the beginning and at the end of the reference year from 2020 to 2024
## Per 100 inhabitants (Q107)

| States | Pending cases 1 Jan. | | | | | Variation | | Pending cases 31 Dec. | | | | | Variation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 |
| **Austria** | 0,31 | 0,23 | 0,21 | 0,22 | 0,22 | -27% | 1% | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,22 | -3% | 0% |
| **Belgium** | 1,64 | 1,98 | 1,73 | 1,56 | 1,56 | -5% | 0% | 2,01 | 1,91 | 1,58 | 1,59 | 1,68 | -16% | 6% |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,06 | -5% | -1% | 0,06 | 0,06 | 0,07 | 0,06 | 0,06 | 6% | -2% |
| **Croatia** | 1,20 | 1,35 | 1,38 | 1,42 | 1,46 | 21% | 3% | 1,29 | 1,37 | 1,42 | 1,47 | 1,60 | 24% | 9% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 0,39 | 0,34 | 0,33 | 0,40 | 0,40 | 2% | -1% | 0,33 | 0,34 | 0,40 | 0,40 | 0,43 | 29% | 8% |
| **Denmark** | 1,04 | 1,04 | 0,88 | 0,92 | 0,54 | -48% | -41% | 1,04 | 0,89 | 0,92 | 0,55 | 0,97 | -8% | 77% |
| **Estonia** | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,16 | 0,16 | -10% | 0% | 0,18 | 0,16 | 0,17 | 0,16 | 0,16 | -10% | 0% |
| **Finland** | 0,25 | 0,32 | 0,32 | 0,34 | 0,32 | 26% | -5% | 0,32 | 0,32 | 0,34 | 0,31 | 0,33 | 5% | 8% |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | 0,88 | 0,85 | 0,88 | 1,01 | 1,10 | 26% | 9% | 0,86 | 0,89 | 1,02 | 1,09 | 1,14 | 33% | 4% |
| **Greece** | NA | 0,41 | 2,29 | 2,09 | 2,36 | NA | 13% | NA | 0,58 | 2,24 | 2,27 | 2,29 | NA | 1% |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 2,68 | 2,48 | 2,36 | 2,23 | 2,19 | -18% | -2% | 2,71 | 2,60 | 2,50 | 2,42 | 2,57 | -5% | 6% |
| **Latvia** | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 24% | 8% | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 57% | -6% |
| **Lithuania** | 0,91 | 0,83 | 0,86 | 0,88 | 0,90 | -1% | 2% | 0,82 | 0,85 | 0,87 | 0,88 | 0,89 | 8% | 1% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | 2,31 | 3,08 | 3,04 | 2,93 | 3,46 | 50% | 18% | 3,09 | 3,06 | 3,17 | 3,52 | 4,37 | 42% | 24% |
| **Netherlands** | 0,42 | 0,30 | 0,36 | 0,31 | 0,35 | -18% | 11% | 0,34 | 0,37 | 0,31 | 0,30 | 0,33 | -4% | 7% |
| **Poland** | 0,33 | 0,32 | 0,33 | 0,31 | 0,35 | 6% | 12% | 0,32 | 0,32 | 0,31 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 8% | 1% |
| **Portugal** | 2,11 | 2,38 | 2,41 | 2,61 | 3,07 | 45% | 17% | 2,43 | 2,45 | 2,66 | 3,10 | 3,35 | 38% | 8% |
| **Romania** | 5,97 | 6,10 | 6,00 | 5,98 | 6,02 | 1% | 1% | 6,05 | 6,00 | 5,98 | 6,01 | 6,11 | 1% | 2% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 0,38 | NA | NA | 0,41 | 0,42 | 11% | 3% | 0,37 | NA | NA | 0,42 | 0,55 | 49% | 31% |
| **Slovenia** | 13,07 | 13,35 | 13,36 | 13,62 | 13,42 | 3% | -1% | 13,34 | 13,73 | 13,67 | 13,47 | 13,28 | 0% | -1% |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 1,15 | 1,07 | 1,03 | 1,02 | 1,07 | -6% | 5% | 1,08 | 1,04 | 1,03 | 1,08 | 1,08 | -1% | 0% |
| **Average** | 1,77 | 1,83 | 1,90 | 1,84 | 1,88 | 4% | 2% | 1,84 | 1,86 | 1,95 | 1,89 | 1,99 | 13% | 9% |
| **Median** | 0,89 | 0,84 | 0,88 | 0,92 | 0,90 | 1% | 2% | 0,84 | 0,87 | 0,97 | 0,88 | 0,97 | 5% | 4% |
| **Minimum** | 0,03 | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | -48% | -41% | 0,02 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | -16% | -6% |
| **Maximum** | 13,07 | 13,35 | 13,36 | 13,62 | 13,42 | 50% | 18% | 13,34 | 13,73 | 13,67 | 13,47 | 13,28 | 57% | 77% |
| **% of NA** | 26% | 26% | 26% | 22% | 22% | 26% | 22% | 26% | 26% | 26% | 22% | 22% | 26% | 22% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

The structure and organization of public prosecution services differ considerably among states resulting in different internal classifications of cases. For that reason, analysis based on data collected for this question should consider specific national legal framework and peculiarities related to the functioning of each state prosecution system. For example, if they include or not the suspended cases or if they count by case, perpetrator or by crime. Details are provided in the comments of the question 107.

**Greece**: In 2022, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting statistical data. Consequently, comparisons with previous cycles should be made with care.

# Number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure

## Table 4.2.1 Number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure in 2024 (Q107-1)

| States | Number of cases concluded through guilty plea procedure | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 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** | 22 375 | NA | NA | 11 804 | NA | NA | 10 571 | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 1 077 | 499 | 578 | 1 077 | 499 | 578 | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 1 173 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 26 312 | NAP | NAP | 26 312 | 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** | 114 472 | NAP | NAP | 114 472 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Germany** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Greece** | 51 | 25 | 26 | 34 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 7 | 10 |
| **Hungary** | 12 218 | NA | NA | 11 381 | NA | NA | 837 | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | 1 398 | 443 | 955 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | 14 849 | NA | NA | 14 849 | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | 94 | NAP | 94 | 94 | NAP | 94 | 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 | 33 386 | NA | NA | NA | 31 354 | NA |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 1 974 | NAP | NAP | 1 974 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1 230 | NA | NA | 1 230 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 511 | 511 | NAP | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Average** | 15 210 | 370 | 413 | 19 692 | - | 229 | 2 856 | - | - |
| **Median** | 1 398 | 471 | 336 | 11 381 | - | 94 | 427 | - | - |
| **Minimum** | 51 | 25 | 26 | 34 | - | 16 | 0 | - | - |
| **Maximum** | 114 472 | 511 | 955 | 114 472 | - | 578 | 10 571 | - | - |
| **% of NA** | 22% | 41% | 41% | 30% | 48% | 44% | 37% | 41% | 41% |
| **% of NAP** | 30% | 44% | 44% | 30% | 44% | 44% | 48% | 52% | 52% |

## Table 4.2.2 Evolution of the number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure from 2020 to 2024 (Q107-1)

| States | Number of cases concluded through guilty plea procedure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | | | | Variation | | Severe criminal cases | | | | | Variation | | Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases | | | | | Variation | |
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 |
| **Austria** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 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 | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 19 155 | 21 346 | 21 326 | 21 806 | 22 375 | 17% | 3% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 504 | 521 | 612 | 607 | 1 077 | 114% | 77% | 238 | 279 | 294 | 230 | 499 | 110% | 117% | 266 | 242 | 318 | 377 | 578 | 117% | 53% |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 222 | 1 593 | 1 514 | 1 604 | 1 173 | 428% | -27% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Denmark** | 28 468 | 20 941 | 27 224 | 24 582 | 26 312 | -8% | 7% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | 78 600 | 101 706 | 107 005 | 114 774 | 114 472 | 46% | 0% | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Germany** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Greece** | NA | 3 102 | 1 441 | 152 | 51 | NA | -66% | NA | 728 | 19 | 7 | 25 | NA | 257% | NA | 2 374 | 1 422 | 145 | 26 | NA | -82% |
| **Hungary** | 9 675 | 10 978 | 11 825 | 12 658 | 12 218 | 26% | -3% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NA | 29 259 | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | 10 583 | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | 18 676 | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1 398 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 443 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 955 | NA | 95500% |
| **Lithuania** | 16 672 | 14 365 | 15 181 | 15 401 | 14 849 | -11% | -4% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Luxembourg** | 32 | 64 | 70 | 59 | 94 | 194% | 59% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 32 | 64 | 70 | 59 | 94 | 194% | 59% |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 96 189 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 2 175 | 2 171 | 1 848 | 1 820 | 1 974 | -9% | 8% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1 356 | 1 422 | 1 961 | 1 512 | 1 230 | -9% | -19% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 255 | 342 | 294 | 401 | 511 | 100% | 27% | NA | 342 | 294 | 401 | 511 | NA | 27% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | 152 254 | 204 177 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 149 904 | 201 286 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2 350 | 2 891 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Average** | 25 781 | 29 428 | 15 858 | 16 281 | 15 210 | 81% | 5% | - | 42 644 | 24 199 | 213 | 370 | - | 134% | 883 | 4 849 | 603 | 194 | 413 | - | 23883% |
| **Median** | 5 925 | 7 040 | 1 905 | 1 712 | 1 398 | 26% | 1% | - | 728 | 294 | 230 | 471 | - | 117% | 266 | 2 374 | 318 | 145 | 336 | - | 56% |
| **Minimum** | 32 | 64 | 70 | 59 | 51 | -11% | -66% | - | 279 | 19 | 7 | 25 | - | 27% | 32 | 64 | 70 | 59 | 26 | - | -82% |
| **Maximum** | 152 254 | 204 177 | 107 005 | 114 774 | 114 472 | 428% | 77% | - | 201 286 | 96 189 | 401 | 511 | - | 257% | 2 350 | 18 676 | 1 422 | 377 | 955 | - | 95500% |
| **% of NA** | 30% | 22% | 30% | 26% | 22% | 30% | 26% | 56% | 44% | 44% | 44% | 41% | 52% | 44% | 52% | 44% | 48% | 44% | 41% | 48% | 41% |
| **% of NAP** | 26% | 26% | 26% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 37% | 37% | 41% | 44% | 44% | 44% | 44% | 37% | 37% | 41% | 44% | 44% | 44% | 44% |

# Budget of the public prosecution services

## Table 4.3.1 (a) Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution services from 2014 to 2024 (Q13)

| States | Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution services | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 263 148 000 € | 297 252 000 € | 311 771 000 € |
| **Bulgaria** | 93 698 490 € | 95 590 817 € | 103 474 815 € | 111 702 235 € | 117 132 394 € | 137 635 835 € | 152 917 818 € | 168 983 884 € | 180 015 668 € | 204 259 036 € | 233 055 927 € |
| **Croatia** | 40 820 393 € | 40 018 315 € | 45 315 977 € | 46 536 649 € | 48 037 039 € | 57 035 536 € | 58 737 144 € | 55 773 565 € | 55 976 788 € | 65 256 837 € | 86 774 981 € |
| **Cyprus** | 15 798 704 € | 18 562 103 € | 21 953 972 € | 18 184 425 € | 20 478 203 € | 22 640 515 € | 21 117 635 € | 34 446 594 € | 62 341 935 € | 35 035 000 € | 30 232 435 € |
| **Czech Republic** | 85 213 339 € | 93 199 782 € | 93 217 029 € | 110 580 595 € | 115 530 744 € | 126 534 122 € | 133 683 358 € | 136 195 988 € | 138 055 286 € | 149 375 120 € | 151 969 088 € |
| **Denmark** | 97 116 986 € | 99 140 896 € | 99 406 787 € | 110 570 966 € | 93 961 349 € | 111 398 062 € | 121 432 125 € | 134 145 358 € | 122 677 280 € | 133 880 186 € | 149 565 941 € |
| **Estonia** | 10 627 825 € | 11 042 407 € | 11 533 359 € | 11 525 880 € | 12 936 652 € | 14 146 518 € | 15 159 770 € | 16 002 372 € | 18 312 029 € | 21 240 091 € | 21 812 088 € |
| **Finland** | 46 223 000 € | 43 800 000 € | 46 243 000 € | 44 000 000 € | 45 042 000 € | 48 848 000 € | 51 540 000 € | 57 320 000 € | 56 577 000 € | 59 038 000 € | 63 051 000 € |
| **France** | 780 762 888 € | 774 262 280 € | 809 515 806 € | 816 441 201 € | 848 000 592 € | 886 722 963 € | 894 309 558 € | 744 155 981 € | 925 997 116 € | 994 821 129 € | 1 086 266 356 € |
| **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** | 119 744 000 € | 126 336 480 € | 128 900 776 € | 139 697 479 € | 134 304 383 € | 131 117 610 € | 137 313 106 € | 154 484 011 € | 156 186 293 € | 160 709 546 € | 141 670 121 € |
| **Ireland** | 37 813 000 € | 37 834 000 € | 38 886 000 € | 41 094 000 € | 43 502 000 € | 43 502 000 € | 44 813 000 € | 44 704 000 € | 51 277 000 € | 59 818 000 € | 65 946 000 € |
| **Italy** | 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 € | 1 837 859 138 € | 1 710 949 709 € | 1 952 855 057 € |
| **Latvia** | 21 771 366 € | 22 491 558 € | 22 557 706 € | 24 121 346 € | 26 921 451 € | 32 256 193 € | 35 924 143 € | 39 947 984 € | 42 389 284 € | 48 705 038 € | 52 332 229 € |
| **Lithuania** | 28 563 485 € | 28 810 734 € | 34 962 778 € | 31 042 246 € | 31 620 164 € | 35 043 782 € | 37 323 466 € | 36 818 727 € | 40 542 711 € | 42 191 509 € | 52 719 649 € |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | 1 900 000 € | 2 116 000 € | 2 200 000 € | 2 500 000 € | 2 630 000 € | 2 750 000 € | 2 500 000 € | 2 250 000 € | 3 400 000 € | 3 500 000 € | 5 000 000 € |
| **Netherlands** | 568 734 000 € | 525 593 000 € | 549 596 000 € | NA | 566 176 000 € | 576 365 000 € | 535 469 000 € | 557 302 000 € | 582 473 000 € | 681 395 000 € | 763 220 000 € |
| **Poland** | 437 424 395 € | - | 480 141 000 € | 588 482 409 € | 566 825 248 € | 623 467 890 € | 631 630 571 € | 687 218 210 € | 699 380 849 € | 883 186 313 € | 1 092 823 347 € |
| **Portugal** | 88 786 150 € | 96 054 391 € | 110 412 452 € | 106 000 000 € | 109 000 000 € | 111 132 465 € | 113 728 078 € | 114 613 180 € | 115 613 038 € | 115 613 038 € | 117 301 029 € |
| **Romania** | 238 801 232 € | 228 155 155 € | 194 760 300 € | 263 489 280 € | 269 902 871 € | 293 276 421 € | 322 119 974 € | 385 786 430 € | 364 383 312 € | 400 941 181 € | 525 830 600 € |
| **Slovak Republic** | 70 099 751 € | 76 888 494 € | 83 121 003 € | 95 273 918 € | 98 894 576 € | 106 705 475 € | 113 790 569 € | 115 422 855 € | 119 509 809 € | 128 154 457 € | 143 303 490 € |
| **Slovenia** | 16 730 967 € | 18 276 528 € | 19 383 835 € | 20 309 563 € | 21 348 447 € | 22 418 592 € | 22 442 890 € | 23 933 518 € | 24 204 262 € | 26 919 284 € | 28 765 061 € |
| **Spain** | 270 480 209 € | 266 685 555 € | 272 791 497 € | 288 087 745 € | 293 102 752 € | 297 010 077 € | 305 162 654 € | 353 544 607 € | 365 266 042 € | 393 522 197 € | 398 511 459 € |
| **Sweden** | 138 456 474 € | 151 769 003 € | 156 090 472 € | 154 793 265 € | 149 975 424 € | NA | 232 518 046 € | 250 676 000 € | 248 743 236 € | 295 947 091 € | 338 309 636 € |
| **Average** | 212 269 714 € | 206 624 054 € | 214 770 253 € | 214 987 250 € | 235 080 777 € | 249 184 435 € | 253 775 074 € | 263 157 352 € | 281 492 569 € | 300 509 120 € | 339 699 413 € |
| **Median** | 86 999 745 € | 93 199 782 € | 96 311 908 € | 106 000 000 € | 103 947 288 € | 111 132 465 € | 117 611 347 € | 124 784 107 € | 122 677 280 € | 133 880 186 € | 143 303 490 € |
| **Minimum** | 1 900 000 € | 2 116 000 € | 2 200 000 € | 2 500 000 € | 2 630 000 € | 2 750 000 € | 2 500 000 € | 2 250 000 € | 3 400 000 € | 3 500 000 € | 5 000 000 € |
| **Maximum** | 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 € | 1 837 859 138 € | 1 710 949 709 € | 1 952 855 057 € |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 19% | 19% | 22% | 19% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 15% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Spain:** the figure provided represents the estimations, and it includes only the salaries of prosecutors.

## Table 4.3.1 (b) Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution services per inhabitant from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q13)

| States | Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution services per inhabitant | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 22,50 € | 25,27 € | 26,36 € |
| **Bulgaria** | 13,01 € | 13,36 € | 14,57 € | 15,84 € | 16,73 € | 19,80 € | 22,11 € | 24,71 € | 27,92 € | 31,69 € | 36,20 € |
| **Croatia** | 9,66 € | 9,55 € | 10,91 € | 11,34 € | 11,78 € | 14,05 € | 14,55 € | 14,40 € | 14,54 € | 16,94 € | 22,44 € |
| **Cyprus** | 18,41 € | 21,88 € | 25,88 € | 21,27 € | 23,38 € | 25,50 € | 23,57 € | 38,08 € | 67,71 € | 37,53 € | 31,28 € |
| **Czech Republic** | 8,10 € | 8,83 € | 8,81 € | 10,44 € | 10,85 € | 11,86 € | 12,49 € | 12,95 € | 12,72 € | 13,70 € | 13,93 € |
| **Denmark** | 17,16 € | 17,37 € | 17,29 € | 19,13 € | 16,18 € | 19,13 € | 20,79 € | 22,84 € | 20,69 € | 22,57 € | 24,96 € |
| **Estonia** | 8,09 € | 8,39 € | 8,77 € | 8,76 € | 9,81 € | 10,68 € | 11,40 € | 12,03 € | 13,78 € | 15,55 € | 15,87 € |
| **Finland** | 8,45 € | 7,98 € | 8,40 € | 7,98 € | 8,16 € | 8,84 € | 9,31 € | 10,33 € | 10,17 € | 10,52 € | 11,19 € |
| **France** | 11,77 € | 11,62 € | 12,08 € | 12,15 € | 12,66 € | 13,22 € | 13,27 € | 11,00 € | 13,61 € | 14,55 € | 15,83 € |
| **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** | 12,15 € | 12,85 € | 13,16 € | 14,14 € | 14,00 € | 13,42 € | 13,88 € | 15,94 € | 16,27 € | 16,77 € | 14,85 € |
| **Ireland** | 8,17 € | 8,11 € | 8,32 € | 8,57 € | 8,96 € | 8,84 € | 9,00 € | 8,73 € | 9,96 € | 11,19 € | 12,12 € |
| **Italy** | 24,02 € | 26,09 € | 23,11 € | 24,64 € | 25,79 € | 25,78 € | 26,99 € | 28,41 € | 31,15 € | 29,01 € | 33,14 € |
| **Latvia** | 10,88 € | 11,42 € | 11,46 € | 12,37 € | 14,02 € | 16,91 € | 18,98 € | 21,30 € | 22,51 € | 26,02 € | 28,18 € |
| **Lithuania** | 9,78 € | 9,97 € | 12,28 € | 11,05 € | 11,32 € | 12,54 € | 13,35 € | 13,12 € | 14,19 € | 14,62 € | 18,24 € |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | 4,32 € | 4,70 € | 4,78 € | 5,26 € | 5,53 € | 5,57 € | 4,86 € | 4,36 € | 6,54 € | 6,21 € | 8,71 € |
| **Netherlands** | 33,65 € | 30,96 € | 32,17 € | NA | 32,76 € | 33,11 € | 30,64 € | 31,83 € | 32,70 € | 37,98 € | 42,30 € |
| **Poland** | 11,36 € | - | 12,49 € | 15,31 € | 14,76 € | 16,23 € | 16,52 € | 18,04 € | 18,52 € | 23,47 € | 29,09 € |
| **Portugal** | 8,56 € | 9,29 € | 10,71 € | 10,30 € | 10,61 € | 10,79 € | 11,05 € | 11,07 € | 11,05 € | 10,87 € | 10,91 € |
| **Romania** | 10,72 € | 11,55 € | 9,92 € | 13,50 € | 13,91 € | 15,11 € | 16,79 € | 20,26 € | 19,13 € | 21,03 € | 27,62 € |
| **Slovak Republic** | 12,93 € | 14,17 € | 15,29 € | 17,50 € | 18,14 € | 19,55 € | 20,84 € | 21,24 € | 22,01 € | 23,62 € | 26,44 € |
| **Slovenia** | 8,12 € | 8,85 € | 9,38 € | 9,83 € | 10,26 € | 10,70 € | 10,64 € | 11,36 € | 11,43 € | 12,67 € | 13,50 € |
| **Spain** | 5,82 € | 5,74 € | 5,86 € | 6,17 € | 6,24 € | 6,26 € | 6,45 € | 7,45 € | 7,60 € | 8,10 € | 8,12 € |
| **Sweden** | 14,20 € | 15,41 € | 15,62 € | 15,30 € | 14,66 € | NA | 22,40 € | 23,98 € | 23,64 € | 28,05 € | 31,95 € |
| **Average** | 12,24 € | 12,77 € | 13,24 € | 12,90 € | 14,11 € | 15,14 € | 15,90 € | 17,43 € | 19,58 € | 19,91 € | 21,88 € |
| **Median** | 10,80 € | 11,42 € | 11,77 € | 12,15 € | 13,28 € | 13,42 € | 14,22 € | 15,17 € | 16,27 € | 16,94 € | 22,44 € |
| **Minimum** | 4,32 € | 4,70 € | 4,78 € | 5,26 € | 5,53 € | 5,57 € | 4,86 € | 4,36 € | 6,54 € | 6,21 € | 8,12 € |
| **Maximum** | 33,65 € | 30,96 € | 32,17 € | 24,64 € | 32,76 € | 33,11 € | 30,64 € | 38,08 € | 67,71 € | 37,98 € | 42,30 € |
| **% of NA** | 0,19 € | 0,19 € | 0,19 € | 0,22 € | 0,19 € | 0,22 € | 0,19 € | 0,19 € | 0,15 € | 0,15 € | 0,15 € |
| **% of NAP** | 0,00 € | 0,00 € | 0,00 € | 0,00 € | 0,00 € | 0,00 € | 0,00 € | 0,00 € | 0,00 € | 0,00 € | 0,00 € |

**Spain:** the figure provided represents the estimations, and it includes only the salaries of prosecutors.

## Table 4.3.2 (a) Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution services from 2014 to 2024 (Q13)

| States | Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution services | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 243 867 402 € | 260 579 044 € | 296 420 905 € | 277 740 804 € |
| **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 € | 178 508 426 € | 197 617 281 € | 230 482 904 € |
| **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 € | 55 677 431 € | 64 915 708 € | 86 097 767 € |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | 36 139 641 € | 31 872 434 € | 19 706 797 € | 13 807 046 € | 20 126 033 € | 33 317 620 € | 59 087 055 € | 34 476 187 € | 27 988 510 € |
| **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 € | 149 073 927 € | 161 327 249 € | 160 054 197 € |
| **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 € | 133 111 033 € | 144 436 227 € | 150 196 568 € |
| **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 € | 17 702 395 € | 21 419 855 € | 22 331 389 € |
| **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 € | 55 299 030 € | 60 454 000 € | 64 089 810 € |
| **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 € | 924 356 631 € | 985 188 635 € | 1 047 860 597 € |
| **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** | 117 130 667 € | NA | 133 882 353 € | NA | 150 355 723 € | NA | 143 320 003 € | 153 468 293 € | 156 626 566 € | 164 848 738 € | 156 650 472 € |
| **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 € | 50 047 000 € | 58 546 000 € | 65 215 000 € |
| **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 € | 1 592 960 028 € | 1 574 073 732 € | 1 792 802 007 € |
| **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 € | 36 664 603 € | 44 571 922 € | 46 667 781 € |
| **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 € | 39 818 386 € | 41 594 317 € | 51 885 531 € |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | 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 € | 3 478 907 € | 5 486 340 € | 5 443 334 € |
| **Netherlands** | 586 562 000 € | 607 219 000 € | 598 708 000 € | NA | 610 915 000 € | 636 963 000 € | 603 770 000 € | 621 331 000 € | 671 324 000 € | 750 707 000 € | 868 909 000 € |
| **Poland** | 441 872 463 € | - | 478 772 000 € | 587 923 359 € | 563 400 019 € | 623 440 944 € | 631 595 690 € | 687 121 234 € | 699 330 175 € | 881 965 489 € | 1 091 075 704 € |
| **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 € | 137 208 499 € | 145 337 269 € | 152 309 075 € |
| **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 € | 352 923 994 € | 388 962 386 € | 517 847 182 € |
| **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 € | 128 119 628 € | 140 840 265 € | 152 940 343 € |
| **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 € | 23 322 520 € | 26 103 377 € | 28 672 682 € |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 309 499 786 € | 336 445 888 € | 373 399 744 € | 409 297 675 € | 446 945 613 € |
| **Sweden** | 138 875 248 € | 147 410 202 € | 150 418 994 € | 153 528 265 € | 147 464 139 € | NA | 232 692 480 € | 248 433 000 € | 241 015 126 € | 291 319 818 € | 332 661 447 € |
| **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 € | 275 636 267 € | 299 561 321 € | 338 124 683 € |
| **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 € | 137 208 499 € | 145 337 269 € | 152 940 343 € |
| **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 € | 3 478 907 € | 5 486 340 € | 5 443 334 € |
| **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 € | 1 592 960 028 € | 1 574 073 732 € | 1 792 802 007 € |
| **% of NA** | 30% | 31% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 30% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Spain:** the figure provided is an estimation, and it includes only the salaries of prosecutors.

## Table 4.3.2 (b) Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution services per inhabitant from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q13)

| States | Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution services per inhabitant | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 21,08 € | 22,28 € | 25,20 € | 23,49 € |
| **Bulgaria** | 12,96 € | 13,28 € | 14,49 € | 15,66 € | 16,63 € | 19,62 € | 21,58 € | 24,29 € | 27,69 € | 30,66 € | 35,80 € |
| **Croatia** | 9,65 € | 9,53 € | 10,90 € | 11,33 € | 11,78 € | 14,05 € | 14,55 € | 14,39 € | 14,46 € | 16,85 € | 22,27 € |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | 42,60 € | 37,29 € | 22,50 € | 15,55 € | 22,46 € | 36,83 € | 64,18 € | 36,93 € | 28,96 € |
| **Czech Republic** | 8,10 € | 10,15 € | 10,13 € | 10,43 € | 10,90 € | 12,20 € | 12,32 € | 13,35 € | 13,74 € | 14,80 € | 14,67 € |
| **Denmark** | 20,47 € | 17,83 € | 19,21 € | 18,72 € | 19,36 € | 20,73 € | 22,82 € | 24,30 € | 22,45 € | 24,35 € | 25,06 € |
| **Estonia** | 7,44 € | 8,18 € | 8,61 € | 8,62 € | 9,81 € | 10,56 € | 11,50 € | 11,86 € | 13,33 € | 15,68 € | 16,24 € |
| **Finland** | 8,45 € | 7,69 € | 8,40 € | 8,13 € | 8,16 € | 8,84 € | 9,07 € | 9,33 € | 9,94 € | 10,77 € | 11,37 € |
| **France** | 11,96 € | 11,69 € | 12,05 € | 12,08 € | 12,44 € | 13,06 € | 13,12 € | 10,89 € | 13,58 € | 14,41 € | 15,27 € |
| **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** | 11,88 € | NA | 13,66 € | NA | 15,68 € | NA | 14,49 € | 15,84 € | 16,32 € | 17,20 € | 16,42 € |
| **Ireland** | 8,14 € | 8,07 € | 8,26 € | 8,37 € | 8,77 € | 8,65 € | 8,89 € | 8,68 € | 9,72 € | 10,96 € | 11,99 € |
| **Italy** | 23,50 € | 25,54 € | 22,56 € | 23,37 € | 24,67 € | 23,12 € | 22,88 € | 25,04 € | 27,00 € | 26,69 € | 30,42 € |
| **Latvia** | 10,69 € | 11,42 € | 11,44 € | 12,33 € | 13,99 € | 16,62 € | 18,15 € | 19,85 € | 19,47 € | 23,81 € | 25,13 € |
| **Lithuania** | 9,80 € | 9,97 € | 12,27 € | 11,03 € | 11,31 € | 12,52 € | 13,28 € | 12,99 € | 13,94 € | 14,41 € | 17,95 € |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NA | 5,22 € | 5,08 € | 5,22 € | 5,58 € | 5,85 € | 5,34 € | 5,82 € | 6,69 € | 9,74 € | 9,48 € |
| **Netherlands** | 34,70 € | 35,76 € | 35,05 € | NA | 35,35 € | 36,59 € | 34,55 € | 35,49 € | 37,69 € | 41,84 € | 48,15 € |
| **Poland** | 11,48 € | - | 12,46 € | 15,30 € | 14,67 € | 16,23 € | 16,51 € | 18,04 € | 18,52 € | 23,43 € | 29,05 € |
| **Portugal** | 11,03 € | 11,79 € | 12,26 € | 12,43 € | 12,75 € | 12,81 € | 13,86 € | 13,07 € | 13,11 € | 13,66 € | 14,17 € |
| **Romania** | 10,62 € | 11,42 € | 9,79 € | 13,30 € | 13,80 € | 14,95 € | 16,24 € | 19,38 € | 18,52 € | 20,40 € | 27,20 € |
| **Slovak Republic** | 15,42 € | 15,46 € | 17,52 € | 17,94 € | 18,58 € | 21,20 € | 21,01 € | 21,83 € | 23,60 € | 25,96 € | 28,22 € |
| **Slovenia** | 8,37 € | 8,79 € | 9,37 € | 9,79 € | 10,23 € | 10,66 € | 10,42 € | 11,04 € | 11,02 € | 12,29 € | 13,46 € |
| **Spain** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 6,54 € | 7,09 € | 7,77 € | 8,42 € | 9,11 € |
| **Sweden** | 14,25 € | 14,96 € | 15,05 € | 15,17 € | 14,41 € | NA | 22,42 € | 23,77 € | 22,91 € | 27,61 € | 31,42 € |
| **Average** | 13,10 € | 13,15 € | 14,82 € | 14,03 € | 14,83 € | 15,46 € | 16,00 € | 17,58 € | 19,47 € | 20,26 € | 21,97 € |
| **Median** | 11,03 € | 11,42 € | 12,26 € | 12,33 € | 13,80 € | 14,05 € | 14,52 € | 15,84 € | 16,32 € | 17,20 € | 22,27 € |
| **Minimum** | 7,44 € | 5,22 € | 5,08 € | 5,22 € | 5,58 € | 5,85 € | 5,34 € | 5,82 € | 6,69 € | 8,42 € | 9,11 € |
| **Maximum** | 34,70 € | 35,76 € | 42,60 € | 37,29 € | 35,35 € | 36,59 € | 34,55 € | 36,83 € | 64,18 € | 41,84 € | 48,15 € |
| **% of NA** | 30% | 31% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 30% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Spain:** the figure provided is an estimation, and it includes only the salaries of prosecutors.

# Indicator 4: Public prosecution services - Case flow

## Comments provided by the national correspondents

## organised by country

*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 013. Annual (approved and implemented) public budget allocated to the public prosecution services, in €.*

**Austria**

**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).
Following a change in Question 107, starting from 2022, cases previously reported as "closed for other reasons" are included in "discontinued for other reasons".

**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).
**Q013 (General Comment):** In Austria the budget for courts cannot be separated from the budget of the prosecution services. With regard to the sub-category “annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services” an answer is not possible because the costs for trainings for judges, public prosecutors, judicial officers (“Rechtspfleger”) and other staff working within courts or public prosecution services are summarized in one figure.

**Q013 (2024):** In Austria the budget for courts cannot be separated from the budget of the prosecution services. With regard to the sub-category “annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services” an answer is not possible because the costs for trainings for judges, public prosecutors, judicial officers (“Rechtspfleger”) and other staff working within courts or public prosecution services are summarized in one figure.

**Belgium**

**Q107 (General Comment):** Data concerning the investigation and prosecution of criminal cases by the prosecutors' offices at the courts of first instance (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9 and 11.
The data concern only criminal offences committed by persons of legal age. For “juvenile cases”, only data for incoming cases are available (no data available for resolved cases). Statistics on juvenile courts are currently being developed. Cases where the perpetrator is unknown are also included. The unit of account is a criminal case: a case may involve none, one or more defendants and/or one or more offences. Since the reform of the judicial landscape entered into force on 1 April 2014, Belgium has 15 first instance public prosecutors' offices (14 public prosecutors' offices + the Federal prosecutor's office). Data of the Federal prosecutor's office (FPO) are not included in the figures. The FPO prosecutes a limited list of offences set out in articles 144ter et seq of the Judicial Code. This list includes the following offences: crimes and offences against State security; threats of attack or theft of nuclear material; trafficking and organised trafficking in human beings; illegal arms trafficking; criminal conspiracy and criminal organisation; terrorism; offences related to these offences; offences which, to a large extent, concern several jurisdictions or which have an international dimension, in particular those of organised crime. Given the specific matters dealt with by the FPO and the low figures, the FPO data are not included in the figures provided. The FP0 data can be consulted separately on the Public Prosecutor's website: https://www.om-mp.be/stat/corr/jstat2022/n/home.html .
Prior to 2022, “cases discontinued for other reasons” referred only to cases in which it was possible to determine from the database that they had been discontinued but the reason was not entered or was not correctly recorded. When the reason is correctly recorded, the case is then classified under headings 3.1.1, 3.1.2 or 3.1.3. As a result, the heading “discontinued for other reasons” concerned “unknown reasons” and not “special’ reasons”. Since 2022, following the deletion of a sub-category in Q107, cases previously reported in line 3.3. “Cases closed by the prosecutor for other reasons” are added to cases in line “3.1.4. Discontinued for other reasons”.

**Q107 (2024):** Source: Annual statistics from the Public Prosecutor's Office – Investigation and prosecution of criminal cases by prosecution offices attached to first instance courts (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9, and 11.
Useful information for interpreting the data: of the 74 526 cases in section “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor” (see table 9), 23 827 cases were closed following probation, 25 370 cases were closed following a chain settlement: administrative processing, 6 318 cases were closed following another chain settlement, 16 746 cases were closed following payment of a sum of money, 2 265 cases were closed following successful mediation and measures.
The 124 792 cases in section 3.1.4 “Discontinued for other reasons” include: 6 611 cases in which the suspect is the subject of a report. Once the suspect has been identified, the case may be reopened; 43 397 cases that were referred to another authority for disposition. A case referred for disposition is considered as a closed case for the public prosecutor's office that made this decision. The recipient of this case will open a new case and start the judicial investigation; 74 242 cases joined to another case. When one or more cases are joined to a parent case, all subsequent decisions are recorded at the parent case level. The “daughter case” receives the joinder decision; 542 cases closed following processing without criminal prosecution for unknown reasons/error.

**Q107 (2023):** “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor”: of the 60 912 cases, 20 658 cases were terminated following probation; 22 410 cases were closed following a chain settlement - administrative processing; 3 836 cases were closed following another chain settlement; 11 766 cases were closed following payment of a sum of money; 2 242 cases were closed following a successful mediation procedure and measures.
“3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons”: out of 126 624 cases, 6 372 cases in which the suspect is the subject of an alert. Once the suspect has been discovered, the case can be reopened; 43 955 cases that have been referred for disposal to another authority. A case that has been sent for disposal is a closed case for the public prosecutor who took the decision. The authority that receives this case will open a new case and start the judicial investigation; 76 235 cases were joined to another case. If one or more cases are joined to a “mother-case”, all subsequent decisions are recorded in the “mother -case”. The daughter case receives the decision of joining; 62 cases were closed without prosecution for unknown/erroneous reasons.
“3.3 Cases brought to court”: in order to count these cases (34 166 cases), all cases closed by direct summons (18 825 cases) and all cases placed under judicial investigation (15 341 cases) are taken into account. In fact, all these cases are also considered as cases closed by the public prosecutor's office in the annual statistics of the Public Prosecutor's Office (see table 9).
See: Annual statistics of the public prosecution offices - Investigation and prosecution of criminal cases by the criminal prosecution departments of the first instance courts (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9 and 11.

**Q107 (2022):** Annual statistics of the Public Prosecutor's Office - Investigation and prosecution of criminal cases by the criminal prosecutors' offices at the courts of first instance (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9 and 11.

More precisely, in respect of cases "3.2. Concluded with a sanction", out of the 65 486 cases, 20 799 cases were closed following praetorian probation, 24 881 cases were closed following an administrative settlement chain process, 2 130 cases were closed following another settlement chain process, 15 025 cases were closed following a payment of money, 2 651 cases were closed due to successful mediation procedure.

Out of the 126 753 cases "discontinued for other reasons" there were: 6 697 cases where the suspect is the subject of an alert (once a suspect is identified, the case may be reopened); 45 327 cases referred to another instance (such cases are closed for the prosecutor making this decision, while they are incoming cases for the recipient); 74 526 cases that were joined with others; 203 cases settled following processing without criminal prosecutions for unknown reasons/error.

As concerns the 36 068 cases brought to court, were taken into account all cases closed by direct citation (21 679) and all cases that take place under judicial instruction(14 389).

The decreases observed in respect of cases "concluded by a penalty" and "brought to court", have been explained by the decrease in the number of Covid-19 files following the relaxation of Corona measures. Such cases were solved mainly through payment or direct summons.

**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 pe-
nalty"). In the case of non-payment of the settlement, repeat offenses, or serious violations of these measures, the criminal policy was to bring the case to court, given the importance of compliance with these measures. About half of the increase in court cases is due to the new methodology. The other half is explained by citations in health crisis cases, as explained above.

**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 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". There are no national statistics available due to the lack of uniform coding rules.

**Q109 (General Comment):** The data do not include traffic offences, cases handled by the labor auditorates, or appeals against police decisions handled by the prosecutor's offices attached to teh first instance criminal courts.

**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.

**Q013 (General Comment):** Training budget for the public prosecutor's offices: the vast majority of training courses are open to both, judges and public prosecutors, as well as to non-judge and non-prosecutor staff. It is therefore very difficult to distinguish the training budget for the public prosecutor's offices. Only the total training budget (for judges and public prosecutors) is available.

**Q013 (2023):** 2023 Budget for training: total planned expenditure for courts and public prosecution services: EUR 2,573,900.00; total implemented budget for courts and public prosecution services: EUR 2,315,435.95'.

**Q013 (2021):** Approved budget (total €721 493 690): this budget represents the total budget allocated to the Court of Cassation, all ordinary courts except administrative courts, and the public prosecution services. It is not possible to isolate the approved budget of the Public Prosecutor's Office from the aforementioned total amount. Implemented budget (total €243 867 402): this total includes the operating costs of the public prosecution services (including staff costs, equipment) but excludes the budget for training.

**Bulgaria**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The following clarification is made on the specific indicators in the table:
“1. 1.Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year” – This refers to pre-trial proceedings pending with the prosecutor on 1 January of the reference year, where the investigation has been completed by an investigating body and sent to the prosecutor. PTP not closed by an investigating authority are not included under this indicator.
“2. Incoming/received cases” – Report the pre-trial proceedings for which an investigation by an investigative body was completed during the reference year and sent to the prosecutor for adjudication. The Prosecutor's Office reports as closed PTP cases with an investigation completed by an investigative body, not cases adjudicated by a prosecutor.
“3. Processed cases” – For this indicator, the number indicated for PTP represents the number of PTPs disposed by a prosecutor. This number is formed as the sum of the number of cases decided by the PTP prosecutor (either by an act of referral to court or by an act of discontinuance of pre-trial proceedings) and the number of pre-trial proceedings decided by the prosecutor by an act of suspension or referral to another prosecutor's office. Cases suspended and sent to the prosecutor's office are counted as decided by the prosecutor's office, but provisionally, not on the merits. The prosecutor's act of suspending PTP does not constitute a decision on the merits, as it does not put an end to the criminal proceedings and the work on them is only suspended temporarily, i.e. they are not investigated by the investigating authority.
With regard to the PTPs discontinued by the Prosecutor referred to under indicator “3.1. Discontinued during the reference year” the figure is formed by the sum of the data submitted under indicator “3.1.2. Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation”, including pre-trial proceedings terminated because the act was not committed or did not constitute a crime, as well as PTPs terminated due to statute of limitations; and the data submitted under indicator "3.1.4. Discontinued for other reasons”, reporting on PTPs discontinued/suspended and PTPs sent to the jurisdiction/sent by competence during the reporting period. The data on cases discontinued due to perpetrator of the crime not being identified are reported in indicator 3.1.4. This indicator (3.1.4.) reflects the total number of discontinued/suspended cases, without distinguishing between those discontinued due to failure to identify the perpetrator and those discontinued against a known perpetrator on other grounds. It should be borne in mind that PTPs suspended by limitation and PTPs sent to the competent prosecutor's office (by the sending prosecutor's office) are counted as PTPs resolved, so their number is included under the indicator 'Processed cases (3.1+3.2+3.3)', but not under the indicator 'Incoming/received cases '.
Indicators “3.1.1. Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified”, “3.1.3. Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity” and 3.2. “Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor” are not applicable to prosecutors' rulings according to the CCP, and therefore no data are presented.
“3.3. Cases brought to court” – This indicator takes into account the number of pre-trial proceedings brought to court with a prosecutor's report during the reference year.
In the official statistical reporting of the PRB, a criminal case is reported as brought to cour

t if at least one prosecutorial act has been submitted to the court – an indictment; a proposal for an agreement under Article 381 of the Penal Procedure Code; a proposal for exemption from criminal liability and imposition of an administrative penalty under Article 78a of the Criminal Code, and a proposal for an agreement under Article 375a(1) of the Penal Procedure Code. However, more than one prosecutorial act may be submitted to the court in relation to a single pre-trial proceeding (e.g. an agreement in relation to one person and an indictment in relation to the other defendants). The prosecutorial acts submitted give rise to court cases in which prosecutors participate in court hearings, including when a proposal has been submitted to settle the case by agreement. A case is also opened in court, in which the prosecutor, the defendant and his defence counsel appear, and the court issues a judicial act. It should be noted that the official statistics of the PRB do not explicitly collect data on the number of pre-trial proceedings in which an indictment has been filed (the acts are counted, not the cases). Since there can only be one indictment per pre-trial proceeding, we have assumed that the number of pre-trial proceedings with an indictment is equal to the number of indictments. However, the official statistics of the PRB do not explicitly collect data on the number of pre-trial proceedings brought before the court with proposals for agreements under Article 381 of the Penal Procedure Code, proposals for exemption from criminal liability and imposition of administrative penalties under Article 78a of the Criminal Code, and proposals for agreements under Article 375a(1) of the Penal Procedure Code. In order to obtain this data, the number of pre-trial proceedings in which an indictment has been filed is subtracted from the total number of pre-trial proceedings brought before the court. Cases resolved by agreement or proposal under Article 78a of the Criminal Code can be indicated as a total number, without being able to distinguish them by type of prosecutorial act. “4. Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year” – This refers to PTPs remaining with the prosecutor for resolution as of 31 December of the reference year, where the investigation has been concluded by an investigating authority and sent to the prosecutor. The indicator does not include PTPs pending prosecution by an investigating authority as of 31 December.
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 “discontinued 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 (2024):** The official statistics of the PORB also report and aggregate data on other indicators of pre-trial work that cannot be identified or do not match the indicators in the Questionnaire, therefore the following clarification is made:
According to the reporting system introduced in the PORB, pretrial proceedings are reported as: Monitored, Closed (with investigation completed by investigating authority) and Resolved (by a prosecutor).
Supervised pre-trial proceedings include: the newly initiated PTPs during the reporting period, in this case 2024 (89 145 PTPs), the PTPs pending by an investigating authority at the end of the previous reporting period (57 495 PTPs), the PTPs pending by a prosecutor at the end of the previous reporting period (4 163 PTPs), the PTPs received under the jurisdiction during the reporting period, the PTPs returned by the court as well as by a prosecutor (incl. PTPs decided in previous periods but returned during the reporting period), PTPs reopened during the reporting period, PTPs merged (joined) and PTPs split.
For statistical reporting purposes in the PORB (and not pursuant to the CCP), a pretrial proceeding is reported as resolved when any of the following prosecutor's decisions are made: a decree to send the PTP to the competent jurisdiction, a decree to suspend the PTP, a decree of discontinuance, a prosecutor's act to bring the case to court – indictment, a proposal for a settlement under Article 381 CCP, a proposal under Article 375 CCP, in conjunction with Article 78a CCP, for exemption from criminal responsibility with the imposition of an administrative penalty, and a proposal for a settlement under Article 375a(1) CCP.
The statistical analysis distinguishes between the total number of cases decided in which one of the above-mentioned prosecutor's acts was handed down and the cases decided on the merits. Cases decided on the merits are only those decided by a decision to discontinue the criminal proceedings or by a prosecutor's act to bring the case to court, which concludes the pre-trial phase. PTPs decided by a decision to suspend and refer are not included as they do not end the pre-trial phase/criminal proceedings. PTPs sent to the jurisdiction are reported by the sending prosecutor's office as monitored PTPs and resolved PTPs, but are not reported as PTPs closed by the investigating authority. PTPs discontinued due to the expiry of the statutory limitation period (under Article 24(1)(3) CCP) shall be counted as PTPs observed and decided, but shall not be counted in the number of PTPs discontinued as they were already counted as such when they were discontinued. Suspended PTPs in previous periods are not counted in the total number of PTPs observed during the reference period, except in cases where the suspended PTP is resumed, where it is included in the number of PTPs observed and according to its current status at the end of the period.

**Q107 (2023):** The data in the table, are derived from the official statistical reporting of the PTB for 2023, according to the indicators and order defined by the Guideline on the organization of information activities in the PTB, approved by order of the Attorney General, as follows point by point:
1) in the indicator "Pending cases as of January 1 of the reference year", the pending pre-trial proceedings (PTP) by a prosecutor as of January 1 of 2023 are reported
2) the indicator "Incoming/received cases" reports the closed PTPs by an investigating authority.
3) the "Processed cases" indicator reports PTPs processed of by a prosecutor and is the sum of data from the three indicators (3.1+3.2+3.3), with PTP disposition types reflected. This number is formed as the sum of the number of PTP decided by a prosecutor on the merits (by an act to bring the case to court or by an act to terminate the pre-trial proceedings), and the number of pre-trial proceedings that the prosecutor decided by an act to suspend them or to send them to another prosecutor's office.
3.1) The indicator "Discontinued during the reference year" takes into account the discontinued PTP, including those due to prescription, the suspended PTP and the PTP sent to the jurisdiction and is the sum of the data from the following four indicators.
(3.1.1 + 3.1.2 + 3.1.3 + 3.1.4), reflecting the types of terminations:
3.1.1) in indicator "Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified", no data is shown as it is not applicable.
3.1.2) in indicator "Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation", PTP terminations are reported, including those due to statute of limitations.
3.1.3) in the indicator "Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity" – no data is provided as it is not applicable.
3.1.4) in indicator "Discontinued for other reasons" – PTPs terminated are reported, as well as PTPs sent to another prosecutor's office for jurisdiction. These cases are considered closed/resolved for the respective prosecutor's office, albeit without a final decision on the merits.
3.2) in indicator "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor" – not applicable. No data is provided.
3.3) in indicator "Cases brought to court", PTP filed in court are reported.
4) In the indicator "Cases pending on December 31 of the reference year", the PTP pending by the prosecutor as of December 31, 2023 are reported.
The official statistics of the PORB also report and aggregate data on other indicators of pre-trial work that cannot be identified or do not match the indicators in the Questionnaire, therefore the following clarification is made:
According to the reporting system introduced in the PRB, pretrial proceedings (PTP) are reported as: Monitored, Closed (with investigation completed by investigating authority) and Resolved (by a prosecutor).
Supervised pre-trial proceedings include: the newly initiated PTPs during the reporting period, in this case 2023 (89 580 PTPs), the PTPs pending by an investigating authority at the end of the previous reporting period (57 495 PTPs), the PTPs pending by a prosecutor at the end of the previous reporting period (4 208 PTPs), the PTPs received under the jurisdiction
ical reporting purposes in the PTP (and not pursuant to the CCP), a pretrial proceeding is reported as resolved when any of the following prosecutor's decisions are made: a decree to send the PTP to the competent jurisdiction, a decree to suspend the PTP, a decree of discontinuance, a prosecutor's act to bring the case to court – indictment, a proposal for a settlement under Article 381 CCP, a proposal under Article 375 CCP, in conjunction with Article 78a CCP, for exemption from criminal responsibility with the imposition of an administrative penalty, and a proposal for a settlement under Article 375a(1) CCP.
The statistical analysis distinguishes between the total number of cases decided in which one of the above-mentioned prosecutor's acts was handed down and the cases decided on the merits. Cases decided on the merits are only those decided by a decision to discontinue the criminal proceedings or by a prosecutor's act to bring the case to court, which concludes the pre-trial phase. PTPs decided by a decision to suspend and refer are not included as they do not end the pre-trial phase/criminal proceedings. PTPs sent to the jurisdiction are reported by the sending prosecutor's office as monitored PTPs and resolved PTPs, but are not reported as PTPs closed by the investigating authority. PTPs discontinued due to the expiry of the statutory limitation period (under Article 24(1)(3) CCP) shall be counted as PTPs observed and decided, but shall not be counted in the number of PTPs discontinued as they were already counted as such when they were discontinued. Suspended PTPs in previous periods are not counted in the total number of PTPs observed during the reference period, except in cases where the suspended PTP is resumed, where it is included in the number of PTPs observed and according to its current status at the end of the period.

**Q107 (2022):** “1. Pending cases on 1 January of the reference year” – pre-trial proceedings (PTP) pending with the prosecutor as of 1 January of the reference year (4 205) for which the investigation has been completed by an investigative body and sent to the prosecutor (PTPs closed by an investigating authority (47 969) are not included). “2. Received/Incoming cases” – PTP in which an investigation by an investigative body was completed during the reference year and sent to the prosecutor for adjudication. In the Prosecutor's Office the term closed PTP refers to cases with a completed investigation by an investigative body, not cases resolved by a prosecutor “3. Processed cases” – the figure of 161,905 PTP is the sum of the number of PTP decided on merits by the prosecutor (by act of bringing the cases to court or by act of termination the pre-trial proceedings), and the number of pre-trial proceedings decided by the prosecutor by act of suspending them or sending by competence during the reporting period to another prosecutor's office. Cases suspended and sent by competence are reported as resolved by the prosecution, but temporarily, not on the merits. The prosecutor's act of suspension of PTP does not constitute a decision on the merits, as it does not put an end to the criminal proceedings and the work on them is only temporarily suspended, i.e. they are not investigated by the investigating authority. "3.1. The number of PTPs discontinued during the reference year" is 133 466, the figure being formed by the sum of the data submitted under indicator "3.1.2. Terminated by the prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation" (98 306), including pre-trial proceedings terminated because the act was not committed or did not constitute an offence, pursuant to Art. 243(1), in conjunction with Art. 1(1) of the CPC, (31 302) and PTPs terminated due to the statute of limitations (67 004), and the data submitted under indicator "3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons" (35 160), taking into account the suspended PTPs and the pre-trial proceedings sent by competence during the reporting period Indicators "3.1.1 Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified", "3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity" and 3.2. "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor" are not applicable to the decisions of prosecutors according to the CCP, as indicated in the Questionnaire. “3.3. Cases brought to court" – PTP brought to court with a prosecutor's report in the reference year – 28 439. “4. Pending cases on 31 December" – PTP pending with the prosecutor on 31 December of the reference year (4 208), where the investigation has been completed by an investigating authority and sent to the prosecutor. The indicator does not include PTPs pending with an investigating authority, which total 52 423 as of 31 December 2022.

**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.

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** The indicator "Before the main trial" takes into account the agreements submitted to the court by the prosecutor on the basis of Article 381 CCP and on the basis of Article 375a(1) CCP (the latter was introduced by the Law on the Internal Revenue Code, promulgated, SG No. 48 of 2023), while the indicator "During the main trial" gives a value, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Article 384 CCP (with a person or for any of the offences) concluded by the prosecutors in the trial phase (after an indictment has been filed), by the number of proceedings under the summary trial procedure under Article 371, item 2 CCP (under Chapter Twenty-Eight CCP, under Article 373(3), in conjunction with Article 372(4), in conjunction with Article 371(2) CCP), in which convictions have been handed down (similar to the previous questionnaires), and by the number of agreements under Article 375a(3) CCP, in conjunction with Article 78a CCP, concluded by prosecutors in the judicial phase (after an indictment has been filed or after the submission of orders for exemption from criminal liability with the imposition of an administrative penalty).
Thus, of the 10 571 plea procedures during the trial, 8 049 were agreements concluded under Article 384 CCP, 906 were agreements concluded under Article 375a(3) CCP, and 1 616 were summary proceedings under Article 373(3) in conjunction with Article 372(4) in conjunction with Article 371(2) CCP.
In the indicator "Total number of guilty plea procedures" the aggregate of the above two indicators is indicated.

**Q107-1 (2023):** The indicator "Before the main trial" takes into account the agreements submitted to the court by the prosecutor on the basis of Article 381 CCP and on the basis of Article 375a(1) CCP (the latter was introduced by the Law on the Internal Revenue Code, promulgated, SG No. 48 of 2023), while the indicator "During the main trial" gives a value, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Article 384 CCP (with a person or for any of the offences) concluded by the prosecutors in the trial phase (after an indictment has been filed), by the number of proceedings under the summary trial procedure under Article 371, item 2 CCP (under Chapter Twenty-Eight CCP, under Article 373(3), in conjunction with Article 372(4), in conjunction with Article 371(2) CCP), in which convictions have been handed down (similar to the previous questionnaires), and by the number of agreements under Article 375a(3) CCP, in conjunction with Article 78a CCP, concluded by prosecutors in the judicial phase (after the submission of orders for exemption from criminal liability with the imposition of an administrative penalty).
Thus, of the 10 691 plea procedures during the trial, 8 589 were agreements concluded under Article 384 CCP, 472 were agreements concluded under Article 375a(3) CCP, and 1 630 were summary proceedings under Article 373(3) in conjunction with Article 372(4) in conjunction with Article 371(2) CCP.
In the indicator "Total number of guilty plea proceedings" the aggregate of the above two indicators is indicated.

**Q107-1 (2022):** - in the "Total number of guilty plea procedures" indicator, the total value of the following two indicators is indicated;
- in the indicator "Before the main trial" the agreements submitted to the court by the prosecutor on the basis of Art. 381 et seq. of the Criminal Procedure Code.
- in the indicator "During the main trial" a value is indicated, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Art. 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code (with a person or for any of the crimes), concluded by the prosecutors in a court phase (after the indictment has been filed), as well as the number of procedures under reduced court investigation under Art. 371, item 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code (under Chapter Twenty-Seven of the Criminal Procedure Code, pursuant to Art. 373, paragraph 3, article 372, paragraph 4, article 371, item 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code), under which convictions and acquittals have been handed down (analogous to the previous questionnaires). Out of 10 541 procedures for admission of guilt during the trial, 9 113 were the agreements concluded under Art. 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

**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).

**Q109 (2024):** The figures in the table in question 107 include criminal cases for traffic offences which constitute a public crime under the Bulgarian Criminal Code.
**Q109 (2022):** Only the cases for violations that constitute a crime of a general nature under the Bulgarian Criminal Code are included.
**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.

**Q013 (General Comment):** The Prosecutor's Office prepares a consolidated budget for all units, namely district, regional, military-regional, appellate, military-appellate prosecutor's offices, the administration of the European delegated prosecutors, training and rest bases and submits it to the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC). Pursuant to Article 361 of the Judicial System Act, the budget of the PRB includes all revenues from the activity, maintenance costs, relations with the central budget and other budgets.
The budget procedure is carried out in two stages. First stage - preparation of a medium-term forecast for a period of three years. Second stage - preparation of a draft budget for the relevant year and updated budget forecasts for the next two years. The Minister of Justice proposes a draft budget for the judiciary and submits it for discussion in the Plenum of the SJC. The draft budget of the judiciary is accompanied by estimates for the next two years. The Council of Ministers submits to the National Assembly the draft law on the state budget of the Republic of Bulgaria for the relevant year together with the draft annual budget of the judiciary, proposed by the plenary session of the SJC, with a detailed justification. When adopting the state budget, the National Assembly listens to a report of the plenary session of the SJC, presented by its representative. The National Assembly adopts the budget of the judicial power, allocated to the SJC, the Inspectorate of the SJC, the bodies of the judicial power, including PRB and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ).
The Plenum of the SJC organizes the execution of the budget of the judiciary through the Inspectorate of the SJC, the Supreme Court of Cassation, the Supreme Administrative Court, the courts, the Prosecutor General and the National Institute of Justice. The PRB is a second-level budget manager and all units of the PRB system are third-level budget managers. For third-level managers, the budget manager is the relevant manager.
1. Preparation and presentation of a draft budget for the current budget year. The Law on the State Budget of the Republic of Bulgaria adopts the budget of the judiciary, including the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria. By decree of the Council of Ministers, the main parameters and Guidelines for the implementation of the budget are given.
2. Budget adjustments. Currently, during the calendar year, the Prosecutor General submits proposals for updating to the Budget and Finance Committee of the SJC

**Q013 (2024):** The specific indicators in the table are explained as follows:
For the total annual public budget allocated to the prosecution service, the column ‘Approved budget’ shows the budget of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria as finally approved by the SJC on 31 December 2024, which is updated and amended during the budget year by decisions of the Plenary Session of the SJC.
For the total annual public budget allocated to the prosecution service, the column ‘Executed budget’ shows the amount corresponding to the actual reported expenditure at cash level as at 31 December 2024.
In section 13.1 Annual public budget allocated for training of the prosecution services, the column ‘Approved budget’ shows the approved budget for all structural units of the Prosecutor's Office for training in 2024. In section 13.1 Annual public budget allocated for training of the prosecution services, in the column ‘Executed budget’, the amount corresponding to the actual reported, actual expenses for training at cash level as at 31 December 2024 is indicated. The difference between the approved/planned and implemented/spent funds for training in 2024 is due to savings achieved at the level of actual expenditure at lower rates than that forecast. The amounts indicated are in EUR.

**Q013 (2023):** Q 13 – There are objective reasons for the high growth in the approved (and respectively implemented) training budget in 2023 compared to 2022. On the one hand, there was higher activity of magistrates in organizing and participating in external trainings (organized by other institutions, forums, etc. with participation fees) after the lifting of the COVID 19 quarantine.
On the other hand the in-person trainings in the learning facilities and training centers of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria were minimized or not conducted during the coronavirus period according to the internal training calendar. In addition, by Decision under Protocol No. 8/10.03.2022, p. 3 of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council a positive opinion was expressed that the Prosecutors' Training Base - Recreational Facility "Izgrev" in the town of Byala, assigned to be managed by the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Bulgaria, should be provided for temporary use by evacuating representatives of the judiciary in the Republic of Ukraine and their family members and/or Bulgarian citizens and Bulgarians with Ukrainian citizenship living in Ukraine, including in the event of evacuation. In 2022, due to the accommodation of refugees from Ukraine, the base in Byala could not be used for conducting trainings/seminars, which is also the reason for the higher increase in funds for training magistrates planned for 2023 after the base is emptied of refugees.

**Q013 (2022):** Supreme Judicial Council: The implemented budget differs from the approved due to unspent funds for major repairs, acquisition of long-lasting tangible and intangible assets, as well as current repairs due to unfinished procedures under the Law on Public Procurement (LPP).
The Prosecutor's Office:
The difference between the approved and the executed budget lies in the fact that the approved budget corresponds to the budget of the Judiciary, including the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, adopted by the State Budget Act for 2022 – SBRBA (as of 01.01.2022), while the executed budget corresponds to the actual expenditures as of 31.12.2022 – at the cash level.
Specifically, at the beginning of 2022, funds for training amounting to BGN 23 800 are planned. (EUR 12 169). The information is based on summary draft budgets for all structural units in PORB for 2022, prepared at the end of January 2022. At the end of the reference year (as at 31.12.2022), approximately BGN 14,129 had actually been spent at cash level (EUR 7 224). The lower implementation is to some extent due to both organisational (most of the training organised and delivered was conducted online) and financial reasons (in 2022, the SBARB was adopted later – on 4 March 2022).
A comparison of data for several consecutive years – 2020, 2021 and 2022 – shows an increase in the planned training funds for the respective years (given the increase in the cost of posting and services) and a decrease in the actual spent ones in relation to the restrictive measures introduced during the coronavirus pandemic and conducting online trainings instead of face-to-face ones, resulting in a decrease in spending.

**Q013 (2021):** The implemented budget differs from approvals due to unspent funds for major repairs, acquisition of durable tangible assets and current repairs due to unfinished procedures under the Public Procurement Law and restrictive measures related to COVID-19.
The source of the data for the approved and implemented budget, including for the Trainings in the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, is the Annual Financial Report of the Public Prosecutor's Office for 2021.
As to the annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecutors, it should be recalled that the significant reduction in 2020 of this budgetary component was the result of the declared in March 2020 extraordinary epidemic situation in Bulgaria, as well as the restrictive measures related to the spread of COVID-19.

**Q013 (2020):** The significant differences in the approved and implemented budget for 2020 compared to 2018 for the prosecution are due to the reasons set out in the remarks on question 6, namely - increase in funds for remunerations by 10% in 2019 and in 2020, increase the amount of the minimum wage, which is the basis for determining payments under contracts. There is also an increase in the compensations under the JSA and LC by EUR 786,870 compared to 2018, as well as the planned and paid funds for apparel. For detailed information - see question 6.
The implemented budget differs from the approved one due to unspent funds for major repairs, acquisition of tangible fixed assets and current repairs due to unfinished procedures under the Public Procurement Act and restrictive measures related to COVID 19.
The source of the data for approved and implemented budget, including for Trainings in the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria is the Annual Financial Report of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria for 2020.
The probability of a significant reduction of the utilized budget for training of prosecutors is the declared in March 2020 extraordinary epidemic situation in Bulgaria, which continues to this day, as well as the restrictive measures related to the spread of COVID-19.

**Croatia**

**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 (2024):** The calculation of the vertical discrepancy in the table results in the following: (56,550 + 42,187) - 41,035 = 57,702. The total number of pending cases as of December 31 is 61,969, reflecting a 9.59% increase in discrepancy compared to the previous reporting period.
It is important to highlight that the data requested in the questionnaire are not fully aligned with the statistical reporting framework employed by the State Attorney’s Office. This discrepancy is evident in sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, where the responses were marked as NA (not available), and in section 3.2, marked as NAP (not applicable). Section 3.1.3 includes data on decisions not to initiate proceedings under the principle of opportunity, but only in relation to juvenile offenders, as these are the only such cases recorded separately in statistical reports. For other offenders, only the overall number of dismissals is provided, without distinguishing whether they were based on the principle of expediency.
The questionnaire instructions clarify that when several NA and NAP responses are present—as is the case here—the standard requirement for vertical and horizontal consistency of the data in the table does not apply. Part of the observed discrepancy can be attributed to the increase in pending cases by the end of the year, which rose to 61,969 from 56,550 in the previous year.
The rise in case numbers can be attributed, among other things, to vacant positions for deputy prosecutors and legal advisors, which has led to an above-average workload for the remaining staff, as well as a higher number of hearings and court sessions. Additionally, question 107 in category 3.2 did not initially include plea agreements, although these were later entered under question 107-1.

**Q107 (2022):** Data source: Report of the Attorney General of the Republic of Croatia on the work of state attorneys' offices in 2022.
*3.1. the total number of cases are completed with the adoption of a decision on the dismissal of the criminal report or a decision on the suspension of the investigation, however statistical data are not reccorded according to the categories requested in the table (15,414).
**3.1.3. the data includes only juvenile offenders, as data in relation to other offenders is not available in the aforementioned Report.
For 2022, the data in section 3.1 (Discontinued during the reference year) also include data from section 3.1.4 (Discontinued for other reasons), which for 2021 were presented in section 3.3. (cases closed by public prosecutor for other reasons).
It is necessary to take into account the statistical specifics of the presentation of individual decisions, because the questionnaire asks for data in a way that is not harmonized with the statistical presentation of the work of the state attorney's office. This is why there are certain statistical deviations because the data is not compared in the annual report of the State Attorney's Office of the Republic of Croatia. Besides, due to the overloading of certain state attorney's offices, specifically for the Municipal Criminal State Attorney's Office in Zagreb, 1,060 cases were delegated to other state attorney's offices, which statistically for the Zagreb Municipal Criminal State Attorney's Office is shown as a transfer of cases and also included in the number of cases resolved by the state attorney's office to another method (that is, for 2022 in section 3.1.4, which is included in the total in section 3.1). So, in fact, the increase in the number of cases discontinued during the reference year is an increase that occurred due to the statistical method of presentation, and not a real increase.

**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.

**Q107-1 (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 (2024):** In response to question 107-1 (guilty plea procedure), information on judgments based on plea agreements was provided only under the "Before the main trial" section. The "During the main trial" section was marked as NAP (not applicable), as our legal system does not recognize a formal procedure for plea agreements during the trial. The reason for the increase relates to more frequent use of guilty plea procedures in 2024. The emphasis on utilizing such procedures stems from their ability to expedite court proceedings, enhance overall efficiency, and significantly reduce expenditures from the national budget."
**Q107-1 (2023):** Regarding question 107-1 (guilty plea procedure), data on judgments based on the parties' agreement were entered only in the column "Before the main trial," while the column "During the main trial" was entered as NAP (not applicable) because our country lacks a formal institute for communication during the discussion.
The stated discrepancy percentage of 21.77% can be attributed to the strike.

**Q107-1 (2022):** Data source: Report of the Attorney General of the Republic of Croatia on the work of state attorneys' offices in 2022.
* The data refer to cases under the jurisdiction of county state attorneys' offices and the Office for the Suppression of Corruption and Organized Crime
**The data refer to cases under the jurisdiction of the municipal state attorney's offices, with a note that certain severe criminal cases are also under their jurisdiction, however, statistical data are presented in total for all criminal offenses under the jurisdiction of the municipal state attorney's offices without separating them into "lighter" and "serious" crimes.
The number of agreements from municipal jurisdiction was 318 in 2022, and 242 in 2021, which represents a true increase of 31%. There is no particular reason for this increase, as it is a number that varies depending on the specifics of each reporting period (for example, it was 190 in 2018, 2019 -315, 2020 -266, 2021 -242 and 2022 -318). In fact, it is about the decisions of the court that should accept the agreement proposal submitted jointly by the state attorney's office and the defence. The State Attorney's Office strives to increase the number of agreements concluded every year in order to shorten court proceedings and relieve the work of the State Attorney's Office and the court, which is why the number of judgments based on the parties' agreement is monitored and analysed. However, the state attorney's office tries to maintain an appropriate criminal policy and insists on compensation for damages for victims, which is why the state attorney's office's proposals for agreements are not acceptable for defence in conditions of slow trials due to the significant workload of the courts, and realistically the number of agreements is not high. For this reason, data on the number of verdicts based on agreements in the annual report of the State Attorney's Office of the Republic of Croatia are considered in relation to the total number of convictions. In 2022, agreements from municipal jurisdiction accounted for 2.19% of the total number of convictions from municipal jurisdiction, which is only a slight increase of 0.62% compared to 2021, when agreements accounted for 1.68% of the total number of convictions % which actually does not represent a significant difference and is therefore not commented on.

**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.

**Q109 (2024):** In question 109, the answer "yes" was submitted, indicating that the data in question 107 includes only criminal violations against traffic safety.
Specifically, evaluating the Croatian version of Directive 2015/413 of March 11, 2015, it was discovered that "road traffic offense cases" were rendered as traffic violations

**Q109 (2023):** In question 109, the answer "yes" was submitted, indicating that the data in question 107 exclusively covers criminal violations against traffic safety.
Specifically, evaluating the Croatian version of Directive 2015/413 of March 11, 2015, it was discovered that "road traffic offense cases" were rendered as traffic violations.

**Q109 (2022):** The data includes cases of criminal offenses committed in traffic.

**Q013 (2024):** The increase compared to the previous period is due to the implementation of mandatory consultations and seminars for judicial officials, as well as the rise in training fees and associated costs related to the training (such as accommodation, travel, etc.).
**Q013 (2023):** In the previous period, there were more on-line educations, and therefore in the observed period there was an increase in planned and executed funds.
**Q013 (2022):** The stated amount differs from the previously submitted data because of an increase in the base for civil servants and state employees, as well as an increase in the amount for holiday pay, Christmas bonus, and children's gift.

**Q013 (2021):** Between 2020 and 2021 there was a significant increase in the budget approved and implemented for the training of public prosecution services because during the Covid pandemic in 2020 trainings were not held.

**Q013 (2020):** There is a significant increasing of the total annual budget allocated to the public prosecution services due to the increasing of salaries of the public prosecutors.
The annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services is lower than in 2019 due to the fact that in 2019 the Judicial Academy conducted professional training of judicial officials and advisors and a foreign language education program for judicial officials, while in 2020 due to the COVID pandemic these trainings were not held.

**Cyprus**

**Q013 (2024):** The judicial training school is completely independent from the Academy of the Law office. The Academy had been set up in 2022 but started to plan and organize seminars in 2024.
**Q013 (2023):** In 2022 there was an increase in the budget due to specific copensations awarded only in that year.

**Q013 (2022):** There was a major restructuring of the posts in the public prosecution service as a number of new posts were created. At the same time, there was an increase in the salaries of the counsels working at the Attorney General's Office.
In the previous cycle, there were not many trainings as a result of covid.

**Q013 (2021):** In 2021 there was a massive increase in the compensation paid in action of 10 million, representing compensation awarded in actions against the state.
Less training seminars have been held in person due to covid.
**Q013 (2020):** In 2020, there was a significant increase in the salaries of the prosecutors of the office of the Attorney General.

**Czech Republic**

**Q107 (2024):** Four years ago, 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 (2023):** Three years ago, 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.
There is no specific reason identified for the 53% increase in cases discontinued during the reference year, as these figures can vary annually.

**Q107 (2022):** Two years ago, 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 (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.

**Q107-1 (2024):** Total number of guilty plea procedures: After the change in legislation in 2020, there was a huge increase in the number of guilty pleas. It seems that the number is now again decreasing. It could be just a random fluctuation though.

**Q107-1 (2022):** There was a legislative change, which make several changes regarding the guilty pleas - it is 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 (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.
**Q013 (General Comment):** It is noteworthy that before 2014, the implemented budget was provided instead of the approved one.
**Q013 (2024):** More money was planned for training, but the priority remains to make full use primarily of the services provided by the Judicial Academy.
**Q013 (2022):** There can be movement between the different categories of the budget during the year according to the current needs.
Desirable increasing of budget to training.
**Q013 (2021):** There can be movement between the different categories of the budget during the year according to the current needs. Moreover, there is also influence of exchange rate. The difference between approved and implemented budget allocated to training is mostly caused by pandemic situation.
**Q013 (2020):** There can be movement between the different categories of the budget during the year according to the current needs. Moreover, there is also influence of exchange rate.

**Denmark**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor. All prosecutors are subject to a recruitment procedure conducted by The Director of Public Prosecutions' Office on behalf of the Ministry of Justice. A prosecutor can serve within The Local Prosecution Service based in one of the 15 the police districts or within The Central Prosecution Service with one of the Regional State Prosecutors' offices or with The Director of Public Prosecutions' Office.

**Q107 (2024):** In some cases indictment and subsequent discontinuation occurs within the same year. In such instances, a single case will both occur in both point 3.2 and 3.3. However, the case will only occur once when computing the total. Thus, the sum of 3.1-3.3 might not be the same as the total in 3.
The reason for the discrepancy in closed/finished cases relative to incoming cases is that processed cases include cases that the prosecution service has responsibility for, but that both the police and prosecution service conducts work on – depending on the case. 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.
One case accounts for one crime for each person involved in the crime. If two crimes were committed by three people, there would be six counts of crimes (=cases). Reports of crime might also grow in number of counts as it progresses through the chain of criminal proceedings. The 'owner' of the case is the department that last worked on it.
The term "Reasons of opportunity" entails cases discontinued according to section 721, subsection 1, no. 3-4 of The Danish Administration of Justice Act, which is applied in cases where it is assed that legal costs and processing time are disproportionate in relation to the significance of the case and its potential sentence.
It is correct that there has been an increase of approximately 83% when comparing 2024 to 2023. However, it is important to emphasize that these number cover individual offences rather than court cases they fall under. When comparing the number of court cases, where one or more offences have been discontinued due to reason of opportunity, we only see an ~18% increase. The reason behind this being that in 2024 a number of court cases, with a large number of individual offences, were settled with discontinuation. For instance; in 2024 five court cases had over 100 offences discontinued due to reason of opportunity – while another case had over 500 offences.
Throughout 2024, there has been an increased effort in reducing the backlog of pending indictments, by prioritizing the processing of existing cases in court. Due to this prioritization, there has been a ~40% decrease in the number of pending indictments when comparing the beginning and end of 2024. However, this has also meant fewer resources allocated to initiating new prosecutions. The natural consequence being an increase in the number of pending charges.

**Q107 (2023):** The reason for the discrepancy in closed/finished cases relative to incoming cases is that processed cases include cases that the prosecution service has responsibility for, but that both the police and prosecution service conduct work on – depending on the case. 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.
One case accounts for one crime for each person involved in the crime. If two crimes were committed by three people, there would be six counts of crimes (=cases). Reports of crime might also grow in number of counts as it progresses through the chain of criminal proceedings. The 'owner' of the case is the department that last worked on it.
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 divided in such subsectors.
From 2021 to 2023 we have had an increased effort in lowering the amount of pending cases. This can partly explain the surge of processed cases.

**Q107 (2022):** 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 divided 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 and 2022 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.
Regarding the increase in incoming cases, it should be noted, that the police is responsible for charging possible perpetrators and hence the number of incoming cases received by the prosecution service. An explanation of the increase in number of incoming cases should therefore be directed to the police. With that being said, the number of incoming cases varies from year to year and the amount in 2021 was lower than the previous years.

**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.

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** The guilty plea procedure including a main trial will always be concluded during the main trial, as it is a court decision whether or not a person can be convicted in court. Cases with accepted fines are not included in the answer above, as it is not part of a trial. Plea guilty procedure can only take place during the main trial.

**Q107-1 (2024):** 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 Denmark, a guilty plea procedure is concluded in a court hearing, not in 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 ensure that the conditions for proceeding the case as a guilty plea procedure are present.

**Q107-1 (2023):** 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 2023, the number of complexes are 3,909. There has been an increase 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 in a court hearing, not in 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 ensure that the conditions for proceeding the case as a guilty plea procedure are present.

**Q107-1 (2022):** Comments 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 2022, the number of complexes are 3.526. There has been an increase 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 registered 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 (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.
**Q013 (General Comment):** The implemented budget corresponds to the observed expenditures during the reference year. There has moreover been a strengthening of criminal case processing in recent years, especially compared to 2021 with a wish to reduce case processing times and case backlogs in criminal case processing, which has led to an increase in re-source consumption on case processing and prosecution activities

**Q013 (2024):** In 2024, there was a balance between budget and consumption. Compared to 2023, consumption has increased by approximately 5 percent. This can primarily be attributed to a continued strong focus on strengthening criminal case processing with a view to reducing case processing times and case backlogs in criminal case processing.

**Q013 (2023):** The explanation of the difference between the implemented budget and the budget that has been formally approved by the Parliament is that the implemented budget corresponds to the observed expenditures during the reference year. There has moreover been a strengthening of criminal case processing in 2023 compared to 2021 with a wish to reduce case processing times and case backlogs in criminal case processing, which has led to an increase in resource consumption on case processing and prosecution activities.

**Q013 (2020):** The increasing expenses compared to previous years are partly due to an increased effort to reduce case processing times and case stocks in the criminal case chain. In 2019, further expenses were incurred in connection with the implementation of several commissions of inquiry set up by the government

**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 (2022):** The general trend shows a decrease in registered crimes.

**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.
**Q109 (2020):** Only the ones that are classified as criminal offences.

**Q013 (2023):** Ministry of Justice does not have data on budget allocated to training.

**Q013 (2020):** Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: due to COVID-19 restrictions, there were less trainings.

**Finland**

**Q107 (2024):** Regarding section 3.1.2, there has been a change in our statistic model. The previous statistic model was inaccurate and did not respond this section reliably. The figures previously included in this section are now included in section 3.1.4.
**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.4 In earlier reply there was a mistake in figures:In earlier answer the 3.1.4 included only motions to dismiss and restrictions of pretrial investigations; now the numbers include also other technical decisions (5205, "closed by other reasons"). 3.2 The absolute amounts in these transfers of are so small, that even a change to just a few cases causes discrepencies. The drop of the number of cases from 9 to 4 is within normal variation.

**Q107 (2022):** 3.2 Notice cases of summary fines are not included. The number of summary fines in 2022 was 34426.

**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.

**Q107-1 (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 (2022):** Data on guilty plea procedure is not comprehensive. The procedure is registered in information systems only in a few cases. The usage of the procedure is likely much more broad than indicated, but there is no data available to confirm this.
**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.
**Q013 (2024):** The budget excess is due to a surprising and large overshoot in ICT expenditures in 2024.
The direct training costs were 465 242 euros. The wage costs (indirect costs) for the training days were 521 243 euros.

**Q013 (2023):** Budget excess is due to increase in prosecutor personel resources. Reason for this was to control the amount of pending cases and shorten case processing time. Training budget contains only direct costs but training implementation also contain indirect costs such as travel expenses. Overall, the trend of training participation has been on the increase.
Training costs have increased strongly: year 2021 they were 393 000 euro, year 2022: 749 000 euro and year 2023: 933 000 euro. Also number of training participants has increased: 475 (2021), 484 (2022), 783 (2023) as were the training days: 1189 (2021), 1555 (2022) and 1821 (2023).

**Q013 (2022):** Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: in 2022 the total amount used for training was 715 813 euro. This comprises of: 374 587 euro for salaries related to trainings (+ plus pensions etc. payments), 173 843 euro of travel expenses, 57 925 euro for purchasing different course and conference services, and 109 458 euro (excluding VAT) used for training by the Office of the Prosecutor General. In 2020 the expenses were historically low and in 2022 the expenses were closer to the annual average. In 2022, there were about 50 % more training days than in 2020. More people also participated in the trainings. In addition, the travel costs for trainings increased in 2022. The exact reasons for the low figures in 2020 are no clear, but it can be assumed that the Covid pandemic had an impact.

**Q013 (2021):** Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: in 2021 the total amount used for training was 407 595 euro. This comprises of: 261 683 euro for salaries related to trainings (+ plus pensions etc payments); 29 328 euro of travel expenses (excluding VAT), 73 230 euro for purchasing different course and conference services, and 43 354 euro used for training by the Office of the Prosecutor General.
The annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services increased only slightly since the particular year of the pandemic. In fact, in 2021, the Prosecution Authority had a recommendation on remote work in force and also most of the trainings were organized remotely.

**Q013 (2020):** Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: in 2020 the total amount used for training was 379 043 euro. This comprises of: 208 000 euro for salaries related to trainings (+ plus pensions etc payments); 38 673 euro of travel expenses (excluding VAT), 83 062 euro for purchasing different course and conference services, and 49 300 euro used for training by the Office of the Prosecutor General. It is noteworthy that the travel expenses decreased approximately 170.000. This was due to, amongst others, covid-19 situation which led to holding the training remotely.

**France**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The complexity and diversity of criminal data do not allow for estimates of pending cases to be produced.
The data concern cases recorded regardless of the number of offenses or individuals involved. However, if the same case involving multiple individuals is subject to several different courses of action (for example, different treatment of minors and adults or dismissal and prosecution in the same case), then the number of actions taken is counted.
The data concern adults, minors, and legal entities.

**Q107 (2024):** Source: SSER, statistical file Cassiopée

**Q107 (2023):** “3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation” and “3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity”: data used are based on extractions from “Cassiopée”. However, the introduction of the PPN has led to the gradual integration into the applications over the period 2022-2024 of cases that were not previously recorded in the applications. As a result, the number of criminal cases at first instance has increased artificially in 2023 as a result of the integration of unrecorded cases (small X). It should be noted that there is an effect from 2022, which is less strong but already present. Source(s) : SSER, Cassiopée statistical file

**Q107 (2021):** source SDSE

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** Appearance on prior recognition of guilt (CRPC) is a simplified prosecution procedure. The public prosecutor can propose to any adult offender who acknowledges the facts attributed to them to serve one or more of the penalties they face. This procedure applies to offenses (délits) except for exceptions provided by law (see Article 495-7 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). In case of acceptance of the proposed penalties, the public prosecutor refers the case to the judge to approve the accepted penalties. The approval order has the effect of a conviction judgment. It is recorded in the National Criminal Record.
The CRPC is considered a full hearing (the judge wears a robe, and renders an "order" accepting the sentence — though not a judgment). The penalty imposed will carry the same weight as if it had been imposed during a "regular" hearing. However, if the individual refuses the penalty during this process, the prosecutor will redirect the case to a regular criminal trial. If the CRPC is successful, it will be considered the "main judicial procedure." However, if it fails, the individual will be presented before the criminal court, meaning the CRPC can be seen as a procedure that happens "before the main trial" In this sense, during a CRPC, the individual is not subject to "formal prosecution" before the court, but rather summoned before the prosecutor who offers them a penalty, which may or may not be accepted, and later approved or not by a judge.

**Q107-1 (2024):** These figures correspond only to the CRPC: Appearance on prior recognition of guilt.
It is a simplified prosecution procedure. The public prosecutor can propose to any adult offender who acknowledges the facts attributed to them to serve one or more of the penalties they face. This procedure applies to offenses (délits) except for exceptions provided by law (see Article 495-7 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). In case of acceptance of the proposed penalties, the public prosecutor refers the case to the judge to approve the accepted penalties. The approval order has the effect of a conviction judgment. It is recorded in the National Criminal Record.

**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.

**Q109 (2022):** The positive reply concerns criminal offences and fines.

**Q109 (2021):** source SDSE

**Q013 (2024):** For 2024, and in accordance with the CEPEJ methodology, the credits allocated to the National School for the Judiciary have not been included in “13.1 Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services.

**Q013 (2021):** As in the previous year, as it is not possible to distinguish between data related to courts and data related to the public prosecution services, an 80/20 ratio has been applied to the data from the LFI 2021 of P166 and the annual performance report 2021 of P 166.
Source DSJ

**Germany**

**Q107 (General Comment):** 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 statistics. The public prosecution offices collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the federal states, 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 survey" 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 category "covered by the procedural surveys".

**Q107 (2024):** "Other reasons" include: referral to private action, referral to administrative authority as regulatory offence, referral to a different public prosecutor's office, joining with another case, referral to the European Public Prosecutor's Office
3.2 Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor:
The number represents the cases that were discontinued in accordance with Section 153a of the Code of Criminal Procedure ("nonprosecution 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.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistency with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occurs in the official statistic published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this are count corrections of the monthly collected data at the end of the year.

**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.4: Cases from former line 3.3 "closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons" are now included here. In the previous evaluation cycle, those cases were included in the total of processed cases (3.) but were not displayed under "discontinued cases".
"Other reasons" include: referral to private action, referral to administrative authority as regulatory offence, referral to a different public prosecutor's office, joining with another case, referral to the European Public Prosecutor's Office
3.2 Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor:
The number represents 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 (2022):** 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 Discrepancy in comparison to the 2020-2022 cycle: The number of cases discontinued for other reasons was consideralbly higher in the public prosecution statistic 2020 and in previous years. This was due to a programming issue in one of the federal states. 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 (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.

**Q013 (General Comment):** It is noteworthy that all data concerning the budget should be construed in the light of the federal structure of the justice system in Germany. Variations are often due to the fact that the federal states' budget plans and budget statistics can differ from one another relatively widely. Accordingly, the federal states' answers in this section are inconstistent.

**Q013 (2024):** Roughly half of the federal states cannot provide seperate information on the budget allocated to the public prosecution services.
**Q013 (2023):** In roughly half of the federal states, the budget of the courts cannot be separated from budget of the public prosecution. A few federal states that can make this distinction, can, however, not separate the training budget of the public prosecution services from the training budget of the whole judiciary.
Of the 16 federal states - 7 could not provide any data
- 9 have figures available
The Federal Ministry of Justice can provide budget information for the Federal Public Prosecutor's office.
**Q013 (2022):** In the majority of the federal states, the budget of the courts cannot be separated from budget of the public prosecution. A few federal states that can make this distinction, can, however, not separate the training budget of the public prosecution services from the training budget of the whole judiciary.
Of the 16 federal states - 7 could not provide any data
- 8 have figures available
One federal state has not yet replied. The Federal Ministry of Justice can provide budget information for the Federal Public Prosecutor's office.
**Q013 (2021):** In the majority of the Länder, the budget of the courts cannot be separated from budget of the public prosecution. A few Länder that can make this distinction, can, however, not separate the training budget of the public prosecution services from the training budget of the whole judiciary.
**Q013 (2020):** The budget of the courts cannot be separatd from budget of the public prosecution.

**Greece**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The data in the table are presented by case file (and not, for example, on the number of offenders). Vertical consistency in the table is not ensured because the data are continuously updated/corrected and because of unknown offender cases that are referred either to the investigating magistrate (when they are felonies) or to a preliminary procedure (when they are misdemeanors) have not yet been completed. All cases that are referred to the investigator are returned to the public prosecutor, whether the perpetrator is identified or not. Cases where the perpetrator could not be identified are considered as resolved, while the rest (where the perpetrator is identified) follow further criminal proceedings and are either solved within the reporting period or are considered pending in the next time period. More precisely, cases where the offender could not be identified are placed in the "unknown perpetrator file". Cases placed in the "unknown perpetrator file" are suspended with a decision of the prosecutor and such decisions are counted as “ 3.1.1 Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified”.

**Q107 (2024):** Source: Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat).
The observed increase in the number of cases discontinued for reasons of opportunity (+42%) and the number of cases referred to court (+30%) can be attributed to the reforms of the public prosecutor's office introduced in 2024. More specifically, under Law 5090/2024 prosecutors were given greater discretion to close cases when it is not in the public interest or when the offense is of low severity. This was applied more actively to misdemeanors, especially in cases with limited evidence or with conciliatory intentions.
At the same time, the prosecution of crimes of domestic violence, organized crime, and corruption was strengthened, resulting in an increase in the number of cases brought to court for trial.

**Q107 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
Decreases in the number of cases dismissed for reasons of opportunity and cases concluded by a penalty: during the implementation of the restrictive measures to deal with the Covid 19 pandemic, police activity was greatly increased with constant patrols which resulted in a rapid increase in arrests and consequently in criminal prosecutions for selected offences, such as violation of the drug law (supplying drugs even for personal use is strictly illegal in Greece). With the expiry of the restraining orders, arrests and criminal convictions decreased.

**Q107 (2022):** It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting and calculating statistical data. As the methodology is developing, discrepancies in data can be observed.
**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.

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** The accused who is usually a temporary prisoner but whose case is pending before the investigating judge, requests, either through his/her counsel or himself/herself (through an ex officio counsel) the criminal negotiation of his/her case. This request is forwarded to the Prosecutor's Office of Appeal to which copies of the relevant file are sent. Depending on the case, the appeal prosecutor will either recommend that the case be successful or unsuccessful. In the first case, if the case succeeds, a trial date is set at which the defendant appears before the court (Court of Appeal) and is given the proposed sentence. If he or she agrees, the procedure is completed and in most cases the defendant is released and the time spent in temporary custody is taken into account. If the defendant does not agree with the sentence proposed, the defendant withdraws his/her request for criminal negotiation, the proceedings are considered as not having taken place, and the defendant's criminal treatment continues from the point of the request for criminal negotiation.

**Q107-1 (2024):** Source: Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat)
The violations of restrictive measures that led to mass registrations and quick guilty pleas in 2021–2022 no longer exist, resulting in a natural decrease in related cases. However, additional factors in 2024 contributed to this trend, including reforms of the prosecution service under Law 5090/2024, stricter criteria for accepting guilty pleas, increased use of the principle of opportunity, and the expansion of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. More specifically, the new Criminal Code introduced stricter criteria for accepting guilty pleas, especially in cases involving social disapproval or domestic violence.
The strengthening of the opportunity principle has led to more cases being shelved rather than confessions being accepted.
The promotion of criminal mediation and out-of-court settlements has reduced the need for formal guilty plea procedures.

**Q107-1 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
The observed decreases in the number of guilty plea procedures between 2022 and 2023 are due to specific offenses related to violations of containment measures implemented in 2021 and 2022 to address the pandemic. For example, while gatherings were banned at that time, social events e.g. weddings were held in some areas of the country. In these cases, the guests (who may have exceeded, for example, 100) were brought before, for example, the public prosecutor who, in application of Article 48 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, terminated the criminal prosecution by means of a reasoned order after imposing on the accused the obligation to pay a donation to the Greek State.

**Q107-1 (2022):** This year, we modified the request by asking the information from the courts. We believe that this is reason for the variations observed.

**Q107-1 (2020):** No data available for this query.

**Q109 (2024):** The new Penal Code, which came into effect on May 1, 2024, with Law 5090/2024, introduced significant stiffening of penalties for cases of traffic accidents and dangerous driving. The new Article 290A defines 'dangerous driving' as any behavior that seriously endangers life or health, such as: Excessive speed, Driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, Ignoring traffic signals, Aggressive or careless driving. Some violations now incur, in addition to a monetary fine, prison sentences ranging from 1 to 5 years.

**Q013 (General Comment):** The public prosecution services budget can not be separated from the courts budget.

**Q013 (2023):** There is no possibility of separating the budgeted expenses on the one hand and some individual categories of expenses (in terms of execution) on the other, between the prosecutor's offices and other courts of the country.

**Q013 (2022):** As explained in question 6, there is no possibility of separating budgeted expenditures on the one hand and some sub-categories of expenditures (in terms of execution) on the other, between the public prosecutor's offices and other courts in the country.

**Q013 (2021):** Not available, cannot be separated.

**Q013 (2020):** There is no separate budget for Public Prosecutions included in the special code 1017-201-00000000 .Impossible to fill.

**Hungary**

**Q107 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
Overall, it can be concluded that from 2023 to 2024, there was a significant increase in both the number of offences (+20.2%) and the number of offenders (number of offences per offender) (+40.6%).
Since the number of procedural decisions recorded takes into account the individual offences and, if there are multiple perpetrators of an offence, the procedural decisions recorded for the perpetrators, the number of procedural decisions recorded by the prosecution service has increased exponentially (+45.7%).
The most significant changes in the individual data can be attributed to the following: With regard to question 3.1.2, the increase (110.64%) – beyond the average increase detailed above – can be attributed to two cases. 1) In case no. 926/2021 of the Szigetszentmiklós District Prosecution Office, procedural decision M036 was recorded in 4,381 cases (It cannot be established that the suspect committed the crime [Section 398 (2) a) of the Criminal Procedure Code]).
In the case of several thousand counts of “serial fraud”, the proceedings were terminated in respect of all acts with regard to eight perpetrators, while the other perpetrators were subject to indictment.
2) In case no. 25/2024 of the Budapest XIV-XVI District Prosecution Office, procedural decision M036 was recorded in 1,734 cases (It cannot be established that the suspect committed the crime [Section 398 (2) a) of the Criminal Procedure Code]).
In the case of 868 counts of "serial fraud," the proceedings were terminated in respect of all acts committed with regard to two perpetrators, while the other perpetrators were subject to indictment.
In contrast, in 2023, even the case with the most procedural decisions on this legal basis contained only 76 such procedural decisions. With regard to question 3.1.1, although the decrease appears significant, such "fluctuations" may occur due to the low number of cases. It can be stated that the vast majority of procedural decisions in this category (investigation/proceedings suspended due to the perpetrator being unknown/statute of limitations) are made by the investigating authority, so it is difficult to draw conclusions from the data provided by the prosecution service about changes in the legal system.
In general, the prosecution service has no influence on the number of cases in a given year in which sufficient evidence is obtained to bring charges (point 3.3) or in which proceedings are terminated for any reason (points 3.1, 3.1.1, 3.1.2. and 3.1.4.). Depending on the assessment of evidence in specific cases, changes in statistical data from year to year may occur (decreases or increases).

**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.4 Cases discontinued for other reasons - The reason for the increase is the growth in the number of cases recorded under provision IV of Section 398 (2) c) of the Criminal Procedure Code (Termination of liability to punishment for other reasons specified by law).

**Q107 (2022):** The data source - in accordance with the previous data provision - is The Statistical Subsystem of Completed Criminal Proceedings of the Unified Investigation Authority and Prosecution Service Criminal Statistics System (hereinafter ENyÜBS-BBS). In the ENyÜBS-BBS subsystem, the data is recorded when the investigating authorities or the Prosecution Service have made a procedural decision giving reasons for the provision of statistical data in connection with the crime (e.g.: dismissal of the criminal complaint, termination, suspension, accusation/indictment), relating to which statistical data was provided. Considering the time of data recording, the ENyÜBS-BBS subsystem is, therefore, of a so-called follow-up nature, so it does not show how many crimes occurred in the year under review, but it shows how many legal decisions were made in connection with such acts and in how many cases statistical data was provided in this context (in a registrative manner). As a result, the above also means that it may occur there is an ongoing criminal proceeding that is not included in the ENyÜBS database yet. For the questions "Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year" and "Pending cases on 31 December ref.year" in the table, please note that no data is collected on the number of pending cases – on a given day – into the records of the Prosecution Service. Set of data: ENyÜBS-BBS: number of criminal procedure decisions
Unit of recording: criminal procedure decision
Selection date: May 30, 2023.

**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 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
Based solely on data analysis, it can be stated that the number of defendants affected by final court decisions decreased by 3.8% in 2024 compared to the previous year (2,156 defendants). Thus, as can be seen from the other data sets, there has been a general decrease in the number of defendants.
If we examine the ratios of the two legal institutions (acceptance of confessions made at preparatory hearings; acceptance of confessions made at first instance trials), a kind of restructuring can be observed.
In 2023, compared to all defendants affected by final judgments, the acceptance of confessions made at the preparatory hearing by the court accounted for 21.4%, while the acceptance of confessions made at the first instance trials by the court accounted for 2.2% of the cases. The same figures for 2024 were 21.9% and 1.7%, respectively. It can therefore be concluded from the above that although the number of defendants decreased in both data sets, proportionally more defendants made confessions and had them accepted by the court during the preparatory proceedings than during the first instance trial.
Thus, it can be concluded that, looking solely at the ratios, proportionally more defendants made confessions during the preparatory proceedings, which were accepted by the court, and this presumably led to a decrease in the number of defendants who made confessions during the first-instance trial.
In general, the prosecution service has no influence on how many defendants make confessions during court proceedings in a given year, or at what stage of the proceedings they do so.

**Q107-1 (2022):** 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 (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.
**Q013 (2024):** When evaluating the data, the change in the euro/forint exchange rate must be taken into account in all cases, as a decrease/increase in the exchange rate may result in a significant change in the figures given in euros, while there is no significant change in the forint figures.
**Q013 (2022):** Act XC of 2021 on Hungary's central budget for 2022.
The draft act for implemented state budget of 2022 has not yet been adopted by the Parliament.

**Q013 (2021):** Statistical data on the human resources of the prosecution service of Hungary;
Data from the 'Persona' electronic human resources database of the prosecution service;
Act CLXIV of 2011 on the status of the General Prosecutor, prosecutors and other employees of the prosecution service, as well as on the career of prosecutors (hereinafter: 'Act on Prosecutors').
**Q013 (2020):** Q 13 Act LXXI of 2019 on Hungary's central budget for 2020
The act for implemented state budget of 2020 is before the Parliament (T / 17188. of law proposal ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF Act LXXI OF 2019 ON HUNGARY'S CENTRAL BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020) but not yet adapted.

**Ireland**

**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 (2024):** Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified' files should never have been sent into the ODPP as a direction cannot be issued if there is no suspect to direct upon. The fall should be considered positive on this basis.
In relation to Q107-3.3.2, it must be noted that prosecutors do not negotiate or plea bargain in this jurisdiction. This information is therefore not available.

**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.4- In 2023, the remaining 3,490 files in the 'discontinued' figure are files where all the suspects were directed for 'no prosecution'. It is not possible to break them down into 107.3.1.2 and 107.3.1.3 as they don't map to the picklist of reasons for not prosecuting that are selected by our Directing Officers.
Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified' files should never have been sent into the ODPP as a direction cannot issue if there is no suspect to direct upon. The fall should be considered positive on this basis.

**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

**Q107-1 (2024):** There is no 'guilty plea procedure' in Ireland, as defined by the explanatory note. We have a procedure for guilty pleas but not as envisaged by the question. Also, our system does not collect data on guilty pleas in accordance with the timing of entry as requested. Data on pleas is based on the year that the file is opened, as opposed to the year the plea is entered. This information is published in the Office's Annual Report:https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2024/05/AR-2022-eng-copy.pdf
**Q107-1 (2023):** There is no 'guilty plea procedure' in Ireland, as defined by the explanatory notes. We have a procedure for guilty pleas but not as envisaged by the question. Also, our system does not collect data on guilty pleas in accordance with the timing of entry as requested. Data on pleas is based on the year that the file is opened, as opposed to the year the plea is entered. This information is published in the Office's Annual Report
**Q107-1 (2022):** Data is collected in the Office of Director Public Prosecutions but is not available in the format specifically set out in the explanatory notes.
**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.

**Q109 (2023):** 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.

**Q109 (2022):** There was no discrepancy in the replies provided.

**Q013 (2024):** The total annual budget is for:
- The salaries and expenses of the Director and her staff;
- Fees to counsel engaged by the Director to prosecute cases in the various courts;
- Costs awarded against the State arising out of Judicial Review and other legal proceedings;
- The cost of the local State Solicitor Service.

The increase in expenditure for training is due to increased staff numbers.

**Q013 (2023):** The shortfall in expenditure on approved budget can be attributed to a shortfall on salaries which was due to the slower than expected recruitment of staff and an IT shortfall which was due to infrastructure which did not proceed as quickly as expected.
The increase in the implemented budget for training is due to a number of factors. There was a significant increase in new staff to the Office over 2023 which led to a rise in the number of training courses availed of by staff. In addition, there was an increased demand for the Office's sponsorship of third level educational courses which the Office wanted to respond positively to as it is committed to being a learning organisation

**Q013 (2020):** Parliament approved a budget of €44.813M for the public prosecution service for 2020. Expenditure by the prosecution service in 2020 amounted to €44.248M. The unspent amount of approved funding was surrendered at the end of the year in accordance with national public expenditure rules.
The annual budget for training is allocated by the prosecution service from within total funds allocated to it annually by Parliament. In 2020 expenditure on training initiatives amounted to €201K. This was down somewhat on previous years because of restrictions in place due to COVID-19.

**Italy**

**Q107 (2023):** "Discontinued for other reasons" includes e.g. the transfer of the case by competence to another office or another register, the joining with another case.
An increase in cases "Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity" and "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor" has been recorded due to due to Legislative Decree 150/2022 which aims to reduce the load on the courts by facilitating the definition by dismissal in the case of tenuousness or irrelevance of the fact.

**Q107 (2022):** We do not know the reasons for these discrepancies. However, the figures are correct.

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** In the Italian judicial system, it is not the public prosecutor but the judge who determines the plea bargain, following the request of the public prosecutor or the defendant before the trial, or even during the trial, or in opposition to a conviction by decree.
**Q107-1 (2024):** In the Italian judicial system, it is not the public prosecutor but the judge who determines the plea bargain, following the request of the public prosecutor or the defendant before the trial, or even during the trial, or in opposition to a conviction by decree.

**Q013 (General Comment):** Starting from 2023, the final balance is automatically processed by the Init application of the Ragioneria Generale dello Stato on the basis of the individual accounting records made by all the operators of the paying judicial offices on the national territory, therefore the data is devoid of the correction and integration entries that were previously made by the central administration to correct any significant errors found. This explains the higher value compared to the previous year.

**Q013 (2023):** Starting from 2023, the final balance is automatically generated by the INIT application of the Ragioneria Generale dello Stato, based on the individual accounting records entered by all the operators of the paying judicial offices on the national territory. As a result, the data no longer includes the correction and integration entries previously made by the central administration to address significant errors. This change explains the higher value compared to the previous year.

**Q013 (2022):** The increase in the budget for training is due to the fact that in 2020 the training was mainly delivered online (less expensive) due to the pandemic.

**Q013 (2021):** Difference in the implemented budget might be due to spending shifts from one financial year to another.

**Q013 (2020):** In general, the budget for training has drastically decreased in 2020 because the majority of the training was provided online rather than in person. This holds for both courts and prosecution offices. The reason why this trend is not evident at Q.6 (item 6) is due to the presence of administrative justice whose investments in terms of training were massive.

**Latvia**

**Q107 (General Comment):** Information obtained from the ProIS (Prosecution Information System), that is a 'living' system (input of data is not 'freezed' at the end of the year). Vertical consistency cannot be ensured because there is a number of cases that have been added to "cases discontinued for other reasons" and others that have been returned to the investigative authorities to continue the investigation.

**Q107 (2024):** Increase in Cases Brought to Court (Section 3.3):
In 2024, prosecutors took over 4,057 criminal proceedings involving particularly significant offenses. Compared to 2022, this represents a 40.3% increase. This rise is partly due to the reclassification of certain crimes as high-priority, such as violations of international and national sanctions, illegal border crossings, human smuggling, and facilitating unlawful residence in Latvia. Additionally, the number of cases submitted for prosecution involving these offenses increased significantly—from 454 in 2023 to 975 in 2024—reflecting both improved investigative efforts and enhanced prosecutorial oversight.
Decrease in Cases Concluded by Prosecutorial Penalty or Measure (Section 3.2):
Contrary to previous years, where a growing number of cases were concluded within the prosecution, 2024 saw a notable decline. This shift is primarily due to amendments to the Criminal Law (effective July 4, 2024), which changed sentencing policies for certain categories of offenses—especially those involving violence or committed under the influence of alcohol or drugs in traffic incidents. These amendments removed alternative penalties such as community service and fines, leaving only probation supervision as an option. As a result, for offenses committed between July 4 and December 31, 2024, prosecutors could not conclude proceedings without referring the cases to court. This led to a significant increase in cases brought to court and a decrease in those resolved by prosecutorial penalty.

**Q107 (2023):** Comment on 3.1. : (3.1.+3.2.+3.3.+4.) does not equal to 3, therefore it should be noted that the difference lies in 3.1. since some cases match and are included in both – 3.1.2. (discontinued due to statute of limitation) and 3.1.3. (discontinued for reasons of opportunity).
3.1.3. point - last year's "non-rehabilitating circumstances of a person" covered by the law, defined in articles 415 and 415.1 of the Criminal Code (conditional release from liability) was included in 3.1.3.point, but for 2023 data, these data are included in 3.2. point (because cases are still considered completed with a sanction (last year, paragraph 3.2 contained only the prosecutor's instructions on punishment)).

**Q107 (2022):** Information obtained from the ProIS (Prosecution Information System) data downloaded in February 2023. The same data is used in drawing up the Annual Report of the Prosecution Office submitted to the Parliament. The difference from the number of pending cases on 31 December previous period reported in last CEPEJ questionnaire may be explained that the ProIS is a 'living' system (input of data is not 'freezed' at the end of the year), therefore some cases may be marked in the system as 'pending' between August 2022 and February 2023. One of the reasons for the increase of the number in comparison with the year 2020 may be the structural reforms carried out in the prosecution office, as of 1 November 2021 first instance prosecution offices prosecute all types of criminal offences that were previously prosecuted by prosecution offices of the Judicial Regions. Thus, not only the number/numerical volume of 1st instance prosecutors' cases (criminal proceedings taken under supervision) increased, but also their legal complexity which has impacted the workload backlog. -107. 3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1.-3.1.4.) In consistency with the decrease in total number of incoming/received cases, a decrease can also be observed in the number of all of the discontinued cases.
- 3.1.3. Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity: includes discontinued on the basis of the following grounds set forth in Article 380 of the Criminal Procedure Law: termination of criminal proceedings on the basis of circumstances that exclude criminal proceedings (several subcategories listed in Article 377), termination of criminal proceedings by releasing a person from criminal liability (Parts 1 and 2 of Article 379), including conditional release from liability (Article 415), and termination of criminal proceedings against a person who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime.
The remaining reason of opportunity mentioned in Article 380, namely Article 421 'Prosecutor's penal order' – number of cases discontinued on this basis is included in 107.3.2.: Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor.
- 3.1.4. Discontinued for other reasons: includes 675 cases in which criminal proceedings were suspended, 5 cases where the criminal proceedings have been terminated by conditionally releasing from criminal liability for a serious crime, plus 41 case sent on the basis of the jurisdiction (including – abroad).
- 107. 3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor – the answer for the increase in number lies within the proposed strategical goal of the prosecution office – to complete the criminal proceedings in the prosecution office whenever possible. This has led to the significant increase in the total value of number in Q 107. 3.2. and decrease in numbers in Q 107. 3.3.
- 107. 4. Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: explanation given for Q 107. 1.1. applies to this number as well.

**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/in

vestigative 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.

**Q107-1 (2024):** Data collection and monitoring tools allow to provide more detailed overview of guilty plea procedures that was not available before.

**Q109 (2021):** Data from Accountancy system

**Q013 (General Comment):** Data on budget of the public prosecution includes only State budget for prosecution.

**Q013 (2024):** The main reason for difference between the approved budget and the implemented budget is related to the fact that there were several vacant prosecutor positions that were not filled but the salary amounts for these positions were allocated. In addition, several prosecutors are on maternity leave, their salary amounts also were allocated but not spent.
Another reason for underutilization of the planned budget was the fact that the expenses planned for foreign business trips in 2024 were not fully utilized, mainly because a significant part of the business trip expenses were covered by the institutions that had invited representatives of the Prosecution Office.
Savings were also generated because several prosecutors and employees were not working due to different incapacity for work situations, also several prosecutors retired.
Finally, part of the saving occurred because the Office of the Prosecutor General did not move to temporary premises at 1, Talejas Street and 3, Ierēdņu Street in Riga as was planned. The current premises of the Office of the Prosecutor General building on 6, Kalpaka Boulevard need major renovation. For reasons that were beyond the control of the Prosecution Office the funding that was allocated to cover costs of reconstruction, rent, equipment, relocation and other related expenses was not spent.
Prosecution Office of the Republic of Latvia has requested allocation of funds for trainings designed for prosecutors. In 2024 training regarding i2 Analysis Notebook software was organized to promote more efficient data analysis and coordination work among prosecutors and senior prosecutor assistants. Trainings regarding specific topics were conducted, such as psychological aspects of committing a crime, regulation of construction projects and criminal liability etc. Few of the activities were implemented by the Justice Academy, therefore some of the allocated budget for training was not spent for the activities.
Funding for training activities implemented by the Prosecution Office has increased due to the specific nature of the training activities organized, such as training in the use of specific software, improving English language skills, etc. The number of employees providing highly qualified support to prosecutors has increased at the Prosecution Office, and these employees also needed specific training to ensure the high-quality performance of their duties.

**Q013 (2023):** The expenses for the Prosecutor's Office has increased, as well as the number and scope of implemented trainings has been increased. Prosecution Office of the Republic of Latvia has requested additional budget allocation in respect to various training activities - such as language training courses, trainings and discussion regarding professional ethics and integrity, strengthening of communication skills etc. therefore the budget allocated for trainings has indeed increased.

**Q013 (2022):** The allocated budget has increased due to the fact that we were implementing the EC co-financed project BALTICS that conducted trainings for prosecutors in the field of financial and economic crime investigation. The project was financed from the funds of the Prosecutor's Office (budget was 28 930 EUR).
Decrease observed in the spending of budget in the training activities was due to the fact that several activities implemented in the Prosecution Office were financed by the European Commissions project (in accordance with the Explanatory note, EU fundings are not taken into consideration in Q13). Additionally, during the training period of 2022 many activities for prosecutors were financed by the project run by the Court Administration "Justice for growth".

**Q013 (2020):** 1. The cost of reimbursement was EUR 23 492 less due to the absence of 2 new posts.
2. Expenditure on goods and services of less than EUR 1 254 277, of which EUR 1 191 298 was not exhausted (used) because the original planned repairs were not carried out in the General Prosecutor's Office building on Kalpaka Boulevard 6 in 2020.
3. Capital expenditure was not fully absorbed at EUR 288 678.
4. Taking into account that raising the qualification of prosecutors is one of the priorities of the Prosecutor's Office, additional training measures and, accordingly, increased budgetary resources are envisaged.
On 1 January 2019, the Law “Amendments to the Law on Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities” entered into force, by which there was prescribed a significantly higher remuneration for prosecutors. Consequently, the budget allocated to the Prosecution Office in 2020 is higher than in 2018.
“Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services”: The Prosecution Office is financed from the State budget, then, taking into account the additional State budget funding allocated to the Prosecution Office for 2020, it was possible to increase the funding for the training of prosecutors.

**Lithuania**

**Q107 (General Comment):** Inconsistency is a result of different sources of data and their differing formulas for calculating some statistical indicators. Numbers of „Pending cases on 1 Jan“, „Pending cases on 31 Dec.“ and „Incoming cases“ are taken from the national register, however number of „Processed cases“ is taken from registers of the Lithuanian Prosecution Service. Number of "criminal cases" is counted by the crimes.
Before 2021, the Prosecutor's Office of Lithuania collected statistics by pre-trial investigations, but no matter if investigation is carried out for 1 crime or for 100 crimes, it would still count as one investigation in the statistics. For this reason methodology was changed, because data in crimes is more suitable for comparative analysis.

**Q107 (2024):** * Section 3.1.4 provides information on criminal cases transferred to a foreign country for further criminal proceedings. Number of "criminal cases" is counted by the crimes. Before 2021, the Prosecutor's Office of Lithuania collected statistics by pre-trial investigations, but no matter if investigation is carried out for 1 crime or for 100 crimes, it would still count as one investigation in the statistics. For this reason methodology was changed, because data in crimes is more suitable for comparative analysis.

**Q107 (2023):** Section 3.1.4 provides information on criminal cases transferred to a foreign country for further criminal proceedings. A large number of cases used to be transferred to Belarus or Russia. Recently, the Lithuanian Prosecutor's Office has reduced international cooperation with these countries to a minimum, which has had an impact on the total number of criminal proceedings transferred to foreign countries.

**Q107 (2022):** Inconsistency is a result of different sources of data and their differing formulas for calculating some statistical indicators. Numbers of „Pending cases on 1 Jan“, „Pending cases on 31 Dec.“ and „Incoming cases“ are taken from the national register, however number of „Processed cases“ is taken from registers of the Lithuanian Prosecution Service.

**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.

**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.

**Q013 (2024):** The increase in the budget for 2024 is primarily due to the increase of salaries of prosecutor‘s. On 1st January 2024 amendments to the Law on the Public Prosecution Service came into force which implemented the first phase of increase in the salaries of prosecutors. On 1 January 2025 – the second phase of salary increase came into force. The salary reform is considered completed and provides for the ratio between salaries of prosecutors and judges at on average 90 %.

**Q013 (2023):** In 2022, the Prosecutor's Office was intensively implementing projects and trainings funded by foreign grants, which reduced needs from Prosecutor's Office's training budget. The indicated amount of EUR 34,642 does not include funding from foreign grants and comes solely from the state budget.
With the conclusion of these grant-funded initiatives, all training activities must now be fully supported by the state budget. This transition accounts for the observed increase in budgetary allocation for training in 2023.
More over, the costs associated with organizing training events have risen, including venue rentals, materials, and other logistical expenses. These cost increases also contribute to the higher budgetary needs for 2023.

**Q013 (2021):** National Audit Office of Lithuania carried out an audit on the investigation and prevention of cybercrime, which aims to contribute to the creation of a safe environment for society in cyberspace. The audit recommendations highlighted the need for the General Prosecutor's Office to pay more attention to the development of competences in the investigation of cybercrime, as the competences of specialised prosecutors are not sufficiently enhanced due to an insufficient and unsystematic education system and the lack of methodologies for the investigation of cybercrime. Due to the high cost of cybercrime training, an additional budget was requested and a small part of it was received.

**Q013 (2020):** In 2020 the decrease in the state budget funds allocated to the training of prosecutors was influenced by objective reasons. It should be noted that the Prosecutor's Office participates in a wide range of international projects, from which it receives funding for capacity building activities. Also, individual trainings, traineeships and exchanges are funded by the European Judicial Training Network. In this context, there was no increased need for funds from the state budget for the training of prosecutors in 2020. In addition, the decrease in the need for allocations in this area has also been influenced by the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Luxembourg**

**Q107 (2024):** 3.1.1 Between 2023 and 2024, a significant 26% increase was observed in resolved cases by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified. This development is part of a broader trend, marked by a continuous rise in the number of incoming cases registered by the public prosecutor's offices in recent years. Since 2022, the proportion of cases with an unknown perpetrator has regularly exceeded 40% of the total cases handled.

This situation is partly explained by the growing prevalence of cybercrime, which represents an increasing share of discontinued cases without further action. Prosecution in this area is particularly complex due to the technical nature of the offenses and their often international scope, making it difficult or even impossible to identify the perpetrators.

Moreover, this increase also affects other categories of offenses, such as scams, frauds, and the intentional destruction or damage of movable property. In these cases as well, the absence of elements allowing for the identification of perpetrators prevents any judicial proceedings, thereby contributing to the rise in discontinued cases without further action.

**Q107 (2023):** The cases referred to under 3.2. are considered closed if the party concerned complies with the condition imposed by the warning or fulfils its obligations arising from the mediation.
In the event of non-compliance, the public prosecution will resume.
3.1.4: These mainly concern two specific measures: firstly, with regard to road traffic, the obligation to follow a driving course and, only for young adult offenders, participation in a course in the Choice 18+ programme designed to prevent drug addiction (https://www.solina.lu/fr/facilities/impuls/).
The drop in cases closed for Other reasons is explained by the drop in cases closed involving young adult offenders (aged 18 to 21). If these young offenders take part in a course as part of the Choice 18+ programme, designed to prevent drug addiction, and successfully complete it, their cases are closed. However, for reasons of internal organisation within the public prosecutor's offices, these cases are not closed as and when a traineeship is completed, but as a group, i.e. when a certain threshold of completed traineeships is reached. Finally, the drop in closed cases recorded since 2023 in the area of narcotics and concerning young offenders can be explained by the legalisation of recreational cannabis in Luxembourg in July 2023 and the subsequent drop in prosecutions by law enforcement.

**Q107 (2022):** Case covered by subcategory 3.2. are deemed closed if the relevant party complies with the condition set forth in the warning or fulfills its obligations arising from mediation. In case of non-compliance, public prosecution resumes.

Section 3.1.4 primarily encompasses two specific measures; firstly, concerning traffic regulations, the requirement to attend a driving course and, exclusively for young adult offenders, participation in a program called Choice 18+ aimed at preventing drug addiction (https://www.solina.lu/fr/facilities/impuls)."

**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/)."

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** The "criminal transaction" introduced by a law on February 24th, 2015 under the name of "judgment by agreement" allows the prosecutor and the defendant to engage in negotiations for a criminal judgment that will be enforced by the courts.

**Q107-1 (2024):** There was a marked increase in the use of the consent decree procedure in fiscal 2024, due to a heightened awareness of this procedure on the part of public prosecutors. This procedure is mainly used in cases of economic and financial crime.
**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.
**Q013 (General Comment):** The budget of the public prosecution services cannot be distinguished from the budget of the courts.
**Q013 (2024):** There is no separate budget for the Public Prosecution Services.

**Q013 (2023):** There is no single budget for the Public Prosecution Service.

**Q013 (2022):** There is no separate budget allocation for the prosecution services.

**Q013 (2020):** Il n'existe pas de budget isolé pour les services du ministère public.

**Malta**

**Q107 (2024):** The quoted cases do not specifically refer to the caseload of the attorney general, but to all the cases brought to court at first instance by the police acting as prosecutors in cases requiring less than 2 years imprisonment.

**Q107 (2022):** Presently the figures provided are in lien with the cases that are brought to court. The Office of the Attorney General shall be developing its case management system and this data should then be easily captured by the new system.

**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.

**Q013 (General Comment):** The public prosecution services are carried out by the Attorney General's office. The Attorney General not only acts as a public prosecutor but also as the principal legal advisor of all the Government Departments. As a result, the amount budgeted cannot be considered as being funds allocated solely for public prosecution services, but also for other purposes relating to legal work and advise for the Government, both locally and internationally.

**Q013 (2024):** This is the actual data derived from the financial estimates across different ministries and entities. The overall increase in the approved budget as well as the implemented training budget relates to the increase in the number of prosecutors within the office, but also to the efforts of the Attorney General to ensure that the staff receive continuous training.

**Q013 (2023):** The discrepancy between the approved and implemented budget results from an increase in the number of lawyers within the Office of the AG. This translated into added costs in respect of wages and training.
**Q013 (2022):** The Office of the Attorney General underwent a recruitment drive that resulted in an increment in wage-related costs.

**Netherlands**

**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 (2022):** There are a few numbers available, but NL does not register whether cases are litigious or not in the manner asked here.

**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.
**Q107-1 (General Comment):** Over the past years, 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 2022/2023, see eg. https://www.om.nl/onderwerpen/beleidsregels/aanwijzingen/executie/aanwijzing-procesafspraken-in-strafzaken-2023a002. The numbers are not yet available.

**Q107-1 (2023):** Over the past years, 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 2022/2023, see eg. https://www.om.nl/onderwerpen/beleidsregels/aanwijzingen/executie/aanwijzing-procesafspraken-in-strafzaken-2023a002. The numbers are not yet available.

**Q107-1 (2022):** 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.

**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):** 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).
**Q109 (2022):** 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).
**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).
**Q013 (General Comment):** Approved budget: the first version of the budget (estimated budget); implemented budget: annual financial report on the state expenditure. The budget for public prosecution services includes justice expenses in criminal cases, namely all kinds of cost types (e.g. wiretaps, interpreters, compensations for witnesses).
Budget allocated to training of public prosecution services is not registered separately in the budget report. The public prosecution services do have budget reserved for training, but that is for the entire public prosecution services and not just for public prosecutors. Regarding the public prosecutors, the services take part in the training institute of the Rechtspraak, and pay a yearly fee for that.

**Poland**

**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: - refusal to prosecute, suspension, dealt with in another way, transfer to commander, criminal prosecution transferred.. At the end that following a change in Q107, starting from 2022, cases previously reported as “closed for other reason are presented as “discontinued for other reasons”.

**Q107 (2023):** 3.3. in the number of cases brought to the court (264,341) includes the cases indicated in 3.2. (41,512), after deducting these cases the value is 222,829 and in 3. is the number 1,099,217.
Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons - 428 294
**Q107 (2022):** The other modes of termination concerned 414,485 cases (other modes of termination: refusal to prosecute, suspension, dealt with in another way, transfer to commander, criminal prosecution transferred). These cases are reported within the category “discontinued for other reasons”.
**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.
**Q107-1 (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 (2024):** *) Data refers to persons convicted at first instance (31354):
- Convicted as a result of granting an application under Article 335 § 1 or 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: in Regional Courts - 748 persons, in District Courts - 27 405 persons.
- Voluntary surrender to liability for criminal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 3 201 persons.

**Q107-1 (2023):** *) Data refers to persons convicted at first instance (39073):
- Convicted as a result of granting an application under Article 335 § 1 or 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: in Regional Courts - 814 persons, in District Courts - 35,020 persons.
- Voluntary surrender to liability for criminal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 3,239 persons.

**Q107-1 (2022):** *) 46 263 = 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 District Courts - 658 persons, in Regional Courts - 41,690 persons.
- Voluntary surrender to liability for criminal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 3,915 persons.

**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

**Q013 (2024):** The lowest expenditure on training was recorded in 2020 due to the epidemiological situation related to the COVID-19 pandemic and the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. This resulted in a significant reduction in training courses and workshops in the form of traditional meetings. This situation was mainly influenced by the training offer. Most of the training courses were offered and conducted online, which resulted in lower training costs. Since 2021, training expenditure has been steadily increasing. The reason for this is the expansion of the offer to include training in the form of traditional meetings, as well as an increase in training costs (inflation). The highest increase in expenditure in 2024 compared to 2023 for training recorded in § 4700 Training of employees who are not members of the civil service was recorded in the National Public Prosecutor's Office. In the National Prosecutor's Office, the increase in expenditure in 2024 on training compared to 2023 is primarily due to the purchase of the following specialist IT training courses: ‘Combating terrorist threats’ for the Department for Organised Crime and Corruption- for persons from general organisational units of the prosecutor's office performing tasks within the IT Shared Services Centre for the Department of Cybercrime and Computerisation, "Provision of warranty services for the Ordering Party's RedHat software" for the Department for Cybercrime and Computerisation, "Renewal of warranty service for the Ordering Party's backup system equipment and expansion of the current backup environment" for technical personnel in the Department of Cybercrime and Computerisation.

**Q013 (2023):** The average NBP exchange rate of 29 December 2023 was used to convert PLN to €. - 4,3480.
In 2023, the Prosecutor's Office budget was implemented in 99.86%. The difference between the approved and implemented budget is the amount of PLN 5,308,139.16 (1 220 823,17 euro). Within this amount, the planned budget expenditure was blocked. The blockage was a result of the notification by the organisational units of the Prosecutor's Office in section 753 Compulsory social insurance of the excess of the sub-allocated funds in the 2023 Prosecutor's Office budget for retired prosecutors‘ emoluments and family emoluments, due to the lower number of retired prosecutors’ retirements in relation to the amount assumed during the work on the 2023 Budget Act. The financial plan for 2023 in part 88 General organizational units of the Prosecutor's Office compared to 2022 increased by 17.08%, and the realized budget in 2023. was higher than that realized in 2022 by 16.92%.
The change in the size of the prosecutor's office budget for 2023 with respect to 2022 was mainly influenced by:
- Department 752 - National Defense - the creation of a new department for military affairs in accordance with the Decree of the Minister of Justice dated December 2, 2022. Regarding the establishment of a Department for Military Affairs in the District Prosecutor's Office Łódź - Polesie in Łódź,
- Section 753 Social Insurance - change of emoluments of prosecutors in retired status and family emoluments, the increase in relation to 2022 was as a result of the 7.8% salary indexation and the amounts of increased remuneration referred to in Article 10a of the Law on Special Solutions for the Implementation of the Budget Act for 2023 (outstanding benefit indexation) as well as additional funds for retiring prosecutors in 2023,
- Section 755 Justice - valorization of benefits of adjudicators and employees by 7.8%, as well as the amounts of increased remuneration referred to in Article 10a of the Law on Special Solutions for the Implementation of the Budget Act for 2023 (outstanding benefit valorization) as well as increased costs of operation of prosecution units and increased costs of pre-trial proceedings.

**Q013 (2022):** The average exchange rate of the National Bank of Poland as at 30 December 2022 was used to convert PLN to €. - PLN 4.6899.
In 2022, the budget of the Public Prosecutor's Office was implemented in 99.99%. The difference between the approved and implemented budget is the amount of PLN 237,656.33. Within this amount, the planned budget expenditure was blocked in the amount of PLN 228,314. The blockage was a result of the failure to realise planned expenditure, primarily under the Operational Programme Knowledge Education Development 2014-2020 in the amount of PLN 176,221, an excess of funds in the financial plan of expenditures due to a lower number of retirements of prosecutors than assumed in the course of work on the Budget Act for 2022, and remaining funds in the Prosecutor's Office units in § 6060 Investment expenditure on budgetary units.
*13.1
In fact, the prosecutor's budget for training in 2020-2021 was significantly lower than in previous years and in 2022.
In 2020-2021, the epidemiological situation related to the COVID-19 pandemic and the risk of infection with the SARS-CoV-2 virus resulted in a significant reduction in training and workshops in the form of traditional meetings. In fact, online trainings have prevailed.
Prosecution units also held in-house training sessions.
Expenditures on training in 2022 compared to 2020 and 2021 definitely increased. However, the training offerings have changed. Training in the form of traditional meetings returned but largely remained online training, which results in lower training costs. The budget for training in 2022 is 80.53% of the budget for training in 2018. It is likely that this trend will already continue.
It should be noted that prosecution units had a budget in 2022 that was sufficient to implement training at the 2018 level.

**Q013 (2021):** *1 euro= 4,5994 pln
*In 2020, the epidemiological situation related to the COVID-19 outbreak and the risk of virus infection resulted in a significant reduction in training and workshops in the form of traditional meetings. Training offerings changed and on line training was available. In view of the lack of mobility and the limitation of interpersonal contacts, the prosecution units organised in-house training. The training budget for 2020 represented 35.27% of the 2019 implementation and 36.3% of the 2018 implementation. The budget allocated for training in 2021 increased by 56.16% compared to 2020. The execution of training expenditure did not reach the level of 2018 and 2019. This was mainly influenced by the training offer. The majority of training is offered and delivered on line which results in lower training costs.

**Q013 (2020):** 1 euro=4.6148 PLN
The lower implementation of the training budget in 2020 compared to the implementation in previous years is primarily due to constraints related to the COVID-19 pandemic and the risk of SARS-COV-2 virus infection. The epidemiological situation has led to a reduction in training and workshops in the form of traditional meetings. Training offerings have changed. In essence, online training has become available. In view of the lack of mobility and the limitation of interpersonal contacts, the prosecution units organized in-house trainings. The budget for training in 2020 represents 35.7% of the 2019 implementation and 36.3% of the 2018 implementation. Below, I present the amounts of expenditures realized in 2018 - 2020 for training in the common prosecution units: 2018 - 683 618,27 euro, 2019 - 694 686,85 euro, 2020 - 248 164,77 euro. *The decrease in the approved budget alloceted of the training budget is primarily due to constraints related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Portugal**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The counting unit is the case (criminal proceedings at the investigation stage), so it is the same unit used to count incoming and outgoing cases for the other issues.
Incoming and outgoing cases include internal movements of cases between units (in 2023 there were 36,432 cases transferred between units).
Outgoing cases include cases that are joined together to form a single case.
3.1.1 When the offender is unknown, the case remains open until it is closed by decision of the competent public prosecutor, when all efforts to identify the offender have been exhausted. If a case is reopened, for statistical purposes it is considered a new case on the date it is reopened.

**Q107 (2022):** 3. The total figure for 2022 for the total number of completed criminal cases at the investigation stage is 427 664.

**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.

**Q013 (2024):** The 30% variation concerns DGAJ-MMP (Direção-Geral da Administração da Justiça - Magistratura do Ministério Público): payments were €35M higher than the initial allocation due to higher-level authorisations.

**Q013 (2021):** During the economic year, the budget needed to face needs that were not anticipated.

**Q013 (2020):** During the economic year, the budget needed to face needs that were not anticipated.

**Romania**

**Q107 (2020):** There are no available data on grounds on which a decision to discontinue a case is taken by the public prosecutor.
**Q109 (2020):** Only serious offenses that are considered crimes, such as drunk driving or involuntary manslaughter.

**Q013 (2024):** The data is now directly provided by the Prosecutor's Office Attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice, while in previous reporting years the data was extracted by the Economic Department within the Ministry of Justice from the reports of the Ministry of Finance. Therefore, the difference could be explained by a distinct benchmark in reporting.

**Q013 (2022):** These figures concern the training of civil servants and other categories of staff in this system, not prosecutors - the costs of training magistrates cannot be broken down /highlighted here, being included in the budget of the Superior Council of Magistracy (training of this latter category carried out through the Higher Institute of Magistracy).

**Q013 (2021):** The training of judges and prosecutors is provided by the National Institute of Magistracy (Superior Council of Magistracy)- separate budgets. For 13.1, the amounts included only the sums from the state budget provided for the training of civil servants and other categories of non-judge/non-prosecutor staff within the system of the Public Ministry. Post-pandemic, both the frequency of trainings and the number of participants at trainings grew.

**Q013 (2020):** The training of judges and prosecutors is provided by the National Institute of Magistracy (Superior Council of Magistracy). For 2020, the amounts included to both Q6 and O13 included the amounts from the state budget provided for the training of civil servants and other categories of non-judge / non-prosecutor staff. In 2018, according the data provided by the economic department, at these amounts were included, the training within some European training programs (programs within European funds) of a number of judges (and prosecutors )- a separate budget from the budget regarding the training through the National Institute of Magistracy (Superior Council of Magistracy).

**Slovak Republic**

**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.3 Opportunism is not a feature of the Slovak legal system. Prosecutorial decisions are strictly bound by legality and officiality, with no discretion to decline prosecution if legal criteria are met. For the CEPEJ questionnaire, "NAP" is appropriate for the subcategory 'cases discontinued for reasons of opportunity'.
**Q107 (2022):** It is necessary to state that the required table, or criteria, are different from our legal system. In our criminal proceedings, a large number of cases in the preliminary proceedings are closed by the investigator or police officer, while the table only requires cases closed by the prosecutor. In addition, matters terminated by the prosecutor may also be terminated by the so-called diversions in criminal proceedings, while the table only requires cases stopped by the prosecutor. The inconsistency of data with previous years is also caused by the fact that the prosecutor in the Slovak Republic has slightly different powers in the preliminary proceedings in contrast to the legal systems of other countries, so the data differ according to the point of view of the processor of the data.

**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.
**Q107-1 (2024):** * Note: The above number represents only the number of guilty pleas agreements concluded at the prosecutor's office and submitted for court approval. We currently do not have the number of agreements that have been approved beyond the agreements submitted by prosecutors to the court during the main trial.
**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.
**Q109 (2024):** https://www.genpro.gov.sk/statistiky/statisticky-prehlad-trestnej-a-netrestnej-cinnosti-za-rok-2024/

**Q013 (General Comment):** The increase is correct. The prosecution department once again expected increased interest in training due to legislative changes. The approved budget may be adjusted by the prosecution department during the year with budgetary measures based on the real need for funding, while it must adhere to the overall limits of the allocated budget. The valorization of prosecutors' salaries, which we stated in the questionnaire as an increase in prosecutors' salary requirements.

**Q013 (2024):** The Prosecution Department may, during the course of the year, adjust the approved budget through budgetary measures based on the actual financing needs, while respecting the overall limits of the allocated budget.
The difference between the approved budget and the actual budget amounts to EUR 9,636,852.94.
The financial resources were allocated for the following purposes:
-reconstruction of buildings and premises of regional and district prosecutor's offices,
-increase of remuneration and salary components of prosecutors,
-severance payments for prosecutors,
-procurement of Microsoft licences,
-procurement of software and IT equipment for asset tagging,
-additional financing of essential operational expenditures of the prosecutor's offices,
-functional allowances for the performance of prosecutorial duties.

**Q013 (2023):** The prosecution department once again expected increased interest in training due to legislative changes.
The approved budget may be adjusted by the prosecution department during the year with budgetary measures based on the real need for funding, while it must adhere to the overall limits of the allocated budget.
The difference between the approved budget and the actual budget is EUR 12,685,808.10.
The funds were intended for:
- reconstruction of buildings and premises of regional and district prosecutor's offices,
- purchase of desktops for administrative staff and renewal of Lotus Notes e-mail equipment,
- building a communication infrastructure for the Nové Zámky District Prosecutor's Office,
- increase in salary requirements for prosecutors,
- severance pay of prosecutors,
- procurement of Microsoft licenses,
- payment of increased expenses for electricity and natural gas,
- additional fees for performing the function of a prosecutor,
- additional financing of operating costs (rent, communication infrastructure, general services) and expenses in the field of information technology,
- procurement of mobile workplaces for prosecutors.

**Q013 (2022):** The difference between the approved budget and the implemented budget is 8 609 822 Eurs. The increased funds were allocated to:
- valorisation of prosecutors' salaries
- implementation of the ECRIS TCN Third Country Citizens Registration Project
- expansion of the PATRICIA information system and its connection to the information system of the European Public Prosecutor's Office
- necessary reconstruction of district and regional prosecutor's offices
- more training - relieve of COVID19 restrictions - additional financing of energies.

**Q013 (2021):** The difference between the approved budget and the actual budget is EUR 3 197 554.
The increased funds were allocated to:
- valorisation of prosecutors' salaries;
- modernization of the ECRIS software to version 1.6 for the Criminal Register;
- connection of IS Patricia to IS of the European Prosecutor;
- necessary renovation of buildings of the General Prosecutor's Office of the Slovak Republic;
- budget allocated to training of public prosecution services has changed due to the possibility to make face-to-face trainings.

**Q013 (2020):** The General Prosecutor of the Slovak republic:
The difference between the approved and the implemented budget is 903 692 euros.
The financial means were allocated to:
- wage valorisation of prosecutors, increase of number of employees of the Prosecutor's - investment into the buildings
Discrepancies form the previous cycle in the annual public budget allocated to training are due to the COVID 19 pandemic situation due to which the trainings were not planned or applied. The increase in the approved budget in 2020 reflects the implemented budged allocated to training of public prosecution services in 2019. The budgetary needs for training in 2020 were expected similar (higher) as in 2019, therefore the increase. But the training plans were not implemented due the Covid pandemic situation, so the implementation of the budget in this category was much lower.

**Slovenia**

**Q107 (General Comment):** Methodology used: statistical data are kept on the accused, 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 has been used in previous reports).
IMPORTANT: Data also includes unfinished criminal complaintes against unknown perpetrators. It should be noted that on average, State Prosecutor's Offices receive between 30.000 and 60,000 complaints per year against unknown perpetrators. These are included in statistical data as unresolved cases until the perpetrator is discovered or the statute of limitations expires.
1.Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. Year: unresolved criminal complaints against known perpetrators (incl. adults, minors and legal entities) and unknown perpetrators.
2. Incoming/received cases: criminal denunciations against known and unknown offenders.
Criminal denunciations against known offenders include cases that were received by the prosecution office as cases with unknown offenders whose identity was discovered during the reporting period. Cases against known offenders are counted by the number of persons involved (i.e. a denunciation against five individuals is counited as five cases), cases against unknown offenders are counted by files.
3. Processed cases: all resolved criminal complaints in the reporting year. There can be multiple criminal complaints in one case file, however the resolution is only one (for all complaints in one case file) – hence the difference between the sum of subcategories (3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4) and the actual number of resolved criminal complaints. The discrepancies in the numbers arise from the way cases are recorded in the information system: in general, in cases with multiple offences by one suspect typically there is a single resolution; in cases with multiple suspects with different offences cases may be split to allow different resolutions; in cases with same suspect and multiple complaints the cases may be merged.
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.
3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation: dismissed denunciations for other reasons than opportunity and accomplishing some tasks imposed or negotiated by state prosecutor. This category includes cases where prosecutor refrains from prosecution after the finish of judicial investigation.
The great majority of cases against unknown offenders is dismissed because the pending time exceeds limitation period for criminal prosecution.
In the case of proposed criminal offenses, the motion of the injured party is a procedural precondition for conducting criminal proceedings. If this presumption does not exist (it is no longer due to withdrawal), the legal consequence is rejection.
For the most part, public prosecutors rejected complaints for other reasons, including 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 offense (prosecuted ex officio), various procedural obstacles).
3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity
Cases where denunciations were dismissed because the consequences of criminal prosecution would prove disproportionate to the weight of criminal offence and dismissed denunciations agains

t minors because the proceedings against him/her would not be appropriate in view of the nature of the offence and circumstances in which it was committed, as well as in view of the past conduct of the minor and his personal traits.
3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons
NAP - all data already covered in the above.
3.2.Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor
Dismissed denunciations due to concluded settlement between an offender and the aggrieved person or due to the offender accomplishing some tasks imposed by public prosecutor.
3.3.Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons
NAP - all already covered in the above data.
3.4.Cases brought to court
Natural persons and legal entities charged before district and local courts and motions for punishment or educational measure for minors.
4. Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year
Unresolved criminal complaints as at 31 December of the previous year for all categories (adults, minors and legal entities).
Inconsistencies within the table are possible due to the peculiarity of the IT system - 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.). Every category (row in the table) is calculated (counted) separately, therefore the „Pending on 31 Dec“ may not equal to the formula (Pending 1 Jan + Incoming – Processed) due to aforementioned influences.

**Q107 (2024):** Further break-down of data reported:
(1) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year include transferred criminal complaints against known offenders (4,60%) and unknown offenders (95,40%)
(2) Incoming cases include criminal denunciations against known offenders (42,40%) and unknown offenders (57,60%)
(3) Processed cases include processed cases against known offenders (38,44%) and unknown offenders (61,56%)
(3.1.) Discontinued during the reference year include dismissed criminal complaints against known offenders (26,70%) and unknown offenders (73,30%)
(3.1.2.) Discontinued due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation include known offenders (22,32%) and unknown offenders (77,68%)
(4) Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year include unresolved criminal complaints against known offenders (5,08%) and unknown offenders (94,92%)

**Q107 (2023):** Further break-down of data reported:
(1) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year include transferred criminal complaints against known offenders (5%) and unknown offenders (95%)
(2) Incoming cases include criminal denunciations against known offenders (44%) and unknown offenders (56%)
(3) Processed cases include processed cases against known offenders (38%) and unknown offenders (62%)
(3.1.) Discontinued during the reference year include dismissed criminal complaints against known offenders (26%) and unknown offenders (74%)
(3.1.2.) Discontinued due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation include known offenders (23%) and unknown offenders (77%)
(4) Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year include unresolved criminal complaints against known offenders (5%) and unknown offenders (95%)
Discrepancies (to 2022 data):
The increase in processed cases (3) is due to increase in discontinued cases (3, 3.1) against unknown offenders, due to the expiry of statue of limitations (an increase in number of cases against known offenders is negligible). 50% of cases, discontinued in 2023 were in fact filed in 2013 (10 years is the statue of limitation for most of criminal offences in the Penal Code). Structurally, in 50% of discontinued cases the criminal offence was theft. Another factor is that in 2013 the data collection in public prosecution migrated from written records to informatised records, which might affected the consistency of data pre/post 2013. However in long term, the number of cases filed against unknown offenders had been decreasing from 2012 to 2021 (decrease by more than 55%), and only in 2022 the number of filed cases increased somewhat.

**Q107 (2022):** Discrepancies (to 2020 data) - 3.Processed cases: 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).
3.Processed cases... increase by 91%: 2 factors contributed to the increase: 1) in 2020, the work of state prosecution was impacted by the Covid19 pandemic; 2) more willingness of suspects and victims to cooperate in alternative forms of law enforcement is observed.
Further break-down of data reported:
(1) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year include transferred criminal complaints: 11.543 (known offenders) and 271.319 (unknown offenders)
(2) Incoming cases include criminal denunciations: 24.815 (known offenders) and 35.036 (unknown offenders)
(3) Processed cases include processed cases: 24.475 (known offenders) and 29.886 (unknown offenders)
(3.1.) Discontinued during the reference year include dismissed criminal complaints: 14.207 (known offenders) and 29.886 (unknown offenders)
(3.1.2.) Discontinued due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation include: 11.639 (known offenders) and 29.886 (unknown offenders)
(4) Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year include unresolved criminal complaints: 12.024 (known offenders) and 277.436 (unknown offenders)

**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.

**Q107-1 (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.

**Q107-1 (2024):** In 2024, the majority of plea negotiations were conducted in cases falling within the jurisdiction of the district courts and concerned serious criminal offences, often involving multiple defendants and requiring complex evidentiary proceedings. Increase in number of procedures: Approximately 40% of all plea agreements were concluded by a district prosecutor's office located in proximity to the state border, primarily in relation to offences of unlawful border crossing or irregular entry into the country, as defined in Article 308 of the Criminal Code-1.

**Q107-1 (2023):** Compared to the previous year, there has been a 43% increase in the number of plea agreements. The increase in plea agreements is primarily due to crimes involving illegal border crossings.
**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.

**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.

**Q013 (General Comment):** The indicated amount of approved and implemented budget is allocated for the overall functioning of State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Slovenia. It does not include budget for functioning of the State Prosecution Council (included in Q15.1 and Q15.2.)
**Q013 (2024):** The biggest savings were on salaries, which is still mainly due to vacancies, especially in prosecutorial posts, for which salaries were already planned in 2024. There were also some savings due to several longer absences from work for health reasons, which were reimbursed by the Health Insurance Institute of Slovenia. The same reasons apply also for lower expenditures on training.
**Q013 (2023):** Difference between approved and implemented: The biggest savings were on salaries, which is still mainly due to vacancies, especially in prosecutorial posts, for which salaries were already planned in 2023. There were also significant savings due to several longer absences from work for health reasons, which were reimbursed by the Health Insurance Institute of Slovenia. The same reasons apply also for lower expenditures on training.

**Q013 (2022):** Discrepancies at 13.1 (training): In 2020 and 2021, the budget was impacted by the limitations due to Covid-19 pandemics, hence the increase in 2022 (compared to 2020).
**Q013 (2021):** The low implementation in comparison with the adopted budget is a consequence of the COVID- 19 epidemic, as there were no educational events with physical participation, but rather virtual ones. For the aforementioned type of events there were no registration fees, or they were lower, compared to participation fees for events with physical participation. Due to the COVID-19 epidemic, the public prosecution's own educational event - Educational Prosecutor's Days, which represents the largest cost of the state prosecutor's office in the field of education, was held virtually.

**Q013 (2020):** Training: the implemented budget was impacted by the limitations due to Covid-19 pandemics.

**Spain**

**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, 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.
**Q107-1 (2021):** Explanation of the increased number of guilty plea procedures: Probably, coming back to normal activity after covid restrictions.
**Q013 (General Comment):** In Spain, it is very difficult to carry out a perfect separation between the budget of Courts and the Budget of Prosecution services, because some concepts are common (civil servants, material resources, buildings, etc). These items cannot be separated from the budget allocated to the functioning of courts. Therefore, the figure provided in respect of the "Total" represents only the salaries.
It is noteworthy that data on the implemented budget is an estimations of the Statistic Department of the General Council of the Judiciary.

**Q013 (2024):** The data Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services are those contained in the General State Budget for the financial year 2024. Programme: 111R "Training of the Prosecutorial Career" of State General Budget, which has led to an improvement in the investment destined to the training of the prosecutors' career. This is a result of the political commitment to improving investment in prosecutors training. Since 2021, the budget has steadily increased with the implementation of the Ministry's Scholarship Programme. The increase in the 2024 budget compared to 2023 is due to the financial requirements needed to implement the Ministry of the Presidency, Justice and Relations with the Parliament's Scholarship Programme for the exam preparation for entry into the public prosecutor career.
Below are the figures for the total aproval budget and, within that total, the portion corresponding exclusively to scholarships. Also included, with the same breakdown, are the figures for the executed budget.
Total Aproved budget (€)12,308,387; total implemented budget :10.021.227,61 € Scholarship Program aproved budget: 7.085.671,99 (€); Scholarship Program implemented budget: 6.323.316,53; €

**Q013 (2023):** -The data Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services are those contained in the General State Budget for the financial year 2023.
Section: 13 MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
Programme: 111R Training of the Prosecutorial Career
- Justification for the discrepancy of the approved budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: The increase is due to the Program 111R "Training of Prosecution Career" of State General Budget, which has led to an improvement in the investment destined to the training of the prosecutors' career. This is a result of the political commitment to improving investment in prosecutors training

**Q013 (2022):** The variation in the implemented budget are within normal parameters taking into account the variation in the price of money in two years. The budget allocated to training includes a part of the training institution's budget corresponding to the prosecutors training. Regarding approved budget allocated to training the increase is related to the Program 111R "Training of Prosecution Career" that is financed from the State General Budget.

**Q013 (2021):** Regarding the approved annual budget allocated to training, the difference with respect to 2020 lies mainly in the fact that the budgets had been extended for several budget years, starting from a year in which the number of trainee prosecutors was much lower. The increase is due to the approval of budgets for the year 2021 that already took into account much greater promotions of the Prosecution career.
**Q013 (2020):** Concerning budget allocated for training of public prosecutors, the difference between the approved and implemented budget, namely the fact that the latter is considerably lower than the former, possibly stems from the pandemic and the impossibility to carry out all the foreseen training courses in 2020.

# Indicator 4: Public prosecution services - Case flow

## Comments provided by the national correspondents

## organised by question no.

*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 013. Annual (approved and implemented) public budget allocated to the public prosecution services, in €.*

### Question 107

**Austria**

**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).
Following a change in Question 107, starting from 2022, cases previously reported as "closed for other reasons" are included in "discontinued for other reasons".

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q107 (General Comment):** Data concerning the investigation and prosecution of criminal cases by the prosecutors' offices at the courts of first instance (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9 and 11.
The data concern only criminal offences committed by persons of legal age. For “juvenile cases”, only data for incoming cases are available (no data available for resolved cases). Statistics on juvenile courts are currently being developed. Cases where the perpetrator is unknown are also included. The unit of account is a criminal case: a case may involve none, one or more defendants and/or one or more offences. Since the reform of the judicial landscape entered into force on 1 April 2014, Belgium has 15 first instance public prosecutors' offices (14 public prosecutors' offices + the Federal prosecutor's office). Data of the Federal prosecutor's office (FPO) are not included in the figures. The FPO prosecutes a limited list of offences set out in articles 144ter et seq of the Judicial Code. This list includes the following offences: crimes and offences against State security; threats of attack or theft of nuclear material; trafficking and organised trafficking in human beings; illegal arms trafficking; criminal conspiracy and criminal organisation; terrorism; offences related to these offences; offences which, to a large extent, concern several jurisdictions or which have an international dimension, in particular those of organised crime. Given the specific matters dealt with by the FPO and the low figures, the FPO data are not included in the figures provided. The FP0 data can be consulted separately on the Public Prosecutor's website: https://www.om-mp.be/stat/corr/jstat2022/n/home.html .
Prior to 2022, “cases discontinued for other reasons” referred only to cases in which it was possible to determine from the database that they had been discontinued but the reason was not entered or was not correctly recorded. When the reason is correctly recorded, the case is then classified under headings 3.1.1, 3.1.2 or 3.1.3. As a result, the heading “discontinued for other reasons” concerned “unknown reasons” and not “special’ reasons”. Since 2022, following the deletion of a sub-category in Q107, cases previously reported in line 3.3. “Cases closed by the prosecutor for other reasons” are added to cases in line “3.1.4. Discontinued for other reasons”.

**Q107 (2024):** Source: Annual statistics from the Public Prosecutor's Office – Investigation and prosecution of criminal cases by prosecution offices attached to first instance courts (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9, and 11.
Useful information for interpreting the data: of the 74 526 cases in section “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor” (see table 9), 23 827 cases were closed following probation, 25 370 cases were closed following a chain settlement: administrative processing, 6 318 cases were closed following another chain settlement, 16 746 cases were closed following payment of a sum of money, 2 265 cases were closed following successful mediation and measures.
The 124 792 cases in section 3.1.4 “Discontinued for other reasons” include: 6 611 cases in which the suspect is the subject of a report. Once the suspect has been identified, the case may be reopened; 43 397 cases that were referred to another authority for disposition. A case referred for disposition is considered as a closed case for the public prosecutor's office that made this decision. The recipient of this case will open a new case and start the judicial investigation; 74 242 cases joined to another case. When one or more cases are joined to a parent case, all subsequent decisions are recorded at the parent case level. The “daughter case” receives the joinder decision; 542 cases closed following processing without criminal prosecution for unknown reasons/error.

**Q107 (2023):** “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor”: of the 60 912 cases, 20 658 cases were terminated following probation; 22 410 cases were closed following a chain settlement - administrative processing; 3 836 cases were closed following another chain settlement; 11 766 cases were closed following payment of a sum of money; 2 242 cases were closed following a successful mediation procedure and measures.
“3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons”: out of 126 624 cases, 6 372 cases in which the suspect is the subject of an alert. Once the suspect has been discovered, the case can be reopened; 43 955 cases that have been referred for disposal to another authority. A case that has been sent for disposal is a closed case for the public prosecutor who took the decision. The authority that receives this case will open a new case and start the judicial investigation; 76 235 cases were joined to another case. If one or more cases are joined to a “mother-case”, all subsequent decisions are recorded in the “mother -case”. The daughter case receives the decision of joining; 62 cases were closed without prosecution for unknown/erroneous reasons.
“3.3 Cases brought to court”: in order to count these cases (34 166 cases), all cases closed by direct summons (18 825 cases) and all cases placed under judicial investigation (15 341 cases) are taken into account. In fact, all these cases are also considered as cases closed by the public prosecutor's office in the annual statistics of the Public Prosecutor's Office (see table 9).
See: Annual statistics of the public prosecution offices - Investigation and prosecution of criminal cases by the criminal prosecution departments of the first instance courts (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9 and 11.

**Q107 (2022):** Annual statistics of the Public Prosecutor's Office - Investigation and prosecution of criminal cases by the criminal prosecutors' offices at the courts of first instance (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9 and 11.

More precisely, in respect of cases "3.2. Concluded with a sanction", out of the 65 486 cases, 20 799 cases were closed following praetorian probation, 24 881 cases were closed following an administrative settlement chain process, 2 130 cases were closed following another settlement chain process, 15 025 cases were closed following a payment of money, 2 651 cases were closed due to successful mediation procedure.

Out of the 126 753 cases "discontinued for other reasons" there were: 6 697 cases where the suspect is the subject of an alert (once a suspect is identified, the case may be reopened); 45 327 cases referred to another instance (such cases are closed for the prosecutor making this decision, while they are incoming cases for the recipient); 74 526 cases that were joined with others; 203 cases settled following processing without criminal prosecutions for unknown reasons/error.

As concerns the 36 068 cases brought to court, were taken into account all cases closed by direct citation (21 679) and all cases that take place under judicial instruction(14 389).

The decreases observed in respect of cases "concluded by a penalty" and "brought to court", have been explained by the decrease in the number of Covid-19 files following the relaxation of Corona measures. Such cases were solved mainly through payment or direct summons.

**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 pe-
nalty"). In the case of non-payment of the settlement, repeat offenses, or serious violations of these measures, the criminal policy was to bring the case to court, given the importance of compliance with these measures. About half of the increase in court cases is due to the new methodology. The other half is explained by citations in health crisis cases, as explained above.

**Bulgaria**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The following clarification is made on the specific indicators in the table:
“1. 1.Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year” – This refers to pre-trial proceedings pending with the prosecutor on 1 January of the reference year, where the investigation has been completed by an investigating body and sent to the prosecutor. PTP not closed by an investigating authority are not included under this indicator.
“2. Incoming/received cases” – Report the pre-trial proceedings for which an investigation by an investigative body was completed during the reference year and sent to the prosecutor for adjudication. The Prosecutor's Office reports as closed PTP cases with an investigation completed by an investigative body, not cases adjudicated by a prosecutor.
“3. Processed cases” – For this indicator, the number indicated for PTP represents the number of PTPs disposed by a prosecutor. This number is formed as the sum of the number of cases decided by the PTP prosecutor (either by an act of referral to court or by an act of discontinuance of pre-trial proceedings) and the number of pre-trial proceedings decided by the prosecutor by an act of suspension or referral to another prosecutor's office. Cases suspended and sent to the prosecutor's office are counted as decided by the prosecutor's office, but provisionally, not on the merits. The prosecutor's act of suspending PTP does not constitute a decision on the merits, as it does not put an end to the criminal proceedings and the work on them is only suspended temporarily, i.e. they are not investigated by the investigating authority.
With regard to the PTPs discontinued by the Prosecutor referred to under indicator “3.1. Discontinued during the reference year” the figure is formed by the sum of the data submitted under indicator “3.1.2. Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation”, including pre-trial proceedings terminated because the act was not committed or did not constitute a crime, as well as PTPs terminated due to statute of limitations; and the data submitted under indicator "3.1.4. Discontinued for other reasons”, reporting on PTPs discontinued/suspended and PTPs sent to the jurisdiction/sent by competence during the reporting period. The data on cases discontinued due to perpetrator of the crime not being identified are reported in indicator 3.1.4. This indicator (3.1.4.) reflects the total number of discontinued/suspended cases, without distinguishing between those discontinued due to failure to identify the perpetrator and those discontinued against a known perpetrator on other grounds. It should be borne in mind that PTPs suspended by limitation and PTPs sent to the competent prosecutor's office (by the sending prosecutor's office) are counted as PTPs resolved, so their number is included under the indicator 'Processed cases (3.1+3.2+3.3)', but not under the indicator 'Incoming/received cases '.
Indicators “3.1.1. Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified”, “3.1.3. Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity” and 3.2. “Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor” are not applicable to prosecutors' rulings according to the CCP, and therefore no data are presented.
“3.3. Cases brought to court” – This indicator takes into account the number of pre-trial proceedings brought to court with a prosecutor's report during the reference year.
In the official statistical reporting of the PRB, a criminal case is reported as brought to cour

t if at least one prosecutorial act has been submitted to the court – an indictment; a proposal for an agreement under Article 381 of the Penal Procedure Code; a proposal for exemption from criminal liability and imposition of an administrative penalty under Article 78a of the Criminal Code, and a proposal for an agreement under Article 375a(1) of the Penal Procedure Code. However, more than one prosecutorial act may be submitted to the court in relation to a single pre-trial proceeding (e.g. an agreement in relation to one person and an indictment in relation to the other defendants). The prosecutorial acts submitted give rise to court cases in which prosecutors participate in court hearings, including when a proposal has been submitted to settle the case by agreement. A case is also opened in court, in which the prosecutor, the defendant and his defence counsel appear, and the court issues a judicial act. It should be noted that the official statistics of the PRB do not explicitly collect data on the number of pre-trial proceedings in which an indictment has been filed (the acts are counted, not the cases). Since there can only be one indictment per pre-trial proceeding, we have assumed that the number of pre-trial proceedings with an indictment is equal to the number of indictments. However, the official statistics of the PRB do not explicitly collect data on the number of pre-trial proceedings brought before the court with proposals for agreements under Article 381 of the Penal Procedure Code, proposals for exemption from criminal liability and imposition of administrative penalties under Article 78a of the Criminal Code, and proposals for agreements under Article 375a(1) of the Penal Procedure Code. In order to obtain this data, the number of pre-trial proceedings in which an indictment has been filed is subtracted from the total number of pre-trial proceedings brought before the court. Cases resolved by agreement or proposal under Article 78a of the Criminal Code can be indicated as a total number, without being able to distinguish them by type of prosecutorial act. “4. Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year” – This refers to PTPs remaining with the prosecutor for resolution as of 31 December of the reference year, where the investigation has been concluded by an investigating authority and sent to the prosecutor. The indicator does not include PTPs pending prosecution by an investigating authority as of 31 December.
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 “discontinued 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 (2024):** The official statistics of the PORB also report and aggregate data on other indicators of pre-trial work that cannot be identified or do not match the indicators in the Questionnaire, therefore the following clarification is made:
According to the reporting system introduced in the PORB, pretrial proceedings are reported as: Monitored, Closed (with investigation completed by investigating authority) and Resolved (by a prosecutor).
Supervised pre-trial proceedings include: the newly initiated PTPs during the reporting period, in this case 2024 (89 145 PTPs), the PTPs pending by an investigating authority at the end of the previous reporting period (57 495 PTPs), the PTPs pending by a prosecutor at the end of the previous reporting period (4 163 PTPs), the PTPs received under the jurisdiction during the reporting period, the PTPs returned by the court as well as by a prosecutor (incl. PTPs decided in previous periods but returned during the reporting period), PTPs reopened during the reporting period, PTPs merged (joined) and PTPs split.
For statistical reporting purposes in the PORB (and not pursuant to the CCP), a pretrial proceeding is reported as resolved when any of the following prosecutor's decisions are made: a decree to send the PTP to the competent jurisdiction, a decree to suspend the PTP, a decree of discontinuance, a prosecutor's act to bring the case to court – indictment, a proposal for a settlement under Article 381 CCP, a proposal under Article 375 CCP, in conjunction with Article 78a CCP, for exemption from criminal responsibility with the imposition of an administrative penalty, and a proposal for a settlement under Article 375a(1) CCP.
The statistical analysis distinguishes between the total number of cases decided in which one of the above-mentioned prosecutor's acts was handed down and the cases decided on the merits. Cases decided on the merits are only those decided by a decision to discontinue the criminal proceedings or by a prosecutor's act to bring the case to court, which concludes the pre-trial phase. PTPs decided by a decision to suspend and refer are not included as they do not end the pre-trial phase/criminal proceedings. PTPs sent to the jurisdiction are reported by the sending prosecutor's office as monitored PTPs and resolved PTPs, but are not reported as PTPs closed by the investigating authority. PTPs discontinued due to the expiry of the statutory limitation period (under Article 24(1)(3) CCP) shall be counted as PTPs observed and decided, but shall not be counted in the number of PTPs discontinued as they were already counted as such when they were discontinued. Suspended PTPs in previous periods are not counted in the total number of PTPs observed during the reference period, except in cases where the suspended PTP is resumed, where it is included in the number of PTPs observed and according to its current status at the end of the period.

**Q107 (2023):** The data in the table, are derived from the official statistical reporting of the PTB for 2023, according to the indicators and order defined by the Guideline on the organization of information activities in the PTB, approved by order of the Attorney General, as follows point by point:
1) in the indicator "Pending cases as of January 1 of the reference year", the pending pre-trial proceedings (PTP) by a prosecutor as of January 1 of 2023 are reported
2) the indicator "Incoming/received cases" reports the closed PTPs by an investigating authority.
3) the "Processed cases" indicator reports PTPs processed of by a prosecutor and is the sum of data from the three indicators (3.1+3.2+3.3), with PTP disposition types reflected. This number is formed as the sum of the number of PTP decided by a prosecutor on the merits (by an act to bring the case to court or by an act to terminate the pre-trial proceedings), and the number of pre-trial proceedings that the prosecutor decided by an act to suspend them or to send them to another prosecutor's office.
3.1) The indicator "Discontinued during the reference year" takes into account the discontinued PTP, including those due to prescription, the suspended PTP and the PTP sent to the jurisdiction and is the sum of the data from the following four indicators.
(3.1.1 + 3.1.2 + 3.1.3 + 3.1.4), reflecting the types of terminations:
3.1.1) in indicator "Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified", no data is shown as it is not applicable.
3.1.2) in indicator "Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation", PTP terminations are reported, including those due to statute of limitations.
3.1.3) in the indicator "Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity" – no data is provided as it is not applicable.
3.1.4) in indicator "Discontinued for other reasons" – PTPs terminated are reported, as well as PTPs sent to another prosecutor's office for jurisdiction. These cases are considered closed/resolved for the respective prosecutor's office, albeit without a final decision on the merits.
3.2) in indicator "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor" – not applicable. No data is provided.
3.3) in indicator "Cases brought to court", PTP filed in court are reported.
4) In the indicator "Cases pending on December 31 of the reference year", the PTP pending by the prosecutor as of December 31, 2023 are reported.
The official statistics of the PORB also report and aggregate data on other indicators of pre-trial work that cannot be identified or do not match the indicators in the Questionnaire, therefore the following clarification is made:
According to the reporting system introduced in the PRB, pretrial proceedings (PTP) are reported as: Monitored, Closed (with investigation completed by investigating authority) and Resolved (by a prosecutor).
Supervised pre-trial proceedings include: the newly initiated PTPs during the reporting period, in this case 2023 (89 580 PTPs), the PTPs pending by an investigating authority at the end of the previous reporting period (57 495 PTPs), the PTPs pending by a prosecutor at the end of the previous reporting period (4 208 PTPs), the PTPs received under the jurisdiction
ical reporting purposes in the PTP (and not pursuant to the CCP), a pretrial proceeding is reported as resolved when any of the following prosecutor's decisions are made: a decree to send the PTP to the competent jurisdiction, a decree to suspend the PTP, a decree of discontinuance, a prosecutor's act to bring the case to court – indictment, a proposal for a settlement under Article 381 CCP, a proposal under Article 375 CCP, in conjunction with Article 78a CCP, for exemption from criminal responsibility with the imposition of an administrative penalty, and a proposal for a settlement under Article 375a(1) CCP.
The statistical analysis distinguishes between the total number of cases decided in which one of the above-mentioned prosecutor's acts was handed down and the cases decided on the merits. Cases decided on the merits are only those decided by a decision to discontinue the criminal proceedings or by a prosecutor's act to bring the case to court, which concludes the pre-trial phase. PTPs decided by a decision to suspend and refer are not included as they do not end the pre-trial phase/criminal proceedings. PTPs sent to the jurisdiction are reported by the sending prosecutor's office as monitored PTPs and resolved PTPs, but are not reported as PTPs closed by the investigating authority. PTPs discontinued due to the expiry of the statutory limitation period (under Article 24(1)(3) CCP) shall be counted as PTPs observed and decided, but shall not be counted in the number of PTPs discontinued as they were already counted as such when they were discontinued. Suspended PTPs in previous periods are not counted in the total number of PTPs observed during the reference period, except in cases where the suspended PTP is resumed, where it is included in the number of PTPs observed and according to its current status at the end of the period.

**Q107 (2022):** “1. Pending cases on 1 January of the reference year” – pre-trial proceedings (PTP) pending with the prosecutor as of 1 January of the reference year (4 205) for which the investigation has been completed by an investigative body and sent to the prosecutor (PTPs closed by an investigating authority (47 969) are not included). “2. Received/Incoming cases” – PTP in which an investigation by an investigative body was completed during the reference year and sent to the prosecutor for adjudication. In the Prosecutor's Office the term closed PTP refers to cases with a completed investigation by an investigative body, not cases resolved by a prosecutor “3. Processed cases” – the figure of 161,905 PTP is the sum of the number of PTP decided on merits by the prosecutor (by act of bringing the cases to court or by act of termination the pre-trial proceedings), and the number of pre-trial proceedings decided by the prosecutor by act of suspending them or sending by competence during the reporting period to another prosecutor's office. Cases suspended and sent by competence are reported as resolved by the prosecution, but temporarily, not on the merits. The prosecutor's act of suspension of PTP does not constitute a decision on the merits, as it does not put an end to the criminal proceedings and the work on them is only temporarily suspended, i.e. they are not investigated by the investigating authority. "3.1. The number of PTPs discontinued during the reference year" is 133 466, the figure being formed by the sum of the data submitted under indicator "3.1.2. Terminated by the prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation" (98 306), including pre-trial proceedings terminated because the act was not committed or did not constitute an offence, pursuant to Art. 243(1), in conjunction with Art. 1(1) of the CPC, (31 302) and PTPs terminated due to the statute of limitations (67 004), and the data submitted under indicator "3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons" (35 160), taking into account the suspended PTPs and the pre-trial proceedings sent by competence during the reporting period Indicators "3.1.1 Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified", "3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity" and 3.2. "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor" are not applicable to the decisions of prosecutors according to the CCP, as indicated in the Questionnaire. “3.3. Cases brought to court" – PTP brought to court with a prosecutor's report in the reference year – 28 439. “4. Pending cases on 31 December" – PTP pending with the prosecutor on 31 December of the reference year (4 208), where the investigation has been completed by an investigating authority and sent to the prosecutor. The indicator does not include PTPs pending with an investigating authority, which total 52 423 as of 31 December 2022.

**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.

**Croatia**

**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 (2024):** The calculation of the vertical discrepancy in the table results in the following: (56,550 + 42,187) - 41,035 = 57,702. The total number of pending cases as of December 31 is 61,969, reflecting a 9.59% increase in discrepancy compared to the previous reporting period.
It is important to highlight that the data requested in the questionnaire are not fully aligned with the statistical reporting framework employed by the State Attorney's Office. This discrepancy is evident in sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, where the responses were marked as NA (not available), and in section 3.2, marked as NAP (not applicable). Section 3.1.3 includes data on decisions not to initiate proceedings under the principle of opportunity, but only in relation to juvenile offenders, as these are the only such cases recorded separately in statistical reports. For other offenders, only the overall number of dismissals is provided, without distinguishing whether they were based on the principle of expediency.
The questionnaire instructions clarify that when several NA and NAP responses are present—as is the case here—the standard requirement for vertical and horizontal consistency of the data in the table does not apply. Part of the observed discrepancy can be attributed to the increase in pending cases by the end of the year, which rose to 61,969 from 56,550 in the previous year.
The rise in case numbers can be attributed, among other things, to vacant positions for deputy prosecutors and legal advisors, which has led to an above-average workload for the remaining staff, as well as a higher number of hearings and court sessions. Additionally, question 107 in category 3.2 did not initially include plea agreements, although these were later entered under question 107-1.

**Q107 (2022):** Data source: Report of the Attorney General of the Republic of Croatia on the work of state attorneys' offices in 2022.
*3.1. the total number of cases are completed with the adoption of a decision on the dismissal of the criminal report or a decision on the suspension of the investigation, however statistical data are not reccorded according to the categories requested in the table (15,414).
**3.1.3. the data includes only juvenile offenders, as data in relation to other offenders is not available in the aforementioned Report.
For 2022, the data in section 3.1 (Discontinued during the reference year) also include data from section 3.1.4 (Discontinued for other reasons), which for 2021 were presented in section 3.3. (cases closed by public prosecutor for other reasons).
It is necessary to take into account the statistical specifics of the presentation of individual decisions, because the questionnaire asks for data in a way that is not harmonized with the statistical presentation of the work of the state attorney's office. This is why there are certain statistical deviations because the data is not compared in the annual report of the State Attorney's Office of the Republic of Croatia. Besides, due to the overloading of certain state attorney's offices, specifically for the Municipal Criminal State Attorney's Office in Zagreb, 1,060 cases were delegated to other state attorney's offices, which statistically for the Zagreb Municipal Criminal State Attorney's Office is shown as a transfer of cases and also included in the number of cases resolved by the state attorney's office to another method (that is, for 2022 in section 3.1.4, which is included in the total in section 3.1). So, in fact, the increase in the number of cases discontinued during the reference year is an increase that occurred due to the statistical method of presentation, and not a real increase.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**Q107 (2024):** Four years ago, 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 (2023):** Three years ago, 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.
There is no specific reason identified for the 53% increase in cases discontinued during the reference year, as these figures can vary annually.

**Q107 (2022):** Two years ago, 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 (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.

**Denmark**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor. All prosecutors are subject to a recruitment procedure conducted by The Director of Public Prosecutions' Office on behalf of the Ministry of Justice. A prosecutor can serve within The Local Prosecution Service based in one of the 15 the police districts or within The Central Prosecution Service with one of the Regional State Prosecutors' offices or with The Director of Public Prosecutions' Office.

**Q107 (2024):** In some cases indictment and subsequent discontinuation occurs within the same year. In such instances, a single case will both occur in both point 3.2 and 3.3. However, the case will only occur once when computing the total. Thus, the sum of 3.1-3.3 might not be the same as the total in 3.
The reason for the discrepancy in closed/finished cases relative to incoming cases is that processed cases include cases that the prosecution service has responsibility for, but that both the police and prosecution service conducts work on – depending on the case. 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.
One case accounts for one crime for each person involved in the crime. If two crimes were committed by three people, there would be six counts of crimes (=cases). Reports of crime might also grow in number of counts as it progresses through the chain of criminal proceedings. The 'owner' of the case is the department that last worked on it.
The term "Reasons of opportunity" entails cases discontinued according to section 721, subsection 1, no. 3-4 of The Danish Administration of Justice Act, which is applied in cases where it is assed that legal costs and processing time are disproportionate in relation to the significance of the case and its potential sentence.
It is correct that there has been an increase of approximately 83% when comparing 2024 to 2023. However, it is important to emphasize that these number cover individual offences rather than court cases they fall under. When comparing the number of court cases, where one or more offences have been discontinued due to reason of opportunity, we only see an ~18% increase. The reason behind this being that in 2024 a number of court cases, with a large number of individual offences, were settled with discontinuation. For instance; in 2024 five court cases had over 100 offences discontinued due to reason of opportunity – while another case had over 500 offences.
Throughout 2024, there has been an increased effort in reducing the backlog of pending indictments, by prioritizing the processing of existing cases in court. Due to this prioritization, there has been a ~40% decrease in the number of pending indictments when comparing the beginning and end of 2024. However, this has also meant fewer resources allocated to initiating new prosecutions. The natural consequence being an increase in the number of pending charges.

**Q107 (2023):** The reason for the discrepancy in closed/finished cases relative to incoming cases is that processed cases include cases that the prosecution service has responsibility for, but that both the police and prosecution service conduct work on – depending on the case. 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.
One case accounts for one crime for each person involved in the crime. If two crimes were committed by three people, there would be six counts of crimes (=cases). Reports of crime might also grow in number of counts as it progresses through the chain of criminal proceedings. The 'owner' of the case is the department that last worked on it.
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 divided in such subsectors.
From 2021 to 2023 we have had an increased effort in lowering the amount of pending cases. This can partly explain the surge of processed cases.

**Q107 (2022):** 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 divided 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 and 2022 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.
Regarding the increase in incoming cases, it should be noted, that the police is responsible for charging possible perpetrators and hence the number of incoming cases received by the prosecution service. An explanation of the increase in number of incoming cases should therefore be directed to the police. With that being said, the number of incoming cases varies from year to year and the amount in 2021 was lower than the previous years.

**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.

**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 (2022):** The general trend shows a decrease in registered crimes.

**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.

**Finland**

**Q107 (2024):** Regarding section 3.1.2, there has been a change in our statistic model. The previous statistic model was inaccurate and did not respond this section reliably. The figures previously included in this section are now included in section 3.1.4.

**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.4 In earlier reply there was a mistake in figures:In earlier answer the 3.1.4 included only motions to dismiss and restrictions of pretrial investigations; now the numbers include also other technical decisions (5205, "closed by other reasons"). 3.2 The absolute amounts in these transfers of are so small, that even a change to just a few cases causes discrepencies. The drop of the number of cases from 9 to 4 is within normal variation.

**Q107 (2022):** 3.2 Notice cases of summary fines are not included. The number of summary fines in 2022 was 34426.

**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.

**France**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The complexity and diversity of criminal data do not allow for estimates of pending cases to be produced.
The data concern cases recorded regardless of the number of offenses or individuals involved. However, if the same case involving multiple individuals is subject to several different courses of action (for example, different treatment of minors and adults or dismissal and prosecution in the same case), then the number of actions taken is counted.
The data concern adults, minors, and legal entities.

**Q107 (2024):** Source: SSER, statistical file Cassiopée

**Q107 (2023):** “3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation” and “3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity”: data used are based on extractions from “Cassiopée”. However, the introduction of the PPN has led to the gradual integration into the applications over the period 2022-2024 of cases that were not previously recorded in the applications. As a result, the number of criminal cases at first instance has increased artificially in 2023 as a result of the integration of unrecorded cases (small X). It should be noted that there is an effect from 2022, which is less strong but already present. Source(s) : SSER, Cassiopée statistical file

**Q107 (2021):** source SDSE

**Germany**

**Q107 (General Comment):** 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 statistics. The public prosecution offices collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the federal states, 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 survey" 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 category "covered by the procedural surveys".

**Q107 (2024):** "Other reasons" include: referral to private action, referral to administrative authority as regulatory offence, referral to a different public prosecutor's office, joining with another case, referral to the European Public Prosecutor's Office
3.2 Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor:
The number represents the cases that were discontinued in accordance with Section 153a of the Code of Criminal Procedure ("nonprosecution 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.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistency with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occurs in the official statistic published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this are count corrections of the monthly collected data at the end of the year.

**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.4: Cases from former line 3.3 "closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons" are now included here. In the previous evaluation cycle, those cases were included in the total of processed cases (3.) but were not displayed under "discontinued cases".
"Other reasons" include: referral to private action, referral to administrative authority as regulatory offence, referral to a different public prosecutor's office, joining with another case, referral to the European Public Prosecutor's Office
3.2 Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor:
The number represents 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 (2022):** 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 Discrepancy in comparison to the 2020-2022 cycle: The number of cases discontinued for other reasons was consideralbly higher in the public prosecution statistic 2020 and in previous years. This was due to a programming issue in one of the federal states. 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 (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.

**Greece**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The data in the table are presented by case file (and not, for example, on the number of offenders). Vertical consistency in the table is not ensured because the data are continuously updated/corrected and because of unknown offender cases that are referred either to the investigating magistrate (when they are felonies) or to a preliminary procedure (when they are misdemeanors) have not yet been completed. All cases that are referred to the investigator are returned to the public prosecutor, whether the perpetrator is identified or not. Cases where the perpetrator could not be identified are considered as resolved, while the rest (where the perpetrator is identified) follow further criminal proceedings and are either solved within the reporting period or are considered pending in the next time period. More precisely, cases where the offender could not be identified are placed in the "unknown perpetrator file". Cases placed in the "unknown perpetrator file" are suspended with a decision of the prosecutor and such decisions are counted as “ 3.1.1 Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified”.

**Q107 (2024):** Source: Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat).
The observed increase in the number of cases discontinued for reasons of opportunity (+42%) and the number of cases referred to court (+30%) can be attributed to the reforms of the public prosecutor's office introduced in 2024. More specifically, under Law 5090/2024 prosecutors were given greater discretion to close cases when it is not in the public interest or when the offense is of low severity. This was applied more actively to misdemeanors, especially in cases with limited evidence or with conciliatory intentions.
At the same time, the prosecution of crimes of domestic violence, organized crime, and corruption was strengthened, resulting in an increase in the number of cases brought to court for trial.

**Q107 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
Decreases in the number of cases dismissed for reasons of opportunity and cases concluded by a penalty: during the implementation of the restrictive measures to deal with the Covid 19 pandemic, police activity was greatly increased with constant patrols which resulted in a rapid increase in arrests and consequently in criminal prosecutions for selected offences, such as violation of the drug law (supplying drugs even for personal use is strictly illegal in Greece). With the expiry of the restraining orders, arrests and criminal convictions decreased.

**Q107 (2022):** It is worth highlighting that comparisons with previous data/cycles are not relevant. Indeed, since last year, measures have been taken to improve the system for collecting and calculating statistical data. As the methodology is developing, discrepancies in data can be observed.

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q107 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
Overall, it can be concluded that from 2023 to 2024, there was a significant increase in both the number of offences (+20.2%) and the number of offenders (number of offences per offender) (+40.6%).
Since the number of procedural decisions recorded takes into account the individual offences and, if there are multiple perpetrators of an offence, the procedural decisions recorded for the perpetrators, the number of procedural decisions recorded by the prosecution service has increased exponentially (+45.7%).
The most significant changes in the individual data can be attributed to the following: With regard to question 3.1.2, the increase (110.64%) – beyond the average increase detailed above – can be attributed to two cases. 1) In case no. 926/2021 of the Szigetszentmiklós District Prosecution Office, procedural decision M036 was recorded in 4,381 cases (It cannot be established that the suspect committed the crime [Section 398 (2) a) of the Criminal Procedure Code]).
In the case of several thousand counts of "serial fraud", the proceedings were terminated in respect of all acts with regard to eight perpetrators, while the other perpetrators were subject to indictment.
2) In case no. 25/2024 of the Budapest XIV-XVI District Prosecution Office, procedural decision M036 was recorded in 1,734 cases (It cannot be established that the suspect committed the crime [Section 398 (2) a) of the Criminal Procedure Code]).
In the case of 868 counts of "serial fraud," the proceedings were terminated in respect of all acts committed with regard to two perpetrators, while the other perpetrators were subject to indictment.
In contrast, in 2023, even the case with the most procedural decisions on this legal basis contained only 76 such procedural decisions. With regard to question 3.1.1, although the decrease appears significant, such "fluctuations" may occur due to the low number of cases. It can be stated that the vast majority of procedural decisions in this category (investigation/proceedings suspended due to the perpetrator being unknown/statute of limitations) are made by the investigating authority, so it is difficult to draw conclusions from the data provided by the prosecution service about changes in the legal system.
In general, the prosecution service has no influence on the number of cases in a given year in which sufficient evidence is obtained to bring charges (point 3.3) or in which proceedings are terminated for any reason (points 3.1, 3.1.1, 3.1.2. and 3.1.4.). Depending on the assessment of evidence in specific cases, changes in statistical data from year to year may occur (decreases or increases).

**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.4 Cases discontinued for other reasons - The reason for the increase is the growth in the number of cases recorded under provision IV of Section 398 (2) c) of the Criminal Procedure Code (Termination of liability to punishment for other reasons specified by law).

**Q107 (2022):** The data source - in accordance with the previous data provision - is The Statistical Subsystem of Completed Criminal Proceedings of the Unified Investigation Authority and Prosecution Service Criminal Statistics System (hereinafter ENyÜBS-BBS). In the ENyÜBS-BBS subsystem, the data is recorded when the investigating authorities or the Prosecution Service have made a procedural decision giving reasons for the provision of statistical data in connection with the crime (e.g.: dismissal of the criminal complaint, termination, suspension, accusation/indictment), relating to which statistical data was provided. Considering the time of data recording, the ENyÜBS-BBS subsystem is, therefore, of a so-called follow-up nature, so it does not show how many crimes occurred in the year under review, but it shows how many legal decisions were made in connection with such acts and in how many cases statistical data was provided in this context (in a registrative manner). As a result, the above also means that it may occur there is an ongoing criminal proceeding that is not included in the ENyÜBS database yet. For the questions "Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year" and "Pending cases on 31 December ref.year" in the table, please note that no data is collected on the number of pending cases – on a given day – into the records of the Prosecution Service. Set of data: ENyÜBS-BBS: number of criminal procedure decisions
Unit of recording: criminal procedure decision
Selection date: May 30, 2023.

**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.

**Ireland**

**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 (2024):** Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified' files should never have been sent into the ODPP as a direction cannot be issued if there is no suspect to direct upon. The fall should be considered positive on this basis.
In relation to Q107-3.3.2, it must be noted that prosecutors do not negotiate or plea bargain in this jurisdiction. This information is therefore not available.

**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.4- In 2023, the remaining 3,490 files in the 'discontinued' figure are files where all the suspects were directed for 'no prosecution'. It is not possible to break them down into 107.3.1.2 and 107.3.1.3 as they don't map to the picklist of reasons for not prosecuting that are selected by our Directing Officers.
Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified' files should never have been sent into the ODPP as a direction cannot issue if there is no suspect to direct upon. The fall should be considered positive on this basis.

**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

**Italy**

**Q107 (2023):** “Discontinued for other reasons” includes e.g. the transfer of the case by competence to another office or another register, the joining with another case.
An increase in cases "Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity" and "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor" has been recorded due to due to Legislative Decree 150/2022 which aims to reduce the load on the courts by facilitating the definition by dismissal in the case of tenuousness or irrelevance of the fact.

**Q107 (2022):** We do not know the reasons for these discrepancies. However, the figures are correct.

**Latvia**

**Q107 (General Comment):** Information obtained from the ProIS (Prosecution Information System), that is a 'living' system (input of data is not 'freezed' at the end of the year). Vertical consistency cannot be ensured because there is a number of cases that have been added to "cases discontinued for other reasons" and others that have been returned to the investigative authorities to continue the investigation.

**Q107 (2024):** Increase in Cases Brought to Court (Section 3.3):
In 2024, prosecutors took over 4,057 criminal proceedings involving particularly significant offenses. Compared to 2022, this represents a 40.3% increase. This rise is partly due to the reclassification of certain crimes as high-priority, such as violations of international and national sanctions, illegal border crossings, human smuggling, and facilitating unlawful residence in Latvia. Additionally, the number of cases submitted for prosecution involving these offenses increased significantly—from 454 in 2023 to 975 in 2024—reflecting both improved investigative efforts and enhanced prosecutorial oversight.
Decrease in Cases Concluded by Prosecutorial Penalty or Measure (Section 3.2):
Contrary to previous years, where a growing number of cases were concluded within the prosecution, 2024 saw a notable decline. This shift is primarily due to amendments to the Criminal Law (effective July 4, 2024), which changed sentencing policies for certain categories of offenses—especially those involving violence or committed under the influence of alcohol or drugs in traffic incidents. These amendments removed alternative penalties such as community service and fines, leaving only probation supervision as an option. As a result, for offenses committed between July 4 and December 31, 2024, prosecutors could not conclude proceedings without referring the cases to court. This led to a significant increase in cases brought to court and a decrease in those resolved by prosecutorial penalty.

**Q107 (2023):** Comment on 3.1. : (3.1.+3.2.+3.3.+4.) does not equal to 3, therefore it should be noted that the difference lies in 3.1. since some cases match and are included in both – 3.1.2. (discontinued due to statute of limitation) and 3.1.3. (discontinued for reasons of opportunity).
3.1.3. point - last year's "non-rehabilitating circumstances of a person" covered by the law, defined in articles 415 and 415.1 of the Criminal Code (conditional release from liability) was included in 3.1.3.point, but for 2023 data, these data are included in 3.2. point (because cases are still considered completed with a sanction (last year, paragraph 3.2 contained only the prosecutor's instructions on punishment)).

**Q107 (2022):** Information obtained from the ProIS (Prosecution Information System) data downloaded in February 2023. The same data is used in drawing up the Annual Report of the Prosecution Office submitted to the Parliament. The difference from the number of pending cases on 31 December previous period reported in last CEPEJ questionnaire may be explained that the ProIS is a 'living' system (input of data is not 'freezed' at the end of the year), therefore some cases may be marked in the system as 'pending' between August 2022 and February 2023. One of the reasons for the increase of the number in comparison with the year 2020 may be the structural reforms carried out in the prosecution office, as of 1 November 2021 first instance prosecution offices prosecute all types of criminal offences that were previously prosecuted by prosecution offices of the Judicial Regions. Thus, not only the number/numerical volume of 1st instance prosecutors' cases (criminal proceedings taken under supervision) increased, but also their legal complexity which has impacted the workload backlog. -107. 3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1.-3.1.4.) In consistency with the decrease in total number of incoming/received cases, a decrease can also be observed in the number of all of the discontinued cases.
- 3.1.3. Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity: includes discontinued on the basis of the following grounds set forth in Article 380 of the Criminal Procedure Law: termination of criminal proceedings on the basis of circumstances that exclude criminal proceedings (several subcategories listed in Article 377), termination of criminal proceedings by releasing a person from criminal liability (Parts 1 and 2 of Article 379), including conditional release from liability (Article 415), and termination of criminal proceedings against a person who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime.
The remaining reason of opportunity mentioned in Article 380, namely Article 421 'Prosecutor's penal order' – number of cases discontinued on this basis is included in 107.3.2.: Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor.
- 3.1.4. Discontinued for other reasons: includes 675 cases in which criminal proceedings were suspended, 5 cases where the criminal proceedings have been terminated by conditionally releasing from criminal liability for a serious crime, plus 41 case sent on the basis of the jurisdiction (including – abroad).
- 107. 3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor – the answer for the increase in number lies within the proposed strategical goal of the prosecution office – to complete the criminal proceedings in the prosecution office whenever possible. This has led to the significant increase in the total value of number in Q 107. 3.2. and decrease in numbers in Q 107. 3.3.
- 107. 4. Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: explanation given for Q 107. 1.1. applies to this number as well.

**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/in

vestigative 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.

**Lithuania**

**Q107 (General Comment):** Inconsistency is a result of different sources of data and their differing formulas for calculating some statistical indicators. Numbers of „Pending cases on 1 Jan“, „Pending cases on 31 Dec.“ and „Incoming cases“ are taken from the national register, however number of „Processed cases“ is taken from registers of the Lithuanian Prosecution Service. Number of "criminal cases" is counted by the crimes.
Before 2021, the Prosecutor's Office of Lithuania collected statistics by pre-trial investigations, but no matter if investigation is carried out for 1 crime or for 100 crimes, it would still count as one investigation in the statistics. For this reason methodology was changed, because data in crimes is more suitable for comparative analysis.

**Q107 (2024):** * Section 3.1.4 provides information on criminal cases transferred to a foreign country for further criminal proceedings. Number of "criminal cases" is counted by the crimes. Before 2021, the Prosecutor's Office of Lithuania collected statistics by pre-trial investigations, but no matter if investigation is carried out for 1 crime or for 100 crimes, it would still count as one investigation in the statistics. For this reason methodology was changed, because data in crimes is more suitable for comparative analysis.

**Q107 (2023):** Section 3.1.4 provides information on criminal cases transferred to a foreign country for further criminal proceedings. A large number of cases used to be transferred to Belarus or Russia. Recently, the Lithuanian Prosecutor's Office has reduced international cooperation with these countries to a minimum, which has had an impact on the total number of criminal proceedings transferred to foreign countries.

**Q107 (2022):** Inconsistency is a result of different sources of data and their differing formulas for calculating some statistical indicators. Numbers of „Pending cases on 1 Jan“, „Pending cases on 31 Dec.“ and „Incoming cases“ are taken from the national register, however number of „Processed cases“ is taken from registers of the Lithuanian Prosecution Service.

**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q107 (2024):** 3.1.1 Between 2023 and 2024, a significant 26% increase was observed in resolved cases by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified. This development is part of a broader trend, marked by a continuous rise in the number of incoming cases registered by the public prosecutor’s offices in recent years. Since 2022, the proportion of cases with an unknown perpetrator has regularly exceeded 40% of the total cases handled.

This situation is partly explained by the growing prevalence of cybercrime, which represents an increasing share of discontinued cases without further action. Prosecution in this area is particularly complex due to the technical nature of the offenses and their often international scope, making it difficult or even impossible to identify the perpetrators.

Moreover, this increase also affects other categories of offenses, such as scams, frauds, and the intentional destruction or damage of movable property. In these cases as well, the absence of elements allowing for the identification of perpetrators prevents any judicial proceedings, thereby contributing to the rise in discontinued cases without further action.

**Q107 (2023):** The cases referred to under 3.2. are considered closed if the party concerned complies with the condition imposed by the warning or fulfils its obligations arising from the mediation.
In the event of non-compliance, the public prosecution will resume.
3.1.4: These mainly concern two specific measures: firstly, with regard to road traffic, the obligation to follow a driving course and, only for young adult offenders, participation in a course in the Choice 18+ programme designed to prevent drug addiction (https://www.solina.lu/fr/facilities/impuls/).
The drop in cases closed for Other reasons is explained by the drop in cases closed involving young adult offenders (aged 18 to 21). If these young offenders take part in a course as part of the Choice 18+ programme, designed to prevent drug addiction, and successfully complete it, their cases are closed. However, for reasons of internal organisation within the public prosecutor's offices, these cases are not closed as and when a traineeship is completed, but as a group, i.e. when a certain threshold of completed traineeships is reached. Finally, the drop in closed cases recorded since 2023 in the area of narcotics and concerning young offenders can be explained by the legalisation of recreational cannabis in Luxembourg in July 2023 and the subsequent drop in prosecutions by law enforcement.

**Q107 (2022):** Case covered by subcategory 3.2. are deemed closed if the relevant party complies with the condition set forth in the warning or fulfills its obligations arising from mediation. In case of non-compliance, public prosecution resumes.

Section 3.1.4 primarily encompasses two specific measures; firstly, concerning traffic regulations, the requirement to attend a driving course and, exclusively for young adult offenders, participation in a program called Choice 18+ aimed at preventing drug addiction (https://www.solina.lu/fr/facilities/impuls)."

**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/)."

**Malta**

**Q107 (2024):** The quoted cases do not specifically refer to the caseload of the attorney general, but to all the cases brought to court at first instance by the police acting as prosecutors in cases requiring less than 2 years imprisonment.

**Q107 (2022):** Presently the figures provided are in lien with the cases that are brought to court. The Office of the Attorney General shall be developing its case management system and this data should then be easily captured by the new system.

**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.

**Netherlands**

**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 (2022):** There are a few numbers available, but NL does not register whether cases are litigious or not in the manner asked here.

**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.

**Poland**

**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: - refusal to prosecute, suspension, dealt with in another way, transfer to commander, criminal prosecution transferred.. At the end that following a change in Q107, starting from 2022, cases previously reported as “closed for other reason are presented as “discontinued for other reasons”.

**Q107 (2023):** 3.3. in the number of cases brought to the court (264,341) includes the cases indicated in 3.2. (41,512), after deducting these cases the value is 222,829 and in 3. is the number 1,099,217.
Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons - 428 294

**Q107 (2022):** The other modes of termination concerned 414,485 cases (other modes of termination: refusal to prosecute, suspension, dealt with in another way, transfer to commander, criminal prosecution transferred). These cases are reported within the category “discontinued for other reasons”.

**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.

**Portugal**

**Q107 (General Comment):** The counting unit is the case (criminal proceedings at the investigation stage), so it is the same unit used to count incoming and outgoing cases for the other issues.
Incoming and outgoing cases include internal movements of cases between units (in 2023 there were 36,432 cases transferred between units).
Outgoing cases include cases that are joined together to form a single case.
3.1.1 When the offender is unknown, the case remains open until it is closed by decision of the competent public prosecutor, when all efforts to identify the offender have been exhausted. If a case is reopened, for statistical purposes it is considered a new case on the date it is reopened.

**Q107 (2022):** 3. The total figure for 2022 for the total number of completed criminal cases at the investigation stage is 427 664.

**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.

**Romania**

**Q107 (2020):** There are no available data on grounds on which a decision to discontinue a case is taken by the public prosecutor.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q107 (2023):** 3.1.3 Opportunism is not a feature of the Slovak legal system. Prosecutorial decisions are strictly bound by legality and officiality, with no discretion to decline prosecution if legal criteria are met. For the CEPEJ questionnaire, "NAP" is appropriate for the subcategory 'cases discontinued for reasons of opportunity'.

**Q107 (2022):** It is necessary to state that the required table, or criteria, are different from our legal system. In our criminal proceedings, a large number of cases in the preliminary proceedings are closed by the investigator or police officer, while the table only requires cases closed by the prosecutor. In addition, matters terminated by the prosecutor may also be terminated by the so-called diversions in criminal proceedings, while the table only requires cases stopped by the prosecutor. The inconsistency of data with previous years is also caused by the fact that the prosecutor in the Slovak Republic has slightly different powers in the preliminary proceedings in contrast to the legal systems of other countries, so the data differ according to the point of view of the processor of the data.

**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.

**Slovenia**

**Q107 (General Comment):** Methodology used: statistical data are kept on the accused, 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 has been used in previous reports).
IMPORTANT: Data also includes unfinished criminal complaintes against unknown perpetrators. It should be noted that on average, State Prosecutor's Offices receive between 30.000 and 60,000 complaints per year against unknown perpetrators. These are included in statistical data as unresolved cases until the perpetrator is discovered or the statute of limitations expires.
1.Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. Year: unresolved criminal complaints against known perpetrators (incl. adults, minors and legal entities) and unknown perpetrators.
2. Incoming/received cases: criminal denunciations against known and unknown offenders.
Criminal denunciations against known offenders include cases that were received by the prosecution office as cases with unknown offenders whose identity was discovered during the reporting period. Cases against known offenders are counted by the number of persons involved (i.e. a denunciation against five individuals is counited as five cases), cases against unknown offenders are counted by files.
3. Processed cases: all resolved criminal complaints in the reporting year. There can be multiple criminal complaints in one case file, however the resolution is only one (for all complaints in one case file) – hence the difference between the sum of subcategories (3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4) and the actual number of resolved criminal complaints. The discrepancies in the numbers arise from the way cases are recorded in the information system: in general, in cases with multiple offences by one suspect typically there is a single resolution; in cases with multiple suspects with different offences cases may be split to allow different resolutions; in cases with same suspect and multiple complaints the cases may be merged.
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.
3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation: dismissed denunciations for other reasons than opportunity and accomplishing some tasks imposed or negotiated by state prosecutor. This category includes cases where prosecutor refrains from prosecution after the finish of judicial investigation.
The great majority of cases against unknown offenders is dismissed because the pending time exceeds limitation period for criminal prosecution.
In the case of proposed criminal offenses, the motion of the injured party is a procedural precondition for conducting criminal proceedings. If this presumption does not exist (it is no longer due to withdrawal), the legal consequence is rejection.
For the most part, public prosecutors rejected complaints for other reasons, including 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 offense (prosecuted ex officio), various procedural obstacles).
3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity
Cases where denunciations were dismissed because the consequences of criminal prosecution would prove disproportionate to the weight of criminal offence and dismissed denunciations agains

t minors because the proceedings against him/her would not be appropriate in view of the nature of the offence and circumstances in which it was committed, as well as in view of the past conduct of the minor and his personal traits.
3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons
NAP - all data already covered in the above.
3.2.Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor
Dismissed denunciations due to concluded settlement between an offender and the aggrieved person or due to the offender accomplishing some tasks imposed by public prosecutor.
3.3.Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons
NAP - all already covered in the above data.
3.4.Cases brought to court
Natural persons and legal entities charged before district and local courts and motions for punishment or educational measure for minors.
4. Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year
Unresolved criminal complaints as at 31 December of the previous year for all categories (adults, minors and legal entities).
Inconsistencies within the table are possible due to the peculiarity of the IT system - 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.). Every category (row in the table) is calculated (counted) separately, therefore the „Pending on 31 Dec“ may not equal to the formula (Pending 1 Jan + Incoming – Processed) due to aforementioned influences.

**Q107 (2024):** Further break-down of data reported:
(1) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year include transferred criminal complaints against known offenders (4,60%) and unknown offenders (95,40%)
(2) Incoming cases include criminal denunciations against known offenders (42,40%) and unknown offenders (57,60%)
(3) Processed cases include processed cases against known offenders (38,44%) and unknown offenders (61,56%)
(3.1.) Discontinued during the reference year include dismissed criminal complaints against known offenders (26,70%) and unknown offenders (73,30%)
(3.1.2.) Discontinued due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation include known offenders (22,32%) and unknown offenders (77,68%)
(4) Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year include unresolved criminal complaints against known offenders (5,08%) and unknown offenders (94,92%)

**Q107 (2023):** Further break-down of data reported:
(1) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year include transferred criminal complaints against known offenders (5%) and unknown offenders (95%)
(2) Incoming cases include criminal denunciations against known offenders (44%) and unknown offenders (56%)
(3) Processed cases include processed cases against known offenders (38%) and unknown offenders (62%)
(3.1.) Discontinued during the reference year include dismissed criminal complaints against known offenders (26%) and unknown offenders (74%)
(3.1.2.) Discontinued due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation include known offenders (23%) and unknown offenders (77%)
(4) Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year include unresolved criminal complaints against known offenders (5%) and unknown offenders (95%)
Discrepancies (to 2022 data):
The increase in processed cases (3) is due to increase in discontinued cases (3, 3.1) against unknown offenders, due to the expiry of statue of limitations (an increase in number of cases against known offenders is negligible). 50% of cases, discontinued in 2023 were in fact filed in 2013 (10 years is the statue of limitation for most of criminal offences in the Penal Code). Structurally, in 50% of discontinued cases the criminal offence was theft. Another factor is that in 2013 the data collection in public prosecution migrated from written records to informatised records, which might affected the consistency of data pre/post 2013. However in long term, the number of cases filed against unknown offenders had been decreasing from 2012 to 2021 (decrease by more than 55%), and only in 2022 the number of filed cases increased somewhat.

**Q107 (2022):** Discrepancies (to 2020 data) - 3.Processed cases: 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).
3.Processed cases... increase by 91%: 2 factors contributed to the increase: 1) in 2020, the work of state prosecution was impacted by the Covid19 pandemic; 2) more willingness of suspects and victims to cooperate in alternative forms of law enforcement is observed.
Further break-down of data reported:
(1) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year include transferred criminal complaints: 11.543 (known offenders) and 271.319 (unknown offenders)
(2) Incoming cases include criminal denunciations: 24.815 (known offenders) and 35.036 (unknown offenders)
(3) Processed cases include processed cases: 24.475 (known offenders) and 29.886 (unknown offenders)
(3.1.) Discontinued during the reference year include dismissed criminal complaints: 14.207 (known offenders) and 29.886 (unknown offenders)
(3.1.2.) Discontinued due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation include: 11.639 (known offenders) and 29.886 (unknown offenders)
(4) Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year include unresolved criminal complaints: 12.024 (known offenders) and 277.436 (unknown offenders)

**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.

**Spain**

**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, 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.

**Question 107-1**

**Austria**

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** There is no guilty plea procedure in Austria.

**Belgium**

**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 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". There are no national statistics available due to the lack of uniform coding rules.

**Bulgaria**

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** The indicator "Before the main trial" takes into account the agreements submitted to the court by the prosecutor on the basis of Article 381 CCP and on the basis of Article 375a(1) CCP (the latter was introduced by the Law on the Internal Revenue Code, promulgated, SG No. 48 of 2023), while the indicator "During the main trial" gives a value, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Article 384 CCP (with a person or for any of the offences) concluded by the prosecutors in the trial phase (after an indictment has been filed), by the number of proceedings under the summary trial procedure under Article 371, item 2 CCP (under Chapter Twenty-Eight CCP, under Article 373(3), in conjunction with Article 372(4), in conjunction with Article 371(2) CCP), in which convictions have been handed down (similar to the previous questionnaires), and by the number of agreements under Article 375a(3) CCP, in conjunction with Article 78a CCP, concluded by prosecutors in the judicial phase (after an indictment has been filed or after the submission of orders for exemption from criminal liability with the imposition of an administrative penalty).
Thus, of the 10 571 plea procedures during the trial, 8 049 were agreements concluded under Article 384 CCP, 906 were agreements concluded under Article 375a(3) CCP, and 1 616 were summary proceedings under Article 373(3) in conjunction with Article 372(4) in conjunction with Article 371(2) CCP.
In the indicator "Total number of guilty plea procedures" the aggregate of the above two indicators is indicated.

**Q107-1 (2023):** The indicator "Before the main trial" takes into account the agreements submitted to the court by the prosecutor on the basis of Article 381 CCP and on the basis of Article 375a(1) CCP (the latter was introduced by the Law on the Internal Revenue Code, promulgated, SG No. 48 of 2023), while the indicator "During the main trial" gives a value, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Article 384 CCP (with a person or for any of the offences) concluded by the prosecutors in the trial phase (after an indictment has been filed), by the number of proceedings under the summary trial procedure under Article 371, item 2 CCP (under Chapter Twenty-Eight CCP, under Article 373(3), in conjunction with Article 372(4), in conjunction with Article 371(2) CCP), in which convictions have been handed down (similar to the previous questionnaires), and by the number of agreements under Article 375a(3) CCP, in conjunction with Article 78a CCP, concluded by prosecutors in the judicial phase (after the submission of orders for exemption from criminal liability with the imposition of an administrative penalty).
Thus, of the 10 691 plea procedures during the trial, 8 589 were agreements concluded under Article 384 CCP, 472 were agreements concluded under Article 375a(3) CCP, and 1 630 were summary proceedings under Article 373(3) in conjunction with Article 372(4) in conjunction with Article 371(2) CCP.
In the indicator "Total number of guilty plea proceedings" the aggregate of the above two indicators is indicated.

**Q107-1 (2022):** - in the "Total number of guilty plea procedures" indicator, the total value of the following two indicators is indicated;
- in the indicator "Before the main trial" the agreements submitted to the court by the prosecutor on the basis of Art. 381 et seq. of the Criminal Procedure Code.
- in the indicator "During the main trial" a value is indicated, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Art. 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code (with a person or for any of the crimes), concluded by the prosecutors in a court phase (after the indictment has been filed), as well as the number of procedures under reduced court investigation under Art. 371, item 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code (under Chapter Twenty-Seven of the Criminal Procedure Code, pursuant to Art. 373, paragraph 3, article 372, paragraph 4, article 371, item 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code), under which convictions and acquittals have been handed down (analogous to the previous questionnaires). Out of 10 541 procedures for admission of guilt during the trial, 9 113 were the agreements concluded under Art. 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

**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).

**Croatia**

**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 (2024):** In response to question 107-1 (guilty plea procedure), information on judgments based on plea agreements was provided only under the "Before the main trial" section. The "During the main trial" section was marked as NAP (not applicable), as our legal system does not recognize a formal procedure for plea agreements during the trial. The reason for the increase relates to more frequent use of guilty plea procedures in 2024. The emphasis on utilizing such procedures stems from their ability to expedite court proceedings, enhance overall efficiency, and significantly reduce expenditures from the national budget."

**Q107-1 (2023):** Regarding question 107-1 (guilty plea procedure), data on judgments based on the parties' agreement were entered only in the column "Before the main trial," while the column "During the main trial" was entered as NAP (not applicable) because our country lacks a formal institute for communication during the discussion.
The stated discrepancy percentage of 21.77% can be attributed to the strike.

**Q107-1 (2022):** Data source: Report of the Attorney General of the Republic of Croatia on the work of state attorneys' offices in 2022.
* The data refer to cases under the jurisdiction of county state attorneys' offices and the Office for the Suppression of Corruption and Organized Crime
**The data refer to cases under the jurisdiction of the municipal state attorney's offices, with a note that certain severe criminal cases are also under their jurisdiction, however, statistical data are presented in total for all criminal offenses under the jurisdiction of the municipal state attorney's offices without separating them into "lighter" and "serious" crimes.
The number of agreements from municipal jurisdiction was 318 in 2022, and 242 in 2021, which represents a true increase of 31%. There is no particular reason for this increase, as it is a number that varies depending on the specifics of each reporting period (for example, it was 190 in 2018, 2019 -315, 2020 -266, 2021 -242 and 2022 -318). In fact, it is about the decisions of the court that should accept the agreement proposal submitted jointly by the state attorney's office and the defence. The State Attorney's Office strives to increase the number of agreements concluded every year in order to shorten court proceedings and relieve the work of the State Attorney's Office and the court, which is why the number of judgments based on the parties' agreement is monitored and analysed. However, the state attorney's office tries to maintain an appropriate criminal policy and insists on compensation for damages for victims, which is why the state attorney's office's proposals for agreements are not acceptable for defence in conditions of slow trials due to the significant workload of the courts, and realistically the number of agreements is not high. For this reason, data on the number of verdicts based on agreements in the annual report of the State Attorney's Office of the Republic of Croatia are considered in relation to the total number of convictions. In 2022, agreements from municipal jurisdiction accounted for 2.19% of the total number of convictions from municipal jurisdiction, which is only a slight increase of 0.62% compared to 2021, when agreements accounted for 1.68% of the total number of convictions % which actually does not represent a significant difference and is therefore not commented on.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**Q107-1 (2024):** Total number of guilty plea procedures: After the change in legislation in 2020, there was a huge increase in the number of guilty pleas. It seems that the number is now again decreasing. It could be just a random fluctuation though.

**Q107-1 (2022):** There was a legislative change, which make several changes regarding the guilty pleas - it is 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 (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**

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** The guilty plea procedure including a main trial will always be concluded during the main trial, as it is a court decision whether or not a person can be convicted in court. Cases with accepted fines are not included in the answer above, as it is not part of a trial. Plea guilty procedure can only take place during the main trial.

**Q107-1 (2024):** 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 Denmark, a guilty plea procedure is concluded in a court hearing, not in 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 ensure that the conditions for proceeding the case as a guilty plea procedure are present.

**Q107-1 (2023):** 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 2023, the number of complexes are 3,909. There has been an increase 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 in a court hearing, not in 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 ensure that the conditions for proceeding the case as a guilty plea procedure are present.

**Q107-1 (2022):** Comments 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 2022, the number of complexes are 3.526. There has been an increase 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 registered 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 (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.

**Finland**

**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 (2022):** Data on guilty plea procedure is not comprehensive. The procedure is registered in information systems only in a few cases. The usage of the procedure is likely much more broad than indicated, but there is no data available to confirm this.

**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.

**France**

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** Appearance on prior recognition of guilt (CRPC) is a simplified prosecution procedure. The public prosecutor can propose to any adult offender who acknowledges the facts attributed to them to serve one or more of the penalties they face. This procedure applies to offenses (délits) except for exceptions provided by law (see Article 495-7 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). In case of acceptance of the proposed penalties, the public prosecutor refers the case to the judge to approve the accepted penalties. The approval order has the effect of a conviction judgment. It is recorded in the National Criminal Record.
The CRPC is considered a full hearing (the judge wears a robe, and renders an "order" accepting the sentence — though not a judgment). The penalty imposed will carry the same weight as if it had been imposed during a "regular" hearing. However, if the individual refuses the penalty during this process, the prosecutor will redirect the case to a regular criminal trial. If the CRPC is successful, it will be considered the "main judicial procedure." However, if it fails, the individual will be presented before the criminal court, meaning the CRPC can be seen as a procedure that happens "before the main trial" In this sense, during a CRPC, the individual is not subject to "formal prosecution" before the court, but rather summoned before the prosecutor who offers them a penalty, which may or may not be accepted, and later approved or not by a judge.

**Q107-1 (2024):** These figures correspond only to the CRPC: Appearance on prior recognition of guilt.
It is a simplified prosecution procedure. The public prosecutor can propose to any adult offender who acknowledges the facts attributed to them to serve one or more of the penalties they face. This procedure applies to offenses (délits) except for exceptions provided by law (see Article 495-7 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). In case of acceptance of the proposed penalties, the public prosecutor refers the case to the judge to approve the accepted penalties. The approval order has the effect of a conviction judgment. It is recorded in the National Criminal Record.

**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.

**Greece**

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** The accused who is usually a temporary prisoner but whose case is pending before the investigating judge, requests, either through his/her counsel or himself/herself (through an ex officio counsel) the criminal negotiation of his/her case. This request is forwarded to the Prosecutor's Office of Appeal to which copies of the relevant file are sent. Depending on the case, the appeal prosecutor will either recommend that the case be successful or unsuccessful. In the first case, if the case succeeds, a trial date is set at which the defendant appears before the court (Court of Appeal) and is given the proposed sentence. If he or she agrees, the procedure is completed and in most cases the defendant is released and the time spent in temporary custody is taken into account. If the defendant does not agree with the sentence proposed, the defendant withdraws his/her request for criminal negotiation, the proceedings are considered as not having taken place, and the defendant's criminal treatment continues from the point of the request for criminal negotiation.

**Q107-1 (2024):** Source: Independent Department for the Collection and Processing of Judicial Statistical Data (JustStat)
The violations of restrictive measures that led to mass registrations and quick guilty pleas in 2021–2022 no longer exist, resulting in a natural decrease in related cases. However, additional factors in 2024 contributed to this trend, including reforms of the prosecution service under Law 5090/2024, stricter criteria for accepting guilty pleas, increased use of the principle of opportunity, and the expansion of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. More specifically, the new Criminal Code introduced stricter criteria for accepting guilty pleas, especially in cases involving social disapproval or domestic violence. The strengthening of the opportunity principle has led to more cases being shelved rather than confessions being accepted. The promotion of criminal mediation and out-of-court settlements has reduced the need for formal guilty plea procedures.

**Q107-1 (2023):** The data are provided by the Office for the collection and processing of judicial statistics.
The observed decreases in the number of guilty plea procedures between 2022 and 2023 are due to specific offenses related to violations of containment measures implemented in 2021 and 2022 to address the pandemic. For example, while gatherings were banned at that time, social events e.g. weddings were held in some areas of the country. In these cases, the guests (who may have exceeded, for example, 100) were brought before, for example, the public prosecutor who, in application of Article 48 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, terminated the criminal prosecution by means of a reasoned order after imposing on the accused the obligation to pay a donation to the Greek State.

**Q107-1 (2022):** This year, we modified the request by asking the information from the courts. We believe that this is reason for the variations observed.

**Q107-1 (2020):** No data available for this query.

**Hungary**

**Q107-1 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
Based solely on data analysis, it can be stated that the number of defendants affected by final court decisions decreased by 3.8% in 2024 compared to the previous year (2,156 defendants). Thus, as can be seen from the other data sets, there has been a general decrease in the number of defendants.
If we examine the ratios of the two legal institutions (acceptance of confessions made at preparatory hearings; acceptance of confessions made at first instance trials), a kind of restructuring can be observed.
In 2023, compared to all defendants affected by final judgments, the acceptance of confessions made at the preparatory hearing by the court accounted for 21.4%, while the acceptance of confessions made at the first instance trials by the court accounted for 2.2% of the cases. The same figures for 2024 were 21.9% and 1.7%, respectively. It can therefore be concluded from the above that although the number of defendants decreased in both data sets, proportionally more defendants made confessions and had them accepted by the court during the preparatory proceedings than during the first instance trial.
Thus, it can be concluded that, looking solely at the ratios, proportionally more defendants made confessions during the preparatory proceedings, which were accepted by the court, and this presumably led to a decrease in the number of defendants who made confessions during the first-instance trial.
In general, the prosecution service has no influence on how many defendants make confessions during court proceedings in a given year, or at what stage of the proceedings they do so.

**Q107-1 (2022):** 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 (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.

**Ireland**

**Q107-1 (2024):** There is no 'guilty plea procedure' in Ireland, as defined by the explanatory note. We have a procedure for guilty pleas but not as envisaged by the question. Also, our system does not collect data on guilty pleas in accordance with the timing of entry as requested. Data on pleas is based on the year that the file is opened, as opposed to the year the plea is entered. This information is published in the Office's Annual Report:https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2024/05/AR-2022-eng-copy.pdf

**Q107-1 (2023):** There is no 'guilty plea procedure' in Ireland, as defined by the explanatory notes. We have a procedure for guilty pleas but not as envisaged by the question. Also, our system does not collect data on guilty pleas in accordance with the timing of entry as requested. Data on pleas is based on the year that the file is opened, as opposed to the year the plea is entered. This information is published in the Office's Annual Report

**Q107-1 (2022):** Data is collected in the Office of Director Public Prosecutions but is not available in the format specifically set out in the explanatory notes.

**Italy**

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** In the Italian judicial system, it is not the public prosecutor but the judge who determines the plea bargain, following the request of the public prosecutor or the defendant before the trial, or even during the trial, or in opposition to a conviction by decree.

**Q107-1 (2024):** In the Italian judicial system, it is not the public prosecutor but the judge who determines the plea bargain, following the request of the public prosecutor or the defendant before the trial, or even during the trial, or in opposition to a conviction by decree.

**Latvia**

**Q107-1 (2024):** Data collection and monitoring tools allow to provide more detailed overview of guilty plea procedures that was not available before.

**Luxembourg**

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** The "criminal transaction" introduced by a law on February 24th, 2015 under the name of "judgment by agreement" allows the prosecutor and the defendant to engage in negotiations for a criminal judgment that will be enforced by the courts.

**Q107-1 (2024):** There was a marked increase in the use of the consent decree procedure in fiscal 2024, due to a heightened awareness of this procedure on the part of public prosecutors. This procedure is mainly used in cases of economic and financial crime.

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q107-1 (General Comment):** Over the past years, 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 2022/2023, see eg. https://www.om.nl/onderwerpen/beleidsregels/aanwijzingen/executie/aanwijzing-procesafspraken-in-strafzaken-2023a002. The numbers are not yet available.

**Q107-1 (2023):** Over the past years, 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 2022/2023, see eg. https://www.om.nl/onderwerpen/beleidsregels/aanwijzingen/executie/aanwijzing-procesafspraken-in-strafzaken-2023a002. The numbers are not yet available.

**Q107-1 (2022):** 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.

**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.

**Poland**

**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 (2024):** *) Data refers to persons convicted at first instance (31354):
- Convicted as a result of granting an application under Article 335 § 1 or 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: in Regional Courts - 748 persons, in District Courts - 27 405 persons.
- Voluntary surrender to liability for criminal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 3 201 persons.

**Q107-1 (2023):** *) Data refers to persons convicted at first instance (39073):
- Convicted as a result of granting an application under Article 335 § 1 or 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: in Regional Courts - 814 persons, in District Courts - 35,020 persons.
- Voluntary surrender to liability for criminal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 3,239 persons.

**Q107-1 (2022):** *) 46 263 = 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 District Courts - 658 persons, in Regional Courts - 41,690 persons.
- Voluntary surrender to liability for criminal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 3,915 persons.

**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

**Slovak Republic**

**Q107-1 (2024):** * Note: The above number represents only the number of guilty pleas agreements concluded at the prosecutor's office and submitted for court approval. We currently do not have the number of agreements that have been approved beyond the agreements submitted by prosecutors to the court during the main trial.

**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**

**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.

**Q107-1 (2024):** In 2024, the majority of plea negotiations were conducted in cases falling within the jurisdiction of the district courts and concerned serious criminal offences, often involving multiple defendants and requiring complex evidentiary proceedings. Increase in number of procedures: Approximately 40% of all plea agreements were concluded by a district prosecutor's office located in proximity to the state border, primarily in relation to offences of unlawful border crossing or irregular entry into the country, as defined in Article 308 of the Criminal Code-1.

**Q107-1 (2023):** Compared to the previous year, there has been a 43% increase in the number of plea agreements. The increase in plea agreements is primarily due to crimes involving illegal border crossings.

**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.

**Spain**

**Q107-1 (2021):** Explanation of the increased number of guilty plea procedures: Probably, coming back to normal activity after covid restrictions.

### Question 109

**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**

**Q109 (General Comment):** The data do not include traffic offences, cases handled by the labor auditorates, or appeals against police decisions handled by the prosecutor's offices attached to teh first instance criminal courts.

**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**

**Q109 (2024):** The figures in the table in question 107 include criminal cases for traffic offences which constitute a public crime under the Bulgarian Criminal Code.

**Q109 (2022):** Only the cases for violations that constitute a crime of a general nature under the Bulgarian Criminal Code are included.

**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**

**Q109 (2024):** In question 109, the answer "yes" was submitted, indicating that the data in question 107 includes only criminal violations against traffic safety.
Specifically, evaluating the Croatian version of Directive 2015/413 of March 11, 2015, it was discovered that "road traffic offense cases" were rendered as traffic violations

**Q109 (2023):** In question 109, the answer "yes" was submitted, indicating that the data in question 107 exclusively covers criminal violations against traffic safety.
Specifically, evaluating the Croatian version of Directive 2015/413 of March 11, 2015, it was discovered that "road traffic offense cases" were rendered as traffic violations.

**Q109 (2022):** The data includes cases of criminal offenses committed in traffic.

**Estonia**

**Q109 (2020):** Only the ones that are classified as criminal offences.

**France**

**Q109 (2022):** The positive reply concerns criminal offences and fines.

**Q109 (2021):** source SDSE

**Greece**

**Q109 (2024):** The new Penal Code, which came into effect on May 1, 2024, with Law 5090/2024, introduced significant stiffening of penalties for cases of traffic accidents and dangerous driving. The new Article 290A defines 'dangerous driving' as any behavior that seriously endangers life or health, such as: Excessive speed, Driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, Ignoring traffic signals, Aggressive or careless driving. Some violations now incur, in addition to a monetary fine, prison sentences ranging from 1 to 5 years.

**Ireland**

**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.

**Q109 (2023):** 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.

**Q109 (2022):** There was no discrepancy in the replies provided.

**Latvia**

**Q109 (2021):** Data from Accountancy system

**Lithuania**

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q109 (General Comment):** 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).

**Q109 (2022):** 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).

**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).

**Romania**

**Q109 (2020):** Only serious offenses that are considered crimes, such as drunk driving or involuntary manslaughter.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q109 (2024):** https://www.genpro.gov.sk/statistiky/statisticky-prehlad-trestnej-a-netrestnej-cinnosti-za-rok-2024/

**Slovenia**

**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.

## Question 013

**Austria**

**Q013 (General Comment):** In Austria the budget for courts cannot be separated from the budget of the prosecution services. With regard to the sub-category “annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services” an answer is not possible because the costs for trainings for judges, public prosecutors, judicial officers (“Rechtspfleger”) and other staff working within courts or public prosecution services are summarized in one figure.

**Q013 (2024):** In Austria the budget for courts cannot be separated from the budget of the prosecution services. With regard to the sub-category “annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services” an answer is not possible because the costs for trainings for judges, public prosecutors, judicial officers (“Rechtspfleger”) and other staff working within courts or public prosecution services are summarized in one figure.

**Belgium**

**Q013 (General Comment):** Training budget for the public prosecutor's offices: the vast majority of training courses are open to both, judges and public prosecutors, as well as to non-judge and non-prosecutor staff. It is therefore very difficult to distinguish the training budget for the public prosecutor's offices. Only the total training budget (for judges and public prosecutors) is available.

**Q013 (2023):** 2023 Budget for training: total planned expenditure for courts and public prosecution services: EUR 2,573,900.00; total implemented budget for courts and public prosecution services: EUR 2,315,435.95’.

**Q013 (2021):** Approved budget (total €721 493 690): this budget represents the total budget allocated to the Court of Cassation, all ordinary courts except administrative courts, and the public prosecution services. It is not possible to isolate the approved budget of the Public Prosecutor's Office from the aforementioned total amount. Implemented budget (total €243 867 402): this total includes the operating costs of the public prosecution services (including staff costs, equipment) but excludes the budget for training.

**Bulgaria**

**Q013 (General Comment):** The Prosecutor's Office prepares a consolidated budget for all units, namely district, regional, military-regional, appellate, military-appellate prosecutor's offices, the administration of the European delegated prosecutors, training and rest bases and submits it to the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC). Pursuant to Article 361 of the Judicial System Act, the budget of the PRB includes all revenues from the activity, maintenance costs, relations with the central budget and other budgets.
The budget procedure is carried out in two stages. First stage - preparation of a medium-term forecast for a period of three years. Second stage - preparation of a draft budget for the relevant year and updated budget forecasts for the next two years. The Minister of Justice proposes a draft budget for the judiciary and submits it for discussion in the Plenum of the SJC. The draft budget of the judiciary is accompanied by estimates for the next two years. The Council of Ministers submits to the National Assembly the draft law on the state budget of the Republic of Bulgaria for the relevant year together with the draft annual budget of the judiciary, proposed by the plenary session of the SJC, with a detailed justification. When adopting the state budget, the National Assembly listens to a report of the plenary session of the SJC, presented by its representative. The National Assembly adopts the budget of the judicial power, allocated to the SJC, the Inspectorate of the SJC, the bodies of the judicial power, including PRB and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ).
The Plenum of the SJC organizes the execution of the budget of the judiciary through the Inspectorate of the SJC, the Supreme Court of Cassation, the Supreme Administrative Court, the courts, the Prosecutor General and the National Institute of Justice. The PRB is a second-level budget manager and all units of the PRB system are third-level budget managers. For third-level managers, the budget manager is the relevant manager.
1. Preparation and presentation of a draft budget for the current budget year. The Law on the State Budget of the Republic of Bulgaria adopts the budget of the judiciary, including the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria. By decree of the Council of Ministers, the main parameters and Guidelines for the implementation of the budget are given.
2. Budget adjustments. Currently, during the calendar year, the Prosecutor General submits proposals for updating to the Budget and Finance Committee of the SJC

**Q013 (2024):** The specific indicators in the table are explained as follows:
For the total annual public budget allocated to the prosecution service, the column ‘Approved budget’ shows the budget of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria as finally approved by the SJC on 31 December 2024, which is updated and amended during the budget year by decisions of the Plenary Session of the SJC.
For the total annual public budget allocated to the prosecution service, the column ‘Executed budget’ shows the amount corresponding to the actual reported expenditure at cash level as at 31 December 2024.
In section 13.1 Annual public budget allocated for training of the prosecution services, the column ‘Approved budget’ shows the approved budget for all structural units of the Prosecutor's Office for training in 2024. In section 13.1 Annual public budget allocated for training of the prosecution services, in the column ‘Executed budget’, the amount corresponding to the actual reported, actual expenses for training at cash level as at 31 December 2024 is indicated. The difference between the approved/planned and implemented/spent funds for training in 2024 is due to savings achieved at the level of actual expenditure at lower rates than that forecast. The amounts indicated are in EUR.

**Q013 (2023):** Q 13 – There are objective reasons for the high growth in the approved (and respectively implemented) training budget in 2023 compared to 2022. On the one hand, there was higher activity of magistrates in organizing and participating in external trainings (organized by other institutions, forums, etc. with participation fees) after the lifting of the COVID 19 quarantine.
On the other hand the in-person trainings in the learning facilities and training centers of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria were minimized or not conducted during the coronavirus period according to the internal training calendar. In addition, by Decision under Protocol No. 8/10.03.2022, p. 3 of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council a positive opinion was expressed that the Prosecutors' Training Base - Recreational Facility "Izgrev" in the town of Byala, assigned to be managed by the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Bulgaria, should be provided for temporary use by evacuating representatives of the judiciary in the Republic of Ukraine and their family members and/or Bulgarian citizens and Bulgarians with Ukrainian citizenship living in Ukraine, including in the event of evacuation. In 2022, due to the accommodation of refugees from Ukraine, the base in Byala could not be used for conducting trainings/seminars, which is also the reason for the higher increase in funds for training magistrates planned for 2023 after the base is emptied of refugees.

**Q013 (2022):** Supreme Judicial Council: The implemented budget differs from the approved due to unspent funds for major repairs, acquisition of long-lasting tangible and intangible assets, as well as current repairs due to unfinished procedures under the Law on Public Procurement (LPP).
The Prosecutor's Office:
The difference between the approved and the executed budget lies in the fact that the approved budget corresponds to the budget of the Judiciary, including the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, adopted by the State Budget Act for 2022 – SBRBA (as of 01.01.2022), while the executed budget corresponds to the actual expenditures as of 31.12.2022 – at the cash level.
Specifically, at the beginning of 2022, funds for training amounting to BGN 23 800 are planned. (EUR 12 169). The information is based on summary draft budgets for all structural units in PORB for 2022, prepared at the end of January 2022. At the end of the reference year (as at 31.12.2022), approximately BGN 14,129 had actually been spent at cash level (EUR 7 224). The lower implementation is to some extent due to both organisational (most of the training organised and delivered was conducted online) and financial reasons (in 2022, the SBARB was adopted later – on 4 March 2022).
A comparison of data for several consecutive years – 2020, 2021 and 2022 – shows an increase in the planned training funds for the respective years (given the increase in the cost of posting and services) and a decrease in the actual spent ones in relation to the restrictive measures introduced during the coronavirus pandemic and conducting online trainings instead of face-to-face ones, resulting in a decrease in spending.

**Q013 (2021):** The implemented budget differs from approvals due to unspent funds for major repairs, acquisition of durable tangible assets and current repairs due to unfinished procedures under the Public Procurement Law and restrictive measures related to COVID-19.
The source of the data for the approved and implemented budget, including for the Trainings in the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, is the Annual Financial Report of the Public Prosecutor's Office for 2021.
As to the annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecutors, it should be recalled that the significant reduction in 2020 of this budgetary component was the result of the declared in March 2020 extraordinary epidemic situation in Bulgaria, as well as the restrictive measures related to the spread of COVID-19.

**Q013 (2020):** The significant differences in the approved and implemented budget for 2020 compared to 2018 for the prosecution are due to the reasons set out in the remarks on question 6, namely - increase in funds for remunerations by 10% in 2019 and in 2020, increase the amount of the minimum wage, which is the basis for determining payments under contracts. There is also an increase in the compensations under the JSA and LC by EUR 786,870 compared to 2018, as well as the planned and paid funds for apparel. For detailed information - see question 6.
The implemented budget differs from the approved one due to unspent funds for major repairs, acquisition of tangible fixed assets and current repairs due to unfinished procedures under the Public Procurement Act and restrictive measures related to COVID 19.
The source of the data for approved and implemented budget, including for Trainings in the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria is the Annual Financial Report of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria for 2020.
The probability of a significant reduction of the utilized budget for training of prosecutors is the declared in March 2020 extraordinary epidemic situation in Bulgaria, which continues to this day, as well as the restrictive measures related to the spread of COVID-19.

**Croatia**

**Q013 (2024):** The increase compared to the previous period is due to the implementation of mandatory consultations and seminars for judicial officials, as well as the rise in training fees and associated costs related to the training (such as accommodation, travel, etc.).

**Q013 (2023):** In the previous period, there were more on-line educations, and therefore in the observed period there was an increase in planned and executed funds.

**Q013 (2022):** The stated amount differs from the previously submitted data because of an increase in the base for civil servants and state employees, as well as an increase in the amount for holiday pay, Christmas bonus, and children's gift.

**Q013 (2021):** Between 2020 and 2021 there was a significant increase in the budget approved and implemented for the training of public prosecution services because during the Covid pandemic in 2020 trainings were not held.

**Q013 (2020):** There is a significant increasing of the total annual budget allocated to the public prosecution services due to the increasing of salaries of the public prosecutors.
The annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services is lower than in 2019 due to the fact that in 2019 the Judicial Academy conducted professional training of judicial officials and advisors and a foreign language education program for judicial officials, while in 2020 due to the COVID pandemic these trainings were not held.

**Cyprus**

**Q013 (2024):** The judicial training school is completely independent from the Academy of the Law office. The Academy had been set up in 2022 but started to plan and organize seminars in 2024.

**Q013 (2023):** In 2022 there was an increase in the budget due to specific copensations awarded only in that year.

**Q013 (2022):** There was a major restructuring of the posts in the public prosecution service as a number of new posts were created. At the same time, there was an increase in the salaries of the counsels working at the Attorney General's Office.
In the previous cycle, there were not many trainings as a result of covid.

**Q013 (2021):** In 2021 there was a massive increase in the compensation paid in action of 10 million, representing compensation awarded in actions against the state.
Less training seminars have been held in person due to covid.

**Q013 (2020):** In 2020, there was a significant increase in the salaries of the prosecutors of the office of the Attorney General.

**Czech Republic**

**Q013 (General Comment):** It is noteworthy that before 2014, the implemented budget was provided instead of the approved one.

**Q013 (2024):** More money was planned for training, but the priority remains to make full use primarily of the services provided by the Judicial Academy.

**Q013 (2022):** There can be movement between the different categories of the budget during the year according to the current needs.
Desirable increasing of budget to training.

**Q013 (2021):** There can be movement between the different categories of the budget during the year according to the current needs. Moreover, there is also influence of exchange rate. The difference between approved and implemented budget allocated to training is mostly caused by pandemic situation.

**Q013 (2020):** There can be movement between the different categories of the budget during the year according to the current needs. Moreover, there is also influence of exchange rate.

**Denmark**

**Q013 (General Comment):** The implemented budget corresponds to the observed expenditures during the reference year. There has moreover been a strengthening of criminal case processing in recent years, especially compared to 2021 with a wish to reduce case processing times and case backlogs in criminal case processing, which has led to an increase in re-source consumption on case processing and prosecution activities

**Q013 (2024):** In 2024, there was a balance between budget and consumption. Compared to 2023, consumption has increased by approximately 5 percent. This can primarily be attributed to a continued strong focus on strengthening criminal case processing with a view to reducing case processing times and case backlogs in criminal case processing.

**Q013 (2023):** The explanation of the difference between the implemented budget and the budget that has been formally approved by the Parliament is that the implemented budget corresponds to the observed expenditures during the reference year. There has moreover been a strengthening of criminal case processing in 2023 compared to 2021 with a wish to reduce case processing times and case backlogs in criminal case processing, which has led to an increase in resource consumption on case processing and prosecution activities.

**Q013 (2020):** The increasing expenses compared to previous years are partly due to an increased effort to reduce case processing times and case stocks in the criminal case chain. In 2019, further expenses were incurred in connection with the implementation of several commissions of inquiry set up by the government

**Estonia**

**Q013 (2023):** Ministry of Justice does not have data on budget allocated to training.

**Q013 (2020):** Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: due to COVID-19 restrictions, there were less trainings.

**Finland**

**Q013 (2024):** The budget excess is due to a surprising and large overshoot in ICT expenditures in 2024.
The direct training costs were 465 242 euros. The wage costs (indirect costs) for the training days were 521 243 euros.

**Q013 (2023):** Budget excess is due to increase in prosecutor personel resources. Reason for this was to control the amount of pending cases and shorten case processing time. Training budget contains only direct costs but training implementation also contain indirect costs such as travel expenses. Overall, the trend of training participation has been on the increase.
Training costs have increased strongly: year 2021 they were 393 000 euro, year 2022: 749 000 euro and year 2023: 933 000 euro. Also number of training participants has increased: 475 (2021), 484 (2022), 783 (2023) as were the training days: 1189 (2021), 1555 (2022) and 1821 (2023).

**Q013 (2022):** Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: in 2022 the total amount used for training was 715 813 euro. This comprises of: 374 587 euro for salaries related to trainings (+ plus pensions etc. payments), 173 843 euro of travel expenses, 57 925 euro for purchasing different course and conference services, and 109 458 euro (excluding VAT) used for training by the Office of the Prosecutor General. In 2020 the expenses were historically low and in 2022 the expenses were closer to the annual average. In 2022, there were about 50 % more training days than in 2020. More people also participated in the trainings. In addition, the travel costs for trainings increased in 2022. The exact reasons for the low figures in 2020 are no clear, but it can be assumed that the Covid pandemic had an impact.

**Q013 (2021):** Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: in 2021 the total amount used for training was 407 595 euro. This comprises of: 261 683 euro for salaries related to trainings (+ plus pensions etc payments); 29 328 euro of travel expenses (excluding VAT), 73 230 euro for purchasing different course and conference services, and 43 354 euro used for training by the Office of the Prosecutor General.
The annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services increased only slightly since the particular year of the pandemic. In fact, in 2021, the Prosecution Authority had a recommendation on remote work in force and also most of the trainings were organized remotely.

**Q013 (2020):** Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: in 2020 the total amount used for training was 379 043 euro. This comprises of: 208 000 euro for salaries related to trainings (+ plus pensions etc payments); 38 673 euro of travel expenses (excluding VAT), 83 062 euro for purchasing different course and conference services, and 49 300 euro used for training by the Office of the Prosecutor General. It is noteworthy that the travel expenses decreased approximately 170.000. This was due to, amongst others, covid-19 situation which led to holding the training remotely.

**France**

**Q013 (2024):** For 2024, and in accordance with the CEPEJ methodology, the credits allocated to the National School for the Judiciary have not been included in “13.1 Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services.

**Q013 (2021):** As in the previous year, as it is not possible to distinguish between data related to courts and data related to the public prosecution services, an 80/20 ratio has been applied to the data from the LFI 2021 of P166 and the annual performance report 2021 of P 166.
Source DSJ

**Germany**

**Q013 (General Comment):** It is noteworthy that all data concerning the budget should be construed in the light of the federal structure of the justice system in Germany. Variations are often due to the fact that the federal states' budget plans and budget statistics can differ from one another relatively widely. Accordingly, the federal states' answers in this section are inconstistent.

**Q013 (2024):** Roughly half of the federal states cannot provide seperate information on the budget allocated to the public prosecution services.

**Q013 (2023):** In roughly half of the federal states, the budget of the courts cannot be separated from budget of the public prosecution. A few federal states that can make this distinction, can, however, not separate the training budget of the public prosecution services from the training budget of the whole judiciary.
Of the 16 federal states - 7 could not provide any data
- 9 have figures available
The Federal Ministry of Justice can provide budget information for the Federal Public Prosecutor's office.

**Q013 (2022):** In the majority of the federal states, the budget of the courts cannot be separated from budget of the public prosecution. A few federal states that can make this distinction, can, however, not separate the training budget of the public prosecution services from the training budget of the whole judiciary.
Of the 16 federal states - 7 could not provide any data
- 8 have figures available
One federal state has not yet replied. The Federal Ministry of Justice can provide budget information for the Federal Public Prosecutor's office.

**Q013 (2021):** In the majority of the Länder, the budget of the courts cannot be separated from budget of the public prosecution. A few Länder that can make this distinction, can, however, not separate the training budget of the public prosecution services from the training budget of the whole judiciary.

**Q013 (2020):** The budget of the courts cannot be separatd from budget of the public prosecution.

**Greece**

**Q013 (General Comment):** The public prosecution services budget can not be separated from the courts budget.

**Q013 (2023):** There is no possibility of separating the budgeted expenses on the one hand and some individual categories of expenses (in terms of execution) on the other, between the prosecutor's offices and other courts of the country.

**Q013 (2022):** As explained in question 6, there is no possibility of separating budgeted expenditures on the one hand and some sub-categories of expenditures (in terms of execution) on the other, between the public prosecutor's offices and other courts in the country.

**Q013 (2021):** Not available, cannot be separated.

**Q013 (2020):** There is no separate budget for Public Prosecutions included in the special code 1017-201-00000000 .Impossible to fill.

**Hungary**

**Q013 (2024):** When evaluating the data, the change in the euro/forint exchange rate must be taken into account in all cases, as a decrease/increase in the exchange rate may result in a significant change in the figures given in euros, while there is no significant change in the forint figures.

**Q013 (2022):** Act XC of 2021 on Hungary's central budget for 2022.
The draft act for implemented state budget of 2022 has not yet been adopted by the Parliament.

**Q013 (2021):** Statistical data on the human resources of the prosecution service of Hungary;
Data from the 'Persona' electronic human resources database of the prosecution service;
Act CLXIV of 2011 on the status of the General Prosecutor, prosecutors and other employees of the prosecution service, as well as on the career of prosecutors (hereinafter: 'Act on Prosecutors').

**Q013 (2020):** Q 13 Act LXXI of 2019 on Hungary's central budget for 2020
The act for implemented state budget of 2020 is before the Parliament (T / 17188. of law proposal ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF Act LXXI OF 2019 ON HUNGARY'S CENTRAL BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020) but not yet adapted.

**Ireland**

**Q013 (2024):** The total annual budget is for:
- The salaries and expenses of the Director and her staff;
- Fees to counsel engaged by the Director to prosecute cases in the various courts;
- Costs awarded against the State arising out of Judicial Review and other legal proceedings;
- The cost of the local State Solicitor Service.

The increase in expenditure for training is due to increased staff numbers.

**Q013 (2023):** The shortfall in expenditure on approved budget can be attributed to a shortfall on salaries which was due to the slower than expected recruitment of staff and an IT shortfall which was due to infrastructure which did not proceed as quickly as expected.
The increase in the implemented budget for training is due to a number of factors. There was a significant increase in new staff to the Office over 2023 which led to a rise in the number of training courses availed of by staff. In addition, there was an increased demand for the Office’s sponsorship of third level educational courses which the Office wanted to respond positively to as it is committed to being a learning organisation

**Q013 (2020):** Parliament approved a budget of €44.813M for the public prosecution service for 2020. Expenditure by the prosecution service in 2020 amounted to €44.248M. The unspent amount of approved funding was surrendered at the end of the year in accordance with national public expenditure rules.
The annual budget for training is allocated by the prosecution service from within total funds allocated to it annually by Parliament. In 2020 expenditure on training initiatives amounted to €201K. This was down somewhat on previous years because of restrictions in place due to COVID-19.

**Italy**

**Q013 (General Comment):** Starting from 2023, the final balance is automatically processed by the Init application of the Ragioneria Generale dello Stato on the basis of the individual accounting records made by all the operators of the paying judicial offices on the national territory, therefore the data is devoid of the correction and integration entries that were previously made by the central administration to correct any significant errors found. This explains the higher value compared to the previous year.

**Q013 (2023):** Starting from 2023, the final balance is automatically generated by the INIT application of the Ragioneria Generale dello Stato, based on the individual accounting records entered by all the operators of the paying judicial offices on the national territory. As a result, the data no longer includes the correction and integration entries previously made by the central administration to address significant errors. This change explains the higher value compared to the previous year.

**Q013 (2022):** The increase in the budget for training is due to the fact that in 2020 the training was mainly delivered online (less expensive) due to the pandemic.

**Q013 (2021):** Difference in the implemented budget might be due to spending shifts from one financial year to another.

**Q013 (2020):** In general, the budget for training has drastically decreased in 2020 because the majority of the training was provided online rather than in person. This holds for both courts and prosecution offices. The reason why this trend is not evident at Q.6 (item 6) is due to the presence of administrative justice whose investments in terms of training were massive.

**Latvia**

**Q013 (General Comment):** Data on budget of the public prosecution includes only State budget for prosecution.

**Q013 (2024):** The main reason for difference between the approved budget and the implemented budget is related to the fact that there were several vacant prosecutor positions that were not filled but the salary amounts for these positions were allocated. In addition, several prosecutors are on maternity leave, their salary amounts also were allocated but not spent.
Another reason for underutilization of the planned budget was the fact that the expenses planned for foreign business trips in 2024 were not fully utilized, mainly because a significant part of the business trip expenses were covered by the institutions that had invited representatives of the Prosecution Office.
Savings were also generated because several prosecutors and employees were not working due to different incapacity for work situations, also several prosecutors retired.
Finally, part of the saving occurred because the Office of the Prosecutor General did not move to temporary premises at 1, Talejas Street and 3, Ierēdņu Street in Riga as was planned. The current premises of the Office of the Prosecutor General building on 6, Kalpaka Boulevard need major renovation. For reasons that were beyond the control of the Prosecution Office the funding that was allocated to cover costs of reconstruction, rent, equipment, relocation and other related expenses was not spent.
Prosecution Office of the Republic of Latvia has requested allocation of funds for trainings designed for prosecutors. In 2024 training regarding i2 Analysis Notebook software was organized to promote more efficient data analysis and coordination work among prosecutors and senior prosecutor assistants. Trainings regarding specific topics were conducted, such as psychological aspects of committing a crime, regulation of construction projects and criminal liability etc. Few of the activities were implemented by the Justice Academy, therefore some of the allocated budget for training was not spent for the activities.
Funding for training activities implemented by the Prosecution Office has increased due to the specific nature of the training activities organized, such as training in the use of specific software, improving English language skills, etc. The number of employees providing highly qualified support to prosecutors has increased at the Prosecution Office, and these employees also needed specific training to ensure the high-quality performance of their duties.

**Q013 (2023):** The expenses for the Prosecutor's Office has increased, as well as the number and scope of implemented trainings has been increased. Prosecution Office of the Republic of Latvia has requested additional budget allocation in respect to various training activities - such as language training courses, trainings and discussion regarding professional ethics and integrity, strengthening of communication skills etc. therefore the budget allocated for trainings has indeed increased.

**Q013 (2022):** The allocated budget has increased due to the fact that we were implementing the EC co-financed project BALTICS that conducted trainings for prosecutors in the field of financial and economic crime investigation. The project was financed from the funds of the Prosecutor's Office (budget was 28 930 EUR).
Decrease observed in the spending of budget in the training activities was due to the fact that several activities implemented in the Prosecution Office were financed by the European Commissions project (in accordance with the Explanatory note, EU fundings are not taken into consideration in Q13). Additionally, during the training period of 2022 many activities for prosecutors were financed by the project run by the Court Administration "Justice for growth".

**Q013 (2020):** 1. The cost of reimbursement was EUR 23 492 less due to the absence of 2 new posts.
2. Expenditure on goods and services of less than EUR 1 254 277, of which EUR 1 191 298 was not exhausted (used) because the original planned repairs were not carried out in the General Prosecutor's Office building on Kalpaka Boulevard 6 in 2020.
3. Capital expenditure was not fully absorbed at EUR 288 678.
4. Taking into account that raising the qualification of prosecutors is one of the priorities of the Prosecutor's Office, additional training measures and, accordingly, increased budgetary resources are envisaged.
On 1 January 2019, the Law “Amendments to the Law on Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities” entered into force, by which there was prescribed a significantly higher remuneration for prosecutors. Consequently, the budget allocated to the Prosecution Office in 2020 is higher than in 2018.
“Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services”: The Prosecution Office is financed from the State budget, then, taking into account the additional State budget funding allocated to the Prosecution Office for 2020, it was possible to increase the funding for the training of prosecutors.

**Lithuania**

**Q013 (2024):** The increase in the budget for 2024 is primarily due to the increase of salaries of prosecutor‘s. On 1st January 2024 amendments to the Law on the Public Prosecution Service came into force which implemented the first phase of increase in the salaries of prosecutors. On 1 January 2025 – the second phase of salary increase came into force. The salary reform is considered completed and provides for the ratio between salaries of prosecutors and judges at on average 90 %.

**Q013 (2023):** In 2022, the Prosecutor's Office was intensively implementing projects and trainings funded by foreign grants, which reduced needs from Prosecutor's Office's training budget. The indicated amount of EUR 34,642 does not include funding from foreign grants and comes solely from the state budget.
With the conclusion of these grant-funded initiatives, all training activities must now be fully supported by the state budget. This transition accounts for the observed increase in budgetary allocation for training in 2023.
More over, the costs associated with organizing training events have risen, including venue rentals, materials, and other logistical expenses. These cost increases also contribute to the higher budgetary needs for 2023.

**Q013 (2021):** National Audit Office of Lithuania carried out an audit on the investigation and prevention of cybercrime, which aims to contribute to the creation of a safe environment for society in cyberspace. The audit recommendations highlighted the need for the General Prosecutor's Office to pay more attention to the development of competences in the investigation of cybercrime, as the competences of specialised prosecutors are not sufficiently enhanced due to an insufficient and unsystematic education system and the lack of methodologies for the investigation of cybercrime. Due to the high cost of cybercrime training, an additional budget was requested and a small part of it was received.

**Q013 (2020):** In 2020 the decrease in the state budget funds allocated to the training of prosecutors was influenced by objective reasons. It should be noted that the Prosecutor’s Office participates in a wide range of international projects, from which it receives funding for capacity building activities. Also, individual trainings, traineeships and exchanges are funded by the European Judicial Training Network. In this context, there was no increased need for funds from the state budget for the training of prosecutors in 2020. In addition, the decrease in the need for allocations in this area has also been influenced by the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Luxembourg**

**Q013 (General Comment):** The budget of the public prosecution services cannot be distinguished from the budget of the courts.

**Q013 (2024):** There is no separate budget for the Public Prosecution Services.

**Q013 (2023):** There is no single budget for the Public Prosecution Service.

**Q013 (2022):** There is no separate budget allocation for the prosecution services.

**Q013 (2020):** Il n'existe pas de budget isolé pour les services du ministère public.

**Malta**

**Q013 (General Comment):** The public prosecution services are carried out by the Attorney General's office. The Attorney General not only acts as a public prosecutor but also as the principal legal advisor of all the Government Departments. As a result, the amount budgeted cannot be considered as being funds allocated solely for public prosecution services, but also for other purposes relating to legal work and advise for the Government, both locally and internationally.

**Q013 (2024):** This is the actual data derived from the financial estimates across different ministries and entities. The overall increase in the approved budget as well as the implemented training budget relates to the increase in the number of prosecutors within the office, but also to the efforts of the Attorney General to ensure that the staff receive continuous training.

**Q013 (2023):** The discrepancy between the approved and implemented budget results from an increase in the number of lawyers within the Office of the AG. This translated into added costs in respect of wages and training.

**Q013 (2022):** The Office of the Attorney General underwent a recruitment drive that resulted in an increment in wage-related costs.

**Netherlands**

**Q013 (General Comment):** Approved budget: the first version of the budget (estimated budget); implemented budget: annual financial report on the state expenditure. The budget for public prosecution services includes justice expenses in criminal cases, namely all kinds of cost types (e.g. wiretaps, interpreters, compensations for witnesses).
Budget allocated to training of public prosecution services is not registered separately in the budget report. The public prosecution services do have budget reserved for training, but that is for the entire public prosecution services and not just for public prosecutors. Regarding the public prosecutors, the services take part in the training institute of the Rechtspraak, and pay a yearly fee for that.

**Poland**

**Q013 (2024):** The lowest expenditure on training was recorded in 2020 due to the epidemiological situation related to the COVID-19 pandemic and the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. This resulted in a significant reduction in training courses and workshops in the form of traditional meetings. This situation was mainly influenced by the training offer. Most of the training courses were offered and conducted online, which resulted in lower training costs. Since 2021, training expenditure has been steadily increasing. The reason for this is the expansion of the offer to include training in the form of traditional meetings, as well as an increase in training costs (inflation). The highest increase in expenditure in 2024 compared to 2023 for training recorded in § 4700 Training of employees who are not members of the civil service was recorded in the National Public Prosecutor's Office. In the National Prosecutor's Office, the increase in expenditure in 2024 on training compared to 2023 is primarily due to the purchase of the following specialist IT training courses: 'Combating terrorist threats' for the Department for Organised Crime and Corruption- for persons from general organisational units of the prosecutor's office performing tasks within the IT Shared Services Centre for the Department of Cybercrime and Computerisation, "Provision of warranty services for the Ordering Party's RedHat software" for the Department for Cybercrime and Computerisation, "Renewal of warranty service for the Ordering Party's backup system equipment and expansion of the current backup environment" for technical personnel in the Department of Cybercrime and Computerisation.

**Q013 (2023):** The average NBP exchange rate of 29 December 2023 was used to convert PLN to €. - 4,3480.
In 2023, the Prosecutor's Office budget was implemented in 99.86%. The difference between the approved and implemented budget is the amount of PLN 5,308,139.16 (1 220 823,17 euro). Within this amount, the planned budget expenditure was blocked. The blockage was a result of the notification by the organisational units of the Prosecutor's Office in section 753 Compulsory social insurance of the excess of the sub-allocated funds in the 2023 Prosecutor's Office budget for retired prosecutors‘ emoluments and family emoluments, due to the lower number of retired prosecutors’ retirements in relation to the amount assumed during the work on the 2023 Budget Act. The financial plan for 2023 in part 88 General organizational units of the Prosecutor's Office compared to 2022 increased by 17.08%, and the realized budget in 2023. was higher than that realized in 2022 by 16.92%.
The change in the size of the prosecutor's office budget for 2023 with respect to 2022 was mainly influenced by:
- Department 752 - National Defense - the creation of a new department for military affairs in accordance with the Decree of the Minister of Justice dated December 2, 2022. Regarding the establishment of a Department for Military Affairs in the District Prosecutor's Office Łódź - Polesie in Łódź,
- Section 753 Social Insurance - change of emoluments of prosecutors in retired status and family emoluments, the increase in relation to 2022 was as a result of the 7.8% salary indexation and the amounts of increased remuneration referred to in Article 10a of the Law on Special Solutions for the Implementation of the Budget Act for 2023 (outstanding benefit indexation) as well as additional funds for retiring prosecutors in 2023,
- Section 755 Justice - valorization of benefits of adjudicators and employees by 7.8%, as well as the amounts of increased remuneration referred to in Article 10a of the Law on Special Solutions for the Implementation of the Budget Act for 2023 (outstanding benefit valorization) as well as increased costs of operation of prosecution units and increased costs of pre-trial proceedings.

**Q013 (2022):** The average exchange rate of the National Bank of Poland as at 30 December 2022 was used to convert PLN to €. - PLN 4.6899.
In 2022, the budget of the Public Prosecutor's Office was implemented in 99.99%. The difference between the approved and implemented budget is the amount of PLN 237,656.33. Within this amount, the planned budget expenditure was blocked in the amount of PLN 228,314. The blockage was a result of the failure to realise planned expenditure, primarily under the Operational Programme Knowledge Education Development 2014-2020 in the amount of PLN 176,221, an excess of funds in the financial plan of expenditures due to a lower number of retirements of prosecutors than assumed in the course of work on the Budget Act for 2022, and remaining funds in the Prosecutor's Office units in § 6060 Investment expenditure on budgetary units.
*13.1
In fact, the prosecutor's budget for training in 2020-2021 was significantly lower than in previous years and in 2022.
In 2020-2021, the epidemiological situation related to the COVID-19 pandemic and the risk of infection with the SARS-CoV-2 virus resulted in a significant reduction in training and workshops in the form of traditional meetings. In fact, online trainings have prevailed.
Prosecution units also held in-house training sessions.
Expenditures on training in 2022 compared to 2020 and 2021 definitely increased. However, the training offerings have changed. Training in the form of traditional meetings returned but largely remained online training, which results in lower training costs. The budget for training in 2022 is 80.53% of the budget for training in 2018. It is likely that this trend will already continue.
It should be noted that prosecution units had a budget in 2022 that was sufficient to implement training at the 2018 level.

**Q013 (2021):** *1 euro= 4,5994 pln
*In 2020, the epidemiological situation related to the COVID-19 outbreak and the risk of virus infection resulted in a significant reduction in training and workshops in the form of traditional meetings. Training offerings changed and on line training was available. In view of the lack of mobility and the limitation of interpersonal contacts, the prosecution units organised in-house training. The training budget for 2020 represented 35.27% of the 2019 implementation and 36.3% of the 2018 implementation. The budget allocated for training in 2021 increased by 56.16% compared to 2020. The execution of training expenditure did not reach the level of 2018 and 2019. This was mainly influenced by the training offer. The majority of training is offered and delivered on line which results in lower training costs.

**Q013 (2020):** 1 euro=4.6148 PLN
The lower implementation of the training budget in 2020 compared to the implementation in previous years is primarily due to constraints related to the COVID-19 pandemic and the risk of SARS-COV-2 virus infection. The epidemiological situation has led to a reduction in training and workshops in the form of traditional meetings. Training offerings have changed. In essence, online training has become available. In view of the lack of mobility and the limitation of interpersonal contacts, the prosecution units organized in-house trainings. The budget for training in 2020 represents 35.7% of the 2019 implementation and 36.3% of the 2018 implementation. Below, I present the amounts of expenditures realized in 2018 - 2020 for training in the common prosecution units: 2018 - 683 618,27 euro, 2019 - 694 686,85 euro, 2020 - 248 164,77 euro. *The decrease in the approved budget alloceted of the training budget is primarily due to constraints related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Portugal**

**Q013 (2024):** The 30% variation concerns DGAJ-MMP (Direção-Geral da Administração da Justiça - Magistratura do Ministério Público): payments were €35M higher than the initial allocation due to higher-level authorisations.

**Q013 (2021):** During the economic year, the budget needed to face needs that were not anticipated.

**Q013 (2020):** During the economic year, the budget needed to face needs that were not anticipated.

**Romania**

**Q013 (2024):** The data is now directly provided by the Prosecutor's Office Attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice, while in previous reporting years the data was extracted by the Economic Department within the Ministry of Justice from the reports of the Ministry of Finance. Therefore, the difference could be explained by a distinct benchmark in reporting.

**Q013 (2022):** These figures concern the training of civil servants and other categories of staff in this system, not prosecutors - the costs of training magistrates cannot be broken down /highlighted here, being included in the budget of the Superior Council of Magistracy (training of this latter category carried out through the Higher Institute of Magistracy).

**Q013 (2021):** The training of judges and prosecutors is provided by the National Institute of Magistracy (Superior Council of Magistracy)- separate budgets. For 13.1, the amounts included only the sums from the state budget provided for the training of civil servants and other categories of non-judge/non-prosecutor staff within the system of the Public Ministry. Post-pandemic, both the frequency of trainings and the number of participants at trainings grew.

**Q013 (2020):** The training of judges and prosecutors is provided by the National Institute of Magistracy (Superior Council of Magistracy). For 2020, the amounts included to both Q6 and O13 included the amounts from the state budget provided for the training of civil servants and other categories of non-judge / non-prosecutor staff. In 2018, according the data provided by the economic department, at these amounts were included, the training within some European training programs (programs within European funds) of a number of judges (and prosecutors )- a separate budget from the budget regarding the training through the National Institute of Magistracy (Superior Council of Magistracy).

**Slovak Republic**

**Q013 (General Comment):** The increase is correct. The prosecution department once again expected increased interest in training due to legislative changes. The approved budget may be adjusted by the prosecution department during the year with budgetary measures based on the real need for funding, while it must adhere to the overall limits of the allocated budget. The valorization of prosecutors' salaries, which we stated in the questionnaire as an increase in prosecutors' salary requirements.

**Q013 (2024):** The Prosecution Department may, during the course of the year, adjust the approved budget through budgetary measures based on the actual financing needs, while respecting the overall limits of the allocated budget.
The difference between the approved budget and the actual budget amounts to EUR 9,636,852.94.
The financial resources were allocated for the following purposes:
-reconstruction of buildings and premises of regional and district prosecutor's offices,
-increase of remuneration and salary components of prosecutors,
-severance payments for prosecutors,
-procurement of Microsoft licences,
-procurement of software and IT equipment for asset tagging,
-additional financing of essential operational expenditures of the prosecutor's offices,
-functional allowances for the performance of prosecutorial duties.

**Q013 (2023):** The prosecution department once again expected increased interest in training due to legislative changes.
The approved budget may be adjusted by the prosecution department during the year with budgetary measures based on the real need for funding, while it must adhere to the overall limits of the allocated budget.
The difference between the approved budget and the actual budget is EUR 12,685,808.10.
The funds were intended for:
- reconstruction of buildings and premises of regional and district prosecutor's offices,
- purchase of desktops for administrative staff and renewal of Lotus Notes e-mail equipment,
- building a communication infrastructure for the Nové Zámky District Prosecutor's Office,
- increase in salary requirements for prosecutors,
- severance pay of prosecutors,
- procurement of Microsoft licenses,
- payment of increased expenses for electricity and natural gas,
- additional fees for performing the function of a prosecutor,
- additional financing of operating costs (rent, communication infrastructure, general services) and expenses in the field of information technology,
- procurement of mobile workplaces for prosecutors.

**Q013 (2022):** The difference between the approved budget and the implemented budget is 8 609 822 Eurs. The increased funds were allocated to:
- valorisation of prosecutors' salaries
- implementation of the ECRIS TCN Third Country Citizens Registration Project
- expansion of the PATRICIA information system and its connection to the information system of the European Public Prosecutor's Office
- necessary reconstruction of district and regional prosecutor's offices
- more training - relieve of COVID19 restrictions - additional financing of energies.

**Q013 (2021):** The difference between the approved budget and the actual budget is EUR 3 197 554.
The increased funds were allocated to:
- valorisation of prosecutors' salaries;
- modernization of the ECRIS software to version 1.6 for the Criminal Register;
- connection of IS Patricia to IS of the European Prosecutor;
- necessary renovation of buildings of the General Prosecutor's Office of the Slovak Republic;
- budget allocated to training of public prosecution services has changed due to the possibility to make face-to-face trainings.

**Q013 (2020):** The General Prosecutor of the Slovak republic:
The difference between the approved and the implemented budget is 903 692 euros.
The financial means were allocated to:
- wage valorisation of prosecutors, increase of number of employees of the Prosecutor's - investment into the buildings
Discrepancies form the previous cycle in the annual public budget allocated to training are due to the COVID 19 pandemic situation due to which the trainings were not planned or applied. The increase in the approved budget in 2020 reflects the implemented budged allocated to training of public prosecution services in 2019. The budgetary needs for training in 2020 were expected similar (higher) as in 2019, therefore the increase. But the training plans were not implemented due the Covid pandemic situation, so the implementation of the budget in this category was much lower.

**Slovenia**

**Q013 (General Comment):** The indicated amount of approved and implemented budget is allocated for the overall functioning of State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Slovenia. It does not include budget for functioning of the State Prosecution Council (included in Q15.1 and Q15.2.)

**Q013 (2024):** The biggest savings were on salaries, which is still mainly due to vacancies, especially in prosecutorial posts, for which salaries were already planned in 2024. There were also some savings due to several longer absences from work for health reasons, which were reimbursed by the Health Insurance Institute of Slovenia. The same reasons apply also for lower expenditures on training.

**Q013 (2023):** Difference between approved and implemented: The biggest savings were on salaries, which is still mainly due to vacancies, especially in prosecutorial posts, for which salaries were already planned in 2023. There were also significant savings due to several longer absences from work for health reasons, which were reimbursed by the Health Insurance Institute of Slovenia. The same reasons apply also for lower expenditures on training.

**Q013 (2022):** Discrepancies at 13.1 (training): In 2020 and 2021, the budget was impacted by the limitations due to Covid-19 pandemics, hence the increase in 2022 (compared to 2020).

**Q013 (2021):** The low implementation in comparison with the adopted budget is a consequence of the COVID- 19 epidemic, as there were no educational events with physical participation, but rather virtual ones. For the aforementioned type of events there were no registration fees, or they were lower, compared to participation fees for events with physical participation. Due to the COVID-19 epidemic, the public prosecution's own educational event - Educational Prosecutor's Days, which represents the largest cost of the state prosecutor's office in the field of education, was held virtually.

**Q013 (2020):** Training: the implemented budget was impacted by the limitations due to Covid-19 pandemics.

**Spain**

**Q013 (General Comment):** In Spain, it is very difficult to carry out a perfect separation between the budget of Courts and the Budget of Prosecution services, because some concepts are common (civil servants, material resources, buildings, etc). These items cannot be separated from the budget allocated to the functioning of courts. Therefore, the figure provided in respect of the "Total" represents only the salaries.
It is noteworthy that data on the implemented budget is an estimations of the Statistic Department of the General Council of the Judiciary.

**Q013 (2024):** The data Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services are those contained in the General State Budget for the financial year 2024. Programme: 111R "Training of the Prosecutorial Career" of State General Budget, which has led to an improvement in the investment destined to the training of the prosecutors' career. This is a result of the political commitment to improving investment in prosecutors training. Since 2021, the budget has steadily increased with the implementation of the Ministry's Scholarship Programme. The increase in the 2024 budget compared to 2023 is due to the financial requirements needed to implement the Ministry of the Presidency, Justice and Relations with the Parliament's Scholarship Programme for the exam preparation for entry into the public prosecutor career.
Below are the figures for the total aproval budget and, within that total, the portion corresponding exclusively to scholarships. Also included, with the same breakdown, are the figures for the executed budget.
Total Aproved budget (€)12,308,387; total implemented budget :10.021.227,61 € Scholarship Program aproved budget: 7.085.671,99 (€); Scholarship Program implemented budget: 6.323.316,53; €

**Q013 (2023):** -The data Annual public budget allocated to training of public prosecution services are those contained in the General State Budget for the financial year 2023.
Section: 13 MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
Programme: 111R Training of the Prosecutorial Career
- Justification for the discrepancy of the approved budget allocated to training of public prosecution services: The increase is due to the Program 111R "Training of Prosecution Career" of State General Budget, which has led to an improvement in the investment destined to the training of the prosecutors' career. This is a result of the political commitment to improving investment in prosecutors training

**Q013 (2022):** The variation in the implemented budget are within normal parameters taking into account the variation in the price of money in two years. The budget allocated to training includes a part of the training institution's budget corresponding to the prosecutors training. Regarding approved budget allocated to training the increase is related to the Program 111R "Training of Prosecution Career" that is financed from the State General Budget.

**Q013 (2021):** Regarding the approved annual budget allocated to training, the difference with respect to 2020 lies mainly in the fact that the budgets had been extended for several budget years, starting from a year in which the number of trainee prosecutors was much lower. The increase is due to the approval of budgets for the year 2021 that already took into account much greater promotions of the Prosecution career.

**Q013 (2020):** Concerning budget allocated for training of public prosecutors, the difference between the approved and implemented budget, namely the fact that the latter is considerably lower than the former, possibly stems from the pandemic and the impossibility to carry out all the foreseen training courses in 2020.

# Indicator 5: System for compensation of users

- System for compensating users

## Table 5.1 System for compensating users: number of requests for compensations and number of granted compensations by specific circumstances in 2024 (Q37)

| States | Total | | Excessive length of proceedings | | Non-execution of court decisions | | Wrongful arrest / detention | | Wrongful conviction | | Other | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of requests for compensation | Number of compensations granted | Number of requests for compensation | Number of compensations granted | Number of requests for compensation | Number of compensations granted | Number of requests for compensation | Number of compensations granted | Number of requests for compensation | Number of compensations granted | Number of requests for compensation | Number of compensations granted |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | 64 | 20 | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | 1 285 | 577 | 828 | 346 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 399 | 228 | 45 | 2 |
| **Croatia** | 337 | 190 | 101 | 61 | NAP | NAP | 236 | 129 | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 3 926 | 2 384 | NA | 881 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 710 |
| **Denmark** | 3 139 | 1 569 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | 110 | 103 | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 4 550 | 2 254 | 1 307 | 577 | NA | NA | 584 | 549 | NA | NA | 2 659 | 1 127 |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 14 | 7 | 528 | 57 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | NA | NA | 176 | 122 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 29 192 | 21 279 | 18 974 | 14 898 | 9 049 | 5 789 | 1 154 | 589 | 15 | 3 | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | 23 | 47 | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | 12 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 9 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4 250 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | 9 495 | 2 112 | NA | NA | NA | 216 | NA | 18 | 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 | 855 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 15 | 24 | 4 | 3 | NAP | NAP | 9 | 17 | 2 | 4 | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | 745 | 165 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 188 | 55 | 66 | NA | 491 | 110 |
| **Sweden** | 2 351 | 1 824 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 344 | 1 822 | 0 | 0 | NAP | NAP |
| **Average** | 4 143 | 2 597 | 2 820 | 1 593 | 1 915 | 1 169 | 460 | 638 | 70 | 36 | 800 | 390 |
| **Median** | 1 285 | 716 | 110 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 92 | 4 | 3 | 268 | 110 |
| **Minimum** | 12 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 29 192 | 21 279 | 18 974 | 14 898 | 9 049 | 5 789 | 2 344 | 4 250 | 399 | 228 | 2 659 | 1 127 |
| **% of NA** | 56% | 52% | 56% | 52% | 56% | 56% | 59% | 52% | 70% | 70% | 48% | 44% |
| **% of NAP** | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 26% | 26% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 37% | 37% |

## Table 5.2 System for compensating users: amounts of granted compensations by specific circumstances in 2024 (Q37)

| States | Total amount | Excessive length of proceedings | | Non-execution of court decisions | | Wrongful arrest/ detention | | 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** | 959 474 € | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | 123 747 € | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | 3 087 968 € | 714 184 € | 23,1% | 0 € | 0,0% | 5 502 € | 0,2% | 2 241 839 € | 72,6% | 126 443 € | 4,1% |
| **Croatia** | 917 984 € | 32 414 € | 3,5% | NAP | NAP | 885 570 € | 96,5% | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 11 203 296 € | 3 469 309 € | 31,0% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2 433 665 € | 21,7% |
| **Denmark** | 3 884 400 € | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | NA | 386 843 € | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 24 422 592 € | 2 808 488 € | 11,5% | NA | NA | 15 901 314 € | 65,1% | NA | NA | 5 712 790 € | 23,4% |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | NA | 24 000 € | NA | 232 350 € | 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** | 106 201 € | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Lithuania** | 2 943 € | 0 € | 0,0% | 0 € | 0,0% | 0 € | 0,0% | 2 943 € | 100,0% | 0 € | 0,0% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 35 197 € | NA | 5 000 € | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 8 900 000 € | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | 1 620 432 € | NA | NA | NA | 3 238 419 € | NA | 201 953 € | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | 808 924 € | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovak Republic** | 4 846 479 € | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 500 061 € | 74 733 € | 14,9% | NAP | NAP | 371 228 € | 74,2% | 54 100 € | 10,8% | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | 3 193 665 € | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Sweden** | 8 588 546 € | 4 091 € | 0,0% | 0 € | 0,0% | 8 584 455 € | 100,0% | 0 € | 0,0% | NAP | NAP |
| **Average** | 4 809 426 € | 913 449 € | 12,0% | 58 088 € | 0,0% | 3 804 543 € | 56,0% | 417 639 € | 45,9% | 2 068 225 € | 12,3% |
| **Median** | 3 087 968 € | 230 788 € | 11,5% | 0 € | 0,0% | 628 399 € | 69,7% | 29 550 € | 41,7% | 1 280 054 € | 12,9% |
| **Minimum** | 2 943 € | 0 € | 0,0% | 0 € | 0,0% | 0 € | 0,0% | 0 € | 0,0% | 0 € | 0,0% |
| **Maximum** | 24 422 592 € | 3 469 309 € | 31,0% | 232 350 € | 0,0% | 15 901 314 € | 100,0% | 2 241 839 € | 100,0% | 5 712 790 € | 23,4% |
| **% of NA** | 48% | 59% | 70% | 1 € | 63% | 59% | 74% | 74% | 81% | 48% | 48% |
| **% of NAP** | 4% | 4% | 4% | 26% | 26% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 37% | 37% |

## Table 5.3 Evolution of the system for compensating users: total number of requests for compensations, number of granted compensations and amount paid from 2020 to 2024 (Q37)

| States | Number of requests for compensation | | | | | Variation | Number of granted compensations | | | | | Variation | Amount paid in compensations | | | | | Variation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2023-2024 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2023-2024 |
| **Austria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1 310 376 € | 1 288 715 € | 1 253 752 € | 1 537 311 € | 959 474 € | -38% |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1 285 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 577 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 3 087 968 € | NA |
| **Croatia** | 332 | 332 | 380 | 410 | 337 | -18% | 180 | 131 | 149 | 162 | 190 | 17% | 1 290 594 € | 1 106 447 € | 3 224 053 € | 1 114 614 € | 917 984 € | -18% |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | NA | 5 356 | 4 762 | 4 511 | 3 926 | -13% | NA | 2 490 | 2 153 | 2 082 | 2 384 | 15% | NA | 9 617 860 € | 11 446 891 € | 14 641 780 € | 11 203 296 € | -23% |
| **Denmark** | NA | 3 400 | 2 921 | 3 400 | 3 139 | -8% | NA | 1 499 | 1 529 | 1 654 | 1 569 | -5% | NA | 2 742 529 € | 3 705 779 € | 3 973 934 € | 3 884 400 € | -2% |
| **Estonia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Finland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | 908 | NA | 2 545 | 3 995 | 4 550 | 14% | 249 | NA | 1 648 | 2 040 | 2 254 | 10% | 1 975 018 € | NA | 15 729 100 € | 21 270 877 € | 24 422 592 € | 15% |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 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 | 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 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | NAP | 26 964 | 25 523 | 25 719 | 29 192 | 14% | NAP | 25 853 | 24 563 | 18 881 | 21 279 | 13% | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Latvia** | 45 | 39 | 22 | 24 | 23 | -4% | NAP | NAP | 50 | 33 | 47 | 42% | 103 420 € | 97 212 € | 104 314 € | 76 368 € | 106 201 € | 39% |
| **Lithuania** | 78 | 73 | 93 | 12 | 12 | 0% | 35 | 47 | 67 | 1 | 1 | 0% | 26 705 € | 133 818 € | 343 767 € | 850 € | 2 943 € | 246% |
| **Luxembourg** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Portugal** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 808 924 € | NA |
| **Romania** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Slovak Republic** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 855 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4 846 479 € | NA |
| **Slovenia** | 32 | 18 | 17 | 24 | 15 | -38% | 11 | 21 | 17 | 17 | 24 | 41% | 389 871 € | 994 446 € | 1 007 737 € | 532 315 € | 500 061 € | -6% |
| **Spain** | 605 | 656 | 673 | 648 | 745 | 15% | 29 | 113 | 84 | 88 | 165 | 88% | 569 858 € | 2 289 703 € | 841 296 € | 2 795 290 € | 3 193 665 € | 14% |
| **Sweden** | 2 125 | 2 085 | 2 508 | 2 240 | 2 351 | 5% | 1 880 | 1 812 | 2 246 | 2 273 | 1 824 | -20% | 7 170 985 € | 7 036 964 € | 8 832 545 € | 9 120 181 € | 8 588 546 € | -6% |
| **Average** | 589 | 4 325 | 3 944 | 4 098 | 4 143 | -3% | 397 | 3 996 | 3 251 | 2 723 | 2 597 | 20% | 1 604 603 € | 2 811 966 € | 4 648 923 € | 5 506 352 € | 4 809 426 € | 22% |
| **Median** | 332 | 656 | 1 591 | 1 444 | 1 285 | -2% | 108 | 815 | 839 | 908 | 716 | 14% | 930 226 € | 1 288 715 € | 2 238 903 € | 2 166 301 € | 3 087 968 € | -4% |
| **Minimum** | 32 | 18 | 17 | 12 | 12 | -38% | 11 | 21 | 17 | 1 | 1 | -20% | 26 705 € | 97 212 € | 104 314 € | 850 € | 2 943 € | -38% |
| **Maximum** | 2 125 | 26 964 | 25 523 | 25 719 | 29 192 | 15% | 1 880 | 25 853 | 24 563 | 18 881 | 21 279 | 88% | 7 170 985 € | 9 617 860 € | 15 729 100 € | 21 270 877 € | 24 422 592 € | 246% |
| **% of NA** | 67% | 63% | 59% | 59% | 56% | 59% | 67% | 63% | 59% | 59% | 52% | 59% | 63% | 63% | 59% | 59% | 48% | 59% |
| **% of NAP** | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |

# Indicator 5: Legal aid

## Comments provided by the national correspondents

## organised by country

*Question 037. Is there a system of compensation in the following circumstances:*

**Austria**

**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 (2024):** The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act, European Convention on Human Rights 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 and the European Convention on Human Rights in the area of the courts were: € 524.788,14 and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were € 434.686,04 in 2024. The decrease of payments of more than 20% compared to the previous year is due to the fact that those payments are based on decisions by independent courts, which cannot be controlled by the judicial administration and are subject to strong fluctuations.

**Q037 (2023):** The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act, European Convention on Human Rights 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 and the European Convention on Human Rights in the area of the courts were 1.004.651,63 Euro and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were 532.659,80 Euro in 2023.
The increase in payments of more than 20% compared to the previous year is due to the fact that those payments are based on decisions by independent courts, which cannot be controlled by the judicial administration and are subject to strong fluctuations.

**Q037 (2022):** The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act, European Convention on Human Rights 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 and the European Convention on Human Rights in the area of the courts were 458.891,35 Euro and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were 593.651,96 Euro in 2022.

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q037 (General Comment):** In Belgian law, the term « inoperative pre-trial detention" is used instead of "wrongful arrest".
Compensation through the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the State's liability for damages resulting from faults committed by the public prosecutor's office or judges falls under Article 1382 of the Civil Code according to which: "Any act whatsoever of a person 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/she causes not only by his/her own act but also by his/her negligence or imprudence". To obtain compensation, the plaintiff must prove 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 30th, 2014 (no. 99/2014)), a constitutionally correct interpretation of Article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that even if an erroneous decision is not repealed, modified, annulled, or revoked, the state can be held responsible for a serious mistake of a judge sitting at last instance. It is necessary that the mistake constitutes a sufficiently serious violation of the applicable rule of law and that, because of the limited appeal remedies available against the wrong decision, it is not possible to obtain the annulment of such decision. These claims are brought before civil courts.
Exceeding the reasonable time of proceedings should also be considered as a fault. However, article 21ter of the Criminal Procedure Code provides for that in case the right to be judged within a reasonable time is violated, courts can either inflict lower sentence than the legal minimum sentence, or simply pronounce guilty verdict without imposing punishment. With regard to the State's liability for unlawful detention, Article 27 of the Act of March 13, 1973, on compensation for ineffective pre-trial detention provides for a right to compensation for any person who has been deprived of their liberty in conditions incompatible with the provisions of Article 5 of the ECHR.
Reference should also be made to the Act of 13 March 1973 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. Article 28 of this law provides for 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/her own conduct may claim compensation:
a) if he or she has been directly or indirectly exempted 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 granted 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 charge is refused, if the amount of the compensation or the number of days charged 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

Pre-trial Detention.

**Q037 (2024):** Number of cases still open (for inoperative pre-trial detention): 19.

**Q037 (2023):** Number of cases still open for (for inoperative pre-trial detention): 28

**Q037 (2022):** The number of ongoing cases (for ineffective pre-trial detention) stands at 29. Compensation has been granted in 13 cases.
**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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q037 (General Comment):** In the Republic of Bulgaria, there are two mechanisms for indemnification for damages. 1)The proceedings under the State and Municipalities Liability for Damages Act (SMLDA) aim to determine the procedure and grounds for holding the state and municipalities liable and for citizens and legal entities to receive compensation in cases of damage suffered as a result of unlawful acts, actions or omissions of state or municipal authorities and officials in the course of or in connection with the performance of administrative activities. Article 2 of SMLDA also regulates the liability of human rights bodies, including the prosecution service, whereby the state is liable for damage caused to citizens by the investigating authorities, the prosecution service or the court in the following cases: detention, including all cases of deprivation of liberty in violation of Article 5, § 1 of the ECHR; violation of rights protected by Article 5, § 2 – 4 of the Convention; charges for a crime if the person is found not guilty or if the criminal proceedings are dropped or the act has been amnestied; imposition of a penalty under the Criminal Code or an administrative penalty where the person is acquitted or the administrative penalty is annulled; application by the court of an administrative measure where its decision is annulled as unlawful; enforcement of a penalty imposed in excess of the specified term or amount; unlawful use of special intelligence means; an established violation committed by a pre-trial body through the disclosure of investigation materials in violation of the presumption of innocence or in a public statement in which the accused is presented as guilty; established violation of the rights of third parties under Section IX of Chapter Fourteen of the Criminal Procedure Code. Claims under Article 2, paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be examined by the courts in accordance with the procedure established in the Civil Procedure Code. Article 2b of SMLDA regulates the liability of the judicial authorities for violation of the right to have a case examined and decided within a reasonable time, in accordance with Article 6, §1 of the Convention. The courts shall determine the amount of compensation to be awarded on an equitable basis.
2)The second legal indemnification mechanism is based on Chapter 3 “a” of the Judicial System Act that provides for the examination of applications by citizens and legal entities against acts, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities that violate their right to have their case examined and decided within a reasonable time.
Applications may be submitted by citizens and legal entities who are: parties to concluded civil, administrative and criminal proceedings; defendants, victims or aggrieved legal entities in terminated pre-trial proceedings. Compensation for concluded or terminated proceedings shall be determined and paid in accordance with the practice of the ECrHR in an amount not exceeding BGN 10,000.
Applications under paragraph 1 shall be submitted within six months of the conclusion of the relevant proceedings with a final act through the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorised by him shall determine the amount of compensation (provided from the state budget ) in accordance with the practice of the ECHR and shall propose the conclusion of an agreement with the applicant. The circumstances shall be verified and a decision on the application shall be taken within six months of its receipt. Compensation shall be paid on the ba

sis of the agreement concluded. Persons who have received compensation under this chapter may not seek compensation on the same grounds through the courts.
A separate register shall be created for applications, which shall be published on the website of the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council. The Prosecutor's Office shall not keep statistics on compensation awarded under this procedure in connection with the activities of the Prosecutor's Office.
No fee shall be payable for the examination of applications under this chapter.

**Q037 (2024):** The table above presents data from both mechanisms: 1)Claims brought against the Public Prosecutor's Office before the courts under the State and Municipalities Liability for Damages Act (SMLDA), as the amount of damages awarded by the courts in such claims. Column 1: the number of claims brought against the Public Prosecutor's Office under the SMLDA in 2024. Column 2: number of court decisions handed down in 2024 in respect of such claims (not yet final). Column 3: total amount of compensation awarded (in EUR) in court decisions handed down in 2024 under the SMLDA in claims against the prosecution service (not yet final). In 2024, the total amount of compensation under the SMLDA in claims against the prosecution based on enforcement orders (final court decisions) was €33,319.61 – all for wrongful conviction.
- “the numbers provided by the Prosecutor's Office also include the cases for damages against the investigative bodies. This probably also covers the police investigative bodies, which, although being part of the Ministry of Interior, investigate individual cases under the leadership of a prosecutor and in this area they are subordinate to him and are obliged to carry out his orders”.
-“As for cases against the courts under Art. 2 and 2b SMLDA, the data relating to civil proceedings cannot be differentiated within the larger data set, which is collected by the SJC and which covers all cases under this act”.
2)Ministry of Justice (Chapter Three "a" of the Judicial System Act: “Excessive length of proceedings”): number of requests for compensation:775; number of compensations granted:327; total amount of compensations granted (in €):524 954
It should be noted that for 2024, in contrast with the previous evaluation cycles, the category “excessive length of proceedings” contain data from both mechanisms: Number of requests for compensation:53 (first mechanism) +775 (second mechanism)=828; Number of compensations granted: 19(first mechanism) +327(second mechanism)=346; Total amount of compensations granted (in €): 189 230(first mechanism) +524 954 (second mechanism) = 714 184. Before, only data from the Ministry of Justice were communicated.

**Q037 (2023):** Prosecutor's Office of RB: In the Republic of Bulgaria, there are two mechanisms for indemnification for damages, in relation to the criminal proceedings.
The first mechanism is regulated in the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act. The state and the municipalities are liable for the damages caused to citizens and legal entities by unlawful deeds, acts or omissions of their authorities and officials in relation or with respect to the performance of an administrative activity, as well as for damages caused by the effect of secondary legislation revoked as being unlawful or declared null and void. Pursuant to Article 2 of this Act, the state is liable for damages caused to citizens by the investigation authorities, the prosecutor's office or the court in hypotheses determined in this text of the Act.
Statistics is not maintained in the Prosecutor's Office, in the form of the indicators in the table in the present questionnaire. The data for year 2023 about the obtaining of a damage award against the Prosecutor's Office under the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act is, as follows:
In 2023, the Prosecutor's Office lost suits filed by 292 persons under actions based on the legal grounds of Article 2 and Article 2b of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act, as 281 court damage awards entered into force.
Out of the legally effective 281 damage awards, 146 are based on granted actions based on the legal grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 3, Option 1 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (legally effective acquittal), and 103 — based on the legal ground of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 3, Option 2 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (legally effective writ for the termination of the criminal proceeding).
There are no legally effective court judgments based on the legal grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 2 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (violation of rights protected by Article 5, § 2-4 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.)
On the grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 1, Option 1 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act, 7 damage awards were issued (unlawful detention in custody), which are legally effective.
As regards actions based on the legal grounds of Article 2b of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (violation of the right to hearing of the case within a reasonable time, in accordance with Article 6, § 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms), 22 award damages were rendered and entered into legal force.
There are no actions brought on the legal grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 1, last option of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (deprivation of liberty in violation of Article 5, § 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms). On the grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 7 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (unlawful use of Special Intelligence Means), 1 damage award is rendered, which is legally effective. Under Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 6 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (execution of an punishment imposed over and above the determined period or amount) 2 legally effective damage awards were rendered.
The total amount of the in

demnifications awarded under actions brought against the Prosecutor's Office in accordance with the procedure of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act for year 2023 is BGN 2 824 095.16 (EUR 1 443 937).
The data contained in column 3 of the table is in EUR on the basis of the legally effective court judgments under the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act in year 2023 in cases pursued against the Prosecutor's Office. The Prosecutor's Office does not keep statistics in the form of the other indicators in the table in the questionnaire. The data is therefore presented as a text in the answer to question No.37.
The second legal indemnification mechanism is provided for in the Judicial System Act (Chapter Three "a" of the Judicial System Act — consideration of applications against a violation of the right to hearing and resolution of the case within a reasonable time.
This chapter governs the hearing of applications of citizens and legal entities against deeds, acts or omissions of the bodies of the Judiciary whereby their right to hearing and resolution of the case within a reasonable time is violated.
The applications are filed by citizens and legal entities, which are:
1.parties to completed civil, administrative and criminal proceedings;
2.accused, victims or damaged legal entities under terminated pre-trial proceedings.
This chapter also governs the determination and payment of an indemnification in accordance with the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights in the amount of no more than BGN 10 000.
The Minister of Justice is competent to make a decision, and the deadline for considering applications is 6 months.
The Procedural Representation before the ECHR Directorate of the Ministry of Justice: In 2023, under the Judicial System Act, Chapter Three "a", compensations were paid under 213 agreements in the amount of 311,320 euros /608,900 BGN/ total.

**Q037 (2022):** Prosecutor's Office of RB: In the Republic of Bulgaria, there are two mechanisms for compensation for damages in connection with criminal proceedings.
The first mechanism is regulated in the Law on the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages (LLSMD). The state and municipalities are responsible for the damages caused to citizens and legal entities by illegal acts, actions or inactions of their bodies and officials during or on the occasion of the performance of administrative activities, as well as for the damages caused by the action of canceled as illegal or declared as null and void by-laws. According to Art. 2 of this law, the state is responsible for the damages caused to citizens by the investigative bodies, the prosecutor's office or the court in the hypotheses specified in this text of the law.
The Prosecutor's Office does not keep statistics in the form of the indicators in the table in this questionnaire. The data for 2022 regarding the conviction of the Prosecutor's Office under LLSMD are as follows:
In 2022, the Prosecutor's Office was convicted by 255 persons on claims with a legal basis, Art. 2 and Art. 2b LLSMD, with 248 convictions entering into force.
Of the 248 convictions that entered into force, 134 were based on upheld claims with a legal basis, Art. 2, para. 1, item 3, item 1 LLSMD (acquittal entered into force), and 92 - with legal basis, Art. 2, para. 1, item 3, item 2 LLSMD (decree on termination of criminal proceedings entered into force).
2 court decisions were issued on the basis of Art. 2, para. 1, item 2 LLSMD (violation of rights protected by Art. 5, § 2-4 of the ECHR.)
Pursuant to Art. 2, para. 1, item 1, item 1 LLSMD, 2 convictions were rendered (illegal detention).
For claims with a legal basis, Art. 2b LLSMD (violation of the right to consider the case within a reasonable time, according to Art. 6, § 1 of the Criminal Procedure Code) 18 convictions were issued and entered into force.
There are no claims filed with a legal basis under Art. 2, para. 1, item 1, proposal last LLSMD (imprisonment, in violation of Art. 5, § 1 ECHR), under Art. 2, para. 1, item 7 of LLSMD (illegal use of Special Intelligence Means) and under Art. 2, para. 1, item 6 LLSMD (execution of an imposed penalty exceeding the specified term or amount).
The total amount of compensation awarded for claims brought against the Prosecutor's Office under the LLSMD procedure for 2022 is BGN 2,564,814.75 (EUR 1,311,369).
The second legal mechanism for compensation is regulated in the Law on the Judiciary (Chapter Three "a" Judiciary System Act- consideration of applications against violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.
In accordance with the procedure of this chapter, applications of citizens and legal entities against acts, actions or inactions of the bodies of judicial power, which violate their right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time, are considered.
Applications are submitted by citizens and legal entities that are:
1. parties to closed civil, administrative and criminal proceedings;
2. accused, injured or damaged legal entities in terminated pre-trial proceedings.
In accordance with the procedure of this chapter, compensation is determined and paid in accordance with the practice of the European Court of Human Rights in the amount of no more than BGN 10,000.
Data on the implementation of the mechanism under Chapter Three "a" of the Judicial System Act are not collected in the Prosecutor's Office. The applications under para. 1 shall be submitted within 6

months from the completion of the relevant proceedings with a final act through the Inspectorate of the Supreme Judicial Council to the Minister of Justice.
Supreme Judicial Council: The Law on the Judiciary regulates an administrative procedure according to which citizens and legal entities can be compensated when their right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time is violated. Compensations are in the amount of no more than BGN 10,000. The Minister of Justice is competent to make a decision, and the deadline for considering applications is 6 months.
Ministry of Justice: Statistics on number of compensations granted for wrongful arrest include overall prosecution data on detention in custody and house arrest, but also for wrongful charges with subsequent acquittals and termination of proceedings, as well as violations of Art. 5, § 2 – 4 of the ECHR, since the numbers under the provision for seeking compensation for those are aggregate. Amount of compensation also includes compensations under another 18 court decisions for length of proceedings, but data cannot be disaggregated. No exact explanation can be given for any possible differences, because there is no data available on the calculation method or details on the proceedings. 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 excessive length of proceedings under the Judicial System Act. Sums paid may include payments under applications from December of the previous year. No exact explanation can be given for differences in numbers of requests, or compensations given, as they are subject to complex criteria, based on ECtHR case-law.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q037 (2024):** Claims for compensation for unlawful detention and wrongful conviction shall be submitted to this Ministry, which is also competent to conduct the procedure for an amicable settlement. Should the claimant not accept the offer made by the Ministry, they are entitled to bring an action before the competent court.
The amount of compensation offered by the Ministry, as fair pecuniary reparation on this basis, is fixed at a uniform rate of EUR 37.16 per day of deprivation of liberty, applicable in all cases.
The amounts disbursed in 2024 relate to payments made pursuant to decisions adopted in amicable settlement proceedings, as well as to court judgments delivered in 2024 concerning cases initiated in previous years.

**Q037 (2023):** In our instance, the term "wrongful arrest/detention" in the chart refers to payment for an erroneous arrest and conviction.
To this Ministry, which is also in charge of peaceful processes, is presented the request for compensation for unwarranted arrest and conviction. The applicant has the option to file a complaint with the appropriate court if he rejects the Ministry's offer. On this basis, the Ministry provides the aggrieved parties with a unique sum of compensation—HRK 280.00 (€37.16) per day of deprivation of liberty—as a fair monetary settlement. Payments based on peaceful proceedings rulings and 2023 court judgments are included in the sum paid for 2023; these cases are from previous years.

**Q037 (2022):** The information in the table also refers to Wrongful arrest/detention and wrongful conviction.
The request for compensation for unfounded arrest and unjustified conviction is submitted to the Ministry of Justice and Administration, which is also responsible for peaceful proceedings. In case the applicant does not accept the offer of the Ministry of Justice and Administration, he has the right to file a complaint with the competent court.
The amount of compensation that the Ministry offers to the injured parties as a fair monetary compensation on this basis is unique in all cases and amounts to HRK 280.00 per day of deprivation of liberty. The amount paid for 2022 refers to payments based on decisions made in a peaceful procedure. The amount is expressed in kuna.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**Q037 (2024):** Number of requests for compensation: 2 710 in the pre-court phase, 1 216 court cases.
Number of compensations granted: in 1 673 cases compensation was granted at least partially by the ministry, in 711 cases compensation was granted by the court (28 fully and 683 partially).
Other - it can be any other malpractice of the court, public prosecution, executor or notary.
in 2023 we reported the number of cases that we ourselves classify statistically as “other,” but in the current table, “other” also includes compensation for harm/damage caused by criminal prosecution. If we read what the table means by the row “other” (wrongful criminal proceedings…), I understood it as their intention to separate data on compensation for unjustified criminal prosecution (in our system, this issue is more complex due to case law, because we have absolute objective liability of the state—as the only country in Europe, together with Slovakia—and the state is liable, based on a legal fiction of unlawfulness, even for criminal prosecutions that were procedurally correct but did not end with a conviction).

**Q037 (2023):** Number of requests for compensation: 2 631 in the pre-court phase, 1 880 court cases.
Number of compensations granted: in 1 472 cases compensation was granted at least partially by the ministry, in 610 cases compensation was granted by the court.
Other - it can be any other malpractice of the court, public prosecution, executor or notary.
**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**

**Q037 (2024):** The numbers in table 37 are based on data from Platina, which is a case management system used by The Danish Prosecution System. Data in table 37 has been created outside the standard data model. Specifically developed data models are tested, but still associated with a higher risk of unidentified errors compared to the standard model. Thus, the data in table 37 is associated with considerable uncertainty. The number of cases with a request for compensation corresponds to the number of distinct case reference numbers of relevant cases within the Regional State Prosecutors or the State Prosecutor for Special Crimes. The number of cases where a compensation has been granted, corresponds to the number of distinct case reference numbers of relevant cases within the Regional State Prosecutors, the State Prosecutor for Special Crimes or the Director of Public Prosecutions.
The total sum of compensations is calculated as the sum of compensations in cases where the request for compensation has been either fully or partially granted by the Regional State Prosecutors, the State Prosecutor for Special Crimes or the Director of Public Prosecutions. It should be noted that cases in which a court has ordered The Danish Prosecution System to grant compensation are not included in table 37. This is because such cases are not registered in our case handling system (Platina). It should be noted that in Platina the amount of compensation granted is registered in a text-field where it is possible for the user to write characters other than numbers. Thus, there is a risk of some amounts not being included in the total if these are written in a way that means they cannot be converted in to a numerical value. In Platina, it is possible for a user to assign a case certain keywords. These keywords can later aid the identification of cases regarding a request for compensation that involve specific interventions, such as “arrests”, “pre-trial detentions” or “preliminary charges”. Since a single case may contain multiple keywords, but only one compensation amount, it is not possible to determine which specific interventions the compensation covers, or how the compensation is distributed if compensation was granted due to several different interventions. For this reason, a keyword-based classification is associated with such significant uncertainty that it is assessed that such a classification of numbers will provide an un-accurate representation of how request for compensation and compensations amounts are distributed across the categories ’Wrongful arrest/detention’ and ’Wrongful conviction’. We are aware that we, in previous contributions to CEPEJ’s evaluation, have provided data on request for compensation and compensations amounts divided into the categories ’Wrongful arrest/detention’ and ’Wrongful conviction’. However, we have subsequently become aware that previously used data models were subject to a significant uncertainty for the reason described above.

**Q037 (2023):** Data in the table (37) has been created outside the standard data 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 considerable uncertainty. All figures indicating condemnations of requests and total amount are the sum of cases and amounts fully or partially granted. € amount is calculated via xe.com. 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).
There is no specific reason to the surges in compensation requests and awards, but these can fluctuate considerably from year to year. The available data is from a case management system and is not constructed for statistical purposes. For this reason the registrations within the different categories may vary a lot, depending on the case manager. Nevertheless; the total number of compensation requests, compensations granted and amounts should be correct. It is the division into the different categories that is associated with uncertainty.

**Q037 (2022):** 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 (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).

**Finland**

**Q037 (General Comment):** 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 reflect the whole picture of the cases where the proceeding has taken too long. In 2023 the sentence was reduced in five cases. 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.

**Q037 (2023):** In 2023 there were 442 requests and the State Treasury issued 462 decisions. On 71 cases the right to compensation was denied. A total of 1 800 000 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 (2022):** 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 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 459 requests. A total of 2 200 000 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 (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.

**France**

**Q037 (General Comment):** The Legal Affairs Sub-Directorate of the Ministry of Justice, in conjunction with the State Judicial Officer, monitors liability actions relating to the malfunctioning of the public justice service (mainly based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation, with regard to users of this service).
The State Judicial Officer directly monitors actions for compensation for pre-trial detention in criminal proceedings that have ended in a decision to dismiss the case, acquittal, or discharge (Articles 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure).
1. With regard to liability actions relating to the malfunctioning of the public justice service:
the vast majority of these are based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation.
Under this article, the State is required to compensate for damage caused by the malfunctioning of the justice service. Unless otherwise specified, this liability is only incurred in the event of gross negligence or denial of justice. This liability regime applies only to users of the public justice service, as third parties to legal proceedings can only invoke the State's strict liability for breach of equality before public burdens.
With regard to actions brought on the basis of Article 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure: article 149 of the CPC grants the right, under certain conditions, to full compensation for damage suffered as a result of detention in proceedings that have been dismissed, discharged, or acquitted.
Any person who has been held in pre-trial detention during proceedings that have been terminated by a final decision to dismiss the case, acquit or discharge them is entitled, except in cases specifically defined in Article 149 of the CPC, to full compensation for the moral and material damage caused by such detention, upon request. The compensation awarded shall be paid by the State.
The first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision to dismiss the case, acquit or discharge the detainee, thereby establishing their innocence, was handed down, shall rule, following a public and adversarial procedure, by means of a reasoned decision that may be appealed before the National Commission for the Compensation of Detentions attached to the Court of Cassation (CNRD).

**Q037 (2024):** The figures provided with regard to the category “excessive length of proceedings” correspond to liability actions relating to the malfunctioning of the public justice service (Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organization); the figures provided for the category “Unjustified arrest/detention” correspond to legal actions initiated on the basis of Article 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure; the figures indicated for the category ‘Other’ correspond to disputes concerning “seals,” "police material damage” (broken doors) and “malfunctions of the public justice service due to gross negligence.”
With regard to the compensation procedure (IDP) and the method of calculating the amount of compensation (e.g., the daily rate for an unjustified arrest or conviction):
-there is no official scale for IDPs. They are assessed on a case-by-case basis, with reference to the case law of the CNRD, which applies relatively consistent amounts but without an official scale.
The case law of the National Commission for the Compensation of Detentions (CNRD) and the Court of Cassation provides some numerical trends:
• Moral damages: between €50 and €100 per day of detention on average (often around €1,500 to €3,000 per month)
• Material damages: compensated on the basis of supporting documents (pay slips, employer certificates, economic losses).
• In certain serious cases (very long detention, major psychological impact), the compensation may be much higher.
In practice, unjustified detention can result in total compensation (moral + material) averaging around €25,000 to €26,000.
Recent decisions illustrate a range from €10,000 for five months to €73,500 (moral + material damages + costs) for 20 months.

**Q037 (2023):** The figures given in the “excessive length of proceedings” category correspond to liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public justice service (article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation); the figures given in the “wrongful arrest/detention” category correspond to legal actions initiated on the basis of article 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure; the figures given in the “Other” category correspond to legal proceedings relating to ‘seals’ and ‘police property damage’ (door breakage).
**Q037 (2022):** The compensation procedure is the same as the one described for 2020.

**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)

**Germany**

**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 nonpecuniary 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 pub

lic 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) StrEG). In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, Section 2(1) StrEG provides for compensation for the damage suffered inter alia 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 StrEG). 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) StrEG). The current immaterial compensation is €75 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced.

**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 pu

blic 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 inter alia 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 75 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced

**Greece**

**Q037 (2024):** The data in the table correspond to requests for compensation before administrative courts of all instances.
It is to be noted that in two cases the request for compliance concerned a decision of another administrative court and for this reason the Council of State referred the request.

**Q037 (2023):** For 2023, only data concerning the administrative justice are available. Administrative Courts
-Council of State (Supreme Administrative Court)
1. The following data concern the relevant proceedings before the Council of State.
Excessive length of proceedings – just satisfaction: Law 4055/2012 .
Administrative compliance with court decisions: Law 3068/2002. 2. Within 2023, 2 applications for excessive duration of the trial were filed before the Council of State and 4 decisions were issued on applications from previous years, with which the public was imposed a total amount of 15,400 euros as just satisfaction. 3. Within 2023, 42 applications were submitted for non-execution of decisions of the Council of State and 4 decisions were issued on applications from previous years, with which monetary sanctions of 76,000 euros were imposed on the administration.
-first and second instance Administrative Courts
•Excessive length of proceedings: 11 ( number of requests for compensation), 6 ( number of compensations granted), 10,500 € { total amount of compensation granted (in €)}
•Non -execution of court decisions: 396( number of requests for compensation),38(number of compensations granted),150,800€ so far, as significant percentage of these cases is still pending and it is not possible to estimate the total amount of compensation awarded by Administrative Tribunals during 2023{ total amount of compensation granted (in €)}
[A] Compensation cases before the civil Courts Due to unjustified delay – Excessive length of trial
In accordance with the provisions of article 1 of Law 4239/2014 (Government Gazette A 43) "Just satisfaction due to exceeding the reasonable duration of the trial in the civil and criminal courts and in the Court of Auditors and other provisions" under the title "Entitled to bring an application".
In accordance with the provisions of article 2 of the above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Competence".
In accordance with the provisions of article 3 of the same above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Application".
In accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the same above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Procedure".
In accordance with the provisions of article 5 of the same above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Criteria for the determination of the excess and the adjudication of just satisfaction".
In accordance with the provisions of article 6 of the same above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Execution of the decision".
[B] Compensation cases before the criminal Courts [I] Due to unjustified delay – Excessive length of trial.
In accordance with the provisions of article 7 of Law 4239/2014 under the title "Procedures before criminal courts".
[II] Due to wrongful arrest/detention and wrongful conviction.
In accordance with the provisions of article 535 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the title "Who is entitled to compensation.".
According to the provisions of article 536 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the title "When there is no right to compensation.".
According to the provisions of article 537 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the title "Who else is entitled to compensation.".
According to the provisions of article 538 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the heading "Submit the application".
According to the provisions of article 540 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the heading "Determination of for wrongful conviction at least 50,140€.

**Q037 (2022):** -Articles 538,539,540 of the Code of Criminal Procedure
-According to the Council of the State (1501/2014) and in line with the case law of the CJUE, the State may be held liable for damages to the citizen in case of an erroneous judicial decision if there is a manifest error.
-Law 4239/2014 as amended by Law 4842/2021 provides for fair compensation for excessive length of proceedings

**Hungary**

**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 (2024):** Civil Proceedings

Excessive Length of Proceedings (Civil Proceedings)

In 2022, Act XCIV of 2021 on the enforcement of financial compensation related to the delay of civil litigation entered into force.

According to the Hungarian civil procedural law there is a compensation for breach of the reasonable time requirement and also for not paying the monetary compensation. The consequences of the breach of the reasonable time requirement are regulated in the Act XCIV of 2021 on the enforcement of pecuniary compensation in connection with the protracted civil proceedings.

Financial compensation is only available to the party who participated in the proceedings complained of, regardless of whether he or she was the successful or unsuccessful party. It is granted if the reasonable period of time specified by law is exceeded during the proceedings or a specific stage of the proceedings (according to the Hungarian laws, such stages are the first instance, the second instance and the review proceedings), and no concrete disadvantage needs to be proven.

To determine the amount of pecuniary compensation, the duration of the proceedings or stage of proceedings to be taken into account must first be determined. This can be calculated by deducting from the duration of the proceedings or stage of proceedings calculated in accordance with the law the periods of time that are to be disregarded in accordance with the law. The period calculated in this way is subject to the payment of financial compensation if it exceeds the reasonable period laid down by law. In general, the duration of the entire court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed sixty months. The duration of the procedural stages is deemed reasonable if the duration of the proceedings at first instance does not exceed thirty months (or thirty-six months if the proceedings are initiated by an order for payment procedure), the duration of the proceedings at second instance eighteen months, and the duration of the review proceedings twelve months.

For some actions (personal status, maintenance of a minor child, press vindication and employment) shorter time limits apply. In these cases, the duration of the entire court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed thirty-six months.

The amount of the pecuniary compensation is the multiplication of the duration of the procedure (procedural stage) to be taken into account by four hundred forints per day.

As of August 19th of 2025 according to Section 147/A of the Act CXXX of 2016 on the Code of Civil Procedure in case the time limit is overrun, the parties are entitled ex officio to monetary compensations, starting from the day after the time limit is overrun. The daily amount of monetary compensation is the 1,5 percent of the minimum wage (valid on the day of delay) and the courts are obligated to pay the monetary compensation for the entire duration of the time limit overrun.

Non-execution of Court Decisions (Civil Proceedings)

First of all, it should be noted that the fulfilment of judgments in civil proceedings is essentially voluntary. Consequently, if the unsuccessful party fails to fulfil the judgment voluntarily within a prescribed period of time, the successful party has the possibility to initiate enforcement proceedings. The costs of the enforcement procedure is borne by the unsuccessful party.

According to the Hungarian laws in the case of a payment delay, the debtor is liable to pay interest for late payment from the date of the delay. It is important to note that this is not compensation, i.e. it is

not necessary that the successful party suffers damages as a result of late payment.

Criminal Proceedings

Act XC of 2017 on Criminal Procedure (hereinafter: Be.) arranges in Chapter CVIII of its own right compensation in the case of unjustly limited and abstract leave. Compensation shall be payable for unlawful arrest, prior forced medical treatment and criminal supervision in which the defendant was required not to leave an apartment, other premises, institution or enclosed place without authorisation, and for detention ordered prior to the order of the accused person. In addition, compensation shall be granted to the accused person for imprisonment, imprisonment, education at a juvenile institution or forced treatment carried out on the basis of a final judgment, if he was subsequently acquitted as a result of an extraordinary remedy, the proceedings were terminated or a lesser penalty was imposed on him.

The length of the criminal proceedings does not in itself constitute a ground for compensation, but the court may consider it as an attenuating circumstance when imposing the penalty, and then the Be. In accordance with Paragraph 562(1), the grounds of the court’s decision must state this.

**Q037 (2023):** Civil Proceedings

Excessive Length of Proceedings (Civil Proceedings)

According to the Hungarian civil procedural law there is a compensation for breach of the reasonable time requirement. Financial compensation is only available to the party who participated in the proceedings complained of, regardless of whether he or she was the successful or unsuccessful party. It is granted if the reasonable period of time specified by law is exceeded during the proceedings or a specific stage of the proceedings (according to the Hungarian laws, such stages are the first instance, the second instance and the review proceedings), and no concrete disadvantage needs to be proven.

To determine the amount of pecuniary compensation, the duration of the proceedings or stage of proceedings to be taken into account must first be determined. This can be calculated by deducting from the duration of the proceedings or stage of proceedings calculated in accordance with the law the periods of time that are to be disregarded in accordance with the law. The period calculated in this way is subject to the payment of financial compensation if it exceeds the reasonable period laid down by law. In general, the duration of the entire court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed sixty months. The duration of the procedural stages is deemed reasonable if the duration of the proceedings at first instance does not exceed thirty months (or thirty-six months if the proceedings are initiated by an order for payment procedure), the duration of the proceedings at second instance eighteen months, and the duration of the review proceedings twelve months.

For some actions (personal status, maintenance of a minor child, press vindication and employment) shorter time limits apply. In these cases, the duration of the entire court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed thirty-six months. The amount of the pecuniary compensation is the multiplication of the duration of the procedure (procedural stage) to be taken into account by four hundred forints per day.

Non-execution of Court Decisions (Civil Proceedings)

First of all, it should be noted that the fulfilment of judgments in civil proceedings is essentially voluntary. Consequently, if the unsuccessful party fails to fulfil the judgment voluntarily within a prescribed period of time, the successful party has the possibility to initiate enforcement proceedings. The costs of the enforcement procedure is borne by the unsuccessful party. According to the Hungarian laws in the case of a payment delay, the debtor is liable to pay interest for late payment from the date of the delay. It is important to note that this is not compensation, i.e. it is not necessary that the successful party suffers damages as a result of late payment.

Criminal Proceedings

Act XC of 2017 on Criminal Proceedings (hereinafter: Be.) regulates the recompense in case of unjustly limited and deprived liberty in a separate Chapter (Chapter CVIII – Recompense for unfounded restriction of freedom). Recompense shall be provided for any pre-trial detention, preliminary compulsory psychiatric treatment, criminal supervision during which, as prescribed by the court, the defendant was not allowed to leave a home, other premises, an institute or a fenced area of it without permission, or custody ordered before ordering any of the above. Recompense shall also be provided for any imprisonment, confinement, special education in a juvenile correctional institution, or compulsory psychiatric treatment enforced on the basis of a final and b

inding judgment, provided that a court, as a result of extraordinary legal remedy acquitted the defendant with final and binding effect; imposed a less detrimental penalty on the defendant; terminated the proceeding against the defendant with a final and binding conclusive order. Protraction of the criminal proceedings does not in itself constitute a ground for recompense, but the court may take it into account as a mitigating circumstance when imposing the sentence. In this case, pursuant to Section 562 (1) of Be., a reference to this fact shall be included in the short statement of reasons for the decision.

In 2022, Act XCIV of 2021 on the enforcement of financial compensation related to the delay of civil litigation entered into force. The above data shows the results of the proceedings initiated under the new legislation.

**Q037 (2022):** As regards private law, we highlight the possibility to enforce claims based on Act XCIV of 2021 on the Enforcement of Property Compensation for Delay in Civil Proceedings.
The act defines the timeframe which may be regarded as reasonable and which is absolutely sufficient for the court to carry out the procedural steps necessary for a well-founded decision in the case.
As a general rule, the duration of court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed sixty months from the date of commencement of the proceedings at first instance to the date of notification of the final decision closing the proceedings. A claim may also be brought in the event of a delay in the procedure phase. The duration of the procedural phase is considered reasonable if, for example, the duration of procedural phase at first instance does not exceed thirty months, the duration of procedural phase at second instance does not exceed eighteen months, and the duration of the review proceedings does not exceed twelve months. A shorter objective timeframe is set for specific cases that need to be dealt with quickly such as cases related to personal status, child support and employment. However, depending on the circumstances of a given case, the court seised may, at its judicial discretion, set a shorter timeframe as reasonable. A claim for compensation may be brought in relation to both pending and concluded cases if either the duration of the entire proceedings or a procedural phase exceeds the reasonable timeframe defined by law.
If the duration of the court proceedings or procedural phase exceeds the timeframe considered reasonable, the party may claim monetary compensation from the court conducting the delayed proceedings at the rate set by government decree (HUF 400,- per day). The compensation awarded is in proportion to the duration of the court proceedings. [see also the Government Decree 372/2021 (VI. 30.) on the amount of property compensation for delay in civil proceedings and the rules for calculating the amount to be paid.]
Concerning criminal law, we would add that in case of an unlawful arrest, imprisonment, confinement, placement in a juvenile correctional institution or compulsory psychiatric treatment, a recompensation procedure as included in the Criminal Procedural Act, may be initiated. The person entitled to compensation may choose to enter into an agreement with the Ministry of Justice in a simplified procedure, in the framework of which a settlement is reached on the amount of the compensation, or to file a lawsuit and the court will decide on the amount of the compensation.
In case of an agreement in the simplified compensation procedure, the compensation is adjusted to the number of days of unlawful deprivation of liberty, the amount per day is seven thousand forints (in the case of criminal supervision, the amount per day of compensation is three thousand five hundred forints).

**Q037 (2020):** There is no national level database containing the data for the question.

**Italy**

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q037 (General Comment):** In Latvia, there is no compensation in the category “Non-execution of court decisions”. In civil proceedings it is possible for individuals in Latvia to bring an action against the State for damages caused by the malfunctioning, or abnormal functioning, of the justice system (for example in case of excessive length of proceedings). The basis for bringing such an action is Article 92 of the Constitution of Latvia, which states that "Everyone, where his or her rights are violated without basis, has a right to commensurate compensation."

**Q037 (2024):** Number of requests for compensation - received at the Ministry of Justice (no data about requests received at prosecutor's office and the State Police). Number of compensations granted - the compensation shall be disbursed by the Ministry of Justice accordance also with the decisions of the prosecutor's office and the State Police on the compensation from the State basic budget resources intended for such purpose.
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 2024 consists of non-pecuniary damages 56 392,77 euros, damages 46 390,78 euros, state social insurance contributions 2433,94 euros and personal income tax compensation 983,06 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 2024 was 46 euros ((700 euros : 30 = 23 euros); 23 euro x 2 x 1 day = 46 euros).

**Q037 (2023):** Number of requests for compensation - received at the Ministry of Justice (no data about requests received at prosecutor's office). Number of compensations granted - the compensation shall be disbursed by the Ministry of Justice accordance also with the decision of the prosecutor's office on the compensation from the State basic budget resources intended for such purpose.
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 2023 consists of non-pecuniary damages 23 738 euros, damages 43 081,76 euros, state social insurance contributions 6032,35 euros and personal income tax compensation 3515,59 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 2023 was 40 euros ((620 euros : 30 = 20,66 euros); 20 euro x 2 x 1 day = 40 euros).

**Q037 (2022):** Number of requests for compensation - received at the Ministry of Justice (no data about requests received at prosecutor's office).
The Ministry of Justice informs that the total amount of compensation in 2022 consists of non-pecuniary damages 62147.40 euros, damages 35 699.71 euros, state social insurance contributions 4 776.49 euros and personal income tax compensation 1 912.68 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 (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”.

**Lithuania**

**Q037 (2023):** We cannot indicate any specific reasons why the number of requests for compensation for damage out of court has significantly decreased. We also observe a consistent decrease in the number of persons applying to court for compensation for damage caused by unlawful actions of the state. We can perhaps attribute such a general trend to the fact that state institutions and officials make fewer mistakes that cause harm to individuals.
From 2022-06-30, the legal regulation was changed, the amounts of damage that we compensate outside the court procedure were increased (property - no more than 10 thousand, non-property - no more than 5 thousand). However, the predictions that the number of requests would increase did not come true. Since the number of cases in courts is not increasing, it can be concluded that the institutions adhere to the human rights standard and try not to perform such actions that would be considered unlawful and cause harm (particularly positive changes are seen in criminal proceedings and in the execution of sentences).

**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;

**Luxembourg**

**Q037 (General Comment):** The law of 1st September 1988 concerning the civil liability of the State and public authorities permits the State to be held civilly liable before ordinary courts when a litigant alleges harm resulting from the defective functioning of judicial bodies. Examples of such dysfunction include excessive length of proceedings or a conviction stemming from judicial malpractice, which could form the basis of a claim. These complaints are typically brought before courts of first instance.

Additionally, complaints about the excessive length of proceedings may also be pursued before the European Court of Human Rights (for violations of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights) or could result in procedural sanctions during ongoing proceedings. However, the latter do not appear within the scope of our national systems. The involvement of various actors complicates the identification and categorisation of claims and compensation decisions, making it challenging to provide data that accurately reflects the broader situation.

Nevertheless, we have been able to compile data on compensation for wrongful arrest/detention as regulated by the law of 30 December 1981 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. Available figures pertain to requests for compensation and decisions granting such compensation in cases of inoperative preventive detention (IPD)(https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detention-preventive.html), as well as the total amounts disbursed. It should be noted that, under the provisions of the law of 30 December 1981, the decisions are of administrative nature, rather than convictions.

**Q037 (2024):** Wrongful convictions: This category includes applications for review submitted to the Court of Cassation. In 2024, two applications for review were filed, one of which was dismissed. In the case where the review was granted, compensation of 5000€ was awarded.
**Q037 (2023):** Wrongful convictions: This item includes applications for review lodged with the Cour de cassation. In 2023, no requests for compensation were lodged with the Court of Cassation and consequently, there were no compensations granted.

**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.

**Malta**

**Q037 (General Comment):** 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 (2024):** Anyone who has experienced an injustice can seek redress in the Courts of Justice. The Laws of Malta provide for compensation in cases of wrongful conviction and unlawful detention (Chapter 319 of the Laws of Malta), while S.L. 9.12 of the Criminal Code establishes a compensation system for victims of crime. However, data on these cases is not currently available.

**Q037 (2022):** 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 (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.

**Netherlands**

**Q037 (General Comment):** There are compensation regulations for certain situations (see 4th Book, Title VIa of the Penal Code). If an offender is acquitted, he/she may request compensation for travel- and accommodation costs, the costs of a lawyer, or because of being held in temporary custody.
Numbers cannot be provided for most categories, as compensation may involve people who were held in custody but were either not accused or not found guilty, damages due to an arrest, or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or gone missing.

**Q037 (2024):** Under Article 533 Sv, a suspect who is not convicted or whose case is dismissed may be compensated for damages suffered as a result of undergoing (pre-trial) detention or clinical observation.

**Q037 (2023):** Under Article 533 Sv, a suspect who is not convicted or whose case is dismissed may be compensated for damages suffered as a result of undergoing (pre-trial) detention or clinical observation.

**Q037 (2022):** There are compensation regulations for certain situations (see 4th Book, Title VIa of the Penal Code). If an offender is acquitted, he/she may request compensation for travel- and accommodation costs, the costs of a lawyer, or because of being held in temporary custody.

**Poland**

**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 (2024):** The data below presents the amounts of compensation paid in 2024 from chapter 75595, which were awarded against the State Treasury, indicating the specific legal acts on the basis of which the compensation was awarded.
Specification of compensation from chapter 75595 amounts paid in 2024:
1. Act of February 23, 1991, on the invalidation of judgments issued against persons repressed for activities in favor of the independent existence of the Polish State 193 733 000 (PLN) 45 339 000(EUR)
2. Article 552 of the Act of June 6, 1997 - Code of Criminal Procedure 21 368 000 (PLN) 5 001 000(EUR)
3. Act of June 17, 2004, on complaints against violations of the right of a party to have their case heard in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and in court proceedings without undue delay 6 581 000(PLN) 1 540 000 (EUR)
4. Other compensation: including compensation pensions, compensation for property damage, unlawful eviction 658 000 (PLN) 154 000 (EUR)
5. Act of July 7, 2005, on state compensation for victims of certain prohibited acts 224 000 PLN 52 000 EUR;
Total compensation from chapter 75595 222 564 000 (PLN) 52 086 000 PLN
The amount of funds spent on compensation payments to eligible persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the validity of claims and the amount of compensation awarded. The implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the fiscal year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, as the payment of funds by the court's financial department is based solely on a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the eligible person.

**Q037 (2022):** *246 - number of persons
11 - number of persons
**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 invalid rulings 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 euros3. pursuant to the Act of 17 June 2004 on a complaint for violation of 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 Compensation to 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.

**Portugal**

**Q037 (General Comment):** There is no data with these levels of disaggregation in Portugal, we can only offer the total amount of the compensation.
The right to compensation in the cases listed is provided for in Law no. 67/2007 of December 31, which establishes the regime of non-contractual civil liability of the State and other Public Entities, specifically providing for an autonomous regime of State liability for damages arising from the exercise of the judicial function (chapter III, arts. 12 to 14).
In particular, with regard to Wrongful arrest/detention, it is important to mention article 225 and 226 of the Criminal Procedure Code, which provide for the right to compensation for illegal or unjustified deprivation of liberty by establishing a special regime. These articles also give effect to Article 27(5) CRP, which states that "Deprivation of liberty contrary to the provisions of the Constitution and the law shall constitute the State's duty to compensate the injured party under the terms established by law".

**Q037 (2024):** The total amount paid includes compensation in cases of the European Court of Human Rights and compensations set by national courts in cases within the responsibility of the Ministry of Justice .
Compared to previous cycles, this year it was found that the data (Total amount of compensations granted) was available in other entity of the Ministry of Justice (The Secretary General of the Ministry of Justice).
**Q037 (2022):** The right to compensation in the cases listed is provided for in Law no. 67/2007 of December 31, which establishes the regime of non-contractual civil liability of the State and other Public Entities, specifically providing for an autonomous regime of State liability for damages arising from the exercise of the judicial function (chapter III, arts. 12 to 14).
In particular, with regard to Wrongful arrest/detention, it is important to mention article 225 and 226 of the Criminal Procedure Code, which provide for the right to compensation for illegal or unjustified deprivation of liberty by establishing a special regime. These articles also give effect to Article 27(5) CRP, which states that "Deprivation of liberty contrary to the provisions of the Constitution and the law shall constitute the State's duty to compensate the injured party under the terms established by law".

**Romania**

**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 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 CPC, 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 CPC 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. Law no. 201/2023 introduced a new article in the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010) art. 359/1, stating the right to compensation for damage in the case of technical surveillance measures or activities specific to the collection of information illegally arranged ( 1 ) The person against whom he was ordered, confirmed, extended or illegally enforced a technical surveillance measure is entitled to compensation for the damage caused by this measure.

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**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 (2022):** The data are not collected in this structure in our judicial system.

**Slovenia**

**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.
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.
The State Attorney's Office has its own budget to pay compensation in preliminary procedures. If a case goes to court, it usually becomes a long and complex process. Once the case is in court, compensation based on judgments or settlements is paid by the Ministry of Finance. To reach a court settlement, the State Attorney's Office must first get the Ministry’s approval.

**Q037 (2024):** The figures above represent cases, opened or closed in 2024, with compensations to be paid in 2024 or later. The figures above represent only cases in courts and court settlements.
Wrongful conviction: Out of 4 court cases, 3 ended in court settlement. Wrongful arrest: Out of 17 court cases, 9 ended in court settlement. The number of court settlements indicates that the State Attorney plays an effective role in resolving disputes peacefully. Even when it isn't possible to agree on the amount of compensation during the preliminary procedure, settlements are often reached later in court—usually after some evidence has already been presented and the facts in the court process are clear enough to justify a settlement.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2024 (mandatory before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 30;
Number of settlements: 14;
Total amount (in €): 32.224,49;
Number of requests decreased significantly in 2024. In its 2024 Annual Report, the State Attorney concluded that the increased number of cases in 2022 and 2023 did not reflect a systemic problem of court backlogs or a violation of the parties' right to a trial without undue delay. 2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 36;
Number of settlements: 17;
Total amount (in €): 99.309,34
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 10;
Number of settlements: 0;
Total amount (in €): 0.
Not all cases where a settlement wasn't reached in the preliminary procedure end up in court, because the State Attorney's Office often rejects compensation claims with strong arguments.

**Q037 (2023):** The figures above represent cases, opened or closed in 2023, with compensations to be paid in 2023 or later. The figures above represent only cases in courts and court settlements.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2023 (mandatory before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 138;
Number of settlements: 23;
Total amount (in €): 47.546,80;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 49;
Number of settlements: 19;
Total amount (in €): 104.281,60
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 6;
Number of settlements: 3;
Total amount (in €): 103.730,00.
The above data demonstrate the effective role of the State Attorney's Office in the peaceful resolution of disputes, as only cases in which the amount of appropriate compensation cannot be determined in the preliminary proceedings at the State Attorney's Office are brought to court.

**Q037 (2022):** The figures above represent cases, closed in 2022, with compensations to be paid in 2022 or later. The figures above represent cases before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2022 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 6.810;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 35;
Number of settlements: 18;
Total amount (in €): 157.893
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 56;
Number of settlements: 23;
Total amount (in €): 42.209.

**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.

**Spain**

**Q037 (General Comment):** Spanish legislation recognizes the right to compensation from the State in two generic cases, judicial error and abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice and in a specific case of judicial error relating to pre-trial detention followed by acquittal or dismissal for lack of evidence. Cases of intentional or negligent conduct by the injured party and cases of force majeure are exempted. The request for compensation shall be processed in accordance with the rules regulating state liability. In cases of dolo (wilful misconduct) or gross negligence by judges or magistrates, the injured party may not directly sue them but shall address their request to the Ministry of Justice. The right to claim compensation has one year limitation period (statutory time-limit). The General Administration of the State may demand reimbursement from the responsible party once the injured party has been compensated. This will require that the dolo (wilful misconduct) or gross negligence of the judge or magistrate has been expressly recognized by a judgment or resolution issued by the General Council of the Judiciary. Article 121 Spanish Constitution and articles 292 et seq, Organic Law of the Judiciary, of July 1, 1985.

**Q037 (2024):** The "Others" category corresponds to abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice.

**Q037 (2023):** In the current cycle the data has been provided in disaggregated form (a breakdown for number of requests for compensation for wrongful arrest/detention, wrongful conviction and others) by the National Centre for Court Statistics.
Others category corresponds to abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice.
The total amount of compensation fluctuates from year to year and corresponds to the amount recognised by the contentious-administrative jurisdiction.
648 cases of patrimonial liability were opened and 410 were resolved, of which 88 were upheld

**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.

# Indicator 5: Legal aid

## Comments provided by the national correspondents

## organised by question no.

*Question 037. Is there a system of compensation in the following circumstances:*

### Question 037

**Austria**

**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 (2024):** The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act, European Convention on Human Rights 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 and the European Convention on Human Rights in the area of the courts were: € 524.788,14 and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were € 434.686,04 in 2024. The decrease of payments of more than 20% compared to the previous year is due to the fact that those payments are based on decisions by independent courts, which cannot be controlled by the judicial administration and are subject to strong fluctuations.

**Q037 (2023):** The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act, European Convention on Human Rights 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 and the European Convention on Human Rights in the area of the courts were 1.004.651,63 Euro and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were 532.659,80 Euro in 2023.
The increase in payments of more than 20% compared to the previous year is due to the fact that those payments are based on decisions by independent courts, which cannot be controlled by the judicial administration and are subject to strong fluctuations.

**Q037 (2022):** The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act, European Convention on Human Rights 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 and the European Convention on Human Rights in the area of the courts were 458.891,35 Euro and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were 593.651,96 Euro in 2022.

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q037 (General Comment):** In Belgian law, the term « inoperative pre-trial detention" is used instead of "wrongful arrest".
Compensation through the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the State's liability for damages resulting from faults committed by the public prosecutor's office or judges falls under Article 1382 of the Civil Code according to which: "Any act whatsoever of a person 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/she causes not only by his/her own act but also by his/her negligence or imprudence". To obtain compensation, the plaintiff must prove 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 30th, 2014 (no. 99/2014)), a constitutionally correct interpretation of Article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that even if an erroneous decision is not repealed, modified, annulled, or revoked, the state can be held responsible for a serious mistake of a judge sitting at last instance. It is necessary that the mistake constitutes a sufficiently serious violation of the applicable rule of law and that, because of the limited appeal remedies available against the wrong decision, it is not possible to obtain the annulment of such decision. These claims are brought before civil courts.
Exceeding the reasonable time of proceedings should also be considered as a fault. However, article 21ter of the Criminal Procedure Code provides for that in case the right to be judged within a reasonable time is violated, courts can either inflict lower sentence than the legal minimum sentence, or simply pronounce guilty verdict without imposing punishment. With regard to the State's liability for unlawful detention, Article 27 of the Act of March 13, 1973, on compensation for ineffective pre-trial detention provides for a right to compensation for any person who has been deprived of their liberty in conditions incompatible with the provisions of Article 5 of the ECHR.
Reference should also be made to the Act of 13 March 1973 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. Article 28 of this law provides for 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/her own conduct may claim compensation:
a) if he or she has been directly or indirectly exempted 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 granted 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 charge is refused, if the amount of the compensation or the number of days charged 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

Pre-trial Detention.

**Q037 (2024):** Number of cases still open (for inoperative pre-trial detention): 19.

**Q037 (2023):** Number of cases still open for (for inoperative pre-trial detention): 28

**Q037 (2022):** The number of ongoing cases (for ineffective pre-trial detention) stands at 29. Compensation has been granted in 13 cases.

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q037 (General Comment):** In the Republic of Bulgaria, there are two mechanisms for indemnification for damages. 1)The proceedings under the State and Municipalities Liability for Damages Act (SMLDA) aim to determine the procedure and grounds for holding the state and municipalities liable and for citizens and legal entities to receive compensation in cases of damage suffered as a result of unlawful acts, actions or omissions of state or municipal authorities and officials in the course of or in connection with the performance of administrative activities. Article 2 of SMLDA also regulates the liability of human rights bodies, including the prosecution service, whereby the state is liable for damage caused to citizens by the investigating authorities, the prosecution service or the court in the following cases: detention, including all cases of deprivation of liberty in violation of Article 5, § 1 of the ECHR; violation of rights protected by Article 5, § 2 – 4 of the Convention; charges for a crime if the person is found not guilty or if the criminal proceedings are dropped or the act has been amnestied; imposition of a penalty under the Criminal Code or an administrative penalty where the person is acquitted or the administrative penalty is annulled; application by the court of an administrative measure where its decision is annulled as unlawful; enforcement of a penalty imposed in excess of the specified term or amount; unlawful use of special intelligence means; an established violation committed by a pre-trial body through the disclosure of investigation materials in violation of the presumption of innocence or in a public statement in which the accused is presented as guilty; established violation of the rights of third parties under Section IX of Chapter Fourteen of the Criminal Procedure Code. Claims under Article 2, paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be examined by the courts in accordance with the procedure established in the Civil Procedure Code. Article 2b of SMLDA regulates the liability of the judicial authorities for violation of the right to have a case examined and decided within a reasonable time, in accordance with Article 6, §1 of the Convention. The courts shall determine the amount of compensation to be awarded on an equitable basis.
2)The second legal indemnification mechanism is based on Chapter 3 “a” of the Judicial System Act that provides for the examination of applications by citizens and legal entities against acts, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities that violate their right to have their case examined and decided within a reasonable time.
Applications may be submitted by citizens and legal entities who are: parties to concluded civil, administrative and criminal proceedings; defendants, victims or aggrieved legal entities in terminated pre-trial proceedings. Compensation for concluded or terminated proceedings shall be determined and paid in accordance with the practice of the ECrHR in an amount not exceeding BGN 10,000.
Applications under paragraph 1 shall be submitted within six months of the conclusion of the relevant proceedings with a final act through the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorised by him shall determine the amount of compensation (provided from the state budget ) in accordance with the practice of the ECHR and shall propose the conclusion of an agreement with the applicant. The circumstances shall be verified and a decision on the application shall be taken within six months of its receipt. Compensation shall be paid on the ba

sis of the agreement concluded. Persons who have received compensation under this chapter may not seek compensation on the same grounds through the courts.
A separate register shall be created for applications, which shall be published on the website of the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council. The Prosecutor's Office shall not keep statistics on compensation awarded under this procedure in connection with the activities of the Prosecutor's Office.
No fee shall be payable for the examination of applications under this chapter.

**Q037 (2024):** The table above presents data from both mechanisms: 1)Claims brought against the Public Prosecutor's Office before the courts under the State and Municipalities Liability for Damages Act (SMLDA), as the amount of damages awarded by the courts in such claims. Column 1: the number of claims brought against the Public Prosecutor's Office under the SMLDA in 2024. Column 2: number of court decisions handed down in 2024 in respect of such claims (not yet final). Column 3: total amount of compensation awarded (in EUR) in court decisions handed down in 2024 under the SMLDA in claims against the prosecution service (not yet final). In 2024, the total amount of compensation under the SMLDA in claims against the prosecution based on enforcement orders (final court decisions) was €33,319.61 – all for wrongful conviction.
- “the numbers provided by the Prosecutor's Office also include the cases for damages against the investigative bodies. This probably also covers the police investigative bodies, which, although being part of the Ministry of Interior, investigate individual cases under the leadership of a prosecutor and in this area they are subordinate to him and are obliged to carry out his orders”.
-“As for cases against the courts under Art. 2 and 2b SMLDA, the data relating to civil proceedings cannot be differentiated within the larger data set, which is collected by the SJC and which covers all cases under this act”.
2)Ministry of Justice (Chapter Three "a" of the Judicial System Act: “Excessive length of proceedings”): number of requests for compensation:775; number of compensations granted:327; total amount of compensations granted (in €):524 954
It should be noted that for 2024, in contrast with the previous evaluation cycles, the category “excessive length of proceedings” contain data from both mechanisms: Number of requests for compensation:53 (first mechanism) +775 (second mechanism)=828; Number of compensations granted: 19(first mechanism) +327(second mechanism)=346; Total amount of compensations granted (in €): 189 230(first mechanism) +524 954 (second mechanism) = 714 184. Before, only data from the Ministry of Justice were communicated.

**Q037 (2023):** Prosecutor's Office of RB: In the Republic of Bulgaria, there are two mechanisms for indemnification for damages, in relation to the criminal proceedings.
The first mechanism is regulated in the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act. The state and the municipalities are liable for the damages caused to citizens and legal entities by unlawful deeds, acts or omissions of their authorities and officials in relation or with respect to the performance of an administrative activity, as well as for damages caused by the effect of secondary legislation revoked as being unlawful or declared null and void. Pursuant to Article 2 of this Act, the state is liable for damages caused to citizens by the investigation authorities, the prosecutor's office or the court in hypotheses determined in this text of the Act.
Statistics is not maintained in the Prosecutor's Office, in the form of the indicators in the table in the present questionnaire. The data for year 2023 about the obtaining of a damage award against the Prosecutor's Office under the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act is, as follows:
In 2023, the Prosecutor's Office lost suits filed by 292 persons under actions based on the legal grounds of Article 2 and Article 2b of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act, as 281 court damage awards entered into force.
Out of the legally effective 281 damage awards, 146 are based on granted actions based on the legal grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 3, Option 1 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (legally effective acquittal), and 103 — based on the legal ground of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 3, Option 2 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (legally effective writ for the termination of the criminal proceeding).
There are no legally effective court judgments based on the legal grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 2 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (violation of rights protected by Article 5, § 2-4 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.)
On the grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 1, Option 1 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act, 7 damage awards were issued (unlawful detention in custody), which are legally effective.
As regards actions based on the legal grounds of Article 2b of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (violation of the right to hearing of the case within a reasonable time, in accordance with Article 6, § 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms), 22 award damages were rendered and entered into legal force.
There are no actions brought on the legal grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 1, last option of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (deprivation of liberty in violation of Article 5, § 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms). On the grounds of Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 7 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (unlawful use of Special Intelligence Means), 1 damage award is rendered, which is legally effective. Under Article 2, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 6 of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act (execution of an punishment imposed over and above the determined period or amount) 2 legally effective damage awards were rendered.
The total amount of the in

demnifications awarded under actions brought against the Prosecutor's Office in accordance with the procedure of the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act for year 2023 is BGN 2 824 095.16 (EUR 1 443 937).
The data contained in column 3 of the table is in EUR on the basis of the legally effective court judgments under the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages Act in year 2023 in cases pursued against the Prosecutor's Office. The Prosecutor's Office does not keep statistics in the form of the other indicators in the table in the questionnaire. The data is therefore presented as a text in the answer to question No.37.
The second legal indemnification mechanism is provided for in the Judicial System Act (Chapter Three "a" of the Judicial System Act — consideration of applications against a violation of the right to hearing and resolution of the case within a reasonable time.
This chapter governs the hearing of applications of citizens and legal entities against deeds, acts or omissions of the bodies of the Judiciary whereby their right to hearing and resolution of the case within a reasonable time is violated.
The applications are filed by citizens and legal entities, which are:
1.parties to completed civil, administrative and criminal proceedings;
2.accused, victims or damaged legal entities under terminated pre-trial proceedings.
This chapter also governs the determination and payment of an indemnification in accordance with the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights in the amount of no more than BGN 10 000.
The Minister of Justice is competent to make a decision, and the deadline for considering applications is 6 months.
The Procedural Representation before the ECHR Directorate of the Ministry of Justice: In 2023, under the Judicial System Act, Chapter Three "a", compensations were paid under 213 agreements in the amount of 311,320 euros /608,900 BGN/ total.

**Q037 (2022):** Prosecutor's Office of RB: In the Republic of Bulgaria, there are two mechanisms for compensation for damages in connection with criminal proceedings.
The first mechanism is regulated in the Law on the Liability of the State and Municipalities for Damages (LLSMD). The state and municipalities are responsible for the damages caused to citizens and legal entities by illegal acts, actions or inactions of their bodies and officials during or on the occasion of the performance of administrative activities, as well as for the damages caused by the action of canceled as illegal or declared as null and void by-laws. According to Art. 2 of this law, the state is responsible for the damages caused to citizens by the investigative bodies, the prosecutor's office or the court in the hypotheses specified in this text of the law.
The Prosecutor's Office does not keep statistics in the form of the indicators in the table in this questionnaire. The data for 2022 regarding the conviction of the Prosecutor's Office under LLSMD are as follows:
In 2022, the Prosecutor's Office was convicted by 255 persons on claims with a legal basis, Art. 2 and Art. 2b LLSMD, with 248 convictions entering into force.
Of the 248 convictions that entered into force, 134 were based on upheld claims with a legal basis, Art. 2, para. 1, item 3, item 1 LLSMD (acquittal entered into force), and 92 - with legal basis, Art. 2, para. 1, item 3, item 2 LLSMD (decree on termination of criminal proceedings entered into force).
2 court decisions were issued on the basis of Art. 2, para. 1, item 2 LLSMD (violation of rights protected by Art. 5, § 2-4 of the ECHR.)
Pursuant to Art. 2, para. 1, item 1, item 1 LLSMD, 2 convictions were rendered (illegal detention).
For claims with a legal basis, Art. 2b LLSMD (violation of the right to consider the case within a reasonable time, according to Art. 6, § 1 of the Criminal Procedure Code) 18 convictions were issued and entered into force.
There are no claims filed with a legal basis under Art. 2, para. 1, item 1, proposal last LLSMD (imprisonment, in violation of Art. 5, § 1 ECHR), under Art. 2, para. 1, item 7 of LLSMD (illegal use of Special Intelligence Means) and under Art. 2, para. 1, item 6 LLSMD (execution of an imposed penalty exceeding the specified term or amount).
The total amount of compensation awarded for claims brought against the Prosecutor's Office under the LLSMD procedure for 2022 is BGN 2,564,814.75 (EUR 1,311,369).
The second legal mechanism for compensation is regulated in the Law on the Judiciary (Chapter Three "a" Judiciary System Act- consideration of applications against violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.
In accordance with the procedure of this chapter, applications of citizens and legal entities against acts, actions or inactions of the bodies of judicial power, which violate their right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time, are considered.
Applications are submitted by citizens and legal entities that are:
1. parties to closed civil, administrative and criminal proceedings;
2. accused, injured or damaged legal entities in terminated pre-trial proceedings.
In accordance with the procedure of this chapter, compensation is determined and paid in accordance with the practice of the European Court of Human Rights in the amount of no more than BGN 10,000.
Data on the implementation of the mechanism under Chapter Three "a" of the Judicial System Act are not collected in the Prosecutor's Office. The applications under para. 1 shall be submitted within 6

months from the completion of the relevant proceedings with a final act through the Inspectorate of the Supreme Judicial Council to the Minister of Justice.
Supreme Judicial Council: The Law on the Judiciary regulates an administrative procedure according to which citizens and legal entities can be compensated when their right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time is violated. Compensations are in the amount of no more than BGN 10,000. The Minister of Justice is competent to make a decision, and the deadline for considering applications is 6 months.
Ministry of Justice: Statistics on number of compensations granted for wrongful arrest include overall prosecution data on detention in custody and house arrest, but also for wrongful charges with subsequent acquittals and termination of proceedings, as well as violations of Art. 5, § 2 – 4 of the ECHR, since the numbers under the provision for seeking compensation for those are aggregate. Amount of compensation also includes compensations under another 18 court decisions for length of proceedings, but data cannot be disaggregated. No exact explanation can be given for any possible differences, because there is no data available on the calculation method or details on the proceedings. 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 excessive length of proceedings under the Judicial System Act. Sums paid may include payments under applications from December of the previous year. No exact explanation can be given for differences in numbers of requests, or compensations given, as they are subject to complex criteria, based on ECtHR case-law.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q037 (2024):** Claims for compensation for unlawful detention and wrongful conviction shall be submitted to this Ministry, which is also competent to conduct the procedure for an amicable settlement. Should the claimant not accept the offer made by the Ministry, they are entitled to bring an action before the competent court.
The amount of compensation offered by the Ministry, as fair pecuniary reparation on this basis, is fixed at a uniform rate of EUR 37.16 per day of deprivation of liberty, applicable in all cases.
The amounts disbursed in 2024 relate to payments made pursuant to decisions adopted in amicable settlement proceedings, as well as to court judgments delivered in 2024 concerning cases initiated in previous years.

**Q037 (2023):** In our instance, the term "wrongful arrest/detention" in the chart refers to payment for an erroneous arrest and conviction.
To this Ministry, which is also in charge of peaceful processes, is presented the request for compensation for unwarranted arrest and conviction. The applicant has the option to file a complaint with the appropriate court if he rejects the Ministry's offer. On this basis, the Ministry provides the aggrieved parties with a unique sum of compensation—HRK 280.00 (€37.16) per day of deprivation of liberty—as a fair monetary settlement. Payments based on peaceful proceedings rulings and 2023 court judgments are included in the sum paid for 2023; these cases are from previous years.

**Q037 (2022):** The information in the table also refers to Wrongful arrest/detention and wrongful conviction.
The request for compensation for unfounded arrest and unjustified conviction is submitted to the Ministry of Justice and Administration, which is also responsible for peaceful proceedings. In case the applicant does not accept the offer of the Ministry of Justice and Administration, he has the right to file a complaint with the competent court.
The amount of compensation that the Ministry offers to the injured parties as a fair monetary compensation on this basis is unique in all cases and amounts to HRK 280.00 per day of deprivation of liberty. The amount paid for 2022 refers to payments based on decisions made in a peaceful procedure. The amount is expressed in kuna.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**Q037 (2024):** Number of requests for compensation: 2 710 in the pre-court phase, 1 216 court cases.
Number of compensations granted: in 1 673 cases compensation was granted at least partially by the ministry, in 711 cases compensation was granted by the court (28 fully and 683 partially).
Other - it can be any other malpractice of the court, public prosecution, executor or notary.
in 2023 we reported the number of cases that we ourselves classify statistically as “other,” but in the current table, “other” also includes compensation for harm/damage caused by criminal prosecution. If we read what the table means by the row “other” (wrongful criminal proceedings…), I understood it as their intention to separate data on compensation for unjustified criminal prosecution (in our system, this issue is more complex due to case law, because we have absolute objective liability of the state—as the only country in Europe, together with Slovakia—and the state is liable, based on a legal fiction of unlawfulness, even for criminal prosecutions that were procedurally correct but did not end with a conviction).

**Q037 (2023):** Number of requests for compensation: 2 631 in the pre-court phase, 1 880 court cases.
Number of compensations granted: in 1 472 cases compensation was granted at least partially by the ministry, in 610 cases compensation was granted by the court.
Other - it can be any other malpractice of the court, public prosecution, executor or notary.

**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**

**Q037 (2024):** The numbers in table 37 are based on data from Platina, which is a case management system used by The Danish Prosecution System. Data in table 37 has been created outside the standard data model. Specifically developed data models are tested, but still associated with a higher risk of unidentified errors compared to the standard model. Thus, the data in table 37 is associated with considerable uncertainty. The number of cases with a request for compensation corresponds to the number of distinct case reference numbers of relevant cases within the Regional State Prosecutors or the State Prosecutor for Special Crimes. The number of cases where a compensation has been granted, corresponds to the number of distinct case reference numbers of relevant cases within the Regional State Prosecutors, the State Prosecutor for Special Crimes or the Director of Public Prosecutions.
The total sum of compensations is calculated as the sum of compensations in cases where the request for compensation has been either fully or partially granted by the Regional State Prosecutors, the State Prosecutor for Special Crimes or the Director of Public Prosecutions. It should be noted that cases in which a court has ordered The Danish Prosecution System to grant compensation are not included in table 37. This is because such cases are not registered in our case handling system (Platina). It should be noted that in Platina the amount of compensation granted is registered in a text-field where it is possible for the user to write characters other than numbers. Thus, there is a risk of some amounts not being included in the total if these are written in a way that means they cannot be converted in to a numerical value. In Platina, it is possible for a user to assign a case certain keywords. These keywords can later aid the identification of cases regarding a request for compensation that involve specific interventions, such as “arrests”, “pre-trial detentions” or “preliminary charges”. Since a single case may contain multiple keywords, but only one compensation amount, it is not possible to determine which specific interventions the compensation covers, or how the compensation is distributed if compensation was granted due to several different interventions. For this reason, a keyword-based classification is associated with such significant uncertainty that it is assessed that such a classification of numbers will provide an un-accurate representation of how request for compensation and compensations amounts are distributed across the categories ’Wrongful arrest/detention’ and ’Wrongful conviction’. We are aware that we, in previous contributions to CEPEJ’s evaluation, have provided data on request for compensation and compensations amounts divided into the categories ’Wrongful arrest/detention’ and ’Wrongful conviction’. However, we have subsequently become aware that previously used data models were subject to a significant uncertainty for the reason described above.

**Q037 (2023):** Data in the table (37) has been created outside the standard data 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 considerable uncertainty. All figures indicating condemnations of requests and total amount are the sum of cases and amounts fully or partially granted. € amount is calculated via xe.com. 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).
There is no specific reason to the surges in compensation requests and awards, but these can fluctuate considerably from year to year. The available data is from a case management system and is not constructed for statistical purposes. For this reason the registrations within the different categories may vary a lot, depending on the case manager. Nevertheless; the total number of compensation requests, compensations granted and amounts should be correct. It is the division into the different categories that is associated with uncertainty.

**Q037 (2022):** 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 (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).

**Finland**

**Q037 (General Comment):** 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 reflect the whole picture of the cases where the proceeding has taken too long. In 2023 the sentence was reduced in five cases. 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.

**Q037 (2023):** In 2023 there were 442 requests and the State Treasury issued 462 decisions. On 71 cases the right to compensation was denied. A total of 1 800 000 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 (2022):** 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 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 459 requests. A total of 2 200 000 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 (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.

**France**

**Q037 (General Comment):** The Legal Affairs Sub-Directorate of the Ministry of Justice, in conjunction with the State Judicial Officer, monitors liability actions relating to the malfunctioning of the public justice service (mainly based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation, with regard to users of this service).
The State Judicial Officer directly monitors actions for compensation for pre-trial detention in criminal proceedings that have ended in a decision to dismiss the case, acquittal, or discharge (Articles 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure).
1. With regard to liability actions relating to the malfunctioning of the public justice service:
the vast majority of these are based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation.
Under this article, the State is required to compensate for damage caused by the malfunctioning of the justice service. Unless otherwise specified, this liability is only incurred in the event of gross negligence or denial of justice. This liability regime applies only to users of the public justice service, as third parties to legal proceedings can only invoke the State's strict liability for breach of equality before public burdens.
With regard to actions brought on the basis of Article 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure: article 149 of the CPC grants the right, under certain conditions, to full compensation for damage suffered as a result of detention in proceedings that have been dismissed, discharged, or acquitted.
Any person who has been held in pre-trial detention during proceedings that have been terminated by a final decision to dismiss the case, acquit or discharge them is entitled, except in cases specifically defined in Article 149 of the CPC, to full compensation for the moral and material damage caused by such detention, upon request. The compensation awarded shall be paid by the State.
The first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision to dismiss the case, acquit or discharge the detainee, thereby establishing their innocence, was handed down, shall rule, following a public and adversarial procedure, by means of a reasoned decision that may be appealed before the National Commission for the Compensation of Detentions attached to the Court of Cassation (CNRD).

**Q037 (2024):** The figures provided with regard to the category “excessive length of proceedings” correspond to liability actions relating to the malfunctioning of the public justice service (Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organization); the figures provided for the category “Unjustified arrest/detention” correspond to legal actions initiated on the basis of Article 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure; the figures indicated for the category ‘Other’ correspond to disputes concerning “seals,” "police material damage” (broken doors) and “malfunctions of the public justice service due to gross negligence.”
With regard to the compensation procedure (IDP) and the method of calculating the amount of compensation (e.g., the daily rate for an unjustified arrest or conviction):
-there is no official scale for IDPs. They are assessed on a case-by-case basis, with reference to the case law of the CNRD, which applies relatively consistent amounts but without an official scale.
The case law of the National Commission for the Compensation of Detentions (CNRD) and the Court of Cassation provides some numerical trends:
• Moral damages: between €50 and €100 per day of detention on average (often around €1,500 to €3,000 per month)
• Material damages: compensated on the basis of supporting documents (pay slips, employer certificates, economic losses).
• In certain serious cases (very long detention, major psychological impact), the compensation may be much higher.
In practice, unjustified detention can result in total compensation (moral + material) averaging around €25,000 to €26,000.
Recent decisions illustrate a range from €10,000 for five months to €73,500 (moral + material damages + costs) for 20 months.

**Q037 (2023):** The figures given in the “excessive length of proceedings” category correspond to liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public justice service (article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation); the figures given in the “wrongful arrest/detention” category correspond to legal actions initiated on the basis of article 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure; the figures given in the “Other” category correspond to legal proceedings relating to ‘seals’ and ‘police property damage’ (door breakage).

**Q037 (2022):** The compensation procedure is the same as the one described for 2020.

**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)

**Germany**

**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 nonpecuniary 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 pub

lic 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) StrEG). In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, Section 2(1) StrEG provides for compensation for the damage suffered inter alia 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 StrEG). 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) StrEG). The current immaterial compensation is €75 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced.

**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 pu

blic 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 inter alia 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 75 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced

**Greece**

**Q037 (2024):** The data in the table correspond to requests for compensation before administrative courts of all instances.
It is to be noted that in two cases the request for compliance concerned a decision of another administrative court and for this reason the Council of State referred the request.

**Q037 (2023):** For 2023, only data concerning the administrative justice are available. Administrative Courts
-Council of State (Supreme Administrative Court)
1. The following data concern the relevant proceedings before the Council of State.
Excessive length of proceedings – just satisfaction: Law 4055/2012 .
Administrative compliance with court decisions: Law 3068/2002. 2. Within 2023, 2 applications for excessive duration of the trial were filed before the Council of State and 4 decisions were issued on applications from previous years, with which the public was imposed a total amount of 15,400 euros as just satisfaction. 3. Within 2023, 42 applications were submitted for non-execution of decisions of the Council of State and 4 decisions were issued on applications from previous years, with which monetary sanctions of 76,000 euros were imposed on the administration.
-first and second instance Administrative Courts
•Excessive length of proceedings: 11 ( number of requests for compensation), 6 ( number of compensations granted), 10,500 € { total amount of compensation granted (in €)}
•Non -execution of court decisions: 396( number of requests for compensation),38(number of compensations granted),150,800€ so far, as significant percentage of these cases is still pending and it is not possible to estimate the total amount of compensation awarded by Administrative Tribunals during 2023{ total amount of compensation granted (in €)}
[A] Compensation cases before the civil Courts Due to unjustified delay – Excessive length of trial
In accordance with the provisions of article 1 of Law 4239/2014 (Government Gazette A 43) "Just satisfaction due to exceeding the reasonable duration of the trial in the civil and criminal courts and in the Court of Auditors and other provisions" under the title "Entitled to bring an application".
In accordance with the provisions of article 2 of the above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Competence".
In accordance with the provisions of article 3 of the same above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Application".
In accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the same above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Procedure".
In accordance with the provisions of article 5 of the same above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Criteria for the determination of the excess and the adjudication of just satisfaction".
In accordance with the provisions of article 6 of the same above Law 4239/2014, under the title "Execution of the decision".
[B] Compensation cases before the criminal Courts [I] Due to unjustified delay – Excessive length of trial.
In accordance with the provisions of article 7 of Law 4239/2014 under the title "Procedures before criminal courts".
[II] Due to wrongful arrest/detention and wrongful conviction.
In accordance with the provisions of article 535 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the title "Who is entitled to compensation.".
According to the provisions of article 536 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the title "When there is no right to compensation.".
According to the provisions of article 537 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the title "Who else is entitled to compensation.".
According to the provisions of article 538 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the heading "Submit the application".
According to the provisions of article 540 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under the heading "Determination of for wrongful conviction at least 50,140€.

**Q037 (2022):** -Articles 538,539,540 of the Code of Criminal Procedure
-According to the Council of the State (1501/2014) and in line with the case law of the CJUE, the State may be held liable for damages to the citizen in case of an erroneous judicial decision if there is a manifest error.
-Law 4239/2014 as amended by Law 4842/2021 provides for fair compensation for excessive length of proceedings

**Hungary**

**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 (2024):** Civil Proceedings

Excessive Length of Proceedings (Civil Proceedings)

In 2022, Act XCIV of 2021 on the enforcement of financial compensation related to the delay of civil litigation entered into force.

According to the Hungarian civil procedural law there is a compensation for breach of the reasonable time requirement and also for not paying the monetary compensation. The consequences of the breach of the reasonable time requirement are regulated in the Act XCIV of 2021 on the enforcement of pecuniary compensation in connection with the protracted civil proceedings.

Financial compensation is only available to the party who participated in the proceedings complained of, regardless of whether he or she was the successful or unsuccessful party. It is granted if the reasonable period of time specified by law is exceeded during the proceedings or a specific stage of the proceedings (according to the Hungarian laws, such stages are the first instance, the second instance and the review proceedings), and no concrete disadvantage needs to be proven.

To determine the amount of pecuniary compensation, the duration of the proceedings or stage of proceedings to be taken into account must first be determined. This can be calculated by deducting from the duration of the proceedings or stage of proceedings calculated in accordance with the law the periods of time that are to be disregarded in accordance with the law. The period calculated in this way is subject to the payment of financial compensation if it exceeds the reasonable period laid down by law. In general, the duration of the entire court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed sixty months. The duration of the procedural stages is deemed reasonable if the duration of the proceedings at first instance does not exceed thirty months (or thirty-six months if the proceedings are initiated by an order for payment procedure), the duration of the proceedings at second instance eighteen months, and the duration of the review proceedings twelve months.

For some actions (personal status, maintenance of a minor child, press vindication and employment) shorter time limits apply. In these cases, the duration of the entire court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed thirty-six months.

The amount of the pecuniary compensation is the multiplication of the duration of the procedure (procedural stage) to be taken into account by four hundred forints per day.

As of August 19th of 2025 according to Section 147/A of the Act CXXX of 2016 on the Code of Civil Procedure in case the time limit is overrun, the parties are entitled ex officio to monetary compensations, starting from the day after the time limit is overrun. The daily amount of monetary compensation is the 1,5 percent of the minimum wage (valid on the day of delay) and the courts are obligated to pay the monetary compensation for the entire duration of the time limit overrun.

Non-execution of Court Decisions (Civil Proceedings)

First of all, it should be noted that the fulfilment of judgments in civil proceedings is essentially voluntary. Consequently, if the unsuccessful party fails to fulfil the judgment voluntarily within a prescribed period of time, the successful party has the possibility to initiate enforcement proceedings. The costs of the enforcement procedure is borne by the unsuccessful party.

According to the Hungarian laws in the case of a payment delay, the debtor is liable to pay interest for late payment from the date of the delay. It is important to note that this is not compensation, i.e. it is

not necessary that the successful party suffers damages as a result of late payment.

Criminal Proceedings

Act XC of 2017 on Criminal Procedure (hereinafter: Be.) arranges in Chapter CVIII of its own right compensation in the case of unjustly limited and abstract leave. Compensation shall be payable for unlawful arrest, prior forced medical treatment and criminal supervision in which the defendant was required not to leave an apartment, other premises, institution or enclosed place without authorisation, and for detention ordered prior to the order of the accused person. In addition, compensation shall be granted to the accused person for imprisonment, imprisonment, education at a juvenile institution or forced treatment carried out on the basis of a final judgment, if he was subsequently acquitted as a result of an extraordinary remedy, the proceedings were terminated or a lesser penalty was imposed on him.

The length of the criminal proceedings does not in itself constitute a ground for compensation, but the court may consider it as an attenuating circumstance when imposing the penalty, and then the Be. In accordance with Paragraph 562(1), the grounds of the court’s decision must state this.

**Q037 (2023):** Civil Proceedings

Excessive Length of Proceedings (Civil Proceedings)

According to the Hungarian civil procedural law there is a compensation for breach of the reasonable time requirement. Financial compensation is only available to the party who participated in the proceedings complained of, regardless of whether he or she was the successful or unsuccessful party. It is granted if the reasonable period of time specified by law is exceeded during the proceedings or a specific stage of the proceedings (according to the Hungarian laws, such stages are the first instance, the second instance and the review proceedings), and no concrete disadvantage needs to be proven.

To determine the amount of pecuniary compensation, the duration of the proceedings or stage of proceedings to be taken into account must first be determined. This can be calculated by deducting from the duration of the proceedings or stage of proceedings calculated in accordance with the law the periods of time that are to be disregarded in accordance with the law. The period calculated in this way is subject to the payment of financial compensation if it exceeds the reasonable period laid down by law. In general, the duration of the entire court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed sixty months. The duration of the procedural stages is deemed reasonable if the duration of the proceedings at first instance does not exceed thirty months (or thirty-six months if the proceedings are initiated by an order for payment procedure), the duration of the proceedings at second instance eighteen months, and the duration of the review proceedings twelve months.

For some actions (personal status, maintenance of a minor child, press vindication and employment) shorter time limits apply. In these cases, the duration of the entire court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed thirty-six months. The amount of the pecuniary compensation is the multiplication of the duration of the procedure (procedural stage) to be taken into account by four hundred forints per day.

Non-execution of Court Decisions (Civil Proceedings)

First of all, it should be noted that the fulfilment of judgments in civil proceedings is essentially voluntary. Consequently, if the unsuccessful party fails to fulfil the judgment voluntarily within a prescribed period of time, the successful party has the possibility to initiate enforcement proceedings. The costs of the enforcement procedure is borne by the unsuccessful party. According to the Hungarian laws in the case of a payment delay, the debtor is liable to pay interest for late payment from the date of the delay. It is important to note that this is not compensation, i.e. it is not necessary that the successful party suffers damages as a result of late payment.

Criminal Proceedings

Act XC of 2017 on Criminal Proceedings (hereinafter: Be.) regulates the recompense in case of unjustly limited and deprived liberty in a separate Chapter (Chapter CVIII – Recompense for unfounded restriction of freedom). Recompense shall be provided for any pre-trial detention, preliminary compulsory psychiatric treatment, criminal supervision during which, as prescribed by the court, the defendant was not allowed to leave a home, other premises, an institute or a fenced area of it without permission, or custody ordered before ordering any of the above. Recompense shall also be provided for any imprisonment, confinement, special education in a juvenile correctional institution, or compulsory psychiatric treatment enforced on the basis of a final and b

inding judgment, provided that a court, as a result of extraordinary legal remedy acquitted the defendant with final and binding effect; imposed a less detrimental penalty on the defendant; terminated the proceeding against the defendant with a final and binding conclusive order. Protraction of the criminal proceedings does not in itself constitute a ground for recompense, but the court may take it into account as a mitigating circumstance when imposing the sentence. In this case, pursuant to Section 562 (1) of Be., a reference to this fact shall be included in the short statement of reasons for the decision.

In 2022, Act XCIV of 2021 on the enforcement of financial compensation related to the delay of civil litigation entered into force. The above data shows the results of the proceedings initiated under the new legislation.

**Q037 (2022):** As regards private law, we highlight the possibility to enforce claims based on Act XCIV of 2021 on the Enforcement of Property Compensation for Delay in Civil Proceedings.
The act defines the timeframe which may be regarded as reasonable and which is absolutely sufficient for the court to carry out the procedural steps necessary for a well-founded decision in the case.
As a general rule, the duration of court proceedings is considered reasonable if it does not exceed sixty months from the date of commencement of the proceedings at first instance to the date of notification of the final decision closing the proceedings. A claim may also be brought in the event of a delay in the procedure phase. The duration of the procedural phase is considered reasonable if, for example, the duration of procedural phase at first instance does not exceed thirty months, the duration of procedural phase at second instance does not exceed eighteen months, and the duration of the review proceedings does not exceed twelve months. A shorter objective timeframe is set for specific cases that need to be dealt with quickly such as cases related to personal status, child support and employment. However, depending on the circumstances of a given case, the court seised may, at its judicial discretion, set a shorter timeframe as reasonable. A claim for compensation may be brought in relation to both pending and concluded cases if either the duration of the entire proceedings or a procedural phase exceeds the reasonable timeframe defined by law.
If the duration of the court proceedings or procedural phase exceeds the timeframe considered reasonable, the party may claim monetary compensation from the court conducting the delayed proceedings at the rate set by government decree (HUF 400,- per day). The compensation awarded is in proportion to the duration of the court proceedings. [see also the Government Decree 372/2021 (VI. 30.) on the amount of property compensation for delay in civil proceedings and the rules for calculating the amount to be paid.]
Concerning criminal law, we would add that in case of an unlawful arrest, imprisonment, confinement, placement in a juvenile correctional institution or compulsory psychiatric treatment, a recompensation procedure as included in the Criminal Procedural Act, may be initiated. The person entitled to compensation may choose to enter into an agreement with the Ministry of Justice in a simplified procedure, in the framework of which a settlement is reached on the amount of the compensation, or to file a lawsuit and the court will decide on the amount of the compensation.
In case of an agreement in the simplified compensation procedure, the compensation is adjusted to the number of days of unlawful deprivation of liberty, the amount per day is seven thousand forints (in the case of criminal supervision, the amount per day of compensation is three thousand five hundred forints).

**Q037 (2020):** There is no national level database containing the data for the question.

**Italy**

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q037 (General Comment):** In Latvia, there is no compensation in the category “Non-execution of court decisions”. In civil proceedings it is possible for individuals in Latvia to bring an action against the State for damages caused by the malfunctioning, or abnormal functioning, of the justice system (for example in case of excessive length of proceedings). The basis for bringing such an action is Article 92 of the Constitution of Latvia, which states that "Everyone, where his or her rights are violated without basis, has a right to commensurate compensation."

**Q037 (2024):** Number of requests for compensation - received at the Ministry of Justice (no data about requests received at prosecutor's office and the State Police). Number of compensations granted - the compensation shall be disbursed by the Ministry of Justice accordance also with the decisions of the prosecutor's office and the State Police on the compensation from the State basic budget resources intended for such purpose.
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 2024 consists of non-pecuniary damages 56 392,77 euros, damages 46 390,78 euros, state social insurance contributions 2433,94 euros and personal income tax compensation 983,06 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 2024 was 46 euros ((700 euros : 30 = 23 euros); 23 euro x 2 x 1 day = 46 euros).

**Q037 (2023):** Number of requests for compensation - received at the Ministry of Justice (no data about requests received at prosecutor's office). Number of compensations granted - the compensation shall be disbursed by the Ministry of Justice accordance also with the decision of the prosecutor's office on the compensation from the State basic budget resources intended for such purpose.
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 2023 consists of non-pecuniary damages 23 738 euros, damages 43 081,76 euros, state social insurance contributions 6032,35 euros and personal income tax compensation 3515,59 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 2023 was 40 euros ((620 euros : 30 = 20,66 euros); 20 euro x 2 x 1 day = 40 euros).

**Q037 (2022):** Number of requests for compensation - received at the Ministry of Justice (no data about requests received at prosecutor's office).
The Ministry of Justice informs that the total amount of compensation in 2022 consists of non-pecuniary damages 62147.40 euros, damages 35 699.71 euros, state social insurance contributions 4 776.49 euros and personal income tax compensation 1 912.68 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 (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”.

**Lithuania**

**Q037 (2023):** We cannot indicate any specific reasons why the number of requests for compensation for damage out of court has significantly decreased. We also observe a consistent decrease in the number of persons applying to court for compensation for damage caused by unlawful actions of the state. We can perhaps attribute such a general trend to the fact that state institutions and officials make fewer mistakes that cause harm to individuals.
From 2022-06-30, the legal regulation was changed, the amounts of damage that we compensate outside the court procedure were increased (property - no more than 10 thousand, non-property - no more than 5 thousand). However, the predictions that the number of requests would increase did not come true. Since the number of cases in courts is not increasing, it can be concluded that the institutions adhere to the human rights standard and try not to perform such actions that would be considered unlawful and cause harm (particularly positive changes are seen in criminal proceedings and in the execution of sentences).

**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;

**Luxembourg**

**Q037 (General Comment):** The law of 1st September 1988 concerning the civil liability of the State and public authorities permits the State to be held civilly liable before ordinary courts when a litigant alleges harm resulting from the defective functioning of judicial bodies. Examples of such dysfunction include excessive length of proceedings or a conviction stemming from judicial malpractice, which could form the basis of a claim. These complaints are typically brought before courts of first instance.

Additionally, complaints about the excessive length of proceedings may also be pursued before the European Court of Human Rights (for violations of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights) or could result in procedural sanctions during ongoing proceedings. However, the latter do not appear within the scope of our national systems. The involvement of various actors complicates the identification and categorisation of claims and compensation decisions, making it challenging to provide data that accurately reflects the broader situation.

Nevertheless, we have been able to compile data on compensation for wrongful arrest/detention as regulated by the law of 30 December 1981 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. Available figures pertain to requests for compensation and decisions granting such compensation in cases of inoperative preventive detention (IPD)(https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detention-preventive.html), as well as the total amounts disbursed. It should be noted that, under the provisions of the law of 30 December 1981, the decisions are of administrative nature, rather than convictions.

**Q037 (2024):** Wrongful convictions: This category includes applications for review submitted to the Court of Cassation. In 2024, two applications for review were filed, one of which was dismissed. In the case where the review was granted, compensation of 5000€ was awarded.

**Q037 (2023):** Wrongful convictions: This item includes applications for review lodged with the Cour de cassation. In 2023, no requests for compensation were lodged with the Court of Cassation and consequently, there were no compensations granted.

**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.

**Malta**

**Q037 (General Comment):** 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 (2024):** Anyone who has experienced an injustice can seek redress in the Courts of Justice. The Laws of Malta provide for compensation in cases of wrongful conviction and unlawful detention (Chapter 319 of the Laws of Malta), while S.L. 9.12 of the Criminal Code establishes a compensation system for victims of crime. However, data on these cases is not currently available.

**Q037 (2022):** 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 (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.

**Netherlands**

**Q037 (General Comment):** There are compensation regulations for certain situations (see 4th Book, Title VIa of the Penal Code). If an offender is acquitted, he/she may request compensation for travel- and accommodation costs, the costs of a lawyer, or because of being held in temporary custody.
Numbers cannot be provided for most categories, as compensation may involve people who were held in custody but were either not accused or not found guilty, damages due to an arrest, or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or gone missing.

**Q037 (2024):** Under Article 533 Sv, a suspect who is not convicted or whose case is dismissed may be compensated for damages suffered as a result of undergoing (pre-trial) detention or clinical observation.

**Q037 (2023):** Under Article 533 Sv, a suspect who is not convicted or whose case is dismissed may be compensated for damages suffered as a result of undergoing (pre-trial) detention or clinical observation.

**Q037 (2022):** There are compensation regulations for certain situations (see 4th Book, Title VIa of the Penal Code). If an offender is acquitted, he/she may request compensation for travel- and accommodation costs, the costs of a lawyer, or because of being held in temporary custody.

**Poland**

**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 (2024):** The data below presents the amounts of compensation paid in 2024 from chapter 75595, which were awarded against the State Treasury, indicating the specific legal acts on the basis of which the compensation was awarded.
Specification of compensation from chapter 75595 amounts paid in 2024:
1. Act of February 23, 1991, on the invalidation of judgments issued against persons repressed for activities in favor of the independent existence of the Polish State 193 733 000 (PLN) 45 339 000(EUR)
2. Article 552 of the Act of June 6, 1997 - Code of Criminal Procedure 21 368 000 (PLN) 5 001 000(EUR)
3. Act of June 17, 2004, on complaints against violations of the right of a party to have their case heard in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and in court proceedings without undue delay 6 581 000(PLN) 1 540 000 (EUR)
4. Other compensation: including compensation pensions, compensation for property damage, unlawful eviction 658 000 (PLN) 154 000 (EUR)
5. Act of July 7, 2005, on state compensation for victims of certain prohibited acts 224 000 PLN 52 000 EUR;
Total compensation from chapter 75595 222 564 000 (PLN) 52 086 000 PLN
The amount of funds spent on compensation payments to eligible persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the validity of claims and the amount of compensation awarded. The implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the fiscal year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, as the payment of funds by the court's financial department is based solely on a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the eligible person.

**Q037 (2022):** *246 - number of persons
11 - number of persons

**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 invalid rulings 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 euros3. pursuant to the Act of 17 June 2004 on a complaint for violation of 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 Compensation to 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.

**Portugal**

**Q037 (General Comment):** There is no data with these levels of disaggregation in Portugal, we can only offer the total amount of the compensation.
The right to compensation in the cases listed is provided for in Law no. 67/2007 of December 31, which establishes the regime of non-contractual civil liability of the State and other Public Entities, specifically providing for an autonomous regime of State liability for damages arising from the exercise of the judicial function (chapter III, arts. 12 to 14).
In particular, with regard to Wrongful arrest/detention, it is important to mention article 225 and 226 of the Criminal Procedure Code, which provide for the right to compensation for illegal or unjustified deprivation of liberty by establishing a special regime. These articles also give effect to Article 27(5) CRP, which states that "Deprivation of liberty contrary to the provisions of the Constitution and the law shall constitute the State's duty to compensate the injured party under the terms established by law".

**Q037 (2024):** The total amount paid includes compensation in cases of the European Court of Human Rights and compensations set by national courts in cases within the responsibility of the Ministry of Justice .
Compared to previous cycles, this year it was found that the data (Total amount of compensations granted) was available in other entity of the Ministry of Justice (The Secretary General of the Ministry of Justice).

**Q037 (2022):** The right to compensation in the cases listed is provided for in Law no. 67/2007 of December 31, which establishes the regime of non-contractual civil liability of the State and other Public Entities, specifically providing for an autonomous regime of State liability for damages arising from the exercise of the judicial function (chapter III, arts. 12 to 14).
In particular, with regard to Wrongful arrest/detention, it is important to mention article 225 and 226 of the Criminal Procedure Code, which provide for the right to compensation for illegal or unjustified deprivation of liberty by establishing a special regime. These articles also give effect to Article 27(5) CRP, which states that "Deprivation of liberty contrary to the provisions of the Constitution and the law shall constitute the State's duty to compensate the injured party under the terms established by law".

**Romania**

**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 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 CPC, 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 CPC 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. Law no. 201/2023 introduced a new article in the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010) art. 359/1, stating the right to compensation for damage in the case of technical surveillance measures or activities specific to the collection of information illegally arranged ( 1 ) The person against whom he was ordered, confirmed, extended or illegally enforced a technical surveillance measure is entitled to compensation for the damage caused by this measure.

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**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 (2022):** The data are not collected in this structure in our judicial system.

**Slovenia**

**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.
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.
The State Attorney's Office has its own budget to pay compensation in preliminary procedures. If a case goes to court, it usually becomes a long and complex process. Once the case is in court, compensation based on judgments or settlements is paid by the Ministry of Finance. To reach a court settlement, the State Attorney's Office must first get the Ministry’s approval.

**Q037 (2024):** The figures above represent cases, opened or closed in 2024, with compensations to be paid in 2024 or later. The figures above represent only cases in courts and court settlements.
Wrongful conviction: Out of 4 court cases, 3 ended in court settlement. Wrongful arrest: Out of 17 court cases, 9 ended in court settlement. The number of court settlements indicates that the State Attorney plays an effective role in resolving disputes peacefully. Even when it isn't possible to agree on the amount of compensation during the preliminary procedure, settlements are often reached later in court—usually after some evidence has already been presented and the facts in the court process are clear enough to justify a settlement.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2024 (mandatory before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 30;
Number of settlements: 14;
Total amount (in €): 32.224,49;
Number of requests decreased significantly in 2024. In its 2024 Annual Report, the State Attorney concluded that the increased number of cases in 2022 and 2023 did not reflect a systemic problem of court backlogs or a violation of the parties' right to a trial without undue delay. 2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 36;
Number of settlements: 17;
Total amount (in €): 99.309,34
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 10;
Number of settlements: 0;
Total amount (in €): 0.
Not all cases where a settlement wasn't reached in the preliminary procedure end up in court, because the State Attorney's Office often rejects compensation claims with strong arguments.

**Q037 (2023):** The figures above represent cases, opened or closed in 2023, with compensations to be paid in 2023 or later. The figures above represent only cases in courts and court settlements.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2023 (mandatory before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 138;
Number of settlements: 23;
Total amount (in €): 47.546,80;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 49;
Number of settlements: 19;
Total amount (in €): 104.281,60
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 6;
Number of settlements: 3;
Total amount (in €): 103.730,00.
The above data demonstrate the effective role of the State Attorney's Office in the peaceful resolution of disputes, as only cases in which the amount of appropriate compensation cannot be determined in the preliminary proceedings at the State Attorney's Office are brought to court.

**Q037 (2022):** The figures above represent cases, closed in 2022, with compensations to be paid in 2022 or later. The figures above represent cases before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2022 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 6.810;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 35;
Number of settlements: 18;
Total amount (in €): 157.893
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 56;
Number of settlements: 23;
Total amount (in €): 42.209.

**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.

**Spain**

**Q037 (General Comment):** Spanish legislation recognizes the right to compensation from the State in two generic cases, judicial error and abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice and in a specific case of judicial error relating to pre-trial detention followed by acquittal or dismissal for lack of evidence. Cases of intentional or negligent conduct by the injured party and cases of force majeure are exempted. The request for compensation shall be processed in accordance with the rules regulating state liability. In cases of dolo (wilful misconduct) or gross negligence by judges or magistrates, the injured party may not directly sue them but shall address their request to the Ministry of Justice. The right to claim compensation has one year limitation period (statutory time-limit). The General Administration of the State may demand reimbursement from the responsible party once the injured party has been compensated. This will require that the dolo (wilful misconduct) or gross negligence of the judge or magistrate has been expressly recognized by a judgment or resolution issued by the General Council of the Judiciary. Article 121 Spanish Constitution and articles 292 et seq, Organic Law of the Judiciary, of July 1, 1985.

**Q037 (2024):** The "Others" category corresponds to abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice.

**Q037 (2023):** In the current cycle the data has been provided in disaggregated form (a breakdown for number of requests for compensation for wrongful arrest/detention, wrongful conviction and others) by the National Centre for Court Statistics.
Others category corresponds to abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice.
The total amount of compensation fluctuates from year to year and corresponds to the amount recognised by the contentious-administrative jurisdiction.
648 cases of patrimonial liability were opened and 410 were resolved, of which 88 were upheld

**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.

# Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and court users

### Table 6.1 Deployment and usage rate of the writing assistance tools in 2024 (Q62-23)

| States | Writing assistance tools | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Civil and/or commercial | | Administrative | | Criminal | |
| | Deployment rate | Usage rate | Deployment rate | Usage rate | Deployment rate | Usage rate |
| **Austria** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 75-95 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Belgium** | 95-100 % | 50-75 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 50-75 % |
| **Bulgaria** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Croatia** | 95-100 % | 1-25 % | 95-100 % | 1-25 % | 95-100 % | 1-25 % |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 75-95 % | NA | 75-95 % | NA | 75-95 % | NA |
| **Denmark** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Estonia** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Finland** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **France** | 75-95 % | 75-95 % | 95-100 % | 25-50 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Germany** | 75-95 % | 50-75 % | 75-95 % | 50-75 % | 75-95 % | 50-75 % |
| **Greece** | 50-75 % | 50-75 % | 50-75 % | 50-75 % | 50-75 % | 50-75 % |
| **Hungary** | 95-100 % | 25-50 % | 50-75 % | 1-25 % | 95-100 % | 25-50 % |
| **Ireland** | 50-75 % | 50-75 % | 50-75 % | 50-75 % | 50-75 % | 50-75 % |
| **Italy** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Latvia** | 95-100 % | 75-95 % | 95-100 % | 75-95 % | 95-100 % | 75-95 % |
| **Lithuania** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Luxembourg** | 75-95 % | 75-95 % | NAP | NAP | 75-95 % | 75-95 % |
| **Malta** | 25-50 % | 75-95 % | 25-50 % | 75-95 % | 25-50 % | 25-50 % |
| **Netherlands** | 95-100 % | NA | 95-100 % | NA | 95-100 % | NA |
| **Poland** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | NAP | NAP | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Portugal** | 75-95 % | NA | 75-95 % | NA | 75-95 % | NA |
| **Romania** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Slovak Republic** | 95-100 % | 50-75 % | 95-100 % | 50-75 % | 95-100 % | 50-75 % |
| **Slovenia** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Spain** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Sweden** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| 95-100 % | 18 | 12 | 17 | 11 | 19 | 13 |
| 75-95 % | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 50-75 % | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| 25-50 % | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1-25 % | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NAP | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| NA | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |

## Table 6.2 Functionalities of the writing assistance tools in 2024 (Q62-24)

| States | Civil and/or commercial | | | | | | Administrative | | | | | | Criminal | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Templates | Automatically generated text | Automatically suggested decision | Speech-to-text | Electronic signature | Other special functionality | Templates | Automatically generated text | Automatically suggested decision | Speech-to-text | Electronic signature | Other special functionality | Templates | Automatically generated text | Automatically suggested decision | Speech-to-text | Electronic signature | Other special functionality |
| **Austria** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Belgium** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| **Bulgaria** | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| **Croatia** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Denmark** | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Estonia** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Finland** | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| **France** | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| **Germany** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Greece** | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Hungary** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Ireland** | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| **Italy** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Latvia** | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| **Lithuania** | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| **Luxembourg** | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| **Malta** | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| **Netherlands** | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| **Poland** | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| **Portugal** | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Romania** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| **Slovak Republic** | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Slovenia** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Spain** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **Sweden** | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| Yes | 26 | 21 | 3 | 13 | 18 | 4 | 24 | 17 | 2 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 26 | 21 | 5 | 12 | 18 | 4 |
| No | 0 | 5 | 23 | 13 | 8 | 22 | 0 | 7 | 22 | 11 | 7 | 21 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 14 | 8 | 22 |
| NAP | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### Table 6.3 Deployment and usage rate of the recording of court hearings in 2024 (Q62-25)

| States | Recording of court hearings | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Civil and/or commercial | | Administrative | | Criminal | |
| | Deployment rate | Usage rate | Deployment rate | Usage rate | Deployment rate | Usage rate |
| **Austria** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 25-50 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Denmark** | 95-100 % | 1-25 % | 95-100 % | 0% | 95-100 % | 25-50 % |
| **Estonia** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Finland** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **France** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | 1-25 % | 1-25 % | 1-25 % | 0% | 1-25 % | 1-25 % |
| **Greece** | 95-100 % | 75-95 % | NAP | NAP | 50-75 % | 75-95 % |
| **Hungary** | 75-95 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 75-95 % | 95-100 % |
| **Ireland** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Italy** | 1-25 % | 1-25 % | NAP | NAP | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Latvia** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Lithuania** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Netherlands** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Poland** | 95-100 % | 75-95 % | 95-100 % | 50-75 % | 50-75 % | 1-25 % |
| **Portugal** | 95-100 % | NA | 95-100 % | NA | 95-100 % | NA |
| **Romania** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Slovak Republic** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Slovenia** | 95-100 % | 75-95 % | 95-100 % | 75-95 % | 95-100 % | 75-95 % |
| **Spain** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |
| **Sweden** | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % | 95-100 % |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | | | | | | |
| No | | | | | | |
| 95-100 % | 18 | 14 | 17 | 14 | 17 | 15 |
| 75-95 % | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 50-75 % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 25-50 % | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1-25 % | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| NAP | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| NA | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |

## Table 6.4 Functionalities of the tool to record court hearings in 2024 (Q62-26)

| States | Civil and/or commercial | | | | | | | Administrative | | | | | | | Criminal | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Audio recording | Video recording | Systematic recording for all hearings | Automatically indexed recording | Automatic transcript from recording | Possibility to request a copy of the recording | Other special functionality | Audio recording | Video recording | Systematic recording for all hearings | Automatically indexed recording | Automatic transcript from recording | Possibility to request a copy of the recording | Other special functionality | Audio recording | Video recording | Systematic recording for all hearings | Automatically indexed recording | Automatic transcript from recording | Possibility to request a copy of the recording | Other special functionality |
| **Austria** | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Belgium** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| **Croatia** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **Denmark** | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Estonia** | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Finland** | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| **France** | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| **Germany** | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Greece** | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| **Hungary** | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Ireland** | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Italy** | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Latvia** | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Lithuania** | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| **Luxembourg** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| **Netherlands** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Poland** | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Portugal** | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| **Romania** | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| **Slovak Republic** | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Slovenia** | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| **Spain** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **Sweden** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Yes | 22 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 15 | 4 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 22 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 19 | 5 |
| No | 0 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 16 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 17 |
| NAP | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| NA | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

# Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and for court users

## Comments provided by the national correspondents

## organised by country

*Question 062-23. If writing assistance tools exist in courts, what are their deployment and usage rates?*

*Question 062-24. If writing assistance tools exist in courts, please describe their functionalities:*

*Question 062-25. If a tool to record court hearings exists, what are the deployment and usage rates?*

*Question 062-26. If a tool to record court hearings exist, please specify its functionalities:*

**Austria**

**Q062-23 (2024):** Administrative: Numbers above are for the Federal Administrative Court
Regional administrative courts: DR: 95-100 %, UR: 50-75 %
Supreme administrative court: 25-50 % deployment and usage rate

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** An electronic case file system is used for the administration of investigative and court proceedings at public prosecutor's offices and courts. The case file system enables users to store, organise and structure documents as well as to use templates to create and sign documents electronically. Files can also be uploaded to the electronic case file. These files may also be dictated using speech-to-text applications, such as Dragon.
Templates for LibreOffice are made available to all users. In addition, users can also create their own templates, so-called "structured short orders" for registry instructions and other tasks, using text modules and custom text samples. Automatically generated text is generally created by workflow rules and not by LLM-based artificial intelligence. LLM-based artificial intelligence is used for the anonymisation of documents.

**Q062-24 (2024):** Regarding the Administrative Courts, not all functions are available in all the courts.

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** Administrative: Numbers are for the Federal Administrative Court only! The others do not have tools for recording hearings yet.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In recent years, the rate at which recording solutions have been deployed has steadily increased, and these systems are now implemented throughout the entire judicial system. Consequently, there are very few areas remaining where such solutions are not utilised—provided their application is considered appropriate. Notably, in criminal cases, audiovisual recordings of hearings are primarily employed, whereas in civil and administrative proceedings, dictation devices are predominantly used. These devices enable decision-making bodies to summarise and record the session in a concise protocol.

Description for the ordinary courts and the Federal Administrative Court:
Each court is equipped with a video recording system; additionally, decision-making bodies and court clerks may use mobile audio recording devices to document court proceedings. Audio and video files may be electronically entered into the case file and transmitted electronically to the parties. The automatic transcription of audio tracks using AI (including time stamps, speaker identification, etc.) is currently under evaluation. The decision whether to produce a summary protocol or a verbatim transcript lies with the decision-making body.

**Belgium**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** Administrative matters (Council of State): for each type of procedure, there are template judgments containing certain standardised paragraphs. This standardisation particularly concerns the part relating to the conduct of the proceedings. Some documents are now generated automatically on the basis of information contained in internal databases (setting orders and hearing tables, for example).
Strictly speaking, however, there are no ‘"writing assistance tools » for judgments.
However, since 2017 all Council of State judgments have been written in direct style. This generalisation has ensured greater uniformity in the presentation of judgments. Council of State judges also have a number of tools at their disposal:
a. Legal databases are maintained internally and also made available to the public (Juridict www.juridict.be , refLex www.reflex.be , etc.);
b. Access is provided to private, paying legal databases (StradaLex www.stradalex.be , Jurisquare www.jurisquare.be, etc.);
c. 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.
d. The Council of State's website also offers numerous search options: www.raadvst-consetat.be.

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** In civil and criminal matters:
- most templates are available for all courts, or all templates are available for most courts - local modification of templates is always possible;
- the options are not all part of the same application (e.g. speech-to-text)
For speech-to-text: this is possible in the WORD application.
Limitation: text generated automatically according to the Case Management Systems (CMS).
Concerning electronic signature: only possible for justices of the peace; these courts are currently working with eSign to digitally sign documents. From 2025, police courts and criminal courts should also be able to sign electronically, followed by other courts.
It is worth mentioning the JustCourt project, officially launched in 2024. This is a new tool that will enable virtual or hybrid hearings to be held in courts. It is currently being rolled out to cover all courts (scheduled for 2025–2026). Like other applications, JustCourt is part of the overall digitisation process undertaken by the FPS Justice to modernise and improve the Belgian judicial system for all its users.

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** In May 2024, a new JustCourt tool was launched, enabling virtual or hybrid hearings to be held in Belgian courts. This involves installing videoconferencing systems in the courtrooms. This new application is part of the FPS Justice's digitisation initiative, which aims to modernise and improve the judicial system for all litigants. The pilot phase is currently underway. In civil and criminal matters: prior to the deployment of JustCourt: - in criminal matters, use of videoconferencing for research and investigations.
- videoconferencing equipment was not available everywhere and systematically. Where necessary or appropriate, equipment could (also) be rented. Thanks to the new projects in this area, the availability of this equipment for the judiciary will be increased. In administrative matters - Council of State: the possibility exists in exceptional circumstances to hold a hearing by videoconference, but it is not foreseen to record it. It should be recalled that during the coronavirus crisis, a Royal Decree of Special Powers No. 12 (http://www.raadvstconsetat.be/?page=news&lang=fr&newsitem=592) enabled the Council of State to rule in writing and without a hearing, with the agreement of all the parties. In the same context, the Council of State was able to organise a number of remote hearings, virtually (via Skype or Teams), as part of the extreme emergency suspension procedure. This is still used on an ad hoc basis today, but to a very limited extent.

**Q062-26 (2024):** The possibility of audio or audiovisual recording is enshrined in Article 759/2 of the Judicial Code, which states that "The court before which the public hearing is taking place may decide, on an exceptional basis, to record that public hearing where such audio or audiovisual recording is of interest for the creation of historical archives of the justice system or for educational purposes with a view to imparting knowledge in the field of law or the functioning of the justice system, with the consent of the persons whose voices and images are recorded, each for their own part. This consent may be withdrawn at any time during the hearing. (...)" (provision introduced by a law of April 25, 2024).

**Bulgaria**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** “Speech to text” – By Decision under Protocol No. 25/29.09.2023, the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council approved and implemented in all judicial bodies the software created under the project "Development and implementation in the judicial system of software for accelerated creation and reproduction of acts and other documents through dictation and automatic conversion of voice recording into text /voice-to-text/ and accompanying processing systems", according to which the SJC is a beneficiary in a contract financed under the Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020. The "voice-to-text" (V2T) system is a tool for digitization and allows magistrates instead of manually type their acts, to dictate and receive automatically typed text, allowing for quick formatting, searching and bolding words, referencing, annotation and other options for additional text processing and references to all key segments of the acts. The software for accelerated creation and reproduction of acts and other documents through dictation and automatic conversion of voice recording into text /voice-to-text/ is of the "artificial intelligence" type. It was developed using the "deep neural networks" method and of key importance for its effectiveness was training through voice recordings of words, through audio recordings of judicial and prosecutorial acts, that correspond to maximum extent to the real use of terminology in judicial practice. The system supports the following file formats:
WAV (Waveform audio), *.wav;
AIFF (Audio Interchange File Format), *.aif;
FLAC (Free Lossless Audio Codec), *.flac;
MP3 (MPEG Audio-1 Layer 3), *.mp3;
AAC (Advanced Audio Coding), *.m4a, *.m4b, *.m4p, *.m4v, *.m4r, *.3gp, *.mp4, *.aac;
WMA (Windows Media Audio), *.wma;
OGG (Vorbis), *.ogg.
The supported text formats are:
MS Word, *.doc, *.docx);
Rich Text Format, *.rtf;
Plain Text Format, *.txt;
Portable Document Format, *.pdf.
On 05.06.2024, the Operational Program "Good Governance" published information in the Information System for Management and Monitoring of EU Funds in Bulgaria (ISMM) about the successful fulfillment of all SJC obligations and, accordingly, about the project completion.
“Templates” – The Unified Information System of Courts (UISC) contains templates for judicial acts, such as decisions, orders, rulings, etc. As an example of how it works, we provide the steps for the preparation of a decision. After the judge enters the specific hearing and selects the necessary act, a window is generated in the UISC, where only the motivation and dispositive parts of the act are entered. After filling in the necessary fields and sequentially selecting the buttons "record", "prepare an act" and "send for signature", the complete decision is generated. This also applies to other types of acts, i.e. the judge does not write the title part, but only the motivation and dispositive parts.

**Q062-24 (2024):** It should be noted that the Supreme Court of Cassation indicated "electronic signature". Besides, except those mentioned in the table the Supreme Administrative Court indicated "automatically generated text".

**Croatia**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** The implementation of the Audio Recording and Transcription System for court hearings is currently underway. The contract with the Contractor was signed on March 28, 2025. The deadline for the completion of the procurement is 18 months from the date of contract signing.
At the moment, work is being carried out on establishing a central software solution for the integration of all courts into a unified system for monitoring and managing a shared repository of all recordings, as well as a central software solution for the automated transcription of recordings stored in the central shared repository. After completion implementation will proceed in individual courtrooms (a total of 1,317 courtrooms).

**Czech Republic**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The use of writing assistance tools in courts depends on the type of agenda and the information system used. Some systems automatically generate documents based on templates, data, and selected procedural actions. Older systems use an external application called APSTR, which helps create documents but is only available for district courts.
Document templates are developed either by the Ministry of Justice or at the national level in cooperation with experts and court staff. These templates can be modified locally by individual courts or even by users, allowing for adjustments to specific court agendas. However, not all types of cases are covered by these templates. Additionally, speech-to-text tools are available for all courts.

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** Recording of court hearings has been compulsory in all matters in the form of audio or audiovisual recordings since 2009. While the implementation of recording systems progressed gradually in previous years due to hardware, software, and funding limitations, significant progress was made in 2023-2024. Several key digitalisation projects were completed, resulting in a substantial increase in coverage. Currently, approximately 95–100% of court hearings are recorded.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In this cycle, we have selected "Automatically indexed recording" due to the integration of the courtroom recording system with the Beey transcription tool. This integration enables automatic timestamping and structured linking of audio segments to specific parts of the hearing, improving navigation and usability of the recordings.

**Q062-26 (2024):** Echo-cancellation technology has been implemented in courtrooms to improve the quality of audio recordings. The system identifies and suppresses audio feedback (echo), which is particularly important during videoconferencing. The first devices were deployed in 2024, and as of September 2025, a total of 154 units have been installed, with further expansion planned depending on available funding.

**Denmark**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Civil: The system has a function that replaces a physical signature through an approval flow, but it is NOT a digital signature.
**Q062-24 (2024):** The Criminal and Probate Case Administration Program is aiming to support criminal and probate areas within the Danish courts. Within this program we have introduced the fine case system and the new criminal case system, where the judge approves electronically within the solution instead of signing printed paper.

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** Civil: Currently 287 courtrooms in 26 courts. Only used sporadically. Requires explicit acceptance from the parties involved.
Administrative: Not relevant in practice. Currently 287 courtrooms in 26 courts.
Criminal: Primary usage. Currently 287 courtrooms in 26 courts. Usage rate varies from Court to court and from judge to judge. Each judge decides whether to avail herself of the possibility or not on a hearing-to-hearing basis.
Authorized officially in Danish legislation.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** It is possible to request a copy, just not possible for the average citizen. Other special functionality: playback during court proceedings for jurors. Automatic transcript from re-cording is planned in the future when quality i reliable (currently done by court clerks on ad hoc basis).

**Estonia**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Dictation in Microsoft 365 is being used by some judges, and the option to use it is available to everyone.
**Q062-26 (General Comment):** If there is a virtual hearing, then it's possible to record video as well.

**Finland**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** Our case management systems HAIPA and AIPA use Word as the writing assistance tool.

**Q062-24 (2024):** Along with the introduction of the AIPA system in 2024, electronic signature has been possible also in criminal matters.
**Q062-25 (General Comment):** In criminal and civil matters only the witness testimonial is recorded.
**Q062-26 (2024):** In 2026, new legislation will enter into force, after which a video and audio recording will be made of evidence taken in district courts instead of the previous audio recording.

**France**

**Q062-24 (2024):** In civil matters, the courts have an electronic docket to record decisions signed electronically. In both civil and criminal matters, there is a quick word library: the OARM tool (Writing Assistance Tool for judges) was replaced in 2025 by the Lawrite solution, deployed nationwide by the PPN (available in the software center for all judicial service agents) and allowing the management of quick word libraries in all word processing software.
In both civil and criminal matters:
- The OpenText publishing solution automatically generates decision documents from templates that use data entered into business applications and allows for manual enrichment with the rationale for the decision (within the scope of the OpenText deployment).
- The Lawrite solution allows for the automatic integration of standard phrases or paragraphs (the judge's personal library) to speed up the entry of the decision's reasoning by reusing previous formulations.

**Q062-26 (2024):**
Whether civil, criminal, economic, or administrative, court hearings can now be recorded or filmed for reasons of public interest, for educational, informational, cultural, or scientific purposes. Article 38 quater of the law of July 29, 1881, on the freedom of the press sets the legal framework for the recording and broadcasting of hearings and was supplemented by Decree No. 2022-462 of March 31, 2022. This legal framework only allows same-day broadcasting of hearings before the Council of State and the Court of Cassation. Within this framework, in 2024, the latter recorded and broadcast seven hearings of its solemn formations (Plenary Assembly and mixed chambers) on the same day, held in both civil and criminal matters.

**Germany**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** The use of information technology in the courts is in the competency of the federal states and therefore not at all homogenous. The answers in this section reflect the answers as provided by of the majority of the federal states, eventhough there my be significant differences in some cases.
**Q062-23 (2024):** The majority of the respondent federal states reported deployment rates of 95 - 100% (civil, administrative and criminal). A minority of 3 federal states reported deployment rates of 75 - 95%
The majority of the federal states reported a usage rates of 75 - 100% (civil, administrative and criminal). In comparison to the pervious reference year 2023, 3 federal states reportet increased usage rates regarding civil cases, 4 regarding administrative cases and 3 regarding criminal cases. A minority of 4 federal states reported usage rates of 50 - 75 % or NA (1).

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The use of information technology in the courts is in the competency of the federal states and therefore not at all homogenous. The answers in this section reflect the answers as provided by of the majority of the federal states, eventhough there my be significant differences in some cases.
**Q062-24 (2024):** In all 16 federal states writing assistance tools include the functionality "templates". In the majority of the federal states (13 - 15), writing assistance tools include the functionalities automatically generated text speech to text and electronic signature.
**Q062-25 (2024):** The majority of the federal states reported "NAP" on deployment and usage rate in civil, administrative and criminal cases. With regard to civil and administrative cases 1 federal state and with regard to criminal cases 2 federal states reported existing recording tools.
One federal state reported successful introduction of a pilot project regarding video interrogation of victim witnesses. This system prevents victims and perpetrators from encountering each other in court and allows statements to be transmitted directly to the courtroom and also recorded.
**Q062-26 (2024):** The majority of the federal states reported "NAP". Functionalities of recording tools were reported by 1 federal state for administrative and civil cases and two federal states for criminal cases.

**Greece**

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** There are no witness testimony in administrative cases.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In civil and criminal hearings, the recordings are systematic by default. However, the president of the court and/or the presiding judge has discretionary power to decide not to record a hearing.

**Hungary**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** In 2022, writing assistance tools were made available to all employees working within the entire court system. These were licensed tools that staff members tried and tested. Based on user feedback, it was determined by 2023 that, considering the specific characteristics of the Hungarian language and the legal terminology, these tools did not improve the efficiency of court work. Their language recognition functions were not easily scalable, and therefore, they were phased out. Simultaneously, we sought new solutions and acquired cloud-based tools that, although previously restricted by legal regulations, could now be developed and trained. These tools were fewer in number than in the past.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** A ViaVideo system has been implemented nationwide. Every police station has at least one room equipped with it, every penitentiary institution has several rooms, and every court in the country has at least one courtroom — in some cases more — equipped with the system. It transmits both audio and video simultaneously and is also capable of recording hearings. The recorded material is saved in a format suitable for use by the court. The system also allows other participants — for instance, the prosecutor, defence counsel, expert witness, or a party/defendant/witness— to join the hearing via a link sent by e-mail. If the judge uses this system to make a continuous audio and video recording of the hearing, the recording itself constitutes the official record (minutes). In such cases, a written summary must be prepared from the recording. This summary contains only technical information — such as who appears on the recording and during which time interval, and what procedural act took place — but not the substantive content of those acts.

**Ireland**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** Approximately half of our case types and scenarios are supported in practice by templates as an order writing assistance – and where they are available, they are used 100% (roughly) of the time. Close to half of our jurisdictions do not support templates at all (or didn't at the point of filling out the survey).

**Q062-23 (2024):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases, as such, we have given the same answers here as provided for civil cases.
**Q062-24 (2024):** Although there is no separate category for administrative cases in Ireland, we have given the same answers here as provided for civil cases.
**Q062-25 (2024):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases, as such, we have given the same answers here as provided for civil cases.
**Q062-26 (General Comment):** Court hearings are recorded by use of DAR (Digital Audio Recordings). Audio recordings are made for internal court purposes and are under the control of the court. They are not generally available to parties or to the public, unless ordered by the Court although applications can be made to the court for a transcript of the recording, or part thereof for a fee. For example, this might arise if court proceedings are subject to a Judicial Review in a higher court.

**Q062-26 (2024):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases, as such, we have given the same answers here as provided for civil cases.

**Latvia**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** In Latvian courts, writing and text processing support tools are used to ensure consistent document quality and to facilitate daily work. The central platform is the Court Information System, which serves as the main environment for preparing, storing, and managing judicial documents. It provides pre-defined templates, allows text formatting in line with regulatory requirements, and enables automated case registration, helping judges and staff maintain consistency in documentation.
An important element is the integration with the e-Case platform, which allows procedural documents to be submitted and received electronically, as well as the use of digital signatures, thereby reducing the circulation of paper documents. Writing support is also ensured by language and terminology tools – text editors with Latvian spell-check functionality and access to legal databases that help secure the accuracy of judgments and other procedural documents.
Since 2024, Latvian courts have been gradually testing speech recognition solutions that automatically convert hearing audio recordings into text. These tools are still in the testing phase, and human verification remains essential, but in the long run, they are expected to reduce manual transcription work and speed up the preparation of protocols. In addition, document generation tools are employed to quickly produce standard rulings, summons, or notifications, reducing repetitive drafting. Writing assistance also extends to secure electronic communication forms, ensuring that information provided to parties is clear, standardized, and in full compliance with procedural requirements. Together, these tools form a solid foundation for more efficient court operations and improved quality of judicial documentation.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In all cases the audio protocol is mandatory according to the legal acts. There are used also TIX or AVR tool, in which the most important places in the audio protocol are tagged. The audio protocol is developed in pdf format or mp4.
**Q062-26 (2024):** Transcription tool in development.
All recordings are available in E-Case platform for both parties.

**Lithuania**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The system contains many prepared Templates, that can be filled out by judges, assistant judges or secretaries (e.g. court summons, order on temporary protection measures and other forms).

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In criminal cases, interviews of minors are videotaped.

**Q062-26 (2024):** see general comment

**Luxembourg**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The existing tools are not automated and do not use any artificial intelligence assistance. They involve the use of Word templates for certain documents generated by business applications. These documents are automatically generated and pre-filled with metadata.
A POC was conducted to implement a tool to assist in drafting judgments, but it was not successful.
Other avenues are currently under analysis.

**Malta**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** In the current system, DigiCourts, the main writing assistance tools deployed are templates of standard documentation used by the court staff. Most of these templates reflect official court documents that are also annexed to the Code of Civil Procedure, Chp 12 of the Laws of Malta. The proposed new case management system will have enhanced writing assistance tools and will include the use of the electronic signature to facilitate the transition to a fully digitalised system.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In terms of 'automatically indexed recording', the recordings made during the sittings are automatically organised by sitting, which simplifies storage and retrieval in a specific order. The Court Services Agency have also implemented an advanced audio-digital system that will enable the judiciary and court officials to record hearings seamlessly, securely store and organise files, and quickly retrieve and manage recordings. This makes the audio-visual recordings more efficient, reliable and transparent in the handling of the judicial proceedings.

**Netherlands**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Other functionalities: automatically fill in data from CMS, like names, dates and type of case. 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.

**Q062-24 (2024):** The electronic signature is a small pilot in administrative law for now.

**Q062-26 (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/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.

**Q062-26 (2024):** There are no tools, except local recorders. Usage is less than 10%. This is applicable for civil, administrative and criminal cases.

**Poland**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** 1. All courts use document templates to prepare judgments, decisions, and orders. These are most often MS Word templates with macros allowing for the addition of case data, parties data, etc. from the case management system (SRB). Courts can use the centrally developed ZEUS tool (an advanced editor for court justifications). Selected courts also use local applications that enable voice-to-text conversion. In selected proceedings conducted in central systems supporting court proceedings, such as the National Debtors Register KRZ (bankruptcy and restructuring proceedings) and the Electronic Writ of Payment Proceedings EPU, documents related to a given stage of the proceedings are generated based on data collected in the system supporting that procedure.
2. Judges conducting proceedings in the KRZ and EPU systems use qualified electronic signatures to sign their decisions, and orders. Judges using the electronic transcript of a hearing sign it with a non-qualified electronic signature.

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** In civil proceedings, recording court sessions is generally obligatory and constitutes an electronic protocol. In criminal proceedings, recording court sessions is not obligatory; any recording is only an annex to the traditional protocol. The exceptions are misdemeanour hearings, where the recording is also an electronic protocol, but this is a small percentage of cases.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In criminal proceedings, recording court sessions is not obligatory; any recording is only an annex to the traditional protocol. The exceptions are misdemeanour hearings, where the recording is also an electronic protocol, but this is a small percentage of cases. Automatic transcription of the recording is generated using automatic speech recognition technology. The automatically prepared transcript is then subject to human review.

**Portugal**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Writing assistance tools are available across civil, administrative and criminal courts, and they provide a set of functionalities designed to support and streamline the drafting of judicial and administrative acts.
The main features include:
•Pre-defined templates: Users have access to a wide library of standardized templates for different procedural acts. The system guides the user to select the appropriate template based on their profile and the type of action to be performed, ensuring consistency across courts. In many cases, the user does not need to add any text and only needs to sign the document; however, they may still edit or adjust the content if desired.
•Automatically generated text: The courts' system provides automatic texts that users can use. These indicate the process, the intended recipient, and the action to be performed, and users may also add observations.
•Electronic signature: All documents drafted through these tools can be finalised and authenticated using a qualified electronic signature, ensuring legal validity.
Additional contextual notes:
•A language simplification initiative was implemented to make certain standard texts clearer and more accessible, particularly when addressing natural and legal persons.
•The system also provides spelling and text correction, as well as automatic text suggestions for routine formulations. Users may add specific remarks or tailor content when necessary, even within automatically generated acts.
Overall, these tools support efficiency, uniformity, and quality in the preparation of documents across all jurisdictions.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In our courts, audio recording is available, providing an official and reliable record of proceedings when applied.
The system also enables the following functionalities:
•Audio streaming of hearings: users may access recordings through their interface, either upon request or by action of the judicial secretariat.
•Real-time streaming: Authorized users can listen to ongoing hearings live, via the case interface.
•Remote participation: Multiple users can join a hearing simultaneously from different locations across the country or abroad, as if physically present in the courtroom.
Access is strictly controlled, and these functionalities are used only by authorized judicial actors, in accordance with applicable procedural rules.

**Q062-26 (2024):** Audio streaming of recordings of proceedings and hearings for forensic prosecutors, on their interface, upon request and/or by action of the judicial secretariat.

**Romania**

**Q062-24 (2024):** (See general comments)

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In Romania's judicial system, the integrated solution OPTIMUS has been implemented. Developed in-house, it manages audio recordings and automatic voice-to-text transcription. It is "cloud ready" and uses machine learning algorithms to identify speakers. The solution underwent a successful technological pilot that evaluated its performance in challenging acoustic environments. The project is continuing with integration into the national case management system, ECRIS V, as part of the PNRR investment titled "Development of integrated audio recording systems in courtrooms and automatic transcription components."
1. Technical Clarifications Regarding Automatic Indexing
Automatic indexing of recordings is achieved through speaker change detection and automatic segmentation of the audio stream (diarization). Machine learning algorithms identify transitions between speakers and automatically mark key moments in the recording, generating time markers used for both audio navigation and alignment of sound segments with the transcribed text.
2. General Context Regarding Courtroom Session Recording
Audio recording of courtroom sessions is a standard component of judicial activity. The OPTIMUS solution streamlines the transcription process and helps reduce drafting time. The implementation uses dedicated equipment for audio capture, separate from general sound systems. Nationally, the project aims to acquire the necessary IT infrastructure and equip over 1,000 courtrooms with specific devices, with data processing and integration to be carried out through the centralized infrastructure of ECRIS V.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In 2015, courtrooms were equipped with recording technology. These recordings are part of the electronic court file. The application "Audiorecording" is used to process multimedia recordings created during hearings in individual courtrooms. The Audio Recordings Client application (formerly MonoReCourt) is used for processing multimedia recordings produced during hearings in individual courtrooms.

**Slovenia**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** In line with EN, under „Civil“ only cases corresponding to Q91 category: “1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases” are taken into account (i.e. civil litigious cases, commercial cases, labour cases, social cases, insolvency cases and various civil cases). In all of these cases, the CMS enables some form of write assistance tools, that are widely used in courts; while the possibility to create a new writing or use a different document still exists. Data on actual usage is only an estimation.

**Q062-23 (2024):** Please note write assistance tools are also available in cases, not included in any of categories above:
- civil enforcement cases (Q91:2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
- family cases (Q91:2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
- land registry cases (Q91:2.2.1 Non-litigious land registry cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
- bussines registry (Q91:2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases)
Deployment rate:95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
- civil enforcement cases on base of authentic document (Q91:4.other cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
Please also note that number of (incoming) cases at Q91:”2. Non-litigious cases” is 14x the number of “1.Civil (and commercial) litigious cases” and number of (incoming) cases at Q91:”4.Other cases” is 4x the number of “1.Civil (and commercial) litigious cases”.

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Automatically generated text: In civil (and commercial) litigious cases, as well as in non-litigious, administrative and criminal cases, only simple court writings are available as templates (i.e. notifications, summons). Automatically generated text: limited only to case metadata.

**Q062-24 (2024):** In 2024, speech-to-text system (TIPKO) has been implemented in all Slovenian courts. Administrative cases: electronic signature is possible, but is not used in practice as the Administrative court did not start with entirely electronic business yet. Criminal cases: In severe criminal cases, a possibility of electronic signature has been implemented in CMS in 2024. In misdemenour cases, the possibility of electronic signature is implemented and used regularly.

**Q062-25 (2024):** Usage rate: the option to record hearings is widely used. However, there is no data collected on actual usage, therefore the above answer is only an estimation.

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** Systematic recording for all hearings: the decision to record or not is in the hands of an individual judge.
Possibility to request a copy of the recording: a party has a right to acces the recording, as well as to object the authenticity of the transcript.

**Q062-26 (2024):** Voice recording: available in all courtrooms. A new system for the central collection of recordings (ASOD II), which enables secure remote access to recordings and provides interoperability with the newly implemented speech-to-text system (TIPKO), is currently being implemented. By the end of 2024, 19 of approximately 350 hearing rooms had been equipped to support this functionality.

**Spain**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The processing of the Case Management System provides hundreds of thousands of models and paragraphs predesigned at each moment of processing to auto complete with the specific information for each procedure, facilitating the preparation of practically 100% of the resolutions and judicial documents.
Likewise, guided processing schemes are provided, which suggest the procedures that can follow the last one carried out, depending on the type of procedure.
Other special functionality: multiple processing (processing similar models of several procedures at the same time), special operations (notes on the deadline agenda at the end of certain documents, phase and status updating, guided processing schemes - processing models for each type of procedure), consultation/copy of texts of previous resolutions made.
It is applicable in every jurisdiction.

**Q062-24 (2024):** AI tools for transcription to plain language and easy reading

**Q062-26 (2024):** Textualized recordings allow the user to search the textualized text by keywords or interveners. All recordings are electronically signed by the Letrado de la Administración de Justicia (responsible for the judicial office) and can be visualized through the electronic judicial file

# Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and for court users

## Comments provided by the national correspondents

## organised by question no.

*Question 062-23. If writing assistance tools exist in courts, what are their deployment and usage rates?*

*Question 062-24. If writing assistance tools exist in courts, please describe their functionalities:*

*Question 062-25. If a tool to record court hearings exists, what are the deployment and usage rates?*

*Question 062-26. If a tool to record court hearings exist, please specify its functionalities:*

### Question 062-23

**Austria**

**Q062-23 (2024):** Administrative: Numbers above are for the Federal Administrative Court
Regional administrative courts: DR: 95-100 %, UR: 50-75 %
Supreme administrative court: 25-50 % deployment and usage rate

**Belgium**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** Administrative matters (Council of State): for each type of procedure, there are template judgments containing certain standardised paragraphs. This standardisation particularly concerns the part relating to the conduct of the proceedings. Some documents are now generated automatically on the basis of information contained in internal databases (setting orders and hearing tables, for example).
Strictly speaking, however, there are no ‘"writing assistance tools » for judgments.
However, since 2017 all Council of State judgments have been written in direct style. This generalisation has ensured greater uniformity in the presentation of judgments. Council of State judges also have a number of tools at their disposal:
a. Legal databases are maintained internally and also made available to the public (Juridict www.juridict.be , refLex www.reflex.be , etc.);
b. Access is provided to private, paying legal databases (StradaLex www.stradalex.be , Jurisquare www.jurisquare.be, etc.);
c. 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.
d. The Council of State's website also offers numerous search options: www.raadvst-consetat.be.

**Finland**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** Our case management systems HAIPA and AIPA use Word as the writing assistance tool.

**Germany**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** The use of information technology in the courts is in the competency of the federal states and therefore not at all homogenous. The answers in this section reflect the answers as provided by of the majority of the federal states, eventhough there my be significant differences in some cases.

**Q062-23 (2024):** The majority of the respondent federal states reported deployment rates of 95 - 100% (civil, administrative and criminal). A minority of 3 federal states reported deployment rates of 75 - 95%
The majority of the federal states reported a usage rates of 75 - 100% (civil, administrative and criminal). In comparison to the pervious reference year 2023, 3 federal states reportet increased usage rates regarding civil cases, 4 regarding administrative cases and 3 regarding criminal cases. A minority of 4 federal states reported usage rates of 50 - 75 % or NA (1).

**Ireland**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** Approximately half of our case types and scenarios are supported in practice by templates as an order writing assistance – and where they are available, they are used 100% (roughly) of the time. Close to half of our jurisdictions do not support templates at all (or didn't at the point of filling out the survey).

**Q062-23 (2024):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases, as such, we have given the same answers here as provided for civil cases.

**Slovenia**

**Q062-23 (General Comment):** In line with EN, under „Civil" only cases corresponding to Q91 category: "1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases" are taken into account (i.e. civil litigious cases, commercial cases, labour cases, social cases, insolvency cases and various civil cases). In all of these cases, the CMS enables some form of write assistance tools, that are widely used in courts; while the possibility to create a new writing or use a different document still exists. Data on actual usage is only an estimation.

**Q062-23 (2024):** Please note write assistance tools are also available in cases, not included in any of categories above:
- civil enforcement cases (Q91:2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
- family cases (Q91:2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
- land registry cases (Q91:2.2.1 Non-litigious land registry cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
- bussines registry (Q91:2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases)
Deployment rate:95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
- civil enforcement cases on base of authentic document (Q91:4.other cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: 95-100%
Please also note that number of (incoming) cases at Q91:"2. Non-litigious cases" is 14x the number of "1.Civil (and commercial) litigious cases" and number of (incoming) cases at Q91:"4.Other cases" is 4x the number of "1.Civil (and commercial) litigious cases".

## Question 062-24

**Austria**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** An electronic case file system is used for the administration of investigative and court proceedings at public prosecutor's offices and courts. The case file system enables users to store, organise and structure documents as well as to use templates to create and sign documents electronically. Files can also be uploaded to the electronic case file. These files may also be dictated using speech-to-text applications, such as Dragon.
Templates for LibreOffice are made available to all users. In addition, users can also create their own templates, so-called "structured short orders" for registry instructions and other tasks, using text modules and custom text samples. Automatically generated text is generally created by workflow rules and not by LLM-based artificial intelligence. LLM-based artificial intelligence is used for the anonymisation of documents.

**Q062-24 (2024):** Regarding the Administrative Courts, not all functions are available in all the courts.

**Belgium**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** In civil and criminal matters:
- most templates are available for all courts, or all templates are available for most courts - local modification of templates is always possible;
- the options are not all part of the same application (e.g. speech-to-text)
For speech-to-text: this is possible in the WORD application.
Limitation: text generated automatically according to the Case Management Systems (CMS).
Concerning electronic signature: only possible for justices of the peace; these courts are currently working with eSign to digitally sign documents. From 2025, police courts and criminal courts should also be able to sign electronically, followed by other courts.
It is worth mentioning the JustCourt project, officially launched in 2024. This is a new tool that will enable virtual or hybrid hearings to be held in courts. It is currently being rolled out to cover all courts (scheduled for 2025–2026). Like other applications, JustCourt is part of the overall digitisation process undertaken by the FPS Justice to modernise and improve the Belgian judicial system for all its users.

**Bulgaria**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** “Speech to text” – By Decision under Protocol No. 25/29.09.2023, the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council approved and implemented in all judicial bodies the software created under the project "Development and implementation in the judicial system of software for accelerated creation and reproduction of acts and other documents through dictation and automatic conversion of voice recording into text /voice-to-text/ and accompanying processing systems", according to which the SJC is a beneficiary in a contract financed under the Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020. The "voice-to-text" (V2T) system is a tool for digitization and allows magistrates instead of manually type their acts, to dictate and receive automatically typed text, allowing for quick formatting, searching and bolding words, referencing, annotation and other options for additional text processing and references to all key segments of the acts. The software for accelerated creation and reproduction of acts and other documents through dictation and automatic conversion of voice recording into text /voice-to-text/ is of the "artificial intelligence" type. It was developed using the "deep neural networks" method and of key importance for its effectiveness was training through voice recordings of words, through audio recordings of judicial and prosecutorial acts, that correspond to maximum extent to the real use of terminology in judicial practice. The system supports the following file formats:
WAV (Waveform audio), *.wav;
AIFF (Audio Interchange File Format), *.aif;
FLAC (Free Lossless Audio Codec), *.flac;
MP3 (MPEG Audio-1 Layer 3), *.mp3;
AAC (Advanced Audio Coding), *.m4a, *.m4b, *.m4p, *.m4v, *.m4r, *.3gp, *.mp4, *.aac;
WMA (Windows Media Audio), *.wma;
OGG (Vorbis), *.ogg.
The supported text formats are:
MS Word, *.doc, *.docx);
Rich Text Format, *.rtf;
Plain Text Format, *.txt;
Portable Document Format, *.pdf.
On 05.06.2024, the Operational Program "Good Governance" published information in the Information System for Management and Monitoring of EU Funds in Bulgaria (ISMM) about the successful fulfillment of all SJC obligations and, accordingly, about the project completion.
“Templates” – The Unified Information System of Courts (UISC) contains templates for judicial acts, such as decisions, orders, rulings, etc. As an example of how it works, we provide the steps for the preparation of a decision. After the judge enters the specific hearing and selects the necessary act, a window is generated in the UISC, where only the motivation and dispositive parts of the act are entered. After filling in the necessary fields and sequentially selecting the buttons "record", "prepare an act" and "send for signature", the complete decision is generated. This also applies to other types of acts, i.e. the judge does not write the title part, but only the motivation and dispositive parts.

**Q062-24 (2024):** It should be noted that the Supreme Court of Cassation indicated "electronic signature". Besides, except those mentioned in the table the Supreme Administrative Court indicated "automatically generated text".

**Czech Republic**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The use of writing assistance tools in courts depends on the type of agenda and the information system used. Some systems automatically generate documents based on templates, data, and selected procedural actions. Older systems use an external application called APSTR, which helps create documents but is only available for district courts.
Document templates are developed either by the Ministry of Justice or at the national level in cooperation with experts and court staff. These templates can be modified locally by individual courts or even by users, allowing for adjustments to specific court agendas. However, not all types of cases are covered by these templates. Additionally, speech-to-text tools are available for all courts.

**Denmark**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Civil: The system has a function that replaces a physical signature through an approval flow, but it is NOT a digital signature.

**Q062-24 (2024):** The Criminal and Probate Case Administration Program is aiming to support criminal and probate areas within the Danish courts. Within this program we have introduced the fine case system and the new criminal case system, where the judge approves electronically within the solution instead of signing printed paper.

**Estonia**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Dictation in Microsoft 365 is being used by some judges, and the option to use it is available to everyone.

**Finland**

**Q062-24 (2024):** Along with the introduction of the AIPA system in 2024, electronic signature has been possible also in criminal matters.

**France**

**Q062-24 (2024):** In civil matters, the courts have an electronic docket to record decisions signed electronically. In both civil and criminal matters, there is a quick word library: the OARM tool (Writing Assistance Tool for judges) was replaced in 2025 by the Lawrite solution, deployed nationwide by the PPN (available in the software center for all judicial service agents) and allowing the management of quick word libraries in all word processing software.
In both civil and criminal matters:
- The OpenText publishing solution automatically generates decision documents from templates that use data entered into business applications and allows for manual enrichment with the rationale for the decision (within the scope of the OpenText deployment).
- The Lawrite solution allows for the automatic integration of standard phrases or paragraphs (the judge's personal library) to speed up the entry of the decision's reasoning by reusing previous formulations.

**Germany**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The use of information technology in the courts is in the competency of the federal states and therefore not at all homogenous. The answers in this section reflect the answers as provided by of the majority of the federal states, eventhough there my be significant differences in some cases.

**Q062-24 (2024):** In all 16 federal states writing assistance tools include the functionality "templates". In the majority of the federal states (13 - 15), writing assistance tools include the functionalities automatically generated text speech to text and electronic signature.

**Hungary**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** In 2022, writing assistance tools were made available to all employees working within the entire court system. These were licensed tools that staff members tried and tested. Based on user feedback, it was determined by 2023 that, considering the specific characteristics of the Hungarian language and the legal terminology, these tools did not improve the efficiency of court work. Their language recognition functions were not easily scalable, and therefore, they were phased out. Simultaneously, we sought new solutions and acquired cloud-based tools that, although previously restricted by legal regulations, could now be developed and trained. These tools were fewer in number than in the past.

**Ireland**

**Q062-24 (2024):** Although there is no separate category for administrative cases in Ireland, we have given the same answers here as provided for civil cases.

**Latvia**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** In Latvian courts, writing and text processing support tools are used to ensure consistent document quality and to facilitate daily work. The central platform is the Court Information System, which serves as the main environment for preparing, storing, and managing judicial documents. It provides pre-defined templates, allows text formatting in line with regulatory requirements, and enables automated case registration, helping judges and staff maintain consistency in documentation.
An important element is the integration with the e-Case platform, which allows procedural documents to be submitted and received electronically, as well as the use of digital signatures, thereby reducing the circulation of paper documents. Writing support is also ensured by language and terminology tools – text editors with Latvian spell-check functionality and access to legal databases that help secure the accuracy of judgments and other procedural documents.
Since 2024, Latvian courts have been gradually testing speech recognition solutions that automatically convert hearing audio recordings into text. These tools are still in the testing phase, and human verification remains essential, but in the long run, they are expected to reduce manual transcription work and speed up the preparation of protocols. In addition, document generation tools are employed to quickly produce standard rulings, summons, or notifications, reducing repetitive drafting. Writing assistance also extends to secure electronic communication forms, ensuring that information provided to parties is clear, standardized, and in full compliance with procedural requirements. Together, these tools form a solid foundation for more efficient court operations and improved quality of judicial documentation.

**Lithuania**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The system contains many prepared Templates, that can be filled out by judges, assistant judges or secretaries (e.g. court summons, order on temporary protection measures and other forms).

**Luxembourg**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The existing tools are not automated and do not use any artificial intelligence assistance. They involve the use of Word templates for certain documents generated by business applications. These documents are automatically generated and pre-filled with metadata.
A POC was conducted to implement a tool to assist in drafting judgments, but it was not successful.
Other avenues are currently under analysis.

**Malta**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** In the current system, DigiCourts, the main writing assistance tools deployed are templates of standard documentation used by the court staff. Most of these templates reflect official court documents that are also annexed to the Code of Civil Procedure, Chp 12 of the Laws of Malta. The proposed new case management system will have enhanced writing assistance tools and will include the use of the electronic signature to facilitate the transition to a fully digitalised system.

**Netherlands**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Other functionalities: automatically fill in data from CMS, like names, dates and type of case. 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.

**Q062-24 (2024):** The electronic signature is a small pilot in administrative law for now.

**Poland**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** 1. All courts use document templates to prepare judgments, decisions, and orders. These are most often MS Word templates with macros allowing for the addition of case data, parties data, etc. from the case management system (SRB). Courts can use the centrally developed ZEUS tool (an advanced editor for court justifications). Selected courts also use local applications that enable voice-to-text conversion. In selected proceedings conducted in central systems supporting court proceedings, such as the National Debtors Register KRZ (bankruptcy and restructuring proceedings) and the Electronic Writ of Payment Proceedings EPU, documents related to a given stage of the proceedings are generated based on data collected in the system supporting that procedure.
2. Judges conducting proceedings in the KRZ and EPU systems use qualified electronic signatures to sign their decisions, and orders. Judges using the electronic transcript of a hearing sign it with a non-qualified electronic signature.

**Portugal**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Writing assistance tools are available across civil, administrative and criminal courts, and they provide a set of functionalities designed to support and streamline the drafting of judicial and administrative acts.
The main features include:
•Pre-defined templates: Users have access to a wide library of standardized templates for different procedural acts. The system guides the user to select the appropriate template based on their profile and the type of action to be performed, ensuring consistency across courts. In many cases, the user does not need to add any text and only needs to sign the document; however, they may still edit or adjust the content if desired.
•Automatically generated text: The courts' system provides automatic texts that users can use. These indicate the process, the intended recipient, and the action to be performed, and users may also add observations.
•Electronic signature: All documents drafted through these tools can be finalised and authenticated using a qualified electronic signature, ensuring legal validity.
Additional contextual notes:
•A language simplification initiative was implemented to make certain standard texts clearer and more accessible, particularly when addressing natural and legal persons.
•The system also provides spelling and text correction, as well as automatic text suggestions for routine formulations. Users may add specific remarks or tailor content when necessary, even within automatically generated acts.
Overall, these tools support efficiency, uniformity, and quality in the preparation of documents across all jurisdictions.

**Romania**

**Q062-24 (2024):** (See general comments)

**Slovenia**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** Automatically generated text: In civil (and commercial) litigious cases, as well as in non-litigious, administrative and criminal cases, only simple court writings are available as templates (i.e. notifications, summons). Automatically generated text: limited only to case metadata.

**Q062-24 (2024):** In 2024, speech-to-text system (TIPKO) has been implemented in all Slovenian courts. Administrative cases: electronic signature is possible, but is not used in practice as the Administrative court did not start with entirely electronic business yet. Criminal cases: In severe criminal cases, a possibility of electronic signature has been implemented in CMS in 2024. In misdemenour cases, the possibility of electronic signature is implemented and used regularly.

**Spain**

**Q062-24 (General Comment):** The processing of the Case Management System provides hundreds of thousands of models and paragraphs predesigned at each moment of processing to auto complete with the specific information for each procedure, facilitating the preparation of practically 100% of the resolutions and judicial documents.
Likewise, guided processing schemes are provided, which suggest the procedures that can follow the last one carried out, depending on the type of procedure.
Other special functionality: multiple processing (processing similar models of several procedures at the same time), special operations (notes on the deadline agenda at the end of certain documents, phase and status updating, guided processing schemes - processing models for each type of procedure), consultation/copy of texts of previous resolutions made.
It is applicable in every jurisdiction.

**Q062-24 (2024):** AI tools for transcription to plain language and easy reading

## Question 062-25

**Austria**

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** Administrative: Numbers are for the Federal Administrative Court only! The others do not have tools for recording hearings yet.

**Belgium**

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** In May 2024, a new JustCourt tool was launched, enabling virtual or hybrid hearings to be held in Belgian courts. This involves installing videoconferencing systems in the courtrooms. This new application is part of the FPS Justice's digitisation initiative, which aims to modernise and improve the judicial system for all litigants. The pilot phase is currently underway. In civil and criminal matters: prior to the deployment of JustCourt: - in criminal matters, use of videoconferencing for research and investigations.
- videoconferencing equipment was not available everywhere and systematically. Where necessary or appropriate, equipment could (also) be rented. Thanks to the new projects in this area, the availability of this equipment for the judiciary will be increased. In administrative matters - Council of State: the possibility exists in exceptional circumstances to hold a hearing by videoconference, but it is not foreseen to record it. It should be recalled that during the coronavirus crisis, a Royal Decree of Special Powers No. 12 (http://www.raadvstconsetat.be/?page=news&lang=fr&newsitem=592) enabled the Council of State to rule in writing and without a hearing, with the agreement of all the parties. In the same context, the Council of State was able to organise a number of remote hearings, virtually (via Skype or Teams), as part of the extreme emergency suspension procedure. This is still used on an ad hoc basis today, but to a very limited extent.

**Czech Republic**

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** Recording of court hearings has been compulsory in all matters in the form of audio or audiovisual recordings since 2009. While the implementation of recording systems progressed gradually in previous years due to hardware, software, and funding limitations, significant progress was made in 2023-2024. Several key digitalisation projects were completed, resulting in a substantial increase in coverage. Currently, approximately 95–100% of court hearings are recorded.

**Denmark**

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** Civil: Currently 287 courtrooms in 26 courts. Only used sporadically. Requires explicit acceptance from the parties involved.
Administrative: Not relevant in practice. Currently 287 courtrooms in 26 courts.
Criminal: Primary usage. Currently 287 courtrooms in 26 courts. Usage rate varies from Court to court and from judge to judge. Each judge decides whether to avail herself of the possibility or not on a hearing-to-hearing basis.
Authorized officially in Danish legislation.

**Finland**

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** In criminal and civil matters only the witness testimonial is recorded.

**Germany**

**Q062-25 (2024):** The majority of the federal states reported "NAP" on deployment and usage rate in civil, administrative and criminal cases. With regard to civil and administrative cases 1 federal state and with regard to criminal cases 2 federal states reported existing recording tools.
One federal state reported successful introduction of a pilot project regarding video interrogation of victim witnesses. This system prevents victims and perpetrators from encountering each other in court and allows statements to be transmitted directly to the courtroom and also recorded.

**Greece**

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** There are no witness testimony in administrative cases.

**Ireland**

**Q062-25 (2024):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases, as such, we have given the same answers here as provided for civil cases.

**Poland**

**Q062-25 (General Comment):** In civil proceedings, recording court sessions is generally obligatory and constitutes an electronic protocol. In criminal proceedings, recording court sessions is not obligatory; any recording is only an annex to the traditional protocol. The exceptions are misdemeanour hearings, where the recording is also an electronic protocol, but this is a small percentage of cases.

**Slovenia**

**Q062-25 (2024):** Usage rate: the option to record hearings is widely used. However, there is no data collected on actual usage, therefore the above answer is only an estimation.

### Question 062-26

**Austria**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In recent years, the rate at which recording solutions have been deployed has steadily increased, and these systems are now implemented throughout the entire judicial system. Consequently, there are very few areas remaining where such solutions are not utilised—provided their application is considered appropriate. Notably, in criminal cases, audiovisual recordings of hearings are primarily employed, whereas in civil and administrative proceedings, dictation devices are predominantly used. These devices enable decision-making bodies to summarise and record the session in a concise protocol.

Description for the ordinary courts and the Federal Administrative Court:
Each court is equipped with a video recording system; additionally, decision-making bodies and court clerks may use mobile audio recording devices to document court proceedings. Audio and video files may be electronically entered into the case file and transmitted electronically to the parties. The automatic transcription of audio tracks using AI (including time stamps, speaker identification, etc.) is currently under evaluation. The decision whether to produce a summary protocol or a verbatim transcript lies with the decision-making body.

**Belgium**

**Q062-26 (2024):** The possibility of audio or audiovisual recording is enshrined in Article 759/2 of the Judicial Code, which states that "The court before which the public hearing is taking place may decide, on an exceptional basis, to record that public hearing where such audio or audiovisual recording is of interest for the creation of historical archives of the justice system or for educational purposes with a view to imparting knowledge in the field of law or the functioning of the justice system, with the consent of the persons whose voices and images are recorded, each for their own part. This consent may be withdrawn at any time during the hearing. (...)" (provision introduced by a law of April 25, 2024).

**Croatia**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** The implementation of the Audio Recording and Transcription System for court hearings is currently underway. The contract with the Contractor was signed on March 28, 2025. The deadline for the completion of the procurement is 18 months from the date of contract signing.
At the moment, work is being carried out on establishing a central software solution for the integration of all courts into a unified system for monitoring and managing a shared repository of all recordings, as well as a central software solution for the automated transcription of recordings stored in the central shared repository. After completion implementation will proceed in individual courtrooms (a total of 1,317 courtrooms).

**Czech Republic**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In this cycle, we have selected "Automatically indexed recording" due to the integration of the courtroom recording system with the Beey transcription tool. This integration enables automatic timestamping and structured linking of audio segments to specific parts of the hearing, improving navigation and usability of the recordings.

**Q062-26 (2024):** Echo-cancellation technology has been implemented in courtrooms to improve the quality of audio recordings. The system identifies and suppresses audio feedback (echo), which is particularly important during videoconferencing. The first devices were deployed in 2024, and as of September 2025, a total of 154 units have been installed, with further expansion planned depending on available funding.

**Denmark**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** It is possible to request a copy, just not possible for the average citizen. Other special functionality: playback during court proceedings for jurors. Automatic transcript from re-cording is planned in the future when quality i reliable (currently done by court clerks on ad hoc basis).

**Estonia**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** If there is a virtual hearing, then it's possible to record video as well.

**Finland**

**Q062-26 (2024):** In 2026, new legislation will enter into force, after which a video and audio recording will be made of evidence taken in district courts instead of the previous audio recording.

**France**

**Q062-26 (2024):**
Whether civil, criminal, economic, or administrative, court hearings can now be recorded or filmed for reasons of public interest, for educational, informational, cultural, or scientific purposes. Article 38 quater of the law of July 29, 1881, on the freedom of the press sets the legal framework for the recording and broadcasting of hearings and was supplemented by Decree No. 2022-462 of March 31, 2022. This legal framework only allows same-day broadcasting of hearings before the Council of State and the Court of Cassation. Within this framework, in 2024, the latter recorded and broadcast seven hearings of its solemn formations (Plenary Assembly and mixed chambers) on the same day, held in both civil and criminal matters.

**Germany**

**Q062-26 (2024):** The majority of the federal states reported "NAP". Functionalities of recording tools were reported by 1 federal state for administrative and civil cases and two federal states for criminal cases.

**Greece**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In civil and criminal hearings, the recordings are systematic by default. However, the president of the court and/or the presiding judge has discretionary power to decide not to record a hearing.

**Hungary**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** A ViaVideo system has been implemented nationwide. Every police station has at least one room equipped with it, every penitentiary institution has several rooms, and every court in the country has at least one courtroom — in some cases more — equipped with the system. It transmits both audio and video simultaneously and is also capable of recording hearings. The recorded material is saved in a format suitable for use by the court. The system also allows other participants — for instance, the prosecutor, defence counsel, expert witness, or a party/defendant/witness— to join the hearing via a link sent by e-mail. If the judge uses this system to make a continuous audio and video recording of the hearing, the recording itself constitutes the official record (minutes). In such cases, a written summary must be prepared from the recording. This summary contains only technical information — such as who appears on the recording and during which time interval, and what procedural act took place — but not the substantive content of those acts.

**Ireland**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** Court hearings are recorded by use of DAR (Digital Audio Recordings). Audio recordings are made for internal court purposes and are under the control of the court. They are not generally available to parties or to the public, unless ordered by the Court although applications can be made to the court for a transcript of the recording, or part thereof for a fee. For example, this might arise if court proceedings are subject to a Judicial Review in a higher court.

**Q062-26 (2024):** Ireland does not have a separate category for Administrative Law cases, as such, we have given the same answers here as provided for civil cases.

**Latvia**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In all cases the audio protocol is mandatory according to the legal acts. There are used also TIX or AVR tool, in which the most important places in the audio protocol are tagged. The audio protocol is developed in pdf format or mp4.

**Q062-26 (2024):** Transcription tool in development.
All recordings are available in E-Case platform for both parties.

**Lithuania**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In criminal cases, interviews of minors are videotaped.

**Q062-26 (2024):** see general comment

**Malta**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In terms of 'automatically indexed recording', the recordings made during the sittings are automatically organised by sitting, which simplifies storage and retrieval in a specific order. The Court Services Agency have also implemented an advanced audio-digital system that will enable the judiciary and court officials to record hearings seamlessly, securely store and organise files, and quickly retrieve and manage recordings. This makes the audio-visual recordings more efficient, reliable and transparent in the handling of the judicial proceedings.

**Netherlands**

**Q062-26 (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/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.

**Q062-26 (2024):** There are no tools, except local recorders. Usage is less than 10%. This is applicable for civil, administrative and criminal cases.

**Poland**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In criminal proceedings, recording court sessions is not obligatory; any recording is only an annex to the traditional protocol. The exceptions are misdemeanour hearings, where the recording is also an electronic protocol, but this is a small percentage of cases. Automatic transcription of the recording is generated using automatic speech recognition technology. The automatically prepared transcript is then subject to human review.

**Portugal**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In our courts, audio recording is available, providing an official and reliable record of proceedings when applied.
The system also enables the following functionalities:
•Audio streaming of hearings: users may access recordings through their interface, either upon request or by action of the judicial secretariat.
•Real-time streaming: Authorized users can listen to ongoing hearings live, via the case interface.
•Remote participation: Multiple users can join a hearing simultaneously from different locations across the country or abroad, as if physically present in the courtroom.
Access is strictly controlled, and these functionalities are used only by authorized judicial actors, in accordance with applicable procedural rules.

**Q062-26 (2024):** Audio streaming of recordings of proceedings and hearings for forensic prosecutors, on their interface, upon request and/or by action of the judicial secretariat.

**Romania**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In Romania’s judicial system, the integrated solution OPTIMUS has been implemented. Developed in-house, it manages audio recordings and automatic voice-to-text transcription. It is “cloud ready” and uses machine learning algorithms to identify speakers. The solution underwent a successful technological pilot that evaluated its performance in challenging acoustic environments. The project is continuing with integration into the national case management system, ECRIS V, as part of the PNRR investment titled “Development of integrated audio recording systems in courtrooms and automatic transcription components.”
1. Technical Clarifications Regarding Automatic Indexing
Automatic indexing of recordings is achieved through speaker change detection and automatic segmentation of the audio stream (diarization). Machine learning algorithms identify transitions between speakers and automatically mark key moments in the recording, generating time markers used for both audio navigation and alignment of sound segments with the transcribed text.
2. General Context Regarding Courtroom Session Recording
Audio recording of courtroom sessions is a standard component of judicial activity. The OPTIMUS solution streamlines the transcription process and helps reduce drafting time. The implementation uses dedicated equipment for audio capture, separate from general sound systems. Nationally, the project aims to acquire the necessary IT infrastructure and equip over 1,000 courtrooms with specific devices, with data processing and integration to be carried out through the centralized infrastructure of ECRIS V.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** In 2015, courtrooms were equipped with recording technology. These recordings are part of the electronic court file. The application "Audiorecording" is used to process multimedia recordings created during hearings in individual courtrooms. The Audio Recordings Client application (formerly MonoReCourt) is used for processing multimedia recordings produced during hearings in individual courtrooms.

**Slovenia**

**Q062-26 (General Comment):** Systematic recording for all hearings: the decision to record or not is in the hands of an individual judge.
Possibility to request a copy of the recording: a party has a right to acces the recording, as well as to object the authenticity of the transcript.

**Q062-26 (2024):** Voice recording: available in all courtrooms. A new system for the central collection of recordings (ASOD II), which enables secure remote access to recordings and provides interoperability with the newly implemented speech-to-text system (TIPKO), is currently being implemented. By the end of 2024, 19 of approximately 350 hearing rooms had been equipped to support this functionality.

**Spain**

**Q062-26 (2024):** Textualized recordings allow the user to search the textualized text by keywords or interveners. All recordings are electronically signed by the Letrado de la Administración de Justicia (responsible for the judicial office) and can be visualized through the electronic judicial file.

# Indicator 7: Professionals of justice

- Professional Judges and Non-judge staff

- Public prosecutors and Non-prosecutor staff

- Court presidents and Heads of prosecution services

- Salaries of judges and public prosecutors

- Lawyers

- EC Templates

# Professional judges and non-judge staff

## Table 7.1.1 Total number of professional judges, non-professional judges and judges working on ocasional basis in 2024
## Absolute number (Q46, Q48, Q48-1,Q49 and Q49-1)

| States | Total number of professional judges | Professional judges sitting in courts on an occasional basis | | | Non-professional judges | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Work without professional judge for the certain types of cases | | | | | | | |
| | | Gross figure | Full time equivalent | Deal with a significant part of cases | Gross figure | Full time equivalent | Criminal cases (severe) | Criminal cases (misdemeanour and/or minor) | Family law cases | Labour law cases | Social law cases | Commercial law cases | Insolvency cases | Other civil cases |
| **Austria** | 2 670 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Belgium** | 1 765 | 149 | NA | No | 3 868 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Bulgaria** | 2 280 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 465 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Croatia** | 1 630 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Cyprus** | 160 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Czech Republic** | 3 049 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 4 786 | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Denmark** | 403 | NA | NA | No | 15 000 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Estonia** | 249 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 502 | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Finland** | 1 213 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 303 | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **France** | 7 968 | 445 | NA | No | 22 836 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Germany** | 20 803 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 108 355 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Greece** | 4 615 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Hungary** | 2 651 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Ireland** | 195 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Italy** | 7 188 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 3 174 | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Latvia** | 512 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Lithuania** | 713 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Luxembourg** | 248 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 30 | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Malta** | 54 | 29 | NAP | Yes | NAP | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Netherlands** | 2 741 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Poland** | 10 617 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 6 075 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Portugal** | 2 086 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Romania** | 4 457 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | | | | | | | |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1 423 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Slovenia** | 839 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 2 141 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Spain** | 5 431 | 944 | NA | Yes | 7 700 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Sweden** | 1 294 | 153 | 44 | No | 9 035 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Number of Yes** | | | | 2 | | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| **Average** | 3 232 | 344 | NA | | 13 305 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Median** | 1 765 | 153 | NA | | 4 327 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Minimum** | 54 | 29 | NA | | 30 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **Maximum** | 20 803 | 944 | NA | | 108 355 | NA | | | | | | | | |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 4% | 15% | 0% | 15% | 48% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 78% | 81% | 78% | 33% | 52% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% |

Legend

Yes

No/NAP

## Table 7.1.2 Evolution of the total number of professional judges from 2014 to 2024
## Absolute number (Q46)

| States | Total number of professional judges | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | 1 620 | 1 621 | 2 397 | 2 478 | 2 411 | 2 625 | 2 589 | 2 387 | 2 677 | 2 614 | 2 670 |
| **Belgium** | 1 602 | 1 614 | 1 600 | 1 566 | 1 523 | 1 526 | 1 524 | 1 669 | 1 684 | 1 805 | 1 765 |
| **Bulgaria** | 2 220 | 2 225 | 2 255 | 2 235 | 2 223 | 2 215 | 2 184 | 2 192 | 2 188 | 2 234 | 2 280 |
| **Croatia** | 1 875 | 1 864 | 1 797 | 1 775 | 1 660 | 1 682 | 1 643 | 1 643 | 1 631 | 1 629 | 1 630 |
| **Cyprus** | 97 | 113 | 111 | 119 | 118 | 115 | 126 | 129 | 143 | 154 | 160 |
| **Czech Republic** | 3 028 | 3 018 | 3 005 | 3 012 | 3 029 | 3 006 | 3 007 | 2 990 | 3 057 | 3 001 | 3 049 |
| **Denmark** | 377 | 374 | 372 | 377 | 375 | 375 | 388 | 388 | 385 | 389 | 403 |
| **Estonia** | 231 | 234 | 232 | 227 | 233 | 229 | 234 | 236 | 237 | 246 | 249 |
| **Finland** | 988 | 991 | 1 068 | 1 045 | 1 081 | 1 087 | 1 077 | 1 158 | 1 148 | 1 180 | 1 213 |
| **France** | 6 935 | 6 967 | 6 995 | 7 066 | 7 277 | 7 427 | 7 522 | 7 574 | 7 690 | 7 573 | 7 968 |
| **Germany** | 19 323 | 19 282 | 19 867 | 20 069 | 20 323 | 20 570 | 20 793 | 20 998 | 20 863 | 21 054 | 20 803 |
| **Greece** | 2 231 | 2 206 | 2 780 | 2 861 | 2 874 | 2 884 | 3 861 | 4 018 | 3 981 | 4 012 | 4 615 |
| **Hungary** | 2 813 | 2 813 | 2 811 | 2 828 | 2 892 | 2 878 | 2 789 | 2 710 | 2 660 | 2 657 | 2 651 |
| **Ireland** | 160 | 159 | 162 | 160 | 160 | 167 | 163 | 170 | 171 | 196 | 195 |
| **Italy** | 6 939 | 6 590 | 6 395 | 6 508 | 7 015 | 7 127 | 7 027 | 7 154 | 7 166 | 7 198 | 7 188 |
| **Latvia** | 488 | 493 | 503 | 490 | NA | 521 | 550 | 545 | 533 | 527 | 512 |
| **Lithuania** | 754 | 762 | 778 | 767 | 758 | 750 | 740 | 718 | 746 | 689 | 713 |
| **Luxembourg** | 184 | 183 | 187 | 198 | 222 | 226 | 229 | 230 | 232 | 238 | 248 |
| **Malta** | 41 | 42 | 45 | 43 | 45 | 43 | 42 | 47 | 47 | 51 | 54 |
| **Netherlands** | 2 359 | 2 357 | 2 331 | 2 538 | 2 522 | 2 523 | 2 597 | 2 644 | 2 671 | 2 695 | 2 741 |
| **Poland** | 10 096 | - | 9 980 | 10 047 | 9 776 | 9 736 | 9 650 | 9 815 | 10 560 | 10 553 | 10 617 |
| **Portugal** | 1 990 | 1 990 | 1 986 | 2 059 | 1 979 | 1 999 | 1 999 | 2 021 | 2 043 | 2 087 | 2 086 |
| **Romania** | 4 577 | 4 608 | 4 628 | 4 664 | 4 677 | 4 753 | 4 600 | 4 590 | 4 367 | 4 091 | 4 457 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1 322 | 1 292 | 1 311 | 1 376 | 1 378 | 1 370 | 1 306 | 1 386 | 1 397 | 1 455 | 1 423 |
| **Slovenia** | 924 | 897 | 880 | 859 | 867 | 873 | 875 | 860 | 862 | 845 | 839 |
| **Spain** | 5 353 | 5 367 | 5 367 | 5 377 | 5 419 | 5 341 | 5 320 | 5 408 | 5 728 | 5 416 | 5 431 |
| **Sweden** | 1 150 | 1 159 | 1 179 | 1 199 | 1 217 | 1 184 | 1 200 | 1 240 | 1 229 | 1 248 | 1 294 |
| **Average** | 2 951 | 2 662 | 3 001 | 3 035 | 3 156 | 3 083 | 3 112 | 3 145 | 3 189 | 3 179 | 3 232 |
| **Median** | 1 620 | 1 618 | 1 797 | 1 775 | 1 820 | 1 682 | 1 643 | 1 669 | 1 684 | 1 805 | 1 765 |
| **Minimum** | 41 | 42 | 45 | 43 | 45 | 43 | 42 | 47 | 47 | 51 | 54 |
| **Maximum** | 19 323 | 19 282 | 19 867 | 20 069 | 20 323 | 20 570 | 20 793 | 20 998 | 20 863 | 21 054 | 20 803 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Austria:** The administrative courts were established in January 2014. Data on administrative justice was introduced for the 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 7.1.2a Evolution of the total number of professional judges from 2014 to 2024 and their variations
## Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q46)

| States | Total number of professional judges per 100 000 inhabitants | | | | | | | | | | | Variation of the number of professional judges | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2014-2024 | 2023-2024 |
| Austria | 18,9 | 18,6 | 27,4 | 28,2 | 27,3 | 29,5 | 29,0 | 26,6 | 29,4 | 28,5 | 29,0 | 53,8% | 1,7% |
| Belgium | 14,3 | 14,3 | 14,1 | 13,8 | 13,3 | 13,3 | 13,2 | 14,4 | 14,4 | 15,3 | 14,9 | 4,4% | -2,7% |
| Bulgaria | 30,8 | 31,1 | 31,8 | 31,7 | 31,8 | 31,9 | 31,6 | 32,1 | 33,9 | 34,7 | 35,4 | 14,9% | 2,2% |
| Croatia | 44,4 | 44,5 | 43,3 | 43,2 | 40,7 | 41,4 | 40,7 | 42,4 | 42,4 | 42,3 | 42,2 | -5,0% | -0,3% |
| Cyprus | 11,3 | 13,3 | 13,1 | 13,9 | 13,5 | 13,0 | 14,1 | 14,3 | 15,5 | 16,5 | 16,6 | 46,4% | 0,4% |
| Czech Republic | 28,8 | 28,6 | 28,4 | 28,4 | 28,4 | 28,2 | 28,1 | 28,4 | 28,2 | 27,5 | 27,9 | -2,9% | 1,5% |
| Denmark | 6,7 | 6,6 | 6,5 | 6,5 | 6,5 | 6,4 | 6,6 | 6,6 | 6,5 | 6,6 | 6,7 | 1,0% | 2,6% |
| Estonia | 17,6 | 17,8 | 17,6 | 17,3 | 17,7 | 17,3 | 17,6 | 17,7 | 17,8 | 18,0 | 18,1 | 3,0% | 0,6% |
| Finland | 18,1 | 18,1 | 19,4 | 19,0 | 19,6 | 19,7 | 19,5 | 20,9 | 20,6 | 21,0 | 21,5 | 19,2% | 2,4% |
| France | 10,5 | 10,5 | 10,4 | 10,5 | 10,9 | 11,1 | 11,2 | 11,2 | 11,3 | 11,1 | 11,6 | 11,1% | 4,9% |
| Germany | 23,9 | 23,6 | 24,2 | 24,3 | 24,5 | 24,7 | 25,0 | 25,2 | 24,7 | 24,9 | 24,9 | 4,1% | 0,1% |
| Greece | 20,6 | 20,3 | 25,8 | 26,6 | 26,8 | 26,9 | 36,0 | 37,6 | 37,3 | 38,5 | 44,4 | 115,7% | 15,2% |
| Hungary | 28,5 | 28,6 | 28,7 | 28,6 | 30,2 | 29,5 | 28,2 | 28,0 | 27,7 | 27,7 | 27,8 | -2,6% | 0,2% |
| Ireland | 3,5 | 3,4 | 3,5 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,4 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,7 | 3,6 | 3,6% | -2,3% |
| Italy | 11,4 | 10,9 | 10,6 | 10,8 | 11,6 | 11,8 | 11,9 | 12,1 | 12,1 | 12,2 | 12,2 | 6,9% | -0,1% |
| Latvia | 24,4 | 25,0 | 25,5 | 25,1 | NA | 27,3 | 29,1 | 29,1 | 28,3 | 28,2 | 27,6 | 13,1% | -2,1% |
| Lithuania | 25,8 | 26,4 | 27,3 | 27,3 | 27,1 | 26,8 | 26,5 | 25,6 | 26,1 | 23,9 | 24,7 | -4,4% | 3,3% |
| Luxembourg | 32,7 | 32,5 | 31,7 | 32,9 | 36,2 | 36,1 | 36,1 | 35,6 | 35,1 | 35,4 | 36,4 | 11,3% | 2,7% |
| Malta | 9,3 | 9,3 | 9,8 | 9,0 | 9,5 | 8,7 | 8,2 | 9,1 | 9,0 | 9,1 | 9,4 | 0,8% | 3,9% |
| Netherlands | 14,0 | 13,9 | 13,6 | 14,8 | 14,6 | 14,5 | 14,9 | 15,1 | 15,0 | 15,0 | 15,2 | 8,8% | 1,1% |
| Poland | 26,2 | - | 26,0 | 26,1 | 25,5 | 25,3 | 25,2 | 25,8 | 28,0 | 28,0 | 28,3 | 7,8% | 0,8% |
| Portugal | 19,2 | 19,2 | 19,3 | 20,0 | 19,3 | 19,4 | 19,4 | 19,5 | 19,5 | 19,6 | 19,4 | 1,2% | -1,1% |
| Romania | 20,5 | 23,3 | 23,6 | 23,9 | 24,1 | 24,5 | 24,0 | 24,1 | 22,9 | 21,5 | 23,4 | 14,0% | 9,1% |
| Slovak Republic | 24,4 | 23,8 | 24,1 | 25,3 | 25,3 | 25,1 | 23,9 | 25,5 | 25,7 | 26,8 | 26,3 | 7,7% | -2,1% |
| Slovenia | 44,8 | 43,5 | 42,6 | 41,6 | 41,7 | 41,7 | 41,5 | 40,8 | 40,7 | 39,8 | 39,4 | -12,2% | -1,0% |
| Spain | 11,5 | 11,6 | 11,5 | 11,5 | 11,5 | 11,3 | 11,2 | 11,4 | 11,9 | 11,1 | 11,1 | -4,0% | -0,7% |
| Sweden | 11,8 | 11,8 | 11,8 | 11,8 | 11,9 | 11,5 | 11,6 | 11,9 | 11,7 | 11,8 | 12,2 | 3,6% | 3,3% |
| Average | 21 | 20,4 | 21 | 21,3 | 21 | 21,5 | 22 | 22,0 | 22 | 22,2 | 22,6 | 0,1 | 0,0 |
| Median | 19 | 18,9 | 24 | 23,9 | 22 | 24,5 | 24 | 24,1 | 23 | 21,5 | 23,4 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| Minimum | 3 | 3,4 | 3 | 3,3 | 3 | 3,4 | 3 | 3,3 | 3 | 3,7 | 3,6 | -0,1 | 0,0 |
| Maximum | 45 | 44,5 | 43 | 43,2 | 42 | 41,7 | 41 | 42,4 | 42 | 42,3 | 44,4 | 1,2 | 0,2 |
| % of NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Austria:** The administrative courts were established in January 2014. Data on administrative justice was introduced for the 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 2014, 2023 and 2024 and their variations
## Absolute number (Q46)

| States | Total Professional judges by instance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | | | | 2023 | | | | 2024 | | | | Variations 2014-2024 | | | | Variations 2023-2024 | | | |
| | 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** | 1 620 | 1 224 | 330 | 66 | 2 614 | 2 177 | 303 | 134 | 2 670 | 2 232 | 303 | 135 | 64,8% | 82,4% | -8,2% | 104,5% | 2,1% | 2,5% | 0,0% | 0,7% |
| **Belgium** | 1 602 | 1 271 | 302 | 29 | 1 805 | 1 467 | 308 | 30 | 1 765 | 1 380 | 317 | 68 | 10,2% | 8,6% | 5,0% | 134,5% | -2,2% | -5,9% | 2,9% | 126,7% |
| **Bulgaria** | 2 220 | 1 753 | 277 | 190 | 2 234 | 1 282 | 780 | 172 | 2 280 | 1 297 | 786 | 197 | 2,7% | -26,0% | 183,8% | 3,7% | 2,1% | 1,2% | 0,8% | 14,5% |
| **Croatia** | 1 875 | 1 343 | 489 | 43 | 1 629 | 1 144 | 454 | 31 | 1 630 | 1 144 | 455 | 31 | -13,1% | -14,8% | -7,0% | -27,9% | 0,1% | 0,0% | 0,2% | 0,0% |
| **Cyprus** | 97 | 84 | NAP | 13 | 154 | 122 | 16 | 16 | 160 | 130 | 14 | 16 | 64,9% | 54,8% | NAP | 23,1% | 3,9% | 6,6% | -12,5% | 0,0% |
| **Czech Republic** | 3 028 | 1 838 | 1 090 | 100 | 3 001 | 1 841 | 1 056 | 104 | 3 049 | 1 898 | 1 044 | 107 | 0,7% | 3,3% | -4,2% | 7,0% | 1,6% | 3,1% | -1,1% | 2,9% |
| **Denmark** | 377 | 261 | 97 | 19 | 389 | 272 | 98 | 19 | 403 | 285 | 100 | 18 | 6,9% | 9,2% | 3,1% | -5,3% | 3,6% | 4,8% | 2,0% | -5,3% |
| **Estonia** | 231 | 169 | 44 | 18 | 246 | 183 | 44 | 19 | 249 | 184 | 46 | 19 | 7,8% | 8,9% | 4,5% | 5,6% | 1,2% | 0,5% | 4,5% | 0,0% |
| **Finland** | 988 | 758 | 186 | 44 | 1 180 | 923 | 213 | 44 | 1 213 | 941 | 231 | 41 | 22,8% | 24,1% | 24,2% | -6,8% | 2,8% | 2,0% | 8,5% | -6,8% |
| **France** | 6 935 | 4 876 | 1 706 | 353 | 7 573 | 5 386 | 1 835 | 352 | 7 968 | 5 683 | 1 920 | 365 | 14,9% | 16,6% | 12,5% | 3,4% | 5,2% | 5,5% | 4,6% | 3,7% |
| **Germany** | 19 323 | 14 840 | 4 024 | 459 | 21 054 | 16 329 | 4 263 | 462 | 20 803 | 16 102 | 4 239 | 462 | 7,7% | 8,5% | 5,3% | 0,7% | -1,2% | -1,4% | -0,6% | 0,0% |
| **Greece** | 2 231 | 1 540 | 459 | 232 | 4 012 | 2 650 | 943 | 419 | 4 615 | 3 255 | 941 | 419 | 106,9% | 111,4% | 105,0% | 80,6% | 15,0% | 22,8% | -0,2% | 0,0% |
| **Hungary** | 2 813 | 1 684 | 1 047 | 82 | 2 657 | 1 287 | 1 277 | 93 | 2 651 | 1 272 | 1 291 | 88 | -5,8% | -24,5% | 23,3% | 7,3% | -0,2% | -1,2% | 1,1% | -5,4% |
| **Ireland** | 160 | 140 | 10 | 10 | 196 | 168 | 18 | 10 | 195 | 167 | 19 | 9 | 21,9% | 19,3% | 90,0% | -10,0% | -0,5% | -0,6% | 5,6% | -10,0% |
| **Italy** | 6 939 | 5 404 | 1 195 | 340 | 7 198 | 5 528 | 1 161 | 509 | 7 188 | 5 502 | 1 151 | 535 | 3,6% | 1,8% | -3,7% | 57,4% | -0,1% | -0,5% | -0,9% | 5,1% |
| **Latvia** | 488 | 307 | 134 | 47 | 527 | 364 | 128 | 35 | 512 | 348 | 129 | 35 | 4,9% | 13,4% | -3,7% | -25,5% | -2,8% | -4,4% | 0,8% | 0,0% |
| **Lithuania** | 754 | 671 | 49 | 34 | 689 | 610 | 50 | 29 | 713 | 630 | 54 | 29 | -5,4% | -6,1% | 10,2% | -14,7% | 3,5% | 3,3% | 8,0% | 0,0% |
| **Luxembourg** | 184 | 143 | 37 | 4 | 238 | 176 | 56 | 6 | 248 | 190 | 52 | 6 | 34,8% | 32,9% | 40,5% | 50,0% | 4,2% | 8,0% | -7,1% | 0,0% |
| **Malta** | 41 | 33 | 8 | NAP | 51 | 41 | 10 | NAP | 54 | 43 | 11 | NAP | 31,7% | 30,3% | 37,5% | NAP | 5,9% | 4,9% | 10,0% | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 2 359 | 1 829 | 530 | NA | 2 695 | 1 944 | 717 | 34 | 2 741 | 1 982 | 724 | 35 | 16,2% | 8,4% | 36,6% | NA | 1,7% | 2,0% | 1,0% | 2,9% |
| **Poland** | 10 096 | 9 516 | 494 | 86 | 10 553 | 9 866 | 484 | 203 | 10 617 | 9 915 | 492 | 210 | 5,2% | 4,2% | -0,4% | 144,2% | 0,6% | 0,5% | 1,7% | 3,4% |
| **Portugal** | 1 990 | 1 478 | 430 | 82 | 2 087 | 1 542 | 456 | 89 | 2 086 | 1 530 | 465 | 91 | 4,8% | 3,5% | 8,1% | 11,0% | 0,0% | -0,8% | 2,0% | 2,2% |
| **Romania** | 4 577 | 2 101 | 2 360 | 116 | 4 091 | 1 739 | 2 245 | 107 | 4 457 | 2 139 | 2 217 | 101 | -2,6% | 1,8% | -6,1% | -12,9% | 8,9% | 23,0% | -1,2% | -5,6% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1 322 | 877 | 369 | 76 | 1 455 | 952 | 424 | 79 | 1 423 | 947 | 395 | 81 | 7,6% | 8,0% | 7,0% | 6,6% | -2,2% | -0,5% | -6,8% | 2,5% |
| **Slovenia** | 924 | 724 | 171 | 29 | 845 | 692 | 124 | 29 | 839 | 692 | 120 | 27 | -9,2% | -4,4% | -29,8% | -6,9% | -0,7% | 0,0% | -3,2% | -6,9% |
| **Spain** | 5 353 | 3 855 | 1 416 | 82 | 5 416 | 3 829 | 1 530 | 57 | 5 431 | 3 827 | 1 553 | 51 | 1,5% | -0,7% | 9,7% | -37,8% | 0,3% | -0,1% | 1,5% | -10,5% |
| **Sweden** | 1 150 | 771 | 343 | 36 | 1 248 | 820 | 396 | 32 | 1 294 | 852 | 409 | 33 | 12,5% | 10,5% | 19,2% | -8,3% | 3,7% | 3,9% | 3,3% | 3,1% |
| **Average** | 2 951 | 2 203 | 677 | 104 | 3 179 | 2 346 | 718 | 120 | 3 232 | 2 391 | 721 | 123 | 15,5% | 14,3% | 21,6% | 19,3% | 2,1% | 2,9% | 0,9% | 4,5% |
| **Median** | 1 620 | 1 271 | 356 | 66 | 1 805 | 1 282 | 424 | 51 | 1 765 | 1 272 | 409 | 60 | 7,6% | 8,5% | 7,6% | 3,7% | 1,6% | 1,2% | 1,0% | 0,0% |
| **Minimum** | 41 | 33 | 8 | 4 | 51 | 41 | 10 | 6 | 54 | 43 | 11 | 6 | -13,1% | -26,0% | -29,8% | -37,8% | -2,8% | -5,9% | -12,5% | -10,5% |
| **Maximum** | 19 323 | 14 840 | 4 024 | 459 | 21 054 | 16 329 | 4 263 | 509 | 20 803 | 16 102 | 4 239 | 535 | 106,9% | 111,4% | 183,8% | 144,2% | 15,0% | 23,0% | 10,0% | 126,7% |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |

**Austria:** The administrative courts were established in January 2014. Data on administrative justice was introduced for the 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:** Starting from 2020, judges who administer justice 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.

**Romania**: The judicial system has four levels of courts. Second-instance figures include judges from tribunals and courts of appeal. Differences between first and second-instance numbers result from changes in calculation methods.

## Table 7.1.3a Total number of professional judges by instance in 2014, 2023 and 2024
## Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q46)

| States | Professional judges by instance per 100 000 inhabitants | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | | | | 2023 | | | | 2024 | | | |
| | Total | 1st instance | 2nd instance | Supreme court | Total | 1st instance | 2nd instance | Supreme court | Total | 1st instance | 2nd instance | Supreme court |
| **Austria** | 18,9 | 14,3 | 3,8 | 0,8 | 28,5 | 23,8 | 3,3 | 1,5 | 29,0 | 24,3 | 3,3 | 1,5 |
| **Belgium** | 14,3 | 11,3 | 2,7 | 0,3 | 15,3 | 12,5 | 2,6 | 0,3 | 14,9 | 11,7 | 2,7 | 0,6 |
| **Bulgaria** | 30,8 | 24,3 | 3,8 | 2,6 | 34,7 | 19,9 | 12,1 | 2,7 | 35,4 | 20,1 | 12,2 | 3,1 |
| **Croatia** | 44,4 | 31,8 | 11,6 | 1,0 | 42,3 | 29,7 | 11,8 | 0,8 | 42,2 | 29,6 | 11,8 | 0,8 |
| **Cyprus** | 11,3 | 9,8 | NAP | 1,5 | 16,5 | 13,1 | 1,7 | 1,7 | 16,6 | 13,5 | 1,4 | 1,7 |
| **Czech Republic** | 28,8 | 17,5 | 10,4 | 1,0 | 27,5 | 16,9 | 9,7 | 1,0 | 27,9 | 17,4 | 9,6 | 1,0 |
| **Denmark** | 6,7 | 4,6 | 1,7 | 0,3 | 6,6 | 4,6 | 1,7 | 0,3 | 6,7 | 4,8 | 1,7 | 0,3 |
| **Estonia** | 17,6 | 12,9 | 3,4 | 1,4 | 18,0 | 13,4 | 3,2 | 1,4 | 18,1 | 13,4 | 3,3 | 1,4 |
| **Finland** | 18,1 | 13,9 | 3,4 | 0,8 | 21,0 | 16,4 | 3,8 | 0,8 | 21,5 | 16,7 | 4,1 | 0,7 |
| **France** | 10,5 | 7,4 | 2,6 | 0,5 | 11,1 | 7,9 | 2,7 | 0,5 | 11,6 | 8,3 | 2,8 | 0,5 |
| **Germany** | 23,9 | 18,4 | 5,0 | 0,6 | 24,9 | 19,3 | 5,0 | 0,5 | 24,9 | 19,3 | 5,1 | 0,6 |
| **Greece** | 20,6 | 14,2 | 4,2 | 2,1 | 38,5 | 25,4 | 9,1 | 4,0 | 44,4 | 31,3 | 9,0 | 4,0 |
| **Hungary** | 28,5 | 17,1 | 10,6 | 0,8 | 27,7 | 13,4 | 13,3 | 1,0 | 27,8 | 13,3 | 13,5 | 0,9 |
| **Ireland** | 3,5 | 3,0 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 3,7 | 3,1 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 3,6 | 3,1 | 0,3 | 0,2 |
| **Italy** | 11,4 | 8,9 | 2,0 | 0,6 | 12,2 | 9,4 | 2,0 | 0,9 | 12,2 | 9,3 | 2,0 | 0,9 |
| **Latvia** | 24,4 | 15,3 | 6,7 | 2,3 | 28,2 | 19,4 | 6,8 | 1,9 | 27,6 | 18,7 | 6,9 | 1,9 |
| **Lithuania** | 25,8 | 23,0 | 1,7 | 1,2 | 23,9 | 21,1 | 1,7 | 1,0 | 24,7 | 21,8 | 1,9 | 1,0 |
| **Luxembourg** | 32,7 | 25,4 | 6,6 | 0,7 | 35,4 | 26,2 | 8,3 | 0,9 | 36,4 | 27,9 | 7,6 | 0,9 |
| **Malta** | 9,3 | 7,5 | 1,8 | NAP | 9,1 | 7,3 | 1,8 | NAP | 9,4 | 7,5 | 1,9 | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 14,0 | 10,8 | 3,1 | NA | 15,0 | 10,8 | 4,0 | 0,2 | 15,2 | 11,0 | 4,0 | 0,2 |
| **Poland** | 26,2 | 24,7 | 1,3 | 0,2 | 28,0 | 26,2 | 1,3 | 0,5 | 28,3 | 26,4 | 1,3 | 0,6 |
| **Portugal** | 19,2 | 14,2 | 4,1 | 0,8 | 19,6 | 14,5 | 4,3 | 0,8 | 19,4 | 14,2 | 4,3 | 0,8 |
| **Romania** | 20,5 | 9,4 | 10,6 | 0,5 | 21,5 | 9,1 | 11,8 | 0,6 | 23,4 | 11,2 | 11,6 | 0,5 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 24,4 | 16,2 | 6,8 | 1,4 | 26,8 | 17,5 | 7,8 | 1,5 | 26,3 | 17,5 | 7,3 | 1,5 |
| **Slovenia** | 44,8 | 35,1 | 8,3 | 1,4 | 39,8 | 32,6 | 5,8 | 1,4 | 39,4 | 32,5 | 5,6 | 1,3 |
| **Spain** | 11,5 | 8,3 | 3,0 | 0,2 | 11,1 | 7,9 | 3,1 | 0,1 | 11,1 | 7,8 | 3,2 | 0,1 |
| **Sweden** | 11,8 | 7,9 | 3,5 | 0,4 | 11,8 | 7,8 | 3,8 | 0,3 | 12,2 | 8,0 | 3,9 | 0,3 |
| **Average** | 20,5 | 15,1 | 4,7 | 0,9 | 22,2 | 15,9 | 5,3 | 1,0 | 22,6 | 16,3 | 5,3 | 1,0 |
| **Median** | 19,2 | 14,2 | 3,7 | 0,8 | 21,5 | 14,5 | 3,8 | 0,8 | 23,4 | 14,2 | 4,0 | 0,9 |
| **Minimum** | 3,5 | 3,0 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 3,7 | 3,1 | 0,3 | 0,1 | 3,6 | 3,1 | 0,3 | 0,1 |
| **Maximum** | 44,8 | 35,1 | 11,6 | 2,6 | 42,3 | 32,6 | 13,3 | 4,0 | 44,4 | 32,5 | 13,5 | 4,0 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |

**Austria:** The administrative courts were established in January 2014. Data on administrative justice was introduced for the 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:** Starting from 2020, judges who administer justice 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.

**Romania**: The judicial system has four levels of courts. Second-instance figures include judges from tribunals and courts of appeal. Differences between first and second-instance numbers result from changes in calculation methods.

## Table 7.1.4 Total number of professional judges by case category in 2024 (Q46-2)

| States | Number of professional 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** | 2 670 | 2 232 | 303 | 135 | 1 257 | 971 | 236 | 50 | 395 | 311 | 67 | 17 | 1 018 | 950 | NAP | 68 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | 1 765 | 1 380 | 317 | 68 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 100 | 62 | NA | 38 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Bulgaria** | 2 280 | 1 297 | 786 | 197 | NA | NA | 456 | 62 | NA | NA | 256 | 30 | 391 | 287 | NAP | 104 | 14 | 8 | 6 | NAP |
| **Croatia** | 1 660 | 1 171 | 457 | 32 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Cyprus** | 160 | 130 | 14 | 16 | NA | 66 | 8 | NA | NA | 46 | 3 | NA | 30 | 17 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 3 049 | 2 021 | 921 | 107 | 1 535 | 1 027 | 462 | 46 | 730 | 422 | 285 | 23 | 161 | 123 | NAP | 38 | 623 | 449 | 174 | 0 |
| **Denmark** | 403 | 285 | 100 | 18 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Estonia** | 249 | 184 | 46 | 19 | 139 | 111 | 20 | 8 | 76 | 55 | 15 | 6 | 34 | 18 | 11 | 5 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | 1 213 | 941 | 231 | 41 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 316 | 292 | NAP | 24 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 7 968 | 5 683 | 1 920 | 365 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1 438 | 1 005 | 308 | 125 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Germany** | 20 803 | 16 102 | 4 239 | 462 | NA | 5 607 | 1 459 | NA | NA | 4 199 | 570 | NA | 4 361 | 3 460 | 843 | 58 | NA | 2 836 | 1 367 | NA |
| **Greece** | 4 615 | 3 255 | 941 | 419 | 1 679 | 1 434 | 190 | 55 | 1 609 | 1 189 | 396 | 24 | 1 327 | 632 | 355 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Hungary** | 2 651 | 1 272 | 1 291 | 88 | 1 408 | 736 | 635 | 37 | 969 | 536 | 416 | 17 | 197 | NA | 163 | 34 | 77 | NA | 77 | NA |
| **Ireland** | 195 | 167 | 19 | 9 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 7 188 | 5 502 | 1 151 | 535 | 3 449 | 2 644 | 606 | 199 | 3 131 | 2 421 | 532 | 178 | 539 | 383 | NAP | 156 | 69 | 54 | 13 | 2 |
| **Latvia** | 512 | 348 | 129 | 35 | NA | NA | 65 | 15 | NA | NA | 44 | 9 | 65 | 34 | 20 | 11 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | 690 | 611 | 50 | 29 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 67 | 46 | 21 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | 248 | 190 | 52 | 6 | NA | 101 | 32 | NA | NA | 66 | 14 | NA | 29 | 23 | 6 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | 54 | 43 | 11 | NAP | 20 | 13 | 7 | NAP | 32 | 28 | 4 | NAP | 2 | 2 | NA | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 2 741 | 1 982 | 724 | 35 | NA | NA | NA | 12 | NA | NA | NA | 12 | NA | NA | NA | 11 | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Poland** | 10 617 | 9 915 | 492 | 210 | NA | NA | NA | 30 | NA | NA | NA | 32 | 511 | 397 | NA | 114 | NA | NA | NA | 34 |
| **Portugal** | 2 086 | 1 530 | 465 | 91 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 371 | 269 | 71 | 31 | 1 715 | 1 261 | 394 | 60 |
| **Romania** | 4 457 | 2 139 | 2 217 | 101 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1 423 | 947 | 395 | 81 | 711 | 451 | 219 | 41 | 287 | 195 | 75 | 17 | 99 | 76 | NAP | 23 | 326 | 225 | 101 | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | 815 | 665 | 121 | 29 | 501 | 403 | 84 | 14 | 269 | 225 | 37 | 7 | 38 | 30 | NAP | 8 | 8 | 8 | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | 5 431 | 3 827 | 1 553 | 51 | 1 400 | 960 | 434 | 6 | 1 504 | 1 003 | 486 | 15 | 537 | 232 | 288 | 17 | 1 990 | 1 632 | 345 | 13 |
| **Sweden** | 1 300 | 852 | 409 | 39 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 358 | 220 | 121 | 17 | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Average** | 3 231 | 2 395 | 717 | 124 | 1 210 | 1 117 | 328 | 44 | 900 | 823 | 213 | 30 | 545 | 408 | 184 | 62 | 482 | 647 | 248 | 18 |
| **Median** | 1 765 | 1 272 | 409 | 60 | 1 329 | 736 | 219 | 37 | 563 | 311 | 75 | 17 | 257 | 220 | 96 | 33 | 73 | 140 | 89 | 8 |
| **Minimum** | 54 | 43 | 11 | 6 | 20 | 13 | 7 | 6 | 32 | 28 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 20 803 | 16 102 | 4 239 | 535 | 3 449 | 5 607 | 1 459 | 199 | 3 131 | 4 199 | 570 | 178 | 4 361 | 3 460 | 843 | 340 | 1 990 | 2 836 | 1 367 | 60 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 52% | 41% | 33% | 37% | 52% | 41% | 33% | 37% | 7% | 11% | 19% | 4% | 22% | 22% | 19% | 19% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 15% | 11% | 11% | 37% | 22% | 41% | 41% | 44% | 59% |

**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.

**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.

**Romania**:The judicial system has four levels of courts. Second-instance figures include judges from tribunals and courts of appeal. Differences between first and second-instance numbers result from changes in calculation methods.

**Slovak Republic**: The distribution of administrative judges per instance is made based on the instance level of the court where they work and not based on the instance of the cases for which they are responsible.

## Table 7.1.5 Total professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2014, 2023 and 2024 (Q46)

| States | Total professional judges: distribution of males and females | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | | 2023 | | 2024 | | Variation 2014-2024 in percentage points | |
| | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | Male | Female |
| Austria | 48,8% | 51,2% | 45,1% | 54,9% | 44,7% | 55,3% | ▼ -4,1 | ▲ 4,1 |
| Belgium | 48,4% | 51,6% | 37,6% | 62,4% | 37,4% | 62,6% | ▼ -11,0 | ▲ 11,0 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | 33,7% | 66,3% | 35,6% | 64,4% | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 31,1% | 68,9% | 27,7% | 72,3% | 27,4% | 72,6% | ▼ -3,7 | ▲ 3,7 |
| Cyprus | 54,6% | 45,4% | 46,8% | 53,2% | 45,6% | 54,4% | ▼ -9,0 | ▲ 9,0 |
| Czech Republic | 39,4% | 60,6% | 39,6% | 60,4% | 39,0% | 61,0% | ▼ -0,4 | ▲ 0,4 |
| Denmark | NA | NA | 47,6% | 52,4% | 46,7% | 53,3% | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 37,2% | 62,8% | 31,3% | 68,7% | 30,1% | 69,9% | ▼ -7,1 | ▲ 7,1 |
| Finland | 47,9% | 52,1% | 38,2% | 61,8% | 37,3% | 62,7% | ▼ -10,5 | ▲ 10,5 |
| France | 37,7% | 62,3% | 30,2% | 69,8% | 30,0% | 70,0% | ▼ -7,7 | ▲ 7,7 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 27,6% | 72,4% | 24,8% | 75,2% | 23,6% | 76,4% | ▼ -4,0 | ▲ 4,0 |
| Hungary | 31,0% | 69,0% | 31,0% | 69,0% | 31,3% | 68,7% | ▲ 0,2 | ▼ -0,2 |
| Ireland | 67,5% | 32,5% | 57,1% | 42,9% | 56,4% | 43,6% | ▼ -11,1 | ▲ 11,1 |
| Italy | 47,6% | 52,4% | 43,3% | 56,7% | 42,6% | 57,4% | ▼ -5,0 | ▲ 5,0 |
| Latvia | 22,7% | 77,3% | 19,9% | 80,1% | 20,3% | 79,7% | ▼ -2,4 | ▲ 2,4 |
| Lithuania | 39,4% | 60,6% | 32,9% | 67,1% | 32,7% | 67,3% | ▼ -6,7 | ▲ 6,7 |
| Luxembourg | 35,3% | 64,7% | 27,3% | 72,7% | 26,2% | 73,8% | ▼ -9,1 | ▲ 9,1 |
| Malta | 61,0% | 39,0% | 43,1% | 56,9% | 44,4% | 55,6% | ▼ -16,5 | ▲ 16,5 |
| Netherlands | 43,7% | 56,3% | 38,7% | 61,3% | 38,7% | 61,3% | ▼ -5,0 | ▲ 5,0 |
| Poland | NA | NA | 38,5% | 61,5% | 38,8% | 61,2% | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 41,6% | 58,4% | 34,4% | 65,6% | 33,0% | 67,0% | ▼ -8,6 | ▲ 8,6 |
| Romania | 26,1% | 73,9% | 28,6% | 71,4% | 27,7% | 72,3% | ▲ 1,6 | ▼ -1,6 |
| Slovak Republic | 37,5% | 62,5% | 36,9% | 63,1% | 37,5% | 62,5% | ▲ 0,0 | ▼ 0,0 |
| Slovenia | 21,9% | 78,1% | 18,1% | 81,9% | 18,5% | 81,5% | ▼ -3,4 | ▲ 3,4 |
| Spain | 48,0% | 52,0% | 42,7% | 57,3% | 41,8% | 58,2% | ▼ -6,3 | ▲ 6,3 |
| Sweden | 50,8% | 49,2% | 42,9% | 57,1% | 43,0% | 57,0% | ▼ -7,7 | ▲ 7,7 |
| **Average** | 41,2% | 58,8% | 36,1% | 63,9% | 35,8% | 64,2% | -6,0 | 6,0 |
| **Median** | 39,4% | 60,6% | 37,2% | 62,8% | 37,4% | 62,6% | -6,3 | 6,3 |
| **Minimum** | 21,9% | 32,5% | 18,1% | 42,9% | 18,5% | 43,6% | -16,5 | -1,6 |
| **Maximum** | 67,5% | 78,1% | 57,1% | 81,9% | 56,4% | 81,5% | 1,6 | 16,5 |
| **% of NA** | 15% | 15% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0,0 | 0,0 |

**Austria:** The administrative courts were established in January 2014. Data on administrative justice was introduced for the 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**: The judicial system has four levels of courts. Second-instance figures include judges from tribunals and courts of appeal. Differences between first and second-instance numbers result from changes in calculation methods.

## Table 7.1.6 First instance professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2014, 2023 and 2024 (Q46)

| States | First instance professional judges: distribution of males and females | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | | 2023 | | 2024 | | Variation 2014-2024 in percentage points | |
| | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | Male | Female |
| Austria | 45,4% | 54,6% | 44,0% | 56,0% | 43,5% | 56,5% | ▼ -1,9 | ▲ 1,9 |
| Belgium | 46,6% | 53,4% | 35,9% | 64,1% | 35,4% | 64,6% | ▼ -11,2 | ▲ 11,2 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | 34,8% | 65,2% | 34,3% | 65,7% | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 28,1% | 71,9% | 25,3% | 74,7% | 25,0% | 75,0% | ▼ -3,1 | ▲ 3,1 |
| Cyprus | 52,4% | 47,6% | 45,1% | 54,9% | 43,1% | 56,9% | ▼ -9,3 | ▲ 9,3 |
| Czech Republic | 34,4% | 65,6% | 32,8% | 67,2% | 32,1% | 67,9% | ▼ -2,2 | ▲ 2,2 |
| Denmark | NA | NA | 41,9% | 58,1% | 41,1% | 58,9% | NA | NA |
| Estonia | 30,2% | 69,8% | 26,2% | 73,8% | 25,0% | 75,0% | ▼ -5,2 | ▲ 5,2 |
| Finland | 47,0% | 53,0% | 35,8% | 64,2% | 35,6% | 64,4% | ▼ -11,4 | ▲ 11,4 |
| France | 34,9% | 65,1% | 27,9% | 72,1% | 27,8% | 72,2% | ▼ -7,1 | ▲ 7,1 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 24,0% | 76,0% | 23,0% | 77,0% | 21,8% | 78,2% | ▼ -2,2 | ▲ 2,2 |
| Hungary | 29,7% | 70,3% | 27,7% | 72,3% | 27,8% | 72,2% | ▼ -1,9 | ▲ 1,9 |
| Ireland | 66,4% | 33,6% | 57,7% | 42,3% | 56,3% | 43,7% | ▼ -10,1 | ▲ 10,1 |
| Italy | 44,9% | 55,1% | 41,1% | 58,9% | 40,4% | 59,6% | ▼ -4,6 | ▲ 4,6 |
| Latvia | 20,2% | 79,8% | 15,9% | 84,1% | 16,1% | 83,9% | ▼ -4,1 | ▲ 4,1 |
| Lithuania | 36,7% | 63,3% | 31,0% | 69,0% | 30,2% | 69,8% | ▼ -6,5 | ▲ 6,5 |
| Luxembourg | 34,3% | 65,7% | 27,3% | 72,7% | 25,8% | 74,2% | ▼ -8,5 | ▲ 8,5 |
| Malta | 54,5% | 45,5% | 39,0% | 61,0% | 39,5% | 60,5% | ▼ -15,0 | ▲ 15,0 |
| Netherlands | 40,3% | 59,7% | 36,3% | 63,7% | 36,7% | 63,3% | ▼ -3,6 | ▲ 3,6 |
| Poland | 36,3% | 63,7% | 37,3% | 62,7% | 37,5% | 62,5% | ▲ 1,3 | ▼ -1,3 |
| Portugal | 33,4% | 66,6% | 29,8% | 70,2% | 28,4% | 71,6% | ▼ -5,0 | ▲ 5,0 |
| Romania | 27,1% | 72,9% | 28,2% | 71,8% | 26,9% | 73,1% | ▼ -0,2 | ▲ 0,2 |
| Slovak Republic | 36,3% | 63,7% | 35,2% | 64,8% | 36,1% | 63,9% | ▼ -0,1 | ▲ 0,1 |
| Slovenia | 19,2% | 80,8% | 16,5% | 83,5% | 16,9% | 83,1% | ▼ -2,3 | ▲ 2,3 |
| Spain | 40,8% | 59,2% | 36,5% | 63,5% | 35,4% | 64,6% | ▼ -5,4 | ▲ 5,4 |
| Sweden | 53,4% | 46,6% | 44,6% | 55,4% | 44,6% | 55,4% | ▼ -8,8 | ▲ 8,8 |
| Average | 38,2% | 61,8% | 33,7% | 66,3% | 33,2% | 66,8% | -5,3 | 5,3 |
| Median | 36,3% | 63,7% | 35,0% | 65,0% | 34,8% | 65,2% | -4,8 | 4,8 |
| Minimum | 19,2% | 33,6% | 15,9% | 42,3% | 16,1% | 43,7% | -15,0 | -1,3 |
| Maximum | 66,4% | 80,8% | 57,7% | 84,1% | 56,3% | 83,9% | 1,3 | 15,0 |
| % of NA | 11% | 11% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 11% | 11% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Austria:** The administrative courts were established in January 2014. Data on administrative justice was introduced for the 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**: The judicial system has four levels of courts. Second-instance figures include judges from tribunals and courts of appeal. Differences between first and second-instance numbers result from changes in calculation methods.

## Table 7.1.7 Second instance judges: distribution of males and females in 2014, 2023 and 2024 (Q46)

| States | Second instance professional judges: distribution of males and females | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | | 2023 | | 2024 | | Variation 2014-2024 in percentage points | | | |
| | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | Male | | Female | |
| Austria | 57,9% | 42,1% | 47,9% | 52,1% | 46,9% | 53,1% | ▼ | -11,0 | ▲ | 11,0 |
| Belgium | 53,3% | 46,7% | 42,2% | 57,8% | 43,2% | 56,8% | ▼ | -10,1 | ▲ | 10,1 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | 33,5% | 66,5% | 39,4% | 60,6% | | NA | | NA |
| Croatia | 36,8% | 63,2% | 30,6% | 69,4% | 30,8% | 69,2% | ▼ | -6,0 | ▲ | 6,0 |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | 56,3% | 43,8% | 64,3% | 35,7% | | NAP | | NAP |
| Czech Republic | 44,7% | 55,3% | 47,8% | 52,2% | 47,7% | 52,3% | ▲ | 3,0 | ▼ | -3,0 |
| Denmark | 59,8% | 40,2% | 57,1% | 42,9% | 56,0% | 44,0% | ▼ | -3,8 | ▲ | 3,8 |
| Estonia | 45,5% | 54,5% | 38,6% | 61,4% | 34,8% | 65,2% | ▼ | -10,7 | ▲ | 10,7 |
| Finland | 47,8% | 52,2% | 42,7% | 57,3% | 39,4% | 60,6% | ▼ | -8,5 | ▲ | 8,5 |
| France | 42,1% | 57,9% | 33,7% | 66,3% | 33,5% | 66,5% | ▼ | -8,6 | ▲ | 8,6 |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | | NA | | NA |
| Greece | 28,8% | 71,2% | 26,6% | 73,4% | 25,9% | 74,1% | ▼ | -2,8 | ▲ | 2,8 |
| Hungary | 31,7% | 68,3% | 33,7% | 66,3% | 34,0% | 66,0% | ▲ | 2,3 | ▼ | -2,3 |
| Ireland | 80,0% | 20,0% | 50,0% | 50,0% | 52,6% | 47,4% | ▼ | -27,4 | ▲ | 27,4 |
| Italy | 51,7% | 48,3% | 42,5% | 57,5% | 42,1% | 57,9% | ▼ | -9,7 | ▲ | 9,7 |
| Latvia | 23,1% | 76,9% | 27,3% | 72,7% | 27,9% | 72,1% | ▲ | 4,8 | ▼ | -4,8 |
| Lithuania | 55,1% | 44,9% | 50,0% | 50,0% | 50,0% | 50,0% | ▼ | -5,1 | ▲ | 5,1 |
| Luxembourg | 37,8% | 62,2% | 28,6% | 71,4% | 28,8% | 71,2% | ▼ | -9,0 | ▲ | 9,0 |
| Malta | 87,5% | 12,5% | 60,0% | 40,0% | 63,6% | 36,4% | ▼ | -23,9 | ▲ | 23,9 |
| Netherlands | 55,3% | 44,7% | 44,6% | 55,4% | 43,5% | 56,5% | ▼ | -11,8 | ▲ | 11,8 |
| Poland | 46,4% | 53,6% | 50,4% | 49,6% | 51,2% | 48,8% | ▲ | 4,9 | ▼ | -4,9 |
| Portugal | 62,1% | 37,9% | 44,1% | 55,9% | 41,9% | 58,1% | ▼ | -20,2 | ▲ | 20,2 |
| Romania | 25,8% | 74,2% | 29,0% | 71,0% | 28,6% | 71,4% | ▲ | 2,8 | ▼ | -2,8 |
| Slovak Republic | 39,6% | 60,4% | 39,2% | 60,8% | 38,7% | 61,3% | ▼ | -0,8 | ▲ | 0,8 |
| Slovenia | 26,3% | 73,7% | 19,4% | 80,6% | 20,0% | 80,0% | ▼ | -6,3 | ▲ | 6,3 |
| Spain | 65,5% | 34,5% | 56,9% | 43,1% | 56,3% | 43,7% | ▼ | -9,1 | ▲ | 9,1 |
| Sweden | 43,7% | 56,3% | 37,9% | 62,1% | 37,9% | 62,1% | ▼ | -5,8 | ▲ | 5,8 |
| Average | 47,8% | 52,2% | 41,2% | 58,8% | 41,5% | 58,5% | | -7,2 | | 7,2 |
| Median | 45,9% | 54,1% | 42,3% | 57,7% | 40,7% | 59,3% | | -7,4 | | 7,4 |
| Minimum | 23,1% | 12,5% | 19,4% | 40,0% | 20,0% | 35,7% | | -27,4 | | -4,9 |
| Maximum | 87,5% | 76,9% | 60,0% | 80,6% | 64,3% | 80,0% | | 4,9 | | 27,4 |
| % of NA | 7% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | | 7% | | 7% |
| % of NAP | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 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.

**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 judges: distribution of males and females in 2014, 2023 and 2024 (Q46)

| States | Supreme Court professional judges: distribution of males and females | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | | 2023 | | 2024 | | Variation 2014-2024 in percentage points | |
| | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | Male | Female |
| Austria | 65,2% | 34,8% | 58,2% | 41,8% | 58,5% | 41,5% | -6,6 | 6,6 |
| Belgium | 79,3% | 20,7% | 70,0% | 30,0% | 51,5% | 48,5% | -27,8 | 27,8 |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | 26,2% | 73,8% | 28,9% | 71,1% | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 60,5% | 39,5% | 71,0% | 29,0% | 67,7% | 32,3% | 7,3 | -7,3 |
| Cyprus | 69,2% | 30,8% | 50,0% | 50,0% | 50,0% | 50,0% | -19,2 | 19,2 |
| Czech Republic | 73,0% | 27,0% | 76,9% | 23,1% | 74,8% | 25,2% | 1,8 | -1,8 |
| Denmark | 73,7% | 26,3% | 78,9% | 21,1% | 83,3% | 16,7% | 9,6 | -9,6 |
| Estonia | 83,3% | 16,7% | 63,2% | 36,8% | 68,4% | 31,6% | -14,9 | 14,9 |
| Finland | 63,6% | 36,4% | 68,2% | 31,8% | 65,9% | 34,1% | 2,2 | -2,2 |
| France | 55,8% | 44,2% | 46,9% | 53,1% | 45,5% | 54,5% | -10,3 | 10,3 |
| Germany | 75,8% | 24,2% | 63,9% | 36,1% | 61,9% | 38,1% | -13,9 | 13,9 |
| Greece | 49,6% | 50,4% | 32,2% | 67,8% | 32,5% | 67,5% | -17,1 | 17,1 |
| Hungary | 50,0% | 50,0% | 40,9% | 59,1% | 40,9% | 59,1% | -9,1 | 9,1 |
| Ireland | 70,0% | 30,0% | 60,0% | 40,0% | 66,7% | 33,3% | -3,3 | 3,3 |
| Italy | 75,3% | 24,7% | 68,2% | 31,8% | 67,3% | 32,7% | -8,0 | 8,0 |
| Latvia | 38,3% | 61,7% | 34,3% | 65,7% | 34,3% | 65,7% | -4,0 | 4,0 |
| Lithuania | 70,6% | 29,4% | 44,8% | 55,2% | 55,2% | 44,8% | -15,4 | 15,4 |
| Luxembourg | 50,0% | 50,0% | 16,7% | 83,3% | 16,7% | 83,3% | -33,3 | 33,3 |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | 55,9% | 44,1% | 54,3% | 45,7% | NA | NA |
| Poland | NA | NA | 70,9% | 29,1% | 70,5% | 29,5% | NA | NA |
| Portugal | 81,7% | 18,3% | 65,2% | 34,8% | 64,8% | 35,2% | -16,9 | 16,9 |
| Romania | 15,5% | 84,5% | 29,0% | 71,0% | 26,7% | 73,3% | 11,2 | -11,2 |
| Slovak Republic | 42,1% | 57,9% | 45,6% | 54,4% | 48,1% | 51,9% | 6,0 | -6,0 |
| Slovenia | 62,1% | 37,9% | 51,7% | 48,3% | 51,9% | 48,1% | -10,2 | 10,2 |
| Spain | 86,6% | 13,4% | 78,9% | 21,1% | 80,4% | 19,6% | -6,2 | 6,2 |
| Sweden | 61,1% | 38,9% | 62,5% | 37,5% | 66,7% | 33,3% | 5,6 | -5,6 |
| **Average** | 63,1% | 36,9% | 55,0% | 45,0% | 55,1% | 44,9% | -7,5 | 7,5 |
| **Median** | 65,2% | 34,8% | 59,1% | 40,9% | 56,8% | 43,2% | -8,0 | 8,0 |
| **Minimum** | 15,5% | 13,4% | 16,7% | 21,1% | 16,7% | 16,7% | -33,3 | -11,2 |
| **Maximum** | 86,6% | 84,5% | 78,9% | 83,3% | 83,3% | 83,3% | 11,2 | 33,3 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 11% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 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.

**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**: The judicial system has four levels of courts. Second-instance figures include judges from tribunals and courts of appeal. Differences between first and second-instance numbers result from changes in calculation methods.

## Table 7.2.1 Total number of non-judge staff (absolute number and per 100 000 inhabitants) and their distribution by category in 2024 (Q1, Q52)

| States | Total number of non-judge staff in 2024 | | Distribution of non-judge staff by category in 2024 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 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** | 5 585 | 60,7 | 698 | 771 | 3 534 | 107 | 475 |
| **Belgium** | 5 892 | 49,8 | NAP | 5 159 | 162 | 571 | 0 |
| **Bulgaria** | 6 640 | 103,1 | NAP | 4 960 | 1 010 | 629 | 41 |
| **Croatia** | 6 011 | 155,5 | 542 | 4 199 | 607 | 664 | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | 568 | 58,8 | NAP | 192 | 156 | 176 | 44 |
| **Czech Republic** | 9 747 | 89,3 | 2 500 | 4 494 | 2 088 | 609 | 56 |
| **Denmark** | 1 748 | 29,2 | 324 | 1 242 | 29 | 109 | 44 |
| **Estonia** | 816 | 59,4 | 55 | 604 | 71 | 54 | 32 |
| **Finland** | 2 278 | 40,4 | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **France** | 26 461 | 38,6 | NAP | 19 977 | 4 260 | 914 | 1 310 |
| **Germany** | 53 875 | 64,5 | 8 518 | 27 360 | 6 954 | 4 329 | 6 714 |
| **Greece** | 5 514 | 53,0 | NAP | 4 940 | 520 | 52 | 2 |
| **Hungary** | 8 163 | 85,6 | 928 | 867 | NA | NA | 6 368 |
| **Ireland** | 1 299 | 23,9 | 23 | 1 034 | 130 | 66 | 46 |
| **Italy** | 28 546 | 48,4 | NAP | 19 613 | 7 011 | 1 922 | 0 |
| **Latvia** | 1 633 | 87,9 | NAP | 1 018 | 467 | 130 | 18 |
| **Lithuania** | 2 493 | 86,3 | NAP | 1 405 | 783 | 238 | 67 |
| **Luxembourg** | 283 | 41,5 | NAP | 243 | 4 | 5 | 31 |
| **Malta** | 560 | 97,5 | NAP | 361 | 55 | 14 | 130 |
| **Netherlands** | 8 310 | 46,1 | NAP | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | 43 435 | 115,6 | 2 851 | 24 634 | 8 574 | 1 899 | 5 477 |
| **Portugal** | 5 481 | 51,0 | NAP | 4 703 | 68 | 468 | 242 |
| **Romania** | 10 736 | 56,4 | NAP | 6 368 | 1 611 | 1 571 | 1 186 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 4 794 | 88,5 | 1 257 | 2 109 | 1 161 | 196 | 71 |
| **Slovenia** | 3 383 | 158,8 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NAP |
| **Spain** | 50 628 | 103,2 | 4 568 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 46 060 |
| **Sweden** | 5 045 | 47,6 | NAP | 3 306 | 713 | 201 | 825 |
| **Average** | 11 108 | 71,9 | 2 024 | 6 068 | 1 817 | 678 | 3 010 |
| **Median** | 5 514 | 59,4 | 928 | 3 306 | 660 | 220 | 67 |
| **Minimum** | 283 | 23,9 | 23 | 192 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| **Maximum** | 53 875 | 158,8 | 8 518 | 27 360 | 8 574 | 4 329 | 46 060 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 4% | 11% | 15% | 15% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 56% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 7% |

## Table 7.2.2 Evolution of the total number of non-judge staff (absolute number) from 2014 to 2024 (Q52)

| States | Total number of non-judge staff | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | 4 705 | 4 735 | 5 544 | 5 544 | 4 966 | 5 117 | 5 270 | 4 997 | 5 410 | 5 498 | 5 585 |
| **Belgium** | 5 290 | 5 204 | 5 054 | 4 940 | 4 974 | 5 614 | 5 064 | 5 097 | 5 712 | 5 718 | 5 892 |
| **Bulgaria** | 6 014 | 6 143 | 6 174 | 6 212 | 6 262 | 6 323 | 6 329 | 6 475 | 6 587 | 6 606 | 6 640 |
| **Croatia** | 6 061 | 5 929 | 5 827 | 5 900 | 5 828 | 5 929 | 5 886 | 6 027 | 6 002 | 5 989 | 6 011 |
| **Cyprus** | 448 | 424 | 437 | 441 | 427 | 475 | 449 | 496 | 513 | 582 | 568 |
| **Czech Republic** | 9 309 | 9 409 | 9 714 | 9 887 | 9 857 | 9 989 | 9 921 | 9 914 | 9 868 | 9 827 | 9 747 |
| **Denmark** | 1 754 | 1 529 | 1 642 | 1 634 | 1 656 | 1 775 | 1 816 | 1 799 | 1 669 | 1 668 | 1 748 |
| **Estonia** | 1 017 | 965 | 877 | 846 | 819 | 802 | 825 | 799 | 806 | 803 | 816 |
| **Finland** | 2 161 | 2 145 | 2 170 | 2 137 | 2 131 | 2 128 | 2 162 | 2 208 | 2 194 | 2 199 | 2 278 |
| **France** | 22 360 | 22 326 | 22 712 | 22 714 | 22 844 | 23 396 | 24 062 | 22 115 | 25 388 | 25 947 | 26 461 |
| **Germany** | 53 302 | 53 292 | 53 181 | 53 178 | 54 072 | 54 434 | 54 107 | 54 117 | 52 999 | 53 717 | 53 875 |
| **Greece** | 5 474 | 5 572 | 4 236 | 4 145 | 4 179 | 4 284 | 4 198 | 4 774 | 4 770 | 4 776 | 5 514 |
| **Hungary** | 8 022 | 7 979 | 8 003 | 8 379 | 8 528 | 8 538 | 8 576 | 8 638 | 8 483 | 8 383 | 8 163 |
| **Ireland** | 927 | 942 | 975 | 1 023 | 1 049 | 1 080 | 1 089 | 1 145 | 1 253 | 1 294 | 1 299 |
| **Italy** | 21 903 | 21 360 | 21 182 | 20 664 | 22 401 | 21 808 | 21 193 | 22 222 | 25 947 | 26 573 | 28 546 |
| **Latvia** | 1 578 | 1 519 | 1 582 | 1 536 | NA | 1 678 | 1 666 | 1 615 | 1 648 | 1 657 | 1 633 |
| **Lithuania** | 2 608 | 2 729 | 2 740 | 2 722 | 2 664 | 2 684 | 2 709 | 2 646 | 2 608 | 2 553 | 2 493 |
| **Luxembourg** | 196 | 197 | 200 | 200 | 220 | 225 | 223 | 239 | 248 | 253 | 283 |
| **Malta** | 389 | 393 | 383 | 394 | 413 | 412 | 396 | 449 | 464 | 498 | 560 |
| **Netherlands** | 7 422 | 7 265 | 7 317 | 7 523 | 7 492 | 7 699 | 7 435 | 7 653 | 7 736 | 7 972 | 8 310 |
| **Poland** | 41 534 | - | 43 176 | 46 807 | 40 662 | 41 927 | 41 973 | 42 854 | 44 832 | 44 117 | 43 435 |
| **Portugal** | 5 698 | 5 799 | 5 652 | 5 789 | 5 818 | 5 829 | 5 779 | 5 732 | 5 412 | 5 698 | 5 481 |
| **Romania** | 10 147 | 10 251 | 10 297 | 10 638 | 10 662 | 10 700 | 10 512 | 11 144 | 11 071 | 11 469 | 10 736 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 4 468 | 4 390 | 4 482 | 4 616 | 4 710 | 4 731 | 4 912 | 4 361 | 4 642 | 4 975 | 4 794 |
| **Slovenia** | 3 355 | 3 300 | 3 330 | 3 328 | 3 391 | 3 427 | 3 427 | 3 455 | 3 416 | 3 428 | 3 383 |
| **Spain** | 48 563 | 49 746 | 49 186 | 46 871 | 47 645 | 47 816 | 48 620 | 49 137 | 49 802 | 50 069 | 50 628 |
| **Sweden** | 4 797 | 4 800 | 4 859 | 5 088 | 5 208 | 4 921 | 4 996 | 4 989 | 4 873 | 4 724 | 5 045 |
| **Average** | 10 352 | 9 167 | 10 405 | 10 487 | 10 726 | 10 509 | 10 504 | 10 559 | 10 902 | 11 000 | 11 108 |
| **Median** | 5 290 | 5 002 | 5 054 | 5 088 | 5 091 | 5 117 | 5 064 | 4 997 | 5 410 | 5 498 | 5 514 |
| **Minimum** | 196 | 197 | 200 | 200 | 220 | 225 | 223 | 239 | 248 | 253 | 283 |
| **Maximum** | 53 302 | 53 292 | 53 181 | 53 178 | 54 072 | 54 434 | 54 107 | 54 117 | 52 999 | 53 717 | 53 875 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**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 Evolution of the total number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 and their variations (Q1, Q52)

| States | Total number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants | | | | | | | | | | | Variations of the number of non-judge staff | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2014-2024 | 2023-2024 |
| Austria | 54,8 | 54,4 | 63,4 | 63,0 | 56,3 | 57,5 | 59,0 | 55,7 | 59,4 | 60,0 | 60,7 | 10,8% | 1,2% |
| Belgium | 47,2 | 46,2 | 44,6 | 43,4 | 43,5 | 49,1 | 44,0 | 44,1 | 48,8 | 48,6 | 49,8 | 5,6% | 2,5% |
| Bulgaria | 83,5 | 85,9 | 86,9 | 88,1 | 89,5 | 91,0 | 91,5 | 94,7 | 102,2 | 102,5 | 103,1 | 23,5% | 0,6% |
| Croatia | 143,4 | 141,5 | 140,3 | 143,7 | 143,0 | 146,1 | 145,8 | 155,7 | 155,9 | 155,4 | 155,5 | 8,4% | 0,0% |
| Cyprus | 52,2 | 50,0 | 51,5 | 51,6 | 48,7 | 53,5 | 50,1 | 54,8 | 55,7 | 62,3 | 58,8 | 12,6% | -5,7% |
| Czech Republic | 88,4 | 89,2 | 91,8 | 93,4 | 92,6 | 93,6 | 92,7 | 94,3 | 90,9 | 90,2 | 89,3 | 1,0% | -0,9% |
| Denmark | 31,0 | 26,8 | 28,6 | 28,3 | 28,5 | 30,5 | 31,1 | 30,6 | 28,2 | 28,1 | 29,2 | -5,9% | 3,7% |
| Estonia | 77,4 | 73,3 | 66,7 | 64,3 | 62,1 | 60,5 | 62,1 | 60,1 | 60,7 | 58,8 | 59,4 | -23,3% | 1,0% |
| Finland | 39,5 | 39,1 | 39,4 | 38,8 | 38,6 | 38,5 | 39,1 | 39,8 | 39,4 | 39,2 | 40,4 | 2,3% | 3,2% |
| France | 33,7 | 33,5 | 33,9 | 33,8 | 34,1 | 34,9 | 35,7 | 32,7 | 37,3 | 37,9 | 38,6 | 14,4% | 1,6% |
| Germany | 66,0 | 65,2 | 64,7 | 64,3 | 65,1 | 65,5 | 65,1 | 65,0 | 62,8 | 63,4 | 64,5 | -2,3% | 1,6% |
| Greece | 50,5 | 51,3 | 39,3 | 38,5 | 38,9 | 39,9 | 39,2 | 44,7 | 44,7 | 45,9 | 53,0 | 5,1% | 15,6% |
| Hungary | 81,4 | 81,2 | 81,7 | 84,8 | 88,9 | 87,4 | 86,7 | 89,2 | 88,4 | 87,5 | 85,6 | 5,1% | -2,2% |
| Ireland | 20,0 | 20,2 | 20,9 | 21,3 | 21,6 | 21,9 | 21,9 | 22,3 | 24,3 | 24,2 | 23,9 | 19,2% | -1,4% |
| Italy | 36,0 | 35,2 | 35,0 | 34,2 | 37,1 | 36,2 | 35,8 | 37,7 | 44,0 | 45,1 | 48,4 | 34,4% | 7,5% |
| Latvia | 78,8 | 77,1 | 80,3 | 78,8 | NA | 88,0 | 88,0 | 86,1 | 87,5 | 88,5 | 87,9 | 11,5% | -0,7% |
| Lithuania | 89,3 | 94,5 | 96,2 | 96,9 | 95,3 | 96,1 | 96,9 | 94,3 | 91,3 | 88,5 | 86,3 | -3,4% | -2,5% |
| Luxembourg | 34,8 | 35,0 | 33,9 | 33,2 | 35,8 | 35,9 | 35,1 | 37,0 | 37,5 | 37,6 | 41,5 | 19,2% | 10,2% |
| Malta | 88,5 | 87,3 | 83,2 | 82,8 | 86,8 | 83,5 | 77,0 | 87,0 | 89,2 | 88,4 | 97,5 | 10,2% | 10,3% |
| Netherlands | 43,9 | 42,8 | 42,8 | 43,8 | 43,4 | 44,2 | 42,5 | 43,7 | 43,4 | 44,4 | 46,1 | 4,9% | 3,7% |
| Poland | 107,9 | - | 112,3 | 121,8 | 105,9 | 109,2 | 109,8 | 112,5 | 118,7 | 117,2 | 115,6 | 7,2% | -1,4% |
| Portugal | 54,9 | 56,1 | 54,8 | 56,3 | 56,6 | 56,6 | 56,1 | 55,4 | 51,7 | 53,6 | 51,0 | -7,2% | -4,8% |
| Romania | 45,5 | 51,9 | 52,4 | 54,5 | 54,9 | 55,1 | 54,8 | 58,5 | 58,1 | 60,2 | 56,4 | 23,8% | -6,3% |
| Slovak Republic | 82,4 | 80,9 | 82,5 | 84,8 | 86,4 | 86,7 | 90,0 | 80,2 | 85,5 | 91,7 | 88,5 | 7,3% | -3,5% |
| Slovenia | 162,8 | 159,9 | 161,2 | 161,0 | 163,0 | 163,5 | 162,5 | 164,0 | 161,4 | 161,4 | 158,8 | -2,5% | -1,6% |
| Spain | 104,6 | 107,1 | 105,7 | 100,4 | 101,4 | 100,8 | 102,7 | 103,6 | 103,6 | 103,0 | 103,2 | -1,4% | 0,2% |
| Sweden | 49,2 | 48,7 | 48,6 | 50,3 | 50,9 | 47,6 | 48,1 | 47,7 | 46,3 | 44,8 | 47,6 | -3,2% | 6,4% |
| Average | 68,4 | 66,7 | 68,2 | 68,7 | 68,0 | 69,4 | 69,0 | 70,0 | 71,0 | 71,4 | 71,9 | 0,1 | 0,0 |
| Median | 54,9 | 55,2 | 63,4 | 63,0 | 56,5 | 57,5 | 59,0 | 58,5 | 59,4 | 60,2 | 59,4 | 0,1 | 0,0 |
| Minimum | 20,0 | 20,2 | 20,9 | 21,3 | 21,6 | 21,9 | 21,9 | 22,3 | 24,3 | 24,2 | 23,9 | -0,2 | -0,1 |
| Maximum | 162,8 | 159,9 | 161,2 | 161,0 | 163,0 | 163,5 | 162,5 | 164,0 | 161,4 | 161,4 | 158,8 | 0,3 | 0,2 |
| % of NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**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 2024 (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** | 4 901 | 517 | 165 | 87,8% | 9,3% | 3,0% |
| **Belgium** | 4 537 | 533 | 89 | 87,9% | 10,3% | 1,7% |
| **Bulgaria** | 4 279 | 1 895 | 466 | 64,4% | 28,5% | 7,0% |
| **Croatia** | 4 982 | 943 | 86 | 82,9% | 15,7% | 1,4% |
| **Cyprus** | 453 | 28 | 87 | 79,8% | 4,9% | 15,3% |
| **Czech Republic** | 6 366 | 2 917 | 464 | 65,3% | 29,9% | 4,8% |
| **Denmark** | 1 548 | 177 | 23 | 88,6% | 10,1% | 1,3% |
| **Estonia** | 657 | 89 | 70 | 80,5% | 10,9% | 8,6% |
| **Finland** | 1 883 | 248 | 147 | 82,7% | 10,9% | 6,5% |
| **France** | 20 426 | 3 700 | 735 | 82,3% | 14,9% | 3,0% |
| **Germany** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | 4 033 | 695 | 786 | 73,1% | 12,6% | 14,3% |
| **Hungary** | 3 990 | 3 915 | 258 | 48,9% | 48,0% | 3,2% |
| **Ireland** | 1 277 | 13 | 9 | 98,3% | 1,0% | 0,7% |
| **Italy** | 22 534 | 4 885 | 1 127 | 78,9% | 17,1% | 3,9% |
| **Latvia** | 1 215 | 303 | 115 | 74,4% | 18,6% | 7,0% |
| **Lithuania** | 1 757 | 647 | 89 | 70,5% | 26,0% | 3,6% |
| **Luxembourg** | 244 | 37 | 2 | 86,2% | 13,1% | 0,7% |
| **Malta** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Netherlands** | 7 013 | 1 071 | 226 | 84,4% | 12,9% | 2,7% |
| **Poland** | 40 721 | 2 615 | 791 | 92,3% | 5,9% | 1,8% |
| **Portugal** | 5 070 | 267 | 144 | 92,5% | 4,9% | 2,6% |
| **Romania** | 3 441 | 6 794 | 501 | 32,1% | 63,3% | 4,7% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 3 839 | 922 | 209 | 80,1% | 19,2% | 4,4% |
| **Slovenia** | 2 954 | 286 | 143 | 87,3% | 8,5% | 4,2% |
| **Spain** | 45 676 | 4 465 | 487 | 90,2% | 8,8% | 1,0% |
| **Sweden** | 3 940 | 952 | 153 | 78,1% | 18,9% | 3,0% |
| **Average** | 7 909 | 1 557 | 295 | 78,8% | 17,0% | 4,4% |
| **Median** | 3 990 | 695 | 153 | 82,3% | 12,9% | 3,2% |
| **Minimum** | 244 | 13 | 2 | 32,1% | 1,0% | 0,7% |
| **Maximum** | 45 676 | 6 794 | 1 127 | 98,3% | 63,3% | 15,3% |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**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 2024 (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 | 28,0% | 72,0% | 27,3% | 72,7% | 32,9% | 67,1% | 31,5% | 68,5% |
| Belgium | 25,1% | 74,9% | 24,2% | 75,8% | 31,5% | 68,5% | 31,5% | 68,5% |
| Bulgaria | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 13,6% | 86,4% | 13,0% | 87,0% | 16,0% | 84,1% | 23,3% | 76,7% |
| Cyprus | 34,0% | 66,0% | 35,5% | 64,5% | 28,6% | 71,4% | 27,6% | 72,4% |
| Czech Republic | 13,2% | 86,8% | 9,6% | 90,4% | 18,0% | 82,0% | 32,5% | 67,5% |
| Denmark | 19,7% | 80,3% | 18,5% | 81,5% | 27,7% | 72,3% | 39,1% | 60,9% |
| Estonia | 13,6% | 86,4% | 10,4% | 89,6% | 15,7% | 84,3% | 41,4% | 58,6% |
| Finland | 22,5% | 77,5% | 22,4% | 77,6% | 21,4% | 78,6% | 25,9% | 74,1% |
| France | 18,9% | 81,1% | 17,2% | 82,8% | 24,6% | 75,4% | 38,2% | 61,8% |
| Germany | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Greece | 24,7% | 75,3% | 22,9% | 77,1% | 26,0% | 74,0% | 32,6% | 67,4% |
| Hungary | 15,9% | 84,1% | 10,6% | 89,4% | 20,6% | 79,4% | 27,5% | 72,5% |
| Ireland | 37,2% | 62,8% | 37,0% | 63,0% | 53,8% | 46,2% | 44,4% | 55,6% |
| Italy | 32,4% | 67,6% | 32,3% | 67,7% | 32,8% | 67,2% | 33,8% | 66,2% |
| Latvia | 7,4% | 92,6% | 5,8% | 94,2% | 9,9% | 90,1% | 17,4% | 82,6% |
| Lithuania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Luxembourg | 36,7% | 63,3% | 37,3% | 62,7% | 32,4% | 67,6% | 50,0% | 50,0% |
| Malta | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Netherlands | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Poland | 16,3% | 83,7% | 14,3% | 85,7% | 43,6% | 56,4% | 33,0% | 67,0% |
| Portugal | 33,7% | 66,3% | 33,5% | 66,5% | 38,2% | 61,8% | 30,6% | 69,4% |
| Romania | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Slovak Republic | 15,8% | 88,0% | 12,7% | 87,3% | 22,6% | 77,4% | 28,7% | 71,3% |
| Slovenia | 13,0% | 87,0% | 13,0% | 78,0% | 19,9% | 80,1% | 28,7% | 71,3% |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Sweden | 26,0% | 74,0% | 25,8% | 74,2% | 26,3% | 73,7% | 29,4% | 70,6% |
| Average | 22,4% | 77,8% | 21,2% | 78,4% | 27,1% | 72,9% | 32,4% | 67,6% |
| Median | 21,1% | 78,9% | 20,5% | 77,8% | 26,2% | 73,8% | 31,5% | 68,5% |
| Minimum | 7,4% | 62,8% | 5,8% | 62,7% | 9,9% | 46,2% | 17,4% | 50,0% |
| Maximum | 37,2% | 92,6% | 37,3% | 94,2% | 53,8% | 90,1% | 50,0% | 82,6% |
| % of NA | 26% | 26% | 26% | 26% | 26% | 26% | 26% | 26% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 7.2.5 Number of professional judges and number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q46, Q52)

| States | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | 2018 | | 2019 | | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 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 | Professional judges | Non-judge staff |
| **Austria** | 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 | 29,4 | 59,4 | 28,5 | 60,0 | 29,0 | 60,7 |
| **Belgium** | 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 | 14,4 | 48,8 | 15,3 | 48,6 | 14,9 | 49,8 |
| **Bulgaria** | 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 | 33,9 | 102,2 | 34,7 | 102,5 | 35,4 | 103,1 |
| **Croatia** | 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 | 42,4 | 155,9 | 42,3 | 155,4 | 42,2 | 155,5 |
| **Cyprus** | 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 | 15,5 | 55,7 | 16,5 | 62,3 | 16,6 | 58,8 |
| **Czech Republic** | 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 | 28,2 | 90,9 | 27,5 | 90,2 | 27,9 | 89,3 |
| **Denmark** | 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 | 6,5 | 28,2 | 6,6 | 28,1 | 6,7 | 29,2 |
| **Estonia** | 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 | 17,8 | 60,7 | 18,0 | 58,8 | 18,1 | 59,4 |
| **Finland** | 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 | 20,6 | 39,4 | 21,0 | 39,2 | 21,5 | 40,4 |
| **France** | 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 | 11,3 | 37,3 | 11,1 | 37,9 | 11,6 | 38,6 |
| **Germany** | 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 | 24,7 | 62,8 | 24,9 | 63,4 | 24,9 | 64,5 |
| **Greece** | 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 | 37,3 | 44,7 | 38,5 | 45,9 | 44,4 | 53,0 |
| **Hungary** | 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 | 27,7 | 88,4 | 27,7 | 87,5 | 27,8 | 85,6 |
| **Ireland** | 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 | 3,3 | 24,3 | 3,7 | 24,2 | 3,6 | 23,9 |
| **Italy** | 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 | 12,1 | 44,0 | 12,2 | 45,1 | 12,2 | 48,4 |
| **Latvia** | 24,4 | 78,8 | 25,0 | 77,1 | 25,5 | 80,3 | 25,1 | 78,8 | NA | NA | 27,3 | 88,0 | 29,1 | 88,0 | 29,1 | 86,1 | 28,3 | 87,5 | 28,2 | 88,5 | 27,6 | 87,9 |
| **Lithuania** | 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 | 26,1 | 91,3 | 23,9 | 88,5 | 24,7 | 86,3 |
| **Luxembourg** | 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 | 35,1 | 37,5 | 35,4 | 37,6 | 36,4 | 41,5 |
| **Malta** | 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 | 9,0 | 89,2 | 9,1 | 88,4 | 9,4 | 97,5 |
| **Netherlands** | 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 | 15,0 | 43,4 | 15,0 | 44,4 | 15,2 | 46,1 |
| **Poland** | 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 | 28,0 | 118,7 | 28,0 | 117,2 | 28,3 | 115,6 |
| **Portugal** | 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 | 19,5 | 51,7 | 19,6 | 53,6 | 19,4 | 51,0 |
| **Romania** | 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 | 22,9 | 58,1 | 21,5 | 60,2 | 23,4 | 56,4 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 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 | 25,7 | 85,5 | 26,8 | 91,7 | 26,3 | 88,5 |
| **Slovenia** | 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 | 40,7 | 161,4 | 39,8 | 161,4 | 39,4 | 158,8 |
| **Spain** | 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 | 11,9 | 103,6 | 11,1 | 103,0 | 11,1 | 103,2 |
| **Sweden** | 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 | 11,7 | 46,3 | 11,8 | 44,8 | 12,2 | 47,6 |
| **Average** | 20,5 | 68,4 | 20,4 | 66,7 | 21,2 | 66,7 | 21,3 | 68,7 | 21,2 | 68,0 | 21,5 | 69,4 | 21,8 | 69,0 | 22,0 | 70,0 | 22,2 | 71,0 | 22,2 | 71,4 | 22,6 | 71,9 |
| **Median** | 19,2 | 54,9 | 18,9 | 55,2 | 23,6 | 55,2 | 23,9 | 63,0 | 21,8 | 56,5 | 24,5 | 57,5 | 23,9 | 59,0 | 24,1 | 58,5 | 22,9 | 59,4 | 21,5 | 60,2 | 23,4 | 59,4 |
| **Minimum** | 3,5 | 20,0 | 3,4 | 20,2 | 3,5 | 20,2 | 3,3 | 21,3 | 3,3 | 21,6 | 3,4 | 21,9 | 3,3 | 21,9 | 3,3 | 22,3 | 3,3 | 24,3 | 3,7 | 24,2 | 3,6 | 23,9 |
| **Maximum** | 44,8 | 162,8 | 44,5 | 159,9 | 43,3 | 159,9 | 43,2 | 161,0 | 41,7 | 163,0 | 41,7 | 163,5 | 41,5 | 162,5 | 42,4 | 164,0 | 42,4 | 161,4 | 42,3 | 161,4 | 44,4 | 158,8 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 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% | 0% | 0% |

**Austria:** The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

**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 2014 to 2024 (Q46, Q52)

| States | Ratio between non-judge staff and judges | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Austria | 2,9 | 2,9 | 2,3 | 2,2 | 2,1 | 1,9 | 2,0 | 2,1 | 2,0 | 2,1 | 2,1 |
| Belgium | 3,3 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,7 | 3,3 | 3,1 | 3,4 | 3,2 | 3,3 |
| Bulgaria | 2,7 | 2,8 | 2,7 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,9 | 2,9 | 3,0 | 3,0 | 3,0 | 2,9 |
| Croatia | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,5 | 3,5 | 3,6 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,7 |
| Cyprus | 4,6 | 3,8 | 3,9 | 3,7 | 3,6 | 4,1 | 3,6 | 3,8 | 3,6 | 3,8 | 3,6 |
| Czech Republic | 3,1 | 3,1 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,2 |
| Denmark | 4,7 | 4,1 | 4,4 | 4,3 | 4,4 | 4,7 | 4,7 | 4,6 | 4,3 | 4,3 | 4,3 |
| Estonia | 4,4 | 4,1 | 3,8 | 3,7 | 3,5 | 3,5 | 3,5 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,3 | 3,3 |
| Finland | 2,2 | 2,2 | 2,0 | 2,0 | 2,0 | 2,0 | 2,0 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 1,9 |
| France | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,1 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 2,9 | 3,3 | 3,4 | 3,3 |
| Germany | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,7 | 2,6 | 2,7 | 2,6 | 2,6 | 2,6 | 2,5 | 2,6 | 2,6 |
| Greece | 2,5 | 2,5 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,1 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 |
| Hungary | 2,9 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 3,0 | 2,9 | 3,0 | 3,1 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,1 |
| Ireland | 5,8 | 5,9 | 6,0 | 6,4 | 6,6 | 6,5 | 6,7 | 6,7 | 7,3 | 6,6 | 6,7 |
| Italy | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,1 | 3,0 | 3,1 | 3,6 | 3,7 | 4,0 |
| Latvia | 3,2 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 3,1 | NA | 3,2 | 3,0 | 3,0 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 3,2 |
| Lithuania | 3,5 | 3,6 | 3,5 | 3,5 | 3,5 | 3,6 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,5 | 3,7 | 3,5 |
| Luxembourg | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 |
| Malta | 9,5 | 9,4 | 8,5 | 9,2 | 9,2 | 9,6 | 9,4 | 9,6 | 9,9 | 9,8 | 10,4 |
| Netherlands | 3,1 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 3,0 | 3,0 | 3,1 | 2,9 | 2,9 | 2,9 | 3,0 | 3,0 |
| Poland | 4,1 | - | 4,3 | 4,7 | 4,2 | 4,3 | 4,3 | 4,4 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 4,1 |
| Portugal | 2,9 | 2,9 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,9 | 2,9 | 2,9 | 2,8 | 2,6 | 2,7 | 2,6 |
| Romania | 2,2 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 2,4 | 2,5 | 2,8 | 2,4 |
| Slovak Republic | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,4 | 3,5 | 3,8 | 3,1 | 3,3 | 3,4 | 3,4 |
| Slovenia | 3,6 | 3,7 | 3,8 | 3,9 | 3,9 | 3,9 | 3,9 | 4,0 | 4,0 | 4,1 | 4,0 |
| Spain | 9,1 | 9,3 | 9,2 | 8,7 | 8,8 | 9,0 | 9,1 | 9,1 | 8,7 | 9,2 | 9,3 |
| Sweden | 4,2 | 4,1 | 4,1 | 4,2 | 4,3 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 4,0 | 4,0 | 3,8 | 3,9 |
| Average | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,6 | 3,6 | 3,6 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,7 |
| Median | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,1 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 |
| Minimum | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,0 | 1,1 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 |
| Maximum | 9,5 | 9,4 | 9,2 | 9,2 | 9,2 | 9,6 | 9,4 | 9,6 | 9,9 | 9,8 | 10,4 |
| % of NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 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.

**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 Evolution of the total number of public prosecutors from 2020 to 2024 and persons with similar duties in 2024
## Absolute number (Q55, Q57, Q57-1)

| States | Total number of public prosecutors | | | | | Persons with similar duties to those of public prosecutors in 2024 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | Existence | Absolute number |
| **Austria** | 398 | 395 | 394 | 404 | 412 | | 143 |
| **Belgium** | 876 | 919 | 883 | 961 | 943 | | 512 |
| **Bulgaria** | 1 520 | 1 527 | 1 542 | 1 549 | 1 538 | | NAP |
| **Croatia** | 622 | 615 | 624 | 627 | 635 | | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | 50 | 47 | 47 | 65 | 65 | | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 1 224 | 1 233 | 1 244 | 1 246 | 1 235 | | NAP |
| **Denmark** | NA | 764 | 800 | 819 | 842 | | NAP |
| **Estonia** | 169 | 177 | 169 | 180 | 195 | | NAP |
| **Finland** | 390 | 424 | 441 | 457 | 471 | | NA |
| **France** | 2 151 | 2 143 | 2 156 | 2 394 | 2 225 | | 392 |
| **Germany** | 6 197 | 6 320 | 6 503 | 6 776 | 7 003 | | 1 087 |
| **Greece** | NA | 611 | 607 | 623 | 625 | | NAP |
| **Hungary** | 1 876 | 1 873 | 1 874 | 1 864 | 1 837 | | NAP |
| **Ireland** | 128 | 123 | 137 | 156 | 157 | | 30 |
| **Italy** | 2 269 | 2 231 | 2 255 | 2 168 | 2 177 | | 1 550 |
| **Latvia** | 461 | 449 | 457 | 415 | 373 | | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | 644 | 622 | 602 | 597 | 587 | | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | 62 | 63 | 65 | 70 | 78 | | NAP |
| **Malta** | 38 | 37 | 46 | 61 | 70 | | 170 |
| **Netherlands** | 945 | 976 | 1 026 | 1 071 | 1 093 | | 279 |
| **Poland** | 5 843 | 5 898 | 5 914 | 5 863 | 5 401 | | 457 |
| **Portugal** | 1 416 | 1 480 | 1 512 | 1 516 | 1 533 | | NAP |
| **Romania** | 2 446 | 2 370 | 2 213 | 2 064 | 2 274 | | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 922 | 976 | 1 014 | 1 017 | 1 021 | | 46 |
| **Slovenia** | 206 | 201 | 207 | 202 | 211 | | NAP |
| **Spain** | 2 544 | 2 631 | 2 679 | 2 750 | 2 812 | | NA |
| **Sweden** | 1 044 | 1 133 | 1 173 | 1 119 | 1 367 | | NAP |
| **Number of Yes** | | | | | | 13 | |
| **Average** | 1 378 | 1 342 | 1 355 | 1 372 | 1 377 | | 467 |
| **Median** | 922 | 919 | 883 | 961 | 943 | | 336 |
| **Minimum** | 38 | 37 | 46 | 61 | 65 | | 30 |
| **Maximum** | 6 197 | 6 320 | 6 503 | 6 776 | 7 003 | | 1 550 |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | 11% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | 52% |

**France:** Persons with similar duties were included in the number of public prosecutors only for 2023

Legend

Yes

No/NAP

## Table 7.3.1a Evolution of the total number of public prosecutors from 2020 to 2024 and their variation
## Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q55)

| States | Total number of public prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitants | | | | | Variation of the number of public prosecutors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 |
| Austria | 4,5 | 4,4 | 4,3 | 4,4 | 4,5 | 0,5% | 1,6% |
| Belgium | 7,6 | 7,9 | 7,5 | 8,2 | 8,0 | 4,9% | -2,4% |
| Bulgaria | 22,0 | 22,3 | 23,9 | 24,0 | 23,9 | 8,7% | -0,6% |
| Croatia | 15,4 | 15,9 | 16,2 | 16,3 | 16,4 | 6,6% | 0,9% |
| Cyprus | 5,6 | 5,2 | 5,1 | 7,0 | 6,7 | 20,5% | -3,4% |
| Czech Republic | 11,4 | 11,7 | 11,5 | 11,4 | 11,3 | -1,0% | -1,0% |
| Denmark | NA | 13,0 | 13,5 | 13,8 | 14,1 | - | 1,8% |
| Estonia | 12,7 | 13,3 | 12,7 | 13,2 | 14,2 | 11,6% | 7,6% |
| Finland | 7,0 | 7,6 | 7,9 | 8,1 | 8,4 | 18,6% | 2,7% |
| France | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,5 | 3,2 | 1,6% | -7,4% |
| Germany | 7,5 | 7,6 | 7,7 | 8,0 | 8,4 | 12,4% | 4,7% |
| Greece | NA | 5,7 | 5,7 | 6,0 | 6,0 | - | 0,4% |
| Hungary | 19,0 | 19,3 | 19,5 | 19,4 | 19,3 | 1,5% | -1,0% |
| Ireland | 2,6 | 2,4 | 2,7 | 2,9 | 2,9 | 12,2% | -1,1% |
| Italy | 3,8 | 3,8 | 3,8 | 3,7 | 3,7 | -3,5% | 0,5% |
| Latvia | 24,4 | 23,9 | 24,3 | 22,2 | 20,1 | -17,5% | -9,4% |
| Lithuania | 23,0 | 22,2 | 21,1 | 20,7 | 20,3 | -11,8% | -1,8% |
| Luxembourg | 9,8 | 9,8 | 9,8 | 10,4 | 11,4 | 17,1% | 9,8% |
| Malta | 7,4 | 7,2 | 8,8 | 10,8 | 12,2 | 65,1% | 12,6% |
| Netherlands | 5,4 | 5,6 | 5,8 | 6,0 | 6,1 | 12,0% | 1,5% |
| Poland | 15,3 | 15,5 | 15,7 | 15,6 | 14,4 | -5,9% | -7,7% |
| Portugal | 13,8 | 14,3 | 14,4 | 14,2 | 14,3 | 3,7% | 0,1% |
| Romania | 12,7 | 12,4 | 11,6 | 10,8 | 11,9 | -6,3% | 10,3% |
| Slovak Republic | 16,9 | 18,0 | 18,7 | 18,7 | 18,8 | 11,6% | 0,5% |
| Slovenia | 9,8 | 9,5 | 9,8 | 9,5 | 9,9 | 1,4% | 4,1% |
| Spain | 5,4 | 5,5 | 5,6 | 5,7 | 5,7 | 6,6% | 1,3% |
| Sweden | 10,1 | 10,8 | 11,1 | 10,6 | 12,9 | 28,4% | 21,7% |
| Average | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11,3 | 11,4 | 8% | 2% |
| Median | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10,6 | 11,4 | 7% | 0% |
| Minimum | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2,9 | 2,9 | -18% | -9% |
| Maximum | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24,0 | 23,9 | 65% | 22% |
| % of NA | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**Table 7.3.2 Total number of public prosecutors by instance from 2020 to 2024 and their variations**
**Absolute number (Q55)**

| States | Total public prosecutors by instance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | | | | 2021 | | | | 2022 | | | | 2023 | | | | 2024 | | | | Variations 2020-2024 | | | | Variations 2023-2024 | | | |
| | 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 | Total | 1st instance | 2nd instance | Supreme court | Total | 1st instance | 2nd instance | Supreme court |
| **Austria** | 398 | 358 | 22 | 18 | 395 | 353 | 26 | 16 | 394 | 355 | 22 | 17 | 404 | 362 | 24 | 18 | 412 | 370 | 24 | 18 | 3,5% | 3,4% | 9,1% | 0,0% | 2,0% | 2,2% | 0,0% | 0,0% |
| **Belgium** | 876 | 705 | 159 | 12 | 919 | 735 | 169 | 15 | 883 | 736 | 132 | 15 | 961 | 810 | 138 | 13 | 943 | 794 | 134 | 15 | 7,6% | 12,6% | -15,7% | 25,0% | -1,9% | -2,0% | -2,9% | 15,4% |
| **Bulgaria** | 1 520 | 884 | 514 | 122 | 1 527 | 904 | 507 | 116 | 1 542 | 883 | 528 | 131 | 1 549 | 900 | 515 | 134 | 1 538 | 904 | 511 | 123 | 1,2% | 2,3% | -0,6% | 0,8% | -0,7% | 0,4% | -0,8% | -8,2% |
| **Croatia** | 622 | 439 | 158 | 25 | 615 | 434 | 159 | 22 | 624 | 439 | 162 | 23 | 627 | 437 | 164 | 26 | 635 | 433 | 174 | 29 | 2,1% | -1,4% | 10,1% | 16,0% | 1,3% | -0,9% | 6,1% | 11,5% |
| **Cyprus** | 50 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 47 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 47 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 65 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 65 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 30,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 1 224 | 822 | 345 | 57 | 1 233 | 834 | 343 | 56 | 1 244 | 836 | 349 | 59 | 1 246 | 832 | 355 | 59 | 1 235 | 829 | 350 | 56 | 0,9% | 0,9% | 1,4% | -1,8% | -0,9% | -0,4% | -1,4% | -5,1% |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 764 | 594 | 170 | 6 | 800 | 662 | 131 | 7 | 819 | 663 | 148 | 8 | 842 | 673 | 162 | 7 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2,8% | 1,5% | 9,5% | -12,5% |
| **Estonia** | 169 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 177 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 169 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 180 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 195 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 15,4% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 8,3% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | 390 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 424 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 441 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 457 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 471 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 20,8% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 3,1% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 2 151 | 1 605 | 489 | 57 | 2 143 | 1 596 | 490 | 57 | 2 156 | 1 614 | 484 | 58 | 2 394 | 1 892 | 444 | 58 | 2 225 | 1 664 | 499 | 62 | 3,4% | 3,7% | 2,0% | 8,8% | -7,1% | -12,1% | 12,4% | 6,9% |
| **Germany** | 6 197 | 5 562 | 492 | 143 | 6 320 | 5 668 | 509 | 143 | 6 503 | 5 808 | 532 | 163 | 6 776 | 6 022 | 591 | 163 | 7 003 | 6 261 | 568 | 174 | 13,0% | 12,6% | 15,4% | 21,7% | 3,4% | 4,0% | -3,9% | 6,7% |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 611 | 388 | 196 | 27 | 607 | 382 | 198 | 27 | 623 | 392 | 204 | 27 | 625 | 395 | 203 | 27 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,3% | 0,8% | -0,5% | 0,0% |
| **Hungary** | 1 876 | 1 207 | 558 | 111 | 1 873 | 1 730 | 29 | 112 | 1 874 | 1 737 | 28 | 107 | 1 864 | 1 710 | 32 | 120 | 1 837 | 1 696 | 28 | 111 | -2,1% | 40,5% | -95,0% | 0,0% | -1,4% | -0,8% | -12,5% | -7,5% |
| **Ireland** | 128 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 123 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 137 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 156 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 157 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 22,7% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 0,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 2 269 | 1 939 | 261 | 69 | 2 231 | 1 924 | 241 | 66 | 2 255 | 1 957 | 225 | 73 | 2 168 | 1 878 | 220 | 70 | 2 177 | 1 876 | 224 | 77 | -4,1% | -3,2% | -14,2% | 11,6% | 0,4% | -0,1% | 1,8% | 10,0% |
| **Latvia** | 461 | 302 | 93 | 66 | 449 | 295 | 90 | 64 | 457 | 306 | 89 | 62 | 415 | 287 | 79 | 49 | 373 | 262 | 69 | 42 | -19,1% | -13,2% | -25,8% | -36,4% | -10,1% | -8,7% | -12,7% | -14,3% |
| **Lithuania** | 644 | 576 | NAP | 68 | 622 | 556 | NAP | 66 | 602 | 533 | NAP | 69 | 597 | 528 | NAP | 69 | 587 | 519 | NAP | 68 | -8,9% | -9,9% | NAP | 0,0% | -1,7% | -1,7% | NAP | -1,4% |
| **Luxembourg** | 62 | 47 | NAP | 15 | 63 | 48 | NAP | 15 | 65 | 48 | NAP | 17 | 70 | 50 | NAP | 20 | 78 | 58 | NAP | 20 | 25,8% | 23,4% | NAP | 33,3% | 11,4% | 16,0% | NAP | 0,0% |
| **Malta** | 38 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 37 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 46 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 61 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 70 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 84,2% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 14,8% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 945 | 850 | 95 | NAP | 976 | 873 | 103 | NAP | 1 026 | 918 | 108 | NAP | 1 071 | 968 | 103 | NAP | 1 093 | 984 | 109 | NAP | 15,7% | 15,8% | 14,7% | NAP | 2,1% | 1,7% | 5,8% | NAP |
| **Poland** | 5 843 | 3 759 | 1 605 | 88 | 5 898 | 3 775 | 1 631 | 90 | 5 914 | 3 791 | 1 638 | 86 | 5 863 | 3 733 | 1 609 | 101 | 5 401 | 3 680 | 1 625 | 96 | -7,6% | -2,1% | 1,2% | 9,1% | -7,9% | -1,4% | 1,0% | -5,0% |
| **Portugal** | 1 416 | 1 325 | 75 | 16 | 1 480 | 1 389 | 75 | 16 | 1 512 | 1 409 | 82 | 21 | 1 516 | 1 406 | 90 | 20 | 1 533 | 1 424 | 88 | 21 | 8,3% | 7,5% | 17,3% | 31,3% | 1,1% | 1,3% | -2,2% | 5,0% |
| **Romania** | 2 446 | 1 144 | 788 | 514 | 2 370 | 1 153 | 707 | 510 | 2 213 | 1 089 | 668 | 456 | 2 064 | 912 | 675 | 477 | 2 274 | 1 055 | 701 | 518 | -7,0% | -7,8% | 11,0% | 0,8% | 10,2% | 15,7% | 3,9% | 8,6% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 922 | 607 | 200 | 115 | 976 | 651 | 206 | 119 | 1 014 | 684 | 213 | 117 | 1 017 | 679 | 212 | 126 | 1 021 | 680 | 222 | 119 | 10,7% | 12,0% | 11,0% | 3,5% | 0,4% | 0,1% | 4,7% | -5,6% |
| **Slovenia** | 206 | 151 | 43 | 12 | 201 | 144 | 45 | 12 | 207 | 148 | 44 | 15 | 202 | 141 | 46 | 15 | 211 | 148 | 47 | 16 | 2,4% | -2,0% | 9,3% | 33,3% | 4,5% | 5,0% | 2,2% | 6,7% |
| **Spain** | 2 544 | NAP | NAP | 33 | 2 631 | NAP | NAP | 32 | 2 679 | NAP | NAP | 40 | 2 750 | NAP | NAP | 36 | 2 812 | NAP | NAP | 38 | 10,5% | NAP | NAP | 15,2% | 2,3% | NAP | NAP | 5,6% |
| **Sweden** | 1 044 | NA | NA | 12 | 1 133 | NA | NA | 12 | 1 173 | NA | NA | 12 | 1 119 | NA | NA | 12 | 1 367 | NA | NA | 13 | 30,9% | NA | NA | 8,3% | 22,2% | NA | NA | 8,3% |
| **Average** | 1 378 | 1 238 | 369 | 82 | 1 342 | 1 202 | 316 | 75 | 1 355 | 1 217 | 313 | 75 | 1 372 | 1 230 | 314 | 77 | 1 377 | 1 235 | 319 | 79 | 10,4% | 5,3% | -4,4% | 9,5% | 2,2% | 1,0% | 0,6% | 1,2% |
| **Median** | 922 | 836 | 231 | 57 | 919 | 785 | 183 | 56 | 883 | 786 | 180 | 58 | 961 | 821 | 184 | 49 | 943 | 812 | 189 | 42 | 7,6% | 2,8% | 1,7% | 8,8% | 1,1% | 0,3% | 0,5% | 0,0% |
| **Minimum** | 38 | 47 | 22 | 12 | 37 | 48 | 26 | 6 | 46 | 48 | 22 | 7 | 61 | 50 | 24 | 8 | 65 | 58 | 24 | 7 | -19,1% | -13,2% | -95,0% | -36,4% | -10,1% | -12,1% | -12,7% | -14,3% |
| **Maximum** | 6 197 | 5 562 | 1 605 | 514 | 6 320 | 5 668 | 1 631 | 510 | 6 503 | 5 808 | 1 638 | 456 | 6 776 | 6 022 | 1 609 | 477 | 7 003 | 6 261 | 1 625 | 518 | 84,2% | 40,5% | 17,3% | 33,3% | 22,2% | 16,0% | 12,4% | 15,4% |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% |

**France:** Persons with similar duties were included in the number of public prosecutors only for 2023

**Poland** has 4 instancies of prosecution and the total does not corespond with the sum of the 3 instances presented.

**Table 7.3.2a Total number of public prosecutors by instance from 2020 to 2024**
**Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q55)**

| States | Total public prosecutors by instance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | | | | 2021 | | | | 2022 | | | | 2023 | | | | 2024 | | | | Variations 2020-2024 | | | | Variations 2023-2024 | | | |
| | 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 | Total | 1st instance | 2nd instance | Supreme court | Total | 1st instance | 2nd instance | Supreme court |
| **Austria** | 4,5 | 4,0 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 4,4 | 3,9 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 4,3 | 3,9 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 4,4 | 4,0 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 4,5 | 4,0 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 0,5% | 0,4% | 6,0% | -2,9% | 1,6% | 1,8% | -0,4% | -0,4% |
| **Belgium** | 7,6 | 6,1 | 1,4 | 0,1 | 7,9 | 6,4 | 1,5 | 0,1 | 7,5 | 6,3 | 1,1 | 0,1 | 8,2 | 6,9 | 1,2 | 0,1 | 8,0 | 6,7 | 1,1 | 0,1 | 4,9% | 9,7% | -17,9% | 21,8% | -2,4% | -2,5% | -3,4% | 14,8% |
| **Bulgaria** | 22,0 | 12,8 | 7,4 | 1,8 | 22,3 | 13,2 | 7,4 | 1,7 | 23,9 | 13,7 | 8,2 | 2,0 | 24,0 | 14,0 | 8,0 | 2,1 | 23,9 | 14,0 | 7,9 | 1,9 | 8,7% | 9,9% | 6,8% | 8,3% | -0,6% | 0,6% | -0,7% | -8,1% |
| **Croatia** | 15,4 | 10,9 | 3,9 | 0,6 | 15,9 | 11,2 | 4,1 | 0,6 | 16,2 | 11,4 | 4,2 | 0,6 | 16,3 | 11,3 | 4,3 | 0,7 | 16,4 | 11,2 | 4,5 | 0,8 | 6,6% | 3,0% | 15,0% | 21,1% | 0,9% | -1,3% | 5,7% | 11,2% |
| **Cyprus** | 5,6 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 5,2 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 5,1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 7,0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 6,7 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 20,5% | NAP | NAP | NAP | -3,4% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 11,4 | 7,7 | 3,2 | 0,5 | 11,7 | 7,9 | 3,3 | 0,5 | 11,5 | 7,7 | 3,2 | 0,5 | 11,4 | 7,6 | 3,3 | 0,5 | 11,3 | 7,6 | 3,2 | 0,5 | -1,0% | -1,1% | -0,5% | -3,6% | -1,0% | -0,4% | -1,5% | -5,2% |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 13,0 | 10,1 | 2,9 | 0,1 | 13,5 | 11,2 | 2,2 | 0,1 | 13,8 | 11,2 | 2,5 | 0,1 | 14,1 | 11,2 | 2,7 | 0,1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1,8% | 0,5% | 8,4% | -13,4% |
| **Estonia** | 12,7 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 13,3 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 12,7 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 13,2 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 14,2 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 11,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 7,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | 7,0 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 7,6 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 7,9 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 8,1 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 8,4 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 18,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 2,7% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 3,2 | 2,4 | 0,7 | 0,1 | 3,2 | 2,4 | 0,7 | 0,1 | 3,2 | 2,4 | 0,7 | 0,1 | 3,5 | 2,8 | 0,6 | 0,1 | 3,2 | 2,4 | 0,7 | 0,1 | 1,6% | 1,9% | 0,3% | 6,9% | -7,4% | -12,3% | 12,0% | 6,5% |
| **Germany** | 7,5 | 6,7 | 0,6 | 0,2 | 7,6 | 6,8 | 0,6 | 0,2 | 7,7 | 6,9 | 0,6 | 0,2 | 8,0 | 7,1 | 0,7 | 0,2 | 8,4 | 7,5 | 0,7 | 0,2 | 12,4% | 12,0% | 14,9% | 21,1% | 4,7% | 5,3% | -2,6% | 8,1% |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | NA | NA | 5,7 | 3,6 | 1,8 | 0,3 | 5,7 | 3,6 | 1,9 | 0,3 | 6,0 | 3,8 | 2,0 | 0,3 | 6,0 | 3,8 | 2,0 | 0,3 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0,4% | 0,9% | -0,4% | 0,1% |
| **Hungary** | 19,0 | 12,2 | 5,6 | 1,1 | 19,3 | 17,9 | 0,3 | 1,2 | 19,5 | 18,1 | 0,3 | 1,1 | 19,4 | 17,8 | 0,3 | 1,3 | 19,3 | 17,8 | 0,3 | 1,2 | 1,5% | 45,7% | -94,8% | 3,7% | -1,0% | -0,3% | -12,1% | -7,1% |
| **Ireland** | 2,6 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 2,4 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 2,7 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 2,9 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 2,9 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 12,2% | NAP | NAP | NAP | -1,1% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 3,8 | 3,3 | 0,4 | 0,1 | 3,8 | 3,3 | 0,4 | 0,1 | 3,8 | 3,3 | 0,4 | 0,1 | 3,7 | 3,2 | 0,4 | 0,1 | 3,7 | 3,2 | 0,4 | 0,1 | -3,5% | -2,7% | -13,7% | 12,2% | 0,5% | 0,0% | 1,9% | 10,1% |
| **Latvia** | 24,4 | 16,0 | 4,9 | 3,5 | 23,9 | 15,7 | 4,8 | 3,4 | 24,3 | 16,3 | 4,7 | 3,3 | 22,2 | 15,3 | 4,2 | 2,6 | 20,1 | 14,1 | 3,7 | 2,3 | -17,5% | -11,5% | -24,4% | -35,1% | -9,4% | -8,0% | -12,0% | -13,6% |
| **Lithuania** | 23,0 | 20,6 | NAP | 2,4 | 22,2 | 19,8 | NAP | 2,4 | 21,1 | 18,7 | NAP | 2,4 | 20,7 | 18,3 | NAP | 2,4 | 20,3 | 18,0 | NAP | 2,4 | -11,8% | -12,8% | NAP | -3,3% | -1,8% | -1,9% | NAP | -1,6% |
| **Luxembourg** | 9,8 | 7,4 | NAP | 2,4 | 9,8 | 7,4 | NAP | 2,3 | 9,8 | 7,3 | NAP | 2,6 | 10,4 | 7,4 | NAP | 3,0 | 11,4 | 8,5 | NAP | 2,9 | 17,1% | 14,9% | NAP | 24,1% | 9,8% | 14,3% | NAP | -1,5% |
| **Malta** | 7,4 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 7,2 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 8,8 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 10,8 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 12,2 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 65,1% | NAP | NAP | NAP | 12,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 5,4 | 4,9 | 0,5 | NAP | 5,6 | 5,0 | 0,6 | NAP | 5,8 | 5,2 | 0,6 | NAP | 6,0 | 5,4 | 0,6 | NAP | 6,1 | 5,5 | 0,6 | NAP | 12,0% | 12,1% | 11,1% | NAP | 1,5% | 1,1% | 5,2% | NAP |
| **Poland** | 15,3 | 9,8 | 4,2 | 0,2 | 15,5 | 9,9 | 4,3 | 0,2 | 15,7 | 10,0 | 4,3 | 0,2 | 15,6 | 9,9 | 4,3 | 0,3 | 14,4 | 9,8 | 4,3 | 0,3 | -5,9% | -0,3% | 3,1% | 11,1% | -7,7% | -1,2% | 1,2% | -4,8% |
| **Portugal** | 13,8 | 12,9 | 0,7 | 0,2 | 14,3 | 13,4 | 0,7 | 0,2 | 14,4 | 13,5 | 0,8 | 0,2 | 14,2 | 13,2 | 0,8 | 0,2 | 14,3 | 13,2 | 0,8 | 0,2 | 3,7% | 2,9% | 12,4% | 25,7% | 0,1% | 0,2% | -3,2% | 3,9% |
| **Romania** | 12,7 | 6,0 | 4,1 | 2,7 | 12,4 | 6,1 | 3,7 | 2,7 | 11,6 | 5,7 | 3,5 | 2,4 | 10,8 | 4,8 | 3,5 | 2,5 | 11,9 | 5,5 | 3,7 | 2,7 | -6,3% | -7,1% | 10,3% | 1,6% | 10,3% | 15,9% | 4,0% | 8,8% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 16,9 | 11,1 | 3,7 | 2,1 | 18,0 | 12,0 | 3,8 | 2,2 | 18,7 | 12,6 | 3,9 | 2,2 | 18,7 | 12,5 | 3,9 | 2,3 | 18,8 | 12,5 | 4,1 | 2,2 | 11,6% | 12,9% | 11,8% | 4,2% | 0,5% | 0,2% | 4,8% | -5,5% |
| **Slovenia** | 9,8 | 7,2 | 2,0 | 0,6 | 9,5 | 6,8 | 2,1 | 0,6 | 9,8 | 7,0 | 2,1 | 0,7 | 9,5 | 6,6 | 2,2 | 0,7 | 9,9 | 6,9 | 2,2 | 0,8 | 1,4% | -3,0% | 8,2% | 32,0% | 4,1% | 4,6% | 1,8% | 6,3% |
| **Spain** | 5,4 | NAP | NAP | 0,1 | 5,5 | NAP | NAP | 0,1 | 5,6 | NAP | NAP | 0,1 | 5,7 | NAP | NAP | 0,1 | 5,7 | NAP | NAP | 0,1 | 6,6% | NAP | NAP | 11,1% | 1,3% | NAP | NAP | 4,6% |
| **Sweden** | 10,1 | NA | NA | 0,1 | 10,8 | NA | NA | 0,1 | 11,1 | NA | NA | 0,1 | 10,6 | NA | NA | 0,1 | 12,9 | NA | NA | 0,1 | 28,4% | NA | NA | 16,2% | 21,7% | NA | NA | 18,0% |
| **Average** | 11,0 | 9,0 | 2,7 | 1,0 | 11,0 | 9,1 | 2,4 | 0,9 | 11,2 | 9,2 | 2,4 | 0,9 | 11,3 | 9,2 | 2,4 | 0,9 | 11,4 | 9,2 | 2,4 | 0,9 | 8,0% | 4,8% | -4,5% | 8,7% | 1,7% | 0,9% | 0,5% | 1,0% |
| **Median** | 9,8 | 7,5 | 2,6 | 0,5 | 9,8 | 7,7 | 2,0 | 0,3 | 9,8 | 7,5 | 2,0 | 0,3 | 10,6 | 7,5 | 2,1 | 0,3 | 11,4 | 8,1 | 2,1 | 0,3 | 6,6% | 2,4% | 4,5% | 8,3% | 0,5% | 0,2% | 0,4% | 0,1% |
| **Minimum** | 2,6 | 2,4 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 2,4 | 2,4 | 0,3 | 0,1 | 2,7 | 2,4 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 2,9 | 2,8 | 0,3 | 0,1 | 2,9 | 2,4 | 0,3 | 0,1 | -17,5% | -12,8% | -94,8% | -35,1% | -9,4% | -12,3% | -12,1% | -13,6% |
| **Maximum** | 24,4 | 20,6 | 7,4 | 3,5 | 23,9 | 19,8 | 7,4 | 3,4 | 24,3 | 18,7 | 8,2 | 3,3 | 24,0 | 18,3 | 8,0 | 3,0 | 23,9 | 18,0 | 7,9 | 2,9 | 65,1% | 45,7% | 15,0% | 32,0% | 21,7% | 15,9% | 12,0% | 14,8% |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 30% | 22% |

**France:** Persons with similar duties were included in the number of public prosecutors only for 2023

**Poland** has 4 instancies of prosecution and the total does not corespond with the sum of the 3 instances presented.

## Table 7.3.3 Total number of public prosecutors: distribution of males and females in 2020 - 2024 (Q55)

| States | Total number of public prosecutors: distribution of males and females | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | | Variation 2020-2024 in percentage points | | | |
| | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | Male | | Female | |
| Search Key | 055.2.1MAN | 055.3.1WOM | 055.2.1MAN | 055.3.1WOM | 055.2.1MAN | 055.3.1WOM | 055.2.1MAN | 055.3.1WOM | 055.2.1MAN | 055.3.1WOM | CALC | CALC | CALC | CALC |
| A | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V |
| **Austria** | 47,7% | 52,3% | 47,8% | 52,2% | 47,5% | 52,5% | 45,3% | 54,7% | 45,1% | 54,9% | ▼ | -2,6 | ▲ | 2,6 |
| **Belgium** | 40,8% | 59,2% | 40,4% | 59,6% | 40,1% | 59,9% | 41,7% | 58,3% | 35,9% | 64,1% | ▼ | -4,8 | ▲ | 4,8 |
| **Bulgaria** | 48,7% | 51,3% | 48,3% | 51,7% | 48,3% | 51,7% | 48,2% | 51,8% | 48,1% | 51,9% | ▼ | -0,6 | ▲ | 0,6 |
| **Croatia** | 31,7% | 68,3% | 30,7% | 69,3% | 30,6% | 69,4% | 30,8% | 69,2% | 30,7% | 69,3% | ▼ | -1,0 | ▲ | 1,0 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 24,6% | 75,4% | 24,6% | 75,4% | | NA | | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 45,8% | 54,2% | 46,1% | 53,9% | 46,9% | 53,1% | 47,6% | 52,4% | 47,4% | 52,6% | ▲ | 1,5 | ▼ | -1,5 |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | 33,1% | 67,0% | 33,0% | 67,0% | 32,7% | 67,3% | 32,3% | 67,7% | | NA | | NA |
| **Estonia** | 29,6% | 70,4% | 28,2% | 71,8% | 29,6% | 70,4% | 30,0% | 70,0% | 29,7% | 70,3% | ▲ | 0,2 | ▼ | -0,2 |
| **Finland** | 39,7% | 60,3% | 37,3% | 62,7% | 35,8% | 64,2% | 33,9% | 66,1% | 33,1% | 66,9% | ▼ | -6,6 | ▲ | 6,6 |
| **France** | 40,5% | 59,5% | 41,2% | 58,8% | 40,2% | 59,8% | 45,5% | 54,5% | 37,4% | 62,6% | ▼ | -3,1 | ▲ | 3,1 |
| **Germany** | 49,4% | 50,6% | 49,6% | 50,4% | 48,4% | 51,6% | 46,9% | 53,1% | 45,5% | 54,5% | ▼ | -3,9 | ▲ | 3,9 |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 38,1% | 61,9% | 35,4% | 64,6% | 35,8% | 64,2% | 36,5% | 63,5% | | NA | | NA |
| **Hungary** | 39,6% | 60,4% | 39,6% | 60,4% | 38,8% | 61,2% | 38,7% | 61,3% | 38,3% | 61,7% | ▼ | -1,3 | ▲ | 1,3 |
| **Ireland** | 39,1% | 60,9% | 37,4% | 62,6% | 35,8% | 64,2% | 35,3% | 64,7% | 33,1% | 66,9% | ▼ | -5,9 | ▲ | 5,9 |
| **Italy** | 52,9% | 47,1% | 52,5% | 47,5% | 51,8% | 48,2% | 51,4% | 48,6% | 50,8% | 49,2% | ▼ | -2,1 | ▲ | 2,1 |
| **Latvia** | 39,3% | 60,7% | 41,0% | 59,0% | 40,9% | 59,1% | 38,8% | 61,2% | 39,1% | 60,9% | ▼ | -0,1 | ▲ | 0,1 |
| **Lithuania** | 48,9% | 51,1% | 49,5% | 50,5% | 49,0% | 51,0% | 48,2% | 51,8% | 48,7% | 51,3% | ▼ | -0,2 | ▲ | 0,2 |
| **Luxembourg** | 50,0% | 50,0% | 52,4% | 47,6% | 47,7% | 52,3% | 44,3% | 55,7% | 46,2% | 53,8% | ▼ | -3,8 | ▲ | 3,8 |
| **Malta** | 52,6% | 47,4% | 56,8% | 43,2% | 47,8% | 52,2% | 50,8% | 49,2% | 47,1% | 52,9% | ▼ | -5,5 | ▲ | 5,5 |
| **Netherlands** | 38,8% | 61,2% | 39,8% | 60,2% | 39,5% | 60,5% | 38,4% | 61,6% | 36,8% | 63,2% | ▼ | -2,1 | ▲ | 2,1 |
| **Poland** | 47,7% | 52,3% | 47,6% | 52,4% | 47,7% | 52,3% | 47,6% | 52,4% | 46,4% | 53,6% | ▼ | -1,3 | ▲ | 1,3 |
| **Portugal** | 35,1% | 64,9% | 34,3% | 65,7% | 33,0% | 67,0% | 30,0% | 70,0% | 28,2% | 71,8% | ▼ | -6,9 | ▲ | 6,9 |
| **Romania** | 48,0% | 52,0% | 48,4% | 51,6% | 48,5% | 51,5% | 49,8% | 50,2% | 49,6% | 50,4% | ▲ | 1,6 | ▼ | -1,6 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 49,8% | 50,2% | 47,1% | 52,9% | 49,1% | 50,9% | 49,9% | 50,1% | 48,9% | 51,1% | ▼ | -0,9 | ▲ | 0,9 |
| **Slovenia** | 31,6% | 68,4% | 30,8% | 69,2% | 31,9% | 68,1% | 29,7% | 70,3% | 28,0% | 72,0% | ▼ | -3,6 | ▲ | 3,6 |
| **Spain** | 34,7% | 65,3% | 34,2% | 65,8% | 33,3% | 66,7% | 33,1% | 66,9% | 33,1% | 66,9% | ▼ | -1,6 | ▲ | 1,6 |
| **Sweden** | 37,9% | 62,1% | 30,0% | 70,0% | 34,6% | 65,4% | 31,5% | 68,5% | 32,3% | 67,7% | ▼ | -5,6 | ▲ | 5,6 |
| **Average** | 42,5% | 57,5% | 41,6% | 58,4% | 41,0% | 59,0% | 40,0% | 60,0% | 39,0% | 61,0% | | -2,5 | | 2,5 |
| **Median** | 40,6% | 59,4% | 40,7% | 59,3% | 40,2% | 59,8% | 38,8% | 61,2% | 37,4% | 62,6% | | -2,1 | | 2,1 |
| **Minimum** | 29,6% | 47,1% | 28,2% | 43,2% | 29,6% | 48,2% | 24,6% | 48,6% | 24,6% | 49,2% | | -6,9 | | -1,6 |
| **Maximum** | 52,9% | 70,4% | 56,8% | 71,8% | 51,8% | 70,4% | 51,4% | 75,4% | 50,8% | 75,4% | | 1,6 | | 6,9 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 11% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | 0,1 | | 0,1 |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | 0,0 | | 0,0 |

## Table 7.3.4 Public prosecutors at the first instance level: distribution of males and females from 2020 to 2024 (Q55)

| States | Public prosecutors at the first instance level: distribution of males and females | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | | Variation 2020-2024 in percentage points | | | |
| | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | Male | | Female | |
| **Austria** | 46,4% | 53,6% | 46,2% | 53,8% | 46,2% | 53,8% | 43,6% | 56,4% | 44,1% | 55,9% | ▼ | -2,3 | ▲ | 2,3 |
| **Belgium** | 36,7% | 63,3% | 35,9% | 64,1% | 36,4% | 63,6% | 38,6% | 61,4% | 32,5% | 67,5% | ▼ | -4,2 | ▲ | 4,2 |
| **Bulgaria** | 44,0% | 56,0% | 43,5% | 56,5% | 45,3% | 54,7% | 45,9% | 54,1% | 45,6% | 54,4% | ▲ | 1,6 | ▼ | -1,6 |
| **Croatia** | 28,7% | 71,3% | 28,6% | 71,4% | 28,5% | 71,5% | 28,4% | 71,6% | 28,4% | 71,6% | ▼ | -0,3 | ▲ | 0,3 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 41,2% | 58,8% | 41,6% | 58,4% | 42,5% | 57,5% | 43,1% | 56,9% | 43,1% | 56,9% | ▲ | 1,8 | ▼ | -1,8 |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | 31,0% | 69,0% | 32,6% | 67,4% | 32,7% | 67,3% | 32,4% | 67,6% | | NA | | NA |
| **Estonia** | 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 |
| **France** | 37,0% | 63,0% | 37,8% | 62,3% | 36,7% | 63,3% | 44,6% | 55,4% | 34,1% | 65,9% | ▼ | -2,9 | ▲ | 2,9 |
| **Germany** | 48,0% | 52,0% | 48,3% | 51,7% | 46,9% | 53,1% | 45,3% | 54,7% | 44,1% | 55,9% | ▼ | -3,9 | ▲ | 3,9 |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 34,5% | 65,5% | 33,8% | 66,2% | 33,4% | 66,6% | 34,4% | 65,6% | | NA | | NA |
| **Hungary** | 35,9% | 64,1% | 38,4% | 61,6% | 37,8% | 62,2% | 37,8% | 62,2% | 37,3% | 62,7% | ▲ | 1,4 | ▼ | -1,4 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| **Italy** | 51,2% | 48,8% | 50,9% | 49,1% | 50,7% | 49,3% | 49,8% | 50,2% | 49,3% | 50,7% | ▼ | -1,9 | ▲ | 1,9 |
| **Latvia** | 34,8% | 65,2% | 36,6% | 63,4% | 36,3% | 63,7% | 35,2% | 64,8% | 35,5% | 64,5% | ▲ | 0,7 | ▼ | -0,7 |
| **Lithuania** | 47,6% | 52,4% | 48,0% | 52,0% | 47,3% | 52,7% | 46,4% | 53,6% | 47,0% | 53,0% | ▼ | -0,6 | ▲ | 0,6 |
| **Luxembourg** | 51,1% | 48,9% | 56,3% | 43,8% | 54,2% | 45,8% | 50,0% | 50,0% | 48,3% | 51,7% | ▼ | -2,8 | ▲ | 2,8 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 37,5% | 62,5% | 38,8% | 61,2% | 38,6% | 61,4% | 37,5% | 62,5% | 36,0% | 64,0% | ▼ | -1,6 | ▲ | 1,6 |
| **Poland** | 42,8% | 57,2% | 42,8% | 57,2% | 42,7% | 57,3% | 42,8% | 57,2% | 43,1% | 56,9% | ▲ | 0,3 | ▼ | -0,3 |
| **Portugal** | 33,2% | 66,8% | 32,1% | 67,9% | 30,6% | 69,4% | 27,7% | 72,3% | 26,1% | 73,9% | ▼ | -7,1 | ▲ | 7,1 |
| **Romania** | 47,6% | 52,4% | 48,0% | 52,0% | 48,9% | 51,1% | 48,9% | 51,1% | 48,1% | 51,9% | ▲ | 0,4 | ▼ | -0,4 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 46,5% | 53,5% | 46,5% | 53,5% | 45,9% | 54,1% | 47,3% | 52,7% | 46,6% | 53,4% | ▲ | 0,2 | ▼ | -0,2 |
| **Slovenia** | 28,5% | 71,5% | 27,8% | 72,2% | 28,4% | 72,3% | 27,0% | 73,0% | 25,7% | 74,3% | ▼ | -2,8 | ▲ | 2,8 |
| **Spain** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | | NA | | NA |
| **Average** | 41,0% | 59,0% | 40,7% | 59,3% | 40,5% | 59,5% | 40,3% | 59,7% | 39,1% | 60,9% | | -1,3 | | 1,3 |
| **Median** | 42,0% | 58,0% | 40,2% | 59,8% | 40,5% | 59,5% | 43,0% | 57,0% | 40,2% | 59,8% | | -1,1 | | 1,1 |
| **Minimum** | 28,5% | 48,8% | 27,8% | 43,8% | 28,4% | 45,8% | 27,0% | 50,0% | 25,7% | 50,7% | | -7,1 | | -1,8 |
| **Maximum** | 51,2% | 71,5% | 56,3% | 72,2% | 54,2% | 72,3% | 50,0% | 73,0% | 49,3% | 74,3% | | 1,8 | | 7,1 |
| **% of NA** | 11% | 11% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | | 0,1 | | 0,1 |
| **% of NAP** | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | | 0,2 | | 0,2 |

## Table 7.3.5 Public prosecutors at the second instance level: distribution of males and females from 2020 to 2024 (Q55)

| States | Public prosecutors at the second instance level: distribution of males and females | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | | Variation 2020-2024 in percentage points | | | |
| | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | Male | | Female | |
| Austria | 63,6% | 36,4% | 57,7% | 42,3% | 59,1% | 40,9% | 58,3% | 41,7% | 54,2% | 45,8% | ▼ | -9,5 | ▲ | 9,5 |
| Belgium | 55,3% | 44,7% | 56,2% | 43,8% | 56,1% | 43,9% | 55,8% | 44,2% | 53,0% | 47,0% | ▼ | -2,4 | ▲ | 2,4 |
| Bulgaria | 57,8% | 42,2% | 57,6% | 42,4% | 54,9% | 45,1% | 54,2% | 45,8% | 54,0% | 46,0% | ▼ | -3,8 | ▲ | 3,8 |
| Croatia | 39,9% | 60,1% | 37,1% | 62,9% | 37,7% | 62,3% | 37,2% | 62,8% | 36,8% | 62,6% | ▼ | -3,1 | ▲ | 2,5 |
| Cyprus | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| Czech Republic | 53,0% | 47,0% | 53,4% | 46,6% | 53,9% | 46,1% | 54,1% | 45,9% | 54,3% | 45,7% | ▲ | 1,2 | ▼ | -1,2 |
| Denmark | NA | NA | 40,6% | 59,4% | 35,1% | 64,9% | 33,1% | 66,9% | 32,1% | 67,9% | | NA | | NA |
| Estonia | 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 |
| France | 50,5% | 49,5% | 50,8% | 49,0% | 50,2% | 49,8% | 48,2% | 51,8% | 46,5% | 53,5% | ▼ | -4,0 | ▲ | 4,0 |
| Germany | 62,6% | 37,4% | 61,3% | 38,7% | 59,6% | 40,4% | 58,9% | 41,1% | 55,6% | 44,4% | ▼ | -7,0 | ▲ | 7,0 |
| Greece | NA | NA | 42,3% | 57,7% | 36,4% | 63,6% | 38,2% | 61,8% | 39,4% | 60,6% | | NA | | NA |
| Hungary | 44,6% | 55,4% | 55,2% | 44,8% | 53,6% | 46,4% | 46,9% | 53,1% | 50,0% | 50,0% | ▲ | 5,4 | ▼ | -5,4 |
| Ireland | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| Italy | 63,2% | 36,8% | 62,2% | 37,8% | 58,7% | 41,3% | 60,9% | 39,1% | 59,8% | 40,2% | ▼ | -3,4 | ▲ | 3,4 |
| Latvia | 44,1% | 55,9% | 47,8% | 52,2% | 47,2% | 52,8% | 43,0% | 57,0% | 44,9% | 55,1% | ▲ | 0,8 | ▼ | -0,8 |
| Lithuania | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| Luxembourg | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| Malta | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| Netherlands | 50,5% | 49,5% | 47,6% | 52,4% | 47,2% | 52,8% | 46,6% | 53,4% | 44,0% | 56,0% | ▼ | -6,5 | ▲ | 6,5 |
| Poland | 54,7% | 45,3% | 54,2% | 45,8% | 54,8% | 45,2% | 53,7% | 46,3% | 52,1% | 47,9% | ▼ | -2,6 | ▲ | 2,6 |
| Portugal | 69,3% | 30,7% | 70,7% | 29,3% | 64,6% | 35,4% | 56,7% | 43,3% | 50,0% | 50,0% | ▼ | -19,3 | ▲ | 19,3 |
| Romania | 46,2% | 53,8% | 46,1% | 53,9% | 45,2% | 54,8% | 48,9% | 51,1% | 49,1% | 50,9% | ▲ | 2,9 | ▼ | -2,9 |
| Slovak Republic | 54,0% | 46,0% | 51,9% | 48,1% | 54,9% | 45,1% | 54,7% | 45,3% | 52,7% | 47,3% | ▼ | -1,3 | ▲ | 1,3 |
| Slovenia | 34,9% | 65,1% | 35,6% | 64,4% | 43,2% | 59,1% | 37,0% | 65,2% | 36,2% | 66,0% | ▲ | 1,3 | ▲ | 0,8 |
| Spain | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | | NAP | | NAP |
| Sweden | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | | NA | | NA |
| Average | 52,8% | 47,2% | 51,6% | 48,4% | 50,7% | 49,4% | 49,2% | 50,9% | 48,0% | 52,0% | | -3,2 | | 3,3 |
| Median | 53,5% | 46,5% | 52,6% | 47,4% | 53,7% | 46,3% | 51,3% | 48,7% | 50,0% | 50,0% | | -2,9 | | 2,6 |
| Minimum | 34,9% | 30,7% | 35,6% | 29,3% | 35,1% | 35,4% | 33,1% | 39,1% | 32,1% | 40,2% | | -19,3 | | -5,4 |
| Maximum | 69,3% | 65,1% | 70,7% | 64,4% | 64,6% | 64,9% | 60,9% | 66,9% | 59,8% | 67,9% | | 5,4 | | 19,3 |
| % of NA | 11% | 11% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | | 0,1 | | 0,1 |
| % of NAP | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | | 0,3 | | 0,3 |

## Table 7.3.6 Public prosecutors at the Supreme court level: distribution of males and females from 2020 to 2024 (Q55)

| States | Public prosecutors at the Supreme court level: distribution of males and females | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | | Variation 2020-2024 in percentage points | |
| | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | % Male | % Female | Male | Female |
| **Austria** | 55,6% | 44,4% | 68,8% | 31,3% | 58,8% | 41,2% | 61,1% | 38,9% | 55,6% | 44,4% | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **Belgium** | 83,3% | 16,7% | 80,0% | 20,0% | 80,0% | 20,0% | 84,6% | 15,4% | 66,7% | 33,3% | -16,7 | 16,7 |
| **Bulgaria** | 44,3% | 55,7% | 45,7% | 54,3% | 42,0% | 58,0% | 40,3% | 59,7% | 42,3% | 57,7% | -2,0 | 2,0 |
| **Croatia** | 32,0% | 68,0% | 27,3% | 72,7% | 21,7% | 78,3% | 30,8% | 69,2% | 27,6% | 72,4% | -4,4 | 4,4 |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 68,4% | 31,6% | 69,6% | 30,4% | 69,5% | 30,5% | 71,2% | 28,8% | 67,9% | 32,1% | -0,6 | 0,6 |
| **Denmark** | NA | NA | 33,3% | 66,7% | 28,6% | 71,4% | 25,0% | 75,0% | 28,6% | 71,4% | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 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 |
| **France** | 52,6% | 47,4% | 52,6% | 47,4% | 55,2% | 44,8% | 55,2% | 44,8% | 48,4% | 51,6% | -4,2 | 4,2 |
| **Germany** | 60,8% | 39,2% | 60,8% | 39,2% | 65,0% | 35,0% | 65,0% | 35,0% | 64,4% | 35,6% | 3,5 | -3,5 |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 59,3% | 40,7% | 51,9% | 48,1% | 51,9% | 48,1% | 44,4% | 55,6% | NA | NA |
| **Hungary** | 54,1% | 45,9% | 52,7% | 47,3% | 50,5% | 49,5% | 49,2% | 50,8% | 50,5% | 49,5% | -3,6 | 3,6 |
| **Ireland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 63,8% | 36,2% | 63,6% | 36,4% | 61,6% | 38,4% | 62,9% | 37,1% | 63,6% | 36,4% | -0,1 | 0,1 |
| **Latvia** | 53,0% | 47,0% | 51,6% | 48,4% | 54,8% | 45,2% | 53,1% | 46,9% | 52,4% | 47,6% | -0,6 | 0,6 |
| **Lithuania** | 60,3% | 39,7% | 62,1% | 37,9% | 62,3% | 37,7% | 62,3% | 37,7% | 61,8% | 38,2% | 1,5 | -1,5 |
| **Luxembourg** | 46,7% | 53,3% | 40,0% | 60,0% | 29,4% | 70,6% | 30,0% | 70,0% | 40,0% | 60,0% | -6,7 | 6,7 |
| **Malta** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Poland** | 69,3% | 30,7% | 67,8% | 32,2% | 70,9% | 29,1% | 65,3% | 34,7% | 74,0% | 26,0% | 4,6 | -4,6 |
| **Portugal** | 31,3% | 68,8% | 50,0% | 50,0% | 71,4% | 28,6% | 75,0% | 25,0% | 76,2% | 23,8% | 44,9 | -44,9 |
| **Romania** | 51,6% | 48,4% | 52,5% | 47,5% | 52,4% | 47,6% | 52,6% | 55,8% | 53,3% | 46,7% | 1,7 | -1,7 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 60,0% | 40,0% | 58,0% | 42,0% | 57,3% | 42,7% | 55,6% | 44,4% | 54,6% | 45,4% | -5,4 | 5,4 |
| **Slovenia** | 58,3% | 41,7% | 50,0% | 50,0% | 40,0% | 60,0% | 33,3% | 66,7% | 31,3% | 68,8% | -27,1 | 27,1 |
| **Spain** | 78,8% | 21,2% | 65,6% | 34,4% | 65,0% | 35,0% | 58,3% | 41,7% | 60,5% | 39,5% | -18,3 | 18,3 |
| **Sweden** | 33,3% | 66,7% | 33,3% | 66,7% | 33,3% | 66,7% | 33,3% | 66,7% | 23,1% | 76,9% | -10,3 | 10,3 |
| **Average** | 55,7% | 44,3% | 54,5% | 45,5% | 53,4% | 46,6% | 53,1% | 47,3% | 51,8% | 48,2% | -2,3 | 2,3 |
| **Median** | 55,6% | 44,4% | 52,7% | 47,3% | 55,2% | 44,8% | 55,2% | 44,8% | 53,3% | 46,7% | -2,0 | 2,0 |
| **Minimum** | 31,3% | 16,7% | 27,3% | 20,0% | 21,7% | 20,0% | 25,0% | 15,4% | 23,1% | 23,8% | -27,1 | -44,9 |
| **Maximum** | 83,3% | 68,8% | 80,0% | 72,7% | 80,0% | 78,3% | 84,6% | 75,0% | 76,2% | 76,9% | 44,9 | 27,1 |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0,1 | 0,1 |
| **% of NAP** | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 0,2 | 0,2 |

## Table 7.4.1 Total number of non-prosecutor staff and their distribution in males and females in 2024 (Q1, Q60)

| States | Total number of staff (non-public prosecutors) | | % Male | % Female |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Absolute number | Per 100 000 inhabitants | | |
| Austria | 373 | 4,1 | 20,1% | 79,9% |
| Belgium | 2 952 | 25,0 | 26,9% | 73,1% |
| Bulgaria | 2 998 | 46,6 | NA | NA |
| Croatia | 1 239 | 32,0 | 14,0% | 86,0% |
| Cyprus | 89 | 9,2 | 19,1% | 80,9% |
| Czech Republic | 1 450 | 13,3 | 15,5% | 84,5% |
| Denmark | 595 | 9,9 | 15,1% | 84,9% |
| Estonia | 113 | 8,2 | 8,0% | 92,0% |
| Finland | 193 | 3,4 | 6,2% | 93,8% |
| France | 623 | 0,9 | 20,5% | 79,5% |
| Germany | 12 844 | 15,4 | 23,9% | 76,1% |
| Greece | 1 504 | 14,5 | 26,4% | 73,6% |
| Hungary | 2 236 | 23,4 | 19,8% | 80,2% |
| Ireland | 127 | 2,3 | 38,6% | 63,0% |
| Italy | 8 372 | 14,2 | 35,6% | 64,4% |
| Latvia | 409 | 22,0 | 30,6% | 69,4% |
| Lithuania | 460 | 15,9 | 19,8% | 80,2% |
| Luxembourg | 227 | 33,3 | 53,7% | 46,3% |
| Malta | 33 | 5,7 | 36,4% | 63,6% |
| Netherlands | 5 220 | 28,9 | 29,9% | 70,1% |
| Poland | 9 272 | 24,7 | 20,3% | 79,7% |
| Portugal | 1 614 | 15,0 | 35,2% | 64,8% |
| Romania | 1 401 | 7,4 | 48,8% | 51,2% |
| Slovak Republic | 913 | 16,8 | 21,4% | 78,6% |
| Slovenia | 308 | 14,5 | 19,2% | 80,8% |
| Spain | 2 378 | 4,8 | NA | NA |
| Sweden | 789 | 7,5 | 19,4% | 80,6% |
| Average | 2 175 | 15,5 | 25,0% | 75,1% |
| Median | 913 | 14,5 | 20,5% | 79,5% |
| Minimum | 33 | 0,9 | 6,2% | 46,3% |
| Maximum | 12 844 | 46,6 | 53,7% | 93,8% |
| % of NA | 0% | 0% | 7% | 7% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 7.4.2 Total number of non-prosecutor staff (absolute number) from 2020 to 2024 (Q60)

| States | Total number of non-prosecutor staff | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | 364 | 369 | 342 | 367 | 373 |
| **Belgium** | 2 424 | 2 711 | 3 240 | 2 855 | 2 952 |
| **Bulgaria** | 3 021 | 2 887 | 2 956 | 3 081 | 2 998 |
| **Croatia** | 1 058 | 1 137 | 1 139 | 1 170 | 1 239 |
| **Cyprus** | 73 | NA | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| **Czech Republic** | 1 474 | 1 454 | 1 449 | 1 448 | 1 450 |
| **Denmark** | 1 670 | 747 | 605 | 595 | 595 |
| **Estonia** | 89 | 102 | 87 | 87 | 113 |
| **Finland** | 139 | 169 | 176 | 185 | 193 |
| **France** | NA | 359 | 375 | 536 | 623 |
| **Germany** | 12 204 | 12 197 | 12 372 | 12 583 | 12 844 |
| **Greece** | 1 631 | 1 508 | 1 565 | 1 503 | 1 504 |
| **Hungary** | 2 425 | 2 411 | 2 353 | 2 344 | 2 236 |
| **Ireland** | 90 | 103 | 99 | 119 | 127 |
| **Italy** | 7 858 | 8 958 | 8 181 | 8 645 | 8 372 |
| **Latvia** | 397 | 357 | NA | 390 | 409 |
| **Lithuania** | 585 | 476 | 477 | 472 | 460 |
| **Luxembourg** | 150 | 172 | 188 | 204 | 227 |
| **Malta** | 21 | 21 | 19 | 26 | 33 |
| **Netherlands** | 3 998 | 4 412 | 4 594 | 4 982 | 5 220 |
| **Poland** | 9 073 | 9 063 | 9 226 | 9 194 | 9 272 |
| **Portugal** | 1 657 | 1 674 | 1 678 | 1 663 | 1 614 |
| **Romania** | 2 408 | 2 413 | 2 089 | 1 810 | 1 401 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 977 | 900 | 840 | 840 | 913 |
| **Slovenia** | 321 | 302 | 304 | 308 | 308 |
| **Spain** | 2 280 | 2 312 | 2 336 | 2 356 | 2 378 |
| **Sweden** | 522 | 580 | 607 | 610 | 789 |
| **Average** | 2 189 | 2 223 | 2 207 | 2 165 | 2 175 |
| **Median** | 1 266 | 1 019 | 990 | 840 | 913 |
| **Minimum** | 21 | 21 | 19 | 26 | 33 |
| **Maximum** | 12 204 | 12 197 | 12 372 | 12 583 | 12 844 |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 7.4.3 Total number of non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants from 2020 to 2024 and their variations (Q1, Q60)

| States | Total number of non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants | | | | | Variations | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2020-2024 | 2023-2024 |
| Austria | 4,1 | 4,1 | 3,8 | 4,0 | 4,1 | -0,5% | 1,2% |
| Belgium | 21,0 | 23,4 | 27,7 | 24,3 | 25,0 | 18,6% | 2,9% |
| Bulgaria | 43,7 | 42,2 | 45,8 | 47,8 | 46,6 | 6,6% | -2,6% |
| Croatia | 26,2 | 29,4 | 29,6 | 30,4 | 32,0 | 22,3% | 5,5% |
| Cyprus | 8,1 | NA | 9,7 | 9,5 | 9,2 | 13,0% | -3,4% |
| Czech Republic | 13,8 | 13,8 | 13,4 | 13,3 | 13,3 | -3,5% | 0,1% |
| Denmark | 28,6 | 12,7 | 10,2 | 10,0 | 9,9 | -65,3% | -1,0% |
| Estonia | 6,7 | 7,7 | 6,5 | 6,4 | 8,2 | 22,8% | 29,1% |
| Finland | 2,5 | 3,0 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,4 | 36,3% | 3,9% |
| France | NA | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,8 | 0,9 | NA | 15,8% |
| Germany | 14,7 | 14,7 | 14,7 | 14,9 | 15,4 | 4,7% | 3,4% |
| Greece | 15,2 | 14,1 | 14,7 | 14,4 | 14,5 | -5,0% | 0,2% |
| Hungary | 24,5 | 24,9 | 24,5 | 24,5 | 23,4 | -4,4% | -4,2% |
| Ireland | 1,8 | 2,0 | 1,9 | 2,2 | 2,3 | 29,1% | 4,8% |
| Italy | 13,3 | 15,2 | 13,9 | 14,7 | 14,2 | 7,1% | -3,1% |
| Latvia | 21,0 | 19,0 | NA | 20,8 | 22,0 | 5,0% | 5,7% |
| Lithuania | 20,9 | 17,0 | 16,7 | 16,4 | 15,9 | -23,9% | -2,7% |
| Luxembourg | 23,6 | 26,7 | 28,4 | 30,4 | 33,3 | 40,8% | 9,7% |
| Malta | 4,1 | 4,1 | 3,7 | 4,6 | 5,7 | 40,8% | 24,5% |
| Netherlands | 22,9 | 25,2 | 25,8 | 27,8 | 28,9 | 26,5% | 4,2% |
| Poland | 23,7 | 23,8 | 24,4 | 24,4 | 24,7 | 4,0% | 1,0% |
| Portugal | 16,1 | 16,2 | 16,0 | 15,6 | 15,0 | -6,7% | -3,9% |
| Romania | 12,6 | 12,7 | 11,0 | 9,5 | 7,4 | -41,4% | -22,5% |
| Slovak Republic | 17,9 | 16,6 | 15,5 | 15,5 | 16,8 | -5,9% | 8,8% |
| Slovenia | 15,2 | 14,3 | 14,4 | 14,5 | 14,5 | -5,0% | -0,3% |
| Spain | 4,8 | 4,9 | 4,9 | 4,8 | 4,8 | 0,6% | 0,0% |
| Sweden | 5,0 | 5,5 | 5,8 | 5,8 | 7,5 | 48,2% | 28,9% |
| Average | 15,8 | 15,1 | 14,9 | 15,2 | 15,5 | 6,3% | 3,9% |
| Median | 15,2 | 14,5 | 14,1 | 14,5 | 14,5 | 4,9% | 1,2% |
| Minimum | 1,8 | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,8 | 0,9 | -65,3% | -22,5% |
| Maximum | 43,7 | 42,2 | 45,8 | 47,8 | 46,6 | 48,2% | 29,1% |
| % of NA | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 7.4.4 Number of public prosecutors and number of non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants, from 2020 to 2024 (Q1, Q55, Q60)

| States | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Public prosecutors | Non-prosecutor staff | Public prosecutors | Non-prosecutor staff | Public prosecutors | Non-prosecutor staff | Public prosecutors | Non-prosecutor staff | Public prosecutors | Non-prosecutor staff |
| **Austria** | 4,5 | 4,1 | 4,4 | 4,1 | 4,3 | 3,8 | 4,4 | 4,0 | 4,5 | 4,1 |
| **Belgium** | 7,6 | 21,0 | 7,9 | 23,4 | 7,5 | 27,7 | 8,2 | 24,3 | 8,0 | 25,0 |
| **Bulgaria** | 22,0 | 43,7 | 22,3 | 42,2 | 23,9 | 45,8 | 24,0 | 47,8 | 23,9 | 46,6 |
| **Croatia** | 15,4 | 26,2 | 15,9 | 29,4 | 16,2 | 29,6 | 16,3 | 30,4 | 16,4 | 32,0 |
| **Cyprus** | 5,6 | 8,1 | 5,2 | NA | 5,1 | 9,7 | 7,0 | 9,5 | 6,7 | 9,2 |
| **Czech Republic** | 11,4 | 13,8 | 11,7 | 13,8 | 11,5 | 13,4 | 11,4 | 13,3 | 11,3 | 13,3 |
| **Denmark** | NA | 28,6 | 13,0 | 12,7 | 13,5 | 10,2 | 13,8 | 10,0 | 14,1 | 9,9 |
| **Estonia** | 12,7 | 6,7 | 13,3 | 7,7 | 12,7 | 6,5 | 13,2 | 6,4 | 14,2 | 8,2 |
| **Finland** | 7,0 | 2,5 | 7,6 | 3,0 | 7,9 | 3,2 | 8,1 | 3,3 | 8,4 | 3,4 |
| **France** | 3,2 | NA | 3,2 | 0,5 | 3,2 | 0,6 | 3,5 | 0,8 | 3,2 | 0,9 |
| **Germany** | 7,5 | 14,7 | 7,6 | 14,7 | 7,7 | 14,7 | 8,0 | 14,9 | 8,4 | 15,4 |
| **Greece** | NA | 15,2 | 5,7 | 14,1 | 5,7 | 14,7 | 6,0 | 14,4 | 6,0 | 14,5 |
| **Hungary** | 19,0 | 24,5 | 19,3 | 24,9 | 19,5 | 24,5 | 19,4 | 24,5 | 19,3 | 23,4 |
| **Ireland** | 2,6 | 1,8 | 2,4 | 2,0 | 2,7 | 1,9 | 2,9 | 2,2 | 2,9 | 2,3 |
| **Italy** | 3,8 | 13,3 | 3,8 | 15,2 | 3,8 | 13,9 | 3,7 | 14,7 | 3,7 | 14,2 |
| **Latvia** | 24,4 | 21,0 | 23,9 | 19,0 | 24,3 | NA | 22,2 | 20,8 | 20,1 | 22,0 |
| **Lithuania** | 23,0 | 20,9 | 22,2 | 17,0 | 21,1 | 16,7 | 20,7 | 16,4 | 20,3 | 15,9 |
| **Luxembourg** | 9,8 | 23,6 | 9,8 | 26,7 | 9,8 | 28,4 | 10,4 | 30,4 | 11,4 | 33,3 |
| **Malta** | 7,4 | 4,1 | 7,2 | 4,1 | 8,8 | 3,7 | 10,8 | 4,6 | 12,2 | 5,7 |
| **Netherlands** | 5,4 | 22,9 | 5,6 | 25,2 | 5,8 | 25,8 | 6,0 | 27,8 | 6,1 | 28,9 |
| **Poland** | 15,3 | 23,7 | 15,5 | 23,8 | 15,7 | 24,4 | 15,6 | 24,4 | 14,4 | 24,7 |
| **Portugal** | 13,8 | 16,1 | 14,3 | 16,2 | 14,4 | 16,0 | 14,2 | 15,6 | 14,3 | 15,0 |
| **Romania** | 12,7 | 12,6 | 12,4 | 12,7 | 11,6 | 11,0 | 10,8 | 9,5 | 11,9 | 7,4 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 16,9 | 17,9 | 18,0 | 16,6 | 18,7 | 15,5 | 18,7 | 15,5 | 18,8 | 16,8 |
| **Slovenia** | 9,8 | 15,2 | 9,5 | 14,3 | 9,8 | 14,4 | 9,5 | 14,5 | 9,9 | 14,5 |
| **Spain** | 5,4 | 4,8 | 5,5 | 4,9 | 5,6 | 4,9 | 5,7 | 4,8 | 5,7 | 4,8 |
| **Sweden** | 10,1 | 5,0 | 10,8 | 5,5 | 11,1 | 5,8 | 10,6 | 5,8 | 12,9 | 7,5 |
| **Average** | 11,0 | 15,8 | 11,0 | 15,1 | 11,2 | 14,9 | 11,3 | 15,2 | 11,4 | 15,5 |
| **Median** | 9,8 | 15,2 | 9,8 | 14,5 | 9,8 | 14,1 | 10,6 | 14,5 | 11,4 | 14,5 |
| **Minimum** | 2,6 | 1,8 | 2,4 | 0,5 | 2,7 | 0,6 | 2,9 | 0,8 | 2,9 | 0,9 |
| **Maximum** | 24,4 | 43,7 | 23,9 | 42,2 | 24,3 | 45,8 | 24,0 | 47,8 | 23,9 | 46,6 |
| **% of NA** | 7% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## Table 7.4.5 Ratio between non-prosecutors staff and public prosecutors from 2020 to 2024 (Q55, Q60)

| States | Ratio between non-prosecutor staff and public prosecutors | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Austria | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 |
| Belgium | 2,8 | 2,9 | 3,7 | 3,0 | 3,1 |
| Bulgaria | 2,0 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 2,0 | 1,9 |
| Croatia | 1,7 | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,9 | 2,0 |
| Cyprus | 1,5 | NA | 1,9 | 1,4 | 1,4 |
| Czech Republic | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,2 |
| Denmark | NA | 1,0 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,7 |
| Estonia | 0,5 | 0,6 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,6 |
| Finland | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,4 |
| France | NA | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 |
| Germany | 2,0 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 1,9 | 1,8 |
| Greece | NA | 2,5 | 2,6 | 2,4 | 2,4 |
| Hungary | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 1,2 |
| Ireland | 0,7 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 0,8 | 0,8 |
| Italy | 3,5 | 4,0 | 3,6 | 4,0 | 3,8 |
| Latvia | 0,9 | 0,8 | NA | 0,9 | 1,1 |
| Lithuania | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,8 |
| Luxembourg | 2,4 | 2,7 | 2,9 | 2,9 | 2,9 |
| Malta | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 0,5 |
| Netherlands | 4,2 | 4,5 | 4,5 | 4,7 | 4,8 |
| Poland | 1,6 | 1,5 | 1,6 | 1,6 | 1,7 |
| Portugal | 1,2 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 |
| Romania | 1,0 | 1,0 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,6 |
| Slovak Republic | 1,1 | 0,9 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 0,9 |
| Slovenia | 1,6 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,5 |
| Spain | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,9 | 0,8 |
| Sweden | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,6 |
| Average | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,5 | 1,5 |
| Median | 1,2 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 1,1 |
| Minimum | 0,4 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,3 |
| Maximum | 4,2 | 4,5 | 4,5 | 4,7 | 4,8 |
| % of NA | 11% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

# Court presidents and Heads of prosecution services

## Table 7.5.1 Total number of Court presidents by instance and their distribution in males and females in 2024 (Q47)

| States | Total number of Court presidents by instance and their distribution in males and females | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | All instances | | | | | First instance | | | | | Second instance | | | | | Supreme court | | | | |
| | Total | Male | Female | % Male | % Female | Total | Male | Female | % Male | % Female | Total | Male | Female | % Male | % Female | Total | Male | Female | % Male | % Female |
| **Austria** | 150 | 77 | 73 | 51,3% | 48,7% | 144 | 72 | 72 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 4 | 3 | 1 | 75,0% | 25,0% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Belgium** | 50 | 29 | 21 | 58,0% | 42,0% | 38 | 21 | 17 | 55,3% | 44,7% | 10 | 6 | 4 | 60,0% | 40,0% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Bulgaria** | 180 | 77 | 103 | 42,8% | 57,2% | 144 | 62 | 82 | 43,1% | 56,9% | 34 | 14 | 20 | 41,2% | 58,8% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 50,0% | 50,0% |
| **Croatia** | 61 | 28 | 33 | 45,9% | 54,1% | 42 | 15 | 27 | 35,7% | 64,3% | 18 | 12 | 6 | 66,7% | 33,3% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Cyprus** | 37 | 19 | 18 | 51,4% | 48,6% | 34 | 17 | 17 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 50,0% | 50,0% |
| **Czech Republic** | 96 | 50 | 46 | 52,1% | 47,9% | 84 | 42 | 42 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 10 | 6 | 4 | 60,0% | 40,0% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Denmark** | 31 | 20 | 11 | 64,5% | 35,5% | 28 | 17 | 11 | 60,7% | 39,3% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Estonia** | 9 | 4 | 5 | 44,4% | 55,6% | 6 | 2 | 4 | 33,3% | 66,7% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Finland** | 36 | 24 | 12 | 66,7% | 33,3% | 29 | 17 | 12 | 58,6% | 41,4% | 5 | 5 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **France** | 248 | 131 | 117 | 52,8% | 47,2% | 202 | 103 | 99 | 51,0% | 49,0% | 44 | 26 | 18 | 59,1% | 40,9% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Germany** | 329 | 262 | 130 | 79,6% | 39,5% | 311 | 206 | 105 | 66,2% | 33,8% | 75 | 54 | 21 | 72,0% | 28,0% | 6 | 2 | 4 | 33,3% | 66,7% |
| **Greece** | 117 | 30 | 87 | 25,6% | 74,4% | 86 | 23 | 63 | 26,7% | 73,3% | 28 | 6 | 22 | 21,4% | 78,6% | 3 | 1 | 2 | 33,3% | 66,7% |
| **Hungary** | 136 | 68 | 68 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 111 | 50 | 61 | 45,0% | 55,0% | 24 | 17 | 7 | 70,8% | 29,2% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Ireland** | 5 | 3 | 2 | 60,0% | 40,0% | 3 | 2 | 1 | 66,7% | 33,3% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Italy** | 203 | 139 | 64 | 68,5% | 31,5% | 178 | 122 | 56 | 68,5% | 31,5% | 23 | 16 | 7 | 69,6% | 30,4% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 50,0% | 50,0% |
| **Latvia** | 15 | 9 | 6 | 60,0% | 40,0% | 8 | 3 | 5 | 37,5% | 62,5% | 6 | 5 | 1 | 83,3% | 16,7% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Lithuania** | 17 | 10 | 7 | 58,8% | 41,2% | 14 | 9 | 5 | 64,3% | 35,7% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| **Luxembourg** | 9 | 4 | 5 | 44,4% | 55,6% | 6 | 1 | 5 | 16,7% | 83,3% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Malta** | 5 | 2 | 3 | 40,0% | 60,0% | 4 | 1 | 3 | 25,0% | 75,0% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 18 | 9 | 9 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 11 | 5 | 6 | 45,5% | 54,5% | 6 | 4 | 2 | 66,7% | 33,3% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| **Poland** | 402 | 201 | 201 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 389 | 192 | 197 | 49,4% | 50,6% | 11 | 8 | 3 | 72,7% | 27,3% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 50,0% | 50,0% |
| **Portugal** | 35 | 19 | 16 | 54,3% | 45,7% | 26 | 12 | 14 | 46,2% | 53,8% | 7 | 5 | 2 | 71,4% | 28,6% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Romania** | 238 | 94 | 144 | 39,5% | 60,5% | 171 | 64 | 107 | 37,4% | 62,6% | 66 | 30 | 36 | 45,5% | 54,5% | 1 | NA | 1 | NA | 100,0% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 41 | 21 | 20 | 51,2% | 48,8% | 33 | 18 | 15 | 54,5% | 45,5% | 6 | 1 | 5 | 16,7% | 83,3% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Slovenia** | 66 | 18 | 48 | 27,3% | 72,7% | 60 | 13 | 47 | 21,7% | 78,3% | 5 | 4 | 1 | 80,0% | 20,0% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Spain** | 99 | 72 | 27 | 72,7% | 27,3% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 94 | 68 | 26 | 72,3% | 27,7% | 5 | 4 | 1 | 80,0% | 20,0% |
| **Sweden** | 70 | 41 | 29 | 58,6% | 41,4% | 58 | 35 | 23 | 60,3% | 39,7% | 10 | 5 | 5 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 50,0% | 50,0% |
| **Average** | 100 | 54 | 48 | 52,6% | 48,1% | 85 | 43 | 42 | 46,9% | 53,1% | 18 | 11 | 7 | 65,0% | 35,0% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 75,9% | 27,1% |
| **Median** | 61 | 28 | 27 | 51,4% | 48,6% | 40 | 18 | 20 | 49,7% | 50,3% | 7 | 5 | 3 | 69,6% | 30,4% | 2 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Minimum** | 5 | 2 | 2 | 25,6% | 27,3% | 3 | 1 | 1 | 16,7% | 31,5% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0,0% | 0,0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0,0% | 0,0% |
| **Maximum** | 402 | 262 | 201 | 79,6% | 74,4% | 389 | 206 | 197 | 68,5% | 83,3% | 94 | 68 | 36 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 6 | 4 | 4 | 100,0% | 100,0% |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |

**Autria**: Starting from 2022, data are provided in number of positions occupied and not in FTE.

## Table 7.5.2 Total number of Heads of prosecution services by instance and their distribution in males and females in 2024 (Q56)

| States | Total number of Heads of prosecution services by instance and their distribution in males and females | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | All instances | | | | | First instance | | | | | Second instance | | | | | Supreme court | | | | |
| | Total | Male | Female | % Male | % Female | Total | Male | Female | % Male | % Female | Total | Male | Female | % Male | % Female | Total | Male | Female | % Male | % Female |
| **Austria** | 22 | 12 | 10 | 54,5% | 45,5% | 17 | 8 | 9 | 47,1% | 52,9% | 4 | 4 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| **Belgium** | 29 | 22 | 7 | 75,9% | 24,1% | 23 | 18 | 5 | 78,3% | 21,7% | 5 | 4 | 1 | 80,0% | 20,0% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| **Bulgaria** | 69 | 44 | 25 | 63,8% | 36,2% | 34 | 18 | 16 | 52,9% | 47,1% | 34 | 25 | 9 | 73,5% | 26,5% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Croatia** | 40 | 20 | 20 | 50,0% | 50,0% | 25 | 13 | 12 | 52,0% | 48,0% | 14 | 6 | 8 | 42,9% | 57,1% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| **Cyprus** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 94 | 56 | 38 | 59,6% | 40,4% | 84 | 49 | 35 | 58,3% | 41,7% | 9 | 6 | 3 | 66,7% | 33,3% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Denmark** | 19 | 9 | 10 | 47,4% | 52,6% | 15 | 6 | 9 | 40,0% | 60,0% | 3 | 2 | 1 | 66,7% | 33,3% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Estonia** | 5 | 2 | 3 | 40,0% | 60,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | 9 | 4 | 5 | 44,4% | 55,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 194 | 125 | 69 | 64,4% | 35,6% | 158 | 99 | 59 | 62,7% | 37,3% | 35 | 25 | 10 | 71,4% | 28,6% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Germany** | 133 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 110 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 22 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Greece** | 76 | 30 | 46 | 39,5% | 60,5% | 56 | 19 | 37 | 33,9% | 66,1% | 19 | 11 | 8 | 57,9% | 42,1% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| **Hungary** | 151 | 91 | 60 | 60,3% | 39,7% | 145 | 85 | 60 | 58,6% | 41,4% | 5 | 5 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Ireland** | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 169 | 129 | 40 | 76,3% | 23,7% | 144 | 108 | 36 | 75,0% | 25,0% | 24 | 20 | 4 | 83,3% | 16,7% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Latvia** | 27 | 14 | 13 | 51,9% | 48,1% | 11 | 4 | 7 | 36,4% | 63,6% | 5 | 3 | 2 | 60,0% | 40,0% | 11 | 7 | 4 | 63,6% | 36,4% |
| **Lithuania** | 70 | 48 | 22 | 68,6% | 31,4% | 59 | 39 | 20 | 66,1% | 33,9% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 11 | 9 | 2 | 81,8% | 18,2% |
| **Luxembourg** | 3 | 2 | 1 | 66,7% | 33,3% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| **Malta** | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 16 | 9 | 7 | 56,3% | 43,8% | 15 | 9 | 6 | 60,0% | 40,0% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Poland** | 413 | 216 | 197 | 52,3% | 47,7% | 356 | 175 | 181 | 49,2% | 50,8% | 45 | 32 | 13 | 71,1% | 28,9% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Portugal** | 48 | 30 | 18 | 62,5% | 37,5% | 38 | 22 | 16 | 57,9% | 42,1% | 7 | 5 | 2 | 71,4% | 28,6% | 3 | 3 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Romania** | 305 | 183 | 122 | 60,0% | 40,0% | 79 | 46 | 33 | 58,2% | 41,8% | 156 | 93 | 63 | 59,6% | 40,4% | 70 | 44 | 26 | 62,9% | 37,1% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 61 | 38 | 23 | 62,3% | 37,7% | 52 | 31 | 21 | 59,6% | 40,4% | 8 | 6 | 2 | 75,0% | 25,0% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100,0% | 0,0% |
| **Slovenia** | 13 | 5 | 8 | 38,5% | 61,5% | 12 | 5 | 7 | 41,7% | 58,3% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| **Spain** | 85 | 45 | 40 | 52,9% | 47,1% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Sweden** | 37 | 17 | 20 | 45,9% | 54,1% | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0,0% | 100,0% |
| **Average** | 77 | 44 | 31 | 53,6% | 46,4% | 72 | 40 | 30 | 57,3% | 42,7% | 23 | 15 | 8 | 67,5% | 32,5% | 6 | 4 | 2 | 58,3% | 41,7% |
| **Median** | 40 | 21 | 19 | 55,4% | 44,6% | 45 | 19 | 16 | 58,2% | 41,8% | 9 | 6 | 3 | 71,3% | 28,7% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 81,8% | 18,2% |
| **Minimum** | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0,0% | 0,0% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 33,9% | 0,0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0,0% | 0,0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0,0% | 0,0% |
| **Maximum** | 413 | 216 | 197 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 356 | 175 | 181 | 100,0% | 66,1% | 156 | 93 | 63 | 100,0% | 100,0% | 70 | 44 | 26 | 100,0% | 100,0% |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 26% | 26% | 26% | 26% | 26% |

# Salaries of judges and public prosecutors

## Table 7.6.1 Annual salaries of judges and public prosecutors in 2024 (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** | 43 416 € | 69 222 € | NA | 191 563 € | NA | 73 426 € | NA | 191 573 € | NA |
| **Belgium** | 53 818 € | 86 916 € | 49 281 € | 158 926 € | 90 111 € | 86 916 € | 49 281 € | 161 835 € | 91 761 € |
| **Bulgaria** | 14 264 € | 39 580 € | 35 622 € | 67 914 € | 61 122 € | 39 580 € | 35 622 € | 67 914 € | 61 122 € |
| **Croatia** | 21 852 € | 40 271 € | 26 601 € | 69 800 € | 44 400 € | 40 668 € | 27 371 € | 79 538 € | 43 314 € |
| **Cyprus** | 29 844 € | 86 815 € | 60 060 € | 154 315 € | 116 974 € | 29 506 € | 24 626 € | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 22 001 € | 50 724 € | NA | 116 172 € | NA | 42 948 € | NA | 89 904 € | NA |
| **Denmark** | 41 400 € | 153 676 € | NA | 298 911 € | NA | 52 969 € | NA | 135 998 € | NA |
| **Estonia** | 23 772 € | 71 760 € | 55 344 € | 93 840 € | 72 360 € | 65 688 € | 50 652 € | 75 072 € | 57 900 € |
| **Finland** | 52 890 € | 80 761 € | NA | 152 787 € | NA | 56 900 € | NA | 95 000 € | NA |
| **France** | 43 730 € | 56 935 € | 48 395 € | 126 504 € | 107 528 € | 56 935 € | 48 395 € | 126 504 € | 107 528 € |
| **Germany** | 62 235 € | 56 569 € | 44 409 € | 148 924 € | 95 273 € | 56 569 € | 44 409 € | 134 927 € | 87 478 € |
| **Greece** | 19 654 € | 34 560 € | 25 551 € | 100 873 € | 62 036 € | 34 560 € | 25 560 € | 91 918 € | 58 972 € |
| **Hungary** | 19 419 € | 24 043 € | 15 989 € | 54 719 € | 36 388 € | 24 043 € | 15 989 € | 51 013 € | 33 923 € |
| **Ireland** | 50 369 € | 151 092 € | NA | 278 468 € | NA | 40 208 € | NA | 254 088 € | NA |
| **Italy** | 35 460 € | 61 347 € | 37 920 € | 217 429 € | 117 960 € | 61 347 € | 37 920 € | 217 429 € | 117 960 € |
| **Latvia** | 20 220 € | 46 296 € | 32 360 € | 73 096 € | 51 435 € | 44 124 € | 30 869 € | 54 552 € | 38 023 € |
| **Lithuania** | 26 676 € | 74 987 € | 45 367 € | 87 842 € | 53 144 € | 56 347 € | 34 090 € | 68 130 € | 41 219 € |
| **Luxembourg** | 77 954 € | 106 135 € | NA | 187 691 € | NA | 106 135 € | NA | 187 691 € | NA |
| **Malta** | 23 596 € | 111 099 € | 79 267 € | 121 591 € | 86 087 € | 61 754 € | 46 710 € | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 76 100 € | 104 324 € | 59 869 € | 183 029 € | NA | 97 606 € | 57 603 € | NA | NA |
| **Poland** | 22 440 € | 40 333 € | 30 249 € | 112 575 € | 73 098 € | 48 340 € | 38 236 € | 105 307 € | 83 192 € |
| **Portugal** | 24 818 € | 51 452 € | NA | 112 789 € | NA | 51 452 € | NA | 112 789 € | NA |
| **Romania** | 19 445 € | 28 826 € | 16 863 € | 113 512 € | 65 755 € | 29 893 € | 17 488 € | 93 769 € | 54 855 € |
| **Slovak Republic** | 18 288 € | 54 054 € | 38 355 € | 78 078 € | 54 150 € | 52 874 € | 38 181 € | 80 867 € | 56 938 € |
| **Slovenia** | 35 133 € | 41 183 € | 25 394 € | 80 343 € | 45 532 € | 41 183 € | 25 394 € | 80 343 € | 45 532 € |
| **Spain** | 27 558 € | 62 123 € | 45 349 € | 144 044 € | 92 188 € | 62 123 € | 45 349 € | 144 044 € | 92 188 € |
| **Sweden** | 45 382 € | 84 812 € | 57 818 € | 146 181 € | 86 972 € | 54 000 € | NA | 87 300 € | NA |
| **Average** | 35 249 € | 69 255 € | 41 503 € | 135 997 € | 74 343 € | 54 374 € | 36 513 € | 116 146 € | 66 994 € |
| **Median** | 27 558 € | 61 347 € | 41 382 € | 121 591 € | 72 360 € | 52 969 € | 37 920 € | 94 385 € | 58 436 € |
| **Minimum** | 14 264 € | 24 043 € | 15 989 € | 54 719 € | 36 388 € | 24 043 € | 15 989 € | 51 013 € | 33 923 € |
| **Maximum** | 77 954 € | 153 676 € | 79 267 € | 298 911 € | 117 960 € | 106 135 € | 57 603 € | 254 088 € | 117 960 € |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 26% | 0% | 30% | 0% | 30% | 4% | 33% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 7% |

## Table 7.6.2 Evolution of the gross annual salaries of professional judges from 2018 to 2024 (Q132)

| States | Professional judges | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | At the beginning of career (Gross in €) | | | | | | | | | Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court (Gross in €) | | | | | | | | |
| | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | Variations | | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | Variations | |
| | | | | | | | | 2018 - 2024 | 2023 - 2024 | | | | | | | | 2018 - 2024 | 2023 - 2024 |
| **Austria** | 53 865 € | 55 392 € | 56 638 € | 57 460 € | 59 188 € | 63 420 € | 69 222 € | 28,5% | 9,1% | 131 228 € | 134 559 € | 137 586 € | 139 581 € | 163 801 € | 175 514 € | 191 563 € | 46,0% | 9,1% |
| **Belgium** | 70 238 € | 67 532 € | 67 532 € | 73 069 € | 83 937 € | 85 615 € | 86 916 € | 23,7% | 1,5% | 128 424 € | 122 877 € | 122 877 € | 133 608 € | 153 479 € | 156 548 € | 158 926 € | 23,8% | 1,5% |
| **Bulgaria** | 19 941 € | 22 957 € | 24 990 € | 27 867 € | 30 085 € | 34 867 € | 39 580 € | 98,5% | 13,5% | 36 097 € | 39 583 € | 44 214 € | 48 222 € | 53 144 € | 61 202 € | 67 914 € | 88,1% | 11,0% |
| **Croatia** | 22 883 € | 27 962 € | 27 878 € | 29 020 € | 27 754 € | 32 787 € | 40 271 € | 76,0% | 22,8% | 53 347 € | 53 636 € | 53 447 € | 57 318 € | 57 558 € | 60 804 € | 69 800 € | 30,8% | 14,8% |
| **Cyprus** | 77 738 € | 77 738 € | 77 916 € | 77 916 € | 77 916 € | 83 494 € | 86 815 € | 11,7% | 4,0% | 137 139 € | 138 179 € | 138 494 € | 138 494 € | 138 494 € | 148 408 € | 154 315 € | 12,5% | 4,0% |
| **Czech Republic** | 34 578 € | 38 064 € | 40 584 € | 42 485 € | 44 182 € | 48 555 € | 50 724 € | 46,7% | 4,5% | 78 296 € | 85 157 € | 89 904 € | 96 492 € | 100 367 € | 108 920 € | 116 172 € | 48,4% | 6,7% |
| **Denmark** | 128 780 € | 132 316 € | 122 545 € | 118 377 € | 140 244 € | 141 942 € | 153 676 € | 19,3% | 8,3% | 225 785 € | 240 196 € | 236 387 € | 221 226 € | 261 648 € | 265 248 € | 298 911 € | 32,4% | 12,7% |
| **Estonia** | 44 388 € | 48 112 € | 51 962 € | 56 952 € | 56 952 € | 64 872 € | 71 760 € | 61,7% | 10,6% | 58 044 € | 62 916 € | 67 942 € | 74 484 € | 74 786 € | 84 840 € | 93 840 € | 61,7% | 10,6% |
| **Finland** | 63 000 € | 64 500 € | 66 900 € | 68 900 € | 70 628 € | 80 761 € | 80 761 € | 28,2% | 0,0% | 132 000 € | 134 500 € | 136 300 € | 141 720 € | 141 720 € | 152 787 € | 152 787 € | 15,7% | 0,0% |
| **France** | 45 728 € | 46 149 € | 46 149 € | 46 149 € | 46 812 € | 54 495 € | 56 935 € | 24,5% | 4,5% | 122 802 € | 123 213 € | 123 213 € | 123 213 € | 122 192 € | 123 504 € | 126 504 € | 3,0% | 2,4% |
| **Germany** | 49 605 € | 51 199 € | 52 928 € | 53 568 € | 54 224 € | 55 971 € | 56 569 € | 14,0% | 1,1% | 130 370 € | 134 040 € | 136 245 € | 137 712 € | 139 986 € | 140 608 € | 148 924 € | 14,2% | 5,9% |
| **Greece** | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 34 560 € | 9,0% | 9,0% | 87 247 € | 87 247 € | 87 247 € | 87 247 € | 96 037 € | 96 037 € | 100 873 € | 15,6% | 5,0% |
| **Hungary** | 22 043 € | 21 812 € | 21 856 € | 23 942 € | 30 157 € | 25 759 € | 24 043 € | 9,1% | 6,7% | 42 104 € | 41 879 € | 57 542 € | 63 886 € | 69 818 € | 58 623 € | 54 719 € | 30,0% | 6,7% |
| **Ireland** | 122 373 € | 123 754 € | 129 704 € | 130 197 € | 139 917 € | 144 856 € | 151 092 € | 23,5% | 4,3% | 196 444 € | 197 916 € | 208 854 € | 208 145 € | 257 872 € | 266 974 € | 278 468 € | 41,8% | 4,3% |
| **Italy** | 56 263 € | 56 263 € | 56 263 € | 57 500 € | 57 500 € | 59 179 € | 61 347 € | 9,0% | 3,7% | 186 637 € | 186 637 € | 187 296 € | 194 005 € | 194 005 € | 199 670 € | 217 429 € | 16,5% | 8,9% |
| **Latvia** | 23 592 € | 32 340 € | 34 104 € | 35 808 € | 36 948 € | 43 680 € | 46 296 € | 96,2% | 6,0% | 50 508 € | 50 520 € | 56 093 € | 57 302 € | 57 712 € | 68 244 € | 73 096 € | 44,7% | 7,1% |
| **Lithuania** | 23 933 € | 35 649 € | 36 267 € | 36 473 € | 36 242 € | 56 115 € | 74 987 € | 213,3% | 33,6% | 36 939 € | 49 425 € | 49 698 € | 49 960 € | 54 213 € | 71 776 € | 87 842 € | 137,8% | 22,4% |
| **Luxembourg** | 84 888 € | 92 016 € | 92 016 € | 92 591 € | 96 084 € | 101 592 € | 106 135 € | 25,0% | 4,5% | NA | NA | 110 177 € | 110 865 € | 169 916 € | 179 657 € | 187 691 € | NA | 4,5% |
| **Malta** | 86 932 € | 90 863 € | 95 215 € | 96 176 € | 97 161 € | 108 905 € | 111 099 € | 27,8% | 2,0% | 94 658 € | 98 713 € | 103 246 € | 104 336 € | 105 451 € | 118 595 € | 121 591 € | 28,5% | 2,5% |
| **Netherlands** | 76 500 € | 82 113 € | 83 765 € | 85 440 € | 89 236 € | 95 913 € | 104 324 € | 36,4% | 8,8% | 138 500 € | NA | NA | 155 799 € | 160 741 € | 165 564 € | 183 029 € | 32,2% | 10,5% |
| **Poland** | 24 146 € | 26 117 € | 25 796 € | 25 796 € | 26 931 € | 37 742 € | 40 333 € | 67,0% | 6,9% | 67 267 € | 72 866 € | 71 941 € | 71 941 € | 79 666 € | 105 819 € | 112 575 € | 67,4% | 6,4% |
| **Portugal** | 35 699 € | 35 805 € | 48 055 € | 48 378 € | 48 728 € | 49 953 € | 51 452 € | 44,1% | 3,0% | 85 820 € | 93 095 € | 105 345 € | 106 183 € | 106 533 € | 109 504 € | 112 789 € | 31,4% | 3,0% |
| **Romania** | 45 127 € | 44 041 € | 43 223 € | 42 550 € | 42 541 € | 27 824 € | 28 826 € | -36,1% | 3,6% | 91 378 € | 89 180 € | 87 522 € | 86 160 € | 86 142 € | 113 501 € | 113 512 € | 24,2% | 0,0% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 36 061 € | 38 291 € | 41 278 € | 42 828 € | 45 775 € | 54 054 € | 54 054 € | 49,9% | 0,0% | 52 088 € | 55 310 € | 59 623 € | 61 862 € | 66 264 € | 71 198 € | 78 078 € | 49,9% | 9,7% |
| **Slovenia** | 32 633 € | 32 633 € | 32 628 € | 32 628 € | 34 101 € | 35 465 € | 41 183 € | 26,2% | 16,1% | 63 664 € | 63 664 € | 63 660 € | 63 660 € | 66 528 € | 69 190 € | 80 343 € | 26,2% | 16,1% |
| **Spain** | 48 997 € | 50 927 € | 51 946 € | 52 534 € | 57 855 € | 58 128 € | 62 123 € | 26,8% | 6,9% | 124 968 € | 128 092 € | 130 654 € | 131 830 € | 140 534 € | 141 220 € | 144 044 € | 15,3% | 2,0% |
| **Sweden** | 72 848 € | 73 800 € | 79 951 € | 79 387 € | 76 973 € | 81 256 € | 84 812 € | 16,4% | 4,4% | 126 152 € | 127 840 € | 138 395 € | 136 945 € | 134 036 € | 138 036 € | 146 181 € | 15,9% | 5,9% |
| **Average** | 53 129 € | 55 558 € | 57 030 € | 57 989 € | 60 733 € | 65 145 € | 69 255 € | 39,87% | 6,89% | 102 996 € | 104 450 € | 107 842 € | 111 192 € | 120 468 € | 127 852 € | 135 997 € | 36,7% | 6,7% |
| **Median** | 45 728 € | 48 112 € | 51 946 € | 52 534 € | 54 224 € | 56 115 € | 61 347 € | 26,79% | 4,47% | 93 018 € | 93 095 € | 104 296 € | 106 183 € | 106 533 € | 118 595 € | 121 591 € | 30,4% | 5,9% |
| **Minimum** | 19 941 € | 21 812 € | 21 856 € | 23 942 € | 26 931 € | 25 759 € | 24 043 € | -36,12% | -6,66% | 36 097 € | 39 583 € | 44 214 € | 48 222 € | 53 144 € | 58 623 € | 54 719 € | 3,0% | -6,7% |
| **Maximum** | 128 780 € | 132 316 € | 129 704 € | 130 197 € | 140 244 € | 144 856 € | 153 676 € | 213,32% | 33,63% | 225 785 € | 240 196 € | 236 387 € | 221 226 € | 261 648 € | 266 974 € | 298 911 € | 137,8% | 22,4% |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

* The wording of question 132 on supreme court salaries of judges and prosecutors slightly changed in 2022 that resulted in some variations for some countries when compared to previous cycles.

## Table 7.6.3 Evolution of the gross annual salaries of public prosecutors from 2018 to 2024 (Q132)

| States | Public prosecutors | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | At the beginning of career (Gross in €) | | | | | | | | | Public prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance (Gross in €) | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | Variations | | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | Variations | | |
| | | | | | | | | 2018 - 2024 | 2023 - 2024 | | | | | | | | 2018 - 2024 | 2023 - 2024 | |
| **Austria** | 57 158 € | 58 762 € | 60 084 € | 60 955 € | 62 782 € | 67 270 € | 73 426 € | 28,5% | 9,2% | 131 228 € | 134 558 € | 137 586 € | 139 581 € | 163 801 € | 175 514 € | 191 573 € | 46,0% | 9,1% | |
| **Belgium** | 70 238 € | 67 532 € | 67 532 € | 73 069 € | 83 937 € | 85 615 € | 86 916 € | 23,7% | 1,5% | 130 775 € | 125 183 € | 125 183 € | 136 054 € | 156 288 € | 159 414 € | 161 835 € | 23,8% | 1,5% | |
| **Bulgaria** | 19 941 € | 22 957 € | 24 990 € | 27 867 € | 30 085 € | 34 867 € | 39 580 € | 98,5% | 13,5% | 36 097 € | 39 583 € | 44 214 € | 48 222 € | 53 144 € | 61 202 € | 67 914 € | 88,1% | 11,0% | |
| **Croatia** | 22 883 € | 27 962 € | 27 878 € | 29 020 € | 27 754 € | 32 787 € | 40 668 € | 77,7% | 24,0% | 53 347 € | 53 636 € | 53 447 € | 57 318 € | 57 558 € | 60 804 € | 79 538 € | 49,1% | 30,8% | |
| **Cyprus** | 34 060 € | 32 959 € | 35 010 € | 35 010 € | 35 010 € | 36 847 € | 29 506 € | -13,4% | -19,9% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | |
| **Czech Republic** | 31 121 € | 34 238 € | 36 528 € | 38 564 € | 39 763 € | 43 700 € | 42 948 € | 38,0% | -1,7% | 67 176 € | 74 171 € | 79 008 € | 79 813 € | 83 522 € | 91 669 € | 89 904 € | 33,8% | -1,9% | |
| **Denmark** | 53 600 € | 54 045 € | 48 322 € | 49 058 € | 49 137 € | 50 011 € | 52 969 € | -1,2% | 5,9% | 91 087 € | 95 657 € | NA | 89 407 € | 126 411 € | 128 625 € | 135 998 € | 49,3% | 5,7% | |
| **Estonia** | 24 384 € | 40 968 € | 47 556 € | 52 140 € | 52 350 € | 59 388 € | 65 688 € | 169,4% | 10,6% | 58 041 € | 47 786 € | 53 353 € | 59 592 € | 59 828 € | 67 872 € | 75 072 € | 29,3% | 10,6% | |
| **Finland** | 48 800 € | 50 400 € | 50 880 € | 50 880 € | 59 000 € | 59 000 € | 56 900 € | 16,6% | -3,6% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | 95 000 € | 95 000 € | 95 000 € | NAP | 0,0% | |
| **France** | 46 317 € | 46 738 € | 48 738 € | 46 738 € | 48 838 € | 54 495 € | 56 935 € | 22,9% | 4,5% | 122 802 € | 123 213 € | 123 213 € | 123 213 € | 122 192 € | 123 504 € | 126 504 € | 3,0% | 2,4% | |
| **Germany** | 49 605 € | 51 199 € | 52 928 € | 53 568 € | 54 224 € | 55 971 € | 56 569 € | 14,0% | 1,1% | 117 941 € | 121 261 € | 123 256 € | 124 583 € | 126 640 € | 127 203 € | 134 927 € | 14,4% | 6,1% | |
| **Greece** | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 31 710 € | 34 560 € | 9,0% | 9,0% | 87 247 € | 87 247 € | 87 247 € | 87 247 € | 87 247 € | 87 247 € | 91 918 € | 5,4% | 5,4% | |
| **Hungary** | 20 263 € | 21 843 € | 21 856 € | 24 156 € | 24 609 € | 25 759 € | 24 043 € | 18,7% | -6,7% | 39 828 € | 41 543 € | 45 961 € | 50 796 € | 52 213 € | 54 652 € | 51 013 € | 28,1% | -6,7% | |
| **Ireland** | 32 153 € | 32 153 € | 33 370 € | 33 370 € | 36 450 € | 37 200 € | 40 208 € | 25,1% | 8,1% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NA | NAP | 254 088 € | NAP | NAP | |
| **Italy** | 56 263 € | 56 263 € | 56 263 € | 57 500 € | 57 500 € | 59 180 € | 61 347 € | 9,0% | 3,7% | 186 637 € | 186 637 € | 187 296 € | 194 005 € | 194 005 € | 199 670 € | 217 429 € | 16,5% | 8,9% | |
| **Latvia** | 27 975 € | 31 668 € | 33 396 € | 35 064 € | 36 192 € | 41 628 € | 44 124 € | 57,7% | 6,0% | 34 827 € | 43 195 € | 41 411 € | 43 479 € | 44 880 € | 51 456 € | 54 552 € | 56,6% | 6,0% | |
| **Lithuania** | 26 495 € | 28 856 € | 29 357 € | 29 523 € | 31 092 € | 32 265 € | 56 347 € | 112,7% | 74,6% | 35 422 € | 45 664 € | 47 038 € | 48 996 € | 52 236 € | 53 679 € | 68 130 € | 92,3% | 26,9% | |
| **Luxembourg** | 84 888 € | 92 016 € | 92 016 € | 92 591 € | 96 084 € | 101 592 € | 106 135 € | 25,0% | 4,5% | NA | NA | 110 177 € | 110 865 € | 169 916 € | 179 657 € | 187 691 € | NA | 4,5% | |
| **Malta** | 33 895 € | 39 612 € | 43 505 € | 44 496 € | 56 958 € | 58 722 € | 61 754 € | 82,2% | 5,2% | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | |
| **Netherlands** | 76 500 € | NA | 84 058 € | 85 195 € | 87 637 € | 91 244 € | 97 606 € | 27,6% | 7,0% | 138 500 € | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| **Poland** | 24 146 € | 26 117 € | 25 796 € | 25 796 € | 26 931 € | 42 399 € | 48 340 € | 100,2% | 14,0% | 67 267 € | 72 866 € | 71 941 € | 71 941 € | 73 651 € | 98 232 € | 105 307 € | 56,6% | 7,2% | |
| **Portugal** | 35 699 € | 35 805 € | 48 055 € | 48 378 € | 48 728 € | 49 953 € | 51 452 € | 44,1% | 3,0% | 85 820 € | 93 095 € | 105 345 € | 106 183 € | 106 533 € | 109 504 € | 112 789 € | 31,4% | 3,0% | |
| **Romania** | 45 127 € | 44 041 € | 43 223 € | 42 550 € | 42 541 € | 29 890 € | 29 893 € | -33,8% | 0,0% | 67 977 € | 68 320 € | 67 051 € | 66 007 € | 65 993 € | 93 759 € | 93 769 € | 37,9% | 0,0% | |
| **Slovak Republic** | 34 058 € | 36 164 € | 38 984 € | 40 448 € | 42 249 € | 46 553 € | 52 874 € | 55,2% | 13,6% | 52 088 € | 55 310 € | 59 623 € | 60 162 € | 62 130 € | 70 750 € | 80 867 € | 55,3% | 14,3% | |
| **Slovenia** | 32 633 € | 32 633 € | 32 628 € | 32 628 € | 34 101 € | 35 465 € | 41 183 € | 26,2% | 16,1% | 63 664 € | 63 664 € | 63 660 € | 63 660 € | 66 528 € | 69 190 € | 80 343 € | 26,2% | 16,1% | |
| **Spain** | 48 997 € | 50 927 € | 51 946 € | 52 534 € | 57 855 € | 58 128 € | 62 123 € | 26,8% | 6,9% | 124 968 € | 128 092 € | 130 654 € | 131 830 € | 140 534 € | 141 220 € | 144 044 € | 15,3% | 2,0% | |
| **Sweden** | 56 000 € | 56 800 € | 56 000 € | 56 000 € | 56 520 € | 49 780 € | 54 000 € | -3,6% | -8,5% | 88 000 € | 89 600 € | 88 000 € | 89 800 € | 97 680 € | 78 700 € | 87 300 € | -0,8% | -10,9% | |
| **Average** | 41 663 € | 42 476 € | 45 282 € | 46 252 € | 48 520 € | 50 793 € | 54 374 € | 39,15% | 8,09% | 85 488 € | 85 251 € | 87 841 € | 90 125 € | 98 171 € | 103 414 € | 116 146 € | 36,1% | 7,6% | |
| **Median** | 34 060 € | 37 888 € | 43 505 € | 44 496 € | 48 728 € | 49 780 € | 52 969 € | 26,20% | 6,00% | 76 899 € | 74 171 € | 79 008 € | 83 530 € | 87 247 € | 93 759 € | 94 385 € | 31,4% | 6,0% | |
| **Minimum** | 19 941 € | 21 843 € | 21 856 € | 24 156 € | 24 609 € | 25 759 € | 24 043 € | -33,76% | -19,92% | 34 827 € | 39 583 € | 41 411 € | 43 479 € | 44 880 € | 51 456 € | 51 013 € | -0,8% | -6,7% | |
| **Maximum** | 84 888 € | 92 016 € | 92 016 € | 92 591 € | 96 084 € | 101 592 € | 106 135 € | 169,39% | 74,64% | 186 637 € | 186 637 € | 187 296 € | 194 005 € | 194 005 € | 199 670 € | 254 088 € | 92,3% | 30,8% | |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 7% | 4% | |
| **% of NAP** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 7% | 11% | 7% | 15% | 11% | |

* The wording of question 132 on supreme court salaries of judges and prosecutors slightly changed in 2022 that resulted in some variations for some countries when compared to previous cycles.

**Table 7.6.4 Ratio of annual salaries of judges and public prosecutors with annual gross salary in the country in 2024 (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 | 4,4 | 1,7 | 4,4 |
| Belgium | 1,6 | 3,0 | 1,6 | 3,0 |
| Bulgaria | 2,8 | 4,8 | 2,8 | 4,8 |
| Croatia | 1,8 | 3,2 | 1,9 | 3,6 |
| Cyprus | 2,9 | 5,2 | 1,0 | NAP |
| Czech Republic | 2,3 | 5,3 | 2,0 | 4,1 |
| Denmark | 3,7 | 7,2 | 1,3 | 3,3 |
| Estonia | 3,0 | 3,9 | 2,8 | 3,2 |
| Finland | 1,5 | 2,9 | 1,1 | 1,8 |
| France | 1,3 | 2,9 | 1,3 | 2,9 |
| Germany | 0,9 | 2,4 | 0,9 | 2,2 |
| Greece | 1,8 | 5,1 | 1,8 | 4,7 |
| Hungary | 1,2 | 2,8 | 1,2 | 2,6 |
| Ireland | 3,0 | 5,5 | 0,8 | 5,0 |
| Italy | 1,7 | 6,1 | 1,7 | 6,1 |
| Latvia | 2,3 | 3,6 | 2,2 | 2,7 |
| Lithuania | 2,8 | 3,3 | 2,1 | 2,6 |
| Luxembourg | 1,4 | 2,4 | 1,4 | 2,4 |
| Malta | 4,7 | 5,2 | 2,6 | NAP |
| Netherlands | 1,4 | 2,4 | 1,3 | NA |
| Poland | 1,8 | 5,0 | 2,2 | 4,7 |
| Portugal | 2,1 | 4,5 | 2,1 | 4,5 |
| Romania | 1,5 | 5,8 | 1,5 | 4,8 |
| Slovak Republic | 3,0 | 4,3 | 2,9 | 4,4 |
| Slovenia | 1,2 | 2,3 | 1,2 | 2,3 |
| Spain | 2,3 | 5,2 | 2,3 | 5,2 |
| Sweden | 1,9 | 3,2 | 1,2 | 1,9 |
| Average | 2,1 | 4,1 | 1,7 | 3,6 |
| Median | 1,8 | 4,3 | 1,7 | 3,5 |
| Minimum | 0,9 | 2,3 | 0,8 | 1,8 |
| Maximum | 4,7 | 7,2 | 2,9 | 6,1 |
| % of NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| % of NAP | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% |

## Table 7.6.5: Existence of additional benefits for judges and public prosecutors in 2024 (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 | 9 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| No | 27 | 18 | 21 | 12 | 27 | 19 | 22 | 14 |

# Lawyers

## Table 7.7.1 Evolution of the number of lawyers from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q146)

| States | Number of lawyers | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | 5 940 | 6 138 | 6 132 | 6 325 | 6 483 | 6 667 | 6 707 | 6 875 | 6 984 | 7 073 | 7 138 |
| **Belgium** | 18 134 | 18 402 | 18 532 | 18 604 | 18 658 | 18 905 | 18 875 | 19 161 | 19 310 | 19 300 | 19 430 |
| **Bulgaria** | 12 696 | 13 013 | 13 500 | 13 720 | 13 640 | 13 880 | 13 964 | 13 605 | 13 487 | 13 533 | 13 641 |
| **Croatia** | 4 487 | 4 560 | 4 690 | 4 719 | 4 756 | 4 752 | 4 835 | 5 002 | 4 979 | 5 301 | 5 362 |
| **Cyprus** | 3 114 | 3 208 | 3 605 | 3 793 | 4 012 | 4 209 | 4 273 | 4 377 | 4 651 | 4 718 | 4 232 |
| **Czech Republic** | 11 842 | 12 300 | 11 310 | 11 587 | 11 180 | 12 188 | 12 267 | 12 390 | 14 335 | 12 766 | 13 067 |
| **Denmark** | 6 134 | 6 235 | 6 236 | 6 450 | 6 563 | 6 843 | 6 870 | 7 063 | 7 290 | 7 290 | 7 671 |
| **Estonia** | 934 | 970 | 993 | 1 024 | 1 041 | 1 076 | 1 096 | 1 074 | 1 085 | 1 136 | 1 154 |
| **Finland** | 2 115 | 3 550 | 3 791 | 3 846 | 3 965 | 4 022 | 4 087 | 4 173 | 4 098 | 4 138 | 4 240 |
| **France** | 62 073 | 62 073 | 65 480 | 66 958 | 66 958 | 68 835 | 70 073 | 70 794 | 72 521 | 72 521 | 73 998 |
| **Germany** | 163 513 | 163 772 | 164 393 | 164 656 | 165 104 | 165 901 | 165 680 | 165 587 | 165 186 | 165 776 | 166 504 |
| **Greece** | 42 052 | 42 226 | 42 091 | 41 903 | 42 949 | 42 500 | 44 595 | 43 240 | 47 141 | 46 009 | 46 204 |
| **Hungary** | 13 000 | 13 000 | 11 191 | 11 191 | 12 715 | 12 719 | 11 436 | 11 617 | 20 221 | 20 686 | 20 447 |
| **Ireland** | 11 588 | 11 907 | 12 237 | 12 588 | 13 142 | 14 816 | 14 054 | 13 434 | 14 177 | 14 054 | 14 357 |
| **Italy** | 223 842 | 237 132 | 229 292 | 231 565 | 234 386 | 236 494 | 235 964 | 229 783 | 234 632 | 227 410 | 223 819 |
| **Latvia** | 1 363 | 1 363 | 1 231 | 1 370 | 1 218 | 1 357 | 1 370 | 1 351 | 1 351 | 1 337 | 1 343 |
| **Lithuania** | 1 988 | 2 117 | 2 213 | 2 207 | 2 213 | 2 248 | 2 254 | 2 277 | 2 297 | 2 297 | 2 313 |
| **Luxembourg** | 2 180 | 2 323 | 2 381 | 2 597 | 2 993 | 2 914 | 3 080 | 3 247 | 3 255 | 3 431 | 3 532 |
| **Malta** | 1 485 | 1 569 | 1 327 | 1 473 | 1 535 | 1 648 | 1 762 | 1 316 | 1 523 | 1 772 | 1 888 |
| **Netherlands** | 17 713 | 17 343 | 17 498 | 17 672 | 17 784 | 17 829 | 17 964 | 18 108 | 18 218 | 18 513 | 18 723 |
| **Poland** | 52 760 | - | 48 315 | 51 227 | 53 081 | 55 178 | 57 365 | 59 635 | 61 554 | 63 447 | 65 038 |
| **Portugal** | 29 337 | 27 277 | 30 475 | 31 326 | 32 368 | 33 204 | 33 115 | 33 937 | 35 432 | 36 634 | 36 652 |
| **Romania** | 23 244 | 23 635 | 23 205 | 23 020 | 22 873 | 23 554 | 23 424 | 23 308 | 23 123 | 23 160 | 23 357 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 5 827 | 5 993 | 6 142 | 6 037 | 6 112 | 6 186 | 6 266 | 6 469 | 6 430 | 6 605 | 6 700 |
| **Slovenia** | 1 628 | 1 669 | 1 711 | 1 737 | 1 768 | 1 813 | 1 834 | 1 856 | 1 872 | 1 907 | 1 912 |
| **Spain** | 135 016 | 149 818 | 142 061 | 144 212 | 143 205 | 143 398 | 143 717 | 144 642 | 148 388 | 145 025 | 145 013 |
| **Sweden** | 5 575 | 5 800 | 5 767 | 5 911 | 6 000 | 6 000 | 6 257 | 6 436 | 6 571 | 5 966 | 5 956 |
| **Average** | 31 836 | 32 207 | 32 437 | 32 878 | 33 211 | 33 672 | 33 822 | 33 732 | 34 819 | 34 511 | 34 581 |
| **Median** | 11 588 | 9 071 | 11 191 | 11 191 | 11 180 | 12 188 | 11 436 | 11 617 | 13 487 | 12 766 | 13 067 |
| **Minimum** | 934 | 970 | 993 | 1 024 | 1 041 | 1 076 | 1 096 | 1 074 | 1 085 | 1 136 | 1 154 |
| **Maximum** | 223 842 | 237 132 | 229 292 | 231 565 | 234 386 | 236 494 | 235 964 | 229 783 | 234 632 | 227 410 | 223 819 |
| **Nb of values** | 27 | 26 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**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 7.7.1a Evolution of the number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 and their variations (Q1, Q146)

| States | Number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants | | | | | | | | | | | Variation of the total number of lawyers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2014-2024 | 2023-2024 |
| **Austria** | 69,2 | 70,5 | 70,2 | 71,9 | 73,5 | 74,9 | 75,1 | 76,6 | 76,7 | 77,2 | 77,6 | 12,2% | 0,5% |
| **Belgium** | 161,8 | 163,3 | 163,7 | 163,5 | 163,2 | 165,4 | 163,8 | 165,6 | 165,1 | 164,1 | 164,3 | 1,6% | 0,1% |
| **Bulgaria** | 176,3 | 181,9 | 190,1 | 194,6 | 194,9 | 199,7 | 201,9 | 198,9 | 209,2 | 210,0 | 211,9 | 20,2% | 0,9% |
| **Croatia** | 106,2 | 108,8 | 112,9 | 114,9 | 116,7 | 117,1 | 119,8 | 129,2 | 129,3 | 137,6 | 138,7 | 30,6% | 0,8% |
| **Cyprus** | 362,9 | 378,2 | 425,0 | 443,7 | 458,0 | 474,0 | 476,9 | 483,8 | 505,2 | 505,4 | 437,9 | 20,7% | -13,4% |
| **Czech Republic** | 112,5 | 116,5 | 106,9 | 109,4 | 105,0 | 114,2 | 114,6 | 117,8 | 132,1 | 117,1 | 119,8 | 6,5% | 2,3% |
| **Denmark** | 108,4 | 109,2 | 108,5 | 111,6 | 113,0 | 117,5 | 117,6 | 120,3 | 123,0 | 122,9 | 128,0 | 18,1% | 4,2% |
| **Estonia** | 71,1 | 73,7 | 75,5 | 77,8 | 78,9 | 81,2 | 82,4 | 80,7 | 81,7 | 83,2 | 83,9 | 18,0% | 0,9% |
| **Finland** | 38,7 | 64,7 | 68,9 | 69,8 | 71,8 | 72,8 | 73,9 | 75,2 | 73,7 | 73,7 | 75,2 | 94,6% | 2,1% |
| **France** | 93,6 | 93,2 | 97,7 | 99,7 | 99,9 | 102,6 | 104,0 | 104,7 | 106,6 | 106,1 | 107,9 | 15,2% | 1,7% |
| **Germany** | 202,4 | 200,3 | 200,1 | 199,2 | 198,9 | 199,5 | 199,2 | 198,9 | 195,8 | 195,8 | 199,2 | -1,6% | 1,8% |
| **Greece** | 387,7 | 388,9 | 390,3 | 389,1 | 399,9 | 396,3 | 416,1 | 404,9 | 441,5 | 441,8 | 444,2 | 14,6% | 0,6% |
| **Hungary** | 131,9 | 132,2 | 114,2 | 113,3 | 132,6 | 130,2 | 115,6 | 119,9 | 210,6 | 215,8 | 214,3 | 62,5% | -0,7% |
| **Ireland** | 250,5 | 255,3 | 261,8 | 262,7 | 270,6 | 301,0 | 282,4 | 262,2 | 275,3 | 263,0 | 263,9 | 5,3% | 0,3% |
| **Italy** | 368,2 | 390,9 | 378,4 | 382,9 | 388,3 | 392,6 | 398,2 | 389,6 | 397,7 | 385,6 | 379,8 | 3,1% | -1,5% |
| **Latvia** | 68,1 | 69,2 | 62,5 | 70,3 | 63,4 | 71,1 | 72,4 | 72,0 | 71,7 | 71,4 | 72,3 | 6,2% | 1,3% |
| **Lithuania** | 68,1 | 73,3 | 77,7 | 78,6 | 79,2 | 80,5 | 80,6 | 81,1 | 80,4 | 79,6 | 80,0 | 17,6% | 0,5% |
| **Luxembourg** | 387,2 | 412,6 | 403,1 | 431,4 | 487,5 | 465,4 | 485,2 | 503,1 | 492,6 | 510,5 | 517,9 | 33,8% | 1,4% |
| **Malta** | 337,7 | 348,3 | 288,3 | 309,6 | 322,7 | 333,9 | 342,4 | 255,0 | 292,8 | 314,5 | 328,8 | -2,7% | 4,5% |
| **Netherlands** | 104,8 | 102,1 | 102,4 | 102,9 | 102,9 | 102,4 | 102,8 | 103,4 | 102,3 | 103,2 | 103,8 | -1,0% | 0,6% |
| **Poland** | 137,1 | - | 125,7 | 133,3 | 138,2 | 143,7 | 150,0 | 156,6 | 163,0 | 168,6 | 173,1 | 26,3% | 2,7% |
| **Portugal** | 282,8 | 263,8 | 295,6 | 304,4 | 315,0 | 322,5 | 321,6 | 327,8 | 338,5 | 344,3 | 341,0 | 20,6% | -1,0% |
| **Romania** | 104,3 | 119,6 | 118,2 | 117,9 | 117,9 | 121,3 | 122,1 | 122,4 | 121,4 | 121,5 | 122,7 | 17,6% | 1,0% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 107,5 | 110,4 | 113,0 | 110,9 | 112,1 | 113,3 | 114,8 | 119,0 | 118,4 | 121,8 | 123,6 | 15,0% | 1,5% |
| **Slovenia** | 79,0 | 80,9 | 82,8 | 84,0 | 85,0 | 86,5 | 87,0 | 88,1 | 88,4 | 89,8 | 89,7 | 13,6% | -0,1% |
| **Spain** | 290,7 | 322,6 | 305,3 | 308,8 | 304,6 | 302,3 | 303,6 | 304,9 | 308,8 | 298,3 | 295,5 | 1,6% | -1,0% |
| **Sweden** | 57,2 | 58,9 | 57,7 | 58,4 | 58,6 | 58,1 | 60,3 | 61,6 | 62,5 | 56,5 | 56,3 | -1,6% | -0,5% |
| **Average** | 172,8 | 180,4 | 177,6 | 182,0 | 187,1 | 190,4 | 192,0 | 189,8 | 198,7 | 199,2 | 198,2 | 17,4% | 0,4% |
| **Median** | 112,5 | 118,1 | 114,2 | 114,9 | 117,9 | 121,3 | 119,8 | 122,4 | 132,1 | 137,6 | 138,7 | 15,0% | 0,8% |
| **Minimum** | 38,7 | 58,9 | 57,7 | 58,4 | 58,6 | 58,1 | 60,3 | 61,6 | 62,5 | 56,5 | 56,3 | -2,7% | -13,4% |
| **Maximum** | 387,7 | 412,6 | 425,0 | 443,7 | 487,5 | 474,0 | 485,2 | 503,1 | 505,2 | 510,5 | 517,9 | 94,6% | 4,5% |
| **Nb of values** | 27 | 26 | 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% |

**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

## Table 7.7.2 Evolution of the number of professional judges and lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q46, Q146)

| States | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | 2018 | | 2019 | | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers | Professional judges | Lawyers |
| **Austria** | 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 | 29,4 | 76,7 | 28,5 | 77,2 | 29,0 | 77,6 |
| **Belgium** | 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 | 14,4 | 165,1 | 15,3 | 164,1 | 14,9 | 164,3 |
| **Bulgaria** | 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 | 33,9 | 209,2 | 34,7 | 210,0 | 35,4 | 211,9 |
| **Croatia** | 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 | 42,4 | 129,3 | 42,3 | 137,6 | 42,2 | 138,7 |
| **Cyprus** | 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 | 15,5 | 505,2 | 16,5 | 505,4 | 16,6 | 437,9 |
| **Czech Republic** | 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 | 28,2 | 132,1 | 27,5 | 117,1 | 27,9 | 119,8 |
| **Denmark** | 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 | 6,5 | 123,0 | 6,6 | 122,9 | 6,7 | 128,0 |
| **Estonia** | 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 | 17,8 | 81,7 | 18,0 | 83,2 | 18,1 | 83,9 |
| **Finland** | 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 | 20,6 | 73,7 | 21,0 | 73,7 | 21,5 | 75,2 |
| **France** | 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 | 11,3 | 106,6 | 11,1 | 106,1 | 11,6 | 107,9 |
| **Germany** | 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 | 24,7 | 195,8 | 24,9 | 195,8 | 24,9 | 199,2 |
| **Greece** | 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 | 37,3 | 441,5 | 38,5 | 441,8 | 44,4 | 444,2 |
| **Hungary** | 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 | 27,7 | 210,6 | 27,7 | 215,8 | 27,8 | 214,3 |
| **Ireland** | 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 | 3,3 | 275,3 | 3,7 | 263,0 | 3,6 | 263,9 |
| **Italy** | 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 | 12,1 | 397,7 | 12,2 | 385,6 | 12,2 | 379,8 |
| **Latvia** | 24,4 | 68,1 | 25,0 | 69,2 | 25,5 | 62,5 | 25,1 | 70,3 | NA | 63,4 | 27,3 | 71,1 | 29,1 | 72,4 | 29,1 | 72,0 | 28,3 | 71,7 | 28,2 | 71,4 | 27,6 | 72,3 |
| **Lithuania** | 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 | 26,1 | 80,4 | 23,9 | 79,6 | 24,7 | 80,0 |
| **Luxembourg** | 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 | 35,1 | 492,6 | 35,4 | 510,5 | 36,4 | 517,9 |
| **Malta** | 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 | 9,0 | 292,8 | 9,1 | 314,5 | 9,4 | 328,8 |
| **Netherlands** | 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 | 15,0 | 102,3 | 15,0 | 103,2 | 15,2 | 103,8 |
| **Poland** | 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 | 28,0 | 163,0 | 28,0 | 168,6 | 28,3 | 173,1 |
| **Portugal** | 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 | 19,5 | 338,5 | 19,6 | 344,3 | 19,4 | 341,0 |
| **Romania** | 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 | 22,9 | 121,4 | 21,5 | 121,5 | 23,4 | 122,7 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 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 | 25,7 | 118,4 | 26,8 | 121,8 | 26,3 | 123,6 |
| **Slovenia** | 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 | 40,7 | 88,4 | 39,8 | 89,8 | 39,4 | 89,7 |
| **Spain** | 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 | 11,9 | 308,8 | 11,1 | 298,3 | 11,1 | 295,5 |
| **Sweden** | 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 | 11,7 | 62,5 | 11,8 | 56,5 | 12,2 | 56,3 |
| **Average** | 20,5 | 172,8 | 20,4 | 180,4 | 21,2 | 177,6 | 21,3 | 182,0 | 21,2 | 187,1 | 21,5 | 190,4 | 21,8 | 192,0 | 22,0 | 189,8 | 22,2 | 198,7 | 22,2 | 199,2 | 22,6 | 198,2 |
| **Median** | 19,2 | 112,5 | 18,9 | 118,1 | 23,6 | 114,2 | 23,9 | 114,9 | 21,8 | 117,9 | 24,5 | 121,3 | 23,9 | 119,8 | 24,1 | 122,4 | 22,9 | 132,1 | 21,5 | 137,6 | 23,4 | 138,7 |
| **Minimum** | 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 | 3,3 | 62,5 | 3,7 | 56,5 | 3,6 | 56,3 |
| **Maximum** | 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 | 42,4 | 505,2 | 42,3 | 510,5 | 44,4 | 517,9 |
| **% of NA** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 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% | 0% | 0% |

**Austria:** The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

**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 is taken into account since 2018.

**Poland:** In 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

# EC Templates - Professional judges and lawyers

## Table 7.8 (EC) Total number of professional judges sitting in courts per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q46)

| States | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | 18,9 | 18,6 | 27,4 | 28,2 | 27,3 | 29,5 | 29,0 | 26,6 | 29,4 | 28,5 | 29,0 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | 14,3 | 14,3 | 14,1 | 13,8 | 13,3 | 13,3 | 13,2 | 14,4 | 14,4 | 15,3 | 14,9 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 30,8 | 31,1 | 31,8 | 31,7 | 31,8 | 31,9 | 31,6 | 32,1 | 33,9 | 34,7 | 35,4 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 44,4 | 44,5 | 43,3 | 43,2 | 40,7 | 41,4 | 40,7 | 42,4 | 42,4 | 42,3 | 42,2 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 11,3 | 13,3 | 13,1 | 13,9 | 13,5 | 13,0 | 14,1 | 14,3 | 15,5 | 16,5 | 16,6 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 28,8 | 28,6 | 28,4 | 28,4 | 28,4 | 28,2 | 28,1 | 28,4 | 28,2 | 27,5 | 27,9 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 6,7 | 6,6 | 6,5 | 6,5 | 6,5 | 6,4 | 6,6 | 6,6 | 6,5 | 6,6 | 6,7 |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 17,6 | 17,8 | 17,6 | 17,3 | 17,7 | 17,3 | 17,6 | 17,7 | 17,8 | 18,0 | 18,1 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 18,1 | 18,1 | 19,4 | 19,0 | 19,6 | 19,7 | 19,5 | 20,9 | 20,6 | 21,0 | 21,5 |
| **France** | *10* | 10,5 | 10,5 | 10,4 | 10,5 | 10,9 | 11,1 | 11,2 | 11,2 | 11,3 | 11,1 | 11,6 |
| **Germany** | *5* | 23,9 | 23,6 | 24,2 | 24,3 | 24,5 | 24,7 | 25,0 | 25,2 | 24,7 | 24,9 | 24,9 |
| **Greece** | *8* | 20,6 | 20,3 | 25,8 | 26,6 | 26,8 | 26,9 | 36,0 | 37,6 | 37,3 | 38,5 | 44,4 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 28,5 | 28,6 | 28,7 | 28,6 | 30,2 | 29,5 | 28,2 | 28,0 | 27,7 | 27,7 | 27,8 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | 3,5 | 3,4 | 3,5 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,4 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,7 | 3,6 |
| **Italy** | *12* | 11,4 | 10,9 | 10,6 | 10,8 | 11,6 | 11,8 | 11,9 | 12,1 | 12,1 | 12,2 | 12,2 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 24,4 | 25,0 | 25,5 | 25,1 | NA | 27,3 | 29,1 | 29,1 | 28,3 | 28,2 | 27,6 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 25,8 | 26,4 | 27,3 | 27,3 | 27,1 | 26,8 | 26,5 | 25,6 | 26,1 | 23,9 | 24,7 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | 32,7 | 32,5 | 31,7 | 32,9 | 36,2 | 36,1 | 36,1 | 35,6 | 35,1 | 35,4 | 36,4 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 9,3 | 9,3 | 9,8 | 9,0 | 9,5 | 8,7 | 8,2 | 9,1 | 9,0 | 9,1 | 9,4 |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 14,0 | 13,9 | 13,6 | 14,8 | 14,6 | 14,5 | 14,9 | 15,1 | 15,0 | 15,0 | 15,2 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 26,2 | - | 26,0 | 26,1 | 25,5 | 25,3 | 25,2 | 25,8 | 28,0 | 28,0 | 28,3 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | 19,2 | 19,2 | 19,3 | 20,0 | 19,3 | 19,4 | 19,4 | 19,5 | 19,5 | 19,6 | 19,4 |
| **Romania** | *23* | 20,5 | 23,3 | 23,6 | 23,9 | 24,1 | 24,5 | 24,0 | 24,1 | 22,9 | 21,5 | 23,4 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 24,4 | 23,8 | 24,1 | 25,3 | 25,3 | 25,1 | 23,9 | 25,5 | 25,7 | 26,8 | 26,3 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 44,8 | 43,5 | 42,6 | 41,6 | 41,7 | 41,7 | 41,5 | 40,8 | 40,7 | 39,8 | 39,4 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 11,5 | 11,6 | 11,5 | 11,5 | 11,5 | 11,3 | 11,2 | 11,4 | 11,9 | 11,1 | 11,1 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 11,8 | 11,8 | 11,8 | 11,8 | 11,9 | 11,5 | 11,6 | 11,9 | 11,7 | 11,8 | 12,2 |

**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 7.9 (EC) Number of lawyers* per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q146)

| States | EC Code | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | *20* | 69,2 | 70,5 | 70,2 | 71,9 | 73,5 | 74,9 | 75,1 | 76,6 | 76,7 | 77,2 | 77,6 |
| **Belgium** | *1* | 161,8 | 163,3 | 163,7 | 163,5 | 163,2 | 165,4 | 163,8 | 165,6 | 165,1 | 164,1 | 164,3 |
| **Bulgaria** | *2* | 176,3 | 181,9 | 190,1 | 194,6 | 194,9 | 199,7 | 201,9 | 198,9 | 209,2 | 210,0 | 211,9 |
| **Croatia** | *11* | 106,2 | 108,8 | 112,9 | 114,9 | 116,7 | 117,1 | 119,8 | 129,2 | 129,3 | 137,6 | 138,7 |
| **Cyprus** | *13* | 362,9 | 378,2 | 425,0 | 443,7 | 458,0 | 474,0 | 476,9 | 483,8 | 505,2 | 505,4 | 437,9 |
| **Czech Republic** | *3* | 112,5 | 116,5 | 106,9 | 109,4 | 105,0 | 114,2 | 114,6 | 117,8 | 132,1 | 117,1 | 119,8 |
| **Denmark** | *4* | 108,4 | 109,2 | 108,5 | 111,6 | 113,0 | 117,5 | 117,6 | 120,3 | 123,0 | 122,9 | 128,0 |
| **Estonia** | *6* | 71,1 | 73,7 | 75,5 | 77,8 | 78,9 | 81,2 | 82,4 | 80,7 | 81,7 | 83,2 | 83,9 |
| **Finland** | *26* | 38,7 | 64,7 | 68,9 | 69,8 | 71,8 | 72,8 | 73,9 | 75,2 | 73,7 | 73,7 | 75,2 |
| **France** | *10* | 93,6 | 93,2 | 97,7 | 99,7 | 99,9 | 102,6 | 104,0 | 104,7 | 106,6 | 106,1 | 107,9 |
| **Germany** | *5* | 202,4 | 200,3 | 200,1 | 199,2 | 198,9 | 199,5 | 199,2 | 198,9 | 195,8 | 195,8 | 199,2 |
| **Greece** | *8* | 387,7 | 388,9 | 390,3 | 389,1 | 399,9 | 396,3 | 416,1 | 404,9 | 441,5 | 441,8 | 444,2 |
| **Hungary** | *17* | 131,9 | 132,2 | 114,2 | 113,3 | 132,6 | 130,2 | 115,6 | 119,9 | 210,6 | 215,8 | 214,3 |
| **Ireland** | *7* | 250,5 | 255,3 | 261,8 | 262,7 | 270,6 | 301,0 | 282,4 | 262,2 | 275,3 | 263,0 | 263,9 |
| **Italy** | *12* | 368,2 | 390,9 | 378,4 | 382,9 | 388,3 | 392,6 | 398,2 | 389,6 | 397,7 | 385,6 | 379,8 |
| **Latvia** | *14* | 68,1 | 69,2 | 62,5 | 70,3 | 63,4 | 71,1 | 72,4 | 72,0 | 71,7 | 71,4 | 72,3 |
| **Lithuania** | *15* | 68,1 | 73,3 | 77,7 | 78,6 | 79,2 | 80,5 | 80,6 | 81,1 | 80,4 | 79,6 | 80,0 |
| **Luxembourg** | *16* | 387,2 | 412,6 | 403,1 | 431,4 | 487,5 | 465,4 | 485,2 | 503,1 | 492,6 | 510,5 | 517,9 |
| **Malta** | *18* | 337,7 | 348,3 | 288,3 | 309,6 | 322,7 | 333,9 | 342,4 | 255,0 | 292,8 | 314,5 | 328,8 |
| **Netherlands** | *19* | 104,8 | 102,1 | 102,4 | 102,9 | 102,9 | 102,4 | 102,8 | 103,4 | 102,3 | 103,2 | 103,8 |
| **Poland** | *21* | 137,1 | - | 125,7 | 133,3 | 138,2 | 143,7 | 150,0 | 156,6 | 163,0 | 168,6 | 173,1 |
| **Portugal** | *22* | 282,8 | 263,8 | 295,6 | 304,4 | 315,0 | 322,5 | 321,6 | 327,8 | 338,5 | 344,3 | 341,0 |
| **Romania** | *23* | 104,3 | 119,6 | 118,2 | 117,9 | 117,9 | 121,3 | 122,1 | 122,4 | 121,4 | 121,5 | 122,7 |
| **Slovak Republic** | *25* | 107,5 | 110,4 | 113,0 | 110,9 | 112,1 | 113,3 | 114,8 | 119,0 | 118,4 | 121,8 | 123,6 |
| **Slovenia** | *24* | 79,0 | 80,9 | 82,8 | 84,0 | 85,0 | 86,5 | 87,0 | 88,1 | 88,4 | 89,8 | 89,7 |
| **Spain** | *9* | 290,7 | 322,6 | 305,3 | 308,8 | 304,6 | 302,3 | 303,6 | 304,9 | 308,8 | 298,3 | 295,5 |
| **Sweden** | *27* | 57,2 | 58,9 | 57,7 | 58,4 | 58,6 | 58,1 | 60,3 | 61,6 | 62,5 | 56,5 | 56,3 |

**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.)*

*Question 056. Number of heads of prosecution offices.*

*Question 057. In your judicial system, do other persons have similar duties to those of public prosecutors?*

*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 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 (2022):** Source: Statistik Austria

**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 as well as in administrative 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:

| | Total | Males | Females |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number of professional judges (1 + 2 + 3) | 1620,65 | 790,52 | 830,13 |
| 1. Number of first instance professional judges | 1222,95 | 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.

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** The decrease in the number of judges at the second instance is attributed to corrections made after discovering that some numbers were counted twice in previous evaluation cycles.
**Q052 (General Comment):** 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”. Moreover, starting from 2021, “technical staff” also includes staff working at the courts‘ IT departments. “Other staff” only includes trainees (including trainees for Rechtspfleger) and staff representation. The trainees concerned are nearly all trained for the handling of case files. A small number of trainees is trained for IT-support. Generally speaking, in the last years, efforts were made to enhance the methodology of presentation of data for Q52 and ensure better compliance with the CEPEJ categorization.
**Q052 (2024):** 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions) - Since last year, case managers are counted within this category by the competent department.
**Q052 (2023):** 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions) - The number is higher now because now case managers are counted within this category by the competent department (since this year). Until now they were hard to count, but now it is possible.
5. Other non-judge staff - The number of Rechtspfleger-candidates has increased significantly compared to the year before and a huge part of them is female.

**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 appeal 798,11 - 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 staff 21,70 - 9,85 - 11,85
5. Other non-judge staff 3456,13 - 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).

**Q056 (General Comment):** Data are presented in full time equivalent.

**Q056 (2024):** Starting from 2022, the data provided in the table correspond to persons who exercise the function of head of prosecution office. Previous data were expressed in FTE.

**Q056 (2023):** Starting from 2022, the data provided in the table correspond to persons who exercise the function of head of prosecution office. Previous data were expressed in FTE.

**Q056 (2022):** Starting from 2022, the data provided in the table correspond to persons who exercise the function of head of prosecution office. Previous data were expressed in FTE.

**Q056 (2014):** The numerical values provided are rounded. The accurate figures are: total – 26,64 (16,79 males/9,85 females); heads of prosecution offices at first instance level – 19,60 (12,50 males/7,10 females); heads of prosecution offices at second instance level – 6,49 (3,89 males/2,60 females); heads of prosecution offices at Supreme Court level – 0,55 (0,40 males/0,15 females).

**Q057 (2024):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); starting from 2022, agents of public prosecutor's offices in training are included in the frame of Q60.
-> The actual number in Q 57 would be 142,28

**Q057 (2023):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); starting from 2022, agents of public prosecutor's offices in training are included in the frame of Q60.

**Q057 (2022):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); starting from 2022, agents of public prosecutor's offices in training are included in the frame of Q60.

**Q057 (2020):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); agents of public prosecutor's offices in training included

**Q057 (2018):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); agents of public prosecutor's offices in training included.

**Q057 (2016):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence).

**Q060 (2024):** - Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices - Technical staff - Trainees (including trainees for Bezirksanwälte) and staff representation

**Q060 (2023):** - Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices
- Technical staff
- Trainees (including trainees for Bezirksanwälte) and staff representation

**Q060 (2022):** Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices
Technical staff
Trainees (including trainees for Bezirksanwälte) and staff representation

**Q132 (General Comment):** Judges/prosecutors are first placed into a certain pay grade according to their position within the judiciary system (e.g. regional courts, supreme court, administrative courts, etc.), where they receive the according base salary (§ 66 RStDG / § 190 RStDG). Every four years the salary increases by a fixed amount up until a certain maximum. Judges and public prosecutors in certain senior positions, such as the head of a district court, the vice president or president of a court of first instance or the head of a senior public prosecutor's office/public prosecutor's office, are entitled to a service allowance (between EUR 201.40 and EUR 1560.60 as at 31 Dezember 2024). The service allowance is part of the monthly salary. The service allowance is part of the monthly payment together with the salary. In principle, it could be stated that the salary covers all additional work performed by judges and public prosecutors in terms of quantity and time. Administrative Courts: First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 86440 Net annual salary: EUR 55850 Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: approx. EUR 150000

**Q132 (2024):** Judges/prosecutors are first placed into a certain pay grade according to their position within the judiciary system (e.g. regional courts, supreme court, administrative courts etc.), where they receive the according base salary (§ 66 RStDG / § 190 RStDG). Every four years the salary increases by a fixed amount up until a certain maximum. Additionally there are several bonuses for advanced functions such as leading positions.
The highest possible salary of a judge of the Supreme Administrative Court is EUR 195.000,-

**Q132 (2023):** Judges/prosecutors are first placed into a certain pay grade according to their position within the judiciary system (e.g. regional courts, supreme court, administrative courts, etc.), where they receive the according base salary (§ 66 RStDG / § 190 RStDG). Every four years the salary increases by a fixed amount up until a certain maximum. Judges and public prosecutors in certain senior positions, such as the head of a district court, the vice president or president of a court of first instance or the head of a senior public prosecutor's office/public prosecutor's office, are entitled to a service allowance (between EUR 171.90 and EUR 1332.30 as at 31 Dezember 2022). The service allowance is part of the monthly salary. The service allowance is part of the monthly payment together with the salary.
In principle, it could be stated that the salary covers all additional work performed by judges and public prosecutors in terms of quantity and time. Administrative Courts:
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 86440 Net annual salary: EUR 55850
Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: approx. EUR 150000

**Q132 (2022):** Judges/prosecutors are first placed into a certain pay grade according to their position within the judiciary system (e.g. regional courts, supreme court, administrative courts, etc.), where they receive the according base salary (§ 66 RStDG / § 190 RStDG). Every four years the salary increases by a fixed amount up until a certain maximum. Judges and public prosecutors in certain senior positions, such as the head of a district court, the vice president or president of a court of first instance or the head of a senior public prosecutor's office/public prosecutor's office, are entitled to a service allowance (between EUR 171.90 and EUR 1332.30 as at 31 Dezember 2022). The service allowance is part of the monthly salary. The service allowance is part of the monthly payment together with the salary.
In principle, it could be stated that the salary covers all additional work performed by judges and public prosecutors in terms of quantity and time. Administrative Courts:
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 78545
Net annual salary: EUR 49400
Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: approx. EUR 142000

**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).
**Q146 (2024):** Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) as of 31 December 2024 (available at www.oerak.at). The data only includes 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 2024. It does not include legal advisors as such a professions/type of service provider does not exist in Austria.

**Q146 (2023):** Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31 December 2023 (available at www.oerak.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 2023. It does not include legal advisors as such a professions/type of service provider does not exist in Austria.

**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 (General Comment):** Source: National Bank of Belgium, https://www.nbb.be

**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):** Since 2021, the table also includes data for the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council. Starting from 2024, judges of the Council of State (counselors) are counted in the category “Supreme Court professional judges.” Those of the Aliens Litigation Council are categorized as first instance judges.

**Q046 (2024):** For 2024, the figures for the Council of State are as follows: 38 councilors (including 14 women and 24 men). The judges of the Council of State (counselors) are counted from this cycle onwards in the category “Supreme Court professional judges” as the highest administrative court (Council of State, administrative law litigation section).
https://www.raadvst-consetat.be/?page=index&lang=fr
For 2024, the figures for the Aliens Litigation Council are: 62 judges (including 38 women and 24 men), categorized as judges of first instance.

**Q046 (2022):** Since 2021, the table also includes data for the Council of State and the Alien Litigation Council, counted as first-instance judges. Following a recent expansion of the framework, the number of judges at the Council of State has increased from 44 to 58 (Law of September 6, 2022). However, in 2022 there were only 30 men and 12 women serving as judges at the Council of State (totaling to 42), with some positions still vacant by late 2022. Therefore, only a total of 42 was accounted for in the table. The current established framework is set at 58 Council of State judges. In the Alien Litigation Council, there are 54 judges (including 33 women and 21 men).

**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.

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** It should be noted that the Council of State (composed of 38 councilors in 2024) also rules in the last instance. It was decided under Q 46 and Q 46-2 to consider the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) as a court of last instance (starting from 2024), and to count only judges of the Aliens Litigation Council (62 judges) as first instance administrative judges. The first column of the table ('total') includes civil and criminal judges as well as 99 administrative judges.

**Q046-2 (2022):** It is to be noted that the Council of State (comprising 42 judges in 2022, and whose framework was extended to 58 by a law in September 2022) also adjudicates as a court of last instance. It has been decided under Q46 and Q46-2 to consider the Council of State as a court of first instance. The Alien Litigation Council counts 54 judges considered as administrative judges of first instance.

**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 (2022):** The variation in comparison to the 2020 data for points 2 and 3 stems from the fact that legal assistants supporting judges were previously categorized under point 3 (with administrative staff) rather than point 2.

**Q052 (2019):** "Technical personnel": the slight increase observed between 2018 and 2019 results from investments in personnel.

**Q052-1 (2024):** The discrepancy between the total for Q 52 and the one for Q 52-1 is due to the fact that technical staff are not included in the table under question 52-1. These employees work at all three levels and their number (571) cannot be divided by level.

**Q052-1 (2023):** The lack of concordance between the total of Q 52 and the one of Q 52-1 is due to the fact that technical staff are not included in the table under question 52-1. These employees work at all three instances and their number (579) cannot be divided by instance.

**Q052-1 (2022):** The discrepancy between the totals of Q52 and Q52-1 is due to the technical staff not being included in the table uner question 52-1. These employees operate at all three instances, and their number (593) cannot be divided among these instances.

**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 (General Comment):** Explanation of the table: 1. all prosecutors working in the labour auditor's offices, public prosecutors' offices of first instance, public prosecutor's office for road safety and the federal public prosecutor's office.
2.All prosecutors working in the public prosecutor's offices of the appeal courts and the public prosecutor's offices of the labour courts.
3.All prosecutors working in the public prosecutor's office at the Court of Cassation.

**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.

**Q056 (General Comment):** The Prosecutor General Office and the Auditor General Office constitute the public prosecution services at the Court of Appeal and the Labor Court, respectively. The Attorney General heads both of them.

**Q056 (2014):** In 2014, the number of first instance prosecutors' offices and prosecution offices within labour courts was reduced, resulting in a decrease in the number of heads of prosecution services. The decrease between 2012 and 2014 in the number of court presidents and heads of prosecution offices in first instance (male and female) is due to the reform of the judicial map concerning first instance courts.

**Q057 (General Comment):** It should be noted that the competent prosecutor general may entrust permanently appointed lawyers at the prosecution services with prosecution before police courts in certain cases. This requires an individual order stating the reasons and the approval of the competent general prosecutor (see Article 162 § 2 of the Judicial Code). In addition to these lawyers, criminologists, trainee prosecutors, and candidate prosecutors have functions similar to those of public prosecutors.

**Q057 (2024):** There are individuals who perform duties comparable to those of prosecutors. This possibility is governed and regulated by the Judicial Code. These individuals may only perform duties when commissioned by the Attorney General. They include (512) lawyers working within the prosecution services, trainee-prosecutors, and candidate-prosecutors.

**Q057 (2023):** It should be noted, however, that there are persons who have functions comparable to those of public prosecutors. This possibility is regulated by the Judicial Code. These persons may only carry out their duties on commission from the prosecutor general. They are (406) lawyers acting within public prosecution offices, trainee prosecutors and candidate prosecutors.

**Q057 (2016):** By a reasoned individual order and after a positive opinion has been given by the competent public prosecutor, permanently appointed public prosecutors may bring a public action before the police court, except in the case of involuntary death as a result of a traffic accident, in so far as they can prove at least two years' seniority as a lawyer in the judiciary.

**Q060 (General Comment):** These figures cover all grades of judicial staff, except for lawyers appointed at the public prosecution offices, prosecutors under training and candidate prosecutors.
These are: secretaries, non-prosecutor staff responsible for assisting prosecutors in the same way as secretaries, staff responsible for administrative tasks, technical staff. “Other staff” encompasses criminologists.

**Q060 (2020):** V: 1694
M: 730

**Q132 (General Comment):** The gross amount of 86,916 corresponds to the salary of a judge in a court of first instance at the start of their career (= between 3 and 6 years of seniority) and that of a deputy public prosecutor at the start of their career (= between 3 and 6 years of seniority).
The amount of 158,926 corresponds to the salary of a counselor at the Court of Cassation with the maximum length of service (given that appointment to the Court of Cassation is the final stage of a judicial career for each of them, they all receive the maximum). The salaries of administrative judges are not included in the table. Counselors to the Council of State are not part of the judicial system. Their salaries are also set by law.
Salary evolves according to financial seniority with an increase every three years. The calculation of net salary depends on individual parameters (based on the situation of the person concerned, married, number of dependent children etc.) and therefore cannot be described in general terms. The following are deducted from the gross salary: health insurance contributions, survivor's pension contributions, special social security contribution, withholding tax.

**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 (General Comment):** Judges and prosecutors are subject to a specific pension scheme (with a retirement age limit of 67 years + preferential fraction). They may receive an “on-call allowance” (for work performed at night or on weekends).

**Q133 (2023):** Judges and public prosecutors have a specific pension scheme (age limit at 67 + preferential rate).

**Q133 (2022):** Judges and prosecutors are subject to a specific pension scheme (with a retirement age limit of 67 years + preferential fraction).

**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).

**Q146 (General Comment):** The latest barometers organised by the Flemish Bars Association (Orde van Vlaamse Balies) and the French- and German-speaking Bars Association (Ordre des barreaux francophones et germanophone) show that the lawyer profession is becoming increasingly feminised in Belgium. - Orde van Vlaamse Balies: according to the latest 'Barometer of the profession' (2020), carried out by the Flemish Bars Association in collaboration with Ghent University (UGent) and Leuven University (KUL), in December 2019, 64.8% of trainee lawyers were women. On the other hand, 57.6% of the lawyers registered on the roll, who therefore completed the traineeship, were men.
- French- and German-speaking Bars Association: according to the latest 'Barometer of the profession' (2022) carried out by AVOCATS.BE in collaboration with ULiège (University of Liège), the percentage of women has been rising steadily since 2007 and has exceeded 50% since 2018. This increase and the shape of the age pyramid point to a strong feminisation of the profession in the years to come.

**Q146 (2024):** For 2024, data per gender are available.

**Q146 (2023):** Unfortunately, data by gender on 1 December 2023 are not available.

**Q146 (2022):** The total is composed as follows: 11 072 for the Order of Flemish Bars - Orde van Vlaamse Balies and 8 238 for the Order of French-speaking and German-speaking Bars (as of December 1st, 2022). It emerges from the latest barometers organized respectively by the Order of Flemish Bars - Orde van Vlaamse Balies and by the Order of French-speaking and German-speaking Bars that more women are working as lawyers in Belgium.

**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 (2024):** The final 2024 data is published on 28.11.2024 covering full and part-time employees. It is 27 898 Leva or 14 264 Euro.
The economic activities in which the largest increase was registered were "Construction" - by 22.6%, "Culture, sports and entertainment" - by 17.1%, and "Transport, storage and post" - by 16.9%.

**Q004 (2023):** The final 2023 data is published on 29.11.2024. It is 24 485 Leva or 12 518 Euro

**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 first instance professional judges encompasses the judges of the first instance courts as follows - 113 district, 28 administrative, 3 military-district;
As well as the courts of second instance to be considered the 28 regional/provincial, 5 appellate and the Military Court of Appeal
Supreme Courts are the Supreme Court of Cassation and the Supreme Administrative Court
It is worth recalling that Regional courts have mixed competences as first and second instance for certain categories of cases, and for the purposes of the questionnaire, in view of the instructions for completing it and given their predominant competences, they are categorized as courts of second instance.

**Q046 (2024):** 1. Number of first instance professional judges- district courts, military courts, administrative courts
2. Number of second instance (court of appeal) professional judges- regional courts, appellate courts, military appellate courts
3. Number of Supreme Court professional judges- Supreme Cassation Court and Supreme Administrative Court
* Regional courts have mixed competences as first and second instance for certain categories of cases, and for the purposes of the questionnaire, in view of the instructions for completing it and given their predominant competences, they are categorized as courts of second instance

**Q046 (2023):** Regional courts have mixed competences as first and second instance for certain categories of cases, as for the purposes of the questionnaire, in view of the instructions for its completion and given their predominant competences, they are categorized as courts of second instance.

**Q046 (2022):** Regional courts have mixed competences as first and second instance for certain categories of cases, as for the purposes of the questionnaire, in view of the instructions for its completion and given their predominant competences, they are categorized as courts of second instance.
**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 (General Comment):** Category "other": military judges

**Q046-2 (2024):** The total number of 1297 judges of first instance includes 1002 district judges for whom no specialization information is available, and military judges are listed in the "Other" column.
The total number of 786 judges of the second instance includes 68 junior judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and the judges of the Military Court of Appeal are listed in the "Other" column.
Regarding the Supreme Court of Cassation, the total number of 197 judges also includes the president of the court, for whom no information is available regarding specialization.

**Q046-2 (2023):** The total number of 1,282 judges of first instance includes 965 district judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and military judges are listed in the "Other" column.
The total number of 780 judges of the second instance includes 46 junior judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and the judges of the Military Court of Appeal are listed in the "Other" column.
Regarding the Supreme Court of Cassation, the total number of 172 judges also includes the president of the court, for whom no information is available regarding specialization.

**Q046-2 (2022):** The total number of 1230 first-instance judges includes 922 district judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and military judges are listed in the "Other" column.
The total number of 778 judges of the second instance includes 37 junior judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and the judges of the Military Court of Appeal are listed in the "Other" column.
Regarding the Supreme Court of Cassation, the total number of 180 judges also includes the president of the court, for whom no information is available regarding specialization.

**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. The Judges’ College of the Supreme Judicial Council does not maintain data on the gender distribution of the court clerks (non-judge staff) in the courts, since each court of the respective level (a total of 180 courts) is an independent legal entity and their employer is the president of the respective court.

**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.
**Q052-1 (General Comment):** Item 1 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of first instance" includes all employees of the district and administrative courts. Item 2 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of second instance (appellate court)" includes all employees working in the regional courts and courts of appeal in the country.

**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):** It is noteworthy recalling the difficulty of determining the place of the regional/provincial courts in the "first instance" and "second instance (appellate)" columns. For the purposes of the CEPEJ survey, they are classified as "second instance (appellate)". Accordingly, item 1 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of first instance" includes all employees of the district and administrative courts, while item 2 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of second instance (appellate court)" includes all employees working in the regional courts and courts of appeal.

**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.

**Q056 (2023):** The process of merging the district prosecutor's offices ended on July 27, 2022. Starting from this date the number of first instance public prosecution offices is 34.

**Q056 (2020):** In the provided in the previous cycle 2018-2020 the information on the total number of administrative heads, instead of the indicated figure 133 (one hundred and thirty-three), the figure should be 153 (one hundred and fifty-three). The difference is probably due to a technical error or to the provision of the actual number of incumbents, without reflecting the persons appointed to perform the functions of administrative heads. Due to the impossibility to establish the real cause, information on the data in the individual columns cannot be given.
The data provided (cycle 2020-2022) comply with the instructions on question № 056 in the explanatory note to the scheme for evaluation of judicial systems, ie. there are also the persons who have been appointed to perform the functions of administrative heads due to the lack of a holder of the position. The optimization performed under Art. 30, para. 2, item 7 of the JSA of the district prosecutor's offices, whereby with decisions of the Plenum of the SJC under protocol № 21 / 19.07.2018 and 20 / 29.07.2019 a total of 39 (thirty-nine) district prosecutor's offices were closed and transformed in territorial divisions as follows:
- 11 district prosecutor's offices, as of 01.01.2019;
- 28 district prosecutor's offices, as of 01.01.2020
Following this transformation, the total number of prosecutors at first instance, respectively their administrative heads, is now 74.
Thus, from the real number of administrative heads cycle (2018 – 2020) - 153, 39 (thirty-nine) administrative heads were removed from the closed district prosecutor's offices, in view of which the total number of heads of prosecutor's offices decreased to 114 (one hundred and fourteen), of which: the number of heads of prosecutor's offices at first instance is 74 (seventy-four), the number of heads of prosecutor's offices at second instance is 39 (thirty-nine), and at the supreme level - 1 (one).

**Q056 (2016):** 113 adminsitrative heads of Regional Prosecutor`s Offices and 1 Specialized Prosecutor`s Office; 38 are the administrative heads of 28 District Prosecutor`s Offices, 3 Military District Prosecutor`s Offices, 7 Appealte Prosecutor`s Offices; 1 Prosecutor General
**Q056 (2014):** For 2014, the figure 113 includes heads of regional prosecutors' offices. The figure 41 includes 29 district, 7 appellate and 3 military district prosecutors' offices, the Supreme Prosecutors Office of Cassation and the Supreme Prosecutors Office of Appellate.
**Q060 (General Comment):** The Prosecutors' College of the Supreme Judicial Council does not maintain data on the gender distribution of the prosecutor's office clerks (non-prosecutor staff) in the prosecutor's offices, since each prosecutor's office of the respective level is an independent legal entity and their employer is the administrative head of the respective prosecutor's office.
**Q060 (2022):** number of full-time positions for judicial officers in the general and specialized administration in all prosecutor's offices of the Republic of Bulgaria – 2901 /as of December 31, 2022/
- number of full-time employees in specific positions for judicial officers in the educational centers of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria – 55 /as of December 31, 2022/

**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.

**Q132 (General Comment):** The gross salary of a Supreme court judge is formed as the sum of the Basic Monthly Salary for the Position of "supreme judge or prosecutor" (BMSP) + Rank + Additional remuneration for time served. The Rank and BMSP are determined according to the Classifier of Positions in the Administration of Courts and Prosecutors' offices, which are approved by decisions of the Judges' and the Prosecutors' College of the Supreme Judicial Council, respectively. The additional remuneration for time served is determined as 2% of (BMSP+Rank) is added for each year of service in the judicial system.
**Q132 (2023):** According to Art. 218, paragraph 3 of the Judiciary System Act (JSA), the remuneration of judges, prosecutors and investigators is determined by a decision of the General Assembly of the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC) and the Supreme Prosecutorial Council (SPC) that adopts "Table No. 1 - for determination of the maximum basic monthly salaries of judges, prosecutors and investigators", which is applicable for all magistrates equally. In this regard, data for judges and prosecutors match completely. The gross monthly remuneration of judges, prosecutors and investigators is formed by adding to the basic monthly remuneration the remuneration for rank (from Table No. 1) and time served (according to Article 219 of the JSA).

**Q132 (2022):** Data, provided by the Supreme Judicial Council. The increase of gross salaries (respectively net salaries) compared to the previous assessment cycle (2020-2022) is due to the increase in labour remuneration - 10% in 2021 and 10% in 2022, as well as the funds provided in the budget of the judiciary for additional remuneration in connection with Art. 233, paragraph 6 of the Judiciary System Act.
Comment from the Supreme Court of Cassation: The amount of maximum basic monthly remuneration of judges shall be determined by the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council. Judges shall receive additional remuneration for long service and professional experience, determined in relation to the basic remuneration at the rate of up to 40% (2% – for 1 calendar year for acquired service and professional experience in a judicial authority; 1.5% – for 1 calendar year for acquired service and professional experience outside a judicial authority, but in the same time, similar or the same nature of work, position or profession; 1% – for 1 calendar year for acquired service and professional experience outside a judicial authority and in another specialty). The maximum amount of 40% is set by the Judicial System Act, in force since 11.08.2007. Judges who reached a higher percentage before the amendment of the law shall retain the percentage reached in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No.29/21.09.2007. In the Supreme Court of Cassation, 14 judges receive additional remuneration in excess of 40%. Judges don't get a 13th salary or bonuses paid regularly to everyone, regardless of their personal circumstances. By a decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council, an additional remuneration may be paid to judges, but its receipt is not mandatory and unconditional. The entitlement to receive an additional remuneration is defined in the Rules for Determination and Payment of Additional Remuneration (adopted by a decision of the Plenum of the Suprem

e Judicial Council under Protocol No. 29/22.11.2018, amended and supplemented by a decision under Protocol No. 13/13.06.2019, amended and supplemented by a decision under Protocol No. 28/21.11.2019, amended and supplemented by a decision under Protocol No. 18/12.05.2022 and the Rules for Determination and Payment of Additional Remuneration to Judges pursuant to Article 233, paragraph 6, the first sentence of the Judiciary System Act (adopted by the Judicial Collegium of the Supreme Judicial Council by Decision under Protocol No. 24/22.06.2021, amended by Decision under Protocol No. 41/17.11.2021). In 2022 additional remuneration in the amount of 11,220 BGN or 5,736.69 EUR was paid to the judges of the Supreme Court of Cassation in accordance with the decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council on the application of the Rules for Determination and Payment of Additional Remuneration. (Gross annual salary, in €= basic salary+ additional remuneration for seniority)

**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.

**Q133 (General Comment):** On the basis of article 223 of the Judiciary System Act, while in office, judges and prosecutors may use housing belonging to the internal housing fund of the judicial system bodies.
**Q133 (2024):** * According to Art. 223 of the Judiciary System Act - judges and prosecutors can use housing from the housing fund of the judicial bodies
**Q133 (2023):** On the basis of Art. 223 of the Judiciary System Act - judges and prosecutors can use housing from the departmental housing fund of the bodies of the judiciary.

**Q133 (2022):** On the basis of Art. 223 of the Judiciary System Act - judges and prosecutors can use housing from the departmental housing fund of the bodies of the judiciary.
**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.
**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 (2024):** Average monthly gross salary for 2024 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/2024/en/76833).
This monthly gross salary (1 821 euro) has been multiplied by 12.

**Q004 (2023):** Values for 2022 and prior years may differ from previous deliveries. The GDP for 1995-2023 was revised and published in 2023, including "Gross Domestic Product, Revised Data" (https://podaci.dzs.hr/media/r1dhalwf/msi-bruto-domaci-proizvod.xlsx) and "Annual Gross Domestic Product - Annual Calculation, Revised Data" (https://podaci.dzs.hr/media/c51dcmbr/bruto-domaci-proizvod-godisnji.xlsx).
**Q004 (2022):** will be explained later

**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 disciplinary procedure; judges transferred to other State body- for example to Ministry of Justice or Judicial Academy).

**Q046 (2024):** The statistics apply to all judges:
-court presidents, judges, and judges with administrative authority.
Those lower the number are:
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q046 (2023):** The statistics apply to all judges:
-court presidents, judges, and judges with administrative authority.
Those lower the number are:
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q046 (2022):** The data refer to all judges:
court presidents, judges authorized to perform court administration and judges.
The number does not include judges:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**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 (2024):** The figures include civil servants and personnel who have been employed for an undetermined period of time.
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q052 (2023):** The figures include civil servants and personnel who have been employed for an undetermined period of time.
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q052 (2022):** The data refer to civil servants and employees employed for an indefinite period.
The number does not include those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**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.

**Q052-1 (2024):** The figures include civil servants and personnel who have been employed for an undetermined period of time. (Data from Table 052.)
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q052-1 (2023):** The figures include civil servants and personnel who have been employed for an undetermined period of time. (Data from Table 052.)
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q052-1 (2022):** The data refer to officials and employees employed on an indefinite basis (data from table 052.)
The number does not include those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**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 (2024):** The data refers to all state attorneys.
The State Attorney General, municipal/county state attorneys, deputy municipal/county state attorneys facilitated to authorization of municipal/county state attorney duties, deputy state attorneys, and municipal/county state attorneys.
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q055 (2023):** The data refers to all state attorneys.
The State Attorney General, municipal/county state attorneys, deputy municipal/county state attorneys facilitated to authorization of municipal/county state attorney duties, deputy state attorneys, and municipal/county state attorneys.
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q055 (2022):** The data refer to all state attorneys:
State Attorney General, municipal/county state attorneys, deputy municipal/county state attorneys authorized to perform duties of municipal/county state attorneys, deputy state attorneys and deputies of municipal/county state attorneys.
The number is reduced by those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**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.

**Q056 (General Comment):** The organisational structure of the public prosecution services comprises: the State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia, the Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime (USKOK), county State attorneys' offices and municipal State attorneys' offices. The number of public prosecutors' offices has been significantly rationalised. The number of Heads of the State attorneys' offices does not correspond to the number of municipal State attorneys' offices, because in some of these offices the Heads of offices were not appointed and, until such appointment is made, their duties are exercised by their deputies. The number of the first instance State attorneys' offices includes the number of the municipal State attorneys and Head of Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime (USKOK).

**Q056 (2024):** The number is reduced by those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

As indicated in the comments from the previous cycle regarding the decrease in the number of Heads of Offices, the decline was due to the fact that certain institutions did not have formally appointed Heads of Offices at the time. Instead, the duties were performed by deputies, who are not included in this category.
Subsequently, by the end of 2024, the number of Heads of Offices increased compared to 2023, as new appointments were made.
In relation to the increase in the number of women compared to the previous cycle, we would like to emphasize that the recruitment and selection procedures for the Heads of Offices positions were conducted in accordance with established competency-based criteria. The most qualified candidates were selected through this process, and those candidates were mostly men.

**Q056 (2023):** Q56 - The organisational structure of the public prosecution services comprises: the State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia, the Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime (USKOK), county State attorneys' offices and municipal State attorneys' offices. The number of public prosecutors' offices has been significantly rationalised.
The number is reduced by those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**Q056 (2022):** The number is reduced by those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**Q056 (2020):** In 2018, the number of Heads of the State attorneys' offices did not correspond to the number of municipal state attorneys' offices, because in some of these offices the Heads of offices were not appointed. By 2020, they were appointed. Additionally, since 1st of January 2019., 3 new first instance POs were established. The number of the first instance State attorneys' offices includes the number of the municipal state attorneys and Head of Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime.

**Q056 (2018):** In 2018, the organisational structure of the public prosecution in the Republic of Croatia is comprised of the State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia, the Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime, 15 county state attorneys' offices and 22 municipal state attorneys' offices. The number of Heads of the State attorneys' offices does not correspond to the number of municipal state attorneys' offices, because in some of these offices the Heads of offices were not appointed. The number of the first instance State attorneys' offices includes the number of the municipal state attorneys and Head of Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime.

**Q056 (2016):** In 2016, the organisational structure of the public prosecution in the Republic of Croatia is comprised of the State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia, the Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime, 15 county state attorneys' offices and 22 municipal state attorneys' offices. The number of Heads of the State attorneys' offices does not correspond to the number of municipal state attorneys' offices, because in some of these offices the Heads of offices were not appointed. The number of the first instance State attorneys' offices includes the number of the municipal state attorneys and Head of Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime.

**Q056 (2014):** On 31 December 2014, there were 10 vacancies opened for Heads of State attorneys' offices (2 at the county level, and 8 at the municipal level).
**Q060 (2024):** The data refer to civil servants and employees with permanent contracts in the following categories: non-prosecutorial (so-called non-judicial) staff, prosecutorial administration, and technical and support staff:
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q060 (2022):** The data refer to civil servants and employees employed for an indefinite period.
The number does not include those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**Q132 (2024):** The Act on Amendments and Supplements to the Act on Salaries and Other Material Rights of Judicial Officials (Official Gazette 71/23) – amendments to salary coefficients and the salary calculation base;
The Act on Amendments to the Act on Salaries and Other Material Rights of Judicial Officials (Official Gazette 35/24) – amendment of the salary calculation base.
**Q132 (2023):** Starting January 1, 2023, the official currency is Euro.

**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%.

**Q133 (General Comment):** Prior to the decision of the promotion, the Council shall request from the competent judicial council the submission of a rating performance of judicial duties. Afterwards, the Council shall conduct a conversation with the candidates. Following the interview, the Council approaches a secret ballot and the points achieved during the interview are summed up to the points of the evaluation of the performance of judicial duties. The Council draws up a list of priority candidates and decides on the promotion of judges. The decision must be based on the total number of points and the established priority list of candidates which is published on the website of the Council.

**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).
**Q147 (2020):** Not applicable

**Q148 (2020):** Not applicable

**Cyprus**

**Q046 (General Comment):** on the 1st of July the Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court of Cyprus were re established. An appeal court was also established.
**Q046 (2024):** Supreme Court judges include the Judges of the Supreme court (7 Judges 3 female 4 male) and of the supreme constitutional court (9 judges 5 Female 4 male)
2. Number of second instance (court of appeal) female professional judges in 2024 two positions remained vacant following retirement
**Q046 (2023):** "3. Number of Supreme Court judges": the data include the Supreme Court Judges (7) and the Supreme Constitutional Court Judges (9). On 1st of July 2023, an Appeal Court was established.
**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):** on July 2023 as part of the judicial reform a Second instance appeal court was established. The Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court were also re established.
District judges deal with both criminal and civil cases. However they are assigned either civil or criminal jurisdiction for a specified period of time. The Appeal court is divided into chambers each one dealing with specific matters.

**Q046-2 (2024):** Supreme court Judges deal both with civil and commercial cases as well as with criminal cases
The number of the judges of the Court of appeal is 16. In 2024 two positions remained vacant following retirement of the judges.

**Q046-2 (2023):** on July 2023 as part of the judicial reform a Second instance appeal court was established. The Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court were also re established. The Supreme court deals with Civil and Criminal cases. The Supreme Constitutional Court deals with constitutional cases and Administrative Case at a last instance.
The category "Other" refers to the military court.
District judges deal with both criminal and civil cases. However they are assigned either civil or criminal jurisdiction for a specified period of time. For 2023 the number listed above was the number of first instance district judges that deal solely for 2023 with criminal or civil cases accordingly.

**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 (2024):** non judge staff include court bailiffs

**Q052 (2023):** The observed variation in the number of "4. technical staff" is due to the establishment of the Appeal court in 2023 and the employment of new staff.
The category "5. Other" includes court bailiffs.
**Q052 (2022):** court bailiffs
Increase in the needs of the court led to appointment of more employees.
**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 (2024):** Following the establishment of the Supreme Constitutional Court on 1 July 2023 there was a reallocation of the staff, which resulted in higher numbers of staff working at second instance and Supreme Court level.

**Q052-1 (2022):** Increase in the needs of the court led to appointment of more employees.

**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 (2023):** The data should be interpreted in the light of the fact that in the Criminal section of the Legal Service of the Republic there are both counsels of the Republic as well as public prosecutors, who are in charge of handling criminal cases before the Criminal Courts. Only the number fo public prosecutors is communicated in the table.

**Q055 (2022):** More positions have been filled.

**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.

**Q056 (General Comment):** All heads of prosecution offices can appear before all courts.

**Q056 (2023):** In the previous cycles the numbers provided were for the whole legal service of the Republic. In this cycle it was possible to isolate the numbers solely for the public prosecution. The two heads of public prosecution services are the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General.
**Q057 (2023):** the Attorney General may assign to lawyers the prosecution of certain cases

**Q057 (2016):** the Attorney General can assign to lawyers the prosecution of certain cases.

**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

**Q132 (2024):** the salary of the Attorney General is gross salary 135.918
net annual salary 92. 828
**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

**Q148 (2023):** The term legal advisor does not exist. Under Advocates Law a registry of practicing lawyers and a registry of non practicing lawyers is kept. The number described above is for practicing lawyers.
**Q148 (2022):** the Cyprus Bar Association regulates the Advocates who have a renewed practicing license.

**Czech Republic**

**Q004 (2022):** The gross salary is constantly growing + the impact of 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.

**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 (2024):** Other: insolvency cases and guardianship proceedings
No special reason, the total number of judges remains stable.
It is consistent with the two cycles ago cycle, whenit was also presented NAP. It is more logical as there are judges of regional courts deciding administrative matters as first-instance judges.

**Q046-2 (2023):** We know the number of first instance and highest instance judges, so 123 is the difference - the number of judges in administrative cases.

**Q046-2 (2022):** The category civil/commercial includes all proceedings except criminal and administrative.

**Q046-2 (2021):** Insolvency proceedings and Guardianship proceedings

**Q046-2 (2020):** Insolvency Proceedings

**Q052 (General Comment):** The category “other” encompasses judicial trainees or staff in charge of court documentation, as well as press center and telephone exchange staff.
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.
Starting from 2022 the title of “judicial trainee” has been replaced with “judicial candidate”.

**Q052 (2024):** 5. Other non-judge staff: No special reason for this no significant discrepancy.

**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.

**Q056 (2023):** The number of females heads of prosecution offices at second instance level has increased from 1 to 3 - it is a desirable trend.

**Q056 (2022):** The number of females heads of prosecution offices has decreased only from 2 to 1.

**Q132 (2024):** It was found that in 2023 the average salary instead of the salary at the beginning of the career was given. In 2023: judges:48.555 EUR public prosecutors: 43.700 EUR
**Q132 (2023):** The Ministry of Justice has clarified that they cannot provide additional comments on the salary increases for judges in the Czech Republic. However, it is worth noting that judicial and prosecutorial salaries were previously frozen. This freeze was later deemed unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court, which led to a substantial increase in salaries, particularly for first-instance judges and public prosecutors, starting in 2023.
**Q132 (2022):** the impact of exchange rate

**Q132 (2020):** the salaries have risen generally + exchange rate

**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.
**Q146 (2022):** There is no special reason for the increase, the profession is open to everyone regardless of the gender.

**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.

**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**

**Q004 (2024):** These data are calculated as total salary income in Denmark 2024 divided by total population, as this seems to be the way it has been calculated historically. For the record, note that it is not, in our estimation, a precise measurement.

**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 = NAP.
**Q046-2 (2024):** Judges in Denmark deal with all types of cases, including both civil, commercial and criminal cases.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Judges in Denmark deal with all types of cases, including both civil, commercial and criminal cases.

**Q052 (2024):** See general comments. In addition, the Danish Courts Authority has the following comments:
Ad 2) The group includes all office employees at the courts, including employees who perform administrative tasks. It will not be possible automatically to separate the two groups without a manual count, because employees at the courts often have the same job title.
Ad 3) The group includes only heads of administration. See ad 2).
Ad 5) The group includes students.
Deviations from previous years' information on the number of full-time equivalents etc., are primarily due to changes in the calculation method. Corresponding figures for 2022 and 2023 are provided below. It should be noted that information on gender distribution is still not available for 2022 and 2023.
2022:
Total non-judge staff working in courts□1.669. 1. Rechtspleger: 305. 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff: 1.196. 3. Staff in charge of adm. mv.: 30. 4. Technical staff: 108. 5. Others (students): 30. 2023:
Total non-judge staff working in courts: 1.668. 1. Rechtspleger: 304. 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff: 1.194. 3. Staff in charge of adm. mv.: 29. 4. Technical staff: 107. 5. Others (students): 33.
The increase in the number of full-time equivalents from 2023 to 2024 is due to the courts' finance agreement, which contains increased funds for the courts to reduce case processing times and case backlogs.

**Q052 (2023):** The category "Other non-judge staff" covers kitchen assistants.

**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 (2024):** Due to the above-mentioned changes in calculation method, there is also new data for 2022 and 2023, see below:
2022:
Total non-judge staff working in courts: 1.669 First instance level: 1.476 Second instance (court of appeal) level: 168 Supreme Court level: 25 2023:
Total non-judge staff working in courts: 1.668 First instance level: 1.475 Second instance (court of appeal) level: 169 Supreme Court level: 24

**Q052-1 (2020):** -

**Q055 (2024):** The data on the number of employees in The Danish Prosecution Service and how they are distributed, is registered through a database, Polpai, containing all employees in the Danish Police and The Danish Prosecution Service.

**Q055 (2023):** The number is the actual number of employees in fulltime equivalent as of December 2023. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number regarding December 31st. Therefore the number is drawn for December 1st 2023 and scaled up to a full year.
The data on the number of employees in The Danish Prosecution Service and how they are distributed, is registered through a database, Polpai, containing all employees in the Danish Police and The Danish Prosecution Service.

**Q055 (2022):** The number is the actual number of employees in fulltime equivalent as of December 2022. 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 2022 and scaled up to a full year.
**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).
**Q056 (2024):** Please note that question 1 is counted as the director of the prosecution service in the 15 different police districts of Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands. Question 2 is the heads of the 3 state prosecutors offices (Copenhagen, Viborg and State Prosecutor for Special Crime). Question 3 is the Director of Public Prosecutions (Rigsadvokaten).

**Q056 (2023):** Please note that question 1 is counted as the director of the prosecution service in the 15 different police districts of Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands. Question 2 is the heads of the 3 state prosecutors offices (Copenhagen, Viborg and State Prosecutor for Special Crime). Question 3 is the Director of Public Prosecutions (Rigsadvokaten).

**Q056 (2022):** Please note that number 1 is counted as the director of the prosecution service in the 15 different police districts of Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands. 2 is the heads of the 3 state prosecutors offices (Copenhagen, Viborg and State Prosecutor for Special Crime). 3 is the Director of Public Prosecutions (Rigsadvokaten).

**Q056 (2020):** Please note that number 1 is counted as the director of the prosecution service in the 15 different police districts of Denmark. 2 is the heads of the 3 state prosecutors offices (Copenhagen, Viborg and State Prosecutor for Special Crime Unit) 3 is the Director of Public Prosecutions (Rigsadvokaten).
**Q056 (2016):** The observed discrepancies are due to ordinary changes in staffing.

**Q057 (General Comment):** Some police officers conduct cases pertaining to minor offences in court, but they carry out this function on behalf of the prosecution service.
**Q057 (2018):** There is a small number of police officers who conduct cases pertaining to minor offences in court behalf of the prosecution service, but it is only a small part of their normal tasks as a police officer.

**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 (2023):** All non-public prosecutor staff is included.

**Q060 (2022):** In the response from 2020, all employees of the prosecution, i.e. also prosecutors, were for unknown reasons included. In the 2021 data the number is 747 in relation to non-public prosecutors. And this year the number is 605 people. The decrease is due to, among other things, that police personnel employed by the prosecution were also included, and due to an organizational change in the public prosecution services.

**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. The employment of a new public prosecutor is covered by the collective agreement. In addition to the amount stated above, the public prosecutor in the beginning of his/her career is paid an annual supplement of 17.388 kr./2.330 €. This supplement covers the prosecutor's participation in The Local Prosecution Service's shift schedule (b-vagt). The public prosecutor is payed a basic salary, which is decided centrally in the collective agreement, based on years of working experience, qualifications, work assignments and responsibility in the specific position. In addition to the basic salary, the public prosecutor can be paid a locally negotiated supplement. The supplements depend on the qualifications and specific responsibilities in the position as a prosecutor. Public prosecutor are entitled to an annual salary negotiation.

**Q132 (2024):** In Denmark, a deputy prosecutor is placed under the collective agreement for academics, in a seniority-based salary system with an availability allowance. Upon completion of the mandatory basic training of the Prosecution Service, the prosecutor receives an additional allowance. Furthermore, prosecutors in rotation receive a supplement during and after their rotation period.
Subsequently, it is possible through annual salary negotiations to obtain further salary increases, either in the form of qualification allowances or by advancement to a higher job category such as special consultant or senior consultant.
For managerial positions, candidates are placed in a new salary framework specifically determined at state level for managerial staff.
Deputy state prosecutor: 135.998,35 EUR
Special prosecutor: 135.074,26 EUR
Deputy state prosecutor: 1.015.146,10 DKK
Special prosecutor: 1.008.248,32 DKK

**Q132 (2023):** The employment of a new public prosecutor is covered by the collective agreement. In addition to the amount stated above, the public prosecutor in the beginning of his/her career is paid an annual supplement of 17.388 kr./2.330 €. This supplement covers the prosecutor's participation in The Local Prosecution Service's shift schedule (b-vagt). The public prosecutor is payed a basic salary, which is decided centrally in the collective agreement, based on years of working experience, qualifications, work assignments and responsibility in the specific position. In addition to the basic salary, the public prosecutor can be paid a locally negotiated supplement. The supplements depend on the qualifications and specific responsibilities in the position as a prosecutor. Public prosecutor are entitled to an annual salary negotiation.

**Q132 (2022):** Regarding prosecutor: The employment of a new public prosecutor is covered by the collective agreement. In addition to the amount stated above, the public prosecutor in the beginning of his/her career is paid an annual supplement of 17.174 kr./€ 2.304. This supplement covers the prosecutor's participation in The Local Prosecution Ser-vice's shift schedule (b-vagt). The public prosecutor is payed a basic salary, which is decided centrally in the collective agreement, based on years of working experience, qualifications, work assignments and responsibility in the specific position. In addition to the basic salary, the public prosecutor can be paid a locally negotiated supplement. The supplements depend on the qualifications and specific responsibilities in the position as a prosecutor. Public prosecutor are entitled to an annual salary negotiation.
The Prosecution Service's Remuneration Policy states a maximum annual salary for the public prosecutors. The maximum annual salary for any Senior Prosecutor/Special Prosecutor, including the prosecutors at The Supreme Court Unit with the Director of Public Prosecutions is 714.000 DKKR/€ 95.829. The maximum annual salary for any Deputy State Prosecutor within the Danish Prosecution Service, including the Deputy State Prosecutor at The Supreme Court Unit with the Director of Public Prosecutions, is 942.000 DKKR/€ 126.430. The amounts are stated without pension as well as without remuneration for participation in shift schedules etc. Civil servants receive 16,8 % of the total salary as a pension contribution, and employees under the collective agreement receive 17,1 %. However, the pension contribution for the availability supplement (rådighedstillæg) is 12,5 %.

**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.

**Q133 (2024):** However, professional judges are employed as "civil servants" who receive a lifelong pension.

**Q133 (2023):** However, professional judges are employed as "civil servants" who receive a lifelong pension.

**Q133 (2022):** However, professional judges are employed as "civil servants" who receive a lifelong pension.

**Q146 (2024):** It should be noted that there is a small discrepancy between the stated total number of lawyers and the number of male and female lawyers, respectively. This is because it is possible to refrain from specifying gender.

**Q146 (2023):** The data from 2023 was also reported last year. Due to the implementation of a new member system at the Danish Bar and Law society, currently it is unfortunately not possible to access the total number of female/male lawyers practicing as of January 1st 2022.

**Q146 (2021):** The figures given above are the number of lawyers at the end of 2021.

**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 (2023):** https://www.stat.ee/

**Q004 (2022):** Inflation

**Q004 (2020):** Inflation

**Q004 (2018):** There is no specific reason.

**Q046 (2014):** In 2014, one male judge left and a female judge was appointed.

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** Judges of 1st and 2nd instance are not olbliged to only be civil or criminal judges. It can change depending on the workload and wishes of the judge.
**Q046-2 (2023):** Since 2023 the first instance courts have criminal and civil divsions. If there's a need a criminal judge can still deal with civil cases and vice versa.
**Q046-2 (2022):** Judges of 1st and 2nd instance are not olbliged to only be civil or criminal judges. It can change depending on the workload and wishes of the judge. The number of civil judges within the courts has been increased in 2022 at the expense of administrative judges.
**Q046-2 (2020):** In the first instance we don't have judges formally seperated as criminal or civil judges.

**Q052 (2023):** No comment provided.

**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.
**Q052-1 (2022):** Many of the non-judge staff is shared between courts, e.g translators. Main purpose is to cut costs and offer better service with the help of digitalisation.
**Q055 (General Comment):** The categorization of questions 55 and 56 regarding public prosecutors do not exist in Estonia.

**Q056 (General Comment):** The categorization of questions 55 and 56 regarding public prosecutors do not exist in Estonia.

**Q056 (2020):** .

**Q057 (2018):** We have assistant prosecutors who act under the guidance of the prosecutor.

**Q057 (2016):** We have assistant prosecutors who act under the guidance of the prosecutor.

**Q060 (2024):** Translators have been added.

**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.

**Q148 (General Comment):** Data on the number of legal advisors who cannot represent their clients in court is not collected.

**Finland**

**Q004 (2024):** Salary for 2024 has been estimated from structure of earnings 2023 and preliminary data from index of wage and salary earnings 2024.
**Q004 (2023):** Data from the year 2023. Calculation method for full-time employees' annual salary = monthly salary+ vacation pay + performance pay +lump sums + annual service allowance.
**Q004 (2022):** Final data for the year 2021. Calculation method for full-time employees’ annual salary = Monthly salary + vacation pay + performance pay + lump sums + annual service allowance.
**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 23 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.
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 appoin

t 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 (2024):** The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1595, summoners 284, trainee district judges 145 and referendaries 254
**Q052 (2023):** The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1537, summoners 273, trainee district judges 133 and referendaries 256.
**Q052 (2022):** The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1521, summoners 274, trainee district judges 135 and referendaries 264.
**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.
**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 (about 91 3000 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 (2023):** All Finnish prosecutors have jurisdiction on first and second court instance. Only the Prosecutor General has jurisdiction on Supreme Court level and can assign a prosecutor to handle a case on Supreme Court level.

**Q055 (2020):** Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

**Q056 (2024):** The change in figures compared to the previous year is a result of organisational change.

**Q056 (2023):** The Prosecutor Authority is a singular organization headed by the Prosecutor General (one individual person). In the answer the Chief Prosecutors of the geographically defined are considered heads of prosecution office as these departments equate the former independent prosecution offices.
**Q056 (2020):** Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.
This number includes the five prosecution districts, the The Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutor General. The number of heads of prosecution offices decreased between 2018 and 2020 due to the re-organization of the prosecution.

**Q056 (2018):** The Prosecutor General, the Deputy Prosecutor General and 11 heads of the local prosecution offices.
New heads of prosecution offices have been appointed and more of them are females.

**Q056 (2016):** the Prosecutor-General, the Deputy Prosecutor-General and 11 heads of local prosecution offices

**Q056 (2014):** For 2014, the total referres to the Prosecutor-General, the Deputy Prosecutor-General and 11 heads of local prosecution offices.
**Q057 (General Comment):** The Chancellor of Justice of the Government and the Parliamentary Ombudsman may also prosecute or order that charges to be brought in matters falling within the scope of their supervisory authority. If a prosecutor has decided not to prosecute, the injured party has the right to him/herself bring a charge for the offence in order to have the case heard by a court.

**Q057 (2024):** The functions of a prosecutor are also performed by the highest legal supervisors the Parliamentary Ombudsman and the Chancellor of Justice.
**Q057 (2018):** If a prosecutor has decided not to prosecute, the injured party has the right to self bring a charge for the offence in order to have the case heard by a court. The Chancellor of Justice of the Government and the Parliamentary Ombudsman may also prosecute or order the charges to be brought in matters falling within the scope of their supervisory authority.

**Q060 (2024):** Prosecutor’s secretaries and other specialist staff.

**Q060 (2023):** Prosecutors´secretaries and other specialist staff.

**Q060 (2022):** Prosecutor's secretaries and other specialist staff

**Q060 (2021):** In 2021, more staff was hired.

**Q060 (2018):** More staff has been recruited.
The number of males has increased.

**Q132 (2024):** In Finland, there are several salary categories for judges. The salary depends also on the years of work experience. At the end of 2024 first instance judge is in a salary category T11 in which the gross salary is from 5415,2 €/month to 7039,76€/month depending on his/her experience. A permanent first instance judge T13 has usually at least nine years of work experience which means the salary is 6036,11 €/month(minimum 5487,37 maximum 7133,58). In Finland, the taxation is progressive so the information on net salary varies from person to person and is not available.
There are several salary categories for prosecutors. Prosecutors salaries are based on three components: task-specific , personal component and component based on the years of employment. At the start of the career prosecutors usually start at the lower levels of task-specific paylevels, as well as the component based on years of employment is lower. By your own capability you can rise your own persona component. Experienced professionals usually have higher levels in all three components.

**Q132 (2022):** In Finland, there are several salary categories for judges. The salary depends also on the years of work experience. At the end of 2022 first instance judge is in a salary category T11 in which the gross salary is from 4944,63 €/month to 6428,019€/month depending on his/her experience. A permanent first instance judge T13 has usually at least nine years of work experience which means the salary is 6036,7065 €/month. In Finland, the taxation is progressive so the information on net salary varies from person to person and is not available.
Prosecutors salaries are based on three components: task-specific , personal component and component based on the years of employment. At the start of the career prosecutors usually start at the lower levels of task-specific paylevels, as well as the component based on years of employment is lower. By your own capability you can rise your own personal component. Experienced professionals usually have higher levels in all three components.

**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.

**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 (2024):** The number includes 2 359 attorneys (i.e. members of the Finnish Bar Association), 1 775 licensed trial counsels and 200 public legal aid attorneys. From the public legal aid attorneys 94 were simultaneously members of the Finnish Bar Association.
**Q146 (2023):** The number includes 2 300 attorneys (i.e. members of the Finnish Bar Association), 1 725 licensed trial counsels and 205 public legal aid attorneus. From the public legal aid attorneys 92 were simultaniously members of the Finnish Bar Association.
**Q146 (2022):** The number includes 2255 attorneys (i.e. members of the Bar Association), 1733 licensed trial counsels and 200 public legal aid attorneys. From the public legal aid attorneys 90 were also members of the Bar Association.

**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 (2022):** Revised calculation method: payroll/headcount computed on a full-time equivalent basis.

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

**Q004 (2020):** The exact figure is 34,494.5_x000D_
Source INSEE
**Q046 (2024):** Civil and criminal justice (ordre judiciaire):
Source: DSJ
Data extracted from the SIRH LOLFI - number of professional judges within civil and criminal courts as of December 31, 2024. Values are expressed in FTE.
Professional judges (1 + 2 + 3): 6 530 (Total), 1 683 (M), 4 847 (F)
1. First instance professional judges: 4 678 (T), 1 098 (M), 3 580 (F)
2. Second instance professional judges: 1 612 (T), 493 (M), 1 119 (F)
3. Professional judges at the highest level: 240 (T), 92 (M), 148 (F)

For the administrative justice:
Source: Council of State
For the number of first instance professional judges: the data provided concern the administrative courts, the National Court of Asylum and the Commission for Parking Disputes
For the number of professional judges at the Supreme court level: the data provided relate to the litigation section of the Council of State. The data take into account the actual assignment rate within the litigation section of the Council of State. A member of the Council of State may be assigned simultaneously to the litigation section—and thus exercise the functions of a judge—and to an administrative section. For information, the actual number of staff, without taking into account the assignment rate, is as follows: a total of 157, including 64 women and 93 men.
Total number of professional administrative judges (1 + 2 + 3) 1 438 (T) 707 (M) 731 (F)
1. Number of first instance professional judges 1 005 (T) 482 (M) 523 (F)
2. Number of second instance professional judges 308 (T) 151(M) 157(F)
3. Number of professional judges in Supreme courts 125(T) 74(M) 51(F)

**Q046 (2023):** The data submitted for the administrative courts, the National Court of Asylum and the Court for disputes relating to paid parking (1) and the data submitted for the Litigation Division of the Council of State (3) are lower than those submitted for the previous cycle because they take into account the actual rate of assignment to the Litigation Division of the Council of State and not the number of individuals. This is because a member of the Council of State may be assigned simultaneously to the Litigation Division - and thus perform the duties of a judge - and to the Administrative division.
For information, the number of staff without taking into account the rate of assignment is as follows:
Total: 155
Men: 92
Women: 63

**Q046 (2022):** Data include judges from both orders: "ordre judiciaire" and "ordre administratif".

DSJ: Data extracted from the SIRH LOLFI - number of professional judges in service at the headquarters of judicial courts as of 31/12/2022. The values are expressed in Full time equivalent.

**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.

**Q046-2 (2022):** The increase in the number of judges at the Council of State between 2021 and 2022 is attributed to returns from mobility.

**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 (2024):** Court staff in civil and criminal matters (“ordre judiciaire”)
Source: DSJ
Total number of non-judge staff working in courts (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5) 23 663 (T) 4 498 (M) 19 165 (F)
2. Non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges such as registrars 17 999 (T) 2 567 (M) 15 432 (F)
3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts 3 723 (T) 1 016 (M) 2 708 (F)
4. Technical staff 801 (T) 698 (M) 103 (F)
5. Other non-judge staff 1 140 (T) 217 (M) 923 (F)

“Other non-judge staff” refers to assistant lawyers who became judicial assistants on November 1, 2024, and specialised assistants who do not work for the public prosecutor's office. Category A, B, and C contractual staff recruited under the local justice support plan implemented since the second half of 2020 on the sole basis of Article 7 bis of law No. 84-16 of January 11, 1984, on statutory provisions relating to the civil service, created by the civil service transformation law of August 6, 2019, establishing the project contract, have also been included in the category of “Non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges such as registrars”. These contractual staff are recruited for three years. The total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1+2+3+4+5) will increase by 405 actual staff between December 31, 2023, and December 31, 2024. This overall upward trend is composed of several contrasting dynamics within the different populations concerned.

The number of non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges such as registrars (2), will decrease by 126 between 2023 and 2024. This decrease is mainly attributable to the fall in the number of local justice contractual staff in all categories and administrative assistants, a number of whose jobs have nevertheless been converted into administrative secretary positions. The number of staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) (excluding local justice contractual staff) will incre

ase by 393 actual staff between 2023 and 2024. This significant increase reflects, in particular, the continued strengthening of regional administrative services that has been underway for several years (+205 actual staff between 2023 and 2024), which has led to the creation of administrative secretary jobs (+79 actual staff).

Finally, the number of assistant lawyers/legal assistants and specialised assistants, who make up the category “other non-judge staff” (5), will increase by 138 between 2023 and 2024. As of December 31, 2024, 1 501 category A and B staff (including 1 233 women) were undergoing initial training at the National School of Court Clerks, most of whom were on practical placements in the courts. These staff members will join the courts in 2025 or 2026, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative services.

For administrative courts’ staff:
Total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5) 2 798 (T) 818 (M) 1 980 (F)
2. Non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars 1 979 (T) 499 (M) 1 480 (F)
3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts 537 (T) 176 (M) 361 (F)
4. Technical staff 113(T) 80 (M) 34(F)
5. Other non-judge staff 170 (T) 64 (M) 105(F) legal assistants and assistant lawyers

The technical staff listed corresponds to employees hired and paid by the administrative courts, and does not include individuals working under service contracts, which are managed locally by each court and paid for out of their operating budgets, for which we have no visibility.
Compared to last year, it was deemed appropriate to transfer certain staff (notably court clerks at the National Court of Asylum) from category 3 to category 2. In addition, staff assigned to the administrative secretariats of the Council of State are no longer counted in category 3.
The overall number of staff has increased, in particular due to the transfer of administrative staff from the paid parking litigation commission to the Council of State.

**Q052 (2023):** “Other non-judge staff” include legal assistants and specialist assistants who do not work for the public prosecutor's office. The category “2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars” includes also A, B and C category contract staff recruited under the local justice support plan implemented from the second half of 2020 on the sole basis of article 7 bis of law no. 84-16 of 11 January 1984 on statutory provisions relating to the State civil service, created by the civil service transformation law of 6 August 2019 instituting the project contract. These contract staff are recruited for 3 years. The total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1+2+3+4+5) increased by 564 actual staff between 31.12.2022 and 31.12.2023. This overall upward trend is made up of several contrasting dynamics within the different populations concerned.
For example, the number of “2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars” decreased by 451 actual staff numbers between 2022 and 2023. This reduction is mainly attributable to the fall in the number of local justice contract staff in all categories (-268 actual staff numbers) and administrative assistants (-192 actual staff numbers), a number of whose posts have nevertheless been converted into administrative secretary posts. The “3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts” (excluding local justice contract staff) increased by 710 actual staff numbers between 2022 and 2023. This significant increase reflects the continued strengthening of regional administrative services, which has been underway for several years (+233 actual staffing levels between 2022 and 2023), which has led to the creation of contract B local IT technicians (contract B TIP, +126 actual staffing levels), administrative secretaries (+42 actual staffing levels) and psychologists (+18 actual staffing levels).
Similarly, the number of non-judg

e administrative staff in the courts has increased significantly (in particular +156 administrative secretarial posts between 2022 and 2023). Finally, the legal assistants and specialist assistants making up the other non-judge staff category increased by 301 real numbers between 2022 and 2023. As at 31/12/2023, 1 580 category A and B staff (including 1 291 women) were undergoing initial training at the National School for Court Registrars, most of them on practical training in the courts. These staff will join the courts in 2024 or 2025, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative departments.
With regard to the administrative courts, the technical staff listed correspond to the staff employed and paid by the administrative court and not the people working under service contracts, managed locally by each court and paid for out of the latter's operating appropriations, for which we have no visibility.

**Q052 (2022):** The "other non-judge staff" correspond to legal assistants and specialised assistants who do not work for the prosecution services, while for the other subcategories it is not possible to distinguish between staff working for the courts and those working for the public prosecution services.

The category "non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars" includes the category B contractual staff created by the law on the transformation of the civil service of 6 August 2019, which institutes the project contract. They have been recruited under the support plan for justice implemented since the second half of 2020, for 3 years term of office. The significant increase in the number of these contractual staff, combined with the increase in the number of court clerks and the increase in the number of other non-judge staff, contributes to the increase in the overall figures communicated for the year 2022.

As at 31/12/2022, 1 549 category A and B staff (including 1 066 women) were undergoing initial training at the École nationale des greffes, most of them within the courts (practical training). These staff will join the courts in 2023 or 2024, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative departments (RAD).

With regard to "staff in charge of administrative tasks", the increase observed is linked to the implementation of a proactive policy to reinforce the SARs and the secretariats of the court presidents (increase in the number of directors of registry services in the SARs, increase in the number of administrative secretaries, etc.).

**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.

**Q052-1 (2024):** For administrative justice
Total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1 + 2 + 3):
2 788.9 (T)  813.6 (M)  1 975.3 (F)
1. Total number of non-judge staff in first instance courts:
1 391.6 (T)  349.9 (M)  1 041.7 (F)
2. Total number of non-judge staff in second instance courts:
1 018.2 (T)  294.4 (M)  723.8 (F)
3. Total number of non-judge staff in Supreme Courts:
407.1 (T)  182.3 (M)  224.8 (F)
Among these staff members, 294.5 FTEs are responsible, within the General Secretariat of the Council of State, for managing all administrative jurisdictions (human resources, budget, information systems, property management, training, communication, etc.).
In contrast with the previous year, staff assigned to the secretariats of the administrative sections of the Council of State are no longer included. Their number is 28.
For civil and criminal justice:
Total Male Female
Total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1 + 2 + 3)22 044 (T)3 890 (M)
1. Total number of non-judge staff in first instance courts:
19 034 (T)  3 173 (M)  15 861 (F)
2. Total number of non-judge staff in second instance courts:
2 682 (T)  618 (M)  2 064 (F)
3. Total number of non-judge staff in Supreme Courts:
328 (T)  99 (M)  229 (F)
As in the previous year, staff working within regional administrative services are not included in the data, which covers only personnel working within courts. This explains the difference observed between the totals for questions 52 and 52-1.

**Q052-1 (2023):** As in the previous year, staff working in regional administrative departments are not included in this census of staff working in courts only. This explains the difference between the totals for questions 52 (23 258) and 52.1 (21 757). Also included in the number of staff working in the courts are the ‘local justice’ contract staff whose recruitment has been authorised from 2020 onwards on the basis of the project contract (see comment to question 52).
The increase of 495 real staff between 2022 and 2023 for these court staff is mainly due to the increase in the number of legal assistants and specialist assistants (+462 posts). It should be noted that, unlike in question 52, it has not been possible to exclude legal assistants and specialised assistants working for the public prosecutor's office when breaking down the data provided in the table above (1 538 in total for courts of first instance, courts of appeal and supreme courts).

**Q052-1 (2022):** It has not been possible to exclude the legal assistants and specialized assistants working for the public prosecutor's office from the breakdown of data provided in the frame of Q52-1 (1076 in total for first instance courts, appellate courts, and Supreme courts). Also included in these figures are contractual staff whose recruitment was authorized as of 2020 under project-based contracts (see comments to question 52). The difference between the total of Q52 and the total of Q52-1 is once again explained this year by the non-inclusion in question Q 52-1 of personnel working in SAR: indeed, since question Q52-1 only concerns non-judicial staff working in first instance courts, appellate courts, and Supreme courts, SAR staff are not counted therein.

**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 (2024):** Data derived from an extraction of the SIRH LOLFI – number of public prosecutors in the criminal courts as of 31 December 2024. Data are expressed in full-time equivalents (FTE).
With regard to the number of first-instance public prosecutors, these figures do not include the “délégués du procureur”, unlike the previous year. Including deputy prosecutors, the total would be 1 983 (671 men and 1 312 women).

**Q055 (2023):** These figures correspond to all public prosecutors in the public prosecution services, excluding court presidents and heads of court.
In first instance courts, the total is 1 892 (843 men / 1 049 women). At first instance, 430 “délégués du procureur”, including 72 women and 358 men, carry out functions comparable to those of public prosecutors. The increase in the number of first instance prosecutors compared with 2022 is due to the inclusion of the “délégués du procureur” in 2023.

**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.

**Q056 (2024):** Data derived from an extraction of the SIRH LOLFI – number of public prosecutors and general prosecutors of criminal courts as of 31 December 2024. Data are expressed in full-time equivalents (FTE).
**Q057 (General Comment):** In France there are other persons having similar duties to those of public prosecutors, namely the so called "délégués du procureur". The latter carry out certain tasks of the public prosecutor: implementing alternative measures to criminal prosecution, notifying measures proposed as part of a penal composition, notifying convicted offenders of penal orders, monitoring the implementation of probationary sentences, monitoring the enforcement of penalty sentences, receiving payment of fines imposed by penal order, representing the public prosecutor in territorial bodies.

**Q057 (2023):** The ”délégués du procureur” carry out functions comparable to those of public prosecutors. They intervene to implement alternative measures to prosecution decided by the public prosecutor for minor offences (reminder of obligations under the law, conditional discontinuation, penal composition). They may also be tasked with issuing summonses to appear in court or criminal orders. They carry out their duties within the premises of first instance courts, courts of appeal or any place of justice designated by the public prosecutor (points of justice, police stations, etc.). As key players in the local justice system, their duties have been extended and diversified as part of the reform to make criminal proceedings more efficient, as set out in decree no. 2020-1640 of 21 December 2020. They can now hold office hours, represent the public prosecutor at meetings of partnership bodies or receive payment of fines.

**Q057 (2022):** In France there are other persons having similar duties to those of public prosecutors, namely the so called "délégués du procureur". The latter carry out certain tasks of the public prosecutor: implementing alternative measures to criminal prosecution, notifying measures proposed as part of a penal composition, notifying convicted offenders of penal orders, monitoring the implementation of probationary sentences, monitoring the enforcement of penalty sentences, receiving payment of fines imposed by penal order, representing the public prosecutor in territorial bodies.

In 2022, there were 1 004 "délégués du procureur". The number in full time equivalent is 400 and it has been calculated approximately, as they work on a sessional basis.

**Q057 (2016):** No other person has functions comparable to those of the public prosecutor, the latter being sole in charge of the public prosecution. On the other hand, certain powers may be delegated on an ad hoc basis within a specific framework. Thus, before the police court and the local court which are competent to try contraventions of the first four levels, the functions of the public prosecutor are carried out by an officer of the public prosecutor's office (OMP) in the person of the competent police commissioner in the jurisdiction of these courts.
The prosecutor of the Republic may also designate a representative of the public prosecutor to intervene in the procedure of criminal composition or to remind the perpetrator of the obligations resulting from the law, to direct the perpetrator to a health, social or professional structure or to ask the perpetrator to regularise his/her situation or to compensate the damage resulting from the offence. The prosecutor's delegates may be natural persons or associations. They are empowered to do so by the public prosecutor, must take an oath before the court and are bound by professional secrecy. They submit an annual activity report to the prosecutor.
The prosecutor's delegates are not members of the public prosecutor's office and are not in charge of initiating public prosecutions, unlike the officers of the public prosecutor's office mentioned above. Indeed, the prosecutor's delegates are only competent within the framework of the mission assigned to them for an alternative measure to prosecution in a specific case.

**Q057 (2014):** Data in FTE is not available for two reasons. On the one hand, deputy prosecutors (about 950) and criminal mediators are involved as delivery agents and not employees. On the other hand, associations, to the number of 155, are also entitled to fulfill these missions, but it is still not possible to determine the number of FTE devoted to these specific missions, among other socio-judicial missions.
**Q060 (2024):** The staff categories taken into account correspond to assistant lawyers who became judicial officers on November 1, 2024, and specialized assistants working for the public prosecutor's office.

**Q060 (2023):** The categories of staff taken into account correspond to legal assistants and specialist assistants working for the public prosecutor's office.
The increase in the number of non-prosecutor staff attached to the Public Prosecutor's Office in 2023 compared with 2022 occurs in the context of the strengthening of the justice budget, in particular by providing for the creation of a large number of posts for legal assistants (300 in 2023), these criteria have made it possible to consolidate the assignment of legal assistants to the Public Prosecutor's Office on a long-term basis.
In accordance with the note from the Directorate of Judicial Services dated 30 January 2023 on the distribution and recruitment of legal assistant staff for the year 2023, the following were taken into account: the support for the activity of the public prosecutors' offices, the ratio of the number of legal assistant staff jobs per localised prosecutor's position so that it is between 1 for 6 and 1 for 7 for all metropolitan jurisdictions, the specificities of overseas jurisdictions and jurisdictions hosting specialized interregional jurisdictions (JIRS) or national centers. In addition, the distribution of the posts of legal assistant officers was linked to an action plan to reduce stocks and improve the quality of processing of proceedings. Similarly, the need to support the public prosecutors' offices, particularly within the JIRS or national centres, in the characterisation and processing of complex offences has led to the assignment of specialised assistants within these courts.

**Q060 (2022):** This figure includes legal assistants and specialised assistants working in the public prosecutor's office.

**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):** Administrative courts:
First-instance professional judge at the beginning of their career: the data mentioned in the first line corresponds to the average salary of a junior advisor at the first-grade level.
Judge of the Supreme Court or final appellate court: this refers to the average salary of deputy presidents of the litigation section. The salary primarily consists of: base salary: this depends on the increased index held by the civil servant in their grade and step within the grade, and it progresses with seniority according to an index scale. This index is multiplied by the value of the public service point to calculate the base salary; additional remuneration components: paid based on personal circumstances (e.g., dependents, location of the administrative residence, allowances for assignments in certain overseas territories, etc.); allowances: either paid on a fixed basis depending on the various functions that may be held during the career or based on the significance and quality of the service rendered, and the achievement of quantitative objectives.

Civil and criminal courts:
The average salary of a first-instance professional judge at the beginning of their career corresponds to the entry-level salary upon starting their position after completing the National School for the Judiciary (ENM).
The average salary of a first-instance prosecutor at the beginning of their career corresponds to the entry-level salary upon starting their position after completing the ENM.
The average salary of judges at the Court of cassation (the methodology used in previous years is applied): it is more relevant to take the average cost of judges at the Court of Cassation, as it should reflect the highest salary of a judge/prosecutor in the highest judicial instance, rather than the salary of the president of the court or the Attorney General.
Prosecutor at the Supreme Court or final appellate court: same as above.

**Q132 (2024):** NB: the salaries of civil and criminal judges ("ordre judiciaire") are listed in the table. For administrative courts: professional first-instance judge at the beginning of their career: €58,828 (gross annual) €49,826 (net annual); judge of the Supreme Court (Council of State) €206,948 (gross annual) €174,139 (net annual).

**Q132 (2023):** As regards the salary of a first instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career, the salary scale for judges at the beginning of their career has been upgraded.
**Q132 (2022):** According to the administrative court judges' annual salary, it amounts to 57,400 euros gross and 48,700 euros net. As for the Council of State judges, their annual remuneration stands at 190,000 euros gross and 161,000 euros net.

The administrative judges in France are subject to another salary regim. The gross annual salary of administrative judges is 57 400 Euro and 48 700 Euro net. For the judges of the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat), the annual salary is 190 000 Euros gross and 161 000 Euros net.

**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 (2024):** For civil and criminal courts:
The benefits are limited to certain magistrates only, due to the location of their duties.
Whether judges or prosecutors, only magistrates working overseas benefit from income tax reductions (for Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guyane, Saint-Martin, Mayotte, and Réunion) and retirement benefits (annuity increments equivalent to one-third of the duration of service performed outside the original territory for retirement rights, except for Mayotte, where the retirement annuity increment is one year for every two years of service completed).
In overseas territories and Corsica, certain positions such as First President, Prosecutor General, President, Prosecutor of the Republic, and President or Prosecutor General of the Appeal Chamber are also eligible for housing concessions, in accordance with the decree of December 30, 2020, which sets out the list of functions in the Ministry of Justice's state services under Articles R. 2124-65 and R. 2124-68 of the General Code of Public Property that may entitle the holder to a housing concession due to the absolute necessity of service or a temporary occupation agreement with on-call duty. A fee is charged to the beneficiary of this agreement. It is equal to 50% of the actual rental value of the occupied premises.
Finally, in accordance with the decree of December 2, 2002, regarding the application in New Caledonia, French Polynesia, Wallis and Futuna, Mayotte, and Saint Pierre and Miquelon of Article 4 of Decree No. 67-1039 of November 29, 1967, regulating housing and furnishing for magistrates and civil servants of the state working in overseas territories, amended by Decree No. 85-1237 of November 25, 1985, the First Presidents, Prosecutors General, Presidents, and Prosecutors of the Republic of the territories of New Caledonia, French Polynesia, and Saint Pierre and Miquelon benefit from the allocation of official housing.

**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_

**Q146 (2024):** Statistics as of January 1, 2023 (latest available year).

**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.

**Q147 (2024):** Since Law No. 90-1259 of December 31, 1990 (which came into effect on January 1, 1992), the term “lawyer” includes both the former profession of legal advisor and lawyers. These two professions have merged to form a single profession of lawyer, all members of which can represent their clients in court.
Corporate jurists, the equivalent of "in-house counsellors," are not part of the legal profession and do not constitute a regulated profession: therefore, the DACS does not have data on this profession.

**Q147 (2023):** This category does not exist. The profession of legal adviser was integrated into the profession of lawyer by the law of 31 December 1990. Legal advice is open to certain professionals by virtue of their status, but also to other professionals after approval has been granted by the Ministry of Justice.

**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 (2024):** The DACS does not have figures on this profession, as explained in the comment relating to question 147.

**Q148 (2021):** Source DACS

**Q148 (2018):** There is no regulated profession in France for lawyers who cannot represent clients in court.

**Germany**

**Q004 (2024):** The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without
special payments: 56 294 EUR)
Special payments are any payments outside of the regular remuneration that can be recurring on an annual basis (such as Christmas bonuses/end-of-the-year bonuses, holiday bonuses, bonuses for the fulfilment of target agreements) or irregular (e.g. payments for jubilees).

**Q004 (2023):** The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without special payments: 53 620 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 (2022):** The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without special payments: 50 805 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 (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 federal states 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 statistic" ("Personalverwendung") of the federal states 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 federal states from statistic No 1 (court staff statistic) with the number of judges at the Federal Courts (full-time equivalent as of 31 December). This statistic is not published every year but every two years. It differentiates between the judges of the federal states 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.

**Q046 (2024):** 1. and 2.: Data was taken from the "staff-assignment statistic 2024" of the federal states. 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) in FTE. The staff-assignment statistic does not distinguish between male and female judges. The "court-staff statistic" of the federal states on the other hand distinguishes between "total" and "female" but does not allow for a differentiation between the instances. According to the court-staff statistic as of 31
December 2024 there were 21 953 judges (FTE) in total, among them 11 140 female and 10 813 male.
3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in FTE as of 31 December 2024. The number of judges at the Federal Courts is published every second year (please refer to the general comment).

**Q046 (2023):** 1. and 2.: Data was taken from the "staff-assignment statistic 2023" of the federal states. 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) in FTE. The staff-assignment statistic does not distinguish between male and female judges. The "court-staff statistic" of the federal states on the other hand distinguishes between "total" and "female" but does not allow for a differentiation between the instances. According to the court-staff statistic as of 31 December 2023 there were 21 882 judges (FTE) in total, among them 10 929 female and 10 953 male.
3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in FTE as of 31 December 2022. The number of judges at the Federal Courts is published every second year (please refer to the general comment).

**Q046 (2022):** 1. and 2.: Data was taken from the "staff-assignment statistic" of the federal states. 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 statistic does not distinguish between male and female jugdes. The "court-staff statistic" of the federal states on the other hand distinguishes between "total" and "female" but does not allow for a differentiation between the instances. According to the court-staff statistic as of 31 December 2022 there were 22 027 judges (FTE) in total, among them 10 813 female and 11 214 male.
3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in FTE as of 31 December 2022. The number of judges at the Federal Courts is published every second year (see General Comment).

**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 (2024):** First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistic 2024" of the federal states. 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) in FTE.
"Supreme Court": the figures are taken from the "court-staff statistic" 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 Constitutional Court, Military Disciplinary Courts) as of 31. December 2024. It shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (154) 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 112 judges (headcount) assigned to the civil panels and 45 to the criminal panels.

**Q046-2 (2023):** "Other" includes judges handling family cases and labour law cases.
"First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistic 2023" of the federal states. 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) in FTE.
"Supreme Court": the figures are taken from the "court-staff statistic" 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 Constitutional Court, Military Disciplinary Courts) as of 31. December 2022. It shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (154) 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.

**Q046-2 (2022):** "Other" includes judges handling familiy cases and labour law cases. In previous cycles, this category also included judges handling cases at the financial and social courts. In accordance with the classification of cases used for question 91, these judges are now allocated to the category "administrative".
"First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistic" of the federal states. 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 statistic" 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 2022. It shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (154) 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.

**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 statistic" of the federal states 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 statistic do not distinguish between male and female staff.
**Q052 (2024):** "Other non-judge staff" represents:
- staff on the basic level career track as far as not allocated to categories 1 - 4 (including motor-pool staff, staff at court cashiers' offices, internal mail and file delivery service, maintenance etc.)
- staff in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities and as gender equality commissioners

**Q052 (2023):** "Other non-judge staff" represents:
- staff on the basic level career track as far as not allocated to categories 1 - 4 (including motor-pool staff, staff at court cashiers' offices, internal mail and file delivery service, maintenance etc.)
- staff in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities and as gender equality commissioners

**Q052 (2022):** "Other non-judge staff" represents:
- staff on the basic level career track as far as not allocated to categories 1 - 4 (including motorpool staff, staff at court cashiers' offices, internal mail and file delivery service, maintenance etc.)
- staff in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities and as gender equality commissioners
Discrepancies of technical staff and other non-judge staff:
The categorisation of staff allocated to "other non-judge staff" was revised and corrected in comparison to previous cycles. Staff on unpaid leave for training purposes was removed. Reception and security services were formerly allocated to "other staff". In alignment with the Explanatory Note, reception and security services are now allocated to the category "technical staff". Other potentially "technical" staff such as motorpool or maintenance staff are not recorded seperatly in the "staff-assignment statistic" but only together with other lines of work as "staff at basic level career track together".

**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 (2024):** While the staff-assignment statistic allocates judges to instances, non-judge staff is not allocated to instances.

**Q052-1 (2023):** While the staff-assignment statistic allocates judges to instances, non-judge staff is not allocated to instances.

**Q052-1 (2022):** While the staff-assignment statistic statistic allocates judges to instances, non-judge staff is not allocated to instances.
**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. The information on the job shares count a public prosecutor working full-time as 1. A public prosecutor 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 public prosecutor working half the usual number of hours).

**Q055 (2024):** 1.: Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the regional courts as of 31. December 2024
2. Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the higher regional courts as of 31. December 2024
3. Data is taken from the biannual juducial statistic and represents number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice as of 31. December 2024

**Q055 (2023):** 1.: Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the regional courts as of 31. December 2023
2. Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the higher regional courts as of 31. December 2023
3. Data is taken from the biannual juducial statistic and represents number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice as of 31. December 2022
**Q055 (2022):** 1.: Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the local and regional courts as of 31. December 2022
2. Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the higher regional courts as of 31. December 2022
3. Data ist taken from the court staff statistic and represents number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice.

**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).

**Q056 (General Comment):** The total number of heads of the public prosecution offices is at least the number of Regional Courts (115) plus the number of Higher Regional Courts (24) at which the chief public prosecution offices are located.

**Q056 (2024):** Figures for No. 1 and 2 were provided by the federal states and represent the number of heads of public prosecution offices (people) exluding posts that are currently vacant. Reports on allocation to gender are not yet conclusive. The discrepancy to previous cycles is due to the fact that previous data was estimated based on the number of public prosecution offices and prosecutor general's offices and therefore represented offices, not people. The figure for No. 3 represents the Federal Prosecutor General.
**Q056 (2023):** The figures were calculated based on the number of public prosecution offices (115 public prosecution offices at the Regional Courts, 24 prosecutor general's offices at the Higher Regional Courts, 1 Federal Prosecutor General`s office at the Federal Court of Justice). Generally, each public prosecution office has one head. Nevertheless, this is merely an approximated value, especially since some posts may be vacant. The federal states have reported a total of 136 heads of prosecution offices. Reports on their allocation to gender and to the first and second instance are not yet conclusive.

**Q056 (2022):** There are no statistics specifically on the number of the heads of public prosecution offices. The figures were calulated based on the number of public prosecution offices (115 public prosecution offices at the Regional Courts, 24 prosecutor general's offices at the Higher Regional Courts, 1 Federal Prosecutor General`s office at the Federal Court of Justice). Generally, each public prosecution office has one head but there might be cases in which two persons working in part time share the position or in which one person (temporarily) is the head of two public prosecution offices.

**Q056 (2020):** There are no statistics specifically on the number of the heads of public prosecution offices. The figures were calulated based on the number of public prosecution offices (115 public prosecution offices at the Regional Courts, 24 prosecutor general's offices at the Higher Regional Courts, 1 Federal Prosecutor General`s office at the Federal Court of Justice). Generally, each public prosecution office has one head but there might be cases in which two persons working in part time share the position or in which one person (temporarily) is the head of two public prosecution offices.

**Q056 (2018):** There is no evidence of how many heads of prosecutors there are.
However, since the structure of the public prosecutor's offices (public prosecutor's offices, Attorney General's Office and General
Prosecutor's Office) is the same as that of the courts (District Court, Higher Regional Court, Federal Supreme Court), there are at least as many senior prosecutors as there are courts. The total number of heads of the public prosecution offices is at least the number of Regional Courts plus the number of Higher Regional Courts at which the chief public prosecution offices are located.

**Q056 (2016):** There is no evidence of how many heads of prosecutors there are. However, since the structure of the public prosecutor's offices (public prosecutor's offices, Attorney General's Office and General Prosecutor's Office) is the same as that of the courts (District Court, Higher Regional Court, Federal Supreme Court), there are at least as many senior prosecutors as there are courts. The total number of heads of the public prosecution offices is at least the number of Regional Courts (116) plus the number of Higher Regional Courts (24) at which the chief public prosecution offices are located.These are currently 140.

**Q057 (General Comment):** Section 142 of the Courts Constitution Act (GVG) provides for the function of an official of the public prosecution office with a right of audience before the local courts. In Germany, an official of the public prosecution office is a civil servant in a special career of the higher judicial service who performs certain tasks of a public prosecutor. In principle, they can perform prosecutorial duties before local courts without restriction. However, the federal states have enacted orders on the organisation and operation of the public prosecutor's offices. These orders regularly limit the activities of the officials of the public prosecution office to an enumerative catalogue of offences to be tried before the criminal judge. Officials of the public prosecution office cannot perform prosecutorial duties before regional, higher regional or federal courts. In addition, section 142 of the Courts Constitution Act (GVG) provides that trainee jurists may be entrusted with the performance of prosecutorial duties. These trainee jurists are persons who have completed their law studies with the first state examination and are in a two-year preparatory service, the completion of which is intended to qualify them for the judicial office. Within the scope of the assignment of duties, the trainee jurist has the same procedural powers as an official of the public prosecution office.

**Q057 (2024):** Please refer to the General Comment

**Q057 (2023):** Please refer to the general comment

**Q057 (2016):** The number cited concerns exclusively associate public prosecutors at a local court (Amtsanwälte). This figure as well reflects job shares (not a number of heads). Besides these associate public prosecutors, there are trainee jurists, civil parties to criminal proceedings, and revenue authorities. However, their number is not known (NA) and therefore was not included in the answer to question 57.
Officials of the public prosecution office:
The office of the public prosecution office at the Local Courts can also be exercised by officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience before the local courts (section 142 (2) of the Courts Constitution Act). The jurisdiction of the officials of the public prosecution office does not encompass preparing public charges in local court proceedings in criminal matters falling under the jurisdiction of courts other than the local courts. In accordance with the Order regarding the Organisation and Service Operations of the Public Prosecution Offices (Anordnung über Organisation und Dienstbetrieb der Staatsanwaltschaft, OrgStA) issued by some Land administrations of justice, officials of the public prosecution office are only assigned criminal matters in which the criminal court judge rules, and then only the criminal matters designated in a list. Trainee jurists:
Responsibility may be assigned to trainee jurists for discharging the duties of an official of the public prosecution office with a right of audience before the local courts and, in an individual case, for discharging the duties of a public prosecutor under the latter’s supervision (section 142 (3) of the Courts Constitution Act).
Civil party to criminal proceedings:
Under certain preconditions, some criminal offences can be prosecuted by aggrieved per-sons by means of a private charge without needing to first call on the public prosecution office. A private charge can also be filed by someone who is entitled to file a request to prosecute in addition to o

r in place of the aggrieved person.
Revenue authorities:
Tasks comparable to those of the public prosecution office are performed by the revenue authorities in the fiscal criminal proceedings: If the revenue authority conducts the investiga-tion independently in accordance with section 386 (2) of the Fiscal Code (Abgabenordnung, AO), it has the same rights and obligations as the public prosecutor’s office has in an investigation (section 399 (1) of the Fiscal Code).

**Q060 (2024):** Figures include officials of the public prosecution office referred to in question 57

**Q060 (2023):** Figures include officials of the public prosecution office referred to in question 57.

**Q060 (2022):** Figures include official solicitors ("Amtsanwälte") referred to in question 57.

**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):** The salaries of judges and public prosecutors are determined by remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") which exist in each federal state as well as on the federal level. These laws define the remuneration based on different pay-groups, pay-grades and experience levels. Judges and public prosecutors belong to pay-group "R" that has several pay-grades ("R1", "R2", "R3"...). The allocation to the pay-grades depends on the kind of court, position at the court and size of the court. The number of available pay-grades and the details of allocation differ among the remuneration laws. In simplified terms, judges at local courts, regional courts, labour courts, social courts and administrative courts are allocated to pay-grade "R1" according to the remuneration laws of the federal states. Judges at higher regional courts, regional labour courts, regional social courts, regional administrative courts and finance courts as well as judges with an outstanding position (e.g. director, presiding judge) at the courts mentioned for pay-grade "R1" are allocated to pay-grade "R2" according to the remuneration laws of the federal states. Higher pay-grades according to the remuneration laws of the federal states are reserved for judges in outstanding positions (e.g. presidents, presiding judges). Pay-grades R1 and R2 have several experience levels. Generally, judges will climb to the next experience level after a period of two years from the beginning of their career and then climb further every two or three years (details may differ among the federal states and also with regard to the Federal Courts). The Federal Remuneration Law applies to judges and public prosecutors at the federal courts. With regard to the Federal Remuneration Law, judges at the Federal Patent Court and Military Disciplinary Courts are allocated to pay-grade "R2". Judges at the highest federal courts (Federal Court of Justice, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Finan

ce Court) are allocated to pay-grade "R6", presiding judges to pay-grade “R8”. Federal Public Prosecutors at the Federal Court of Justice are allocated to pay-grade “R6”.

**Q132 (2024):** First instance judge or public prosecutor at the beginning of their career:
Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the federal states. The average was calculated unweighted. The monthly base-salaries of the federal states were added up and divided by the number of federal states, regardless of how many judges and prosecutors with the respective pay-grades work in a federal state (number unknown). Gross base-salaries range from approx. 53 137 to 61 912 EUR per year.
Judge of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
Data represents the base-salary of presiding judges at the Federal Court of Justice, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a judge can achieve (excluding the court presidents and judges at the Federal Constitutional Court).
Public Prosecutor of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
Data represents the base-salary of the Federal Public Prosecutors at the Federal Court of Justice according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a public prosecutor can achieve (excluding the Federal Prosecutor General).
Judges and public prosecutors are entitled to additional payments depending on 1) their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children); 2) their position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
Calculations were made on the following basis:
1) judge/public prosecutor at the beginning of their career: pay-grade "R1" (remuneration laws of the federal states) , lowest level of experience, unmarried, no children, no special tasks
2) judges at the supreme courts: pay-grade "R8" (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks.
3) public prosecutors at the supreme court: pay-grade "

R6" (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks

**Q132 (2023):** First instance judge or public prosecutor at the beginning of their career:
Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the federal states. The average was calculated unweighted. The monthly base-salaries of the federal states were added up and divided by the number of federal states, regardless of how many judges and prosecutors with the respective pay-grades work in a federal state (number unknown). Gross base-salaries range from approx. 52 737 to 58 298 EUR per year.
Judge of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
Data represents the base-salary of presiding judges at the Federal Court of Justice, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a judge can achieve (excluding the court presidents and judges at the Federal Constitutional Court).
Public Prosecutor of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
Data represents the base-salary of the Federal Public Prosecutors at the Federal Court of Justice according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a public prosecutor can achieve (excluding the Federal Prosecutor General).
Judges and public prosecutors are entitled to additional payments depending on 1) their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children); 2) their position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
Calculations were made on the following basis:
1) judge/public prosecutor at the beginning of their career: pay-grade "R1" (remuneration laws of the federal states) , lowest level of experience, unmarried, no children, no special tasks
2) judges at the supreme courts: pay-grade "R8" (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks.
3) public prosecutors at the supreme court: pay-grade "

R6" (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks

**Q132 (2022):** First instance judge or public prosecutor at the beginning of their career:
Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the federal states. The average was calculated unweighted. The monthly base-salaries of the federal states were added up and divided by the number of federal states, regardless of how many judges and prosecutors with the respective pay-grades work in a federal state (number unknown).
Judge of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
The calculation method was changed in comparison to previous years, causing high discrepancies. Data represents the base-salary of presiding judges at the Federal Court of Justice, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a judge can achieve (excluding the court presidents and judges at the Federal Constitutional Court).
Public Prosecutor of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
The calculation method was changed in comparison to previous years, causing high discrepancies Data represents the base-salary of the Federal Public Prosecutors at the Federal Court of Justice according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a public prosecutor can achieve (excluding the Federal Prosecutor General).
Judges and public prosecutors are entitled to additional payments depending on 1) their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children); 2) their position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
Calculations were made on the following basis:
1) judge/public prosecutor at the beginning of their career: pay-grade "R1" (remuneration laws of the federal states) , lowest level of experience, unmarried, no children, no special tasks
2) judges at the supreme courts: pay-grade "R8" (Fed

eral Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks.
3) public prosecutors at the supreme court: pay-grade "R6" (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks

**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.

**Q133 (2024):** Unlike contracted employees, judges and public prosecutors acquire pension claims in accordance with the Civil Service Benefits Act (Beamtenversorgungsgesetz) and are not included in the statutory pensions insurance scheme. Other financial benefit: Unlike contracted employees, judges and public prosecutors acquire a right to claim assistance with medical expenses and are not required to join the statutory health insurance scheme. Furthermore, married judges and prosecutors receive family allowances, and those with children receive child allowances.

**Q146 (2024):** Number of lawyers as of 1 January 2025

**Q146 (2023):** number of lawyers as of 1 January 2024

**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 27 789 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 (2024):** Please refer to the general comment

**Q147 (2023):** please refer to the general comment

**Q147 (2022):** see General Comment

**Q147 (2021):** See the general comments

**Q147 (2020):** See the general comments

**Q147 (2019):** See the general comments

**Greece**

**Q004 (General Comment):** The survey based on which data on average national salary are established is conducted on a four-year basis. The most recent data are for 2022 and they became available at the end of 2024.

**Q004 (2024):** Total/Avg. Male: 21 947 Female: 17 361. The CEPEJ uses as an estimation the average value of these two figures.
https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SJO47/-

**Q004 (2023):** The most recently available data are 2022 data.
According to the Structure and Distribution of Earnings Survey for 2022, the average annual gross earnings are as follows: Total/Avg. Male: 21 947 Female: 17 361. The CEPEJ uses as an estimation the average value of these two figures.
https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SJO47/-

**Q004 (2022):** 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 o of the survey will be published in late 2024 to early 2025.

**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 (General Comment):** Starting from 2021, the judges of the Court of Audit are included in the table as third instance judges alongside with judges of the Supreme court (Areios Pagos) and the Council of State.
First instance judges - judges of the 56 first instance courts of general jurisdiction and the 30 administrative courts
Second instance judges - judges of the 19 Courts of appeal and the 9 Administrative courts of appeal

**Q046 (2024):** This increase is due to the implementation of Law 5108/2024 for the unification of the First Instance jurisdiction (Judicial Map). This resulted in an increase in the number of First Instance Court Judges as the former Justices of the Peace were transferred to the Courts of First Instance as Special Term Judges. The latter are professional judges.

**Q046 (2023):** Judges of local courts and district criminal courts are included in the number of first instance judges.

**Q046 (2022):** The answer came after the cooperation of the Directorate for the organization and operation of Justice with Juststat. The discrepancy has been analyzed to last year questionnaire.
**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.
**Q046-2 (General Comment):** Starting from 2024, judges of the Court of Audit, a specialised administrative court having the statute of a Supreme court, are categorised as third instance administrative judges.
**Q046-2 (2023):** Same judges ( 2713)intervene in both civil and criminal matters in the Greek judicial system.

**Q046-2 (2022):** 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.For the Council of State( Supreme Administrative Court) in administrative cases the judges are 166.
**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 (2024):** "Other": two drivers at the Council of State.

**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 (2024):** The increase in court personnel is due to the operation of the National School of Judicial Officers (ESDI), from which three cohorts of judicial officers graduated during 2024, staffing the courts. Previously, appointments were made through ASEP, which resulted in understaffing of the courts due to the delays generally observed in the appointment of personnel through ASEP procedures.
**Q052-1 (2022):** The explanation was given in last year's questionnaire.

**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 (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.

**Q056 (2024):** Judicial Map.

**Q056 (2020):** Gender data are not kept.

**Q056 (2016):** The previous data given referred to the heads of prosecution offices, which in Greece is a title (rank) and not to those who are actually in charge of the organization and the management of a Prosecution Office. This year's data are the correct ones.

**Q056 (2014):** The 2014 data concerns all prosecutors that possess the rank of "prosecutors", and not only those who are in charge of each prosecutor's office. The total number of prosecutors in charge of each prosecutor's office (heads) is 83.

**Q057 (General Comment):** Deputy Prosecutors and members of the prosecution(is the first degree after graduation from the National School of Judges) have related duties to prosecutors.
**Q060 (2022):** The majority is the category of Secretaries , the other categories are court bailiffs, typists, It clerks and two public prosecutor's offices have one security clerk each.
**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 (2024):** According to the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 20 of law 5045/2023, the basic salaries of judiciary, as they were structured on December 31, 2023, were increased from January 1, 2024 by the amount corresponding to the product of the starting salary of the category of Mandatory Education (Y.E.) of unified salary employees, multiplied by a coefficient of 0.0897, rounded to the nearest euro, specifically by the amount of 70 euros per month.
By the provisions of Article 39 of Law 5079/2023, the allowances, benefits, and compensations under paragraphs 3, 5, and 6 of paragraph A of Article 30 of Law 3205/2003 (A' 297) for judiciary, as they were established on December 31, 2023, were increased from January 1, 2024, as follows: a) By thirty percent (30%) the allowance for faster processing under paragraph 3 of paragraph A, and b) by ten percent (10%) the fixed compensation and the representation expenses compensation of paragraphs 5 and 6 of paragraph A, respectively, rounded to the nearest euro unit.

**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.
**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.

**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

**Q147 (2022):** All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.
**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 (2024):** All lawyers can be considered legal advisors and represent their clients in court.
**Q148 (2023):** All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.
**Q148 (2022):** 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 (2024):** In comparison to the previous year, the average gross annual salary increased due to the raising of the minimum wage, and of course the forint exchange rate change.
The above data is based on the labour market data (693,529 HUF/month) published on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/mun/en/mun0001.html) and the average EUR currency rate (395,20 HUF/EUR) published on the website, based on the National Bank of Hungary data (http://mnbkozeparfolyam.hu/arfolyam-2024.html).

**Q004 (2023):** In comparison to the previous year, the average gross annual salary increased due to the raising of the minimum wage, and of course the forint exchange rate change.
The above data is based on the labour market data (614,426 HUF/month) published on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/mun/en/mun0001.html) and the average EUR currency rate (381.95 HUF/EUR) published on the website of the National Bank of Hungary (http://mnbkozeparfolyam.hu/arfolyam-2023.html). The relevant data of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office is currently still in “preliminary” status, therefore it cannot be considered final. It is unknown when the preliminary data will be revised and finalised.

**Q004 (2022):** 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

**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 concerns the Regional Courts, the distribution of first and second instance cases is based on the bylaws which are renewed every year by the president of each court after consultation with the judicial council and the professional department 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.
**Q046-2 (2024):** labour

**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 (2024):** According to Act LXVII of 1997 on Judicial Employees, the categories listed under points d) to f) – namely officers, clerks, and manual workers – fall within this category.
**Q052 (2022):** 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".

**Q055 (2024):** On 31 December 2024 2 prosecutors (1 male and 1 female) were working temporarily in the Ministry of Justice. These two persons were also included in the total number of prosecutors, but they were not taken into consideration when looking at the number of prosecutors working at each/different level.
All prosecutors are appointed to work full-time, but it may occur that a prosecutor temporarily works part-time, for child care reasons for example.
As far as prosecutors at first instance level are concerned, the table contains the number of prosecutors working for district and district level prosecution offices together with the number of prosecutors working for chief prosecution offices. Out of this number, the number of prosecutors working at chief prosecution offices is 524 (229 men and 295 women), the number of prosecutors working for district (district level) prosecution offices is 1172 (403 men and 769 women).
As to the number of prosecutors at second instance, the table includes only the number of prosecutors working at the appellate chief prosecution offices.
The reason for this is that no exact answer can be given to the question. In the Prosecution Service of Hungary, prosecutors working at district and district-level prosecution offices only proceed with first instance cases. Prosecutors of chief prosecution offices working at county (or county-level) prosecution offices handle first instance cases which fall into the jurisdiction of regional/county courts, but part of the prosecutors of chief prosecution offices handle cases at second instance or at second instance, as well in cases initiated at first instance by district or district prosecution offices. Our personnel database, however, does not contain information on the number of such prosecutors of chief prosecution offices.
Prosecutors of the appellate chief prosecution offices handle second instance cases or, in specific circumstances, they proceed at third instance.

**Q055 (2023):** On 31 December 2023 2 prosecutors (1 male and 1 female) were working temporarily in the Ministry of Justice. These two persons were also included in the total number of prosecutors, but they were not taken into consideration when looking at the number of prosecutors working at each/different level.
All prosecutors are appointed to work full-time, but it may occur that a prosecutor temporarily works part-time, for child care reasons for example.
As far as prosecutors at first instance level are concerned, the table contains the number of prosecutors working for district and district level prosecution offices together with the number of prosecutors working for chief prosecution offices. Out of this number, the number of prosecutors working at chief prosecution offices is 544 (239 men and 305 women), the number of prosecutors working for district (district level) prosecution offices is 1,166 (408 men and 758 women).
As to the number of prosecutors at second instance, the table includes only the number of prosecutors working at the appellate chief prosecution offices.
The reason for this is that no exact answer can be given to the question. In the Prosecution Service of Hungary, prosecutors working at district and district-level prosecution offices only proceed with first instance cases. Prosecutors of chief prosecution offices working at county (or county-level) prosecution offices handle first instance cases which fall into the jurisdiction of regional/county courts, but part of the prosecutors of chief prosecution offices handle cases at second instance or at second instance, as well in cases initiated at first instance by district or district prosecution offices. Our personnel database, however, does not contain information on the number of such prosecutors of chief prosecution offices.
Prosecutors of the appellate chief prosecution offices handle second instance cases or, in specific circumstances, they proceed at third instance.
Discrepancy explanation:
The explan

ation for the increase in the number of female prosecutors serving in the Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal, which can be considered significant in percentage terms, is the overall low number of prosecutors in the Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal, with a small increase in numbers resulting in a large change in percentage terms. The increase in the number of staff was justified by the evolution of the workload in the relevant Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal, as well as by the need to recruit new colleagues in the Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal due to retirements and transfers. The proportion of women among prosecutors serving at the Prosecution Service of Hungary is already high, 61.3% in 2023. In these circumstances, there is no particular reason why more women were successful in applying for or being seconded to posts as prosecutors in the Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal in 2023.

**Q055 (2022):** On 31 December 2022 2 prosecutors were working temporarily in the Ministry of Justice. These two persons were also included in the total number of prosecutors, but they were not taken into consideration when looking at the number of prosecutors working at each/different level. One of the two public prosecutors assigned to the Ministry of Justice is male and the other one is female. All prosecutors are appointed to work full-time, but it may occur that a prosecutor temporarily works part-time, for child care reasons for example. As far as prosecutors at first instance level are concerned, the table contains the number of prosecutors working for district and district level prosecution offices together with the number of prosecutors working for chief prosecution offices. Out of this number, the number of prosecutors working at chief prosecution offices is 534 (236 men and 298 women), the number of prosecutors working for district (district level) prosecution offices is 1203 (421 men and 782 women).
As to the number of prosecutors at second instance, the table includes the number of prosecutors working at the appellate chief prosecution offices. The reason for this is that no exact answer can be given to the question. In the Hungarian Prosecution Service, prosecutors working at district and district-level prosecution offices only proceed with first instance cases. Prosecutors of chief prosecution offices working at county (or county level) prosecution offices handle first instance cases which fall into the jurisdiction of regional/county courts, but part of the prosecutors of chief prosecution offices handle cases at second instance or at second instance as well in cases initiated at first instance by district or district prosecution offices. Our personnel database, however, does not contain information on the latter group of cases. Prosecutors of the appellate chief prosecution offices handle second instance cases or, in specific circumstances, they proceed at third in

stance. I wish to inform you that prior to 2022 we only indicated among the data the number of prosecutors of dictrict prosecution offices at first instance and the number of prosecutors of chief prosecution offices and appellate chief prosecution offices at second instance. According to this method of calculation, the current data (for 31 December 2022) include the following:
Total number of prosecutors (1 + 2 + 3):
Total: 1874
Males: 727
Females: 1147
1. Number of prosecutors at first instance level:
Total: 1203
Males: 421
Females: 782
2. Number of prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level:
Total: 562
Males: 251
Females: 311
3. Number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level:
Total: 107
Males: 54
Females: 53

**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.
**Q056 (2024):** The table contains the following heads/senior leaders of prosecution offices: the prosecutor general; appellate chief prosecutors (where there was no appointed or acting appellate chief prosecutor, the head of division at the appellate chief prosecution office in charge of the appellate chief prosecution office); chief prosecutors (21 heads of first-instance prosecutors' offices, of which 15 are men and 6 are women); prosecutors who are heads of district (or district-level) prosecution offices (124 heads of first-instance prosecutors' offices, of which 70 are men and 54 are women).
In a district prosecution office, there was temporarily no appointed or acting head of district prosecution office, therefore this structural unit was headed by the deputy head prosecutor).

**Q056 (2023):** The table contains the following heads/senior leaders of prosecution offices: the prosecutor general; prosecutors who are heads of departments at the Office of the Prosecutor General and prosecutors who are heads of autonomous divisions at the Office of the Prosecutor General (the latter two groups of employees consist of 14 persons who are exercising employer’s powers with respect to subordinate prosecutorial employees at the Office of the Prosecutor General); appellate chief prosecutors (where there was no appointed or acting appellate chief prosecutor, the head of division at the appellate chief prosecution office in charge of the appellate chief prosecution office); chief prosecutors; prosecutors who are heads of district (or district-level) prosecution offices (in a district prosecution office, there was temporarily no appointed or acting head of district prosecution office, therefore this structural unit was headed by the deputy head prosecutor).
Within the data relating to the Office of the Prosecutor General, the heads of structural units with functional responsibilities (e.g. IT Department, Autonomous Administrative Division) are also indicated.

**Q056 (2022):** The table contains the following heads/senior leaders of prosecution offices:
the Prosecutor General; appellate chief prosecutors (if there is no appellate chief prosecutor appointed or assigned, then the head of division at the appellate chief prosecution office who leads the appellate chief prosecution office); chief prosecutors (if there is no chief prosecutor appointed or assigned, then the deputy chief prosecutor who leads the chief prosecution office); prosecutors who are heads of district prosecution offices (if there is no leading prosecutor appointed or assigned, then the deputy head of the district prosecution office who leads the organizational unit).
The heads of organizational units with operational responsibilities (such as Information Technology Department and Independent Administrative Unit) are also included in the data of the Office of the Prosecutor General.
As previously indicated, prior to 2022, only the number of public prosecutors at district prosecution offices who handle first-instance cases and the number of public prosecutors at chief prosecution offices and appellate chief prosecution offices who handle second-instance cases were included in the database. According to this calculation method, the data for prosecution leaders as of 31 December 2022 are as follows:
Total number of heads of prosecution offices (1 + 2 + 3 level of jurisdiction)
Total: 151
Males: 91
Females: 60
1. Number of heads of prosecution offices at first-instance level
Total: 124
Males: 70
Females: 54
2. Number of heads of prosecution offices at second-instance (courts of appeal) level
Total: 26
Males: 20
Females: 6
3. Number of heads of prosecution offices at Supreme Court level
Total: 1
Males: 1
Females: 0

**Q057 (2022):** According to the Criminal Procedure Code a victim may act as a private prosecutor and a substitute private prosecutor in criminal proceedings, but private prosecutors and substitute private prosecutors are not part of the administration of justice.
**Q060 (2024):** The above data include junior prosecutors, trainee prosecutors, paralegals, prosecution officials, clerks and blue-collar employees.
**Q060 (2023):** The above data include junior prosecutors, trainee prosecutors, paralegals, prosecution officials, clerks and blue-collar employees.
**Q060 (2022):** The above data include junior prosecutors, trainee prosecutors, officers doing semi-prosecutorial tasks, officers, clerks and blue-collar employees.

**Q132 (2024):** Judges: 1 EUR = 410.09 HUF (official daily exchange rate 31.12.2024)
Judges: the judicial base salary did not change in 2023 and 2024; therefore, judges' salaries, when expressed in forints, did not decrease. The decrease in euros is due to the change in the exchange rate. Compared to the 2023 data, the salary expressed in forints has not changed. As of January 1, 2025, the base judicial salary increased and is expected to continue rising over the next two years, serving also as compensation for inflation.
Public prosecutors: The reason for the difference in the reported salary data is that while the forint value of the salary data remained roughly unchanged, the euro exchange rate increased, so the same salary reported in forints represents a different amount in euros. For example, see the salary of prosecutors at the beginning of their career:
Salary in euros (gross): 24,043 (2024), 25,759 (2023), 24,609 (2022)
EUR exchange rate: 410.09 (2024), 382.78 (2023), 400.66 (2022)
Salary in forints (gross): 9,859,884 (2024), 9,860,030 (2023), 9,859,842 (2022)

**Q132 (2023):** Judges:
Compared to the 2022 data, the decrease in starting (beginning of the career) salary resulted from a change in the calculation method. In previous years, we gave the average salary of the appointed judges, which depends on the length of service and this year the hypothetical lowest salary available at the beginning of the career. The starting salary was calculated according to the above-mentioned calculation method (1 EUR = 382,78 HUF).
The highest salary received at the Supreme Court was defined without any leadership allowances, which is why it is less than the average salary was in the 2022 data.

**Q132 (2022):** During the career/career progression of prosecutors, salaries are determined as follows.
The prosecutor's salary consists of a basic salary and the supplement determined in the Prosecution Employment Status Act Based on Article 66 (2) of Act XC of 2021 on the Central Budget of Hungary for 2022 and pursuant to Article 59 (3) of Act CLXIV of 2011 on the Status and Career Path of the Prosecutor General, Prosecutors and other Prosecution Employees, the basic salary of a prosecutor in 2022 was HUF 566660.
The basic salary of the prosecutor shall be determined on the basis of the length of service calculated in accordance with this Act, multiplied by the salary base and the multiplying factors specified in this Act for each grade.
Prosecutors who do not yet have any service time upon their appointment or whose accepted service time upon their appointment does not exceed three years shall be classified into pay grade 1. Prosecutors shall proceed one pay grade up on the scale upon the completion of every three years of service time. The length of service shall be calculated from the date of appointment of the prosecutor. However, time spent as a prosecutor before the appointment in the prosecution service and in the judiciary, as well as the time spent in other legal employment or activities requiring a completed bar exam or requiring a completed bar exam according to the rules applicable by the person exercising the employer's rights upon authorization by law shall be taken into account as time included in the length of service.
According to the Prosecution Employment Status Act, the basic salary of a prosecutor is 1.25 times the salary base in grade 1 of the prosecutor's salary scale, and 2.10 times the salary base in grade 14, which is the highest grade.
Prosecutors shall be entitled to a position supplement monthly, the amount of which is
a) twenty per cent of the pay base in the case of prosecutors working in district prosecution offices (113332 HUF in 2022), b) forty

per cent of the pay base in the case of prosecutors working in chief prosecution offices (226664 HUF), c) seventy per cent of the pay base in the case of prosecutors working in appellate chief prosecution offices (396662 HUF), d) hundred and twenty per cent of the pay base in the case of prosecutors working in the Office of the Prosecutor General 679992 HUF).
In general, judges' salaries increase automatically with length of service after every 3 years. In addition, they receive a surplus allowance at all levels of jurisdiction (higher bonus on higher levels), and court executies also receive a management bonus. In addition, there are various allowances which may be granted to eligible judges (e.g. language allowance). From 1 January 2020, judges' salaries increased by an average of 32 percent. In 2021 by another 12 percent of the salary base and by a further 13 percent in 2022.

**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.

**Q146 (General Comment):** We would like to clarify that the above total figure includes attorneys, in-house counsels, registered legal advisors, junior attorneys, European community lawyers and foreign legal advisors.
In Hungary, those lawyers who work as employees of a company are called “in-house counsels”. They have the right to represent their employers in any proceedings, the limitation is that they can only act on behalf of their employers and can't have any other clients. There is another category, “registered legal advisors”, who carry out their work under the control of an in-house counsel and have not passed the bar exam yet. Such registered legal advisors have the same representation rights before the court as junior attorneys explained below.
Junior attorneys and registered legal advisors may represent the parties before the District Court only (including appeals and extraordinary revisions in such cases), where legal representation is not mandatory.
European community lawyers and foreign legal advisors do not have representation rights before court (however, the number of such lawyers is insignificant, for 2024 it was 74).
We would also like to note that the above total figure also contains those who are currently suspending their lawyer practice. The total number of active (non-suspended) attorneys, in-house legal counsels, registered legal advisors and junior attorneys is: 18,165.

**Q146 (2024):** We would like to clarify that the above total figure includes attorneys, in-house counsels, registered legal advisors, junior attorneys, European community lawyers and foreign legal advisors.
In Hungary, those lawyers who work as employees of a company are called “in-house counsels”. They have the right to represent their employers in any proceedings, the limitation is that they can only act on behalf of their employers and can't have any other clients. There is another category, “registered legal advisors”, who carry out their work under the control of an in-house counsel and have not passed the bar exam yet. Such registered legal advisors have the same representation rights before the court as junior attorneys explained below.
Junior attorneys and registered legal advisors may represent the parties before the District Court only (including appeals and extraordinary revisions in such cases), where legal representation is not mandatory.
European community lawyers and foreign legal advisors do not have representation rights before court (however, the number of such lawyers is insignificant, for 2024 it was 74).
We would also like to note that the above total figure also contains those who are currently suspending their lawyer practice. The total number of active (non-suspended) attorneys, in-house legal counsels, registered legal advisors and junior attorneys is: 18,165.

**Q146 (2023):** As per the received question regarding our response to Q146 of the CEPEJ questionnaire (2023 data), we would like to clarify that the respective statistical register of the Hungarian Bar Association has changed recently, due to which the data on the separate numbers of female and male lawyers is no longer available to us. We have received data only for the total number of lawyers practicing in Hungary; hence, this is the reason why the number of female and male lawyers were marked with NA in our answer for the first time in contrast to previous years.

**Q146 (2022):** The number of lawyers in 2022 includes the number of legal advisors.

**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 (2022):** Types of lawyers in Hungary
In Hungary "attorneys" are those legal professionals who hold a degree in law and have passed the BAR exam and registered by and members of the local bar association. There is no distinction between Hungarian attorneys, such as solicitors and barristers in the UK, any Hungarian attorney can represent a client before the court. An attorney, however, may practise either as an individual attorney, or as a member of a law firm. In other words, he/she can't be an employee. Please see below the number of attorneys practicing in Hungary (i.e., excluding legal advisors, junior lawyers, EU lawyers):
Number of attorneys (i.e., figures excluding legal advisors)
Total: 11,615
Males: 6,440
Females: 5,175
Those lawyers who work as employees of a company are called "legal advisors" (i.e. in-house counsels). They have the right to represent their employers in any proceedings, the limitation is that they can only act on behalf of their employers and can't have any other clients. There is a special category of legal advisors (in-house counsels) who are members of the local bar association as "registered legal advisors".
Moreover, there are "employed attorneys" (whose employer is limited to a lawyer or law firm), European legal counsels (under the EU Directives as implemented by Hungarian legislation), and employed European legal counsels.
All different categories described above are subordinated to the profession of a lawyer and legal advisor.
Monopoly
Lawyers (attorneys), and to a certain extent registered and non-registered legal advisors are the only professionals who are entitled to represent an individual and/or legal entity in legal matters. So, from this point of view there is a monopoly, since no one else is allowed to fulfil the role of legal representative as a professional, for consideration.
There is no general requirement to have legal representation in court or administrative cases, this is only mandatory in certain proceedings, so from this

point of view there is no monopoly (please see the detailed list of the cases below, where legal representation is mandatory).
Attorneys have a monopoly of representation of defendants in criminal cases during the whole length of criminal proceedings. Victims of criminal cases may also be represented by their family members.
In administrative proceedings, legal representation is not mandatory, and in general any person can represent a party who has the mandate to do so (but the limitation still applies that professionally only an attorney can represent parties in these proceedings too). Section 45 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Act XC of 2017) prescribes the presence of a defence attorney in the following cases:
a) a criminal offence for which the law prescribes five or more years of imprisonment,
b) the accused is subject to a coercive measure affecting a person's personal freedom, or in another matter is subject to arrest, preliminary involuntary treatment in a mental institution, or is placed under imprisonment, custodial arrest or educational training;
c) the accused is deaf, mute, blind or – regardless of his/her legal capacity – mentally incompetent,
d) the accused does not know the Hungarian language or the language of the proceedings,
e) the accused is not able to personally defend himself/herself for other reasons,
f) the court, the public prosecutor's office or the investigating authority assigned a defence attorney upon the request of the defendant or due to considering it necessary for other reasons,
g) it is especially prescribed by law (e.g. in case of an accused minor).
According to the Code of Civil Procedure (Act CXXX of 2016), in the case of civil cases, there is compulsory legal representation in all types of cases with the exception of lawsuits where the District Courts are competent including the appeals and extraordinary revisions in such cases.

**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.

**Q148 (2023):** Types of lawyers in Hungary
Section 4 of the Act on Legal Practice determines comprehensively who is entitled to practise as a lawyer:
a) attorneys,
b) European community lawyers,
c) foreign legal advisors,
d) bar association legal counsel,
e) employed attorneys,
f) employed European community lawyers,
g) junior attorney and
h) legal advisors registered by the bar association.
In Hungary "attorneys" are those legal professionals who hold a degree in law and have passed the BAR exam and registered by and members of the local bar association. There is no distinction between Hungarian attorneys, such as solicitors and barristers in the UK, any Hungarian attorney can represent a client before the court. An attorney, however, may practise either as an individual attorney, or as a member of a law firm. In other words, he/she can't be an employee. Please see below the number of attorneys practicing in Hungary (i.e., excluding in-house counsels, junior lawyers, EU lawyers):
Number of attorneys (i.e., figures excluding in-house counsels)Total:13,348
Males: NA
Females: NA
Those lawyers who work as employees of a company are called “in-house counsels”. They have the right to represent their employers in any proceedings, the limitation is that they can only act on behalf of their employers and can't have any other clients. There is another category, “registered legal advisors”, who carry out their work under the control of an in-house counsel and have not passed the bar exam yet. Such registered legal advisors have the same representation rights before the court as junior attorneys explained below.
Moreover, there are "employed attorneys" (whose employer is limited to a lawyer or law firm), European legal counsels (under the EU Directives as implemented by Hungarian legislation), and employed European legal counsels.

**Ireland**

**Q004 (2022):** Year 2022 is the latest year for which data are available.

**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 (2024):** The judicial numbers provided in the above table are as on 31 December 2024. There were three judicial vacancies on 31 December 2024, namely, one vacancy in the Supreme Court, one vacancy in the High Court, and one vacancy in the District Court. The High and District Courts are both first instance courts.
**Q046 (2023):** On 31 December 2023, there were 198 judicial posts, with two judicial vacancies, namely, one vacancy in the Supreme Court and one vacancy in the Circuit Court (a first instance court). Court Presidents work as judges and these numbers include Court Presidents of first instance, second instance and Supreme Court.

**Q046 (2022):** As of 31 December 2022, the number of male judges in the Court of Appeal had dropped from 8 to 6 in comparison to 2020 due to the elevation of two male judges from the Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court and the subsequent new appointment of two new Court of Appeal judges one of whom was male and the other female (-1 male judge of the Court of Appeal).

**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 (2024):** The judicial numbers provided in the above table are as on 31 December 2024. There were three judicial vacancies on 31 December 2024, namely, one vacancy in the Supreme Court, one vacancy in the High Court, and one vacancy in the District Court. The High and District Courts are both first instance courts.
In all courts, (First Instance, Second Instance and Supreme Court) judges are empowered to deal with all case types within their court jurisdiction. While in some courts, most notably the High Court and the Circuit Court, judges may be assigned to specific cases for a period, nonetheless, all judges can deal with all types of cases within their jurisdiction.

**Q046-2 (2023):** In all courts, (First Instance, Second Instance and Supreme Court) judges are empowered to deal with all case types within their court jurisdiction. While in some courts, most notably the High Court and the Circuit Court, judges may be assigned to specific cases for a period, nonetheless, all judges can deal with all types of cases within their jurisdiction

**Q046-2 (2022):** In all courts, (First Instance, Second Instance and Supreme Court) judges are empowered to deal with all case types within their court jurisdiction. While in some courts, most notably the High Court and the Circuit Court, judges may be assigned to specific cases for a period, nonetheless, all judges can deal with all types of cases within their jurisdiction.

**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 (2024):** Unlike previous campaigns, Tipstaff are now being included under category 2 (Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges). Other non-judge staff includes:
•Service Officers
•Court Messenger

**Q052 (2023):** Other non-judge staff includes Service Officers, Tipstaff, Court Messengers 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions) includes staff in Court offices, court going staff including Judicial Assistants and staff in Court Operational Directorates.
ICT staff for this cycle and for the 2022 cycle are included in 4. Technical Staff.

**Q052 (2022):** 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions): In 2020 the following were counted: staff in Court offices, court going staff including Judicial Assistants and Tipstaff - District, Circuit & High Court including Judicial Assistant and Tipstaff, Court of Appeal including Judicial Assistant, Supreme Court Judicial Assist and Tipstaff. In 2022, Court Operational Directorates/Regional/Judicial Assistants staff are included in this figure. It also includeds Tipstaff/Service Officers and Court Messengers.
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): for 2020 ICT Staff were including in this figure. In 2022 ICT Staff are not included in this figure.
4. Technical staff: for 2022, ICT Staff and Cleaning Staff are included in this figure.

**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).
**Q052-1 (2024):** Some of the variations could be explained by staff changeover, retirements, transfers etc.

**Q052-1 (2022):** 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. 1. Total non-judge staff working in courts at first instance level: The FTE for 2022 is up on 2020, this figure is total staff minus staff in Court of Appeal and Supreme Court.
2. Total non-judge staff working in courts at second instance (court of appeal) level: In 2020 this included Court of Appeal staff including Judicial Assist and Tipstaff. In 2022 this includes Court of Appeal staff only.
3. Total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level: In 2020 this included Supreme Court staff including Judicial Assistants and Tipstaff. In 2022 this includes Supreme Court staff only, as Judicial Assistants are included in figure for 52/Q2 and Tipstaff are included in figure 52/Q5.

**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.The total figure includes the head of the Prosecution Office provided in Q056 as the Director can assume the role and functions of prosecutors in his/her office.

**Q055 (2024):** The Office has a number of grades for prosecutors which are different from the categories above, they include Prosecutor, Senior Prosecutor, Principal Prosecutor, Senior Principal Prosecutor, Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions and Deputy Chief Prosecutor. Senior management includes one Director of Public Prosecutions, one Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions and the Heads of the three Legal Divisions of the Office. The total figure of 157 includes the head of the Prosecution Office provided in Q056 as the Director can assume the role and functions of prosecutors in her office. For further information regarding the structure of the Office, please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 2.8 to 2.10. https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for-Prosecutors-5th-Edition-eng.pdf

**Q055 (2023):** The Office has a number of grades for prosecutors which are different from the categories above, they include Prosecutor, Senior Prosecutor, Principal Prosecutor, Senior Principal Prosecutor, Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions and Deputy Chief Prosecutor. There is one Director of Public Prosecutions and one Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions. The total figure of 156 includes the head of the Prosecution Office provided in Q056 as the Director can assume the role and functions of prosecutors in her office.

**Q055 (2022):** The Office has a number of grades for prosecutors which are different from the categories above, they include Prosecutor, Senior Prosecutor, Principal Prosecutor, Senior Principal Prosecutor, Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions, Deputy Chief Prosecutor. There is one Director of Public Prosecutions and one Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions

**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.

**Q056 (General Comment):** There is only one Office of Public Prosecution in Ireland and the Director of Public Prosecutions is the head of that office.
In fact, the effect of Section 3 (1) of the Prosecution of Offences Act 1974 is to make the Director of Public Prosecutions the prosecuting authority in relation to criminal matters (apart from a very limited number of functions retained by the Attorney General).The daily management of the services are ensured by the Director, the Deputy Director and the Heads of the three Legal Divisions of the Office.

**Q056 (2023):** For further information regarding the structure of the Office, please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 2.8 to 2.10. (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for Prosecutors-5th-Edition-eng.pdf)

**Q056 (2022):** Please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 2.4 to 2.10. (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for-Prosecutors-5th-Edition-eng.pdf).

**Q056 (2020):** Please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 2.4 to 2.10.

**Q057 (General Comment):** For completeness, it should be noted that Section 8 (2) of the Garda Síochána Act 2005 provides that any member of the police service (An Garda Síochána) may institute and conduct prosecutions in a court of summary jurisdiction (the District Court which is the court of first instance in criminal prosecutions) in the name of the Director of Public Prosecutions. The DPP has issued a number of general directions concerning the institution and conduct of prosecutions by members of the police service (Gardaí) who are required by Section 8 (3) of the 2005 Act to comply with such directions in deciding whether to institute and in instituting or conducting a prosecution. 14,191 Garda Members were in service at the end of 2024. In this jurisdiction also, there are a number of specialised investigating authorities in relation to certain particular categories of crime or offending, including breaches of the tax code, provisions for safety and welfare at work, and company or competition law. Many investigative agencies have the power to prosecute summarily (in the District Court) without reference to the DPP.

**Q057 (2024):** Local State Solicitors who provide a solicitor service in the areas outside Dublin; Prosecution Counsel, who are instructed to act for the Director on a case by case basis (201 Barristers in private practice were on the panel for 2024); County Prosecutors, who are instructed to prosecute cases in the Circuit Court in their respective County; and members of the Garda Síochána who have authority to prosecute certain summary offences (14,191 Garda Members were in service at the end of 2024) State Solicitors are solicitors in private practice who are employed on a contract basis to act on behalf of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Outside the Dublin area, local State Solicitors provide a solicitor service for the Director in Circuit Courts and some District Court matters. There is generally one State Solicitor per county but in certain counties, State Solicitor areas have been split to take account of factors such as population.
The conduct of trials on indictment is handled by independent counsel practising at the Bar who are engaged to represent the Director of Public Prosecutions on a case-by-case basis. Counsel prosecute in accordance with the Director's instructions and in compliance with the Guidelines for Prosecutors. Retention on any panel is at the discretion of the Director and is subject to satisfactory performance of work on the Director's behalf, as will be determined by the Director.

**Q057 (2023):** Local State Solicitors who provide a solicitor service in the areas outside Dublin; Prosecution Counsel, who are instructed to act for the Director on a case by case basis; County Prosecutors, who are instructed to prosecute cases in the Circuit Court in their respective County; and members of the Garda Síochána who have authority to prosecute certain summary offences (see general comments). State Solicitors are solicitors in private practice who are employed on a contract basis to act on behalf of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Outside the Dublin area, local State Solicitors provide a solicitor service for the Director in Circuit Courts and some District Court matters. There is generally one State Solicitor per county but in certain counties, State Solicitor areas have been split to take account of factors such as population.
The conduct of trials on indictment is handled by independent counsel practising at the Bar who are engaged to represent the Director of Public Prosecutions on a case-by-case basis. Counsel prosecute in accordance with the Director's instructions and in compliance with the Guidelines for Prosecutors. Retention on any panel is at the discretion of the Director and is subject to satisfactory performance of work on the Director's behalf, as will be determined by the Director. For further details please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 1.5 and 2.13 to 2.15.(https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for-Prosecutors-5th-Edition eng.pdf) and Prosecution System in Ireland (chapters 4 and 5)

**Q057 (2022):** Please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 1.5 and 2.13 to 2.15. (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for-Prosecutors-5th-Edition-eng.pdf).
**Q057 (2020):** Please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 1.5 and 2.13 to 2.15.

**Q057 (2016):** There are 32 State Solicitors contracted to provide a solicitor service to the Director of Public Prosecutions in cases to be heard outside Dublin. Serious criminal offences, with the exception of certain criminal mattes having an international dimension, are prosecuted in the name of the DPP. Much of the work of the DPP is carried out by barristers in private practice rather than by barristers in the employment of the State. Therefore, there is no equivalent to the salaried official known as a public prosecutor in other member states.

**Q060 (2024):** These staff include legal support staff at administrative grades, as well as staff from the corporate and support services area which include, Finance, Facilities, Human Resources, Organisational Development, ICT, Strategy, Public Affairs, Risk and Governance, legal research and knowledge management and the Library.

**Q060 (2023):** The non-public prosecutors include specialists in the following areas: Human resources and organisational development, finance, ICT, facilities, media and communications, corporate governance, procurement, strategic management including risk management, Freedom of Information, quality assurance and audit. There is a Policy and Research Unit supported by knowledge management and research function and librarian. All legal sections are supported by a team of administrative staff who are considered to be generalist.
Our overall sanction headcount increased from 260 in 2022 to 301 in 2023 which resulted in a headcount increase for non-public prosecutors.

**Q060 (2022):** The non-public prosecutors include specialists in the following areas: Human resources and organisational development, finance, ICT, facilities, media and communications, corporate governance, procurement, strategic management including risk management, Freedom of Information, quality assurance and internal audit. There is a Policy and Research Unit supported by knowledge management and research function and librarian. All legal sections are supported by a team of administrative staff who are considered to be generalist.

**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 (2024):** Within the Office we have Prosecutors at various different grade levels which are equaivalant to general Civil Service grades and the rate of pay applicable to those grades are applied to our Prosecutors. The rate of pay per grade are in line with Government pay policy. The highest Prosecutor grade in this Office is the Director of Public Prosecutions.

**Q132 (2023):** It is not possible to provide a net annual salary as each person's tax credits/deductions are personal to them and their circumstances. 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.
The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court (new entrant) and a judge of the Supreme Court (highest point on the pay scale) as at 31 December 2023.Judges appointed post 1 January 2012 are placed on a three-point pay scale.
Within the Office we have Prosecutors at various different grade levels which are equivalent to general Civil Service grades and the rate of pay applicable to those grades are applied to our Prosecutors. The rate of pay per grade are in line with Government pay policy.

**Q132 (2022):** The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2022.
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.
Judges appointed post 1 January 2017 are placed on a three-point pay scale.
Reason for Discrepancy: The question asked in this year's survey is slightly different than the one asked in the previous survey. This means that the replies should not be compared directly. The 2021 survey asked for "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) as at 31 December 2020".
The figure provided for this in 2021 – €208,854.00 – corresponded to the salary for a newly appointed Judge with less than 1 year of experience in the Supreme Court.
The current survey asked for the salaries of judges and public prosecutors on 31 December 2022, specifically, the salary for "Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court (please indicate the highest salary of a judge at this level, excluding the salary of the Court President)".
The figure provided in this year's survey – €257,872.00 – corresponded to the highest salary point on the scale for Judge of the Supreme Court.
It should further be noted, that since 2020, the members of the judiciary had a number of pay increases in Ireland which included the restoration of pay to pre-austerity levels on 1 July 2022.
The salary of the Director of Public Prosecutions (the most senior person in the Irish Prosecution service ) is linked to Irish Civil Service Secretary General Grade II. This salary is currently €243,600. As with all civil service salaries, this is subject to pension (individual and spouse and dependent contributions) and tax related deductions such Income Tax, Universal Social Charge and Pay Rel

ated Social Insurance.

**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.

**Q133 (2023):** Judges receive an annual allowance as well as travel (mileage) and subsistence (hotels).

**Q133 (2022):** Judges receive an annual allowance as well as travel (mileage) and subsistence (hotels).

**Q146 (2024):** The above figures represent members of the Law Library (barristers) and members of the Law Society (solicitors). Of the 12,175 solicitors, 41 were unclassified i.e not classified as either male or female. They are included in the total figure. As of 31 December 2024, there were also an additional 937 barristers on the 'Roll of Practising Barristers' who were not members of the Law Library. These were not included in last years figures and are, likewise, not included in the total figure for this round. This figure can not be broken down into males and females as that data is not requested on the Legal Services Regulatory Authority's application form. You can find further information regarding the Law Library on the Bar of Ireland website at https://www.lawlibrary.ie/about/.

**Q146 (2023):** The above figures represent members of the Law Library (barristers) and members of the Law Society (solicitors). Of the 11,871 solicitors, 37 were unclassified i.e solicitors who did not identify as either male or female. They are included in the total figure. As of 31 December 2023, there were also an additional 912 barristers on the 'Roll of Practising Barristers' who were not members of the Law Library. These were not included in last years figures and are, likewise, not included in the total figure for this round. This figure can not be broken down into males and females as that data is not requested on the Legal Services Regulatory Authority's application form. You can find further information regarding the Law Library on the Bar of Ireland website at https://www.lawlibrary.ie/about/.

**Q146 (2022):** The above figures represent members of the Law Library (barristers) and members of the Law Society (solicitors)

**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 (2024):** Data only relates to those with a practising certificate

**Q147 (2023):** Data only relates to those with a practising certificate

**Q147 (2022):** Practicing solicitors are entitled to represent their clients in court. 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

**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):** Judges serving in specialized first-instance courts, such as regional audit commissions, local tax commissions, and military courts, which operate independently and are financially autonomous from the Ministry of Justice, are not included in the scope of question 46.
**Q046 (2024):** as of 30/06/2024

**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.
**Q046-2 (2024):** Others are judges who perform organizational functions.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Judges who do not specifically deal with any of these types of cases, and judges with coordination and management duties.
**Q046-2 (2022):** Judges who do not specifically deal with any of these types of cases, and judges with coordination and management duties.
**Q052 (General Comment):** Drivers and receptionists are included in the category "Staff in charge of different administrative task" . 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 (2023):** Within the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR), the Ministry of Justice has carried out an extraordinary recruitment process to strengthen the so-called "Trial Office". This is an organisational tool consisting in the creation or the reinforcement of support teams for judges, with fixed-term employment and with the aim of reducing the backlog and the disposition time. This measure also improved the quality of justice by supporting judges in their normal activities of study, legal research, drafting documents, organising documents and thus allowing judges to concentrate on more complex tasks.
**Q052 (2022):** Within the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR), the Ministry of Justice has carried out an extraordinary recruitment process to strengthen the so-called "Trial Office". This is an organisational tool consisting in the creation or the reinforcement of support teams for judges, with fixed-term employment and with the aim of reducing the backlog and the disposition time. This measure also improved the quality of justice by supporting judges in their normal activities of study, legal research, drafting documents, organising documents and thus allowing judges to concentrate on more complex tasks.
**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 (2022):** See comment at Q.52

**Q052-1 (2018):** Since 2018, the figures have also included court staff belonging to Administrative Justice.

**Q055 (2024):** as of 31/12/2024

**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.
**Q056 (2024):** As of 31/12/2024. The number of heads of prosecution offices is also included in Q55 'Number of public prosecutors'
**Q056 (2022):** The percentage of discrepancies is high due to the small absolute value.

**Q057 (General Comment):** In Italy lay magistrates are also members of the public prosecution. They are called “Vice Procuratori Onorari”. After a period of training, they can assist the professional public prosecutors to deal with a variety of different functions such as representing the public prosecution office during hearings regarding misdemeanour criminal cases or studying jurisprudence and case-law, or helping professional public prosecutors in drafting procedural acts.

**Q057 (2023):** In Italy, lay magistrates, known as "Vice Procuratori Onorari," play a unique role as members of the public prosecution system. Following a period of training, they are authorized to support professional public prosecutors in a range of capacities. These responsibilities include: Representation in Court: Lay magistrates can represent the public prosecution office during hearings related to misdemeanor criminal cases. Legal Research and Analysis: They engage in the study of jurisprudence and case-law, contributing to a deeper understanding of legal precedents. Procedural Assistance: Lay magistrates provide valuable assistance to professional public prosecutors in drafting procedural documents and acts.

**Q057 (2020):** In Italy this figure is called “Vice Procuratore Onorario”. After a period of training, they can assist the public prosecutors. They can be employed in a variety of different tasks: hearings of misdemeanor criminal cases, jurisprudence studies, preparation of the request to discontinue cases, etc.
**Q057 (2018):** In Italy this figure is called “Vice Procuratore Aggiunto”. After a period of training, they can assist the public prosecutors. They can be employed in a variety of different tasks: hearings of misdemeanour criminal cases, jurisprudence studies, preparation of the request to discontinue cases, etc.
**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). This 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 Supreme Court of Cassation. The salaries of administrative judges are not included in the data provided.

**Latvia**

**Q004 (General Comment):** After 2012, the minimum monthly salary increased, which had an effect on the average gross annual salary.
**Q004 (2024):** In 2024, the average gross monthly wage in Latvia increased by approximately 9.7% compared to 2023. The main driver of this growth was a significant rise in public sector salaries, particularly in education, where wages rose by over 18%.
**Q004 (2023):** The changes in the average salary in 2023 were influenced by the increase of the national minimum wage, as well as the increase of the maximum non-taxable minimum and the coefficient applied in the calculations of the differentiated non-taxable minimum.
**Q004 (2022):** The average wage in Latvia continues to rise for several years in a row. In 2022, the increase in average wages was influenced by several factors: the lifting of the restrictions of COVID-19, which boosted economic activity, a low unemployment rate, which created the conditions for a small increase in wages.
**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 specialization of judges on the basis of the main types of cases, therefore there is not possible to distinguish number of judges by case type (civil and/or commercial cases and criminal cases). Although there is a separate group of judges in the district (city) courts, which primarily hear cases of certain categories.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Comment on Supreme Court total number of judges. The difference between Q46 and Q46-2 is becauce the chief justice is not included in any of court departments.
**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 (General Comment):** The work of the Judicial Council is ensured by the secretariat of the Judicial Council which is a division of the Supreme Court. This means that the activities of the Council for the Judiciary are provided from the resources of the Budget of the Supreme Court.
**Q052 (2024):** Other - Supreme Court: Division of case-law and research, Division of provision regime of secrecy, Staff of secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary.
**Q052 (2023):** Other - Supreme Court: Division of case-law and research, Division of provision regime of secrecy, Staff of secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary.
The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.
**Q052 (2022):** Other non-judge staff - Supreme court: division of case-law and research, division of provision regime of secrecy, staff of secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary.
The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.
**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.

**Q052-1 (2023):** The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.

**Q052-1 (2022):** The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.

**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 (2023):** Data corresponds to the actual situation. The data are correct for 2023. The mistake is in the data for 2022. The number of prosecutors at SC level for 2022 are 51 (27 males and 24 females).

**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.

**Q056 (2024):** The changes observed are minimal and do not materially affect the overall outcome or conclusions and adjustment reflects low data .volume.
**Q056 (2022):** At the end of 2020, a reorganization was launched in the prosecutor's office with the aim of ensuring rational use of state budget funds, as well as creating a more even distribution of prosecutors' workload. During the reform, which also continued in 2021, the work of individual district-level prosecutor's office units was optimized (reduced number of prosecutors offices and number of heads of offices), at the same time prosecutors were also specialized in criminal offenses committed in the service of state institutions, including those related to corruption.

**Q056 (2020):** The data provides information only about persons performing the duties of head of prosecution office.

**Q056 (2018):** Data includes the position of the deputy Head Prosecutor, who is also the position of a higher prosecutor in the Prosecutor's Office.
**Q056 (2016):** Data includes the position of the deputy Head Prosecutor, who is also the position of a higher prosecutor in the Prosecutor's Office.
**Q056 (2014):** The provided data includes the number of deputy heads of prosecution offices, who are also occupying the higher prosecutor position within the structure of the public prosecution services. The total number of heads of prosecution offices for 2014 is 61 (8 deputy heads), 36 males (3 deputy heads), 25 females (5 deputy heads). The total number of heads of prosecution offices at first instance level is 41 (4 deputy heads), 24 males (2 deputy heads), 17 females (2 deputy heads). The total number of heads of prosecution offices at second instance level is 10 (4 deputy heads), 6 males (1 deputy head), 4 females (3 deputy heads).
**Q060 (General Comment):** Total number of staff- 390 that consists of- 121 - non prosecutor stuff (whose task is to assist the prosecutor such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions); 178 in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices; 91 technical staff.
Discrepancy comment: Data for 2023 is correct related to the number of males and females. In 2022 there was typing mistake and females should be 268, males 109.

**Q060 (2024):** Total number of staff – 409 that consists of – 132 – non-prosecutor stuff (whose task is to assist the prosecutor such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions); 186 in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices; 91 technical staff.

**Q060 (2023):** Total number of staff- 390 that consists of- 121 - non prosecutor stuff (whose task is to assist the prosecutor such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions); 178 in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices; 91 technical staff.
Discrepancy comment: Data for 2023 is correct related to the number of males and females. In 2022 there was typing mistake and females should be 268, males 109.

**Q060 (2022):** Total number of staff working at the Prosecution Office is 377 (268 male employees, 109 female employees). Of this number, qualified (judicial) support for prosecutors in the performance of their functions, such as assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions (category 2 of the question 52) is provided only by 14 employees. Prosecution Office has 105 prosecutor assistants who provide only technical assistance, they do not provide qualified (judicial) assistance (the functions of prosecutor assistants correspond to those described under category 3 of the question 52). There are also 159 employees that perform different administrative and management tasks. Therefore, the total number of employees in charge of administrative and management tasks is 264. And finally, we have 99 employees that perform technical duties.
Changes on proportion of gender of employees are connected with the changes in the number of employees.

**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.

**Q132 (General Comment):** The salary of Supreme Court judges or prosecutors does not depend on the judge's / prosecutor`s seniority in the Supreme Court or Prosecutor Office. All judges of the Supreme Court, with the exception of the chairman of the court and the Chairperson of a department of the Supreme Court, receive the remuneration as stipulated in the Law on Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities.

**Q132 (2024):** If a judge has received a positive statement in the regular assessment of the professional activity of a judge, a service supplement to the monthly salary shall be determined for the judge, except for a judge of the Constitutional Court, in the following amount: 1) after six years worked in the office - 5 per cent of the monthly salary; 2) after 10 years worked in the office - 10 per cent of the monthly salary.

**Q132 (2023):** If a judge has received a positive statement in the regular assessment of the professional activity of a judge, a service supplement to the monthly salary shall be determined for the judge, except for a judge of the Constitutional Court, in the following amount:
1) after six years worked in the office - 5 per cent of the monthly salary;
2) after 10 years worked in the office - 10 per cent of the monthly salary.

**Q132 (2022):** Data on net annual salary, in EUR for first instance professional judges differs from previous period due the raise of gross annual salary.

**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.

**Q146 (2017):** This number includes sworn advocates and assistants to sworn advocates.

**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 (General Comment):** According to data from the State Data Agency, wage changes were influenced by the increase in the minimum monthly wage from January 1, 2024, the increase in the minimum salary coefficients for employees of budgetary institutions, changes in the calculation of the non-taxable income amount, and other reasons.

**Q004 (2024):** The State Data Agency of the Republic of Lithuania announces that the changes in wages were caused by an increase in the minimum monthly wage from January 1, 2024, an increase in the minimum wage coefficients for employees of budgetary institutions, changes in the calculation of non-taxable income, and other reasons.

**Q004 (2023):** Increase in earnings was influenced by increased basic wages for politicians, judges, civil servants, public service employees and employees of budgetary institutions, increased minimum monthly wage and other reasons.

**Q004 (2022):** Changes in wages were affected from 2022 January 1 as the minimum monthly salary was increased, the basic 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.
It should be noted that from 2019 January 1 the rates of state social insurance contributions paid by the employer and the employee have been changed. gross wages indexed 1.289 times.

**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 (2022):** In 2022 the corps of judges was supplemented by 30 judges, which is significantly more than in 2021 and slightly more than in 2020 (12 in 2021, 26 in 2020).
In 2022 27 persons were appointed as district court judges.

**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 (2024):** Not applicable. There's no such staff or similar bodies.

**Q052 (2023):** Other staff – translators and psychologists

**Q052 (2022):** Other staff – translators and psychologists.

**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.

**Q056 (2022):** In 2022, structural changes were implemented (merging of some departments), resulting in a reduction of 10 managerial positions (Chief Prosecutors, Deputy Chief Prosecutors). The number of men and women changes for natural reasons and depends on the gender of the applicants for the position of the Chief / Deputy Chief Prosecutor.

**Q056 (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. The total number of heads of prosecution offices evolved in the following manner: 2010 – 190; 2011 – 187; January 2012 – 145; May 2012 – 126; September 2012 – 93, December 2013 – 90, December 2014 – 89.

**Q060 (2024):** Assistants of prosecutors, lawyers, other administrative staff.

**Q060 (2023):** assistants of prosecutors, lawyers, other administrative staff.

**Q060 (2022):** The number of women in staff (non-public prosecutors) attached to the public prosecution services tends to be higher. Total number of staff changed due to natural changes in human resources and as a result of the optimisation processes within the Public Prosecutor's Office.

**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 (General Comment):** Thus, the budget increased and was approved and executed by 40 percent, mainly because from July 1, 2023, judges' salaries were increased (judges' salaries increased almost 2 times). In 2023, they were only uploaded from July. and for a year and a half, which is why they are not visible in the approved budgets. In 2024, additional appropriations were allocated for the entire year, so both the wage fund and the total budget increased by about 38 percent in 2 years compared to the budgets approved in 2024 and 2022. And since salaries are really paid, execution has also increased. The same goes for prosecutors' salaries.

**Q132 (2024):** Thus, the budget increased and was approved and executed by 40 percent, mainly because from July 1, 2023, judges' salaries were increased (judges' salaries increased almost 2 times). In 2023, they were only uploaded from July. and for a year and a half, which is why they are not visible in the approved budgets. In 2024, additional appropriations were allocated for the entire year, so both the wage fund and the total budget increased by about 38 percent in 2 years compared to the budgets approved in 2024 and 2022. And since salaries are really paid, execution has also increased. The same goes for prosecutors' salaries.

**Q132 (2023):** From the 2023 July 1 after the amendments to the Law of Remuneration of Judges came into force, the coefficient and the base amount applied in calculating the remuneration of judges has been changed. The coefficient of judges' salary increased about 2,03 times (evaluating the changes of base amount and recalculation). Also, with the changes from July 1, no left extra payment for work experience calculating the judge salary, so there is no difference between the judge in the beginning of his career and the judge with long work experience. Because of that, the change in first instance judge salary is bigger (discrepancy ratio approx. 55 %) than in Supreme Court judge salary (discrepancy ratio approx. 32 %).

**Q132 (2022):** The Law on Judges' Remuneration of the Republic of Lithuania establishes, that the salary of judges of general competence and specialized courts consists of:
1) official salary;
2) supplement for length of service to the State of Lithuania (one percent of the official salary of a judge for each year of service to the State of Lithuania, but not more than 30 percent);
3) payment for work and duty on rest days and holidays, substitution;
4) premium for increased workload (the amount of the premium for the increased workload, but not more than 30 percent of his official salary, is determined by the president of the court in accordance with the procedure established by the Juditial Council.

**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.

**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 (2024):** Average annual gross earnings by economic activity – Full-time workers (in EUR) NACE Rev.2: Industrie et services (B-S)
https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CConditions%20sociales%23C%23%7CConditions%20de%20vie%23C1%23&fs[1]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C0%7CConditions%20sociales%23C%23&fs[2]=NACE%20Rev.2%2C0%7CActivit%C3%A9s%20financi%C3%A8res%20et%20d%27assurances%20%28K%29%23SL09%23&pg=0&fc=NACE%20Rev.2&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_C1202&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C&dq=L01%2BSL09.A01.A&ly[rw]=NACE_REV2&ly[cl]=TIME_PERIOD&to[TIME_PERIOD]=false (Data provided by STATEC, not yet published as of 31 October 2025 but whose publication is imminent.)

**Q004 (2023):** Average gross annual earnings by economic activity - Full-time workers (in EUR) NACE Rev.2: Industry and services (B-S)
(https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CConditions%20social%23C%23%7CConditions%20de%20vie%23C1%23&fs[1]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C0%7CConditions%20social%23C%23&fs[2]=NACE%20Rev.2%2C0%7CActivit%C3%A9s%20financi%C3%A8res%20et%20d%27assurances%20%28K%29%23SL09%23&pg=0&fc=NACE%20Rev.2 &df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_C1202&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C&dq=L01%2BSL09..A&ly[rw]=NACE_REV2%2CGENDER&ly[cl]=TIME_PERIOD ; consulté le 01.07.2024)

**Q004 (2022):** Average annual gross incomes by economic activity - Full-time workers (in EUR) NACE Rev.2: Industry and services (B-S). https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?pg=0&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_C1202&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2016%2C2022&dq=L01..A&ly[rw]=GENDER&ly[cl]=TIME_PERIOD&lc=en

**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: Number of professional judges at first instance includes district court judges, justices of the peace and administrative court judges.
Section 2: Number of professional judges in courts of appeal (2nd instance) includes the court of appeal of the superior court of justice and the administrative court.
section 3: Number of professional judges in the supreme courts includes only the 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.
**Q046-2 (2023):** The 6 judges of the Supreme Court, i.e. the Court of Cassation, deal with criminal, civil and commercial cases.

**Q046-2 (2022):** The 5 justices of the Supreme Court, namely the Court of Cassation, deal with criminal, civil and commercial matters.
**Q052 (2024):** The category 'Other non-judge staff' includes judicial clerks. Established by the law of 23 December 2022, the position of judicial clerk has been increasingly used within the judicial and administrative courts to help reduce the workload of judges. The observed increase of over 150% is explained by intensified recruitment of clerks in 2024.

**Q052 (2023):** Other non-judge staff consists of legal secretaries and a data protection compliance officer from the administrative courts.
**Q052 (2022):** In the realm of non-judicial personnel, there are referendaries and a data protection compliance officer within the administrative jurisdictions.

The increase in "other non-judge staff" was elucidated during the 2021 Scoreboard cycle and remains applicable: seen relatively, the number of other non-judge staff has risen by 175% between 2020 and 2022. In absolute terms, this equates to an increase of seven individuals since 2020, encompassing seven positions for referendaries. Both judicial and administrative jurisdictions are increasingly turning to referendaries to relieve magistrates of certain tasks.

**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).

**Q052-1 (2024):** The 23% increase in non-judge staff observed in the courts of appeal is explained by the intensified recruitment of judicial clerks in 2024, as detailed further in question 052.

**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 (2022):** Since the 2020-2022 Evaluation, the General Prosecutor's Office has seen an increase of two female prosecutors and a male prosecutor has been replaced by a female prosecutor following retirement. The decrease of -28.57% in male prosecutors at the Supreme Court and the 50% increase in female prosecutors at the Supreme Court can be attributed to this.
**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.
**Q056 (General Comment):** The General Prosecution Office at the level of the Superior Court is headed by one General State Prosecutor. There are also two district prosecution offices (Luxembourg and Diekirch), so there are two district prosecutors.

**Q056 (2016):** 56.1 to 56.3: the heads referred to therein are also taken into account for items 55.1 to 55.3
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).

**Q060 (2022):** The staff of the judicial and administrative jurisdictions has experienced sustained growth in recent years, as provided for by the amended law of 7 March 1980 on judicial organization, as we had previously explained during the evaluation period of 2020-2022. The variation in total non-judicial staff between 2020 and 2022 is 25.33%. An increase of 9% was observed between 2021 and 2022.
**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.

**Q132 (General Comment):** For the starting salary of a professional judge or a public prosecutor at first instance, we consider the salary of judicial attachés after their first appointment. The magistrates’ salary scale provides a base of 380 index points; any prior professional experience may be added, but is not taken into account in our calculations.

For the theoretical maximum salary of a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal, we consider grade M6, step 7, which corresponds to 647 points; an additional 25 points are added for managerial duties. To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point.

**Q132 (2024):** For the starting salary of a professional judge in first instance or a prosecutor, we consider the salary of judicial attachés after their initial appointment. The magistrates' salary scale is based on 380 index points; any prior professional experience may be added, but is not taken into account in our calculations.

For the theoretical maximum salary of a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal, we consider grade M6, step 7, corresponding to 647 points, with an additional 25 points for managerial functions. To calculate the annual salary, these points are multiplied by the value of the index point. In 2024, the value of the index point was €23.2752 as of 1 January 2024.

Using these figures, a 12-month salary corresponds to €106,135 gross for a professional judge of first instance, and a maximum salary of €187,691 for a judge or prosecutor at the Supreme Court. These amounts do not include any additional bonuses, allowances, or benefits that may apply depending on the magistrate concerned.

Further explanations on the calculation of civil servant salaries, which also apply to the M career track for magistrates, can be found on the Public Service website: https://fonctionpublique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html

**Q132 (2023):** As the salary at the start of the career (professional judge of 1st instance or public prosecutor), we consider the salary of the attachés de justice after their first appointment. The salary scale for magistrates is based on 380 index points; any professional experience may be added to this, but is not taken into account in our calculations.
As the theoretical maximum salary for a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal, we consider grade M6, step 7, which corresponds to 647 points, plus 25 points for management duties. To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point. In 2023, the value of the index point changed three times, namely on 1 February to 21.7301, on 1 April to 22.2733 and on 1 September to 22.8300. Taking these indices into account, a salary over 12 months corresponds to €101,592 gross for a professional judge of first instance, or a maximum salary of €179,657 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. Further 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://fonctionpublique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html).

**Q132 (2022):** As a starting treatment for early career (professional judge or prosecutor), we consider the salary of "attachés de justice" after their initial appointment. The judge's salary scale provides for a base of 380 index points, with potential professional experience that may be added but is not taken into account in our calculations.

For the theoretical maximum salary of a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal, we consider grade M6, step 7, which corresponds to 647 points; an additional 25 points are added for managerial functions. To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of each index point. Between January and March 2022, the value was set at 20.6831871 per index point; after April 1st, 2022 it increased to 21.2002547 per index point. Taking these indices into consideration yields an annual gross salary equivalent to €96,084 for a professional judge at first instance and up to a maximum salary of €169,916 for a judge or prosecutor at Supreme Court level.

These figures do not include any potential bonuses or allowances that may supplement the basic salary according to each individual judge's circumstances."

For further details on calculating civil servant payments applicable also to magistrates' Grade M careers can be found on Public Service website: https://fonction-publique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html

**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.

**Q146 (2024):** At the Luxembourg Bar, the number of individual lawyers (3 485) includes the “natural person” lawyers who represent legal entities. The number of legal-entity lawyers (224) corresponds to the number of law firms registered on the Bar’s Roll.

The Diekirch Bar currently has 47 individual lawyers and 5 law firms, which are represented by natural persons. In total, there were therefore 3 532 individual lawyers in 2024, including those who represent the 229 legal entities.

A natural person may practise the legal profession through a legal entity (registered on list V or VI) since the entry into force of the Law of 16 December 2011 concerning the practice of the legal profession in the form of a legal entity (Article 8(10) and (11) of the Law of 10 August 1991 on the legal profession).

**Q146 (2023):** At the Luxembourg Bar, the number of individual lawyers (3,377) includes the ‘individual’ lawyers who represent legal entities. The number of corporate lawyers (216) includes the number of law firms registered with the Bar. The Diekirch Bar currently has 54 ‘natural person’ lawyers and 6 law firms represented by natural persons. In total, therefore, in 2023 there will be 3431 lawyers who are natural persons, including the lawyers who represent the 222 legal entities. Since the entry into force of the law of 16 December 2011 concerning the practice of the legal profession in the form of a legal entity (article 8 (10) and (11) of the law on the legal profession of 10 August 1991), a natural person (a lawyer registered on list I or IV, i.e. a natural person) may practice the legal profession through a legal entity (registered on list V or VI).

**Q146 (2022):** The number of individual lawyers, amounting to 3202, includes those individual lawyers who represent legal entities. The number of law firms, totalling 207, encompasses the registered law firms listed in the Bar Association's registry. Presently, the Diekirch Bar has 53 individual lawyers and 4 law firms (4 from list V and 1 from list VI) represented by individual lawyers. Therefore, in 2022, there was a total of 3255 individual lawyers including those representing the 211 legal entities.

An individual (lawyer listed on lists I or IV as an individual) may practice law through a legal entity (listed on lists V or VI) since the entry into force of the Law of December 16th 2011 concerning the exercise of lawyer profession in form of a legal entity (article8(10)and(11) of the Law on the Lawyer Profession of August 10th 1991).

**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 (2023):** Data provided by the NSO

**Q004 (2022):** This is the data provided and verified with the National Statistics Office

**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. The number of 1st Instance 'judges' also includes magistrates that preside over 1st Instance Courts.
**Q046 (2023):** Over 2023, the judicial complement was increased by 4 new members that have been appointed to the bench.

**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 (2022):** 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 (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 (2023):** The distribution of gender by category listed above is a reflection of the changes resulting from the recruitment process. The Court Services Agency is an impartial employer and is constantly seeking to recruit additional staff to support the increasing number of the judiciary, and functions/ operations in court. Fluctuations in the gender ratio are purely incidental.

**Q052 (2022):** The increase in the number of non-judge staff when compared to the previous evaluation results from an increase in the staff making up the judicial teams of new judges. In addition, there has also been an increase in the number of technical staff with a new grade entitled 'Other industrial grades' being inserted for the first time in this evaluation.

**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.
**Q052-1 (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, to distinguish between 1st and 2nd Instance Courts. All full-time lawyers have been included in the above figure except the AG herself.
**Q055 (2023):** The increase in the number of prosecutors follows a recruitment drive throughout 2023

**Q055 (2022):** The increase in the number of prosecutors is the result of a recruitment drive that was carried out in 2022.

**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.
**Q056 (General Comment):** The Attorney General is the head of the Office of the Attorney General and her role as Head of Prosecution is defined in the Constitution of Malta.
**Q056 (2018):** The Attorney General is the head of the Office of the Attorney General. He enjoys the support of 2 Deputy Attorney Generals, one dedicated to civil law and the other dedicated to criminal law.
**Q056 (2016):** The Attorney General is the head of the Office of the Attorney General. His role is that of head of the prosecution as well as principal legal advisor to the government (and its various Ministries and Departments).
**Q057 (General Comment):** Police had the authority to investigate and initiate prosecutions before the Court of Magistrates. The Office of the AG prosecutes trials by jury and appeals therefrom and also files and prosecutes appeals from the decisions of the Court of Magistrates. Following the reform in 2020 in which the Office of the AG became Chief Prosecutor, a number of cases previously prosecuted by the police are being gradually handed over to the lawyers working at the Office of the AG.

**Q057 (2018):** Police have the authority to initiate prosecutions and to prosecute cases before the Court of Magistrates. If cases are serious enough to go to trial by jury (theoretically any case liable by imprisonment for more than 2 years can got to trial by jury, but cases in which trial by jury is mandatory are those in which the charge is liable to imprisonment for 12 years or more. In practice, most trials by jury deal with these kind of serious offences). The prosecution from the Office of the Attorney General prosecute trials by jury and appeals therefrom and also files and prosecutes appeals from the decisions of the Court of Magistrates.
**Q057 (2016):** In Malta, the police have the authority to prosecute a case in court, unless the nature of the offence is serious enough to merit prosecution in the higher courts by the lawyers working at the Office of the AG. The figure presented above reflects the number of Police Inspectors and Police Superintendents whose duties include prosecution in court.

**Q060 (2024):** There was an increase in staff over the past 2 years given that the service is expanding

**Q060 (2022):** Like in previous evaluations, the number of non-judge staff includes legal procurators working at the Office of the Attorney General.
**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 (2023):** The increase in the gross and net wages are the result of a recalculation of the wage after adjusting for NI and tax in the 3 tax rates (Single / Parent / Married). Please also note that there was a revision in the salaries backdating to 2023.

**Q132 (2022):** Following the newly signed collective agreement the Office of the Attorney General, the new salary package commensurate to the different positions within the Office have changed since those provided in previous submissions. The salary package provided above within the field 'Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/ her career' refers to the salary package of Lawyer III.

**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.

**Q133 (General Comment):** 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 (2022):** 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 (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.

**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):** Average gross annual salary is based on provisional numbers, definitive numbers (usually available in the next year) may differ slightly from those provided here.
Salary is defined as 'reward per working year'. 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). The CBS has somewhat different numbers available than those used by Eurostat, therefore, numbers presented here might differ from those in Eurostat.

**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. Numbers for first and second instance are on posts filled, not fte. We cannot provide more detailed information. For the Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.

**Q046 (2024):** Total fte for first and second instance is 2 505. For the Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.

**Q046 (2023):** Total fte for first and second instance is 2 477. For the Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.

**Q046 (2022):** Numbers for first and second instance are on posts filled, not fte. Total fte for first and second instance together is 2 451. We cannot provide more detailed information. For the Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.

**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.

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** Numbers for first and second instance are on posts filled, not fte. For the Dutch Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.
Note that the 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.
Judges in first and second instance 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.

**Q046-2 (2024):** Total fte for first and second instance is 2 706.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Total fte for first and second instance is 2 477.

**Q046-2 (2022):** Numbers are on posts filled, not fte. Fte for first and second instance is 2 451.

**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 first and second intance courts is available.

**Q052 (2024):** The Council of the Judiciary is not able to make a distinction between different types of non-judge staff working in courts (total fte = 8 084, number of posts filled: 9 144). The Supreme Court can make the distinction between the number of non-judge staff whose task it is to assist judges (fte=119) and staff in charge of different administrative tasks (fte= 107).

**Q052 (2023):** 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 (total fte =7 762, number of posts filled: 8 769). The Supreme Court can make the distinction between the number of non-judge staff whose task it is to assist judges (fte=110) and staff in charge of different administrative tasks (fte= 100).
**Q052 (2022):** 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 (total fte = 7 477). The Supreme Court can make the distinction between the number of non-judge staff whose task it is to assist judges (fte= 101) and staff in charge of different administrative tasks (fte= 158).

**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.

**Q052-1 (General Comment):** 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 (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.

**Q056 (2016):** total 61,44 44,1 17,34
1 59,32 41,98, 17,34
2 2,12 2,12 0

**Q056 (2014):** The number of heads of prosecution offices at first instance level in 2014 includes 19,77 substitutes (14,54 male/5,23 female). Prosecutors at Supreme Court level are not employees of the National Prosecution Service and therefore they are not included in the total.

**Q057 (General Comment):** In 2018, the function of assistant-public prosecutor (now: deputy public prosecutor) was introduced. They are mandated to act as public prosecutors in parts of the caseload that are high-volume and less complex. In such cases, they have the same powers as a Public Prosecutor: to decide on the type of settlement the Prosecution Service will pursue (afdoeningsbeslissingen), and to represent the prosecution in court as acting Public Prosecutor in single-judge hearings (plaatsvervangend officier enkelvoudige zittingen), independently. It is a permanent position requiring a law degree with a specialisation in criminal law.

**Q057 (2024):** Deputy Public Prosecutor (Adjunct-officier; formerly assistent-officier). They are mandated to function as acting public prosecutor in the part of the case load that is high volume and less complex. In these cases they have the mandate of a Public Prosecutor; to assess which type of settlement the Public Prosecution will seek (afdoeningsbeslissingen) and to act as Public Prosecutor in court (plaatsvervangend officier enkelvoudige zittingen) - independently. It is a permanent position that requires a law degree with a specialization in criminal law.

**Q057 (2020):** Assistant-Public prosecutor
Since the previous cycle, the function of assistant - public prosecutor has been introduced.

**Q060 (2024):** Administration, business operations, policy, management, management support, project managers, secretary, trainees.

**Q060 (2023):** Administration, business operations, policy, management, management support, project managers, secretary, trainees.

**Q132 (General Comment):** Numbers include a vacation stipend and 13th month (together 16.3% of the annual salary). Please refer to legislation (https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0006530/2023-07-01#Hoofdstuk2b) on this subject.
Salary of a judge / prosecutor ‘at the beginning of their career’: the salary used is the one for a starting judge/prosecutor, after finishing a training period of several years. During the training there is a separate salary, which is lower than the salary of a fully functional judge/prosecutor.

**Q132 (2022):** Discrepancy comment: In 2021 we needed to look for a different methodology to calculate the net annual salary for a public prosecutor. This year, we believe we have found a reliable simulation method, and using this, we came to this answer. Using this methodology, answers for previous years would be:
2020: 84.058 (B) en 49.185 (N)
2021: 85.195 (B) en 50.175 (N)
2022: 87.637 (B) en 51.555 (N)

**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 (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.

**Q146 (2024):** Numbers on Jan 1, 2025

**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 (2024):** Data from Central Statistical Office

**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) adjud

ication 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.
Court assesors:
A person may be appointed to the position of assessor if he or she fulfils the conditions laid down in Article 61 § 1 points 1-4 of the Act on the Common Courts System and, moreover, has completed training at the National School of the Judiciary and Public Prosecution and passed a judge's or prosecutor's exam. Court assessors are appointed by the President of the Republic of Poland for an indefinite period of time, at the request of the National Council of the Judiciary. In the exercise of his or her office, a judicial assessor is independent and subject only to the Constitution and the laws. Assessors who are entrusted with the duties of a judge perform adjudicatory functions in district courts alongside judges. However, they may not: apply pre-trial detention to a detainee handed over to the court's disposal with a request for pre-trial detention, hear complaints against decisions on refusal to initiate an investigation or enquiry, against decisions on discontinuance of an investigation or enquiry, or against decisions on discontinuance of an enquiry and entry of a case in the register of offences, and adjudicate family and guardianship law cases. After 36 months, an assessor can be appointed as a judge by the President of the Republic.
Not all professional judges are assessors first. Those who, prior to their appointment, may also apply for the position of judge:
1) occupied the position of a judge of an administrative court or military court;
2) held the position of a prosecutor;
3) worked at a Polish higher education institution, the Polish Academy of Sciences, a research institute or other scientific institution and has the academic title of professor or the academic degree of doctor habilitowany in legal sciences;
4) Has practised as an advocate, legal adviser or notary public for at least three years;
5) has held the position of president, vice-president or counsel of the General Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Poland - for at least three years.
The position of an assessor is not then required. In 2021 and 2022, Question 46 always included the number of district court judges, circuit court judges and assessors adjudicating at first instance.

**Q046 (2023):** Common courts:
1. The number of judges of district, regional courts + court assessors: 9444 (5963 women, 3481 men)
2. The number of judges of the appeal courts: 484 ( 240 women, 244 men)
Administrative Courts - first instance= Voivodship Administrative Courts - 422 judges (226 women, 196 men); Supreme Administrative Court 108 judges ( 37 women, 71 men) Supreme court – 95 judges ( 22 women, 73 men)

**Q046 (2022):** Common courts:
1. The number of judges of district, regional courts + court assessors: 9403 (5904 women, 3499 men)
2. The number of judges of the appeal courts: 469 ( 238 women, 231 men)
The numbers are higher because the president appointed a lot of court assessors as judges in 2022. In addition, there were more appointments to the regional and appeal courts than retirements of judges from these courts.
Administrative courts:
1. The number of judges of district + court assessors: 491 ( 275 women, 216 men)
2. The number of judges of the Supreme Administrative Court : 107 ( 37 women, 70 men)

**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 men, 40 woman).
The number of judges of the supreme court: 97 (75 men, 22 woman).
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 (2023):** In case of the Supreme Court “Other” refers to”
- 16 judges sitting in the Labour and Social Security Law Chamber dealing with the labour law and social security law cases;
- 18 judges sitting in the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber dealing, inter alia, with the extraordinary appeals in the civil and criminal law cases, the safeguard of the fundamental rights and freedoms, competition and consumer protection cases, some registration cases as well as election protests and protests concerning the validity of a national referendum, cases concerning the regulation of energy, telecommunications and postal services, rail transport, as well as the regulation of the water and sewage market or complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings. From the whole number of 90 Supreme Court Judges, 11 Supreme Court Judges are randomly chosen to adjudicate in the Professional Liability Chamber.

**Q046-2 (2022):** In case of the Supreme Court “Other” refers to”
-17 judges sitting in the Labour and Social Security Law Chamber dealing with the labour law and social security law cases;
-17 judges sitting in the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber dealing, inter alia, with the extraordinary appeals in the civil and criminal law cases, the safeguard of the fundamental rights and freedoms, competition and consumer protection cases, some registration cases as well as election protests and protests concerning the validity of a national referendum, cases concerning the regulation of energy, telecommunications and postal services, rail transport, as well as the regulation of the water and sewage market or complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings. From the whole number of 90 Supreme Court Judges, 11 Supreme Court Judges are randomly chosen to adjudicate in the Professional Liability Chamber.

**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 (2024):** administrative officials,other employees specified in the Act on Court and Prosecution Employees,specialists from advisory teams + curators,employees of the Supreme Court's Office of Studies and Analyses (officials and members),employees of the Supreme Court Information Centre,employees of the Correspondence Team,employees of the Supreme Court Library and Archives,employees of the Classified Information Protection Department, text processing specialists, chief medical specialist, medical specialist, health and safety specialist/defence specialist, chief health and safety specialist, legal adviser, internal auditor,data protection inspector, members of the Case Law Office.

**Q052 (2023):** 1. registrars.
2. clerks within the judicial area + assistants.
3. administrative clerks.
4. other employees designated in the Law on Court and Prosecution Staff.
5. specialists from the opinion teams + probation officers.
Supreme court:
Other non-judge staff include:
Supreme Court Research and Analysis Office staff, Supreme Court Information Centre (Press Centre) staff, Supreme Court Correspondence Team staff, Supreme Court Library staff, Visitor Services Team staff, Text-processing specialists, Chief Medical Officer, H&S/Defence Specialist, Internal Audit Officer, Data Protection Officer.

**Q052 (2022):** 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 2023, item 217), 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.

**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 (2024):** This year, the data was provided per instance, because we obtained more accurate data from the human resources departments of district courts and the court of appeals.
**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 general 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.
**Q055 (2024):** Table item 1 shows the number of prosecutors in district prosecutor's offices, and item 2 shows the number of prosecutors in circuit prosecutor's offices. Item 3 shows the number of prosecutors employed by the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it includes the number of prosecutors employed by regional prosecutor's offices (the ‘third level’) – a total of 474 prosecutors (176 women and 298 men), because, pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 – Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2024, item 390, as amended), the general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office are: the National Public Prosecutor's Office, regional public prosecutor's offices, circuit public prosecutor's offices and district public prosecutor's offices.
All positions (1–3) include military prosecutors, of whom 88 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 66 men and 22 women; at the regional prosecutor's office level – 57, including 42 men and 15 women, and at the National Prosecutor's Office – 21 military prosecutors (16 men and 5 women).

**Q055 (2023):** 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 420 prosecutors (158 women and 262 men), as pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2024, item 390), 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 90 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 67 men and 23 women; at the regional prosecutor's office level, 50, including 39 men and 11 women; and at the National Prosecutor's Office, 19 military prosecutors (13 men and 6 women). In regional prosecutors' offices, prosecutors for military affairs do not perform official duties.
The table in question does not, therefore, provide an opportunity to illustrate the full structure of the public prosecutor's office in Poland, which, in accordance with the above-mentioned provision of the Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office, consists of four levels. In regional prosecutors' offices, prosecutors for military affairs do not perform official duties.

**Q055 (2022):** 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 subcategories because it includes the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 399 prosecutors (156 women and 243 men), as, pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2023, item 1360), 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.
The table in question does not, therefore, provide an opportunity to illustrate the full structure of the public prosecutor's office in Poland, which, in accordance with the above-mentioned provision of the Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office, consists of four levels. All items (1 - 3) include military prosecutors, of whom 86 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 61 men and 25 women; 48 at the circuit prosecutor's office level, including 38 men and 10 women; and 16 military prosecutors (12 men and 4 women) at the National Prosecutor's Office. In regional prosecutors' offices, prosecutors for military affairs do not perform official duties.

**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.

**Q056 (2024):** The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it includes the number of heads of regional prosecutor's offices (the 'third level') – a total of 11 prosecutors (3 women and 8 men).
The figures shown in the table do not include the number of persons acting as deputy heads of public prosecutor's offices at all levels of the general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office.

**Q056 (2023):** Comment refers to the description of structure given in Q055. The table takes into account the heads of regional prosecutor's offices, whose number is 11, including 9 men and 2 women. The figures indicated in the table do not take into account the number of persons serving as deputy heads of prosecution offices at the above levels.

**Q056 (2022):** Due to the impossibility of filtering the data as at 31.12.2022, the status as at 21.07.2023 r.
The table takes into account the heads of regional prosecutors' offices, whose number is 11, including nine men and two women.
The figures indicated in the table do not take into account the number of persons serving as deputy heads of prosecution offices at the above levels.

**Q056 (2020):** The sum is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of heads of regional prosecutor's offices, (whose number is 11, including 9 men and 2 women), since according to Article 16 of the Law of January 28, 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 prosecutors' offices, circuit prosecutors' offices and district prosecutors' offices. The figures indicated in the table do not take into account the number of persons serving as deputy heads of prosecution offices at the above levels.

**Q056 (2018):** Universal prosecutorial bodies are: the National Public Prosecutor's Office, appellate public prosecutor's offices, regional public prosecutor's offices and district public prosecutor's offices. Numerical data determined in the table does not include the number of deputy chief prosecutors related to the prosecution offices at the aforementioned levels.

**Q056 (2016):** There are several differences between data which were sent in previous campaigns (2014) and above table. Differences could be caused by indicating in previous cycles also vice heads of prosecution offices.

**Q056 (2014):** Figures provided for 2014 encompass deputy-heads of prosecution offices.

**Q057 (2024):** The above figures are as of 31 December 2024 and also include assessors in the Military Departments, of whom there are 18 in total.
Provisions concerning assessors of the public prosecutor's office are regulated by Section V of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office. Pursuant to Article 173 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office, the Prosecutor General may entrust an assessor of the public prosecutor's office, for a fixed period not exceeding three years, with the performance of prosecutorial activities without the right to:
1) participate in proceedings before the court of appeal and in proceedings in the district court, except for proceedings in the first instance in cases in which he or she conducted the preparatory proceedings;
2) appear at the Supreme Court, draft appeals and motions to the Supreme Court.
A prosecutor's assessor who is not authorised to perform prosecutorial activities may act as a public prosecutor in cases in which an investigation was conducted.
In addition, the provisions concerning prosecutors apply accordingly to prosecutor's assessors (in accordance with Article 174 § 1 of the Act – Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office).

**Q057 (2023):** prosecuting assessors

**Q057 (2022):** The above figures show the status as at 31.12.2022 and also include assessors in the Military Affairs Departments, of which there are 14 in total.
The provisions concerning prosecution assessors are set out in Section V of the Act - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office. Pursuant to Article 173 of the Act - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office, the Public Prosecutor General may entrust an assessor of the public prosecutor's office, for a specified period of time, not exceeding 3 years, with the performance of prosecutorial activities without the right to:
1) participation in the proceedings before the court of appeal and in the proceedings before the district court, with the exception of proceedings at first instance in cases in which he has conducted pre-trial proceedings;
2) to appear before the Supreme Court, to draw up appeals and motions to the Supreme Court.
An assessor of the public prosecutor's office who is not authorised to perform prosecutorial activities may act as a public prosecutor in cases in which an investigation has been conducted.
In addition, the provisions relating to public prosecutors (pursuant to Article 174 § 1 of the Act - Law on Public Prosecution) apply accordingly to prosecution assessors.

**Q057 (2020):** Pursuant to Article 173 § 1 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office of 28 January 2016 (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66), the Public Prosecutor General may entrust an assistant prosecutor (assessor) for a fixed period, not exceeding 3 years, with the performance of prosecutorial activities without the right:
1)to participate in proceedings before the Court of Appeal and in proceedings before the Circuit Court, with the exception of proceedings at first instance in cases where he or she has conducted the pre-trial proceedings;
appearing before the Supreme Court, preparing appeals and applications to the Supreme Court.

**Q057 (2018):** Pursuant to art. 173 § 1 of the Law on Prosecution Act of 28th January 2016 (published in the Journal of Laws 2017, item 1767 and later amendments), Public Prosecutor General can entrust prosecution's assessor (for a specified period of time, not exceeding 3 years) with performance of prosecutor's activities, without the right to:
1)participation in the appeal proceedings, as well as participation in proceedings before the District Court - except for proceedings of a first instance, in cases related to preparatory proceedings conducted by this court;
2)act before the Supreme Court, as well as prepare appeals and motions to the Supreme Court.

**Q060 (2024):** The table provides data on the actual employment of officials, assistant prosecutors and other employees in general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office.
The table shows the actual numbers of persons employed in general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office, as the Human Resources Office does not have detailed data on the number of employees in full-time equivalents by gender. The Human Resources Office also does not have detailed data on the number of employees in general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office who are employed on a permanent or fixed-term basis. At the same time, I would like to inform you that the organisational units of the public prosecutor's office provide the Human Resources Office with data on public prosecutor's office employees (the military section separately) in the following groups:
1) staffing limits,
2) utilisation of staffing limits (without a breakdown by gender), rounded to two decimal places, 3) the actual number of employees (broken down by the number of women and men employed).

**Q060 (2023):** The table provides data on the actual employment of clerks, assistant prosecutors and other employees in common organisational units of the prosecutor's office.
**Q060 (2022):** The table provides data on the actual employment of clerks, assistant prosecutors and other employees in the common organisational units of the 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 (General Comment):** 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 p

ublic 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 (2023):** The increase in judges' and prosecutors' salaries was 7.8% over 2022. The amount of the increase of more than 7.8% is due to the unlocking of the salaries frozen in 2020-2023. It must also be taken into account that the month of November and December 2023 was paid with compensation after the wage unfreeze.
The basic remuneration for prosecutors of common organisational units of the public prosecutor's office shall be determined on the basis of the table of basic remuneration rates for prosecutors of common organisational units of the public 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 remuneration, which constitutes Annex No. 1 to the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 29.02.2016. (Journal of Laws of 2023, item 1656) on the basic remuneration of prosecutors and the amount of function allowances to which prosecutors are entitled. The said table sets out the rates of basic remuneration for individual prosecutor positions and the corresponding multiplier, which is used to determine the amount of basic remuneration for that position. Pursuant to Article 123 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Prosecution Law, the basis for determining the basic 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, announced 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 aforementioned Act, the basic salary of prosecutors of the National Prosecuting Authority is equal to the basic salary of judges of the Supreme Court. Pursuant to Article 48 of the Act of 8 December 2017 on the Supreme Court (Journal of Laws of 2024, item 622), the remuneration of a judge of the Supreme Court is determined at either the basic rate or the promotion rate. The 5 promotion rate is 115% of the

basic rate. On assuming office, a judge of the Supreme Court shall receive basic salary at the basic rate. After 7 years of service in the Supreme Court, the basic salary of a judge of the Supreme Court shall be increased to the promotion rate. At the same time, in accordance with Article 124 § 11 of the cited Act - Prosecution Law, a prosecutor is entitled to an allowance for long service amounting, starting from the 6th year of service, to 5% of the basic salary currently received by the prosecutor and increasing after each subsequent year of service by 1% of this salary, until reaching 20% of the basic salary. After 20 years of service, the allowance shall be paid, irrespective of length of service beyond that period, at 20% of the prosecutor's current basic salary.

**Q132 (2022):** The salary increase for judges and prosecutors at the beginning of their careers was 4.4% by 2021.

**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 p

ublic 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 p

ublic 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 amountin

g 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 (General Comment):** 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 (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.
**Q146 (2022):** Number of advocates: total: 21 447, male- 11 343, female - 10 104
Number of legal counsels: total: 40 107, male - 18 725 , female - 21 382
It is noteworthy that legal advisers have the same powers as advocates.
**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.
**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 (2024):** Figures provided by Eurostat

**Q004 (2023):** The increase reflects the inflation
This is the provisional value for year 2022.
Data for 2023 is still not available.
**Q004 (2022):** This value is for year 2021.
Data for 2022 is still not available.
**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 (2024):** The information provided above is taken from official statistics from the Ministry of Justice. The data includes all judicial magistrates, even those who are absent for a short period (due to illness or accident, labour dispute, holidays or other forms of leave, voluntary absence or temporary impediment due to causes such as unfavourable weather conditions or technical incidents). Judicial magistrates on indefinite leave (prolonged illnesses, unpaid leave, temporary or indefinite suspension for non-disciplinary reasons) are excluded.

**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 (General Comment):** As there are judges who have civil and criminal competences at the same time, it is not possible to discriminate judges by civil and commercial matters. Therefore, the judges of the judicial courts were all included in the column “other”. It is also not possible to distinguish by court, which ones are responsible for civil/commercial or criminal proceedings, because of the existence of courts of general and mixed jurisdiction.

**Q046-2 (2024):** see general comment

**Q046-2 (2023):** See general comment.

**Q046-2 (2022):** As there are judges who have civil and criminal competences at the same time, it is not possible to discriminate judges by civil and commercial matters. Therefore, the judges of the judicial courts were all included in the column “other”.

**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 (2024):** 3. The decrease in the number of females is a consequence of the decrease in the total number of staff.

**Q052 (2023):** The data for the year 2023 reflects a change in the criteria for recording data on non-judge staff by the courts. The personnel working in the central units of the courts began to be registered in the court's common services personnel area. Thus, since 2023 the personnel in the common services have been included in this table.

**Q052 (2022):** The variations in the number of non-judge staff over the different evaluation cycles seem high due to the small numbers. Included in the "Other non-judge staff" category are professionals not included in the other specific categories, such as senior technical staff who mainly provide support to the higher courts.

**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.
**Q052-1 (2023):** The data for the year 2023 reflects a change in the criteria for recording data on non-judge staff by the courts. The personnel working in the central units of the courts began to be registered in the court's common services personnel area. Thus, since 2023 the personnel in the common services have been included in this table.

**Q052-1 (2022):** the data in question 52-1 has also been updated, due to a small error in the accounting of the different categories included in it." Compared to the figures we sent initially, the correction was very small in percentage terms (36 more employees were added, out of a total of 5412).
The amended figures in table 52.1 referred to a specific category of STJ/STA officials who have now been added, as they were not accounted for previously by mistake (neither in the version initially sent with 2022 data, nor in the previous edition with 2021 data).

**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 (2024):** The information provided above is taken from official statistics from the Ministry of Justice. The data includes all prossecutors, even those who are absent for a short period (due to illness or accident, labour dispute, holidays or other forms of leave, voluntary absence or temporary impediment due to causes such as unfavourable weather conditions or technical incidents). Prossecutors on indefinite leave (prolonged illnesses, unpaid leave, temporary or indefinite suspension for non-disciplinary reasons) are excluded.
**Q055 (2023):** Q55.2. The increase in the number of female prosecutors in 2023 compared to 2022 is in line with the steady growth in the number of female prosecutors in recent years.
**Q055 (2022):** The discrepancy rate is due to small numbers

**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.
**Q056 (2023):** At the first instance level, the following were counted:
- County District Prosecutors Coordinators (23)
- Director of the Central Department of Criminal Investigation and Prosecution (1)
- Directors of Regional Departments of Criminal Investigation and Prosecution (3)
- Directors of Departments of Criminal Investigation and Prosecution (11)

At the second instance level, the following were counted:
- Regional Prosecutors General (4)
- Administrative and Tax State Prosecutors Coordinators (2)
- Coordinator of the Public Prosecutor’s Office at the Guimarães Court of Appeal (1)

At Supreme Court level, the following were counted the Coordinators of the Public Prosecutor’s Office at the Supreme Court of Justice, at the Administrative Court and at the Court of Audit.

**Q056 (2016):** Portuguese Official Justice Statistics do not colletct these data.

**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

**Q133 (General Comment):** Special pension: In Portugal, Jubilation (Jubilação) is the name given to a special retirement scheme which, in addition to the title of honour, allows that emeritus judges shall continue to be bound by their statutory duties and attached to the court of which they were a member. They shall enjoy the titles, honours, privileges and immunities corresponding to their category and may attend the solemn ceremonies held in the said court in professional dress, taking their seats to the right of the magistrates on active service. The pension of the retired judge under this special scheme is calculated and updated based on the remuneration of the magistrate in active service, as it is considered that he or she somehow continues to have a connection to the service.
Housing: The salary of a judge includes an annual gross amount of €xxxxx (€xxxx x 14) as a compensation allowance. An 11% tax is deducted from this amount as a contribution to the general pension fund / social security. This allowance is of a mixed nature, between compensation for the specific nature of the job (working on call and on an exclusive basis) and an allowance comparable to subsistence allowance (due to not being given adequate housing). At the judge's request, he or she may be assigned a residence if one of the properties available for this purpose is available. These properties belong to the State, under the management of the Ministry of Justice.

**Q133 (2024):** Concerning «special pension»In Portugal, Jubilation (Jubilação) is the name given to a special retirement scheme which, in addition to the title of honour, allows that emeritus judges and prossecutors shall continue to be bound by their statutory duties and attached to the court of which they were a member. They shall enjoy the titles, honours, privileges and immunities corresponding to their category and may attend the solemn ceremonies held in the said court in professional dress, taking their seats to the right of the magistrates on active service. The pension of the retired judge under this special scheme is calculated and updated based on the remuneration of the magistrate in active service, as it is considered that he or she somehow continues to have a connection to the service.
This year change for public prosectutors (yes for special pension) is following the conclusion that both judges and prossecutors have the same privileges once they are "jubilados".

**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 (2024):** The data is provided by the National Institute of Statistics. The difference can be explained based on salary increases and an upward trend can be observed continuing from 2018.

**Q004 (2022):** The difference can be explained based on salary increases and an upward trend can be observed continuing from 2018.

**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 „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 (2024):** There were more competitions for first instance courts. The gender balance changed as a result of these competitions.
**Q046 (2023):** There were some fluctuations due to a number of retirements and new contests for occupying the vacant positions.

**Q046 (2022):** Only judges of the „judecatorii" are counted as first instance judges.

**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.
**Q046-2 (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 (2023):** The statistical system does not collect information regarding a breakdown in the number of judges based on the different legal matters.
**Q046-2 (2022):** 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, probation counselors and judge's assistants. 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. o T

he position of "judge's assistant" was established by Law no. 393/2023 on the status of the judge's assistant, entered into force on December 17, 2023. Judge's assistants work in courts of appeal, courts of first instance and specialized courts. Judge's assistants perform the following main duties: (a) assist the judge in carrying out specific procedures prior to the setting of the first date of the trial; (b) carry out documentation, verification and presentation of the documents and papers in the case-file and of the facts and points of law relevant to the case (c) draft, under the judge's direction, judgments or other procedural documents.

**Q052 (2024):** Other: assistance magistrates, judicial assistants and probation counselors.

**Q052 (2023):** Other: assistance magistrates, judicial assistants, probation counselors and judge's assistants. It should be noted that the position of "judge's assistant" was established by Law no. 393/2023 on the status of the judge's assistant, entered into force on December 17, 2023.

**Q052 (2022):** Other: assistance magistrates, judicial assistants and probation counselors.

**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.

**Q052-1 (2024):** The data is provided by the High Court of Cassation and Justice. The difference could be explained by staff promotions to a higher court, but also by staff mobility potentially caused by dissatisfaction of salaries.

**Q052-1 (2023):** 3. The difference between the data communicated in 2022 and 2023 is primarily due to changes in the methodology used by the High Court of Cassation and Justice for reporting data on civil servants and contractual staff.

**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 (2023):** 3. The vacancies caused by retirements were followed by a series of competitions for positions in PICCJ, DNA, and DIICOT. As a result of these competitions, the gender balance shifted.
**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).

**Q056 (2024):** There were several vacancies due to retirements or expiration of the term followed by a series of competitions. The gender balance changed as a result of these competitions.
**Q056 (2022):** 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".

**Q056 (2020):** 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".
The discrepancies in terms of number of heads within the prosecution offices compared to the previous campaign are due to the fact that the leading position mandates have expired within the current period and because of the pandemic situation competitions for filling in these positions could not be organised.

**Q056 (2018):** 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".

**Q056 (2016):** As regards the total number of heads of prosecution offices that went from 277 in 2014 to 426 for 2016 data, this may be generated by the fact that the specialised prosecution units (such as the anticorruption and anti organised crime structures) might have not been taken into account. Data may therefore not be comparable.

Without taking into calculation the specialised structures as mentioned above, the number of heads prosecution offices of the Supreme court is 13; if adding the number of heads of prosecution offices of the specialised structures, the number will be as follows: DNA (anticorruption unit) 15 out of which 10 male and 5 female; DIICOT (anti organised crime structure) 51 out of which 28 male and 23 female.

**Q060 (2024):** The data is provided by the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice. The difference could be explained by staff mobility potentially caused by dissatisfaction of salaries. The gender balance changed as a result of this mobility.
**Q060 (2023):** Of the 1 810 filled positions in prosecution offices nationwide, 1 803 are held by clerks, while the remaining 7 are occupied by procedural agents (responsible for tasks such as delivering summons and other courier duties) and other staff, including drivers.

**Q060 (2022):** Out of the total of 2089 filled in positions in the prosecution offices country wide, 1761 are occupied by clerks and the rest of
328 are procedural agents (who accomplish activities such as delivering summons, other courier activities etc.) and other staff such as
drivers.

**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 (2023):** For entry-level salaries, the decline is attributed to legislative changes and a shift in recruitment trends, with preference now given to candidates from the National Institute of Magistracy, without prior seniority. Previously, data included individuals with at least five years of legal experience, resulting in higher average salaries. Conversely, the significant increase in end-of-career salaries stems from adjustments in salary structures, influenced by court rulings and administrative acts recognizing outstanding rights. These changes introduced a broadly applicable benchmark for salary calculations across the justice sector.

**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.

**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).

**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 (2024):** Source: https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/wcm/connect/1e66330c-9270-436f-897d-d5eeb65c0081/Priemerna_mesacna_mzda_zamestnanca_hospodarstva_SR_v_roku_2024.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=pls9P7Q&CVID=pls9P7Q&CVID=pls9P7Q

**Q004 (2023):** High rise in salaries (based on high inflation - similar to the other EU countries) https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/wcm/connect/efd89ec1-751c-4692-8a7d-2ba94b2532f6/Priemerna_mesacna_mzda_zamestnanca_hospodarstva_SR_v_roku_2023.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUiz2Xu

**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 (General Comment):** Supreme Administrative Court is calculated together with Supreme Court.

**Q046 (2024):** Supreme Court: 58 - 27 - 31
Suprem Administrative Court: 23 - 12 - 11

**Q046 (2023):** 3. Number of Supreme Court professional judges: Supreme Administrative Court: 25 - 12 - 13
Supreme Court: 54 - 24 - 30

**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.
**Q046-2 (2024):** Supreme Court: 58-41-17-NAP-NAP
Supreme Administrative Court: 23-NAP-NAP-23-NAP
**Q046-2 (2023):** family, enforcement and reminder departments, visiting judges, judges in evaluation committees, court presidents
**Q046-2 (2022):** For example hosting judges - can not be involved in one case type, presidents of the courts.
The distribution of administrative judges per instance is made based on the instance level of the court where they work and not based on the instance of the cases for which they are responsible.
When comparing the data presented in the table right above with the question Q046, a discrepancy of 11 judges in the overall count comes to light. It is imperative to clarify that Slovak Republic used a different methodology for these two questions. Here in the question Q046-2, it involved calculating an annual average for the number of judges per matter, instead of the critical moment of 31st of December as for Q046-2.
**Q046-2 (2021):** The Supreme Administrative Court had 21 administrative judges in 2021, included in Second instance.

**Q052 (2024):** In Category 4 – Technical staff, the following positions are included: property manager, building manager, regional court library employee, building security staff, telephone operator, boiler operator, maintenance worker, and cleaning staff.
In Category 5 – Other, drivers are included.
All data on the number of employees in the relevant table, as well as in other tables of the submitted CEPEJ questionnaire, represent figures for district, municipal, regional, and administrative courts, as well as for the Specialised Criminal Court.
In previous years, Category 3 also included employees who, in the current 2024 table, are listed under Categories 4 and 5. Given that the current questionnaire was accompanied by guidance specifying which employees should be included in each category, we have reclassified the employees who were previously included solely in Category 3 into Categories 3, 4, and 5 accordingly.

**Q052 (2023):** Q052: Rechtspfleger: In connection with the EU project, project positions of "senior judicial officer - coordinator" were created in the courts, which were financed from EU funds and were kept separately in the records. Currently, these positions are financed from the budget of the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic, and therefore the registered number is significantly higher than in the previous year.
**Q052 (2022):** The judiciary, especially the non-judges' positions, are probably not attractive for the males because of the salary.Another possible explanation is that the position of Rechtspfleger is a starting position before judicial exams and subsequent application for the position of judge, which could have caused an outflow of male employees.

**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".

**Q052-1 (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

**Q056 (2014):** For 2012 and 2014, only the number of heads of prosecution offices was indicated. There is one head prosecutor for every District prosecution office (54), every Regional prosecution office (8) and the General Prosecutor Office (1). However, on 1 January 2015, there were two vacant positions of heads of district prosecution offices.Besides the head of the prosecution office, the post of chief prosecutor implies also the deputies of every prosecution office, the specialised prosecutor and his/her deputies, the directors and the deputies of sections and departments of the General prosecution Office. For example, in 2014, the total number of prosecutors in chief position was 200 (119 men, 81 women).

**Q057 (2024):** These are prosecutor trainees pursuant to Sections 234 et seq. of Act No. 154/2001 Coll., and prosecutor's assistants pursuant to Sections 228 et seq. of the same Act. Their powers are defined in Sections 30a to 30d of Act No. 153/2001 Coll.
A total of 46, of which 41 were prosecutor trainees and 5 were prosecutor's assistants.

**Q057 (2022):** Judicial assistants of the prosecutor's office and assistant prosecutors.

**Q057 (2020):** Other persons with similar duties as prosecutors are the legal attendants of the prosecutor's office and the assistant prosecutors. As for the different answer in the previous cycle, in that time the institute of assistant prosecutors did not yet exist yet.

**Q060 (2022):** The dicrepacy ratio was caused mainly by the resolution of the Govermnet of the Slovak republic, which ordered the state authorities to reduce the number of state employees by 10 %.

**Q060 (2020):** Staff increased for natural recruitment procedure

**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 (2024):** The salaries of prosecutors are determined in accordance with Act No. 154/2001 Coll. on Prosecutors and Prosecutor Trainees.

**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 (2023):** Prosecutors: Prosecutors are paid a pension supplement by the Prosecutor General's Office of the Slovak Republic, which in previous years was reported in "Special pension" and in 2023 was already reported in "Other financial benefits"

**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.

**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.

**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 (2024):** Reported according to Eurostat data (in previous years according to Statistical Office of the Republic of 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. seconded to the Judicial council, Ministry of Justice, Supreme court) and are not included in the reported numbers. The information on actual presence (excluding e.g. seconded judges, the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave) is also available.
Judges at the Administrative Court (first instance court, see Q44) and higher judges at local and district courts (first instance courts) are reported as according to their courts (first-instance judges) and not according to their rank (higher-court judges).

**Q046 (2024):** At the end of 2024, 853 judicial posts were formally occupied, although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 839 professional judges (FTE) sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (14 judges - difference to the total of 853 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. seconded 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 2024 was 772,25 according to actual presence calculations.

**Q046 (2023):** At the end of 2023, 861 judicial posts were formally occupied, although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 845 professional judges (FTE) sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (16 judges - difference to the total of 861 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 2023 was 79,09 according to actual presence calculations.

**Q046 (2022):** At the end of 2022, 878 judicial posts were formally occupied, although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 862 professional judges (FTE) sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (16 judges - difference to the total of 878 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 2022 was 767,15 according to actual presence calculations.
Discrepancies (compared to 2020 data): 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 2021 they are reported according to their court (first-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

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** Since 2021, data on judges classified by legal fields is collected by approximating the time an individual judge is working on a certain type of cases. The data is collected only as actual presence (not occupied posts/FTE).
The category “Other” corresponds to “Other cases” at Q91: 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.
The category "Other" does not include judges involved in the court management as they are partially or entirely relieved from adjudicating cases.

**Q046-2 (2024):** The data does not include judges involved in the court management (additional 44 judges).
The data for 2024 is reported as FTE to be compatible with CEPEJ specification. The data is actually collected as actual presence and is converted to FTE according to general ratio of actual presence/occupied posts in judiciary.
The data is only approximate - please see general comment.

**Q046-2 (2023):** The data does not include judges involved in the court management (additional 42 judges).
The data for 2023 is reported as FTE (previous years: actual presence) to be compatible with CEPEJ specification. The data is actually collected as actual presence and is converted to FTE according to general ratio of actual presence/occupied posts in judiciary.
The data is only approximate - please see general comment.

**Q046-2 (2022):** The data is only approximate - please see general comment. The data is reported as actual presence (not FTE) and therefore not compatible with Q46. As already mentioned in the frame of Q46, the number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2022 was 767,15 according to actual presence calculations.
The category "Other" does not include judges involved in the court management (additional 39 judges).

**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):** Data is not collected in a way to allow reporting in CEPEJ categories above. Court staff is employed by courts to work on work posts as defined by the government regulation. Generally, work posts in public administration are divided on "expert-technical" staff and "officials". The Courts Law explicitly provides typical profiles of non-judge staff: judicial assistants, higher and independent judicial assistants and judicial advisers (comparatively they can also perform some typical Rechtspflegers tasks in civil enforcement, land registry, business registry and insolvency cases). The law also provides for judicial trainees. Other typical profiles in courts include: typists, registrars (case management systems) as well as employees in court management and general services (e.g. accounting, HR, archives, general maintenance, cleaning) and IT staff (system administrators/engineers).

**Q052 (2024):** The number of court staff is reported according to court management reporting standard (occupied work posts), while the number of males/females is calculated according to human resources records.
Break down by some typical profiles (number of occupied posts):
Court directors: 15
Judicial advisers: 621
Judicial assistants: 586
Court registrars: 494
Typists:842
Judicial trainees: 120
Employees of Centre for Informatics at the Supreme Court: 19

**Q052 (2023):** The number of court staff is reported according to court management reporting standard (occupied work posts), while the number of males/females is calculated according to human resources records.
Break down by some typical profiles (number of occupied posts):
Court directors: 15
Judicial advisers: 617
Judicial assistants: 588
Court registrars: 498
Typists:881
Judicial trainees: 120

**Q052 (2022):** Approx. 3,5% of all court staff (120 persons) are judicial trainees (counted under “2. Non-judge (judicial staff”).

**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.

**Q052-1 (General Comment):** Besides profiles typically working in courts, the court staff at second instance include judicial trainees (formally employed by higher courts, while doing internship at first instance courts). At third instance the staff at the Supreme court Centre for Informatics is included - mostly system administrators/engineers and project managers.

**Q052-1 (2024):** The number of court staff is reported according to court management reporting standard (occupied work posts), while the number of males/females is calculated according to human resources records (by instance).
The figures include: 120 judicial trainees at the second instance (formally employed by higher courts, while doing internship at first instance courts), and 19 employees of Centre for Informatics at the Supreme Court.

**Q052-1 (2023):** The number of court staff is reported according to court management reporting standard (occupied work posts), while the number of males/females is calculated according to human resources records (by instance).
The figures include: 120 judicial trainees at the second instance (formally employed by higher courts, while doing internship at first instance courts), and approx 20 employees of Centre for Informatics at third instance.

**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.
Selection process in the procedure for appointing state prosecutors with the formation of a final opinion is in the competence of the State Prosecutor's Council (an independent state body). State prosecutors are appointed by the government.
In 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 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 Prosecution Service 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 senior 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 state prosecutor’s office for certain categories of matters, fo

r 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 before the 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 also before first instance courts.
In the context of question 55 we counted local and district prosecutors 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 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).

**Q055 (2023):** Numbers are reported in FTE and rounded-up to whole numbers.

**Q055 (2022):** The number is reported in FTE format. The total gross number of state prosecutors is 210.
An increase in number of higher and supreme state prosecutors is due to the slow/stalled procedures for appointment of candidates at the government in 2020 and 2021 (in 2022, some candidates that applied in 2018, 2019 and 2020 were appointed.)
**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 r

ang 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.

**Q056 (General Comment):** We considered heads of District State Prosecutor's Offices and Specialized State Prosecutor's Office of The Republic of Slovenia as heads of prosecution office at first instance level. There is no organizational counterpart in the structure of prosecution office to courts of second instance, so the answer is NAP. We considered prosecutor general as the head of prosecution office at supreme court level.

**Q056 (2020):** The difference is due to small absolute number.

**Q056 (2016):** The position of the Supreme Court president was not filled on 31. 12. 2016 . The term of the previous president ended during 2016 and new president was not elected until 2017. The new president for the next 6-years-term is male.

**Q060 (General Comment):** The information is 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; however they participate in hearings and drafting of court decisions in some cases.

**Q060 (2022):** The number is reported in FTE format. The total gross number of staff is 309.

**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: 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.

**Q132 (2024):** In 2023, the Constitutional Court ruled that judges' salaries were unconstitutional because they were insufficient (decision U-I-772/21 of 1 June 2023). In 2024, the Constitutional Court issued a supplementary decision setting out how to implement its earlier ruling, addressing the failure to adjust judges' salaries for inflation. The government complied with this decision, and in September 2024, judges received back pay for January to July 2024 and higher salaries starting in August 2024. This partly resolved the unconstitutional situation regarding the material independence of judges. On 1 January 2025, the new Act on Common Basic Pay Systems in the Public Sector (ZSTSPJS) took effect. It systematically improved judges' material situation (this in not yet reflected in reported figures for 2024).

**Q132 (2023):** In June 2023 the Constitutional Court decided on a request of the Judicial Council to review the constitutionality of the statutory regulation on judges' salaries (Case No. U-I-772/21). The predominant part of the consideration of this case involved the review of the constitutionality of the regulation of judges' basic salaries (regulated in the Public Sector Salary System Act).
The Constitutional Court held that the regulation of judges' basic salaries was inconsistent with the constitutional principle of judicial independence, as it did not comply with the constitutional requirement that judges' salaries be relatively stable. Judges' salaries have namely very significantly lost real value in just over ten years. The Constitutional Court further held that, with regard to the principle of judicial independence, the following allegations may, in principle, also be relevant, namely that the growth of judges' salaries lags behind the growth of the average salary in the state, or in a certain narrower employment segment that is more closely related to judges; that the ratio between judges' salaries and other salaries is inappropriate; that the (excessively) low salaries of judges affect the (un)attractiveness of the judicial profession; and, under certain conditions, the allegations concerning the entitlement of judges to social transfers may also be relevant.
In the context of the review of the consistency of the regulation of judges' basic salaries with the principle of the separation of powers, the Constitutional Court reiterated its position that the three branches of power must also be equal with regard to the financial status of their officials, and that this requirement is not one of perfect uniformity, but of relative comparability. In this regard, taking into account the applicable normative regulation of the entitlement of deputies of the National Assembly to a set monthly allowance for covering the expenses incurred in relation to the performance of their wor

k in a constituency, and taking into account the fact that deputies may be placed into higher salary grades than the starting salary grade, the Constitutional Court established that the regulation of judges' basic salaries, as regards the salary ratio between deputies and the lowest-ranked judges, is inconsistent with the principle of the separation of powers. The Constitutional Court added, however, that it cannot be held that the challenged salary ratios between Supreme Court judges and ministers are unconstitutional.
In the light of the above, the Constitutional Court held that the Public Sector Salary System Act, insofar as it refers to judges's salaries and it's revalorisation procedure, was inconsistent with the Constitution. However and set a deadline for the law-maker to remedy the incompliance with the Constitution. The ruling has not been implemented yet despite protests as the government has been insisting it will tackle judiciary pay as part of comprehensive salary reform in the entire public sector, which is yet to be finalised.
Following up on its earlier decision, the Constitutional Court has decided in May 2024 (U-I-8/24) that judges' pay be raised by an amount corresponding to the total rise in consumer prices in the past decade. The judges will receive higher salaries in September 2024, when they receive their monthly pay for August, along with the difference in back pay starting from 3 January 2024. The Constitutional court's decision determines that salaries should be raised in a way that takes the pay brackets valid on 1 June 2012 and adjusts them for inflation recorded between that day and 31 December 2023. A calculation on the website of the national Statistical Office website shows this amounts to 26.2%.

**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).

**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**

**Q004 (2024):** The gross annual salary of Spanish workers grew by 3,8% in 2024, to 27.558,68 euros, according to the data published by the National Statistics Institute (INE) in the annual labour cost survey.
**Q004 (2023):** The gross annual salary of Spanish workers grew by 4.7% in 2023, to 26.555,89 euros, according to the data published by the National Statistics Institute (INE) in the annual labour cost survey.
**Q004 (2022):** The increase can be explained by increase of minimum legal salary.

**Q052 (General Comment):** The Spanish judicial system distinguishes between three categories of non-judicial staff: Gestión Procesal y Administrativa, Tramitación Procesal y Administrativa, and Auxilio Judicial. The sum of these bodies, destinated to Courts, is the response to Q.52.5 'Other non judge staff'.
**Q052 (2024):** The non judicial staff designated to courts belong to three categories: Gestión Procesal y Administrativa, Tramitación Procesal y Administrativa, and Auxilio Judicial. : 46060
In adition to that, there are 1.164 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 of 17). In these Autonomoues Regions the proportion of females within the civil servants in Courts is
72% (therefore, 28% of males and 72% females). This proportion is possibly applicable to the whole national system.

**Q052 (2023):** The sum of the bodies [Gestor Procesal, Tramitador Procesal and Auxilio Judicial] destinated to Courts: 45.544
In adition to that, there are 1.161 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 of 17). In these Autonomoues Regions the proportion of females within the civil servants in Courts is
72% (therefore, 28% of males and 72% females). This proportion is possibly applicable to the whole national system.

**Q052 (2022):** The sum of the bodies [Gestor Procesal, Tramitador Procesal and Auxilio Judicial] destinated to Courts:45332
In adition to that, there are 1155 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% (therefore, 29% of males). This proportion is possibly applicable to the whole national system.

**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 (2024):** As mentioned in previous exercises, the structure of the Prosecution service does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First category ("Fiscales de Sala") Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 38, Males 23, Females 15 (this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second. "Fiscal": Total 2030, Males 717, Females 1313
Third: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 744, Males 191, Females 553

**Q055 (2023):** As mentioned in previous exercises, the structure of the Prosecution service does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First category ("Fiscales de Sala") Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 36, Males 21, Females 15(this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second category: "Fiscal": Total 1944, Males 706, Females 1238 Third category: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 770, Males 183, Females 587
Source: Ministry of Presidency, Justice and Relations with the Parliament.

**Q055 (2022):** As mentioned in previous exercises, the structure of the Prosecution service does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category ("Fiscales de Sala") Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 40, Males 26, Females 14 (this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second. "Fiscal": Total 1908, Males 704, Females 1204
Third: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 771, Males 187, Females 584

**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 33, Males 26, Females 7
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

**Q056 (General Comment):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
So it is not applicable the cathegories designed by the questionnaire. The Spanish structure distinguishes Heads of offices of the Autonomous Region, Heads of offices of Province, Heads of offices of area.

**Q056 (2024):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 16 (Males 11, Females 5)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 42 (Males 22, Females 20)
Number of Heads of offices of Area: Total 27 (Males 12, Females 15)

**Q056 (2023):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 16 (Males 9, Female 7)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 43 (Males 24, Female 19)
Number of Heads of offices of Area: Total 24 (Males 11, Females 13)

**Q056 (2022):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 17 (Males 9, Female 8)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 44 (Males 25, Female 19)
Number of Heads of offices of Area: Total 26 (Males 11, Females 15)

**Q056 (2020):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 17 (Males 12, Female 5)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 44 (Males 27, Female 17)
Number of Heads of offices of Area: Total 27 (Males 8, Females 19)

**Q056 (2018):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 17
(Males 11, Female 6)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 44 (Males 30, Female 14)
Number of Heads of offices of área: Total 26 (Males 11, Females 15)

**Q056 (2016):** Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 17 (Males 13, Female 04)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 44 (Males 30, Female 14)
Number of Heads of offices of área: Total 27 (Males 10, Females 17)

**Q057 (General Comment):** Police officers can present a police report directly to the Criminal Investigation Courts.

**Q132 (General Comment):** Judicial and Prosecutorial careers - The regulation of the remuneration system for members of the judicial and prosecutorial careers is contained in Law 15/2003 of 26 May regulating the remuneration system of the judicial and prosecutorial careers and is based on the principles of objectivity, fairness, transparency and stability. The remuneration system for judicial and prosecutorial careers is generally made up of a fixed component and a variable component based on objectives, the quantification elements of which are detailed in the law.
The fixed component rewards the category and seniority in the judicial career, as well as the objective characteristics of the positions held. Fixed remuneration is divided into two categories: basic remuneration and additional remuneration. The basic salary is made up of salary (it remunerates the category held within the judicial career and is fixed) and seniority (it is remunerated by a successive increase of five per cent of the initial salary corresponding to the category of entry for every three years of active service or in other administrative situations in which time is recognised for this purpose). Salaries and seniority objectively reflect the category within the judicial career and the successive proportional increase on the initial salary, fixed at five per cent every three years. Judges and magistrates are entitled to two additional payments per year, each equal to one month's salary and recognised seniority, and, if applicable, a proportional amount for the destination allowance under the conditions established by law for the entire State public sector, paid in June and December.
The additional remuneration is made up of the allowance for each post and the specific allowance. The allowance corresponding to each post of judge or magistrate is quantified according to the following criteria The population group to which it belongs; the objective conditions of representation linked to the position held and other specifi

c circumstances linked to the post. The amount of the special allowance for each post of judge or magistrate is set out in Annex II to the Act. The special allowance compensates for the special conditions of certain posts of particular responsibility, complexity or difficulty. The posts benefiting from the special allowance and the amount of the special allowance are listed in Annex III to the Act.
The variable remuneration based on objectives is based specifically on the individual performance of each judge in the performance of his or her judicial and professional duties, as certified by the system of dedication modules. The objective for each assignment in the judicial career is set by the General Council of the Judiciary in accordance with the modules of dedication or other technical criteria it deems appropriate. The variable remuneration works by modulating the amount of the fixed remuneration in parallel with the performance of the previous six-month period. If the members of a court achieve a particularly noteworthy individual performance, i.e. if they exceed the objective assigned to the post by 20 percent, an increase of between five and 10 percent of the fixed remuneration is applied. In cases where, for reasons directly attributable to the judge, the individual performance is insufficient and does not reach 80 percent of the target, the fixed remuneration is automatically reduced by five percent of its amount. Under no circumstances can variable remuneration for targets be consolidated.
The following shall have the status of special remuneration: those corresponding to the performance of on-call duties; those derived from the performance of extraordinary duties without relief from judicial functions; those corresponding to substitutions involving the joint performance of another function, provided that they are in all cases compatible with the other remuneration concepts regulated by law and that their accrual and amount are adapted to the regulatory scheme approved by the Government.
Final comment: Special mention should be made of the recent updating of the amounts of the representation allowance for members of the judicial and prosecutorial professions, which have been subject to an increase in remuneration of between 440 and 450 euros, depending on the type of body and post, by virtue of Royal Decree 775/2023 of 3 October updating the remuneration system for the judicial and prosecutorial professions, in accordance with Law 15/2003 of 26 May regulating the remuneration system for the judicial and prosecutorial professions. These increases are made ex officio by the administration and are retroactive to 1 January 2023.

**Q132 (2024):** In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Judges 15.769.762 euros, Prosecution 3.707.437 euros.
Professional substitutions: Judges 9.737.341 euros. Prosecution 1.382.521 euros,

**Q132 (2023):** In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Judges 7.154.057,70 euros, Prosecution 3.607.755,10 euros.
Professional substitutions: Judges 8.899.597,45 euros. Prosecution 1.094.364,54 euros,

**Q132 (2022):** In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Prosecution 3.462.886,71 euros, Judges 6.889.266,33 euros.
- Professional substitutions. Prosecution 1.014.132,71 euros, Judges 10.489.137,61 euros.
**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)
**Q146 (2024):** Lawyers 'census' [Abogacía en datos] (Spanish General Bar Association website): Information on practicing and resident lawyers. Percentage of women and men (45 and 55% aprox.)
**Q146 (2023):** Lawyers 'census' [Abogacía en datos] (Spanish General Bar Association website): Information on practicing and resident lawyers. Percentage of women and men (45 and 55% aprox.)
**Q146 (2022):** Lawyers 'census' [Abogacía en datos] (General Bar Association website): Information on practicing and resident lawyers. Percentage of women and men (45 and 55% aprox.)
**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.)*

*Question 056. Number of heads of prosecution offices.*

*Question 057. In your judicial system, do other persons have similar duties to those of public prosecutors?*

*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 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**

**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 (2022):** Source: Statistik Austria

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

**Belgium**

**Q004 (General Comment):** Source: National Bank of Belgium, https://www.nbb.be

**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**

**Q004 (2024):** The final 2024 data is published on 28.11.2024 covering full and part-time employees. It is 27 898 Leva or 14 264 Euro.
The economic activities in which the largest increase was registered were "Construction" - by 22.6%, "Culture, sports and entertainment" - by 17.1%, and "Transport, storage and post" - by 16.9%.

**Q004 (2023):** The final 2023 data is published on 29.11.2024. It is 24 485 Leva or 12 518 Euro

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q004 (2024):** Average monthly gross salary for 2024 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/2024/en/76833).
This monthly gross salary (1 821 euro) has been multiplied by 12.

**Q004 (2023):** Values for 2022 and prior years may differ from previous deliveries. The GDP for 1995-2023 was revised and published in 2023, including "Gross Domestic Product, Revised Data" (https://podaci.dzs.hr/media/r1dhalwf/msi-bruto-domaci-proizvod.xlsx) and "Annual Gross Domestic Product - Annual Calculation, Revised Data" (https://podaci.dzs.hr/media/c51dcmbr/bruto-domaci-proizvod-godisnji.xlsx).

**Q004 (2022):** will be explained later

**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.)

**Czech Republic**

**Q004 (2022):** The gross salary is constantly growing + the impact of 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.

**Denmark**

**Q004 (2024):** These data are calculated as total salary income in Denmark 2024 divided by total population, as this seems to be the way it has been calculated historically. For the record, note that it is not, in our estimation, a precise measurement.

**Estonia**

**Q004 (2023):** https://www.stat.ee/

**Q004 (2022):** Inflation

**Q004 (2020):** Inflation

**Q004 (2018):** There is no specific reason.

**Finland**

**Q004 (2024):** Salary for 2024 has been estimated from structure of earnings 2023 and preliminary data from index of wage and salary earnings 2024.

**Q004 (2023):** Data from the year 2023. Calculation method for full-time employees' annual salary = monthly salary+ vacation pay + performance pay +lump sums + annual service allowance.

**Q004 (2022):** Final data for the year 2021. Calculation method for full-time employees’ annual salary = Monthly salary + vacation pay + performance pay + lump sums + annual service allowance.

**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**

**Q004 (2022):** Revised calculation method: payroll/headcount computed on a full-time equivalent basis.

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

**Q004 (2020):** The exact figure is 34,494.5_x000D_
Source INSEE

**Germany**

**Q004 (2024):** The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without
special payments: 56 294 EUR)
Special payments are any payments outside of the regular remuneration that can be recurring on an annual basis (such as Christmas bonuses/end-of-the-year bonuses, holiday bonuses, bonuses for the fulfilment of target agreements) or irregular (e.g. payments for jubilees).

**Q004 (2023):** The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without special payments: 53 620 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 (2022):** The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without special payments: 50 805 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 (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**

**Q004 (General Comment):** The survey based on which data on average national salary are established is conducted on a four-year basis. The most recent data are for 2022 and they became available at the end of 2024.

**Q004 (2024):** Total/Avg. Male: 21 947 Female: 17 361. The CEPEJ uses as an estimation the average value of these two figures.
https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SJO47/-

**Q004 (2023):** The most recently available data are 2022 data.
According to the Structure and Distribution of Earnings Survey for 2022, the average annual gross earnings are as follows: Total/Avg. Male: 21 947 Female: 17 361. The CEPEJ uses as an estimation the average value of these two figures.
https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SJO47/-

**Q004 (2022):** 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 o of the survey will be published in late 2024 to early 2025.

**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**

**Q004 (2024):** In comparison to the previous year, the average gross annual salary increased due to the raising of the minimum wage, and of course the forint exchange rate change.
The above data is based on the labour market data (693,529 HUF/month) published on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/mun/en/mun0001.html) and the average EUR currency rate (395,20 HUF/EUR) published on the website, based on the National Bank of Hungary data (http://mnbkozeparfolyam.hu/arfolyam-2024.html).

**Q004 (2023):** In comparison to the previous year, the average gross annual salary increased due to the raising of the minimum wage, and of course the forint exchange rate change.
The above data is based on the labour market data (614,426 HUF/month) published on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/mun/en/mun0001.html) and the average EUR currency rate (381.95 HUF/EUR) published on the website of the National Bank of Hungary (http://mnbkozeparfolyam.hu/arfolyam-2023.html). The relevant data of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office is currently still in “preliminary” status, therefore it cannot be considered final. It is unknown when the preliminary data will be revised and finalised.

**Q004 (2022):** 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

**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

**Ireland**

**Q004 (2022):** Year 2022 is the latest year for which data are available.

**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/

**Latvia**

**Q004 (General Comment):** After 2012, the minimum monthly salary increased, which had an effect on the average gross annual salary.

**Q004 (2024):** In 2024, the average gross monthly wage in Latvia increased by approximately 9.7% compared to 2023. The main driver of this growth was a significant rise in public sector salaries, particularly in education, where wages rose by over 18%.

**Q004 (2023):** The changes in the average salary in 2023 were influenced by the increase of the national minimum wage, as well as the increase of the maximum non-taxable minimum and the coefficient applied in the calculations of the differentiated non-taxable minimum.

**Q004 (2022):** The average wage in Latvia continues to rise for several years in a row. In 2022, the increase in average wages was influenced by several factors: the lifting of the restrictions of COVID-19, which boosted economic activity, a low unemployment rate, which created the conditions for a small increase in wages.

**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**

**Q004 (General Comment):** According to data from the State Data Agency, wage changes were influenced by the increase in the minimum monthly wage from January 1, 2024, the increase in the minimum salary coefficients for employees of budgetary institutions, changes in the calculation of the non-taxable income amount, and other reasons.

**Q004 (2024):** The State Data Agency of the Republic of Lithuania announces that the changes in wages were caused by an increase in the minimum monthly wage from January 1, 2024, an increase in the minimum wage coefficients for employees of budgetary institutions, changes in the calculation of non-taxable income, and other reasons.

**Q004 (2023):** Increase in earnings was influenced by increased basic wages for politicians, judges, civil servants, public service employees and employees of budgetary institutions, increased minimum monthly wage and other reasons.

**Q004 (2022):** Changes in wages were affected from 2022 January 1 as the minimum monthly salary was increased, the basic 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.
It should be noted that from 2019 January 1 the rates of state social insurance contributions paid by the employer and the employee have been changed. gross wages indexed 1.289 times.

**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).

**Luxembourg**

**Q004 (2024):** Average annual gross earnings by economic activity – Full-time workers (in EUR) NACE Rev.2: Industrie et services (B-S)
https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CConditions%20sociales%23C%23%7CConditions%20de%20vie%23C1%23&fs[1]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C0%7CConditions%20sociales%23C%23&fs[2]=NACE%20Rev.2%2C0%7CActivit%C3%A9s%20financi%C3%A8res%20et%20d%27assurances%20%28K%29%23SL09%23&pg=0&fc=NACE%20Rev.2&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_C1202&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C&dq=L01%2BSL09.A01.A&ly[rw]=NACE_REV2&ly[cl]=TIME_PERIOD&to[TIME_PERIOD]=false (Data provided by STATEC, not yet published as of 31 October 2025 but whose publication is imminent.)

**Q004 (2023):** Average gross annual earnings by economic activity - Full-time workers (in EUR) NACE Rev.2: Industry and services (B-S)
(https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CConditions%20social%23C%23%7CConditions%20de%20vie%23C1%23&fs[1]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C0%7CConditions%20social%23C%23&fs[2]=NACE%20Rev.2%2C0%7CActivit%C3%A9s%20financi%C3%A8res%20et%20d%27assurances%20%28K%29%23SL09%23&pg=0&fc=NACE%20Rev.2 &df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_C1202&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C&dq=L01%2BSL09..A&ly[rw]=NACE_REV2%2CGENDER&ly[cl]=TIME_PERIOD ; consulté le 01.07.2024)

**Q004 (2022):** Average annual gross incomes by economic activity - Full-time workers (in EUR) NACE Rev.2: Industry and services (B-S). https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?pg=0&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_C1202&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2016%2C2022&dq=L01..A&ly[rw]=GENDER&ly[cl]=TIME_PERIOD&lc=en

**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**

**Q004 (2023):** Data provided by the NSO

**Q004 (2022):** This is the data provided and verified with the National Statistics Office

**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**

**Q004 (General Comment):** Average gross annual salary is based on provisional numbers, definitive numbers (usually available in the next year) may differ slightly from those provided here.
Salary is defined as 'reward per working year'. 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). The CBS has somewhat different numbers available than those used by Eurostat, therefore, numbers presented here might differ from those in Eurostat.

**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**

**Q004 (2024):** Data from Central Statistical Office

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

**Q004 (2016):** NA

**Portugal**

**Q004 (2024):** Figures provided by Eurostat

**Q004 (2023):** The increase reflects the inflation
This is the provisional value for year 2022.
Data for 2023 is still not available.

**Q004 (2022):** This value is for year 2021.
Data for 2022 is still not available.

**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**

**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 (2024):** The data is provided by the National Institute of Statistics. The difference can be explained based on salary increases and an upward trend can be observed continuing from 2018.

**Q004 (2022):** The difference can be explained based on salary increases and an upward trend can be observed continuing from 2018.

**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**

**Q004 (2024):** Source: https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/wcm/connect/1e66330c-9270-436f-897d-d5eeb65c0081/Priemerna_mesacna_mzda_zamestnanca_hospodarstva_SR_v_roku_2024.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=pls9P7Q&CVID=pls9P7Q&CVID=pls9P7Q

**Q004 (2023):** High rise in salaries (based on high inflation - similar to the other EU countries) https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/wcm/connect/efd89ec1-751c-4692-8a7d-2ba94b2532f6/Priemerna_mesacna_mzda_zamestnanca_hospodarstva_SR_v_roku_2023.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUj0XlA&CVID=oUiz2Xu

**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 (2024):** Reported according to Eurostat data (in previous years according to Statistical Office of the Republic of 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.

**Spain**

**Q004 (2024):** The gross annual salary of Spanish workers grew by 3,8% in 2024, to 27.558,68 euros, according to the data published by the National Statistics Institute (INE) in the annual labour cost survey.

**Q004 (2023):** The gross annual salary of Spanish workers grew by 4.7% in 2023, to 26.555,89 euros, according to the data published by the National Statistics Institute (INE) in the annual labour cost survey.

**Q004 (2022):** The increase can be explained by increase of minimum legal salary.

## Question 046

**Austria**

**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 as well as in administrative 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:

| | Total | Males | Females |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number of professional judges (1 + 2 + 3) | 1620,65 | - 790,52 | - 830,13 |
| 1. Number of first instance professional judges | 1222,95 | - 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.

**Belgium**

**Q046 (General Comment):** Since 2021, the table also includes data for the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council. Starting from 2024, judges of the Council of State (counselors) are counted in the category “Supreme Court professional judges.” Those of the Aliens Litigation Council are categorized as first instance judges.

**Q046 (2024):** For 2024, the figures for the Council of State are as follows: 38 councilors (including 14 women and 24 men). The judges of the Council of State (counselors) are counted from this cycle onwards in the category “Supreme Court professional judges” as the highest administrative court (Council of State, administrative law litigation section).
https://www.raadvst-consetat.be/?page=index&lang=fr
For 2024, the figures for the Aliens Litigation Council are: 62 judges (including 38 women and 24 men), categorized as judges of first instance.

**Q046 (2022):** Since 2021, the table also includes data for the Council of State and the Alien Litigation Council, counted as first-instance judges. Following a recent expansion of the framework, the number of judges at the Council of State has increased from 44 to 58 (Law of September 6, 2022). However, in 2022 there were only 30 men and 12 women serving as judges at the Council of State (totaling to 42), with some positions still vacant by late 2022. Therefore, only a total of 42 was accounted for in the table. The current established framework is set at 58 Council of State judges. In the Alien Litigation Council, there are 54 judges (including 33 women and 21 men).

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q046 (General Comment):** The number of first instance professional judges encompasses the judges of the first instance courts as follows - 113 district, 28 administrative, 3 military-district;
As well as the courts of second instance to be considered the 28 regional/provincial, 5 appellate and the Military Court of Appeal
Supreme Courts are the Supreme Court of Cassation and the Supreme Administrative Court
It is worth recalling that Regional courts have mixed competences as first and second instance for certain categories of cases, and for the purposes of the questionnaire, in view of the instructions for completing it and given their predominant competences, they are categorized as courts of second instance.

**Q046 (2024):** 1. Number of first instance professional judges- district courts, military courts, administrative courts
2. Number of second instance (court of appeal) professional judges- regional courts, appellate courts, military appellate courts
3. Number of Supreme Court professional judges- Supreme Cassation Court and Supreme Administrative Court
* Regional courts have mixed competences as first and second instance for certain categories of cases, and for the purposes of the questionnaire, in view of the instructions for completing it and given their predominant competences, they are categorized as courts of second instance

**Q046 (2023):** Regional courts have mixed competences as first and second instance for certain categories of cases, as for the purposes of the questionnaire, in view of the instructions for its completion and given their predominant competences, they are categorized as courts of second instance.

**Q046 (2022):** Regional courts have mixed competences as first and second instance for certain categories of cases, as for the purposes of the questionnaire, in view of the instructions for its completion and given their predominant competences, they are categorized as courts of second instance.

**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.

**Croatia**

**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 disciplinary procedure; judges transferred to other State body- for example to Ministry of Justice or Judicial Academy).

**Q046 (2024):** The statistics apply to all judges:
-court presidents, judges, and judges with administrative authority.
Those lower the number are:
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q046 (2023):** The statistics apply to all judges:
-court presidents, judges, and judges with administrative authority.
Those lower the number are:
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q046 (2022):** The data refer to all judges:
court presidents, judges authorized to perform court administration and judges.
The number does not include judges:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**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.

**Cyprus**

**Q046 (General Comment):** on the 1st of July the Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court of Cyprus were re established. An appeal court was also established.

**Q046 (2024):** Supreme Court judges include the Judges of the Supreme court (7 Judges 3 female 4 male) and of the supreme constitutional court (9 judges 5 Female 4 male)
2. Number of second instance (court of appeal) female professional judges in 2024 two positions remained vacant following retirement

**Q046 (2023):** "3. Number of Supreme Court judges": the data include the Supreme Court Judges (7) and the Supreme Constitutional Court Judges (9). On 1st of July 2023, an Appeal Court was established.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**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.

**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.

**Estonia**

**Q046 (2014):** In 2014, one male judge left and a female judge was appointed.

**France**

**Q046 (2024):** Civil and criminal justice (ordre judiciaire):
Source: DSJ
Data extracted from the SIRH LOLFI - number of professional judges within civil and criminal courts as of December 31, 2024. Values are expressed in FTE.
Professional judges (1 + 2 + 3): 6 530 (Total), 1 683 (M), 4 847 (F)
1. First instance professional judges: 4 678 (T), 1 098 (M), 3 580 (F)
2. Second instance professional judges: 1 612 (T), 493 (M), 1 119 (F)
3. Professional judges at the highest level: 240 (T), 92 (M), 148 (F)

For the administrative justice:
Source: Council of State
For the number of first instance professional judges: the data provided concern the administrative courts, the National Court of Asylum and the Commission for Parking Disputes
For the number of professional judges at the Supreme court level: the data provided relate to the litigation section of the Council of State. The data take into account the actual assignment rate within the litigation section of the Council of State. A member of the Council of State may be assigned simultaneously to the litigation section—and thus exercise the functions of a judge—and to an administrative section. For information, the actual number of staff, without taking into account the assignment rate, is as follows: a total of 157, including 64 women and 93 men.
Total number of professional administrative judges (1 + 2 + 3) 1 438 (T) 707 (M) 731 (F)
1. Number of first instance professional judges 1 005 (T) 482 (M) 523 (F)
2. Number of second instance professional judges 308 (T) 151(M) 157(F)
3. Number of professional judges in Supreme courts 125(T) 74(M) 51(F)

**Q046 (2023):** The data submitted for the administrative courts, the National Court of Asylum and the Court for disputes relating to paid parking (1) and the data submitted for the Litigation Division of the Council of State (3) are lower than those submitted for the previous cycle because they take into account the actual rate of assignment to the Litigation Division of the Council of State and not the number of individuals. This is because a member of the Council of State may be assigned simultaneously to the Litigation Division - and thus perform the duties of a judge - and to the Administrative division.
For information, the number of staff without taking into account the rate of assignment is as follows:
Total: 155
Men: 92
Women: 63

**Q046 (2022):** Data include judges from both orders: "ordre judiciaire" and "ordre administratif".

DSJ: Data extracted from the SIRH LOLFI - number of professional judges in service at the headquarters of judicial courts as of 31/12/2022. The values are expressed in Full time equivalent.

**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.

**Germany**

**Q046 (General Comment):** 1. There is a "court-staff statistic" ("Personalbestand") of the federal states 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 statistic" ("Personalverwendung") of the federal states 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 federal states from statistic No 1 (court staff statistic) with the number of judges at the Federal Courts (full-time equivalent as of 31 December). This statistic is not published every year but every two years. It differentiates between the judges of the federal states 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.

**Q046 (2024):** 1. and 2.: Data was taken from the "staff-assignment statistic 2024" of the federal states. 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) in FTE. The staff-assignment statistic does not distinguish between male and female judges. The "court-staff statistic" of the federal states on the other hand distinguishes between "total" and "female" but does not allow for a differentiation between the instances. According to the court-staff statistic as of 31
December 2024 there were 21 953 judges (FTE) in total, among them 11 140 female and 10 813 male.
3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in FTE as of 31 December 2024. The number of judges at the Federal Courts is published every second year (please refer to the general comment).

**Q046 (2023):** 1. and 2.: Data was taken from the "staff-assignment statistic 2023" of the federal states. 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) in FTE. The staff-assignment statistic does not distinguish between male and female judges. The "court-staff statistic" of the federal states on the other hand distinguishes between "total" and "female" but does not allow for a differentiation between the instances. According to the court-staff statistic as of 31 December 2023 there were 21 882 judges (FTE) in total, among them 10 929 female and 10 953 male.
3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in FTE as of 31 December 2022. The number of judges at the Federal Courts is published every second year (please refer to the general comment).

**Q046 (2022):** 1. and 2.: Data was taken from the "staff-assignment statistic" of the federal states. 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 statistic does not distinguish between male and female jugdes. The "court-staff statistic" of the federal states on the other hand distinguishes between "total" and "female" but does not allow for a differentiation between the instances. According to the court-staff statistic as of 31 December 2022 there were 22 027 judges (FTE) in total, among them 10 813 female and 11 214 male.
3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in FTE as of 31 December 2022. The number of judges at the Federal Courts is published every second year (see General Comment).

**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

**Greece**

**Q046 (General Comment):** Starting from 2021, the judges of the Court of Audit are included in the table as third instance judges alongside with judges of the Supreme court (Areios Pagos) and the Council of State.
First instance judges - judges of the 56 first instance courts of general jurisdiction and the 30 administrative courts
Second instance judges - judges of the 19 Courts of appeal and the 9 Administrative courts of appeal

**Q046 (2024):** This increase is due to the implementation of Law 5108/2024 for the unification of the First Instance jurisdiction (Judicial Map). This resulted in an increase in the number of First Instance Court Judges as the former Justices of the Peace were transferred to the Courts of First Instance as Special Term Judges. The latter are professional judges.

**Q046 (2023):** Judges of local courts and district criminal courts are included in the number of first instance judges.

**Q046 (2022):** The answer came after the cooperation of the Directorate for the organization and operation of Justice with Juststat. The discrepancy has been analyzed to last year questionnaire.

**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.

**Hungary**

**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 concerns the Regional Courts, the distribution of first and second instance cases is based on the bylaws which are renewed every year by the president of each court after consultation with the judicial council and the professional department 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.

**Ireland**

**Q046 (2024):** The judicial numbers provided in the above table are as on 31 December 2024. There were three judicial vacancies on 31 December 2024, namely, one vacancy in the Supreme Court, one vacancy in the High Court, and one vacancy in the District Court. The High and District Courts are both first instance courts.

**Q046 (2023):** On 31 December 2023, there were 198 judicial posts, with two judicial vacancies, namely, one vacancy in the Supreme Court and one vacancy in the Circuit Court (a first instance court). Court Presidents work as judges and these numbers include Court Presidents of first instance, second instance and Supreme Court.

**Q046 (2022):** As of 31 December 2022, the number of male judges in the Court of Appeal had dropped from 8 to 6 in comparison to 2020 due to the elevation of two male judges from the Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court and the subsequent new appointment of two new Court of Appeal judges one of whom was male and the other female (-1 male judge of the Court of Appeal).

**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.

**Italy**

**Q046 (General Comment):** Judges serving in specialized first-instance courts, such as regional audit commissions, local tax commissions, and military courts, which operate independently and are financially autonomous from the Ministry of Justice, are not included in the scope of question 46.

**Q046 (2024):** as of 30/06/2024

**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.

**Latvia**

**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.

**Lithuania**

**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 (2022):** In 2022 the corps of judges was supplemented by 30 judges, which is significantly more than in 2021 and slightly more than in 2020 (12 in 2021, 26 in 2020).
In 2022 27 persons were appointed as district court judges.

**Q046 (2017):** Please see general comments.

**Luxembourg**

**Q046 (General Comment):** Section 1: Number of professional judges at first instance includes district court judges, justices of the peace and administrative court judges.
Section 2: Number of professional judges in courts of appeal (2nd instance) includes the court of appeal of the superior court of justice and the administrative court.
section 3: Number of professional judges in the supreme courts includes only the 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.

**Malta**

**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. The number of 1st Instance 'judges' also includes magistrates that preside over 1st Instance Courts.

**Q046 (2023):** Over 2023, the judicial complement was increased by 4 new members that have been appointed to the bench.

**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).

**Netherlands**

**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. Numbers for first and second instance are on posts filled, not fte. We cannot provide more detailed information. For the Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.

**Q046 (2024):** Total fte for first and second instance is 2 505. For the Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.

**Q046 (2023):** Total fte for first and second instance is 2 477. For the Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.

**Q046 (2022):** Numbers for first and second instance are on posts filled, not fte. Total fte for first and second instance together is 2 451. We cannot provide more detailed information. For the Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.

**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.

**Poland**

**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) adjud

ication 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.
Court assesors:
A person may be appointed to the position of assessor if he or she fulfils the conditions laid down in Article 61 § 1 points 1-4 of the Act on the Common Courts System and, moreover, has completed training at the National School of the Judiciary and Public Prosecution and passed a judge's or prosecutor's exam. Court assessors are appointed by the President of the Republic of Poland for an indefinite period of time, at the request of the National Council of the Judiciary. In the exercise of his or her office, a judicial assessor is independent and subject only to the Constitution and the laws. Assessors who are entrusted with the duties of a judge perform adjudicatory functions in district courts alongside judges. However, they may not: apply pre-trial detention to a detainee handed over to the court's disposal with a request for pre-trial detention, hear complaints against decisions on refusal to initiate an investigation or enquiry, against decisions on discontinuance of an investigation or enquiry, or against decisions on discontinuance of an enquiry and entry of a case in the register of offences, and adjudicate family and guardianship law cases. After 36 months, an assessor can be appointed as a judge by the President of the Republic.
Not all professional judges are assessors first. Those who, prior to their appointment, may also apply for the position of judge:
1) occupied the position of a judge of an administrative court or military court;
2) held the position of a prosecutor;
3) worked at a Polish higher education institution, the Polish Academy of Sciences, a research institute or other scientific institution and has the academic title of professor or the academic degree of doctor habilitowany in legal sciences;
4) Has practised as an advocate, legal adviser or notary public for at least three years;
5) has held the position of president, vice-president or counsel of the General Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Poland - for at least three years.
The position of an assessor is not then required. In 2021 and 2022, Question 46 always included the number of district court judges, circuit court judges and assessors adjudicating at first instance.

**Q046 (2023):** Common courts:
1. The number of judges of district, regional courts + court assessors: 9444 (5963 women, 3481 men)
2. The number of judges of the appeal courts: 484 ( 240 women, 244 men)
Administrative Courts - first instance= Voivodship Administrative Courts - 422 judges (226 women, 196 men); Supreme Administrative Court 108 judges ( 37 women, 71 men) Supreme court – 95 judges ( 22 women, 73 men)

**Q046 (2022):** Common courts:
1. The number of judges of district, regional courts + court assessors: 9403 (5904 women, 3499 men)
2. The number of judges of the appeal courts: 469 ( 238 women, 231 men)
The numbers are higher because the president appointed a lot of court assessors as judges in 2022. In addition, there were more appointments to the regional and appeal courts than retirements of judges from these courts.
Administrative courts:
1. The number of judges of district + court assessors: 491 ( 275 women, 216 men)
2. The number of judges of the Supreme Administrative Court : 107 ( 37 women, 70 men)

**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 men, 40 woman).
The number of judges of the supreme court: 97 (75 men, 22 woman).
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)

**Portugal**

**Q046 (General Comment):** The total includes judges from courts of 1st, 2nd and 3rd instances, except the Constitutional Court.

**Q046 (2024):** The information provided above is taken from official statistics from the Ministry of Justice. The data includes all judicial magistrates, even those who are absent for a short period (due to illness or accident, labour dispute, holidays or other forms of leave, voluntary absence or temporary impediment due to causes such as unfavourable weather conditions or technical incidents). Judicial magistrates on indefinite leave (prolonged illnesses, unpaid leave, temporary or indefinite suspension for non-disciplinary reasons) are excluded.

**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.

**Romania**

**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 „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 (2024):** There were more competitions for first instance courts. The gender balance changed as a result of these competitions.

**Q046 (2023):** There were some fluctuations due to a number of retirements and new contests for occupying the vacant positions.

**Q046 (2022):** Only judges of the „judecatorii" are counted as first instance judges.

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q046 (General Comment):** Supreme Administrative Court is calculated together with Supreme Court.

**Q046 (2024):** Supreme Court: 58 - 27 - 31
Suprem Administrative Court: 23 - 12 - 11

**Q046 (2023):** 3. Number of Supreme Court professional judges: Supreme Administrative Court: 25 - 12 - 13
Supreme Court: 54 - 24 - 30

**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.

**Slovenia**

**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. seconded to the Judicial council, Ministry of Justice, Supreme court) and are not included in the reported numbers. The information on actual presence (excluding e.g. seconded judges, the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave) is also available.
Judges at the Administrative Court (first instance court, see Q44) and higher judges at local and district courts (first instance courts) are reported as according to their courts (first-instance judges) and not according to their rank (higher-court judges).

**Q046 (2024):** At the end of 2024, 853 judicial posts were formally occupied, although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 839 professional judges (FTE) sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (14 judges - difference to the total of 853 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. seconded 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 2024 was 772,25 according to actual presence calculations.

**Q046 (2023):** At the end of 2023, 861 judicial posts were formally occupied, although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 845 professional judges (FTE) sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (16 judges - difference to the total of 861 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 2023 was 79,09 according to actual presence calculations.

**Q046 (2022):** At the end of 2022, 878 judicial posts were formally occupied, although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 862 professional judges (FTE) sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (16 judges - difference to the total of 878 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 2022 was 767,15 according to actual presence calculations.
Discrepancies (compared to 2020 data): 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 2021 they are reported according to their court (first-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

### Question 046-2

**Austria**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** The decrease in the number of judges at the second instance is attributed to corrections made after discovering that some numbers were counted twice in previous evaluation cycles.

**Belgium**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** It should be noted that the Council of State (composed of 38 councilors in 2024) also rules in the last instance. It was decided under Q 46 and Q 46-2 to consider the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) as a court of last instance (starting from 2024), and to count only judges of the Aliens Litigation Council (62 judges) as first instance administrative judges. The first column of the table ('total') includes civil and criminal judges as well as 99 administrative judges.

**Q046-2 (2022):** It is to be noted that the Council of State (comprising 42 judges in 2022, and whose framework was extended to 58 by a law in September 2022) also adjudicates as a court of last instance. It has been decided under Q46 and Q46-2 to consider the Council of State as a court of first instance. The Alien Litigation Council counts 54 judges considered as administrative judges of first instance.

**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.

**Bulgaria**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** Category "other": military judges

**Q046-2 (2024):** The total number of 1297 judges of first instance includes 1002 district judges for whom no specialization information is available, and military judges are listed in the "Other" column.
The total number of 786 judges of the second instance includes 68 junior judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and the judges of the Military Court of Appeal are listed in the "Other" column.
Regarding the Supreme Court of Cassation, the total number of 197 judges also includes the president of the court, for whom no information is available regarding specialization.

**Q046-2 (2023):** The total number of 1,282 judges of first instance includes 965 district judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and military judges are listed in the "Other" column.
The total number of 780 judges of the second instance includes 46 junior judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and the judges of the Military Court of Appeal are listed in the "Other" column.
Regarding the Supreme Court of Cassation, the total number of 172 judges also includes the president of the court, for whom no information is available regarding specialization.

**Q046-2 (2022):** The total number of 1230 first-instance judges includes 922 district judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and military judges are listed in the "Other" column.
The total number of 778 judges of the second instance includes 37 junior judges for whom no information regarding specialization is available, and the judges of the Military Court of Appeal are listed in the "Other" column.
Regarding the Supreme Court of Cassation, the total number of 180 judges also includes the president of the court, for whom no information is available regarding specialization.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** The difficulty to provide the data lays in mixed specialization of judges in courts, so exact data cannot be extracted.

**Cyprus**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** on July 2023 as part of the judicial reform a Second instance appeal court was established. The Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court were also re established.
District judges deal with both criminal and civil cases. However they are assigned either civil or criminal jurisdiction for a specified period of time. The Appeal court is divided into chambers each one dealing with specific matters.

**Q046-2 (2024):** Supreme court Judges deal both with civil and commercial cases as well as with criminal cases
The number of the judges of the Court of appeal is 16. In 2024 two positions remained vacant following retirement of the judges.

**Q046-2 (2023):** on July 2023 as part of the judicial reform a Second instance appeal court was established. The Supreme Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court were also re established. The Supreme court deals with Civil and Criminal cases. The Supreme Constitutional Court deals with constitutional cases and Administrative Case at a last instance.
The category "Other" refers to the military court.
District judges deal with both criminal and civil cases. However they are assigned either civil or criminal jurisdiction for a specified period of time. For 2023 the number listed above was the number of first instance district judges that deal solely for 2023 with criminal or civil cases accordingly.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**Q046-2 (2024):** Other: insolvency cases and guardianship proceedings
No special reason, the total number of judges remains stable.
It is consistent with the two cycles ago cycle, whenit was also presented NAP. It is more logical as there are judges of regional courts deciding administrative matters as first-instance judges.

**Q046-2 (2023):** We know the number of first instance and highest instance judges, so 123 is the difference - the number of judges in administrative cases.

**Q046-2 (2022):** The category civil/commercial includes all proceedings except criminal and administrative.

**Q046-2 (2021):** Insolvency proceedings and Guardianship proceedings

**Q046-2 (2020):** Insolvency Proceedings

**Denmark**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** We cannot answer this question by case type as all judges make decisions in all types of cases in Denmark = NAP.

**Q046-2 (2024):** Judges in Denmark deal with all types of cases, including both civil, commercial and criminal cases.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Judges in Denmark deal with all types of cases, including both civil, commercial and criminal cases.

**Estonia**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** Judges of 1st and 2nd instance are not olbliged to only be civil or criminal judges. It can change depending on the workload and wishes of the judge.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Since 2023 the first instance courts have criminal and civil divsions. If there's a need a criminal judge can still deal with civil cases and vice versa.

**Q046-2 (2022):** Judges of 1st and 2nd instance are not olbliged to only be civil or criminal judges. It can change depending on the workload and wishes of the judge. The number of civil judges within the courts has been increased in 2022 at the expense of administrative judges.

**Q046-2 (2020):** In the first instance we don't have judges formally seperated as criminal or civil judges.

**Finland**

**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 23 judges who are civil/commercial judges.

**France**

**Q046-2 (2022):** The increase in the number of judges at the Council of State between 2021 and 2022 is attributed to returns from mobility.

**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. "

**Germany**

**Q046-2 (2024):** First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistic 2024" of the federal states. 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) in FTE.
"Supreme Court": the figures are taken from the "court-staff statistic" 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 Constitutional Court, Military Disciplinary Courts) as of 31. December 2024. It shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (154) 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 112 judges (headcount) assigned to the civil panels and 45 to the criminal panels.

**Q046-2 (2023):** "Other" includes judges handling family cases and labour law cases.
"First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistic 2023" of the federal states. 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) in FTE.
"Supreme Court": the figures are taken from the "court-staff statistic" 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 Constitutional Court, Military Disciplinary Courts) as of 31. December 2022. It shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (154) 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.

**Q046-2 (2022):** "Other" includes judges handling familiy cases and labour law cases. In previous cycles, this category also included judges handling cases at the financial and social courts. In accordance with the classification of cases used for question 91, these judges are now allocated to the category "administrative".
"First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistic" of the federal states. 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 statistic" 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 2022. It shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (154) 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.

**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.

**Greece**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** Starting from 2024, judges of the Court of Audit, a specialised administrative court having the statute of a Supreme court, are categorised as third instance administrative judges.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Same judges ( 2713)intervene in both civil and criminal matters in the Greek judicial system.

**Q046-2 (2022):** 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.For the Council of State( Supreme Administrative Court) in administrative cases the judges are 166.

**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

**Hungary**

**Q046-2 (2024):** labour

**Ireland**

**Q046-2 (2024):** The judicial numbers provided in the above table are as on 31 December 2024. There were three judicial vacancies on 31 December 2024, namely, one vacancy in the Supreme Court, one vacancy in the High Court, and one vacancy in the District Court. The High and District Courts are both first instance courts.
In all courts, (First Instance, Second Instance and Supreme Court) judges are empowered to deal with all case types within their court jurisdiction. While in some courts, most notably the High Court and the Circuit Court, judges may be assigned to specific cases for a period, nonetheless, all judges can deal with all types of cases within their jurisdiction.

**Q046-2 (2023):** In all courts, (First Instance, Second Instance and Supreme Court) judges are empowered to deal with all case types within their court jurisdiction. While in some courts, most notably the High Court and the Circuit Court, judges may be assigned to specific cases for a period, nonetheless, all judges can deal with all types of cases within their jurisdiction

**Q046-2 (2022):** In all courts, (First Instance, Second Instance and Supreme Court) judges are empowered to deal with all case types within their court jurisdiction. While in some courts, most notably the High Court and the Circuit Court, judges may be assigned to specific cases for a period, nonetheless, all judges can deal with all types of cases within their jurisdiction.

**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

**Italy**

**Q046-2 (2024):** Others are judges who perform organizational functions.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Judges who do not specifically deal with any of these types of cases, and judges with coordination and management duties.

**Q046-2 (2022):** Judges who do not specifically deal with any of these types of cases, and judges with coordination and management duties.

**Latvia**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** The courts of first instance of general jurisdiction do not explicitly distinguish between the specialization of judges on the basis of the main types of cases, therefore there is not possible to distinguish number of judges by case type (civil and/or commercial cases and criminal cases). Although there is a separate group of judges in the district (city) courts, which primarily hear cases of certain categories.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Comment on Supreme Court total number of judges. The difference between Q46 and Q46-2 is becauce the chief justice is not included in any of court departments.

**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.

**Lithuania**

**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q046-2 (2023):** The 6 judges of the Supreme Court, i.e. the Court of Cassation, deal with criminal, civil and commercial cases.

**Q046-2 (2022):** The 5 justices of the Supreme Court, namely the Court of Cassation, deal with criminal, civil and commercial matters.

**Malta**

**Q046-2 (2022):** 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 (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).

**Netherlands**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** Numbers for first and second instance are on posts filled, not fte. For the Dutch Supreme Court, fte and posts filled are the same.
Note that the 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.
Judges in first and second instance 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.

**Q046-2 (2024):** Total fte for first and second instance is 2 706.

**Q046-2 (2023):** Total fte for first and second instance is 2 477.

**Q046-2 (2022):** Numbers are on posts filled, not fte. Fte for first and second instance is 2 451.

**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).

**Poland**

**Q046-2 (2023):** In case of the Supreme Court “Other” refers to”
-16 judges sitting in the Labour and Social Security Law Chamber dealing with the labour law and social security law cases;
-18 judges sitting in the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber dealing, inter alia, with the extraordinary appeals in the civil and criminal law cases, the safeguard of the fundamental rights and freedoms, competition and consumer protection cases, some registration cases as well as election protests and protests concerning the validity of a national referendum, cases concerning the regulation of energy, telecommunications and postal services, rail transport, as well as the regulation of the water and sewage market or complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings. From the whole number of 90 Supreme Court Judges, 11 Supreme Court Judges are randomly chosen to adjudicate in the Professional Liability Chamber.

**Q046-2 (2022):** In case of the Supreme Court “Other” refers to”
-17 judges sitting in the Labour and Social Security Law Chamber dealing with the labour law and social security law cases;
-17 judges sitting in the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber dealing, inter alia, with the extraordinary appeals in the civil and criminal law cases, the safeguard of the fundamental rights and freedoms, competition and consumer protection cases, some registration cases as well as election protests and protests concerning the validity of a national referendum, cases concerning the regulation of energy, telecommunications and postal services, rail transport, as well as the regulation of the water and sewage market or complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings. From the whole number of 90 Supreme Court Judges, 11 Supreme Court Judges are randomly chosen to adjudicate in the Professional Liability Chamber.

**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.

**Portugal**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** As there are judges who have civil and criminal competences at the same time, it is not possible to discriminate judges by civil and commercial matters. Therefore, the judges of the judicial courts were all included in the column “other”. It is also not possible to distinguish by court, which ones are responsible for civil/commercial or criminal proceedings, because of the existence of courts of general and mixed jurisdiction.

**Q046-2 (2024):** see general comment

**Q046-2 (2023):** See general comment.

**Q046-2 (2022):** As there are judges who have civil and criminal competences at the same time, it is not possible to discriminate judges by civil and commercial matters. Therefore, the judges of the judicial courts were all included in the column “other”.

**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”.

**Romania**

**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 (2023):** The statistical system does not collect information regarding a breakdown in the number of judges based on the different legal matters.

**Q046-2 (2022):** 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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q046-2 (2024):** Supreme Court: 58-41-17-NAP-NAP
Supreme Administrative Court: 23-NAP-NAP-23-NAP

**Q046-2 (2023):** family, enforcement and reminder departments, visiting judges, judges in evaluation committees, court presidents

**Q046-2 (2022):** For example hosting judges - can not be involved in one case type, presidents of the courts.
The distribution of administrative judges per instance is made based on the instance level of the court where they work and not based on the instance of the cases for which they are responsible.
When comparing the data presented in the table right above with the question Q046, a discrepancy of 11 judges in the overall count comes to light. It is imperative to clarify that Slovak Republic used a different methodology for these two questions. Here in the question Q046-2, it involved calculating an annual average for the number of judges per matter, instead of the critical moment of 31st of December as for Q046-2.

**Q046-2 (2021):** The Supreme Administrative Court had 21 administrative judges in 2021, included in Second instance.

**Slovenia**

**Q046-2 (General Comment):** Since 2021, data on judges classified by legal fields is collected by approximating the time an individual judge is working on a certain type of cases. The data is collected only as actual presence (not occupied posts/FTE).
The category “Other” corresponds to “Other cases” at Q91: 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.
The category "Other" does not include judges involved in the court management as they are partially or entirely relieved from adjudicating cases.

**Q046-2 (2024):** The data does not include judges involved in the court management (additional 44 judges).
The data for 2024 is reported as FTE to be compatible with CEPEJ specification. The data is actually collected as actual presence and is converted to FTE according to general ratio of actual presence/occupied posts in judiciary.
The data is only approximate - please see general comment.

**Q046-2 (2023):** The data does not include judges involved in the court management (additional 42 judges).
The data for 2023 is reported as FTE (previous years: actual presence) to be compatible with CEPEJ specification. The data is actually collected as actual presence and is converted to FTE according to general ratio of actual presence/occupied posts in judiciary.
The data is only approximate - please see general comment.

**Q046-2 (2022):** The data is only approximate - please see general comment. The data is reported as actual presence (not FTE) and therefore not compatible with Q46. As already mentioned in the frame of Q46, the number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2022 was 767,15 according to actual presence calculations.
The category "Other" does not include judges involved in the court management (additional 39 judges).

**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: /

## Question 052

**Austria**

**Q052 (General Comment):** 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”. Moreover, starting from 2021, “technical staff” also includes staff working at the courts‘ IT departments. “Other staff” only includes trainees (including trainees for Rechtspfleger) and staff representation. The trainees concerned are nearly all trained for the handling of case files. A small number of trainees is trained for IT-support. Generally speaking, in the last years, efforts were made to enhance the methodology of presentation of data for Q52 and ensure better compliance with the CEPEJ categorization.

**Q052 (2024):** 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions) - Since last year, case managers are counted within this category by the competent department.

**Q052 (2023):** 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions) - The number is higher now because now case managers are counted within this category by the competent department (since this year). Until now they were hard to count, but now it is possible.
5. Other non-judge staff - The number of Rechtspfleger-candidates has increased significantly compared to the year before and a huge part of them is female.

**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 appeal 798,11 - 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 staff 21,70 - 9,85 - 11,85
5. Other non-judge staff 3456,13 - 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).

**Belgium**

**Q052 (2022):** The variation in comparison to the 2020 data for points 2 and 3 stems from the fact that legal assistants supporting judges were previously categorized under point 3 (with administrative staff) rather than point 2.

**Q052 (2019):** "Technical personnel": the slight increase observed between 2018 and 2019 results from investments in personnel.

**Bulgaria**

**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. The Judges’ College of the Supreme Judicial Council does not maintain data on the gender distribution of the court clerks (non-judge staff) in the courts, since each court of the respective level (a total of 180 courts) is an independent legal entity and their employer is the president of the respective court.

**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.

**Croatia**

**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 (2024):** The figures include civil servants and personnel who have been employed for an undetermined period of time.
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q052 (2023):** The figures include civil servants and personnel who have been employed for an undetermined period of time.
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q052 (2022):** The data refer to civil servants and employees employed for an indefinite period.
The number does not include those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**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.

**Cyprus**

**Q052 (General Comment):** The total number of non-judge staff includes clerical staff and also court bailiffs.

**Q052 (2024):** non judge staff include court bailiffs

**Q052 (2023):** The observed variation in the number of "4. technical staff" is due to the establishment of the Appeal court in 2023 and the employment of new staff.
The category "5. Other" includes court bailiffs.

**Q052 (2022):** court bailiffs
Increase in the needs of the court led to appointment of more employees.

**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.

**Czech Republic**

**Q052 (General Comment):** The category “other” encompasses judicial trainees or staff in charge of court documentation, as well as press center and telephone exchange staff.
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.
Starting from 2022 the title of “judicial trainee” has been replaced with “judicial candidate”.

**Q052 (2024):** 5. Other non-judge staff: No special reason for this no significant discrepancy.

**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.

**Denmark**

**Q052 (2024):** See general comments. In addition, the Danish Courts Authority has the following comments:
Ad 2) The group includes all office employees at the courts, including employees who perform administrative tasks. It will not be possible automatically to separate the two groups without a manual count, because employees at the courts often have the same job title.
Ad 3) The group includes only heads of administration. See ad 2).
Ad 5) The group includes students.
Deviations from previous years' information on the number of full-time equivalents etc., are primarily due to changes in the calculation method. Corresponding figures for 2022 and 2023 are provided below. It should be noted that information on gender distribution is still not available for 2022 and 2023.
2022:
Total non-judge staff working in courts□1.669. 1. Rechtspleger: 305. 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff: 1.196. 3. Staff in charge of adm. mv.: 30. 4. Technical staff: 108. 5. Others (students): 30. 2023:
Total non-judge staff working in courts: 1.668. 1. Rechtspleger: 304. 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff: 1.194. 3. Staff in charge of adm. mv.: 29. 4. Technical staff: 107. 5. Others (students): 33.
The increase in the number of full-time equivalents from 2023 to 2024 is due to the courts' finance agreement, which contains increased funds for the courts to reduce case processing times and case backlogs.

**Q052 (2023):** The category "Other non-judge staff" covers kitchen assistants.

**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.

**Estonia**

**Q052 (2023):** No comment provided.

**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.

**Finland**

**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.
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 appoin

t 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 (2024):** The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1595, summoners 284, trainee district judges 145 and referendaries 254

**Q052 (2023):** The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1537, summoners 273, trainee district judges 133 and referendaries 256.

**Q052 (2022):** The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1521, summoners 274, trainee district judges 135 and referendaries 264.

**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.

**France**

**Q052 (2024):** Court staff in civil and criminal matters (“ordre judiciaire”)
Source: DSJ
Total number of non-judge staff working in courts (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5) 23 663 (T) 4 498 (M) 19 165 (F)
2. Non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges such as registrars 17 999 (T) 2 567 (M) 15 432 (F)
3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts 3 723 (T) 1 016 (M) 2 708 (F)
4. Technical staff 801 (T) 698 (M) 103 (F)
5. Other non-judge staff 1 140 (T) 217 (M) 923 (F)

“Other non-judge staff” refers to assistant lawyers who became judicial assistants on November 1, 2024, and specialised assistants who do not work for the public prosecutor's office. Category A, B, and C contractual staff recruited under the local justice support plan implemented since the second half of 2020 on the sole basis of Article 7 bis of law No. 84-16 of January 11, 1984, on statutory provisions relating to the civil service, created by the civil service transformation law of August 6, 2019, establishing the project contract, have also been included in the category of “Non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges such as registrars”. These contractual staff are recruited for three years. The total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1+2+3+4+5) will increase by 405 actual staff between December 31, 2023, and December 31, 2024. This overall upward trend is composed of several contrasting dynamics within the different populations concerned.

The number of non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges such as registrars (2), will decrease by 126 between 2023 and 2024. This decrease is mainly attributable to the fall in the number of local justice contractual staff in all categories and administrative assistants, a number of whose jobs have nevertheless been converted into administrative secretary positions. The number of staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) (excluding local justice contractual staff) will incre

ase by 393 actual staff between 2023 and 2024. This significant increase reflects, in particular, the continued strengthening of regional administrative services that has been underway for several years (+205 actual staff between 2023 and 2024), which has led to the creation of administrative secretary jobs (+79 actual staff).

Finally, the number of assistant lawyers/legal assistants and specialised assistants, who make up the category “other non-judge staff” (5), will increase by 138 between 2023 and 2024. As of December 31, 2024, 1 501 category A and B staff (including 1 233 women) were undergoing initial training at the National School of Court Clerks, most of whom were on practical placements in the courts. These staff members will join the courts in 2025 or 2026, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative services.

For administrative courts’ staff:
Total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5) 2 798 (T) 818 (M) 1 980 (F)
2. Non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars 1 979 (T) 499 (M) 1 480 (F)
3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts 537 (T) 176 (M) 361 (F)
4. Technical staff 113(T) 80 (M) 34(F)
5. Other non-judge staff 170 (T) 64 (M) 105(F) legal assistants and assistant lawyers

The technical staff listed corresponds to employees hired and paid by the administrative courts, and does not include individuals working under service contracts, which are managed locally by each court and paid for out of their operating budgets, for which we have no visibility.
Compared to last year, it was deemed appropriate to transfer certain staff (notably court clerks at the National Court of Asylum) from category 3 to category 2. In addition, staff assigned to the administrative secretariats of the Council of State are no longer counted in category 3.
The overall number of staff has increased, in particular due to the transfer of administrative staff from the paid parking litigation commission to the Council of State.

**Q052 (2023):** “Other non-judge staff” include legal assistants and specialist assistants who do not work for the public prosecutor's office. The category “2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars” includes also A, B and C category contract staff recruited under the local justice support plan implemented from the second half of 2020 on the sole basis of article 7 bis of law no. 84-16 of 11 January 1984 on statutory provisions relating to the State civil service, created by the civil service transformation law of 6 August 2019 instituting the project contract. These contract staff are recruited for 3 years. The total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1+2+3+4+5) increased by 564 actual staff between 31.12.2022 and 31.12.2023. This overall upward trend is made up of several contrasting dynamics within the different populations concerned.
For example, the number of “2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars” decreased by 451 actual staff numbers between 2022 and 2023. This reduction is mainly attributable to the fall in the number of local justice contract staff in all categories (-268 actual staff numbers) and administrative assistants (-192 actual staff numbers), a number of whose posts have nevertheless been converted into administrative secretary posts. The “3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts” (excluding local justice contract staff) increased by 710 actual staff numbers between 2022 and 2023. This significant increase reflects the continued strengthening of regional administrative services, which has been underway for several years (+233 actual staffing levels between 2022 and 2023), which has led to the creation of contract B local IT technicians (contract B TIP, +126 actual staffing levels), administrative secretaries (+42 actual staffing levels) and psychologists (+18 actual staffing levels).
Similarly, the number of non-judg

e administrative staff in the courts has increased significantly (in particular +156 administrative secretarial posts between 2022 and 2023). Finally, the legal assistants and specialist assistants making up the other non-judge staff category increased by 301 real numbers between 2022 and 2023. As at 31/12/2023, 1 580 category A and B staff (including 1 291 women) were undergoing initial training at the National School for Court Registrars, most of them on practical training in the courts. These staff will join the courts in 2024 or 2025, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative departments.
With regard to the administrative courts, the technical staff listed correspond to the staff employed and paid by the administrative court and not the people working under service contracts, managed locally by each court and paid for out of the latter's operating appropriations, for which we have no visibility.

**Q052 (2022):** The "other non-judge staff" correspond to legal assistants and specialised assistants who do not work for the prosecution services, while for the other subcategories it is not possible to distinguish between staff working for the courts and those working for the public prosecution services.

The category "non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars" includes the category B contractual staff created by the law on the transformation of the civil service of 6 August 2019, which institutes the project contract. They have been recruited under the support plan for justice implemented since the second half of 2020, for 3 years term of office. The significant increase in the number of these contractual staff, combined with the increase in the number of court clerks and the increase in the number of other non-judge staff, contributes to the increase in the overall figures communicated for the year 2022.

As at 31/12/2022, 1 549 category A and B staff (including 1 066 women) were undergoing initial training at the École nationale des greffes, most of them within the courts (practical training). These staff will join the courts in 2023 or 2024, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative departments (RAD).

With regard to "staff in charge of administrative tasks", the increase observed is linked to the implementation of a proactive policy to reinforce the SARs and the secretariats of the court presidents (increase in the number of directors of registry services in the SARs, increase in the number of administrative secretaries, etc.).

**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.

**Germany**

**Q052 (General Comment):** Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistic" of the federal states 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 statistic do not distinguish between male and female staff.

**Q052 (2024):** "Other non-judge staff" represents:
- staff on the basic level career track as far as not allocated to categories 1 - 4 (including motor-pool staff, staff at court cashiers' offices, internal mail and file delivery service, maintenance etc.)
- staff in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities and as gender equality commissioners

**Q052 (2023):** "Other non-judge staff" represents:
- staff on the basic level career track as far as not allocated to categories 1 - 4 (including motor-pool staff, staff at court cashiers' offices, internal mail and file delivery service, maintenance etc.)
- staff in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities and as gender equality commissioners

**Q052 (2022):** "Other non-judge staff" represents:
- staff on the basic level career track as far as not allocated to categories 1 - 4 (including motorpool staff, staff at court cashiers' offices, internal mail and file delivery service, maintenance etc.)
- staff in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities and as gender equality commissioners
Discrepancies of technical staff and other non-judge staff:
The categorisation of staff allocated to "other non-judge staff" was revised and corrected in comparison to previous cycles. Staff on unpaid leave for training purposes was removed. Reception and security services were formerly allocated to "other staff". In alignment with the Explanatory Note, reception and security services are now allocated to the category "technical staff". Other potentially "technical" staff such as motorpool or maintenance staff are not recorded seperatly in the "staff-assignment statistic" but only together with other lines of work as "staff at basic level career track together".

**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.

**Greece**

**Q052 (2024):** "Other": two drivers at the Council of State.

**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.

**Hungary**

**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 (2024):** According to Act LXVII of 1997 on Judicial Employees, the categories listed under points d) to f) – namely officers, clerks, and manual workers – fall within this category.

**Q052 (2022):** 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".

**Ireland**

**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 (2024):** Unlike previous campaigns, Tipstaff are now being included under category 2 (Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges). Other non-judge staff includes:
•Service Officers
•Court Messenger

**Q052 (2023):** Other non-judge staff includes Service Officers, Tipstaff, Court Messengers 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions) includes staff in Court offices, court going staff including Judicial Assistants and staff in Court Operational Directorates.
ICT staff for this cycle and for the 2022 cycle are included in 4. Technical Staff.

**Q052 (2022):** 2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions): In 2020 the following were counted: staff in Court offices, court going staff including Judicial Assistants and Tipstaff - District, Circuit & High Court including Judicial Assistant and Tipstaff, Court of Appeal including Judicial Assistant, Supreme Court Judicial Assist and Tipstaff. In 2022, Court Operational Directorates/Regional/Judicial Assistants staff are included in this figure. It also includeds Tipstaff/Service Officers and Court Messengers.
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): for 2020 ICT Staff were including in this figure. In 2022 ICT Staff are not included in this figure.
4. Technical staff: for 2022, ICT Staff and Cleaning Staff are included in this figure.

**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).

**Italy**

**Q052 (General Comment):** Drivers and receptionists are included in the category "Staff in charge of different administrative task" . 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 (2023):** Within the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR), the Ministry of Justice has carried out an extraordinary recruitment process to strengthen the so-called "Trial Office". This is an organisational tool consisting in the creation or the reinforcement of support teams for judges, with fixed-term employment and with the aim of reducing the backlog and the disposition time. This measure also improved the quality of justice by supporting judges in their normal activities of study, legal research, drafting documents, organising documents and thus allowing judges to concentrate on more complex tasks.

**Q052 (2022):** Within the framework of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR), the Ministry of Justice has carried out an extraordinary recruitment process to strengthen the so-called "Trial Office". This is an organisational tool consisting in the creation or the reinforcement of support teams for judges, with fixed-term employment and with the aim of reducing the backlog and the disposition time. This measure also improved the quality of justice by supporting judges in their normal activities of study, legal research, drafting documents, organising documents and thus allowing judges to concentrate on more complex tasks.

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q052 (General Comment):** The work of the Judicial Council is ensured by the secretariat of the Judicial Council which is a division of the Supreme Court. This means that the activities of the Council for the Judiciary are provided from the resources of the Budget of the Supreme Court.

**Q052 (2024):** Other - Supreme Court: Division of case-law and research, Division of provision regime of secrecy, Staff of secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary.

**Q052 (2023):** Other - Supreme Court: Division of case-law and research, Division of provision regime of secrecy, Staff of secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary.
The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.

**Q052 (2022):** Other non-judge staff - Supreme court: division of case-law and research, division of provision regime of secrecy, staff of secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary.
The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.

**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.

**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 (2024):** Not applicable. There's no such staff or similar bodies.

**Q052 (2023):** Other staff – translators and psychologists

**Q052 (2022):** Other staff – translators and psychologists.

**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q052 (2024):** The category 'Other non-judge staff' includes judicial clerks. Established by the law of 23 December 2022, the position of judicial clerk has been increasingly used within the judicial and administrative courts to help reduce the workload of judges. The observed increase of over 150% is explained by intensified recruitment of clerks in 2024.

**Q052 (2023):** Other non-judge staff consists of legal secretaries and a data protection compliance officer from the administrative courts.

**Q052 (2022):** In the realm of non-judicial personnel, there are referendaries and a data protection compliance officer within the administrative jurisdictions.

The increase in "other non-judge staff" was elucidated during the 2021 Scoreboard cycle and remains applicable: seen relatively, the number of other non-judge staff has risen by 175% between 2020 and 2022. In absolute terms, this equates to an increase of seven individuals since 2020, encompassing seven positions for referendaries. Both judicial and administrative jurisdictions are increasingly turning to referendaries to relieve magistrates of certain tasks.

**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).

**Malta**

**Q052 (2023):** The distribution of gender by category listed above is a reflection of the changes resulting from the recruitment process. The Court Services Agency is an impartial employer and is constantly seeking to recruit additional staff to support the increasing number of the judiciary, and functions/ operations in court. Fluctuations in the gender ratio are purely incidental.

**Q052 (2022):** The increase in the number of non-judge staff when compared to the previous evaluation results from an increase in the staff making up the judicial teams of new judges. In addition, there has also been an increase in the number of technical staff with a new grade entitled 'Other industrial grades' being inserted for the first time in this evaluation.

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q052 (General Comment):** Only the total of non-judge staff working in first and second intance courts is available.

**Q052 (2024):** The Council of the Judiciary is not able to make a distinction between different types of non-judge staff working in courts (total fte = 8 084, number of posts filled: 9 144). The Supreme Court can make the distinction between the number of non-judge staff whose task it is to assist judges (fte=119) and staff in charge of different administrative tasks (fte= 107).

**Q052 (2023):** 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 (total fte =7 762, number of posts filled: 8 769). The Supreme Court can make the distinction between the number of non-judge staff whose task it is to assist judges (fte=110) and staff in charge of different administrative tasks (fte= 100).

**Q052 (2022):** 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 (total fte = 7 477). The Supreme Court can make the distinction between the number of non-judge staff whose task it is to assist judges (fte= 101) and staff in charge of different administrative tasks (fte= 158).

**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.

**Poland**

**Q052 (2024):** administrative officials,other employees specified in the Act on Court and Prosecution Employees,specialists from advisory teams + curators,employees of the Supreme Court's Office of Studies and Analyses (officials and members),employees of the Supreme Court Information Centre,employees of the Correspondence Team,employees of the Supreme Court Library and Archives,employees of the Classified Information Protection Department, text processing specialists, chief medical specialist, medical specialist, health and safety specialist/defence specialist, chief health and safety specialist, legal adviser, internal auditor,data protection inspector, members of the Case Law Office.

**Q052 (2023):** 1. registrars.
2. clerks within the judicial area + assistants.
3. administrative clerks.
4. other employees designated in the Law on Court and Prosecution Staff.
5. specialists from the opinion teams + probation officers.
Supreme court:
Other non-judge staff include:
Supreme Court Research and Analysis Office staff, Supreme Court Information Centre (Press Centre) staff, Supreme Court Correspondence Team staff, Supreme Court Library staff, Visitor Services Team staff, Text-processing specialists, Chief Medical Officer, H&S/Defence Specialist, Internal Audit Officer, Data Protection Officer.

**Q052 (2022):** 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 2023, item 217), 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.

**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.

**Portugal**

**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 (2024):** 3. The decrease in the number of females is a consequence of the decrease in the total number of staff.

**Q052 (2023):** The data for the year 2023 reflects a change in the criteria for recording data on non-judge staff by the courts. The personnel working in the central units of the courts began to be registered in the court's common services personnel area. Thus, since 2023 the personnel in the common services have been included in this table.

**Q052 (2022):** The variations in the number of non-judge staff over the different evaluation cycles seem high due to the small numbers. Included in the "Other non-judge staff" category are professionals not included in the other specific categories, such as senior technical staff who mainly provide support to the higher courts.

**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.

**Romania**

**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, probation counselors and judge's assistants. 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. o T

he position of "judge's assistant" was established by Law no. 393/2023 on the status of the judge's assistant, entered into force on December 17, 2023. Judge's assistants work in courts of appeal, courts of first instance and specialized courts. Judge's assistants perform the following main duties: (a) assist the judge in carrying out specific procedures prior to the setting of the first date of the trial; (b) carry out documentation, verification and presentation of the documents and papers in the case-file and of the facts and points of law relevant to the case (c) draft, under the judge's direction, judgments or other procedural documents.

**Q052 (2024):** Other: assistance magistrates, judicial assistants and probation counselors.

**Q052 (2023):** Other: assistance magistrates, judicial assistants, probation counselors and judge's assistants. It should be noted that the position of "judge's assistant" was established by Law no. 393/2023 on the status of the judge's assistant, entered into force on December 17, 2023.

**Q052 (2022):** Other: assistance magistrates, judicial assistants and probation counselors.

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q052 (2024):** In Category 4 – Technical staff, the following positions are included: property manager, building manager, regional court library employee, building security staff, telephone operator, boiler operator, maintenance worker, and cleaning staff.
In Category 5 – Other, drivers are included.
All data on the number of employees in the relevant table, as well as in other tables of the submitted CEPEJ questionnaire, represent figures for district, municipal, regional, and administrative courts, as well as for the Specialised Criminal Court.
In previous years, Category 3 also included employees who, in the current 2024 table, are listed under Categories 4 and 5. Given that the current questionnaire was accompanied by guidance specifying which employees should be included in each category, we have reclassified the employees who were previously included solely in Category 3 into Categories 3, 4, and 5 accordingly.

**Q052 (2023):** Q052: Rechtspfleger: In connection with the EU project, project positions of "senior judicial officer - coordinator" were created in the courts, which were financed from EU funds and were kept separately in the records. Currently, these positions are financed from the budget of the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic, and therefore the registered number is significantly higher than in the previous year.

**Q052 (2022):** The judiciary, especially the non-judges’ positions, are probably not attractive for the males because of the salary.Another possible explanation is that the position of Rechtspfleger is a starting position before judicial exams and subsequent application for the position of judge, which could have caused an outflow of male employees.

**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”.

**Slovenia**

**Q052 (General Comment):** Data is not collected in a way to allow reporting in CEPEJ categories above. Court staff is employed by courts to work on work posts as defined by the government regulation. Generally, work posts in public administration are divided on "expert-technical" staff and "officials". The Courts Law explicitly provides typical profiles of non-judge staff: judicial assistants, higher and independent judicial assistants and judicial advisers (comparatively they can also perform some typical Rechtspflegers tasks in civil enforcement, land registry, business registry and insolvency cases). The law also provides for judicial trainees. Other typical profiles in courts include: typists, registrars (case management systems) as well as employees in court management and general services (e.g. accounting, HR, archives, general maintenance, cleaning) and IT staff (system administrators/engineers).

**Q052 (2024):** The number of court staff is reported according to court management reporting standard (occupied work posts), while the number of males/females is calculated according to human resources records.
Break down by some typical profiles (number of occupied posts):
Court directors: 15
Judicial advisers: 621
Judicial assistants: 586
Court registrars: 494
Typists:842
Judicial trainees: 120
Employees of Centre for Informatics at the Supreme Court: 19

**Q052 (2023):** The number of court staff is reported according to court management reporting standard (occupied work posts), while the number of males/females is calculated according to human resources records.
Break down by some typical profiles (number of occupied posts):
Court directors: 15
Judicial advisers: 617
Judicial assistants: 588
Court registrars: 498
Typists:881
Judicial trainees: 120

**Q052 (2022):** Approx. 3,5% of all court staff (120 persons) are judicial trainees (counted under “2. Non-judge (judicial staff”).

**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.

**Spain**

**Q052 (General Comment):** The Spanish judicial system distinguishes between three categories of non-judicial staff: Gestión Procesal y Administrativa, Tramitación Procesal y Administrativa, and Auxilio Judicial. The sum of these bodies, destinated to Courts, is the response to Q.52.5 'Other non judge staff'.

**Q052 (2024):** The non judicial staff designated to courts belong to three categories: Gestión Procesal y Administrativa, Tramitación Procesal y Administrativa, and Auxilio Judicial. : 46060
In adition to that, there are 1.164 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 of 17). In these Autonomoues Regions the proportion of females within the civil servants in Courts is
72% (therefore, 28% of males and 72% females). This proportion is possibly applicable to the whole national system.

**Q052 (2023):** The sum of the bodies [Gestor Procesal, Tramitador Procesal and Auxilio Judicial] destinated to Courts: 45.544
In adition to that, there are 1.161 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 of 17). In these Autonomoues Regions the proportion of females within the civil servants in Courts is
72% (therefore, 28% of males and 72% females). This proportion is possibly applicable to the whole national system.

**Q052 (2022):** The sum of the bodies [Gestor Procesal, Tramitador Procesal and Auxilio Judicial] destinated to Courts:45332
In adition to that, there are 1155 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% (therefore, 29% of males). This proportion is possibly applicable to the whole national system.

**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).

### Question 052-1

**Belgium**

**Q052-1 (2024):** The discrepancy between the total for Q 52 and the one for Q 52-1 is due to the fact that technical staff are not included in the table under question 52-1. These employees work at all three levels and their number (571) cannot be divided by level.

**Q052-1 (2023):** The lack of concordance between the total of Q 52 and the one of Q 52-1 is due to the fact that technical staff are not included in the table under question 52-1. These employees work at all three instances and their number (579) cannot be divided by instance.

**Q052-1 (2022):** The discrepancy between the totals of Q52 and Q52-1 is due to the technical staff not being included in the table uner question 52-1. These employees operate at all three instances, and their number (593) cannot be divided among these instances.

**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

**Bulgaria**

**Q052-1 (General Comment):** Item 1 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of first instance" includes all employees of the district and administrative courts. Item 2 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of second instance (appellate court)" includes all employees working in the regional courts and courts of appeal in the country.

**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):** It is noteworthy recalling the difficulty of determining the place of the regional/provincial courts in the "first instance" and "second instance (appellate)" columns. For the purposes of the CEPEJ survey, they are classified as "second instance (appellate)". Accordingly, item 1 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of first instance" includes all employees of the district and administrative courts, while item 2 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of second instance (appellate court)" includes all employees working in the regional courts and courts of appeal.

**Croatia**

**Q052-1 (2024):** The figures include civil servants and personnel who have been employed for an undetermined period of time. (Data from Table 052.)
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q052-1 (2023):** The figures include civil servants and personnel who have been employed for an undetermined period of time. (Data from Table 052.)
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q052-1 (2022):** The data refer to officials and employees employed on an indefinite basis (data from table 052.)
The number does not include those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**Cyprus**

**Q052-1 (2024):** Following the establishment of the Supreme Constitutional Court on 1 July 2023 there was a reallocation of the staff, which resulted in higher numbers of staff working at second instance and Supreme Court level.

**Q052-1 (2022):** Increase in the needs of the court led to appointment of more employees.

**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

**Denmark**

**Q052-1 (2024):** Due to the above-mentioned changes in calculation method, there is also new data for 2022 and 2023, see below:
2022:
Total non-judge staff working in courts: 1.669 First instance level: 1.476 Second instance (court of appeal) level: 168 Supreme Court level: 25 2023:
Total non-judge staff working in courts: 1.668 First instance level: 1.475 Second instance (court of appeal) level: 169 Supreme Court level: 24

**Q052-1 (2020):** -

**Estonia**

**Q052-1 (2022):** Many of the non-judge staff is shared between courts, e.g translators. Main purpose is to cut costs and offer better service with the help of digitalisation.

**France**

**Q052-1 (2024):** For administrative justice
Total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1 + 2 + 3):
2 788.9 (T)  813.6 (M)  1 975.3 (F)
1. Total number of non-judge staff in first instance courts:
1 391.6 (T)  349.9 (M)  1 041.7 (F)
2. Total number of non-judge staff in second instance courts:
1 018.2 (T)  294.4 (M)  723.8 (F)
3. Total number of non-judge staff in Supreme Courts:
407.1 (T)  182.3 (M)  224.8 (F)
Among these staff members, 294.5 FTEs are responsible, within the General Secretariat of the Council of State, for managing all administrative jurisdictions (human resources, budget, information systems, property management, training, communication, etc.).
In contrast with the previous year, staff assigned to the secretariats of the administrative sections of the Council of State are no longer included. Their number is 28.
For civil and criminal justice:
Total Male Female
Total number of non-judge staff working in the courts (1 + 2 + 3)22 044 (T)3 890 (M)
1. Total number of non-judge staff in first instance courts:
19 034 (T)  3 173 (M)  15 861 (F)
2. Total number of non-judge staff in second instance courts:
2 682 (T)  618 (M)  2 064 (F)
3. Total number of non-judge staff in Supreme Courts:
328 (T)  99 (M)  229 (F)
As in the previous year, staff working within regional administrative services are not included in the data, which covers only personnel working within courts. This explains the difference observed between the totals for questions 52 and 52-1.

**Q052-1 (2023):** As in the previous year, staff working in regional administrative departments are not included in this census of staff working in courts only. This explains the difference between the totals for questions 52 (23 258) and 52.1 (21 757). Also included in the number of staff working in the courts are the ‘local justice’ contract staff whose recruitment has been authorised from 2020 onwards on the basis of the project contract (see comment to question 52).
The increase of 495 real staff between 2022 and 2023 for these court staff is mainly due to the increase in the number of legal assistants and specialist assistants (+462 posts). It should be noted that, unlike in question 52, it has not been possible to exclude legal assistants and specialised assistants working for the public prosecutor's office when breaking down the data provided in the table above (1 538 in total for courts of first instance, courts of appeal and supreme courts).

**Q052-1 (2022):** It has not been possible to exclude the legal assistants and specialized assistants working for the public prosecutor's office from the breakdown of data provided in the frame of Q52-1 (1076 in total for first instance courts, appellate courts, and Supreme courts). Also included in these figures are contractual staff whose recruitment was authorized as of 2020 under project-based contracts (see comments to question 52). The difference between the total of Q52 and the total of Q52-1 is once again explained this year by the non-inclusion in question Q 52-1 of personnel working in SAR: indeed, since question Q52-1 only concerns non-judicial staff working in first instance courts, appellate courts, and Supreme courts, SAR staff are not counted therein.

**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

**Germany**

**Q052-1 (2024):** While the staff-assignment statistic allocates judges to instances, non-judge staff is not allocated to instances.

**Q052-1 (2023):** While the staff-assignment statistic allocates judges to instances, non-judge staff is not allocated to instances.

**Q052-1 (2022):** While the staff-assignment statistic statistic allocates judges to instances, non-judge staff is not allocated to instances.

**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.

**Greece**

**Q052-1 (2024):** The increase in court personnel is due to the operation of the National School of Judicial Officers (ESDI), from which three cohorts of judicial officers graduated during 2024, staffing the courts. Previously, appointments were made through ASEP, which resulted in understaffing of the courts due to the delays generally observed in the appointment of personnel through ASEP procedures.

**Q052-1 (2022):** The explanation was given in last year's questionnaire.

**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

**Ireland**

**Q052-1 (2024):** Some of the variations could be explained by staff changeover, retirements, transfers etc.

**Q052-1 (2022):** 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. 1. Total non-judge staff working in courts at first instance level: The FTE for 2022 is up on 2020, this figure is total staff minus staff in Court of Appeal and Supreme Court.
2. Total non-judge staff working in courts at second instance (court of appeal) level: In 2020 this included Court of Appeal staff including Judicial Assist and Tipstaff. In 2022 this includes Court of Appeal staff only.
3. Total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level: In 2020 this included Supreme Court staff including Judicial Assistants and Tipstaff. In 2022 this includes Supreme Court staff only, as Judicial Assistants are included in figure for 52/Q2 and Tipstaff are included in figure 52/Q5.

**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.

**Italy**

**Q052-1 (2022):** See comment at Q.52

**Q052-1 (2018):** Since 2018, the figures have also included court staff belonging to Administrative Justice.

**Latvia**

**Q052-1 (2023):** The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.

**Q052-1 (2022):** The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.

**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)

**Luxembourg**

**Q052-1 (2024):** The 23% increase in non-judge staff observed in the courts of appeal is explained by the intensified recruitment of judicial clerks in 2024, as detailed further in question 052.

**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.

**Malta**

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q052-1 (General Comment):** 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 (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.

**Poland**

**Q052-1 (2024):** This year, the data was provided per instance, because we obtained more accurate data from the human resources departments of district courts and the court of appeals.

**Q052-1 (2020):** Data from the supreme court's human resources Department.
In 2020 data include also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court

**Portugal**

**Q052-1 (2023):** The data for the year 2023 reflects a change in the criteria for recording data on non-judge staff by the courts. The personnel working in the central units of the courts began to be registered in the court's common services personnel area. Thus, since 2023 the personnel in the common services have been included in this table.

**Q052-1 (2022):** the data in question 52-1 has also been updated, due to a small error in the accounting of the different categories included in it." Compared to the figures we sent initially, the correction was very small in percentage terms (36 more employees were added, out of a total of 5412).
The amended figures in table 52.1 referred to a specific category of STJ/STA officials who have now been added, as they were not accounted for previously by mistake (neither in the version initially sent with 2022 data, nor in the previous edition with 2021 data).

**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.

**Romania**

**Q052-1 (2024):** The data is provided by the High Court of Cassation and Justice. The difference could be explained by staff promotions to a higher court, but also by staff mobility potentially caused by dissatisfaction of salaries.

**Q052-1 (2023):** 3. The difference between the data communicated in 2022 and 2023 is primarily due to changes in the methodology used by the High Court of Cassation and Justice for reporting data on civil servants and contractual staff.

**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).

**Slovak Republic**

**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

**Slovenia**

**Q052-1 (General Comment):** Besides profiles typically working in courts, the court staff at second instance include judicial trainees (formally employed by higher courts, while doing internship at first instance courts). At third instance the staff at the Supreme court Centre for Informatics is included - mostly system administrators/engineers and project managers.

**Q052-1 (2024):** The number of court staff is reported according to court management reporting standard (occupied work posts), while the number of males/females is calculated according to human resources records (by instance).
The figures include: 120 judicial trainees at the second instance (formally employed by higher courts, while doing internship at first instance courts), and 19 employees of Centre for Informatics at the Supreme Court.

**Q052-1 (2023):** The number of court staff is reported according to court management reporting standard (occupied work posts), while the number of males/females is calculated according to human resources records (by instance).
The figures include: 120 judicial trainees at the second instance (formally employed by higher courts, while doing internship at first instance courts), and approx 20 employees of Centre for Informatics at third instance.

**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.

**Spain**

**Q052-1 (2018):** These figures include the number of "letrados de Administración de Justicia", which are the CEPEJ equivalent of "Rechtspfleger".

## Question 055

**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).

**Belgium**

**Q055 (General Comment):** Explanation of the table: 1. all prosecutors working in the labour auditor's offices, public prosecutors' offices of first instance, public prosecutor's office for road safety and the federal public prosecutor's office.
2.All prosecutors working in the public prosecutor's offices of the appeal courts and the public prosecutor's offices of the labour courts.
3.All prosecutors working in the public prosecutor's office at the Court of Cassation.

**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.

**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.

**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 (2024):** The data refers to all state attorneys.
The State Attorney General, municipal/county state attorneys, deputy municipal/county state attorneys facilitated to authorization of municipal/county state attorney duties, deputy state attorneys, and municipal/county state attorneys.
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q055 (2023):** The data refers to all state attorneys.
The State Attorney General, municipal/county state attorneys, deputy municipal/county state attorneys facilitated to authorization of municipal/county state attorney duties, deputy state attorneys, and municipal/county state attorneys.
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q055 (2022):** The data refer to all state attorneys:
State Attorney General, municipal/county state attorneys, deputy municipal/county state attorneys authorized to perform duties of municipal/county state attorneys, deputy state attorneys and deputies of municipal/county state attorneys.
The number is reduced by those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**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.

**Cyprus**

**Q055 (2023):** The data should be interpreted in the light of the fact that in the Criminal section of the Legal Service of the Republic there are both counsels of the Republic as well as public prosecutors, who are in charge of handling criminal cases before the Criminal Courts. Only the number fo public prosecutors is communicated in the table.

**Q055 (2022):** More positions have been filled.

**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.

**Denmark**

**Q055 (2024):** The data on the number of employees in The Danish Prosecution Service and how they are distributed, is registered through a database, Polpai, containing all employees in the Danish Police and The Danish Prosecution Service.

**Q055 (2023):** The number is the actual number of employees in fulltime equivalent as of December 2023. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number regarding December 31st. Therefore the number is drawn for December 1st 2023 and scaled up to a full year.
The data on the number of employees in The Danish Prosecution Service and how they are distributed, is registered through a database, Polpai, containing all employees in the Danish Police and The Danish Prosecution Service.

**Q055 (2022):** The number is the actual number of employees in fulltime equivalent as of December 2022. 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 2022 and scaled up to a full year.

**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).

**Estonia**

**Q055 (General Comment):** The categorization of questions 55 and 56 regarding public prosecutors do not exist in Estonia.

**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 (about 91 3000 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 (2023):** All Finnish prosecutors have jurisdiction on first and second court instance. Only the Prosecutor General has jurisdiction on Supreme Court level and can assign a prosecutor to handle a case on Supreme Court level.

**Q055 (2020):** Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

**France**

**Q055 (2024):** Data derived from an extraction of the SIRH LOLFI – number of public prosecutors in the criminal courts as of 31 December 2024. Data are expressed in full-time equivalents (FTE).
With regard to the number of first-instance public prosecutors, these figures do not include the “délégués du procureur”, unlike the previous year. Including deputy prosecutors, the total would be 1 983 (671 men and 1 312 women).

**Q055 (2023):** These figures correspond to all public prosecutors in the public prosecution services, excluding court presidents and heads of court.
In first instance courts, the total is 1 892 (843 men / 1 049 women). At first instance, 430 “délégués du procureur”, including 72 women and 358 men, carry out functions comparable to those of public prosecutors. The increase in the number of first instance prosecutors compared with 2022 is due to the inclusion of the “délégués du procureur” in 2023.

**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.

**Germany**

**Q055 (General Comment):** The information relates to the number of job shares for public prosecutors. The information on the job shares count a public prosecutor working full-time as 1. A public prosecutor 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 public prosecutor working half the usual number of hours).

**Q055 (2024):** 1.: Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the regional courts as of 31. December 2024
2. Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the higher regional courts as of 31. December 2024
3. Data is taken from the biannual juducial statistic and represents number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice as of 31. December 2024

**Q055 (2023):** 1.: Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the regional courts as of 31. December 2023
2. Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the higher regional courts as of 31. December 2023
3. Data is taken from the biannual juducial statistic and represents number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice as of 31. December 2022

**Q055 (2022):** 1.: Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the local and regional courts as of 31. December 2022
2. Data is taken from the court staff statistic of the federal states and represents the number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the higher regional courts as of 31. December 2022
3. Data ist taken from the court staff statistic and represents number of public prosecutors (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice.

**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).

**Greece**

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q055 (2024):** On 31 December 2024 2 prosecutors (1 male and 1 female) were working temporarily in the Ministry of Justice. These two persons were also included in the total number of prosecutors, but they were not taken into consideration when looking at the number of prosecutors working at each/different level.
All prosecutors are appointed to work full-time, but it may occur that a prosecutor temporarily works part-time, for child care reasons for example.
As far as prosecutors at first instance level are concerned, the table contains the number of prosecutors working for district and district level prosecution offices together with the number of prosecutors working for chief prosecution offices. Out of this number, the number of prosecutors working at chief prosecution offices is 524 (229 men and 295 women), the number of prosecutors working for district (district level) prosecution offices is 1172 (403 men and 769 women).
As to the number of prosecutors at second instance, the table includes only the number of prosecutors working at the appellate chief prosecution offices.
The reason for this is that no exact answer can be given to the question. In the Prosecution Service of Hungary, prosecutors working at district and district-level prosecution offices only proceed with first instance cases. Prosecutors of chief prosecution offices working at county (or county-level) prosecution offices handle first instance cases which fall into the jurisdiction of regional/county courts, but part of the prosecutors of chief prosecution offices handle cases at second instance or at second instance, as well in cases initiated at first instance by district or district prosecution offices. Our personnel database, however, does not contain information on the number of such prosecutors of chief prosecution offices.
Prosecutors of the appellate chief prosecution offices handle second instance cases or, in specific circumstances, they proceed at third instance.

**Q055 (2023):** On 31 December 2023 2 prosecutors (1 male and 1 female) were working temporarily in the Ministry of Justice. These two persons were also included in the total number of prosecutors, but they were not taken into consideration when looking at the number of prosecutors working at each/different level.
All prosecutors are appointed to work full-time, but it may occur that a prosecutor temporarily works part-time, for child care reasons for example.
As far as prosecutors at first instance level are concerned, the table contains the number of prosecutors working for district and district level prosecution offices together with the number of prosecutors working for chief prosecution offices. Out of this number, the number of prosecutors working at chief prosecution offices is 544 (239 men and 305 women), the number of prosecutors working for district (district level) prosecution offices is 1,166 (408 men and 758 women).
As to the number of prosecutors at second instance, the table includes only the number of prosecutors working at the appellate chief prosecution offices.
The reason for this is that no exact answer can be given to the question. In the Prosecution Service of Hungary, prosecutors working at district and district-level prosecution offices only proceed with first instance cases. Prosecutors of chief prosecution offices working at county (or county-level) prosecution offices handle first instance cases which fall into the jurisdiction of regional/county courts, but part of the prosecutors of chief prosecution offices handle cases at second instance or at second instance, as well in cases initiated at first instance by district or district prosecution offices. Our personnel database, however, does not contain information on the number of such prosecutors of chief prosecution offices.
Prosecutors of the appellate chief prosecution offices handle second instance cases or, in specific circumstances, they proceed at third instance.
Discrepancy explanation:
The explan

ation for the increase in the number of female prosecutors serving in the Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal, which can be considered significant in percentage terms, is the overall low number of prosecutors in the Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal, with a small increase in numbers resulting in a large change in percentage terms. The increase in the number of staff was justified by the evolution of the workload in the relevant Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal, as well as by the need to recruit new colleagues in the Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal due to retirements and transfers. The proportion of women among prosecutors serving at the Prosecution Service of Hungary is already high, 61.3% in 2023. In these circumstances, there is no particular reason why more women were successful in applying for or being seconded to posts as prosecutors in the Chief Prosecution Offices of Appeal in 2023.

**Q055 (2022):** On 31 December 2022 2 prosecutors were working temporarily in the Ministry of Justice. These two persons were also included in the total number of prosecutors, but they were not taken into consideration when looking at the number of prosecutors working at each/different level. One of the two public prosecutors assigned to the Ministry of Justice is male and the other one is female. All prosecutors are appointed to work full-time, but it may occur that a prosecutor temporarily works part-time, for child care reasons for example. As far as prosecutors at first instance level are concerned, the table contains the number of prosecutors working for district and district level prosecution offices together with the number of prosecutors working for chief prosecution offices. Out of this number, the number of prosecutors working at chief prosecution offices is 534 (236 men and 298 women), the number of prosecutors working for district (district level) prosecution offices is 1203 (421 men and 782 women).
As to the number of prosecutors at second instance, the table includes the number of prosecutors working at the appellate chief prosecution offices. The reason for this is that no exact answer can be given to the question. In the Hungarian Prosecution Service, prosecutors working at district and district-level prosecution offices only proceed with first instance cases. Prosecutors of chief prosecution offices working at county (or county level) prosecution offices handle first instance cases which fall into the jurisdiction of regional/county courts, but part of the prosecutors of chief prosecution offices handle cases at second instance or at second instance as well in cases initiated at first instance by district or district prosecution offices. Our personnel database, however, does not contain information on the latter group of cases. Prosecutors of the appellate chief prosecution offices handle second instance cases or, in specific circumstances, they proceed at third in

stance. I wish to inform you that prior to 2022 we only indicated among the data the number of prosecutors of dictrict prosecution offices at first instance and the number of prosecutors of chief prosecution offices and appellate chief prosecution offices at second instance. According to this method of calculation, the current data (for 31 December 2022) include the following:
Total number of prosecutors (1 + 2 + 3):
Total: 1874
Males: 727
Females: 1147
1. Number of prosecutors at first instance level:
Total: 1203
Males: 421
Females: 782
2. Number of prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level:
Total: 562
Males: 251
Females: 311
3. Number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level:
Total: 107
Males: 54
Females: 53

**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.

**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.The total figure includes the head of the Prosecution Office provided in Q056 as the Director can assume the role and functions of prosecutors in his/her office.

**Q055 (2024):** The Office has a number of grades for prosecutors which are different from the categories above, they include Prosecutor, Senior Prosecutor, Principal Prosecutor, Senior Principal Prosecutor, Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions and Deputy Chief Prosecutor. Senior management includes one Director of Public Prosecutions, one Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions and the Heads of the three Legal Divisions of the Office. The total figure of 157 includes the head of the Prosecution Office provided in Q056 as the Director can assume the role and functions of prosecutors in her office. For further information regarding the structure of the Office, please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 2.8 to 2.10. https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for-Prosecutors-5th-Edition-eng.pdf

**Q055 (2023):** The Office has a number of grades for prosecutors which are different from the categories above, they include Prosecutor, Senior Prosecutor, Principal Prosecutor, Senior Principal Prosecutor, Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions and Deputy Chief Prosecutor. There is one Director of Public Prosecutions and one Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions. The total figure of 156 includes the head of the Prosecution Office provided in Q056 as the Director can assume the role and functions of prosecutors in her office.

**Q055 (2022):** The Office has a number of grades for prosecutors which are different from the categories above, they include Prosecutor, Senior Prosecutor, Principal Prosecutor, Senior Principal Prosecutor, Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions, Deputy Chief Prosecutor. There is one Director of Public Prosecutions and one Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions

**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.

**Italy**

**Q055 (2024):** as of 31/12/2024

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q055 (2023):** Data corresponds to the actual situation. The data are correct for 2023. The mistake is in the data for 2022. The number of prosecutors at SC level for 2022 are 51 (27 males and 24 females).

**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.

**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.

**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 (2022):** Since the 2020-2022 Evaluation, the General Prosecutor's Office has seen an increase of two female prosecutors and a male prosecutor has been replaced by a female prosecutor following retirement. The decrease of -28.57% in male prosecutors at the Supreme Court and the 50% increase in female prosecutors at the Supreme Court can be attributed to this.

**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.

**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, to distinguish between 1st and 2nd Instance Courts. All full-time lawyers have been included in the above figure except the AG herself.

**Q055 (2023):** The increase in the number of prosecutors follows a recruitment drive throughout 2023

**Q055 (2022):** The increase in the number of prosecutors is the result of a recruitment drive that was carried out in 2022.

**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.

**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.

**Poland**

**Q055 (General Comment):** The general 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.

**Q055 (2024):** Table item 1 shows the number of prosecutors in district prosecutor's offices, and item 2 shows the number of prosecutors in circuit prosecutor's offices. Item 3 shows the number of prosecutors employed by the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it includes the number of prosecutors employed by regional prosecutor's offices (the 'third level') – a total of 474 prosecutors (176 women and 298 men), because, pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 – Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2024, item 390, as amended), the general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office are: the National Public Prosecutor's Office, regional public prosecutor's offices, circuit public prosecutor's offices and district public prosecutor's offices.
All positions (1–3) include military prosecutors, of whom 88 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 66 men and 22 women; at the regional prosecutor's office level – 57, including 42 men and 15 women, and at the National Prosecutor's Office – 21 military prosecutors (16 men and 5 women).

**Q055 (2023):** 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 420 prosecutors (158 women and 262 men), as pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2024, item 390), 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 90 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 67 men and 23 women; at the regional prosecutor's office level, 50, including 39 men and 11 women; and at the National Prosecutor's Office, 19 military prosecutors (13 men and 6 women). In regional prosecutors' offices, prosecutors for military affairs do not perform official duties.
The table in question does not, therefore, provide an opportunity to illustrate the full structure of the public prosecutor's office in Poland, which, in accordance with the above-mentioned provision of the Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office, consists of four levels. In regional prosecutors' offices, prosecutors for military affairs do not perform official duties.

**Q055 (2022):** 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 subcategories because it includes the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 399 prosecutors (156 women and 243 men), as, pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2023, item 1360), 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.
The table in question does not, therefore, provide an opportunity to illustrate the full structure of the public prosecutor's office in Poland, which, in accordance with the above-mentioned provision of the Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office, consists of four levels. All items (1 - 3) include military prosecutors, of whom 86 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 61 men and 25 women; 48 at the circuit prosecutor's office level, including 38 men and 10 women; and 16 military prosecutors (12 men and 4 women) at the National Prosecutor's Office. In regional prosecutors' offices, prosecutors for military affairs do not perform official duties.

**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.

**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 (2024):** The information provided above is taken from official statistics from the Ministry of Justice. The data includes all prossecutors, even those who are absent for a short period (due to illness or accident, labour dispute, holidays or other forms of leave, voluntary absence or temporary impediment due to causes such as unfavourable weather conditions or technical incidents). Prossecutors on indefinite leave (prolonged illnesses, unpaid leave, temporary or indefinite suspension for non-disciplinary reasons) are excluded.

**Q055 (2023):** Q55.2. The increase in the number of female prosecutors in 2023 compared to 2022 is in line with the steady growth in the number of female prosecutors in recent years.

**Q055 (2022):** The discrepancy rate is due to small numbers

**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.

**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 (2023):** 3. The vacancies caused by retirements were followed by a series of competitions for positions in PICCJ, DNA, and DIICOT. As a result of these competitions, the gender balance shifted.

**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).

**Slovenia**

**Q055 (General Comment):** The number is reported in FTE.
Selection process in the procedure for appointing state prosecutors with the formation of a final opinion is in the competence of the State Prosecutor's Council (an independent state body). State prosecutors are appointed by the government.
In 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 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 Prosecution Service 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 senior 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 state prosecutor’s office for certain categories of matters, fo

r 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 before the 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 also before first instance courts.
In the context of question 55 we counted local and district prosecutors 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 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).

**Q055 (2023):** Numbers are reported in FTE and rounded-up to whole numbers.

**Q055 (2022):** The number is reported in FTE format. The total gross number of state prosecutors is 210.
An increase in number of higher and supreme state prosecutors is due to the slow/stalled procedures for appointment of candidates at the government in 2020 and 2021 (in 2022, some candidates that applied in 2018, 2019 and 2020 were appointed.)

**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 r

ang 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.

**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 (2024):** As mentioned in previous exercises, the structure of the Prosecution service does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First category ("Fiscales de Sala") Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 38, Males 23, Females 15 (this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second. "Fiscal": Total 2030, Males 717, Females 1313
Third: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 744, Males 191, Females 553

**Q055 (2023):** As mentioned in previous exercises, the structure of the Prosecution service does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First category ("Fiscales de Sala") Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 36, Males 21, Females 15(this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second category: "Fiscal": Total 1944, Males 706, Females 1238 Third category: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 770, Males 183, Females 587
Source: Ministry of Presidency, Justice and Relations with the Parliament.

**Q055 (2022):** As mentioned in previous exercises, the structure of the Prosecution service does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category ("Fiscales de Sala") Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 40, Males 26, Females 14 (this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second. "Fiscal": Total 1908, Males 704, Females 1204
Third: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 771, Males 187, Females 584

**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 33, Males 26, Females 7
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

## Question 056

**Austria**

**Q056 (General Comment):** Data are presented in full time equivalent.

**Q056 (2024):** Starting from 2022, the data provided in the table correspond to persons who exercise the function of head of prosecution office. Previous data were expressed in FTE.

**Q056 (2023):** Starting from 2022, the data provided in the table correspond to persons who exercise the function of head of prosecution office. Previous data were expressed in FTE.

**Q056 (2022):** Starting from 2022, the data provided in the table correspond to persons who exercise the function of head of prosecution office. Previous data were expressed in FTE.

**Q056 (2014):** The numerical values provided are rounded. The accurate figures are: total – 26,64 (16,79 males/9,85 females); heads of prosecution offices at first instance level – 19,60 (12,50 males/7,10 females); heads of prosecution offices at second instance level – 6,49 (3,89 males/2,60 females); heads of prosecution offices at Supreme Court level – 0,55 (0,40 males/0,15 females).

**Belgium**

**Q056 (General Comment):** The Prosecutor General Office and the Auditor General Office constitute the public prosecution services at the Court of Appeal and the Labor Court, respectively. The Attorney General heads both of them.

**Q056 (2014):** In 2014, the number of first instance prosecutors' offices and prosecution offices within labour courts was reduced, resulting in a decrease in the number of heads of prosecution services. The decrease between 2012 and 2014 in the number of court presidents and heads of prosecution offices in first instance (male and female) is due to the reform of the judicial map concerning first instance courts.

**Bulgaria**

**Q056 (2023):** The process of merging the district prosecutor's offices ended on July 27, 2022. Starting from this date the number of first instance public prosecution offices is 34.

**Q056 (2020):** In the provided in the previous cycle 2018-2020 the information on the total number of administrative heads, instead of the indicated figure 133 (one hundred and thirty-three), the figure should be 153 (one hundred and fifty-three). The difference is probably due to a technical error or to the provision of the actual number of incumbents, without reflecting the persons appointed to perform the functions of administrative heads. Due to the impossibility to establish the real cause, information on the data in the individual columns cannot be given.
The data provided (cycle 2020-2022) comply with the instructions on question № 056 in the explanatory note to the scheme for evaluation of judicial systems, ie. there are also the persons who have been appointed to perform the functions of administrative heads due to the lack of a holder of the position. The optimization performed under Art. 30, para. 2, item 7 of the JSA of the district prosecutor's offices, whereby with decisions of the Plenum of the SJC under protocol № 21 / 19.07.2018 and 20 / 29.07.2019 a total of 39 (thirty-nine) district prosecutor's offices were closed and transformed in territorial divisions as follows:
- 11 district prosecutor's offices, as of 01.01.2019;
- 28 district prosecutor's offices, as of 01.01.2020
Following this transformation, the total number of prosecutors at first instance, respectively their administrative heads, is now 74.
Thus, from the real number of administrative heads cycle (2018 – 2020) - 153, 39 (thirty-nine) administrative heads were removed from the closed district prosecutor's offices, in view of which the total number of heads of prosecutor's offices decreased to 114 (one hundred and fourteen), of which: the number of heads of prosecutor's offices at first instance is 74 (seventy-four), the number of heads of prosecutor's offices at second instance is 39 (thirty-nine), and at the supreme level - 1 (one).

**Q056 (2016):** 113 adminsitrative heads of Regional Prosecutor`s Offices and 1 Specialized Prosecutor`s Office; 38 are the administrative heads of 28 District Prosecutor`s Offices, 3 Military District Prosecutor`s Offices, 7 Appealte Prosecutor`s Offices; 1 Prosecutor General

**Q056 (2014):** For 2014, the figure 113 includes heads of regional prosecutors' offices. The figure 41 includes 29 district, 7 appellate and 3 military district prosecutors' offices, the Supreme Prosecutors Office of Cassation and the Supreme Prosecutors Office of Appellate.

**Croatia**

**Q056 (General Comment):** The organisational structure of the public prosecution services comprises: the State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia, the Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime (USKOK), county State attorneys' offices and municipal State attorneys' offices. The number of public prosecutors' offices has been significantly rationalised. The number of Heads of the State attorneys' offices does not correspond to the number of municipal State attorneys' offices, because in some of these offices the Heads of offices were not appointed and, until such appointment is made, their duties are exercised by their deputies. The number of the first instance State attorneys' offices includes the number of the municipal State attorneys and Head of Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime (USKOK).

**Q056 (2024):** The number is reduced by those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

As indicated in the comments from the previous cycle regarding the decrease in the number of Heads of Offices, the decline was due to the fact that certain institutions did not have formally appointed Heads of Offices at the time. Instead, the duties were performed by deputies, who are not included in this category.
Subsequently, by the end of 2024, the number of Heads of Offices increased compared to 2023, as new appointments were made.
In relation to the increase in the number of women compared to the previous cycle, we would like to emphasize that the recruitment and selection procedures for the Heads of Offices positions were conducted in accordance with established competency-based criteria. The most qualified candidates were selected through this process, and those candidates were mostly men.

**Q056 (2023):** Q56 - The organisational structure of the public prosecution services comprises: the State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia, the Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime (USKOK), county State attorneys' offices and municipal State attorneys' offices. The number of public prosecutors' offices has been significantly rationalised.
The number is reduced by those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**Q056 (2022):** The number is reduced by those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**Q056 (2020):** In 2018, the number of Heads of the State attorneys' offices did not correspond to the number of municipal state attorneys' offices, because in some of these offices the Heads of offices were not appointed. By 2020, they were appointed. Additionally, since 1st of January 2019., 3 new first instance POs were established. The number of the first instance State attorneys' offices includes the number of the municipal state attorneys and Head of Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime.

**Q056 (2018):** In 2018, the organisational structure of the public prosecution in the Republic of Croatia is comprised of the State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia, the Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime, 15 county state attorneys' offices and 22 municipal state attorneys' offices. The number of Heads of the State attorneys' offices does not correspond to the number of municipal state attorneys' offices, because in some of these offices the Heads of offices were not appointed. The number of the first instance State attorneys' offices includes the number of the municipal state attorneys and Head of Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime.

**Q056 (2016):** In 2016, the organisational structure of the public prosecution in the Republic of Croatia is comprised of the State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia, the Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime, 15 county state attorneys' offices and 22 municipal state attorneys' offices. The number of Heads of the State attorneys' offices does not correspond to the number of municipal state attorneys' offices, because in some of these offices the Heads of offices were not appointed. The number of the first instance State attorneys' offices includes the number of the municipal state attorneys and Head of Office for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime.

**Q056 (2014):** On 31 December 2014, there were 10 vacancies opened for Heads of State attorneys' offices (2 at the county level, and 8 at the municipal level).

**Cyprus**

**Q056 (General Comment):** All heads of prosecution offices can appear before all courts.

**Q056 (2023):** In the previous cycles the numbers provided were for the whole legal service of the Republic. In this cycle it was possible to isolate the numbers solely for the public prosecution. The two heads of public prosecution services are the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General.

**Czech Republic**

**Q056 (2023):** The number of females heads of prosecution offices at second instance level has increased from 1 to 3 - it is a desirable trend.

**Q056 (2022):** The number of females heads of prosecution offices has decreased only from 2 to 1.

**Denmark**

**Q056 (2024):** Please note that question 1 is counted as the director of the prosecution service in the 15 different police districts of Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands. Question 2 is the heads of the 3 state prosecutors offices (Copenhagen, Viborg and State Prosecutor for Special Crime). Question 3 is the Director of Public Prosecutions (Rigsadvokaten).

**Q056 (2023):** Please note that question 1 is counted as the director of the prosecution service in the 15 different police districts of Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands. Question 2 is the heads of the 3 state prosecutors offices (Copenhagen, Viborg and State Prosecutor for Special Crime). Question 3 is the Director of Public Prosecutions (Rigsadvokaten).

**Q056 (2022):** Please note that number 1 is counted as the director of the prosecution service in the 15 different police districts of Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands. 2 is the heads of the 3 state prosecutors offices (Copenhagen, Viborg and State Prosecutor for Special Crime). 3 is the Director of Public Prosecutions (Rigsadvokaten).

**Q056 (2020):** Please note that number 1 is counted as the director of the prosecution service in the 15 different police districts of Denmark. 2 is the heads of the 3 state prosecutors offices (Copenhagen, Viborg and State Prosecutor for Special Crime Unit) 3 is the Director of Public Prosecutions (Rigsadvokaten).

**Q056 (2016):** The observed discrepancies are due to ordinary changes in staffing.

**Estonia**

**Q056 (General Comment):** The categorization of questions 55 and 56 regarding public prosecutors do not exist in Estonia.

**Q056 (2020):** .

**Finland**

**Q056 (2024):** The change in figures compared to the previous year is a result of organisational change.

**Q056 (2023):** The Prosecutor Authority is a singular organization headed by the Prosecutor General (one individual person). In the answer the Chief Prosecutors of the geographically defined are considered heads of prosecution office as these departments equate the former independent prosecution offices.

**Q056 (2020):** Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.
This number includes the five prosecution districts, the The Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutor General. The number of heads of prosecution offices decreased between 2018 and 2020 due to the re-organization of the prosecution.

**Q056 (2018):** The Prosecutor General, the Deputy Prosecutor General and 11 heads of the local prosecution offices.
New heads of prosecution offices have been appointed and more of them are females.

**Q056 (2016):** the Prosecutor-General, the Deputy Prosecutor-General and 11 heads of local prosecution offices

**Q056 (2014):** For 2014, the total referres to the Prosecutor-General, the Deputy Prosecutor-General and 11 heads of local prosecution offices.

**France**

**Q056 (2024):** Data derived from an extraction of the SIRH LOLFI – number of public prosecutors and general prosecutors of criminal courts as of 31 December 2024. Data are expressed in full-time equivalents (FTE).

**Germany**

**Q056 (General Comment):** The total number of heads of the public prosecution offices is at least the number of Regional Courts (115) plus the number of Higher Regional Courts (24) at which the chief public prosecution offices are located.

**Q056 (2024):** Figures for No. 1 and 2 were provided by the federal states and represent the number of heads of public prosecution offices (people) exluding posts that are currently vacant. Reports on allocation to gender are not yet conclusive. The discrepancy to previous cycles is due to the fact that previous data was estimated based on the number of public prosecution offices and prosecutor general's offices and therefore represented offices, not people. The figure for No. 3 represents the Federal Prosecutor General.

**Q056 (2023):** The figures were calculated based on the number of public prosecution offices (115 public prosecution offices at the Regional Courts, 24 prosecutor general's offices at the Higher Regional Courts, 1 Federal Prosecutor General`s office at the Federal Court of Justice). Generally, each public prosecution office has one head. Nevertheless, this is merely an approximated value, especially since some posts may be vacant. The federal states have reported a total of 136 heads of prosecution offices. Reports on their allocation to gender and to the first and second instance are not yet conclusive.

**Q056 (2022):** There are no statistics specifically on the number of the heads of public prosecution offices. The figures were calulated based on the number of public prosecution offices (115 public prosecution offices at the Regional Courts, 24 prosecutor general's offices at the Higher Regional Courts, 1 Federal Prosecutor General`s office at the Federal Court of Justice). Generally, each public prosecution office has one head but there might be cases in which two persons working in part time share the position or in which one person (temporarily) is the head of two public prosecution offices.

**Q056 (2020):** There are no statistics specifically on the number of the heads of public prosecution offices. The figures were calulated based on the number of public prosecution offices (115 public prosecution offices at the Regional Courts, 24 prosecutor general's offices at the Higher Regional Courts, 1 Federal Prosecutor General`s office at the Federal Court of Justice). Generally, each public prosecution office has one head but there might be cases in which two persons working in part time share the position or in which one person (temporarily) is the head of two public prosecution offices.

**Q056 (2018):** There is no evidence of how many heads of prosecutors there are.
However, since the structure of the public prosecutor's offices (public prosecutor's offices, Attorney General's Office and General
Prosecutor's Office) is the same as that of the courts (District Court, Higher Regional Court, Federal Supreme Court), there are at least as many senior prosecutors as there are courts. The total number of heads of the public prosecution offices is at least the number of Regional Courts plus the number of Higher Regional Courts at which the chief public prosecution offices are located.

**Q056 (2016):** There is no evidence of how many heads of prosecutors there are. However, since the structure of the public prosecutor's offices (public prosecutor's offices, Attorney General's Office and General Prosecutor's Office) is the same as that of the courts (District Court, Higher Regional Court, Federal Supreme Court), there are at least as many senior prosecutors as there are courts. The total number of heads of the public prosecution offices is at least the number of Regional Courts (116) plus the number of Higher Regional Courts (24) at which the chief public prosecution offices are located.These are currently 140.

**Greece**

**Q056 (2024):** Judicial Map.

**Q056 (2020):** Gender data are not kept.

**Q056 (2016):** The previous data given referred to the heads of prosecution offices, which in Greece is a title (rank) and not to those who are actually in charge of the organization and the management of a Prosecution Office. This year’s data are the correct ones.

**Q056 (2014):** The 2014 data concerns all prosecutors that possess the rank of "prosecutors", and not only those who are in charge of each prosecutor's office. The total number of prosecutors in charge of each prosecutor's office (heads) is 83.

**Hungary**

**Q056 (2024):** The table contains the following heads/senior leaders of prosecution offices: the prosecutor general; appellate chief prosecutors (where there was no appointed or acting appellate chief prosecutor, the head of division at the appellate chief prosecution office in charge of the appellate chief prosecution office); chief prosecutors (21 heads of first-instance prosecutors' offices, of which 15 are men and 6 are women); prosecutors who are heads of district (or district-level) prosecution offices (124 heads of first-instance prosecutors' offices, of which 70 are men and 54 are women).
In a district prosecution office, there was temporarily no appointed or acting head of district prosecution office, therefore this structural unit was headed by the deputy head prosecutor).

**Q056 (2023):** The table contains the following heads/senior leaders of prosecution offices: the prosecutor general; prosecutors who are heads of departments at the Office of the Prosecutor General and prosecutors who are heads of autonomous divisions at the Office of the Prosecutor General (the latter two groups of employees consist of 14 persons who are exercising employer's powers with respect to subordinate prosecutorial employees at the Office of the Prosecutor General); appellate chief prosecutors (where there was no appointed or acting appellate chief prosecutor, the head of division at the appellate chief prosecution office in charge of the appellate chief prosecution office); chief prosecutors; prosecutors who are heads of district (or district-level) prosecution offices (in a district prosecution office, there was temporarily no appointed or acting head of district prosecution office, therefore this structural unit was headed by the deputy head prosecutor).
Within the data relating to the Office of the Prosecutor General, the heads of structural units with functional responsibilities (e.g. IT Department, Autonomous Administrative Division) are also indicated.

**Q056 (2022):** The table contains the following heads/senior leaders of prosecution offices:
the Prosecutor General; appellate chief prosecutors (if there is no appellate chief prosecutor appointed or assigned, then the head of division at the appellate chief prosecution office who leads the appellate chief prosecution office); chief prosecutors (if there is no chief prosecutor appointed or assigned, then the deputy chief prosecutor who leads the chief prosecution office); prosecutors who are heads of district prosecution offices (if there is no leading prosecutor appointed or assigned, then the deputy head of the district prosecution office who leads the organizational unit).
The heads of organizational units with operational responsibilities (such as Information Technology Department and Independent Administrative Unit) are also included in the data of the Office of the Prosecutor General.
As previously indicated, prior to 2022, only the number of public prosecutors at district prosecution offices who handle first-instance cases and the number of public prosecutors at chief prosecution offices and appellate chief prosecution offices who handle second-instance cases were included in the database. According to this calculation method, the data for prosecution leaders as of 31 December 2022 are as follows:
Total number of heads of prosecution offices (1 + 2 + 3 level of jurisdiction)
Total: 151
Males: 91
Females: 60
1. Number of heads of prosecution offices at first-instance level
Total: 124
Males: 70
Females: 54
2. Number of heads of prosecution offices at second-instance (courts of appeal) level
Total: 26
Males: 20
Females: 6
3. Number of heads of prosecution offices at Supreme Court level
Total: 1
Males: 1
Females: 0

**Ireland**

**Q056 (General Comment):** There is only one Office of Public Prosecution in Ireland and the Director of Public Prosecutions is the head of that office.
In fact, the effect of Section 3 (1) of the Prosecution of Offences Act 1974 is to make the Director of Public Prosecutions the prosecuting authority in relation to criminal matters (apart from a very limited number of functions retained by the Attorney General).The daily management of the services are ensured by the Director, the Deputy Director and the Heads of the three Legal Divisions of the Office.

**Q056 (2023):** For further information regarding the structure of the Office, please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 2.8 to 2.10. (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for Prosecutors-5th-Edition-eng.pdf)

**Q056 (2022):** Please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 2.4 to 2.10. (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for-Prosecutors-5th-Edition-eng.pdf).

**Q056 (2020):** Please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 2.4 to 2.10.

**Italy**

**Q056 (2024):** As of 31/12/2024. The number of heads of prosecution offices is also included in Q55 'Number of public prosecutors'

**Q056 (2022):** The percentage of discrepancies is high due to the small absolute value.

**Latvia**

**Q056 (2024):** The changes observed are minimal and do not materially affect the overall outcome or conclusions and adjustment reflects low data .volume.

**Q056 (2022):** At the end of 2020, a reorganization was launched in the prosecutor's office with the aim of ensuring rational use of state budget funds, as well as creating a more even distribution of prosecutors' workload. During the reform, which also continued in 2021, the work of individual district-level prosecutor's office units was optimized (reduced number of prosecutors offices and number of heads of offices), at the same time prosecutors were also specialized in criminal offenses committed in the service of state institutions, including those related to corruption.

**Q056 (2020):** The data provides information only about persons performing the duties of head of prosecution office.

**Q056 (2018):** Data includes the position of the deputy Head Prosecutor, who is also the position of a higher prosecutor in the Prosecutor's Office.

**Q056 (2016):** Data includes the position of the deputy Head Prosecutor, who is also the position of a higher prosecutor in the Prosecutor's Office.

**Q056 (2014):** The provided data includes the number of deputy heads of prosecution offices, who are also occupying the higher prosecutor position within the structure of the public prosecution services. The total number of heads of prosecution offices for 2014 is 61 (8 deputy heads), 36 males (3 deputy heads), 25 females (5 deputy heads). The total number of heads of prosecution offices at first instance level is 41 (4 deputy heads), 24 males (2 deputy heads), 17 females (2 deputy heads). The total number of heads of prosecution offices at second instance level is 10 (4 deputy heads), 6 males (1 deputy head), 4 females (3 deputy heads).

**Lithuania**

**Q056 (2022):** In 2022, structural changes were implemented (merging of some departments), resulting in a reduction of 10 managerial positions (Chief Prosecutors, Deputy Chief Prosecutors). The number of men and women changes for natural reasons and depends on the gender of the applicants for the position of the Chief / Deputy Chief Prosecutor.

**Q056 (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. The total number of heads of prosecution offices evolved in the following manner: 2010 – 190; 2011 – 187; January 2012 – 145; May 2012 – 126; September 2012 – 93, December 2013 – 90, December 2014 – 89.

**Luxembourg**

**Q056 (General Comment):** The General Prosecution Office at the level of the Superior Court is headed by one General State Prosecutor. There are also two district prosecution offices (Luxembourg and Diekirch), so there are two district prosecutors.

**Q056 (2016):** 56.1 to 56.3: the heads referred to therein are also taken into account for items 55.1 to 55.3
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).

**Malta**

**Q056 (General Comment):** The Attorney General is the head of the Office of the Attorney General and her role as Head of Prosecution is defined in the Constitution of Malta.

**Q056 (2018):** The Attorney General is the head of the Office of the Attorney General. He enjoys the support of 2 Deputy Attorney Generals, one dedicated to civil law and the other dedicated to criminal law.

**Q056 (2016):** The Attorney General is the head of the Office of the Attorney General. His role is that of head of the prosecution as well as principal legal advisor to the government (and its various Ministries and Departments).

**Netherlands**

**Q056 (2016):** total 61,44 44,1 17,34
1 59,32 41,98, 17,34
2 2,12 2,12 0

**Q056 (2014):** The number of heads of prosecution offices at first instance level in 2014 includes 19,77 substitutes (14,54 male/5,23 female). Prosecutors at Supreme Court level are not employees of the National Prosecution Service and therefore they are not included in the total.

**Poland**

**Q056 (2024):** The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it includes the number of heads of regional prosecutor's offices (the 'third level') – a total of 11 prosecutors (3 women and 8 men).
The figures shown in the table do not include the number of persons acting as deputy heads of public prosecutor's offices at all levels of the general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office.

**Q056 (2023):** Comment refers to the description of structure given in Q055. The table takes into account the heads of regional prosecutor's offices, whose number is 11, including 9 men and 2 women. The figures indicated in the table do not take into account the number of persons serving as deputy heads of prosecution offices at the above levels.

**Q056 (2022):** Due to the impossibility of filtering the data as at 31.12.2022, the status as at 21.07.2023 r.
The table takes into account the heads of regional prosecutors' offices, whose number is 11, including nine men and two women.
The figures indicated in the table do not take into account the number of persons serving as deputy heads of prosecution offices at the above levels.

**Q056 (2020):** The sum is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of heads of regional prosecutor's offices, (whose number is 11, including 9 men and 2 women), since according to Article 16 of the Law of January 28, 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 prosecutors' offices, circuit prosecutors' offices and district prosecutors' offices. The figures indicated in the table do not take into account the number of persons serving as deputy heads of prosecution offices at the above levels.

**Q056 (2018):** Universal prosecutorial bodies are: the National Public Prosecutor’s Office, appellate public prosecutor’s offices, regional public prosecutor’s offices and district public prosecutor’s offices. Numerical data determined in the table does not include the number of deputy chief prosecutors related to the prosecution offices at the aforementioned levels.

**Q056 (2016):** There are several differences between data which were sent in previous campaigns (2014) and above table. Differences could be caused by indicating in previous cycles also vice heads of prosecution offices.

**Q056 (2014):** Figures provided for 2014 encompass deputy-heads of prosecution offices.

**Portugal**

**Q056 (2023):** At the first instance level, the following were counted:
- County District Prosecutors Coordinators (23)
- Director of the Central Department of Criminal Investigation and Prosecution (1)
- Directors of Regional Departments of Criminal Investigation and Prosecution (3)
- Directors of Departments of Criminal Investigation and Prosecution (11)

At the second instance level, the following were counted:
- Regional Prosecutors General (4)
- Administrative and Tax State Prosecutors Coordinators (2)
- Coordinator of the Public Prosecutor’s Office at the Guimarães Court of Appeal (1)

At Supreme Court level, the following were counted the Coordinators of the Public Prosecutor’s Office at the Supreme Court of Justice, at the Administrative Court and at the Court of Audit.

**Q056 (2016):** Portuguese Official Justice Statistics do not colletct these data.

**Romania**

**Q056 (2024):** There were several vacancies due to retirements or expiration of the term followed by a series of competitions. The gender balance changed as a result of these competitions.

**Q056 (2022):** 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".

**Q056 (2020):** 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".
The discrepancies in terms of number of heads within the prosecution offices compared to the previous campaign are due to the fact that the leading position mandates have expired within the current period and because of the pandemic situation competitions for filling in these positions could not be organised.

**Q056 (2018):** 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".

**Q056 (2016):** As regards the total number of heads of prosecution offices that went from 277 in 2014 to 426 for 2016 data, this may be generated by the fact that the specialised prosecution units (such as the anticorruption and anti organised crime structures) might have not been taken into account. Data may therefore not be comparable.

Without taking into calculation the specialised structures as mentioned above, the number of heads prosecution offices of the Supreme court is 13; if adding the number of heads of prosecution offices of the specialised structures, the number will be as follows: DNA (anticorruption unit) 15 out of which 10 male and 5 female; DIICOT (anti organised crime structure) 51 out of which 28 male and 23 female.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q056 (2014):** For 2012 and 2014, only the number of heads of prosecution offices was indicated. There is one head prosecutor for every District prosecution office (54), every Regional prosecution office (8) and the General Prosecutor Office (1). However, on 1 January 2015, there were two vacant positions of heads of district prosecution offices.Besides the head of the prosecution office, the post of chief prosecutor implies also the deputies of every prosecution office, the specialised prosecutor and his/her deputies, the directors and the deputies of sections and departments of the General prosecution Office. For example, in 2014, the total number of prosecutors in chief position was 200 (119 men, 81 women).

**Slovenia**

**Q056 (General Comment):** We considered heads of District State Prosecutor’s Offices and Specialized State Prosecutor's Office of The Republic of Slovenia as heads of prosecution office at first instance level. There is no organizational counterpart in the structure of prosecution office to courts of second instance, so the answer is NAP. We considered prosecutor general as the head of prosecution office at supreme court level.

**Q056 (2020):** The difference is due to small absolute number.

**Q056 (2016):** The position of the Supreme Court president was not filled on 31. 12. 2016 . The term of the previous president ended during 2016 and new president was not elected until 2017. The new president for the next 6-years-term is male.

**Spain**

**Q056 (General Comment):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
So it is not applicable the cathegories designed by the questionnaire. The Spanish structure distinguishes Heads of offices of the Autonomous Region, Heads of offices of Province, Heads of offices of area.

**Q056 (2024):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 16 (Males 11, Females 5)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 42 (Males 22, Females 20)
Number of Heads of offices of Area: Total 27 (Males 12, Females 15)

**Q056 (2023):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 16 (Males 9, Female 7)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 43 (Males 24, Female 19)
Number of Heads of offices of Area: Total 24 (Males 11, Females 13)

**Q056 (2022):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 17 (Males 9, Female 8)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 44 (Males 25, Female 19)
Number of Heads of offices of Area: Total 26 (Males 11, Females 15)

**Q056 (2020):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 17 (Males 12, Female 5)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 44 (Males 27, Female 17)
Number of Heads of offices of Area: Total 27 (Males 8, Females 19)

**Q056 (2018):** The structure of the Prosecutor's body is adapted to the territorial division of Spain in Autonomous Regions and Provinces.
Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 17
(Males 11, Female 6)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 44 (Males 30, Female 14)
Number of Heads of offices of área: Total 26 (Males 11, Females 15)

**Q056 (2016):** Number of Heads of offices of the Autonomous Región: Total 17 (Males 13, Female 04)
Number of Heads of offices of Province: Total 44 (Males 30, Female 14)
Number of Heads of offices of área: Total 27 (Males 10, Females 17)

### Question 057

**Austria**

**Q057 (2024):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); starting from 2022, agents of public prosecutor's offices in training are included in the frame of Q60.
-> The actual number in Q 57 would be 142,28

**Q057 (2023):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); starting from 2022, agents of public prosecutor's offices in training are included in the frame of Q60.

**Q057 (2022):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); starting from 2022, agents of public prosecutor's offices in training are included in the frame of Q60.

**Q057 (2020):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); agents of public prosecutor's offices in training included

**Q057 (2018):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence); agents of public prosecutor's offices in training included.

**Q057 (2016):** The agents of public prosecutor's offices ("Bezirksanwälte") are judicial officers with legal training, and are allowed to act for the public prosecutor's offices under the supervision of a public prosecutor (Quite similar to the "Rechtspfleger", but with a lower range of competence).

**Belgium**

**Q057 (General Comment):** It should be noted that the competent prosecutor general may entrust permanently appointed lawyers at the prosecution services with prosecution before police courts in certain cases. This requires an individual order stating the reasons and the approval of the competent general prosecutor (see Article 162 § 2 of the Judicial Code). In addition to these lawyers, criminologists, trainee prosecutors, and candidate prosecutors have functions similar to those of public prosecutors.

**Q057 (2024):** There are individuals who perform duties comparable to those of prosecutors. This possibility is governed and regulated by the Judicial Code. These individuals may only perform duties when commissioned by the Attorney General. They include (512) lawyers working within the prosecution services, trainee-prosecutors, and candidate-prosecutors.

**Q057 (2023):** It should be noted, however, that there are persons who have functions comparable to those of public prosecutors. This possibility is regulated by the Judicial Code. These persons may only carry out their duties on commission from the prosecutor general. They are (406) lawyers acting within public prosecution offices, trainee prosecutors and candidate prosecutors.

**Q057 (2016):** By a reasoned individual order and after a positive opinion has been given by the competent public prosecutor, permanently appointed public prosecutors may bring a public action before the police court, except in the case of involuntary death as a result of a traffic accident, in so far as they can prove at least two years' seniority as a lawyer in the judiciary.

**Cyprus**

**Q057 (2023):** the Attorney General may assign to lawyers the prosecution of certain cases

**Q057 (2016):** the Attorney General can assign to lawyers the prosecution of certain cases.

**Denmark**

**Q057 (General Comment):** Some police officers conduct cases pertaining to minor offences in court, but they carry out this function on behalf of the prosecution service.

**Q057 (2018):** There is a small number of police officers who conduct cases pertaining to minor offences in court behalf of the prosecution service, but it is only a small part of their normal tasks as a police officer.

**Estonia**

**Q057 (2018):** We have assistant prosecutors who act under the guidance of the prosecutor.

**Q057 (2016):** We have assistant prosecutors who act under the guidance of the prosecutor.

**Finland**

**Q057 (General Comment):** The Chancellor of Justice of the Government and the Parliamentary Ombudsman may also prosecute or order that charges to be brought in matters falling within the scope of their supervisory authority. If a prosecutor has decided not to prosecute, the injured party has the right to him/herself bring a charge for the offence in order to have the case heard by a court.

**Q057 (2024):** The functions of a prosecutor are also performed by the highest legal supervisors the Parliamentary Ombudsman and the Chancellor of Justice.

**Q057 (2018):** If a prosecutor has decided not to prosecute, the injured party has the right to self bring a charge for the offence in order to have the case heard by a court. The Chancellor of Justice of the Government and the Parliamentary Ombudsman may also prosecute or order the charges to be brought in matters falling within the scope of their supervisory authority.

**France**

**Q057 (General Comment):** In France there are other persons having similar duties to those of public prosecutors, namely the so called "délégués du procureur". The latter carry out certain tasks of the public prosecutor: implementing alternative measures to criminal prosecution, notifying measures proposed as part of a penal composition, notifying convicted offenders of penal orders, monitoring the implementation of probationary sentences, monitoring the enforcement of penalty sentences, receiving payment of fines imposed by penal order, representing the public prosecutor in territorial bodies.

**Q057 (2023):** The ”délégués du procureur” carry out functions comparable to those of public prosecutors. They intervene to implement alternative measures to prosecution decided by the public prosecutor for minor offences (reminder of obligations under the law, conditional discontinuation, penal composition). They may also be tasked with issuing summonses to appear in court or criminal orders. They carry out their duties within the premises of first instance courts, courts of appeal or any place of justice designated by the public prosecutor (points of justice, police stations, etc.). As key players in the local justice system, their duties have been extended and diversified as part of the reform to make criminal proceedings more efficient, as set out in decree no. 2020-1640 of 21 December 2020. They can now hold office hours, represent the public prosecutor at meetings of partnership bodies or receive payment of fines.

**Q057 (2022):** In France there are other persons having similar duties to those of public prosecutors, namely the so called "délégués du procureur". The latter carry out certain tasks of the public prosecutor: implementing alternative measures to criminal prosecution, notifying measures proposed as part of a penal composition, notifying convicted offenders of penal orders, monitoring the implementation of probationary sentences, monitoring the enforcement of penalty sentences, receiving payment of fines imposed by penal order, representing the public prosecutor in territorial bodies.

In 2022, there were 1 004 "délégués du procureur". The number in full time equivalent is 400 and it has been calculated approximately, as they work on a sessional basis.

**Q057 (2016):** No other person has functions comparable to those of the public prosecutor, the latter being sole in charge of the public prosecution. On the other hand, certain powers may be delegated on an ad hoc basis within a specific framework. Thus, before the police court and the local court which are competent to try contraventions of the first four levels, the functions of the public prosecutor are carried out by an officer of the public prosecutor's office (OMP) in the person of the competent police commissioner in the jurisdiction of these courts.
The prosecutor of the Republic may also designate a representative of the public prosecutor to intervene in the procedure of criminal composition or to remind the perpetrator of the obligations resulting from the law, to direct the perpetrator to a health, social or professional structure or to ask the perpetrator to regularise his/her situation or to compensate the damage resulting from the offence. The prosecutor's delegates may be natural persons or associations. They are empowered to do so by the public prosecutor, must take an oath before the court and are bound by professional secrecy. They submit an annual activity report to the prosecutor.
The prosecutor's delegates are not members of the public prosecutor's office and are not in charge of initiating public prosecutions, unlike the officers of the public prosecutor's office mentioned above. Indeed, the prosecutor's delegates are only competent within the framework of the mission assigned to them for an alternative measure to prosecution in a specific case.

**Q057 (2014):** Data in FTE is not available for two reasons. On the one hand, deputy prosecutors (about 950) and criminal mediators are involved as delivery agents and not employees. On the other hand, associations, to the number of 155, are also entitled to fulfill these missions, but it is still not possible to determine the number of FTE devoted to these specific missions, among other socio-judicial missions.

**Germany**

**Q057 (General Comment):** Section 142 of the Courts Constitution Act (GVG) provides for the function of an official of the public prosecution office with a right of audience before the local courts. In Germany, an official of the public prosecution office is a civil servant in a special career of the higher judicial service who performs certain tasks of a public prosecutor. In principle, they can perform prosecutorial duties before local courts without restriction. However, the federal states have enacted orders on the organisation and operation of the public prosecutor's offices. These orders regularly limit the activities of the officials of the public prosecution office to an enumerative catalogue of offences to be tried before the criminal judge. Officials of the public prosecution office cannot perform prosecutorial duties before regional, higher regional or federal courts. In addition, section 142 of the Courts Constitution Act (GVG) provides that trainee jurists may be entrusted with the performance of prosecutorial duties. These trainee jurists are persons who have completed their law studies with the first state examination and are in a two-year preparatory service, the completion of which is intended to qualify them for the judicial office. Within the scope of the assignment of duties, the trainee jurist has the same procedural powers as an official of the public prosecution office.

**Q057 (2024):** Please refer to the General Comment

**Q057 (2023):** Please refer to the general comment

**Q057 (2016):** The number cited concerns exclusively associate public prosecutors at a local court (Amtsanwälte). This figure as well reflects job shares (not a number of heads). Besides these associate public prosecutors, there are trainee jurists, civil parties to criminal proceedings, and revenue authorities. However, their number is not known (NA) and therefore was not included in the answer to question 57.
Officials of the public prosecution office:
The office of the public prosecution office at the Local Courts can also be exercised by officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience before the local courts (section 142 (2) of the Courts Constitution Act). The jurisdiction of the officials of the public prosecution office does not encompass preparing public charges in local court proceedings in criminal matters falling under the jurisdiction of courts other than the local courts. In accordance with the Order regarding the Organisation and Service Operations of the Public Prosecution Offices (Anordnung über Organisation und Dienstbetrieb der Staatsanwaltschaft, OrgStA) issued by some Land administrations of justice, officials of the public prosecution office are only assigned criminal matters in which the criminal court judge rules, and then only the criminal matters designated in a list. Trainee jurists:
Responsibility may be assigned to trainee jurists for discharging the duties of an official of the public prosecution office with a right of audience before the local courts and, in an individual case, for discharging the duties of a public prosecutor under the latter’s supervision (section 142 (3) of the Courts Constitution Act).
Civil party to criminal proceedings:
Under certain preconditions, some criminal offences can be prosecuted by aggrieved per-sons by means of a private charge without needing to first call on the public prosecution office. A private charge can also be filed by someone who is entitled to file a request to prosecute in addition to o

r in place of the aggrieved person.
Revenue authorities:
Tasks comparable to those of the public prosecution office are performed by the revenue authorities in the fiscal criminal proceedings: If the revenue authority conducts the investiga-tion independently in accordance with section 386 (2) of the Fiscal Code (Abgabenordnung, AO), it has the same rights and obligations as the public prosecutor’s office has in an investigation (section 399 (1) of the Fiscal Code).

**Greece**

**Q057 (General Comment):** Deputy Prosecutors and members of the prosecution(is the first degree after graduation from the National School of Judges) have related duties to prosecutors.

**Hungary**

**Q057 (2022):** According to the Criminal Procedure Code a victim may act as a private prosecutor and a substitute private prosecutor in criminal proceedings, but private prosecutors and substitute private prosecutors are not part of the administration of justice.

**Ireland**

**Q057 (General Comment):** For completeness, it should be noted that Section 8 (2) of the Garda Síochána Act 2005 provides that any member of the police service (An Garda Síochána) may institute and conduct prosecutions in a court of summary jurisdiction (the District Court which is the court of first instance in criminal prosecutions) in the name of the Director of Public Prosecutions. The DPP has issued a number of general directions concerning the institution and conduct of prosecutions by members of the police service (Gardaí) who are required by Section 8 (3) of the 2005 Act to comply with such directions in deciding whether to institute and in instituting or conducting a prosecution. 14,191 Garda Members were in service at the end of 2024. In this jurisdiction also, there are a number of specialised investigating authorities in relation to certain particular categories of crime or offending, including breaches of the tax code, provisions for safety and welfare at work, and company or competition law. Many investigative agencies have the power to prosecute summarily (in the District Court) without reference to the DPP.

**Q057 (2024):** Local State Solicitors who provide a solicitor service in the areas outside Dublin; Prosecution Counsel, who are instructed to act for the Director on a case by case basis (201 Barristers in private practice were on the panel for 2024); County Prosecutors, who are instructed to prosecute cases in the Circuit Court in their respective County; and members of the Garda Síochána who have authority to prosecute certain summary offences (14,191 Garda Members were in service at the end of 2024) State Solicitors are solicitors in private practice who are employed on a contract basis to act on behalf of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Outside the Dublin area, local State Solicitors provide a solicitor service for the Director in Circuit Courts and some District Court matters. There is generally one State Solicitor per county but in certain counties, State Solicitor areas have been split to take account of factors such as population.
The conduct of trials on indictment is handled by independent counsel practising at the Bar who are engaged to represent the Director of Public Prosecutions on a case-by-case basis. Counsel prosecute in accordance with the Director’s instructions and in compliance with the Guidelines for Prosecutors. Retention on any panel is at the discretion of the Director and is subject to satisfactory performance of work on the Director's behalf, as will be determined by the Director.

**Q057 (2023):** Local State Solicitors who provide a solicitor service in the areas outside Dublin; Prosecution Counsel, who are instructed to act for the Director on a case by case basis; County Prosecutors, who are instructed to prosecute cases in the Circuit Court in their respective County; and members of the Garda Síochána who have authority to prosecute certain summary offences (see general comments). State Solicitors are solicitors in private practice who are employed on a contract basis to act on behalf of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Outside the Dublin area, local State Solicitors provide a solicitor service for the Director in Circuit Courts and some District Court matters. There is generally one State Solicitor per county but in certain counties, State Solicitor areas have been split to take account of factors such as population.
The conduct of trials on indictment is handled by independent counsel practising at the Bar who are engaged to represent the Director of Public Prosecutions on a case-by-case basis. Counsel prosecute in accordance with the Director’s instructions and in compliance with the Guidelines for Prosecutors. Retention on any panel is at the discretion of the Director and is subject to satisfactory performance of work on the Director's behalf, as will be determined by the Director. For further details please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 1.5 and 2.13 to 2.15.(https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for-Prosecutors-5th-Edition eng.pdf) and Prosecution System in Ireland (chapters 4 and 5)

**Q057 (2022):** Please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 1.5 and 2.13 to 2.15. (https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2023/01/Guidelines-for-Prosecutors-5th-Edition-eng.pdf).

**Q057 (2020):** Please see Guidelines for Prosecutors (5th edition, 2019), paragraphs 1.5 and 2.13 to 2.15.

**Q057 (2016):** There are 32 State Solicitors contracted to provide a solicitor service to the Director of Public Prosecutions in cases to be heard outside Dublin. Serious criminal offences, with the exception of certain criminal mattes having an international dimension, are prosecuted in the name of the DPP. Much of the work of the DPP is carried out by barristers in private practice rather than by barristers in the employment of the State. Therefore, there is no equivalent to the salaried official known as a public prosecutor in other member states.

**Italy**

**Q057 (General Comment):** In Italy lay magistrates are also members of the public prosecution. They are called “Vice Procuratori Onorari”. After a period of training, they can assist the professional public prosecutors to deal with a variety of different functions such as representing the public prosecution office during hearings regarding misdemeanour criminal cases or studying jurisprudence and case-law, or helping professional public prosecutors in drafting procedural acts.

**Q057 (2023):** In Italy, lay magistrates, known as "Vice Procuratori Onorari," play a unique role as members of the public prosecution system. Following a period of training, they are authorized to support professional public prosecutors in a range of capacities. These responsibilities include: Representation in Court: Lay magistrates can represent the public prosecution office during hearings related to misdemeanor criminal cases. Legal Research and Analysis: They engage in the study of jurisprudence and case-law, contributing to a deeper understanding of legal precedents. Procedural Assistance: Lay magistrates provide valuable assistance to professional public prosecutors in drafting procedural documents and acts.

**Q057 (2020):** In Italy this figure is called “Vice Procuratore Onorario”. After a period of training, they can assist the public prosecutors. They can be employed in a variety of different tasks: hearings of misdemeanor criminal cases, jurisprudence studies, preparation of the request to discontinue cases, etc.

**Q057 (2018):** In Italy this figure is called “Vice Procuratore Aggiunto”. After a period of training, they can assist the public prosecutors. They can be employed in a variety of different tasks: hearings of misdemeanour criminal cases, jurisprudence studies, preparation of the request to discontinue cases, etc.

**Malta**

**Q057 (General Comment):** Police had the authority to investigate and initiate prosecutions before the Court of Magistrates. The Office of the AG prosecutes trials by jury and appeals therefrom and also files and prosecutes appeals from the decisions of the Court of Magistrates. Following the reform in 2020 in which the Office of the AG became Chief Prosecutor, a number of cases previously prosecuted by the police are being gradually handed over to the lawyers working at the Office of the AG.

**Q057 (2018):** Police have the authority to initiate prosecutions and to prosecute cases before the Court of Magistrates. If cases are serious enough to go to trial by jury (theoretically any case liable by imprisonment for more than 2 years can got to trial by jury, but cases in which trial by jury is mandatory are those in which the charge is liable to imprisonment for 12 years or more. In practice, most trials by jury deal with these kind of serious offences). The prosecution from the Office of the Attorney General prosecute trials by jury and appeals therefrom and also files and prosecutes appeals from the decisions of the Court of Magistrates.

**Q057 (2016):** In Malta, the police have the authority to prosecute a case in court, unless the nature of the offence is serious enough to merit prosecution in the higher courts by the lawyers working at the Office of the AG. The figure presented above reflects the number of Police Inspectors and Police Superintendents whose duties include prosecution in court.

**Netherlands**

**Q057 (General Comment):** In 2018, the function of assistant-public prosecutor (now: deputy public prosecutor) was introduced. They are mandated to act as public prosecutors in parts of the caseload that are high-volume and less complex. In such cases, they have the same powers as a Public Prosecutor: to decide on the type of settlement the Prosecution Service will pursue (afdoeningsbeslissingen), and to represent the prosecution in court as acting Public Prosecutor in single-judge hearings (plaatsvervangend officier enkelvoudige zittingen), independently. It is a permanent position requiring a law degree with a specialisation in criminal law.

**Q057 (2024):** Deputy Public Prosecutor (Adjunct-officier; formerly assistent-officier). They are mandated to function as acting public prosecutor in the part of the case load that is high volume and less complex. In these cases they have the mandate of a Public Prosecutor; to assess which type of settlement the Public Prosecution will seek (afdoeningsbeslissingen) and to act as Public Prosecutor in court (plaatsvervangend officier enkelvoudige zittingen) - independently. It is a permanent position that requires a law degree with a specialization in criminal law.

**Q057 (2020):** Assistant-Public prosecutor
Since the previous cycle, the function of assistant - public prosecutor has been introduced.

**Poland**

**Q057 (2024):** The above figures are as of 31 December 2024 and also include assessors in the Military Departments, of whom there are 18 in total.
Provisions concerning assessors of the public prosecutor's office are regulated by Section V of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office. Pursuant to Article 173 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office, the Prosecutor General may entrust an assessor of the public prosecutor's office, for a fixed period not exceeding three years, with the performance of prosecutorial activities without the right to:
1) participate in proceedings before the court of appeal and in proceedings in the district court, except for proceedings in the first instance in cases in which he or she conducted the preparatory proceedings;
2) appear at the Supreme Court, draft appeals and motions to the Supreme Court.
A prosecutor's assessor who is not authorised to perform prosecutorial activities may act as a public prosecutor in cases in which an investigation was conducted.
In addition, the provisions concerning prosecutors apply accordingly to prosecutor's assessors (in accordance with Article 174 § 1 of the Act – Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office).

**Q057 (2023):** prosecuting assessors

**Q057 (2022):** The above figures show the status as at 31.12.2022 and also include assessors in the Military Affairs Departments, of which there are 14 in total.
The provisions concerning prosecution assessors are set out in Section V of the Act - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office. Pursuant to Article 173 of the Act - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office, the Public Prosecutor General may entrust an assessor of the public prosecutor's office, for a specified period of time, not exceeding 3 years, with the performance of prosecutorial activities without the right to:
1) participation in the proceedings before the court of appeal and in the proceedings before the district court, with the exception of proceedings at first instance in cases in which he has conducted pre-trial proceedings;
2) to appear before the Supreme Court, to draw up appeals and motions to the Supreme Court.
An assessor of the public prosecutor's office who is not authorised to perform prosecutorial activities may act as a public prosecutor in cases in which an investigation has been conducted.
In addition, the provisions relating to public prosecutors (pursuant to Article 174 § 1 of the Act - Law on Public Prosecution) apply accordingly to prosecution assessors.

**Q057 (2020):** Pursuant to Article 173 § 1 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office of 28 January 2016 (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66), the Public Prosecutor General may entrust an assistant prosecutor (assessor) for a fixed period, not exceeding 3 years, with the performance of prosecutorial activities without the right:
1)to participate in proceedings before the Court of Appeal and in proceedings before the Circuit Court, with the exception of proceedings at first instance in cases where he or she has conducted the pre-trial proceedings;
appearing before the Supreme Court, preparing appeals and applications to the Supreme Court.

**Q057 (2018):** Pursuant to art. 173 § 1 of the Law on Prosecution Act of 28th January 2016 (published in the Journal of Laws 2017, item 1767 and later amendments), Public Prosecutor General can entrust prosecution's assessor (for a specified period of time, not exceeding 3 years) with performance of prosecutor's activities, without the right to:
1)participation in the appeal proceedings, as well as participation in proceedings before the District Court - except for proceedings of a first instance, in cases related to preparatory proceedings conducted by this court;
2)act before the Supreme Court, as well as prepare appeals and motions to the Supreme Court.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q057 (2024):** These are prosecutor trainees pursuant to Sections 234 et seq. of Act No. 154/2001 Coll., and prosecutor's assistants pursuant to Sections 228 et seq. of the same Act. Their powers are defined in Sections 30a to 30d of Act No. 153/2001 Coll.
A total of 46, of which 41 were prosecutor trainees and 5 were prosecutor's assistants.

**Q057 (2022):** Judicial assistants of the prosecutor's office and assistant prosecutors.

**Q057 (2020):** Other persons with similar duties as prosecutors are the legal attendants of the prosecutor's office and the assistant prosecutors. As for the different answer in the previous cycle, in that time the institute of assistant prosecutors did not yet exist yet.

**Spain**

**Q057 (General Comment):** Police officers can present a police report directly to the Criminal Investigation Courts.

## Question 060

**Austria**

**Q060 (2024):** - Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices - Technical staff - Trainees (including trainees for Bezirksanwälte) and staff representation

**Q060 (2023):** - Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices
- Technical staff
- Trainees (including trainees for Bezirksanwälte) and staff representation

**Q060 (2022):** Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices
Technical staff
Trainees (including trainees for Bezirksanwälte) and staff representation

**Belgium**

**Q060 (General Comment):** These figures cover all grades of judicial staff, except for lawyers appointed at the public prosecution offices, prosecutors under training and candidate prosecutors.
These are: secretaries, non-prosecutor staff responsible for assisting prosecutors in the same way as secretaries, staff responsible for administrative tasks, technical staff. “Other staff” encompasses criminologists.

**Q060 (2020):** V: 1694
M: 730

**Bulgaria**

**Q060 (General Comment):** The Prosecutors’ College of the Supreme Judicial Council does not maintain data on the gender distribution of the prosecutor’s office clerks (non-prosecutor staff) in the prosecutor’s offices, since each prosecutor’s office of the respective level is an independent legal entity and their employer is the administrative head of the respective prosecutor’s office.

**Q060 (2022):** number of full-time positions for judicial officers in the general and specialized administration in all prosecutor's offices of the Republic of Bulgaria – 2901 /as of December 31, 2022/
- number of full-time employees in specific positions for judicial officers in the educational centers of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria – 55 /as of December 31, 2022/

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q060 (2024):** The data refer to civil servants and employees with permanent contracts in the following categories: non-prosecutorial (so-called non-judicial) staff, prosecutorial administration, and technical and support staff:
-Those who are absent without pay
-who are not actively seeking job
-who are taken off the rolls
-who are dispatched to work for the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, the State Judicial Council, foreign missions, or other state bodies or organizations outside the state service
-who are off for motherhood
-those on leave as fathers
-those who are on leave as parents
-Those who are absent due to adoption
-those who are on leave as parents
-who have a part-time job
-who, as a result of rising childcare costs, work half-time
-who are caring for a child with developmental difficulties while on leave or working a half-time schedule
-whose employment status is dormant until the child's third year of life

**Q060 (2022):** The data refer to civil servants and employees employed for an indefinite period.
The number does not include those:
- who are on unpaid leave
- who have a dormant employment status
- who have a dormant status of employment until the third year of the child's life
- who are part-time in accordance with the Act on maternity and parental benefits
- who work part-time to care for a child with special needs
- who are on maternity leave
- who are on parental leave
- who are on paternity leave
- who are removed from service
- who are sent to work in another state body or outside the state service (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council, international missions and international institutions)

**Cyprus**

**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

**Denmark**

**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 (2023):** All non-public prosecutor staff is included.

**Q060 (2022):** In the response from 2020, all employees of the prosecution, i.e. also prosecutors, were for unknown reasons included. In the 2021 data the number is 747 in relation to non-public prosecutors. And this year the number is 605 people. The decrease is due to, among other things, that police personnel employed by the prosecution were also included, and due to an organizational change in the public prosecution services.

**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).

**Estonia**

**Q060 (2024):** Translators have been added.

**Q060 (2020):** More males have been hired.

**Finland**

**Q060 (2024):** Prosecutor’s secretaries and other specialist staff.

**Q060 (2023):** Prosecutors´secretaries and other specialist staff.

**Q060 (2022):** Prosecutor's secretaries and other specialist staff

**Q060 (2021):** In 2021, more staff was hired.

**Q060 (2018):** More staff has been recruited.
The number of males has increased.

**France**

**Q060 (2024):** The staff categories taken into account correspond to assistant lawyers who became judicial officers on November 1, 2024, and specialized assistants working for the public prosecutor's office.

**Q060 (2023):** The categories of staff taken into account correspond to legal assistants and specialist assistants working for the public prosecutor's office.
The increase in the number of non-prosecutor staff attached to the Public Prosecutor's Office in 2023 compared with 2022 occurs in the context of the strengthening of the justice budget, in particular by providing for the creation of a large number of posts for legal assistants (300 in 2023), these criteria have made it possible to consolidate the assignment of legal assistants to the Public Prosecutor's Office on a long-term basis.
In accordance with the note from the Directorate of Judicial Services dated 30 January 2023 on the distribution and recruitment of legal assistant staff for the year 2023, the following were taken into account: the support for the activity of the public prosecutors' offices, the ratio of the number of legal assistant staff jobs per localised prosecutor’s position so that it is between 1 for 6 and 1 for 7 for all metropolitan jurisdictions, the specificities of overseas jurisdictions and jurisdictions hosting specialized interregional jurisdictions (JIRS) or national centers. In addition, the distribution of the posts of legal assistant officers was linked to an action plan to reduce stocks and improve the quality of processing of proceedings. Similarly, the need to support the public prosecutors' offices, particularly within the JIRS or national centres, in the characterisation and processing of complex offences has led to the assignment of specialised assistants within these courts.

**Q060 (2022):** This figure includes legal assistants and specialised assistants working in the public prosecutor's office.

**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.

**Germany**

**Q060 (2024):** Figures include officials of the public prosecution office referred to in question 57

**Q060 (2023):** Figures include officials of the public prosecution office referred to in question 57.

**Q060 (2022):** Figures include official solicitors ("Amtsanwälte") referred to in question 57.

**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).

**Greece**

**Q060 (2022):** The majority is the category of Secretaries , the other categories are court bailiffs, typists, It clerks and two public prosecutor's offices have one security clerk each.

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q060 (2024):** The above data include junior prosecutors, trainee prosecutors, paralegals, prosecution officials, clerks and blue-collar employees.

**Q060 (2023):** The above data include junior prosecutors, trainee prosecutors, paralegals, prosecution officials, clerks and blue-collar employees.

**Q060 (2022):** The above data include junior prosecutors, trainee prosecutors, officers doing semi-prosecutorial tasks, officers, clerks and blue-collar employees.

**Ireland**

**Q060 (2024):** These staff include legal support staff at administrative grades, as well as staff from the corporate and support services area which include, Finance, Facilities, Human Resources, Organisational Development, ICT, Strategy, Public Affairs, Risk and Governance, legal research and knowledge management and the Library.

**Q060 (2023):** The non-public prosecutors include specialists in the following areas: Human resources and organisational development, finance, ICT, facilities, media and communications, corporate governance, procurement, strategic management including risk management, Freedom of Information, quality assurance and audit. There is a Policy and Research Unit supported by knowledge management and research function and librarian. All legal sections are supported by a team of administrative staff who are considered to be generalist.
Our overall sanction headcount increased from 260 in 2022 to 301 in 2023 which resulted in a headcount increase for non-public prosecutors.

**Q060 (2022):** The non-public prosecutors include specialists in the following areas: Human resources and organisational development, finance, ICT, facilities, media and communications, corporate governance, procurement, strategic management including risk management, Freedom of Information, quality assurance and internal audit. There is a Policy and Research Unit supported by knowledge management and research function and librarian. All legal sections are supported by a team of administrative staff who are considered to be generalist.

**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.

**Italy**

**Q060 (2021):** The number of staff has increased due to the hiring of new personnel through public competition.

**Latvia**

**Q060 (General Comment):** Total number of staff- 390 that consists of- 121 - non prosecutor stuff (whose task is to assist the prosecutor such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions); 178 in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices; 91 technical staff.
Discrepancy comment: Data for 2023 is correct related to the number of males and females. In 2022 there was typing mistake and females should be 268, males 109.

**Q060 (2024):** Total number of staff – 409 that consists of – 132 – non-prosecutor stuff (whose task is to assist the prosecutor such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions); 186 in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices; 91 technical staff.

**Q060 (2023):** Total number of staff- 390 that consists of- 121 - non prosecutor stuff (whose task is to assist the prosecutor such as registrars (case preparation, assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions); 178 in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the prosecution offices; 91 technical staff.
Discrepancy comment: Data for 2023 is correct related to the number of males and females. In 2022 there was typing mistake and females should be 268, males 109.

**Q060 (2022):** Total number of staff working at the Prosecution Office is 377 (268 male employees, 109 female employees). Of this number, qualified (judicial) support for prosecutors in the performance of their functions, such as assistance during the hearing, helping to draft the decisions (category 2 of the question 52) is provided only by 14 employees. Prosecution Office has 105 prosecutor assistants who provide only technical assistance, they do not provide qualified (judicial) assistance (the functions of prosecutor assistants correspond to those described under category 3 of the question 52). There are also 159 employees that perform different administrative and management tasks. Therefore, the total number of employees in charge of administrative and management tasks is 264. And finally, we have 99 employees that perform technical duties.
Changes on proportion of gender of employees are connected with the changes in the number of employees.

**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.

**Lithuania**

**Q060 (2024):** Assistants of prosecutors, lawyers, other administrative staff.

**Q060 (2023):** assistants of prosecutors, lawyers, other administrative staff.

**Q060 (2022):** The number of women in staff (non-public prosecutors) attached to the public prosecution services tends to be higher. Total number of staff changed due to natural changes in human resources and as a result of the optimisation processes within the Public Prosecutor's Office.

**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).

**Luxembourg**

**Q060 (2022):** The staff of the judicial and administrative jurisdictions has experienced sustained growth in recent years, as provided for by the amended law of 7 March 1980 on judicial organization, as we had previously explained during the evaluation period of 2020-2022. The variation in total non-judicial staff between 2020 and 2022 is 25.33%. An increase of 9% was observed between 2021 and 2022.

**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.

**Malta**

**Q060 (2024):** There was an increase in staff over the past 2 years given that the service is expanding

**Q060 (2022):** Like in previous evaluations, the number of non-judge staff includes legal procurators working at the Office of the Attorney General.

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q060 (2024):** Administration, business operations, policy, management, management support, project managers, secretary, trainees.

**Q060 (2023):** Administration, business operations, policy, management, management support, project managers, secretary, trainees.

**Poland**

**Q060 (2024):** The table provides data on the actual employment of officials, assistant prosecutors and other employees in general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office.
The table shows the actual numbers of persons employed in general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office, as the Human Resources Office does not have detailed data on the number of employees in full-time equivalents by gender. The Human Resources Office also does not have detailed data on the number of employees in general organisational units of the public prosecutor's office who are employed on a permanent or fixed-term basis. At the same time, I would like to inform you that the organisational units of the public prosecutor's office provide the Human Resources Office with data on public prosecutor's office employees (the military section separately) in the following groups:
1) staffing limits,
2) utilisation of staffing limits (without a breakdown by gender), rounded to two decimal places, 3) the actual number of employees (broken down by the number of women and men employed).

**Q060 (2023):** The table provides data on the actual employment of clerks, assistant prosecutors and other employees in common organisational units of the prosecutor's office.

**Q060 (2022):** The table provides data on the actual employment of clerks, assistant prosecutors and other employees in the common organisational units of the 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)ETE [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.

**Romania**

**Q060 (2024):** The data is provided by the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice. The difference could be explained by staff mobility potentially caused by dissatisfaction of salaries. The gender balance changed as a result of this mobility.

**Q060 (2023):** Of the 1 810 filled positions in prosecution offices nationwide, 1 803 are held by clerks, while the remaining 7 are occupied by procedural agents (responsible for tasks such as delivering summons and other courier duties) and other staff, including drivers.

**Q060 (2022):** Out of the total of 2089 filled in positions in the prosecution offices country wide, 1761 are occupied by clerks and the rest of
328 are procedural agents (who accomplish activities such as delivering summons, other courier activities etc.) and other staff such as
drivers.

**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

**Slovak Republic**

**Q060 (2022):** The dicrepacy ratio was caused mainly by the resolution of the Govermnet of the Slovak republic, which ordered the state authorities to reduce the number of state employees by 10 %.

**Q060 (2020):** Staff increased for natural recruitment procedure

**Slovenia**

**Q060 (General Comment):** The information is 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; however they participate in hearings and drafting of court decisions in some cases.

**Q060 (2022):** The number is reported in FTE format. The total gross number of staff is 309.

**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.

### Question 132

**Austria**

**Q132 (General Comment):** Judges/prosecutors are first placed into a certain pay grade according to their position within the judiciary system (e.g. regional courts, supreme court, administrative courts, etc.), where they receive the according base salary (§ 66 RStDG / § 190 RStDG). Every four years the salary increases by a fixed amount up until a certain maximum. Judges and public prosecutors in certain senior positions, such as the head of a district court, the vice president or president of a court of first instance or the head of a senior public prosecutor's office/public prosecutor's office, are entitled to a service allowance (between EUR 201.40 and EUR 1560.60 as at 31 Dezember 2024). The service allowance is part of the monthly salary. The service allowance is part of the monthly payment together with the salary. In principle, it could be stated that the salary covers all additional work performed by judges and public prosecutors in terms of quantity and time. Administrative Courts: First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 86440 Net annual salary: EUR 55850 Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: approx. EUR 150000

**Q132 (2024):** Judges/prosecutors are first placed into a certain pay grade according to their position within the judiciary system (e.g. regional courts, supreme court, administrative courts etc.), where they receive the according base salary (§ 66 RStDG / § 190 RStDG). Every four years the salary increases by a fixed amount up until a certain maximum. Additionally there are several bonuses for advanced functions such as leading positions.
The highest possible salary of a judge of the Supreme Administrative Court is EUR 195.000,-

**Q132 (2023):** Judges/prosecutors are first placed into a certain pay grade according to their position within the judiciary system (e.g. regional courts, supreme court, administrative courts, etc.), where they receive the according base salary (§ 66 RStDG / § 190 RStDG). Every four years the salary increases by a fixed amount up until a certain maximum. Judges and public prosecutors in certain senior positions, such as the head of a district court, the vice president or president of a court of first instance or the head of a senior public prosecutor's office/public prosecutor's office, are entitled to a service allowance (between EUR 171.90 and EUR 1332.30 as at 31 Dezember 2022). The service allowance is part of the monthly salary. The service allowance is part of the monthly payment together with the salary.
In principle, it could be stated that the salary covers all additional work performed by judges and public prosecutors in terms of quantity and time. Administrative Courts:
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 86440 Net annual salary: EUR 55850
Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: approx. EUR 150000

**Q132 (2022):** Judges/prosecutors are first placed into a certain pay grade according to their position within the judiciary system (e.g. regional courts, supreme court, administrative courts, etc.), where they receive the according base salary (§ 66 RStDG / § 190 RStDG). Every four years the salary increases by a fixed amount up until a certain maximum. Judges and public prosecutors in certain senior positions, such as the head of a district court, the vice president or president of a court of first instance or the head of a senior public prosecutor's office/public prosecutor's office, are entitled to a service allowance (between EUR 171.90 and EUR 1332.30 as at 31 Dezember 2022). The service allowance is part of the monthly salary. The service allowance is part of the monthly payment together with the salary.
In principle, it could be stated that the salary covers all additional work performed by judges and public prosecutors in terms of quantity and time. Administrative Courts:
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 78545
Net annual salary: EUR 49400
Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: approx. EUR 142000

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q132 (General Comment):** The gross amount of 86,916 corresponds to the salary of a judge in a court of first instance at the start of their career (= between 3 and 6 years of seniority) and that of a deputy public prosecutor at the start of their career (= between 3 and 6 years of seniority).
The amount of 158,926 corresponds to the salary of a counselor at the Court of Cassation with the maximum length of service (given that appointment to the Court of Cassation is the final stage of a judicial career for each of them, they all receive the maximum). The salaries of administrative judges are not included in the table. Counselors to the Council of State are not part of the judicial system. Their salaries are also set by law.
Salary evolves according to financial seniority with an increase every three years. The calculation of net salary depends on individual parameters (based on the situation of the person concerned, married, number of dependent children etc.) and therefore cannot be described in general terms. The following are deducted from the gross salary: health insurance contributions, survivor's pension contributions, special social security contribution, withholding tax.

**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

**Bulgaria**

**Q132 (General Comment):** The gross salary of a Supreme court judge is formed as the sum of the Basic Monthly Salary for the Position of "supreme judge or prosecutor" (BMSP) + Rank + Additional remuneration for time served. The Rank and BMSP are determined according to the Classifier of Positions in the Administration of Courts and Prosecutors' offices, which are approved by decisions of the Judges' and the Prosecutors' College of the Supreme Judicial Council, respectively. The additional remuneration for time served is determined as 2% of (BMSP+Rank) is added for each year of service in the judicial system.

**Q132 (2023):** According to Art. 218, paragraph 3 of the Judiciary System Act (JSA), the remuneration of judges, prosecutors and investigators is determined by a decision of the General Assembly of the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC) and the Supreme Prosecutorial Council (SPC) that adopts "Table No. 1 - for determination of the maximum basic monthly salaries of judges, prosecutors and investigators", which is applicable for all magistrates equally. In this regard, data for judges and prosecutors match completely. The gross monthly remuneration of judges, prosecutors and investigators is formed by adding to the basic monthly remuneration the remuneration for rank (from Table No. 1) and time served (according to Article 219 of the JSA).

**Q132 (2022):** Data, provided by the Supreme Judicial Council. The increase of gross salaries (respectively net salaries) compared to the previous assessment cycle (2020-2022) is due to the increase in labour remuneration - 10% in 2021 and 10% in 2022, as well as the funds provided in the budget of the judiciary for additional remuneration in connection with Art. 233, paragraph 6 of the Judiciary System Act.
Comment from the Supreme Court of Cassation: The amount of maximum basic monthly remuneration of judges shall be determined by the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council. Judges shall receive additional remuneration for long service and professional experience, determined in relation to the basic remuneration at the rate of up to 40% (2% – for 1 calendar year for acquired service and professional experience in a judicial authority; 1.5% – for 1 calendar year for acquired service and professional experience outside a judicial authority, but in the same time, similar or the same nature of work, position or profession; 1% – for 1 calendar year for acquired service and professional experience outside a judicial authority and in another specialty). The maximum amount of 40% is set by the Judicial System Act, in force since 11.08.2007. Judges who reached a higher percentage before the amendment of the law shall retain the percentage reached in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No.29/21.09.2007. In the Supreme Court of Cassation, 14 judges receive additional remuneration in excess of 40%. Judges don't get a 13th salary or bonuses paid regularly to everyone, regardless of their personal circumstances. By a decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council, an additional remuneration may be paid to judges, but its receipt is not mandatory and unconditional. The entitlement to receive an additional remuneration is defined in the Rules for Determination and Payment of Additional Remuneration (adopted by a decision of the Plenum of the Suprem

e Judicial Council under Protocol No. 29/22.11.2018, amended and supplemented by a decision under Protocol No. 13/13.06.2019, amended and supplemented by a decision under Protocol No. 28/21.11.2019, amended and supplemented by a decision under Protocol No. 18/12.05.2022 and the Rules for Determination and Payment of Additional Remuneration to Judges pursuant to Article 233, paragraph 6, the first sentence of the Judiciary System Act (adopted by the Judicial Collegium of the Supreme Judicial Council by Decision under Protocol No. 24/22.06.2021, amended by Decision under Protocol No. 41/17.11.2021). In 2022 additional remuneration in the amount of 11,220 BGN or 5,736.69 EUR was paid to the judges of the Supreme Court of Cassation in accordance with the decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council on the application of the Rules for Determination and Payment of Additional Remuneration. (Gross annual salary, in €= basic salary+ additional remuneration for seniority)

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q132 (2024):** The Act on Amendments and Supplements to the Act on Salaries and Other Material Rights of Judicial Officials (Official Gazette 71/23) – amendments to salary coefficients and the salary calculation base;
The Act on Amendments to the Act on Salaries and Other Material Rights of Judicial Officials (Official Gazette 35/24) – amendment of the salary calculation base.

**Q132 (2023):** Starting January 1, 2023, the official currency is Euro.

**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%.

**Cyprus**

**Q132 (2024):** the salary of the Attorney General is gross salary 135.918
net annual salary 92. 828

**Czech Republic**

**Q132 (2024):** It was found that in 2023 the average salary instead of the salary at the beginning of the career was given. In 2023: judges:48.555 EUR public prosecutors: 43.700 EUR

**Q132 (2023):** The Ministry of Justice has clarified that they cannot provide additional comments on the salary increases for judges in the Czech Republic. However, it is worth noting that judicial and prosecutorial salaries were previously frozen. This freeze was later deemed unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court, which led to a substantial increase in salaries, particularly for first-instance judges and public prosecutors, starting in 2023.

**Q132 (2022):** the impact of exchange rate

**Q132 (2020):** the salaries have risen generally + exchange rate

**Denmark**

**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. The employment of a new public prosecutor is covered by the collective agreement. In addition to the amount stated above, the public prosecutor in the beginning of his/her career is paid an annual supplement of 17.388 kr./2.330 €. This supplement covers the prosecutor's participation in The Local Prosecution Service's shift schedule (b-vagt). The public prosecutor is payed a basic salary, which is decided centrally in the collective agreement, based on years of working experience, qualifications, work assignments and responsibility in the specific position. In addition to the basic salary, the public prosecutor can be paid a locally negotiated supplement. The supplements depend on the qualifications and specific responsibilities in the position as a prosecutor. Public prosecutor are entitled to an annual salary negotiation.

**Q132 (2024):** In Denmark, a deputy prosecutor is placed under the collective agreement for academics, in a seniority-based salary system with an availability allowance. Upon completion of the mandatory basic training of the Prosecution Service, the prosecutor receives an additional allowance. Furthermore, prosecutors in rotation receive a supplement during and after their rotation period.
Subsequently, it is possible through annual salary negotiations to obtain further salary increases, either in the form of qualification allowances or by advancement to a higher job category such as special consultant or senior consultant.
For managerial positions, candidates are placed in a new salary framework specifically determined at state level for managerial staff.
Deputy state prosecutor: 135.998,35 EUR
Special prosecutor: 135.074,26 EUR
Deputy state prosecutor: 1.015.146,10 DKK
Special prosecutor: 1.008.248,32 DKK

**Q132 (2023):** The employment of a new public prosecutor is covered by the collective agreement. In addition to the amount stated above, the public prosecutor in the beginning of his/her career is paid an annual supplement of 17.388 kr./2.330 €. This supplement covers the prosecutor's participation in The Local Prosecution Service's shift schedule (b-vagt). The public prosecutor is payed a basic salary, which is decided centrally in the collective agreement, based on years of working experience, qualifications, work assignments and responsibility in the specific position. In addition to the basic salary, the public prosecutor can be paid a locally negotiated supplement. The supplements depend on the qualifications and specific responsibilities in the position as a prosecutor. Public prosecutor are entitled to an annual salary negotiation.

**Q132 (2022):** Regarding prosecutor: The employment of a new public prosecutor is covered by the collective agreement. In addition to the amount stated above, the public prosecutor in the beginning of his/her career is paid an annual supplement of 17.174 kr./€ 2.304. This supplement covers the prosecutor's participation in The Local Prosecution Ser-vice's shift schedule (b-vagt). The public prosecutor is payed a basic salary, which is decided centrally in the collective agreement, based on years of working experience, qualifications, work assignments and responsibility in the specific position. In addition to the basic salary, the public prosecutor can be paid a locally negotiated supplement. The supplements depend on the qualifications and specific responsibilities in the position as a prosecutor. Public prosecutor are entitled to an annual salary negotiation.
The Prosecution Service's Remuneration Policy states a maximum annual salary for the public prosecutors. The maximum annual salary for any Senior Prosecutor/Special Prosecutor, including the prosecutors at The Supreme Court Unit with the Director of Public Prosecutions is 714.000 DKKR/€ 95.829. The maximum annual salary for any Deputy State Prosecutor within the Danish Prosecution Service, including the Deputy State Prosecutor at The Supreme Court Unit with the Director of Public Prosecutions, is 942.000 DKKR/€ 126.430. The amounts are stated without pension as well as without remuneration for participation in shift schedules etc. Civil servants receive 16,8 % of the total salary as a pension contribution, and employees under the collective agreement receive 17,1 %. However, the pension contribution for the availability supplement (rådighedstillæg) is 12,5 %.

**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.

**Estonia**

**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.

**Finland**

**Q132 (2024):** In Finland, there are several salary categories for judges. The salary depends also on the years of work experience. At the end of 2024 first instance judge is in a salary category T11 in which the gross salary is from 5415,2 €/month to 7039,76€/month depending on his/her experience. A permanent first instance judge T13 has usually at least nine years of work experience which means the salary is 6036,11 €/month(minimum 5487,37 maximum 7133,58). In Finland, the taxation is progressive so the information on net salary varies from person to person and is not available.
There are several salary categories for prosecutors. Prosecutors salaries are based on three components: task-specific , personal component and component based on the years of employment. At the start of the career prosecutors usually start at the lower levels of task-specific paylevels, as well as the component based on years of employment is lower. By your own capability you can rise your own persona component. Experienced professionals usually have higher levels in all three components.

**Q132 (2022):** In Finland, there are several salary categories for judges. The salary depends also on the years of work experience. At the end of 2022 first instance judge is in a salary category T11 in which the gross salary is from 4944,63 €/month to 6428,019€/month depending on his/her experience. A permanent first instance judge T13 has usually at least nine years of work experience which means the salary is 6036,7065 €/month. In Finland, the taxation is progressive so the information on net salary varies from person to person and is not available.
Prosecutors salaries are based on three components: task-specific , personal component and component based on the years of employment. At the start of the career prosecutors usually start at the lower levels of task-specific paylevels, as well as the component based on years of employment is lower. By your own capability you can rise your own personal component. Experienced professionals usually have higher levels in all three components.

**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.

**France**

**Q132 (General Comment):** Administrative courts:
First-instance professional judge at the beginning of their career: the data mentioned in the first line corresponds to the average salary of a junior advisor at the first-grade level.
Judge of the Supreme Court or final appellate court: this refers to the average salary of deputy presidents of the litigation section. The salary primarily consists of: base salary: this depends on the increased index held by the civil servant in their grade and step within the grade, and it progresses with seniority according to an index scale. This index is multiplied by the value of the public service point to calculate the base salary; additional remuneration components: paid based on personal circumstances (e.g., dependents, location of the administrative residence, allowances for assignments in certain overseas territories, etc.); allowances: either paid on a fixed basis depending on the various functions that may be held during the career or based on the significance and quality of the service rendered, and the achievement of quantitative objectives.

Civil and criminal courts:
The average salary of a first-instance professional judge at the beginning of their career corresponds to the entry-level salary upon starting their position after completing the National School for the Judiciary (ENM).
The average salary of a first-instance prosecutor at the beginning of their career corresponds to the entry-level salary upon starting their position after completing the ENM.
The average salary of judges at the Court of cassation (the methodology used in previous years is applied): it is more relevant to take the average cost of judges at the Court of Cassation, as it should reflect the highest salary of a judge/prosecutor in the highest judicial instance, rather than the salary of the president of the court or the Attorney General.
Prosecutor at the Supreme Court or final appellate court: same as above.

**Q132 (2024):** NB: the salaries of civil and criminal judges (“ordre judiciaire”) are listed in the table. For administrative courts: professional first-instance judge at the beginning of their career: €58,828 (gross annual) €49,826 (net annual); judge of the Supreme Court (Council of State) €206,948 (gross annual) €174,139 (net annual).

**Q132 (2023):** As regards the salary of a first instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career, the salary scale for judges at the beginning of their career has been upgraded.

**Q132 (2022):** According to the administrative court judges' annual salary, it amounts to 57,400 euros gross and 48,700 euros net. As for the Council of State judges, their annual remuneration stands at 190,000 euros gross and 161,000 euros net.

The administrative judges in France are subject to another salary regim. The gross annual salary of administrative judges is 57 400 Euro and 48 700 Euro net. For the judges of the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat), the annual salary is 190 000 Euros gross and 161 000 Euros net.

**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€.

**Germany**

**Q132 (General Comment):** The salaries of judges and public prosecutors are determined by remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") which exist in each federal state as well as on the federal level. These laws define the remuneration based on different pay-groups, pay-grades and experience levels. Judges and public prosecutors belong to pay-group "R" that has several pay-grades ("R1", "R2", "R3"...). The allocation to the pay-grades depends on the kind of court, position at the court and size of the court. The number of available pay-grades and the details of allocation differ among the remuneration laws. In simplified terms, judges at local courts, regional courts, labour courts, social courts and administrative courts are allocated to pay-grade "R1" according to the remuneration laws of the federal states. Judges at higher regional courts, regional labour courts, regional social courts, regional administrative courts and finance courts as well as judges with an outstanding position (e.g. director, presiding judge) at the courts mentioned for pay-grade "R1" are allocated to pay-grade "R2" according to the remuneration laws of the federal states. Higher pay-grades according to the remuneration laws of the federal states are reserved for judges in outstanding positions (e.g. presidents, presiding judges). Pay-grades R1 and R2 have several experience levels. Generally, judges will climb to the next experience level after a period of two years from the beginning of their career and then climb further every two or three years (details may differ among the federal states and also with regard to the Federal Courts). The Federal Remuneration Law applies to judges and public prosecutors at the federal courts. With regard to the Federal Remuneration Law, judges at the Federal Patent Court and Military Disciplinary Courts are allocated to pay-grade "R2". Judges at the highest federal courts (Federal Court of Justice, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Finan

ce Court) are allocated to pay-grade "R6", presiding judges to pay-grade “R8”. Federal Public Prosecutors at the Federal Court of Justice are allocated to pay-grade “R6”.

**Q132 (2024):** First instance judge or public prosecutor at the beginning of their career:
Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the federal states. The average was calculated unweighted. The monthly base-salaries of the federal states were added up and divided by the number of federal states, regardless of how many judges and prosecutors with the respective pay-grades work in a federal state (number unknown). Gross base-salaries range from approx. 53 137 to 61 912 EUR per year.
Judge of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
Data represents the base-salary of presiding judges at the Federal Court of Justice, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court according to the Federal Remuneration Law (“Bundesbesoldungsgesetz”). This is the highest base-salary that a judge can achieve (excluding the court presidents and judges at the Federal Constitutional Court).
Public Prosecutor of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
Data represents the base-salary of the Federal Public Prosecutors at the Federal Court of Justice according to the Federal Remuneration Law (“Bundesbesoldungsgesetz”). This is the highest base-salary that a public prosecutor can achieve (excluding the Federal Prosecutor General).
Judges and public prosecutors are entitled to additional payments depending on 1) their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children); 2) their position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
Calculations were made on the following basis:
1) judge/public prosecutor at the beginning of their career: pay-grade "R1" (remuneration laws of the federal states) , lowest level of experience, unmarried, no children, no special tasks
2) judges at the supreme courts: pay-grade "R8" (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks.
3) public prosecutors at the supreme court: pay-grade “

R6” (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks

**Q132 (2023):** First instance judge or public prosecutor at the beginning of their career:
Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the federal states. The average was calculated unweighted. The monthly base-salaries of the federal states were added up and divided by the number of federal states, regardless of how many judges and prosecutors with the respective pay-grades work in a federal state (number unknown). Gross base-salaries range from approx. 52 737 to 58 298 EUR per year.
Judge of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
Data represents the base-salary of presiding judges at the Federal Court of Justice, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a judge can achieve (excluding the court presidents and judges at the Federal Constitutional Court).
Public Prosecutor of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
Data represents the base-salary of the Federal Public Prosecutors at the Federal Court of Justice according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a public prosecutor can achieve (excluding the Federal Prosecutor General).
Judges and public prosecutors are entitled to additional payments depending on 1) their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children); 2) their position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
Calculations were made on the following basis:
1) judge/public prosecutor at the beginning of their career: pay-grade "R1" (remuneration laws of the federal states) , lowest level of experience, unmarried, no children, no special tasks
2) judges at the supreme courts: pay-grade "R8" (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks.
3) public prosecutors at the supreme court: pay-grade "

R6" (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks

**Q132 (2022):** First instance judge or public prosecutor at the beginning of their career:
Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the federal states. The average was calculated unweighted. The monthly base-salaries of the federal states were added up and divided by the number of federal states, regardless of how many judges and prosecutors with the respective pay-grades work in a federal state (number unknown).
Judge of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
The calculation method was changed in comparison to previous years, causing high discrepancies. Data represents the base-salary of presiding judges at the Federal Court of Justice, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court and Federal Finance Court according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a judge can achieve (excluding the court presidents and judges at the Federal Constitutional Court).
Public Prosecutor of the Supreme Court or Highest Appellate Court:
The calculation method was changed in comparison to previous years, causing high discrepancies Data represents the base-salary of the Federal Public Prosecutors at the Federal Court of Justice according to the Federal Remuneration Law ("Bundesbesoldungsgesetz"). This is the highest base-salary that a public prosecutor can achieve (excluding the Federal Prosecutor General).
Judges and public prosecutors are entitled to additional payments depending on 1) their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children); 2) their position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
Calculations were made on the following basis:
1) judge/public prosecutor at the beginning of their career: pay-grade "R1" (remuneration laws of the federal states) , lowest level of experience, unmarried, no children, no special tasks
2) judges at the supreme courts: pay-grade "R8" (Fed

eral Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks.
3) public prosecutors at the supreme court: pay-grade "R6" (Federal Remuneration Law), unmarried, no children, no special tasks

**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.

**Greece**

**Q132 (2024):** According to the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 20 of law 5045/2023, the basic salaries of judiciary, as they were structured on December 31, 2023, were increased from January 1, 2024 by the amount corresponding to the product of the starting salary of the category of Mandatory Education (Y.E.) of unified salary employees, multiplied by a coefficient of 0.0897, rounded to the nearest euro, specifically by the amount of 70 euros per month.
By the provisions of Article 39 of Law 5079/2023, the allowances, benefits, and compensations under paragraphs 3, 5, and 6 of paragraph A of Article 30 of Law 3205/2003 (A' 297) for judiciary, as they were established on December 31, 2023, were increased from January 1, 2024, as follows: a) By thirty percent (30%) the allowance for faster processing under paragraph 3 of paragraph A, and b) by ten percent (10%) the fixed compensation and the representation expenses compensation of paragraphs 5 and 6 of paragraph A, respectively, rounded to the nearest euro unit.

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q132 (2024):** Judges: 1 EUR = 410.09 HUF (official daily exchange rate 31.12.2024)
Judges: the judicial base salary did not change in 2023 and 2024; therefore, judges' salaries, when expressed in forints, did not decrease. The decrease in euros is due to the change in the exchange rate. Compared to the 2023 data, the salary expressed in forints has not changed. As of January 1, 2025, the base judicial salary increased and is expected to continue rising over the next two years, serving also as compensation for inflation.
Public prosecutors: The reason for the difference in the reported salary data is that while the forint value of the salary data remained roughly unchanged, the euro exchange rate increased, so the same salary reported in forints represents a different amount in euros. For example, see the salary of prosecutors at the beginning of their career:
Salary in euros (gross): 24,043 (2024), 25,759 (2023), 24,609 (2022)
EUR exchange rate: 410.09 (2024), 382.78 (2023), 400.66 (2022)
Salary in forints (gross): 9,859,884 (2024), 9,860,030 (2023), 9,859,842 (2022)

**Q132 (2023):** Judges:
Compared to the 2022 data, the decrease in starting (beginning of the career) salary resulted from a change in the calculation method. In previous years, we gave the average salary of the appointed judges, which depends on the length of service and this year the hypothetical lowest salary available at the beginning of the career. The starting salary was calculated according to the above-mentioned calculation method (1 EUR = 382,78 HUF).
The highest salary received at the Supreme Court was defined without any leadership allowances, which is why it is less than the average salary was in the 2022 data.

**Q132 (2022):** During the career/career progression of prosecutors, salaries are determined as follows.
The prosecutor's salary consists of a basic salary and the supplement determined in the Prosecution Employment Status Act Based on Article 66 (2) of Act XC of 2021 on the Central Budget of Hungary for 2022 and pursuant to Article 59 (3) of Act CLXIV of 2011 on the Status and Career Path of the Prosecutor General, Prosecutors and other Prosecution Employees, the basic salary of a prosecutor in 2022 was HUF 566660.
The basic salary of the prosecutor shall be determined on the basis of the length of service calculated in accordance with this Act, multiplied by the salary base and the multiplying factors specified in this Act for each grade.
Prosecutors who do not yet have any service time upon their appointment or whose accepted service time upon their appointment does not exceed three years shall be classified into pay grade 1. Prosecutors shall proceed one pay grade up on the scale upon the completion of every three years of service time. The length of service shall be calculated from the date of appointment of the prosecutor. However, time spent as a prosecutor before the appointment in the prosecution service and in the judiciary, as well as the time spent in other legal employment or activities requiring a completed bar exam or requiring a completed bar exam according to the rules applicable by the person exercising the employer's rights upon authorization by law shall be taken into account as time included in the length of service.
According to the Prosecution Employment Status Act, the basic salary of a prosecutor is 1.25 times the salary base in grade 1 of the prosecutor's salary scale, and 2.10 times the salary base in grade 14, which is the highest grade.
Prosecutors shall be entitled to a position supplement monthly, the amount of which is
a) twenty per cent of the pay base in the case of prosecutors working in district prosecution offices (113332 HUF in 2022), b) forty

per cent of the pay base in the case of prosecutors working in chief prosecution offices (226664 HUF), c) seventy per cent of the pay base in the case of prosecutors working in appellate chief prosecution offices (396662 HUF), d) hundred and twenty per cent of the pay base in the case of prosecutors working in the Office of the Prosecutor General 679992 HUF).
In general, judges' salaries increase automatically with length of service after every 3 years. In addition, they receive a surplus allowance at all levels of jurisdiction (higher bonus on higher levels), and court executies also receive a management bonus. In addition, there are various allowances which may be granted to eligible judges (e.g. language allowance). From 1 January 2020, judges' salaries increased by an average of 32 percent. In 2021 by another 12 percent of the salary base and by a further 13 percent in 2022.

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q132 (2024):** Within the Office we have Prosecutors at various different grade levels which are equaivalant to general Civil Service grades and the rate of pay applicable to those grades are applied to our Prosecutors. The rate of pay per grade are in line with Government pay policy. The highest Prosecutor grade in this Office is the Director of Public Prosecutions.

**Q132 (2023):** It is not possible to provide a net annual salary as each person's tax credits/deductions are personal to them and their circumstances. 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.
The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court (new entrant) and a judge of the Supreme Court (highest point on the pay scale) as at 31 December 2023.Judges appointed post 1 January 2012 are placed on a three-point pay scale.
Within the Office we have Prosecutors at various different grade levels which are equivalent to general Civil Service grades and the rate of pay applicable to those grades are applied to our Prosecutors. The rate of pay per grade are in line with Government pay policy.

**Q132 (2022):** The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2022.
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.
Judges appointed post 1 January 2017 are placed on a three-point pay scale.
Reason for Discrepancy: The question asked in this year's survey is slightly different than the one asked in the previous survey. This means that the replies should not be compared directly. The 2021 survey asked for "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) as at 31 December 2020".
The figure provided for this in 2021 – €208,854.00 – corresponded to the salary for a newly appointed Judge with less than 1 year of experience in the Supreme Court.
The current survey asked for the salaries of judges and public prosecutors on 31 December 2022, specifically, the salary for "Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court (please indicate the highest salary of a judge at this level, excluding the salary of the Court President)".
The figure provided in this year's survey – €257,872.00 – corresponded to the highest salary point on the scale for Judge of the Supreme Court.
It should further be noted, that since 2020, the members of the judiciary had a number of pay increases in Ireland which included the restoration of pay to pre-austerity levels on 1 July 2022.
The salary of the Director of Public Prosecutions (the most senior person in the Irish Prosecution service ) is linked to Irish Civil Service Secretary General Grade II. This salary is currently €243,600. As with all civil service salaries, this is subject to pension (individual and spouse and dependent contributions) and tax related deductions such Income Tax, Universal Social Charge and Pay Rel

ated Social Insurance.

**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.

**Italy**

**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). This 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 Supreme Court of Cassation. The salaries of administrative judges are not included in the data provided.

**Latvia**

**Q132 (General Comment):** The salary of Supreme Court judges or prosecutors does not depend on the judge's / prosecutor`s seniority in the Supreme Court or Prosecutor Office. All judges of the Supreme Court, with the exception of the chairman of the court and the Chairperson of a department of the Supreme Court, receive the remuneration as stipulated in the Law on Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities.

**Q132 (2024):** If a judge has received a positive statement in the regular assessment of the professional activity of a judge, a service supplement to the monthly salary shall be determined for the judge, except for a judge of the Constitutional Court, in the following amount: 1) after six years worked in the office - 5 per cent of the monthly salary; 2) after 10 years worked in the office - 10 per cent of the monthly salary.

**Q132 (2023):** If a judge has received a positive statement in the regular assessment of the professional activity of a judge, a service supplement to the monthly salary shall be determined for the judge, except for a judge of the Constitutional Court, in the following amount:
1) after six years worked in the office - 5 per cent of the monthly salary;
2) after 10 years worked in the office - 10 per cent of the monthly salary.

**Q132 (2022):** Data on net annual salary, in EUR for first instance professional judges differs from previous period due the raise of gross annual salary.

**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.

**Lithuania**

**Q132 (General Comment):** Thus, the budget increased and was approved and executed by 40 percent, mainly because from July 1, 2023, judges' salaries were increased (judges' salaries increased almost 2 times). In 2023, they were only uploaded from July. and for a year and a half, which is why they are not visible in the approved budgets. In 2024, additional appropriations were allocated for the entire year, so both the wage fund and the total budget increased by about 38 percent in 2 years compared to the budgets approved in 2024 and 2022. And since salaries are really paid, execution has also increased. The same goes for prosecutors' salaries.

**Q132 (2024):** Thus, the budget increased and was approved and executed by 40 percent, mainly because from July 1, 2023, judges' salaries were increased (judges' salaries increased almost 2 times). In 2023, they were only uploaded from July. and for a year and a half, which is why they are not visible in the approved budgets. In 2024, additional appropriations were allocated for the entire year, so both the wage fund and the total budget increased by about 38 percent in 2 years compared to the budgets approved in 2024 and 2022. And since salaries are really paid, execution has also increased. The same goes for prosecutors' salaries.

**Q132 (2023):** From the 2023 July 1 after the amendments to the Law of Remuneration of Judges came into force, the coefficient and the base amount applied in calculating the remuneration of judges has been changed. The coefficient of judges’ salary increased about 2,03 times (evaluating the changes of base amount and recalculation). Also, with the changes from July 1, no left extra payment for work experience calculating the judge salary, so there is no difference between the judge in the beginning of his career and the judge with long work experience. Because of that, the change in first instance judge salary is bigger (discrepancy ratio approx. 55 %) than in Supreme Court judge salary (discrepancy ratio approx. 32 %).

**Q132 (2022):** The Law on Judges' Remuneration of the Republic of Lithuania establishes, that the salary of judges of general competence and specialized courts consists of:
1) official salary;
2) supplement for length of service to the State of Lithuania (one percent of the official salary of a judge for each year of service to the State of Lithuania, but not more than 30 percent);
3) payment for work and duty on rest days and holidays, substitution;
4) premium for increased workload (the amount of the premium for the increased workload, but not more than 30 percent of his official salary, is determined by the president of the court in accordance with the procedure established by the Juditial Council.

**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q132 (General Comment):** For the starting salary of a professional judge or a public prosecutor at first instance, we consider the salary of judicial attachés after their first appointment. The magistrates' salary scale provides a base of 380 index points; any prior professional experience may be added, but is not taken into account in our calculations.

For the theoretical maximum salary of a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal, we consider grade M6, step 7, which corresponds to 647 points; an additional 25 points are added for managerial duties. To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point.

**Q132 (2024):** For the starting salary of a professional judge in first instance or a prosecutor, we consider the salary of judicial attachés after their initial appointment. The magistrates' salary scale is based on 380 index points; any prior professional experience may be added, but is not taken into account in our calculations.

For the theoretical maximum salary of a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal, we consider grade M6, step 7, corresponding to 647 points, with an additional 25 points for managerial functions. To calculate the annual salary, these points are multiplied by the value of the index point. In 2024, the value of the index point was €23.2752 as of 1 January 2024.

Using these figures, a 12-month salary corresponds to €106,135 gross for a professional judge of first instance, and a maximum salary of €187,691 for a judge or prosecutor at the Supreme Court. These amounts do not include any additional bonuses, allowances, or benefits that may apply depending on the magistrate concerned.

Further explanations on the calculation of civil servant salaries, which also apply to the M career track for magistrates, can be found on the Public Service website: https://fonctionpublique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html

**Q132 (2023):** As the salary at the start of the career (professional judge of 1st instance or public prosecutor), we consider the salary of the attachés de justice after their first appointment. The salary scale for magistrates is based on 380 index points; any professional experience may be added to this, but is not taken into account in our calculations.
As the theoretical maximum salary for a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal, we consider grade M6, step 7, which corresponds to 647 points, plus 25 points for management duties. To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point. In 2023, the value of the index point changed three times, namely on 1 February to 21.7301, on 1 April to 22.2733 and on 1 September to 22.8300. Taking these indices into account, a salary over 12 months corresponds to €101,592 gross for a professional judge of first instance, or a maximum salary of €179,657 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. Further 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://fonctionpublique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html).

**Q132 (2022):** As a starting treatment for early career (professional judge or prosecutor), we consider the salary of "attachés de justice" after their initial appointment. The judge's salary scale provides for a base of 380 index points, with potential professional experience that may be added but is not taken into account in our calculations.

For the theoretical maximum salary of a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal, we consider grade M6, step 7, which corresponds to 647 points; an additional 25 points are added for managerial functions. To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of each index point. Between January and March 2022, the value was set at 20.6831871 per index point; after April 1st, 2022 it increased to 21.2002547 per index point. Taking these indices into consideration yields an annual gross salary equivalent to €96,084 for a professional judge at first instance and up to a maximum salary of €169,916 for a judge or prosecutor at Supreme Court level.

These figures do not include any potential bonuses or allowances that may supplement the basic salary according to each individual judge's circumstances."

For further details on calculating civil servant payments applicable also to magistrates' Grade M careers can be found on Public Service website: https://fonction-publique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html

**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.

**Malta**

**Q132 (2023):** The increase in the gross and net wages are the result of a recalculation of the wage after adjusting for NI and tax in the 3 tax rates (Single / Parent / Married). Please also note that there was a revision in the salaries backdating to 2023.

**Q132 (2022):** Following the newly signed collective agreement the Office of the Attorney General, the new salary package commensurate to the different positions within the Office have changed since those provided in previous submissions. The salary package provided above within the field 'Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/ her career' refers to the salary package of Lawyer III.

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q132 (General Comment):** Numbers include a vacation stipend and 13th month (together 16.3% of the annual salary). Please refer to legislation (https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0006530/2023-07-01#Hoofdstuk2b) on this subject.
Salary of a judge / prosecutor ‘at the beginning of their career’: the salary used is the one for a starting judge/prosecutor, after finishing a training period of several years. During the training there is a separate salary, which is lower than the salary of a fully functional judge/prosecutor.

**Q132 (2022):** Discrepancy comment: In 2021 we needed to look for a different methodology to calculate the net annual salary for a public prosecutor. This year, we believe we have found a reliable simulation method, and using this, we came to this answer. Using this methodology, answers for previous years would be:
2020: 84.058 (B) en 49.185 (N)
2021: 85.195 (B) en 50.175 (N)
2022: 87.637 (B) en 51.555 (N)

**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 (2016):** The discrepancy of the answers for gross salary is not clarified.

**Poland**

**Q132 (General Comment):** 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 p

ublic 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 (2023):** The increase in judges‘ and prosecutors’ salaries was 7.8% over 2022. The amount of the increase of more than 7.8% is due to the unlocking of the salaries frozen in 2020-2023. It must also be taken into account that the month of November and December 2023 was paid with compensation after the wage unfreeze.
The basic remuneration for prosecutors of common organisational units of the public prosecutor's office shall be determined on the basis of the table of basic remuneration rates for prosecutors of common organisational units of the public 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 remuneration, which constitutes Annex No. 1 to the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 29.02.2016. (Journal of Laws of 2023, item 1656) on the basic remuneration of prosecutors and the amount of function allowances to which prosecutors are entitled. The said table sets out the rates of basic remuneration for individual prosecutor positions and the corresponding multiplier, which is used to determine the amount of basic remuneration for that position.
Pursuant to Article 123 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Prosecution Law, the basis for determining the basic 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, announced 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 aforementioned Act, the basic salary of prosecutors of the National Prosecuting Authority is equal to the basic salary of judges of the Supreme Court. Pursuant to Article 48 of the Act of 8 December 2017 on the Supreme Court (Journal of Laws of 2024, item 622), the remuneration of a judge of the Supreme Court is determined at either the basic rate or the promotion rate. The 5 promotion rate is 115% of the

basic rate. On assuming office, a judge of the Supreme Court shall receive basic salary at the basic rate. After 7 years of service in the Supreme Court, the basic salary of a judge of the Supreme Court shall be increased to the promotion rate. At the same time, in accordance with Article 124 § 11 of the cited Act - Prosecution Law, a prosecutor is entitled to an allowance for long service amounting, starting from the 6th year of service, to 5% of the basic salary currently received by the prosecutor and increasing after each subsequent year of service by 1% of this salary, until reaching 20% of the basic salary. After 20 years of service, the allowance shall be paid, irrespective of length of service beyond that period, at 20% of the prosecutor's current basic salary.

**Q132 (2022):** The salary increase for judges and prosecutors at the beginning of their careers was 4.4% by 2021.

**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 p

ublic 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 p

ublic 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 amountin

g 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.

**Portugal**

**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

**Romania**

**Q132 (2023):** For entry-level salaries, the decline is attributed to legislative changes and a shift in recruitment trends, with preference now given to candidates from the National Institute of Magistracy, without prior seniority. Previously, data included individuals with at least five years of legal experience, resulting in higher average salaries. Conversely, the significant increase in end-of-career salaries stems from adjustments in salary structures, influenced by court rulings and administrative acts recognizing outstanding rights. These changes introduced a broadly applicable benchmark for salary calculations across the justice sector.

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**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 (2024):** The salaries of prosecutors are determined in accordance with Act No. 154/2001 Coll. on Prosecutors and Prosecutor Trainees.

**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.

**Slovenia**

**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: 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.

**Q132 (2024):** In 2023, the Constitutional Court ruled that judges' salaries were unconstitutional because they were insufficient (decision U-I-772/21 of 1 June 2023). In 2024, the Constitutional Court issued a supplementary decision setting out how to implement its earlier ruling, addressing the failure to adjust judges' salaries for inflation. The government complied with this decision, and in September 2024, judges received back pay for January to July 2024 and higher salaries starting in August 2024. This partly resolved the unconstitutional situation regarding the material independence of judges. On 1 January 2025, the new Act on Common Basic Pay Systems in the Public Sector (ZSTSPJS) took effect. It systematically improved judges' material situation (this in not yet reflected in reported figures for 2024).

**Q132 (2023):** In June 2023 the Constitutional Court decided on a request of the Judicial Council to review the constitutionality of the statutory regulation on judges' salaries (Case No. U-I-772/21). The predominant part of the consideration of this case involved the review of the constitutionality of the regulation of judges' basic salaries (regulated in the Public Sector Salary System Act).
The Constitutional Court held that the regulation of judges' basic salaries was inconsistent with the constitutional principle of judicial independence, as it did not comply with the constitutional requirement that judges' salaries be relatively stable. Judges' salaries have namely very significantly lost real value in just over ten years. The Constitutional Court further held that, with regard to the principle of judicial independence, the following allegations may, in principle, also be relevant, namely that the growth of judges' salaries lags behind the growth of the average salary in the state, or in a certain narrower employment segment that is more closely related to judges; that the ratio between judges' salaries and other salaries is inappropriate; that the (excessively) low salaries of judges affect the (un)attractiveness of the judicial profession; and, under certain conditions, the allegations concerning the entitlement of judges to social transfers may also be relevant.
In the context of the review of the consistency of the regulation of judges' basic salaries with the principle of the separation of powers, the Constitutional Court reiterated its position that the three branches of power must also be equal with regard to the financial status of their officials, and that this requirement is not one of perfect uniformity, but of relative comparability. In this regard, taking into account the applicable normative regulation of the entitlement of deputies of the National Assembly to a set monthly allowance for covering the expenses incurred in relation to the performance of their wor

k in a constituency, and taking into account the fact that deputies may be placed into higher salary grades than the starting salary grade, the Constitutional Court established that the regulation of judges' basic salaries, as regards the salary ratio between deputies and the lowest-ranked judges, is inconsistent with the principle of the separation of powers. The Constitutional Court added, however, that it cannot be held that the challenged salary ratios between Supreme Court judges and ministers are unconstitutional.
In the light of the above, the Constitutional Court held that the Public Sector Salary System Act, insofar as it refers to judges's salaries and it's revalorisation procedure, was inconsistent with the Constitution. However and set a deadline for the law-maker to remedy the incompliance with the Constitution. The ruling has not been implemented yet despite protests as the government has been insisting it will tackle judiciary pay as part of comprehensive salary reform in the entire public sector, which is yet to be finalised.
Following up on its earlier decision, the Constitutional Court has decided in May 2024 (U-I-8/24) that judges' pay be raised by an amount corresponding to the total rise in consumer prices in the past decade. The judges will receive higher salaries in September 2024, when they receive their monthly pay for August, along with the difference in back pay starting from 3 January 2024. The Constitutional court's decision determines that salaries should be raised in a way that takes the pay brackets valid on 1 June 2012 and adjusts them for inflation recorded between that day and 31 December 2023. A calculation on the website of the national Statistical Office website shows this amounts to 26.2%.

**Spain**

**Q132 (General Comment):** Judicial and Prosecutorial careers - The regulation of the remuneration system for members of the judicial and prosecutorial careers is contained in Law 15/2003 of 26 May regulating the remuneration system of the judicial and prosecutorial careers and is based on the principles of objectivity, fairness, transparency and stability. The remuneration system for judicial and prosecutorial careers is generally made up of a fixed component and a variable component based on objectives, the quantification elements of which are detailed in the law.
The fixed component rewards the category and seniority in the judicial career, as well as the objective characteristics of the positions held. Fixed remuneration is divided into two categories: basic remuneration and additional remuneration. The basic salary is made up of salary (it remunerates the category held within the judicial career and is fixed) and seniority (it is remunerated by a successive increase of five per cent of the initial salary corresponding to the category of entry for every three years of active service or in other administrative situations in which time is recognised for this purpose). Salaries and seniority objectively reflect the category within the judicial career and the successive proportional increase on the initial salary, fixed at five per cent every three years. Judges and magistrates are entitled to two additional payments per year, each equal to one month's salary and recognised seniority, and, if applicable, a proportional amount for the destination allowance under the conditions established by law for the entire State public sector, paid in June and December.
The additional remuneration is made up of the allowance for each post and the specific allowance. The allowance corresponding to each post of judge or magistrate is quantified according to the following criteria The population group to which it belongs; the objective conditions of representation linked to the position held and other specifi

c circumstances linked to the post. The amount of the special allowance for each post of judge or magistrate is set out in Annex II to the Act. The special allowance compensates for the special conditions of certain posts of particular responsibility, complexity or difficulty. The posts benefiting from the special allowance and the amount of the special allowance are listed in Annex III to the Act.
The variable remuneration based on objectives is based specifically on the individual performance of each judge in the performance of his or her judicial and professional duties, as certified by the system of dedication modules. The objective for each assignment in the judicial career is set by the General Council of the Judiciary in accordance with the modules of dedication or other technical criteria it deems appropriate. The variable remuneration works by modulating the amount of the fixed remuneration in parallel with the performance of the previous six-month period. If the members of a court achieve a particularly noteworthy individual performance, i.e. if they exceed the objective assigned to the post by 20 percent, an increase of between five and 10 percent of the fixed remuneration is applied. In cases where, for reasons directly attributable to the judge, the individual performance is insufficient and does not reach 80 percent of the target, the fixed remuneration is automatically reduced by five percent of its amount. Under no circumstances can variable remuneration for targets be consolidated.
The following shall have the status of special remuneration: those corresponding to the performance of on-call duties; those derived from the performance of extraordinary duties without relief from judicial functions; those corresponding to substitutions involving the joint performance of another function, provided that they are in all cases compatible with the other remuneration concepts regulated by law and that their accrual and amount are adapted to the regulatory scheme approved by the Government.
Final comment: Special mention should be made of the recent updating of the amounts of the representation allowance for members of the judicial and prosecutorial professions, which have been subject to an increase in remuneration of between 440 and 450 euros, depending on the type of body and post, by virtue of Royal Decree 775/2023 of 3 October updating the remuneration system for the judicial and prosecutorial professions, in accordance with Law 15/2003 of 26 May regulating the remuneration system for the judicial and prosecutorial professions. These increases are made ex officio by the administration and are retroactive to 1 January 2023.

**Q132 (2024):** In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Judges 15.769.762 euros, Prosecution 3.707.437 euros.
Professional substitutions: Judges 9.737.341 euros. Prosecution 1.382.521 euros,

**Q132 (2023):** In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Judges 7.154.057,70 euros, Prosecution 3.607.755,10 euros.
Professional substitutions: Judges 8.899.597,45 euros. Prosecution 1.094.364,54 euros,

**Q132 (2022):** In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Prosecution 3.462.886,71 euros, Judges 6.889.266,33 euros.
- Professional substitutions. Prosecution 1.014.132,71 euros, Judges 10.489.137,61 euros.

**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)

## Question 133

**Austria**

**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).

**Belgium**

**Q133 (General Comment):** Judges and prosecutors are subject to a specific pension scheme (with a retirement age limit of 67 years + preferential fraction). They may receive an “on-call allowance” (for work performed at night or on weekends).

**Q133 (2023):** Judges and public prosecutors have a specific pension scheme (age limit at 67 + preferential rate).

**Q133 (2022):** Judges and prosecutors are subject to a specific pension scheme (with a retirement age limit of 67 years + preferential fraction).

**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).

**Bulgaria**

**Q133 (General Comment):** On the basis of article 223 of the Judiciary System Act, while in office, judges and prosecutors may use housing belonging to the internal housing fund of the judicial system bodies.

**Q133 (2024):** * According to Art. 223 of the Judiciary System Act - judges and prosecutors can use housing from the housing fund of the judicial bodies

**Q133 (2023):** On the basis of Art. 223 of the Judiciary System Act - judges and prosecutors can use housing from the departmental housing fund of the bodies of the judiciary.

**Q133 (2022):** On the basis of Art. 223 of the Judiciary System Act - judges and prosecutors can use housing from the departmental housing fund of the bodies of the judiciary.

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q133 (General Comment):** Prior to the decision of the promotion, the Council shall request from the competent judicial council the submission of a rating performance of judicial duties. Afterwards, the Council shall conduct a conversation with the candidates. Following the interview, the Council approaches a secret ballot and the points achieved during the interview are summed up to the points of the evaluation of the performance of judicial duties. The Council draws up a list of priority candidates and decides on the promotion of judges. The decision must be based on the total number of points and the established priority list of candidates which is published on the website of the Council.

**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).

**Czech Republic**

**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.

**Denmark**

**Q133 (2024):** However, professional judges are employed as "civil servants" who receive a lifelong pension.

**Q133 (2023):** However, professional judges are employed as "civil servants" who receive a lifelong pension.

**Q133 (2022):** However, professional judges are employed as "civil servants" who receive a lifelong pension.

**France**

**Q133 (2024):** For civil and criminal courts:
The benefits are limited to certain magistrates only, due to the location of their duties.
Whether judges or prosecutors, only magistrates working overseas benefit from income tax reductions (for Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guyane, Saint-Martin, Mayotte, and Réunion) and retirement benefits (annuity increments equivalent to one-third of the duration of service performed outside the original territory for retirement rights, except for Mayotte, where the retirement annuity increment is one year for every two years of service completed).
In overseas territories and Corsica, certain positions such as First President, Prosecutor General, President, Prosecutor of the Republic, and President or Prosecutor General of the Appeal Chamber are also eligible for housing concessions, in accordance with the decree of December 30, 2020, which sets out the list of functions in the Ministry of Justice's state services under Articles R. 2124-65 and R. 2124-68 of the General Code of Public Property that may entitle the holder to a housing concession due to the absolute necessity of service or a temporary occupation agreement with on-call duty. A fee is charged to the beneficiary of this agreement. It is equal to 50% of the actual rental value of the occupied premises.
Finally, in accordance with the decree of December 2, 2002, regarding the application in New Caledonia, French Polynesia, Wallis and Futuna, Mayotte, and Saint Pierre and Miquelon of Article 4 of Decree No. 67-1039 of November 29, 1967, regulating housing and furnishing for magistrates and civil servants of the state working in overseas territories, amended by Decree No. 85-1237 of November 25, 1985, the First Presidents, Prosecutors General, Presidents, and Prosecutors of the Republic of the territories of New Caledonia, French Polynesia, and Saint Pierre and Miquelon benefit from the allocation of official housing.

**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_

**Germany**

**Q133 (2024):** Unlike contracted employees, judges and public prosecutors acquire pension claims in accordance with the Civil Service Benefits Act (Beamtenversorgungsgesetz) and are not included in the statutory pensions insurance scheme. Other financial benefit: Unlike contracted employees, judges and public prosecutors acquire a right to claim assistance with medical expenses and are not required to join the statutory health insurance scheme. Furthermore, married judges and prosecutors receive family allowances, and those with children receive child allowances.

**Greece**

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q133 (2023):** Judges receive an annual allowance as well as travel (mileage) and subsistence (hotels).

**Q133 (2022):** Judges receive an annual allowance as well as travel (mileage) and subsistence (hotels).

**Lithuania**

**Q133 (2019):** no other financial bennefit.

**Malta**

**Q133 (General Comment):** 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 (2022):** 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 (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.

**Netherlands**

**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.

**Poland**

**Q133 (General Comment):** 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 (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.

**Portugal**

**Q133 (General Comment):** Special pension: In Portugal, Jubilation (Jubilação) is the name given to a special retirement scheme which, in addition to the title of honour, allows that emeritus judges shall continue to be bound by their statutory duties and attached to the court of which they were a member. They shall enjoy the titles, honours, privileges and immunities corresponding to their category and may attend the solemn ceremonies held in the said court in professional dress, taking their seats to the right of the magistrates on active service. The pension of the retired judge under this special scheme is calculated and updated based on the remuneration of the magistrate in active service, as it is considered that he or she somehow continues to have a connection to the service.
Housing: The salary of a judge includes an annual gross amount of €xxxxx (€xxxx x 14) as a compensation allowance. An 11% tax is deducted from this amount as a contribution to the general pension fund / social security. This allowance is of a mixed nature, between compensation for the specific nature of the job (working on call and on an exclusive basis) and an allowance comparable to subsistence allowance (due to not being given adequate housing). At the judge's request, he or she may be assigned a residence if one of the properties available for this purpose is available. These properties belong to the State, under the management of the Ministry of Justice.

**Q133 (2024):** Concerning «special pension»In Portugal, Jubilation (Jubilação) is the name given to a special retirement scheme which, in addition to the title of honour, allows that emeritus judges and prossecutors shall continue to be bound by their statutory duties and attached to the court of which they were a member. They shall enjoy the titles, honours, privileges and immunities corresponding to their category and may attend the solemn ceremonies held in the said court in professional dress, taking their seats to the right of the magistrates on active service. The pension of the retired judge under this special scheme is calculated and updated based on the remuneration of the magistrate in active service, as it is considered that he or she somehow continues to have a connection to the service.
This year change for public prosectutors (yes for special pension) is following the conclusion that both judges and prossecutors have the same privileges once they are "jubilados".

**Romania**

**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).

**Slovak Republic**

**Q133 (2023):** Prosecutors: Prosecutors are paid a pension supplement by the Prosecutor General's Office of the Slovak Republic, which in previous years was reported in "Special pension" and in 2023 was already reported in "Other financial benefits"

**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.

**Slovenia**

**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).

### Question 146

**Austria**

**Q146 (2024):** Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) as of 31 December 2024 (available at www.oerak.at). The data only includes 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 2024. It does not include legal advisors as such a professions/type of service provider does not exist in Austria.

**Q146 (2023):** Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31 December 2023 (available at www.oerak.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 2023. It does not include legal advisors as such a professions/type of service provider does not exist in Austria.

**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.

**Belgium**

**Q146 (General Comment):** The latest barometers organised by the Flemish Bars Association (Orde van Vlaamse Balies) and the French- and German-speaking Bars Association (Ordre des barreaux francophones et germanophone) show that the lawyer profession is becoming increasingly feminised in Belgium. - Orde van Vlaamse Balies: according to the latest 'Barometer of the profession' (2020), carried out by the Flemish Bars Association in collaboration with Ghent University (UGent) and Leuven University (KUL), in December 2019, 64.8% of trainee lawyers were women. On the other hand, 57.6% of the lawyers registered on the roll, who therefore completed the traineeship, were men.
- French- and German-speaking Bars Association: according to the latest 'Barometer of the profession' (2022) carried out by AVOCATS.BE in collaboration with ULiège (University of Liège), the percentage of women has been rising steadily since 2007 and has exceeded 50% since 2018. This increase and the shape of the age pyramid point to a strong feminisation of the profession in the years to come.

**Q146 (2024):** For 2024, data per gender are available.

**Q146 (2023):** Unfortunately, data by gender on 1 December 2023 are not available.

**Q146 (2022):** The total is composed as follows: 11 072 for the Order of Flemish Bars - Orde van Vlaamse Balies and 8 238 for the Order of French-speaking and German-speaking Bars (as of December 1st, 2022). It emerges from the latest barometers organized respectively by the Order of Flemish Bars - Orde van Vlaamse Balies and by the Order of French-speaking and German-speaking Bars that more women are working as lawyers in Belgium.

**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).

**Czech Republic**

**Q146 (2022):** There is no special reason for the increase, the profession is open to everyone regardless of the gender.

**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.

**Denmark**

**Q146 (2024):** It should be noted that there is a small discrepancy between the stated total number of lawyers and the number of male and female lawyers, respectively. This is because it is possible to refrain from specifying gender.

**Q146 (2023):** The data from 2023 was also reported last year. Due to the implementation of a new member system at the Danish Bar and Law society, currently it is unfortunately not possible to access the total number of female/male lawyers practicing as of January 1st 2022.

**Q146 (2021):** The figures given above are the number of lawyers at the end of 2021.

**Finland**

**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 (2024):** The number includes 2 359 attorneys (i.e. members of the Finnish Bar Association), 1 775 licensed trial counsels and 200 public legal aid attorneys. From the public legal aid attorneys 94 were simultaneously members of the Finnish Bar Association.

**Q146 (2023):** The number includes 2 300 attorneys (i.e. members of the Finnish Bar Association), 1 725 licensed trial counsels and 205 public legal aid attorneus. From the public legal aid attorneys 92 were simultaniously members of the Finnish Bar Association.

**Q146 (2022):** The number includes 2255 attorneys (i.e. members of the Bar Association), 1733 licensed trial counsels and 200 public legal aid attorneys. From the public legal aid attorneys 90 were also members of the Bar Association.

**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".

**France**

**Q146 (2024):** Statistics as of January 1, 2023 (latest available year).

**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.

**Germany**

**Q146 (2024):** Number of lawyers as of 1 January 2025

**Q146 (2023):** number of lawyers as of 1 January 2024

**Greece**

**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

**Hungary**

**Q146 (General Comment):** We would like to clarify that the above total figure includes attorneys, in-house counsels, registered legal advisors, junior attorneys, European community lawyers and foreign legal advisors.
In Hungary, those lawyers who work as employees of a company are called “in-house counsels”. They have the right to represent their employers in any proceedings, the limitation is that they can only act on behalf of their employers and can't have any other clients. There is another category, “registered legal advisors”, who carry out their work under the control of an in-house counsel and have not passed the bar exam yet. Such registered legal advisors have the same representation rights before the court as junior attorneys explained below.
Junior attorneys and registered legal advisors may represent the parties before the District Court only (including appeals and extraordinary revisions in such cases), where legal representation is not mandatory.
European community lawyers and foreign legal advisors do not have representation rights before court (however, the number of such lawyers is insignificant, for 2024 it was 74).
We would also like to note that the above total figure also contains those who are currently suspending their lawyer practice.
The total number of active (non-suspended) attorneys, in-house legal counsels, registered legal advisors and junior attorneys is: 18,165.

**Q146 (2024):** We would like to clarify that the above total figure includes attorneys, in-house counsels, registered legal advisors, junior attorneys, European community lawyers and foreign legal advisors.
In Hungary, those lawyers who work as employees of a company are called “in-house counsels”. They have the right to represent their employers in any proceedings, the limitation is that they can only act on behalf of their employers and can't have any other clients. There is another category, “registered legal advisors”, who carry out their work under the control of an in-house counsel and have not passed the bar exam yet. Such registered legal advisors have the same representation rights before the court as junior attorneys explained below.
Junior attorneys and registered legal advisors may represent the parties before the District Court only (including appeals and extraordinary revisions in such cases), where legal representation is not mandatory.
European community lawyers and foreign legal advisors do not have representation rights before court (however, the number of such lawyers is insignificant, for 2024 it was 74).
We would also like to note that the above total figure also contains those who are currently suspending their lawyer practice.
The total number of active (non-suspended) attorneys, in-house legal counsels, registered legal advisors and junior attorneys is: 18,165.

**Q146 (2023):** As per the received question regarding our response to Q146 of the CEPEJ questionnaire (2023 data), we would like to clarify that the respective statistical register of the Hungarian Bar Association has changed recently, due to which the data on the separate numbers of female and male lawyers is no longer available to us. We have received data only for the total number of lawyers practicing in Hungary; hence, this is the reason why the number of female and male lawyers were marked with NA in our answer for the first time in contrast to previous years.

**Q146 (2022):** The number of lawyers in 2022 includes the number of legal advisors.

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q146 (2024):** The above figures represent members of the Law Library (barristers) and members of the Law Society (solicitors). Of the 12,175 solicitors, 41 were unclassified i.e not classified as either male or female. They are included in the total figure. As of 31 December 2024, there were also an additional 937 barristers on the 'Roll of Practising Barristers' who were not members of the Law Library. These were not included in last years figures and are, likewise, not included in the total figure for this round. This figure can not be broken down into males and females as that data is not requested on the Legal Services Regulatory Authority's application form. You can find further information regarding the Law Library on the Bar of Ireland website at https://www.lawlibrary.ie/about/.

**Q146 (2023):** The above figures represent members of the Law Library (barristers) and members of the Law Society (solicitors). Of the 11,871 solicitors, 37 were unclassified i.e solicitors who did not identify as either male or female. They are included in the total figure. As of 31 December 2023, there were also an additional 912 barristers on the 'Roll of Practising Barristers' who were not members of the Law Library. These were not included in last years figures and are, likewise, not included in the total figure for this round. This figure can not be broken down into males and females as that data is not requested on the Legal Services Regulatory Authority's application form. You can find further information regarding the Law Library on the Bar of Ireland website at https://www.lawlibrary.ie/about/.

**Q146 (2022):** The above figures represent members of the Law Library (barristers) and members of the Law Society (solicitors)

**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.

**Latvia**

**Q146 (2017):** This number includes sworn advocates and assistants to sworn advocates.

**Lithuania**

**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.

**Luxembourg**

**Q146 (2024):** At the Luxembourg Bar, the number of individual lawyers (3 485) includes the “natural person” lawyers who represent legal entities. The number of legal-entity lawyers (224) corresponds to the number of law firms registered on the Bar’s Roll.

The Diekirch Bar currently has 47 individual lawyers and 5 law firms, which are represented by natural persons. In total, there were therefore 3 532 individual lawyers in 2024, including those who represent the 229 legal entities.

A natural person may practise the legal profession through a legal entity (registered on list V or VI) since the entry into force of the Law of 16 December 2011 concerning the practice of the legal profession in the form of a legal entity (Article 8(10) and (11) of the Law of 10 August 1991 on the legal profession).

**Q146 (2023):** At the Luxembourg Bar, the number of individual lawyers (3,377) includes the ‘individual’ lawyers who represent legal entities. The number of corporate lawyers (216) includes the number of law firms registered with the Bar. The Diekirch Bar currently has 54 ‘natural person’ lawyers and 6 law firms represented by natural persons. In total, therefore, in 2023 there will be 3431 lawyers who are natural persons, including the lawyers who represent the 222 legal entities. Since the entry into force of the law of 16 December 2011 concerning the practice of the legal profession in the form of a legal entity (article 8 (10) and (11) of the law on the legal profession of 10 August 1991), a natural person (a lawyer registered on list I or IV, i.e. a natural person) may practice the legal profession through a legal entity (registered on list V or VI).

**Q146 (2022):** The number of individual lawyers, amounting to 3202, includes those individual lawyers who represent legal entities. The number of law firms, totalling 207, encompasses the registered law firms listed in the Bar Association's registry. Presently, the Diekirch Bar has 53 individual lawyers and 4 law firms (4 from list V and 1 from list VI) represented by individual lawyers. Therefore, in 2022, there was a total of 3255 individual lawyers including those representing the 211 legal entities.

An individual (lawyer listed on lists I or IV as an individual) may practice law through a legal entity (listed on lists V or VI) since the entry into force of the Law of December 16th 2011 concerning the exercise of lawyer profession in form of a legal entity (article8(10)and(11) of the Law on the Lawyer Profession of August 10th 1991).

**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**

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q146 (2024):** Numbers on Jan 1, 2025

**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

**Poland**

**Q146 (2022):** Number of advocates: total: 21 447, male- 11 343, female - 10 104
Number of legal counsels: total: 40 107, male - 18 725 , female - 21 382
It is noteworthy that legal advisers have the same powers as advocates.

**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.

**Romania**

**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**

**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.

**Slovenia**

**Q146 (2017):** (Male: 939, 798: female).

**Spain**

**Q146 (2024):** Lawyers 'census' [Abogacía en datos] (Spanish General Bar Association website): Information on practicing and resident lawyers. Percentage of women and men (45 and 55% aprox.)

**Q146 (2023):** Lawyers 'census' [Abogacía en datos] (Spanish General Bar Association website): Information on practicing and resident lawyers. Percentage of women and men (45 and 55% aprox.)

**Q146 (2022):** Lawyers 'census' [Abogacía en datos] (General Bar Association website): Information on practicing and resident lawyers. Percentage of women and men (45 and 55% aprox.)

**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”.

## Question 147

**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.

**Croatia**

**Q147 (2020):** Not applicable

**Cyprus**

**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**

**Q147 (2016):** There are no legal advisors (as decribed in the question above) in the Czech Republic.

**Denmark**

**Q147 (2019):** License to practice as an "advokat" is mandatory in Denmark.

**Finland**

**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/ )

**France**

**Q147 (2024):** Since Law No. 90-1259 of December 31, 1990 (which came into effect on January 1, 1992), the term “lawyer” includes both the former profession of legal advisor and lawyers. These two professions have merged to form a single profession of lawyer, all members of which can represent their clients in court.
Corporate jurists, the equivalent of "in-house counsellors," are not part of the legal profession and do not constitute a regulated profession: therefore, the DACS does not have data on this profession.

**Q147 (2023):** This category does not exist. The profession of legal adviser was integrated into the profession of lawyer by the law of 31 December 1990. Legal advice is open to certain professionals by virtue of their status, but also to other professionals after approval has been granted by the Ministry of Justice.

**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.

**Germany**

**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 27 789 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 (2024):** Please refer to the general comment

**Q147 (2023):** please refer to the general comment

**Q147 (2022):** see General Comment

**Q147 (2021):** See the general comments

**Q147 (2020):** See the general comments

**Q147 (2019):** See the general comments

**Greece**

**Q147 (2022):** All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.

**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.

**Hungary**

**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 (2022):** Types of lawyers in Hungary
In Hungary "attorneys" are those legal professionals who hold a degree in law and have passed the BAR exam and registered by and members of the local bar association. There is no distinction between Hungarian attorneys, such as solicitors and barristers in the UK, any Hungarian attorney can represent a client before the court. An attorney, however, may practise either as an individual attorney, or as a member of a law firm. In other words, he/she can't be an employee. Please see below the number of attorneys practicing in Hungary (i.e., excluding legal advisors, junior lawyers, EU lawyers):
Number of attorneys (i.e., figures excluding legal advisors)
Total: 11,615
Males: 6,440
Females: 5,175
Those lawyers who work as employees of a company are called "legal advisors" (i.e. in-house counsels). They have the right to represent their employers in any proceedings, the limitation is that they can only act on behalf of their employers and can't have any other clients. There is a special category of legal advisors (in-house counsels) who are members of the local bar association as "registered legal advisors".
Moreover, there are "employed attorneys" (whose employer is limited to a lawyer or law firm), European legal counsels (under the EU Directives as implemented by Hungarian legislation), and employed European legal counsels.
All different categories described above are subordinated to the profession of a lawyer and legal advisor.
Monopoly
Lawyers (attorneys), and to a certain extent registered and non-registered legal advisors are the only professionals who are entitled to represent an individual and/or legal entity in legal matters. So, from this point of view there is a monopoly, since no one else is allowed to fulfil the role of legal representative as a professional, for consideration.
There is no general requirement to have legal representation in court or administrative cases, this is only mandatory in certain proceedings, so from this

point of view there is no monopoly (please see the detailed list of the cases below, where legal representation is mandatory).
Attorneys have a monopoly of representation of defendants in criminal cases during the whole length of criminal proceedings. Victims of criminal cases may also be represented by their family members.
In administrative proceedings, legal representation is not mandatory, and in general any person can represent a party who has the mandate to do so (but the limitation still applies that professionally only an attorney can represent parties in these proceedings too). Section 45 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Act XC of 2017) prescribes the presence of a defence attorney in the following cases:
a) a criminal offence for which the law prescribes five or more years of imprisonment,
b) the accused is subject to a coercive measure affecting a person's personal freedom, or in another matter is subject to arrest, preliminary involuntary treatment in a mental institution, or is placed under imprisonment, custodial arrest or educational training;
c) the accused is deaf, mute, blind or – regardless of his/her legal capacity – mentally incompetent,
d) the accused does not know the Hungarian language or the language of the proceedings,
e) the accused is not able to personally defend himself/herself for other reasons,
f) the court, the public prosecutor's office or the investigating authority assigned a defence attorney upon the request of the defendant or due to considering it necessary for other reasons,
g) it is especially prescribed by law (e.g. in case of an accused minor).
According to the Code of Civil Procedure (Act CXXX of 2016), in the case of civil cases, there is compulsory legal representation in all types of cases with the exception of lawsuits where the District Courts are competent including the appeals and extraordinary revisions in such cases.

**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**

**Q147 (2024):** Data only relates to those with a practising certificate

**Q147 (2023):** Data only relates to those with a practising certificate

**Q147 (2022):** Practicing solicitors are entitled to represent their clients in court. 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

**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

**Latvia**

**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.

**Lithuania**

**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.

**Netherlands**

**Q147 (2017):** NA

**Q147 (2016):** NA.

**Slovenia**

**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.)

### Question 148

**Bulgaria**

**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**

**Q148 (2020):** Not applicable

**Cyprus**

**Q148 (2023):** The term legal advisor does not exist. Under Advocates Law a registry of practicing lawyers and a registry of non practicing lawyers is kept. The number described above is for practicing lawyers.

**Q148 (2022):** the Cyprus Bar Association regulates the Advocates who have a renewed practicing license.

**Czech Republic**

**Q148 (2016):** There are no legal advisors (as decribed in the question 147) in the Czech Republic.

**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**

**Q148 (General Comment):** Data on the number of legal advisors who cannot represent their clients in court is not collected.

**Finland**

**Q148 (2018):** The exact number of legal advisors who cannot represent their clients in court is not available.

**France**

**Q148 (2024):** The DACS does not have figures on this profession, as explained in the comment relating to question 147.

**Q148 (2021):** Source DACS

**Q148 (2018):** There is no regulated profession in France for lawyers who cannot represent clients in court.

**Greece**

**Q148 (2024):** All lawyers can be considered legal advisors and represent their clients in court.

**Q148 (2023):** All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.

**Q148 (2022):** 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**

**Q148 (2023):** Types of lawyers in Hungary
Section 4 of the Act on Legal Practice determines comprehensively who is entitled to practise as a lawyer:
a) attorneys,
b) European community lawyers,
c) foreign legal advisors,
d) bar association legal counsel,
e) employed attorneys,
f) employed European community lawyers,
g) junior attorney and
h) legal advisors registered by the bar association.
In Hungary "attorneys" are those legal professionals who hold a degree in law and have passed the BAR exam and registered by and members of the local bar association. There is no distinction between Hungarian attorneys, such as solicitors and barristers in the UK, any Hungarian attorney can represent a client before the court. An attorney, however, may practise either as an individual attorney, or as a member of a law firm. In other words, he/she can't be an employee. Please see below the number of attorneys practicing in Hungary (i.e., excluding in-house counsels, junior lawyers, EU lawyers):
Number of attorneys (i.e., figures excluding in-house counsels)Total:13,348
Males: NA
Females: NA
Those lawyers who work as employees of a company are called “in-house counsels”. They have the right to represent their employers in any proceedings, the limitation is that they can only act on behalf of their employers and can't have any other clients. There is another category, “registered legal advisors”, who carry out their work under the control of an in-house counsel and have not passed the bar exam yet. Such registered legal advisors have the same representation rights before the court as junior attorneys explained below.
Moreover, there are "employed attorneys" (whose employer is limited to a lawyer or law firm), European legal counsels (under the EU Directives as implemented by Hungarian legislation), and employed European legal counsels.

**Ireland**

**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.

**Latvia**

**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.

**Malta**

**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.

**Poland**

**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**

**Q148 (2021):** We do not have this figure in Portugal.

**Q148 (2020):** We do not have this figure in Portugal.

**Slovak Republic**

**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.

# Indicator 8: Mediators and notaries

## Table 8.1 Evolution of the absolute number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation from 2014 to 2024 (Q166)

| States | Number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | 2 456 | 2 313 | 2 562 | 2 234 | 2 273 | 1 692 | 1 741 | 1 645 | 1 674 | 1 748 | 1 820 |
| **Belgium** | 1 352 | 1 457 | 1 454 | 1 744 | 2 122 | 2 399 | 2 577 | 2 463 | 2 736 | 2 736 | 2 474 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 453 | 474 | 549 | 588 | 612 | 632 | 673 | 706 | 824 | 927 | 1 134 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 421 | 589 | 620 | 660 | 657 | 589 | 669 | 686 | 712 | 726 | 744 |
| **Denmark** | 151 | 147 | 143 | 135 | 143 | 142 | 143 | 143 | 138 | 133 | 133 |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 2 450 | 2 571 | 2 940 | 2 940 | 1 436 | NA | 2 542 | 2 542 | 2 854 | 2 980 | 2 989 |
| **Germany** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 1 665 | 1 809 | 1 665 | 2 553 | NA | 2 985 | 3 363 | 3 496 | 3 697 |
| **Hungary** | 120 | 160 | 174 | 174 | 153 | 203 | 141 | 150 | 136 | 135 | 126 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 19 266 | 21 555 | 23 612 | 23 932 | 24 010 | 23 875 | 23 804 | 24 944 | 23 561 | 23 745 | 23 309 |
| **Latvia** | 24 | 38 | 43 | 46 | 52 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 51 | 59 |
| **Lithuania** | 109 | 129 | 269 | 366 | 469 | 392 | 552 | 663 | 688 | 743 | 768 |
| **Luxembourg** | 135 | 110 | 173 | 144 | 198 | 227 | 238 | 245 | 270 | 292 | 312 |
| **Malta** | 61 | 61 | 66 | 69 | 67 | 67 | 66 | 71 | 66 | 56 | 56 |
| **Netherlands** | 1 187 | 1 409 | 1 466 | 1 511 | 1 002 | 935 | 865 | 803 | 768 | 760 | 702 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | NA | NA | NA | 4 120 | 4 100 | 4 102 | 4 200 | 6 648 | 7 198 |
| **Portugal** | 196 | 221 | 514 | 617 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 6 833 | 11 701 | 5 080 | 4 739 | 4 585 | 11 234 | 11 259 | 3 075 | 4 357 | 4 298 | 4 330 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 1 068 | 1 248 | 1 450 | 1 664 | 913 | 798 | 877 | 909 | 945 | 1 052 | 928 |
| **Slovenia** | 311 | 292 | 281 | 272 | 276 | 267 | 258 | 245 | 236 | 204 | 235 |
| **Spain** | 1 151 | 3 289 | NA | 5 302 | 6 939 | 7 710 | 8 896 | 9 921 | 10 723 | 9 225 | 9 875 |
| **Sweden** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Average** | 2 097 | 2 654 | 2 392 | 2 576 | 2 643 | 3 216 | 3 303 | 2 966 | 3 068 | 3 156 | 3 205 |
| **Median** | 437 | 532 | 585 | 660 | 785 | 715 | 769 | 803 | 824 | 927 | 928 |
| **Minimum** | 24 | 38 | 43 | 46 | 52 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 51 | 56 |
| **Maximum** | 19 266 | 21 555 | 23 612 | 23 932 | 24 010 | 23 875 | 23 804 | 24 944 | 23 561 | 23 745 | 23 309 |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% |
| **% of NAP** | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% |

## Table 8.2 Evolution of the number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q166)

| States | Number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation per 100 000 inhabitants | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Austria** | 28,6 | 26,6 | 29,3 | 25,4 | 25,8 | 19,0 | 19,5 | 18,3 | 18,4 | 19,1 | 19,8 |
| **Belgium** | 12,1 | 12,9 | 12,8 | 15,3 | 18,6 | 21,0 | 22,4 | 21,3 | 23,4 | 23,3 | 20,9 |
| **Bulgaria** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Croatia** | 10,7 | 11,3 | 13,2 | 14,3 | 15,0 | 15,6 | 16,7 | 18,2 | 21,4 | 24,1 | 29,3 |
| **Cyprus** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Czech Republic** | 4,0 | 5,6 | 5,9 | 6,2 | 6,2 | 5,5 | 6,3 | 6,5 | 6,6 | 6,7 | 6,8 |
| **Denmark** | 2,7 | 2,6 | 2,5 | 2,3 | 2,5 | 2,4 | 2,4 | 2,4 | 2,3 | 2,2 | 2,2 |
| **Estonia** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **France** | 3,7 | 3,9 | 4,4 | 4,4 | 2,1 | NA | 3,8 | 3,8 | 4,2 | 4,4 | 4,4 |
| **Germany** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Greece** | NA | NA | 15,4 | 16,8 | 15,5 | 23,8 | NA | 28,0 | 31,5 | 33,6 | 35,5 |
| **Hungary** | 1,2 | 1,6 | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,6 | 2,1 | 1,4 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,4 | 1,3 |
| **Ireland** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Italy** | 31,7 | 35,5 | 39,0 | 39,6 | 39,8 | 39,6 | 40,2 | 42,3 | 39,9 | 40,3 | 39,6 |
| **Latvia** | 1,2 | 1,9 | 2,2 | 2,4 | 2,7 | 2,5 | 2,6 | 2,7 | 2,5 | 2,7 | 3,2 |
| **Lithuania** | 3,7 | 4,5 | 9,4 | 13,0 | 16,8 | 14,0 | 19,7 | 23,6 | 24,1 | 25,7 | 26,6 |
| **Luxembourg** | 24,0 | 19,5 | 29,3 | 23,9 | 32,3 | 36,3 | 37,5 | 38,0 | 40,9 | 43,4 | 45,7 |
| **Malta** | 13,9 | 13,5 | 14,3 | 14,5 | 14,1 | 13,6 | 12,8 | 13,8 | 12,7 | 9,9 | 9,8 |
| **Netherlands** | 7,0 | 8,3 | 8,6 | 8,8 | 5,8 | 5,4 | 4,9 | 4,6 | 4,3 | 4,2 | 3,9 |
| **Poland** | NA | - | NA | NA | NA | 10,7 | 10,7 | 10,8 | 11,1 | 17,7 | 19,2 |
| **Portugal** | 1,9 | 2,1 | 5,0 | 6,0 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Romania** | 30,7 | 59,2 | 25,9 | 24,3 | 23,6 | 57,9 | 58,7 | 16,2 | 22,9 | 22,5 | 22,7 |
| **Slovak Republic** | 19,7 | 23,0 | 26,7 | 30,6 | 16,8 | 14,6 | 16,1 | 16,7 | 17,4 | 19,4 | 17,1 |
| **Slovenia** | 15,1 | 14,1 | 13,6 | 13,2 | 13,3 | 12,7 | 12,2 | 11,6 | 11,1 | 9,6 | 11,0 |
| **Spain** | 2,5 | 7,1 | NA | 11,4 | 14,8 | 16,3 | 18,8 | 20,9 | 22,3 | 19,0 | 20,1 |
| **Sweden** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Average** | 11,9 | 14,1 | 14,4 | 14,4 | 14,8 | 17,4 | 17,0 | 15,8 | 16,8 | 17,3 | 17,9 |
| **Median** | 8,9 | 9,8 | 13,0 | 13,2 | 14,9 | 14,3 | 14,4 | 16,2 | 17,4 | 19,0 | 19,2 |
| **Minimum** | 1,2 | 1,6 | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,6 | 2,1 | 1,4 | 1,5 | 1,4 | 1,4 | 1,3 |
| **Maximum** | 31,7 | 59,2 | 39,0 | 39,6 | 39,8 | 57,9 | 58,7 | 42,3 | 40,9 | 43,4 | 45,7 |
| **% of NA** | 19% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% |
| **% of NAP** | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% |

## Table 8.3 Number of notaries in 2024 (Q1 and Q192)

| States | Notaries | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Absolute number | per 100 000 inhabitants | Private professionals (without control from public authorities) | Holders of public offices appointed by the State | Civil servants (paid by the State) | Other |
| **Austria** | 535 | 5,8 | NAP | 535 | NAP | NAP |
| **Belgium** | 1788 | 15,1 | NAP | 1788 | NAP | NAP |
| **Bulgaria** | 743 | 11,5 | NAP | 743 | NAP | NAP |
| **Croatia** | 334 | 8,6 | NAP | 334 | NAP | NAP |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 440 | 4,0 | NAP | 440 | NAP | NAP |
| **Denmark** | 53 | 0,9 | NAP | NAP | 53 | NAP |
| **Estonia** | 86 | 6,3 | NAP | 86 | NAP | NAP |
| **Finland** | 129 | 2,3 | NAP | NAP | 129 | NAP |
| **France** | 17484 | 25,5 | NAP | 17484 | NAP | NAP |
| **Germany** | 6346 | 7,6 | NAP | 6346 | NAP | NAP |
| **Greece** | 2887 | 27,8 | NAP | 2887 | NAP | NAP |
| **Hungary** | 313 | 3,3 | NAP | 313 | NAP | NAP |
| **Ireland** | 391 | 7,2 | NAP | 391 | NAP | NAP |
| **Italy** | 5056 | 8,6 | NAP | 5056 | NAP | NAP |
| **Latvia** | 110 | 5,9 | NAP | 110 | NAP | NAP |
| **Lithuania** | 225 | 7,8 | NAP | 225 | NAP | NAP |
| **Luxembourg** | 36 | 5,3 | NAP | 36 | NAP | NAP |
| **Malta** | 392 | 68,3 | NAP | 392 | NAP | NAP |
| **Netherlands** | 3427 | 19,0 | NAP | 3427 | NAP | NAP |
| **Poland** | 4214 | 11,2 | NAP | NAP | NAP | 4214 |
| **Portugal** | 557 | 5,2 | NAP | 557 | NAP | NAP |
| **Romania** | 2847 | 15,0 | NAP | 2847 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovak Republic** | 316 | 5,8 | NAP | 316 | NAP | NAP |
| **Slovenia** | 82 | 3,8 | NAP | 82 | NAP | NAP |
| **Spain** | 2750 | 5,6 | NAP | 2750 | NAP | NAP |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NAP | NA | NAP | NA |
| **Average** | 2062 | 11,5 | NA | 2143,0 | NA | NA |
| **Median** | 440 | 7,2 | NA | 487,5 | NA | NA |
| **Minimum** | 36 | 0,9 | NA | 36,0 | NA | NA |
| **Maximum** | 17484 | 68,3 | NA | 17484,0 | NA | NA |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% |
| **% of NAP** | 4% | 4% | 100% | 15% | 93% | 93% |

## Table 8.4 Number of notaries and their distribution in males and female in 2024 (Q192)

| States | Notaries | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Men | Women | % of Men | % of Women |
| **Austria** | 535 | 445 | 90 | 83% | 17% |
| **Belgium** | 1788 | 997 | 791 | 56% | 44% |
| **Bulgaria** | 743 | 236 | 507 | 32% | 68% |
| **Croatia** | 334 | 128 | 206 | 38% | 62% |
| **Cyprus** | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP | NAP |
| **Czech Republic** | 440 | 158 | 282 | 36% | 64% |
| **Denmark** | 53 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Estonia** | 86 | 17 | 69 | 20% | 80% |
| **Finland** | 129 | 30 | 99 | 23% | 77% |
| **France** | 17484 | 7308 | 10176 | 42% | 58% |
| **Germany** | 6346 | 4807 | 1539 | 76% | 24% |
| **Greece** | 2887 | 462 | 2425 | 16% | 84% |
| **Hungary** | 313 | 132 | 178 | 42% | 58% |
| **Ireland** | 391 | 286 | 105 | 73% | 27% |
| **Italy** | 5056 | 3071 | 1985 | 61% | 39% |
| **Latvia** | 110 | 18 | 92 | 16% | 84% |
| **Lithuania** | 225 | 47 | 178 | 21% | 79% |
| **Luxembourg** | 36 | 19 | 17 | 53% | 47% |
| **Malta** | 392 | 136 | 256 | 35% | 65% |
| **Netherlands** | 3427 | 1493 | 1934 | 44% | 56% |
| **Poland** | 4214 | 1477 | 2737 | 35% | 65% |
| **Portugal** | 557 | 111 | 446 | 20% | 80% |
| **Romania** | 2847 | 871 | 1976 | 31% | 69% |
| **Slovak Republic** | 316 | 102 | 214 | 32% | 68% |
| **Slovenia** | 82 | 29 | 53 | 35% | 65% |
| **Spain** | 2750 | 1754 | 996 | 64% | 36% |
| **Sweden** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Average** | 2062 | 1006 | 1140 | 41% | 59% |
| **Median** | 440 | 197 | 269 | 36% | 64% |
| **Minimum** | 36 | 17 | 17 | 16% | 17% |
| **Maximum** | 17484 | 7308 | 10176 | 83% | 84% |
| **% of NA** | 4% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| **% of NAP** | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |

# 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 192. Number and status of notaries in your country.*

**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

**Q192 (General Comment):** Civil law notaries are appointed by the Federal Minister of Justice. They are entrusted with official functions but practice within the framework of a liberal profession. The number of notary offices continues to grow in Austria.

**Q192 (2023):** Federal Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2022):** Federal Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2020):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2018):** Notaries in Austria are public office holders.

**Belgium**

**Q166 (General Comment):** An individual may hold qualifications in various fields.

**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

**Q192 (General Comment):** The notary is a public official who has been delegated by the State to give authenticity to the deeds that s/he draws up, while ensuring that these deeds are preserved, have probative value and are enforceable. To ensure the necessary independence, notaries practise as self-employed professionals.
Notaries: public officers appointed by the State: the Ministry of Justice is responsible for the appointment procedure (Federal Public Service JUSTICE).

**Q192 (2023):** The Ministry of Justice (Federal Public Service Justice) is responsible for the appointment procedure.

**Q192 (2022):** The Ministry of Justice is competent with regard to the appointment procedure.

**Q192 (2016):** The notary is a public official who has received delegation from the State authority to confer authenticity on the acts of which he is the author, while ensuring the conservation, probative force and enforceability of the said acts. In order to ensure the necessary independence of his activity, the notary exercises it within the framework of a liberal profession.

**Q192 (2014):** In 2014, the figure given corresponded to the number of notaries, associated notaries and alternate notaries.

**Bulgaria**

**Q166 (2024):** The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). The total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators, maintained by the Ministry of Justice until 31.12.2024, is 4844, including 925 mediators registered in 2024. Data on the sex/gender of mediators is not available.

**Q166 (2023):** The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of December 2023, the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 4692 (for 2023 the number of newly registered is 862).
**Q166 (2022):** The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of June 2023, the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 3463 (for 2022 the number of newly registered is 226).
**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.

**Q192 (General Comment):** Notaries and Notarial Practice Act regulates the legal status of notaries and of the Notary Chamber, the organisation of the notarial practice and notarial fees. Notaries are private persons who are entrusted by the State with the performance of notarial acts as provided for in the laws. They are independent in the performance of their duties and comply solely with the law. The Minister of Justice exercises control over the practice of each notary as to the implementation of the law and the Statute of the Notary Chamber of Bulgaria. The Council of Notaries also has the power to monitor compliance with the obligations of the notaries and the assistant notaries, and may take part through its representatives in disciplinary proceedings against such notaries and assistants in the prescribed cases. The notary procedures are stipulated by the Civil Procedure Code (Articles 569-594).

**Q192 (2022):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2020):** According to the current Bulgarian legislation, notaries carry out activities that are explicitly assigned to them through a legal delegation by the state. According to Art. 2, para. 1 of the Law on Notaries and Notarial Activity “the notary is a person to whom the state assigns the performance of the notarial actions provided for in the laws". They are private professionals, who perform their activity independently, with a public function that is given to them by the State. Notaries in Bulgaria are appointed after a national competition organized by the Ministry of Justice and on the basis of an Order of the Minister of Justice. The ministry that is mainly engaged in the procedure is the Ministry of Justice.

**Q192 (2018):** According to the Bulgarian legislation in force, notaries carry out activities that are explicitly assigned to them through a statutory delegation by the state. According to art.2 para 1 of the Notaries and Notarial Activity/Practice Act “A notary is a person, to whom the state assigns the notary activities stipulated by the law.”

**Croatia**

**Q166 (2024):** The reasons for the increase are multifaceted. First and foremost, during the observed period several projects were carried out with the aim of enhancing the level of education and qualifications of professionals involved in conducting mediation. Furthermore, the project activities included basic training for mediators, which significantly increased the number of individuals who meet the requirements for entry into the Register of Mediators.
Another contributing factor is the adoption of the new Act on the Peaceful Resolution of Disputes (“Official Gazette”, No. 67/2023) and the Ordinance on the Register of Mediators (“Official Gazette”, No. 100/2023). Pursuant to Article 11 of this Ordinance, the Centre shall enter into the Register mediators who had already been recorded in the previous register of mediators. In addition, Article 12 allows individuals who had previously obtained a mediator’s certificate, but had not been registered, to submit a request for entry into the Register within one year. This has enabled the formal registration of previously trained mediators. Consequently, the number of mediators in the Register has also increased due to the inclusion of these existing mediators.
The proposal of the new legislative framework has encouraged greater public interest in mediation, resulting in increased demand for training and registration in the Register of Mediators. Since the new legislative proposal envisages a broader application of mediation, further growth in the number of registered mediators is expected.
In conclusion, the increase in the number of mediators is the result of systematic regulatory, educational, and project-based efforts aimed at developing the mediation system in the Republic of Croatia.

**Q166 (2023):** On June 29, 2023, the Law on the Peaceful Resolution of Disputes ("Official Gazette", number 67/23; hereinafter: ZMRS) entered into force, and it provides in Article 7, Paragraph 1 that the title of mediator is acquired by registration in the Register mediator who runs the Center for Peaceful Resolution of Disputes (https://cmrs.hr/) and eliminated by deletion from the Register.

**Q166 (2022):** Judges mediators are determined by the Annual Work Schedule.

**Q192 (2020):** Public notaries in the Republic of Croatia are appointed by the minister competent for judicial affairs.

**Cyprus**

**Q192 (General Comment):** Cyprus does not have notaries but certifying officers whose competences are to authenticate as true copies of documents.

**Q192 (2020):** We only have certifying officers authenticating documents

**Czech Republic**

**Q166 (General Comment):** Registered mediators are people who have proven their knowledge and abilities by passing an exam and meet other conditions set by law. According to the law, upon one's request, the Ministry shall register a person who is capable of legal acts, is of good repute and integrity, has obtained a master's degree from university in the Czech Republic (or has obtained a similar higher education abroad, if according to an international treaty to which the Czech Republic is bound the recognition of such education is determined), has passed the mediator exam (or has been recognized as qualified), and has not been removed from the list of mediators in the last 5 years before submitting the application. Person of a good repute and integrity is one who has not been legally sentenced for an intentionally committed criminal offence or a crime committed due to negligence in connection with the performance of the mediator's activities.

**Q166 (2024):** From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 369 mediators in criminal cases and 375 mediators in non criminal cases (of which there are 307 active mediators).

**Q166 (2023):** From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 362 mediators in criminal cases and 364 mediators in non criminal cases (of which there are 313 active mediators).

**Q166 (2022):** From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 362 mediators in criminal cases and 350 mediators in non criminal cases (of which there are 307 active mediators).

**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.
**Q192 (2023):** Ministry of Justice

**Denmark**

**Q166 (General Comment):** https://domstol.dk/alle-emner/retsmaegling/

**Q166 (2022):** The number of registered attorneys who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2022 is 54. The number of registred jugdes who serves as mediators in court mediation in 2022 is 84.
**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.

**Q192 (General Comment):** The function of a notary is an integrated function of the district courts. All 24 district courts have one or more notaries which can confirm signatures on important documents or confirm that a copy is identical to the original document. Thus, a notary can confirm the identity of a person who signs a will or another document. With its endorsement, the notary guarantees that the signer understands what it means to make a will. A notary can also witness and confirm that a certain person has signed a special document.
The number of notaries in Denmark is uncertain. The Danish Court Administration does not have precise information regarding the total number of notaries employed by the Danish Courts or the gender of the notaries. However, it is possible to make an approximate statement of the number of notaries in the courts in 2024 based on accounting figures and average costs per year. On this basis, it is estimated that in 2024 there have been approx. 53 full-time notary positions in the district courts. Please note, that ‘notary’ is not an occupation, but a function typically carried out by clerical workers or student assistants at the court. Consequently, at some courts, the function is performed by part-time employees, which means that the number of full-time equivalent positions may not accurately reflect the actual number of individuals serving as notaries.

**Q192 (2024):** The number of notaries in Denmark is uncertain. The Danish Court Administration does not have precise information regarding the total number of notaries employed by the Danish Courts or the gender of the notaries. However, it is possible to make an approximate statement of the number of notaries in the courts in 2024 based on of accounting figures and average costs per year. On this basis, it is estimated that in 2024 there have been approx. 53 full-time notary positions in the district courts.
Please note , that 'notary' is not an occupation, but a function typically carried out by clerical workers or student assistants at the court. Consequently, at some courts, the function is performed by part-time employees, which means that the number of full-time equivalent positions may not accurately reflect the actual number of individuals serving as notaries.

**Q192 (2023):** The amount of notaries is uncertain. The Danish Court Administration does not have precise information regarding the total number of notaries employed by the Danish Courts or the gender of the notaries. However, it is possible to make an approximate statement of the number of notaries in the courts in 2023 on the basis of accounting figures and average costs per year. On this basis, it is estimated that in 2023 there have been approx. 41 notary annual works in the district courts.

**Estonia**

**Q192 (General Comment):** A notary is an independent holder of office in public law, to whom the State has delegated the duty of ensuring the security of legal relationships and prevention of legal disputes. A notary executes his/her office as a liberal profession in his/her own name and at his/her own responsibility. Notaries are not proprietors but for accounting and taxation purposes, provisions applying to sole proprietors are applied. Notaries are appointed to office by the Minister of Justice according to the number of notaries and their corresponding territorial jurisdiction determined by the Regulation of the Minister of Justice. The Ministry of Justice supervises the professional activities of notaries.

**Finland**

**Q166 (General Comment):** A specific training is required for judges who want to become mediators. The training is not an actual legal requirement, but it is a general rule to get special training in order to mediate.
In Finland when you mediate in the court, you do not have to be an accredited or registered mediator. Even the training is not actual legal requirement, but it's a general rule to get a training before you can mediate. We have two different kind of training paths, depending which kind of cases are mediated, civil cases or custody dispute. We do not mediate criminal cases yet. In civil cases training is targeted to judges only and it consist of 3 parts, totally 6 days. First part is a 3-days training and is done before you start mediation, 2 others are done while you have mediated some time (year/ 2 years). First training includes basic theories about mediation, examples, structure of the process and practise. Two latter trainings are basically to deepen your skills.
Child dispute mediation training is meant for judges and auxiliaries. Training path consists from 5 different trainings, some targeted to judges, some to auxiliaries and some are joint trainings total 8 days. Training includes basic mediation theory, custody dispute theory/law, child law/ child rights, practise etc.

**Q166 (2023):** See comment to 166-1

**Q166 (2022):** See comment to 166-1

**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.
**Q192 (General Comment):** In Finland, the notary system is not similar to some other European countries. Notaries do not work in the courts but in the local register offices.
The law on public notaries applies to them: https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/2014/20140420 (FI) or https://www.finlex.fi/sv/laki/ajantasa/2014/20140420 (SE)

**Q192 (2016):** In Finland there is not a notary system as in other European countries. Notaries do not work in courts and their competences are limited.
**Q192 (2014):** In 2014, there were 70 notaries public working in 11 local register offices. According to the Act on Notary Public (420/2014), the heads of Local Register Offices and the officers appointed by them as well as the officials appointed by the State Department of Åland are notaries public.
The number of notaries for 2012 and 2014 was provided by local register offices. Possible reasons/ factors explaining the observed decrease of 48% are the new Act on Public Notaries (420/2014) and the reform of local register offices. The number of the latter has decreased since 2014 (currently their number is 9) and the number of branch offices has decreased as well.

**France**

**Q166 (2024):** 2 989, including 353 legal entities and 2 636 individual mediators

**Q166 (2023):** 2 980 mediators (2 627 individuals/353 legal entities).

**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

**Q192 (General Comment):** The status of notaries as public and ministerial officers is defined by the provisions of article 1 of Order no. 45-2590 of 2 November 1945 relating to the status of notaries and article 3 of the amended Act of 25 Ventôse Year XI concerning the organisation of the notarial profession. Article 1 bis of Order no. 45-2590 of 2 November 1945 on the status of notaries defines the various legal forms in which the profession of notary may be practised.

**Q192 (2024):** Source(s): SSER, statistical analysis of data from the OPM portal

**Q192 (2022):** As of 30/04/2023, out of a total of 17 429 notaries, 9 880 were women. As of 31/12/2022, these data are not available.

The status of notaries as public and ministerial officers is defined by the provisions of article 1 of Order no. 45-2590 of 2 November 1945 relating to the status of notaries and article 3 of the amended Act of 25 Ventôse Year XI concerning the organisation of the notarial profession. Article 1 bis of Order no. 45-2590 of 2 November 1945 on the status of notaries defines the various legal forms in which the profession of notary may be practised.

**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 (2024):** Please refer to the general comment

**Q166 (2023):** 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 (2022):** see General Comment

**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.
**Q192 (General Comment):** The number of appointments as notary is in keeping with the number of notaries required in order to ensure the due and proper administration of the law (section 4 of the Federal Code for Notaries). The applicants are to be identified by advertisement (section 4a of the Federal Code for Notaries). Generally, the notary may not pursue any other profession (section 8 paragraphs (1) and (2) of the Federal Code for Notaries).

**Q192 (2024):** Number of notaries as of 1 January 2025
Notaries hold a public office. They are appointed by the Ministry of Justice of the respective state (“Land”), cf. sec. 12 Federal Code for Notaries.
**Q192 (2023):** Notaries hold a public office. They are appointed by the Ministry of Justice of the respective state (“Land”), cf. sec. 12 Federal Code for Notaries.
**Q192 (2022):** Notaries hold a public office. They are appointed by the Ministry of Justice of the respective state (“Land”), cf. sec. 12 Federal Code for Notaries.
**Q192 (2020):** Notaries hold a public office. They are appointed by the Ministry of Justice of the respective state (“Land”), cf. sec. 12 Federal Code for Notaries

**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.

**Q192 (General Comment):** Notaries are professionals appointed by the state and in particular, by the Minister of Justice after successful participation in certain public competition. They are considered by our Constitution as public servants without receiving any salary from the State and they practice their profession as in private sector.
**Q192 (2024):** It should be noted that in 2024, a large number of notaries ceased to perform their duties, either due to resignation or unilateral termination due to reaching the age limit.
In addition, it should be highlighted that the competent service is not computerized, which prevents the accurate reporting of statistical data( Notary Department of the Ministry of Justice).

**Q192 (2020):** 2813 active notaries in a total of 3500 organic positions

**Q192 (2018):** Notaries are professionals appointed by the state and in particular, by the Minister of Justice after successful participation in certain public competition. They are considered by our Constitution as public servants without receiving any salary from the State and they practice their profession as in private sector.

**Hungary**

**Q166 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value.
**Q166 (2023):** Discrepancy explanation: The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value.

**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.
**Q192 (General Comment):** .

**Q192 (2024):** In Hungary due to the official nature and constitutional status of a civil law notary in exercising public authority a notary may only assume office as a result of a successful application procedure and the appointment of the Minister of Justice. The appointment is the sole event when the notary is commissioned by the State to fulfil tasks forming part of the justice system upon the formal request of clients. The number of notaries and their tariffs is governed by a regulation of the Minister of Justice.
The total number of the Hungarian notarial seats is 313. This is a numerus clausus. Concerning the difference between the total of the notarial seats (313) and the added number of the male and female notaries (310), the following has to be remarked. On the seats which are vacant (generally because on the given seat a notary retired and the selection procedure is still ongoing or the newly appointed notary has not taken up the activity yet), the notarial services are fulfilled by another notaries or deputy notaries who act as “substitute notaries”. As this is a temporary status, their number based on genders isn’t included in our calculations.

**Q192 (2023):** In Hungary due to the official nature and constitutional status of a civil law notary in exercising public authority a notary may only assume office as a result of a successful application procedure and the appointment of the Minister of Justice. The appointment is the sole event when the notary is commissioned by the State to fulfil tasks forming part of the justice system upon the formal request of clients. The number of notaries and their tariffs is governed by a regulation of the Minister of Justice.
The total number of the Hungarian notarial seats is 313. This is a numerus clausus. In the near future, this number is expected to be reduced by 3. Concerning the difference between the total of the notarial seats (313) and the added number of the male and female notaries (310), the following has to be remarked. On the seats which are vacant (generally because on the given seat a notary retired and the selection procedure is still ongoing or the newly appointed notary has not taken up the activity yet) , the notarial services are fulfilled by another notaries or deputy notaries who act as ‘substitute notaries’. This is a temporary status in both cases. In case of inclusion of the notary acting as susbstitute, his/her gender would be counted twice, giving a false image on the proportion of genders. In case of a deputy notary acting as substitute, it is not sure that the given person will be appointed as a notary to the given seat (it can be a person with the opposite gender). Therefore, we did not find it adequate to include their number into the data provided.

**Q192 (2022):** In Hungary due to the official nature and constitutional status of a civil law notary in exercising public authority a notary may only assume office as a result of a successful application procedure and the appointment of the Minister of Justice. The appointment is the sole event when the notary is commissioned by the State to fulfil tasks forming part of the justice system upon the formal request of clients. The number of notaries and their tariffs is governed by a regulation of the Minister of Justice.
The total number of the Hungarian notarial seats is 313. This is a numerus clausus. In the near future, this number is expected to be reduced by 3. Concerning the difference between the total of the notarial seats (313) and the added number of the male and female notaries (304), the following has to be remarked. On the seats which are vacant (generally because on the given seat a notary retired and the selection procedure is still ongoing or the newly appointed notary has not taken up the activity yet) , the notarial services are fulfilled by another notaries or deputy notaries who act as ‘substitute notaries’. As this is a temporary status, their number based on genders isn’t included in our calculations.

**Q192 (2020):** Act XLI of 1991 on Civil Law Notaries

**Q192 (2014):** According to 2014 data, notaries are appointed by the Minister of Justice for indefinite term. The number of notary positions is regulated by ministerial decree in such a way as to facilitate the access to notarial services in the whole country and to ensure the sustainability of all notarial offices. Civil law notaries are supervised by regional chambers and the Hungarian National Chamber, which is also obliged to provide various supporting IT-systems and to manage the notarial archives. The Minister of Justice has judicial supervisory competence over civil law notaries. The president of the competent Budapest or county court for the seat of the notary public has legal supervision over the actions of the notary, as part of that, he/she may order that the activities of the notary shall be reviewed by the chamber and may also initiate disciplinary proceedings.
Civil law notaries exercise as part of the State judicature official legal authority in accordance with the legal rules of their competence. Therefore, they have public authority. This is the reason why only Hungarian citizens can be appointed public notaries and this is why some elements of the notaries’ obligations are similar to those of judges. Namely, the appointment is only possible as a result of an open selection procedure, and it is restricted to the jurisdiction of the local court; in case of notary’s absence, a substitute may only be assigned by the local notaries’ chamber; the notary is to act personally, impartially, in accordance with the acts regulating his/her competence; the notary is obliged to cooperate which means that he/she can refuse to proceed only if permitted by law, the form of the refusal shall be a writ; in order to facilitate an impartial procedure, the notary, in accordance with the requirement to provide equal opportunities, is obliged to inform the parties of their rights and obligations; the notary is only subject to legal rules; the notary is entitled to use the arms of the

country; the rules on the liability and exclusion of judges are also applicable to notaries; the remuneration of civil law notaries is fixed by law.

**Ireland**

**Q166 (2024):** The Legal Aid Board has approximately 40 Mediators on staff, who are all fully accredited to do court related mediation. There is also a panel of 35 Private Practitioner Mediators who are accredited to do court based mediation. The Board does not have a list of additional Mediators that might practice outside of the above two categories.

**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.

**Q192 (General Comment):** Notaries in Ireland are recognised in other countries.

**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.

**Q192 (General Comment):** The Notary as existing in Italy belongs to the “Latin (roman) notarial system”. The Latin notary is a public officer and a specialized counselor; his/her expertise must cover estate contracts, loans and mortgages, company law, family law, wills law, the relevant sections of fiscal law. The Latin notary also performs other judicial duties as a judicial auxiliary/assistant. Notaries as public officers are professionals who perform public functions. They are vested by the State with public authority and faith, which allows them to draw authentic deeds (or public deeds). Put differently, a notary can be defined as a public officer to whom the State delegates a specific public power, the power to assert (to affirm) the authenticity of a document. The profession of notary is characterized by the qualities of independence and impartiality. A full description of the responsibilities of the notary can be found at the following link: http://www.notariato.it/en/italian-notaries/who-we-are/responsibilities-of-the-notary.html

**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

**Q192 (General Comment):** In respect of their official duties, sworn notaries are equivalent to State officials, belonging to the court system.

**Q192 (2018):** The number of professional notaries (98) is indicated based on the number of actually practising notaries. Previously, there was indicated the number of the work positions, what is according to the regulation of the Cabinet of Ministers.

**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 an

d 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.

**Q192 (2024):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2020):** The Ministry of Justice.

**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 (2022):** While no detailed analysis has been conducted on this matter, the use of mediation has emerged in recent years as a preferable alternative for resolving minor cases, such as disputes between neighbours. The increase observed since 2020 in the number of criminal cases where parties agree to initiate mediation could be attributed to positive experiences with the mediation centre, particularly with a view to avoiding such matters being referred to already burdened courts, notably following the health crisis.

**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.

**Q192 (2024):** Notary Chamber (https://www.notariat.lu/trouver-notaire)

**Q192 (2023):** Ministry of Justice (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/professions-droit/le-notaire.html)

**Q192 (2022):** Ministry of Justice (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/en/legal-professions/the-notary.html)

Chamber of Notaries (http://www.notariat.lu/find-a-notary/notaries-directory/)
**Q192 (2020):** Ministère de la justice (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/professions-droit/le-notaire.html#:~:text=Le%20nombre%20des%20notaires%20est,pour%20l'ensemble%20du%20pays)
Chambre des notairs (http://www.notariat.lu/trouver-un-notaire/annuaire-des-notaires/)
**Q192 (2014):** In 2014, there were in total 36 notaries with a hybrid status of regulateed liberal profession and public officer.

**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).

**Q192 (General Comment):** The Notary is a Public Officer and as such is an emanation of the State. At the same time he/she is a free professional with his/her own personal office, independent of the State and of the parties. This dual-nature ensures the right balance between the legal-fiscal functions for which the Notary is the ultimate reference point.
Conveyance (property sales, purchase, leasing, etc.), financing collateral (hypothecation of immovable), succession (wills, trusts, etc.) and matters pertaining to civil status (matrimonial regimes, personal separations, etc.) are all within the ambit of the profession and form the portfolio of a notary's day-to-day work. It is only through a notarial act that most transactions related to the above are given legal effect and this adds certainty and improves efficiency. Being a necessary passage at Law, the notarial requirement makes for a very cost-effective way of crystallizing a state of certainty in that notarial tariffs are stipulated by law and the citizen is all the more protected. The notarial intervention is thus imposed by law to safeguard legality and ensuring at all times that the autonomy of the private citizen never goes beyond what is legally and statutorily permitted.

**Q192 (2020):** All Public Notaries are appointed by the state even if they practice in their professional capacity. In previous evaluations we used to list the notaries as 'Public officials' but as from this evaluation, following changes in this question, we are marking them as 'Holders of public offices appointed by the State'.
**Q192 (2018):** The full list of practising Notaries is published in the Government Gazette every year in January. The above number of Notaries has been derived from the publication issued on the 31st January 2019 accessible at (https://www.gov.mt/en/Government/DOI/Government%20Gazette/Documents/2019/01/Government%20Gazette%20-%2031st%20January.pdf)

**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.

**Q192 (General Comment):** Dutch notaries are civil law notaries.
There are three types of notaries: notaries (or notaries entrepreneurs), assigned notaries, and deputy notaries.
Deputy notaries (or deputy civil law notaries) are persons in training to become a notary, or persons who choose to work under a notary. They are not entitled to sign notarial acts in their own name.
Notaries (notary entrepreneur) are formally appointed by the King. They are also entrepreneurs, running their own business.
Assigned notaries are formally appointed by the Minister and are employed by a notary. Both are entitled to sign notarial acts.

**Q192 (2024):** These numbers can be divided into the following categories (see General comment for an explanation on the type of notaries)
Notary entrepreneurs: 1 227 (F 383; M 844)
Assigned notaries: 242 (F 176; M 66)
Deputy notaries: 1 958 (F 1375; M 583)
These are numbers from January 2024.

**Q192 (2023):** These numbers can be divided into the following categories (see General comment for an explanation on the type of notaries)
Notary entrepreneurs: 1 234
Assigned notaries: 224
Deputy notaries: 1 972

**Q192 (2022):** These are numbers on January 1st 2022.
Notaries (or notary-entrepreneurs) are formally appointed by the King. A notary is also an entrepreneur, running his/her own business. The notary may hire ‘assigned notaries’. An assigned notary is formally appointed by the Minister, and is employed by a notary. Both notaries and assigned notaries are entitled to sign notarial acts.
Additionally, there are deputy (civil law) notaries, who are either a person in training to become a notary, or people who choose to continue working under a notary (they are not entitled to sign notarial acts (in their own name). One can remain a deputy notary forever.

**Q192 (2020):** The count of notaries includes the so-called ‘’candidate’-notaries; they do not hold the full professional status, and a notary with full professional status remains responsible for the work of the candidate. People can remain a ‘çandidate’ for many years, even a life time. Notaries are entrepreneurs, work in/ as private enterprises, and are formally appointed by the King; their profession is regulated by law. There are also ‘added notaries’ (toegevoegde notarissen’): they have fulll responsibility like a notary, but they are not entrepreneurs, they are employees.

**Q192 (2018):** The count of notaries includes so-called 'candidates'. They do not hold the full professional status and a notary with full professional status remains responsible for the work of a candidate. People can remain 'candidate' for many years, or even a life time.
Notaries can work in private enterprises, but are formally appointed by the King, and their profession is regulated by Law.

**Q192 (2014):** In 2014, there were 1 336 notaries and 1 631 junior notaries. Notaries are private professionals under the authority (control) of public authorities. Dutch notaries are civil law notaries, meaning that they are fully qualified legal professionals. A notary is not only a sworn official but also an entrepreneur. As of 1 January 2013, it is also possible to become a public official without being an entrepreneur: the assigned notary. To become an assigned notary may be an alternative for junior notaries who do not have entrepreneurial ambition. Other than that the assigned notary has the same competences as the notary entrepreneur. An assigned notary has an employment contract with the notary to whom he/she is assigned and thus he/she is not an entrepreneur; is entitled to sign notarial acts within the protocol of the notary to whom he/she is assigned; acts under the authority of the notary to whom he/she is assigned; is by law the regular replacement of the notary to whom he/she is assigned.

**Poland**

**Q166 (2023):** Between 2020 and 2023, the Ministry of Justice implemented a project entitled ‘Dissemination of Alternative Dispute Resolution Methods by Increasing the Competence of Mediators, Establishment of the National Register of Mediators (NCM) and Outreach Activities’. One of the objectives of the project was to professionalise the mediation profession and increase the number of qualified mediators. As part of the project, training courses on the conduct of judicial and extrajudicial mediation in civil cases were organised (most of the training took place in 2022 and 2023) for mediator candidates and mediators. The trainings were attended by more than 1,600 people
For 2023, there is no gender-disaggregated data - confirmed by the head of the mediation department.

**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.

**Q192 (General Comment):** The profession of notary is governed in Poland by the Law of 14 February 1991 on notary (OJ 2020, Item 1192, rev.).

The Polish legislator conferred the power to appoint notaries solely on the Minister of Justice. The decision on this matter shall be the decision of the administrative authority on a case-by-case basis, is taken under the provisions of the Code of Administrative Conduct and is discretionary. The Minister of Justice has the competence to select candidates to practice the profession of notary, as well as the designation of their office. Before a decision is taken, the provisions only provide for the obligation to consult the board of the competent board of the notary chamber. The Minister of Justice issues an administrative decision under Article 10 of the Law on notary, is not bound in any way by the content of this opinion, which is assessed like any other evidence. The scope of the discretion granted to the Minister of Justice under Article 10(1) of the Act is limited only by the provisions of articles 10(3) and 11 to 13 of the act. The candidates for notaries, when applying for the appointment of a notary and the appointment of a registry, make an autonomous choice as to the path of life, as well as the place where the profession is to be performed. It is their responsibility only to decide on the specific location of the office. In this respect, the Minister of Justice is bound by the content of the proposal. The law provisions - the notarial law also doesn't make the creation of another office dependant on the non-exceeding of a specified number of registries in a given registry. There is no numerical restriction of access to the profession of notary in Poland (numerus clausus).

Notariat in Poland belongs to the group of Latin-type notariats, however the status of notaries is not uniform. On the one hand, notaries conduct their activities at their own risk, and the service nature of this activity can be considered to fall within the scope of freed

om of economic activity. In its resolution of 23 March 2016 (III CZP 4/16), the Supreme Court stated, that the notary is an entrepreneur within the meaning of Article 431 of the Civil Code. On the other hand, the notary is a person of public trust who guarantees security of commerce and shall ensure that the rights of the parties to the acts and of third parties are duly safeguarded. Notaries play an important role in the structure of the bodies responsible for applying the law and building the trust of citizens in the state, its institutions and legal trading entities.

A notary shall be appointed to carry out the acts which the parties are obliged or willing to give a notarial form (notarial activities) acts as a public trust person within the scope of these powers, by exercising the protection of public officers (Article 1(1) and Article 2(1) of the Law of 14 February 1991 on notary). The notarial acts, made by a notary in accordance with the law, are authentic (Article 2(2) of the Law - notary Law). When performing notarized activities, the notary collects taxes and court fees related to the notary activity of the parties, which is then transferred to the account of the competent institution. The notary is remunerated for the notarized activities, determined by agreement with the parties. However, the maximum rates of remuneration are determined officially by means of a regulation of the Minister of Justice, issued in agreement with the minister responsible for financial institutions (OJ of 2020, item 1473, rev.).

The notary is responsible for the damage caused in the performance of the notarial procedure and in this respect, is subject to compulsory civil liability insurance. In addition, a notary may be held liable for disciplinary action. Disciplinary courts are called upon to rule on disciplinary matters – at first instance, disciplinary courts of notary chambers, At second instance, a higher disciplinary Court at the National Notarial Council. The appeal of the Court of first Instance is also served by a surety against the Supreme Court. Disciplinary proceedings shall be open, however, the most severe disciplinary penalty is that the law of the law firm is not allowed to run. Notaries are established by a notary public authority to which membership is mandatory. The local government comprises the notarial chambers and the National Council of Notarial. The notarial Chamber is a notary who leads a registry in the district of the appellate court. The number of notary chambers in Poland therefore corresponds to the number of appellate courts (11). The National Notarial Council is the representative of the notary and consists of notaries selected by general meetings of notaries of notary houses.

**Q192 (2018):** Notaries are appointed by Minister of Justice.

**Portugal**

**Q166 (2024):** There is a national registry managed by the Ministry of Justice, 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 of private mediators is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation

**Q166 (2023):** There is a national registry managed by the Ministry of Justice, 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 of private mediators is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation

**Q166 (2022):** There is a national registry managed by the Ministry of Justice, 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 of private mediators is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation

**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.

**Q192 (General Comment):** In 2004, a new status of the notarial profession was approved. Since, the notaries are private professionals under the authority (control) of public authorities. They compete for licenses and take office before the Minister of Justice and the president of the Chamber of Notaries. As a transition period is still running, some notaries work as public agents (before 2004, notaries were exclusively public officials). Since 2018, with Decree Law 115/2018, 21st December, "public notaries" ceased to exist and were transfered to the special carrear of registrar.

**Q192 (2022):** The increase in the number of notaries was due to the takeovers that took place during 2021 and 2022. Specifically, we refer to the grant of licenses for the installation of notary offices, awarded under the 8th Competition (Notice 4822/2022, of March 8) and the competitions for the award of the title of notary (Notice 3552/2021, of February 26 and Notice 3251/2022, of February 17).

**Romania**

**Q166 (2022):** The data is provided 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 the persons who meet the conditions provided by law.

**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.

**Q192 (2018):** Notaries public are not differentiated by gender within the records of the Ministry of Justice.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q166 (2024):** The decrease in the number of mediators was caused by the fact that in 2024, the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic, in administrative proceedings, removed a significant number of mediators from the official register pursuant to Section 5, letter (f) of Act No. 420/2004 Coll. on Mediation and on the Amendment of Certain Acts, on the grounds that they either failed to pass a repeated professional examination or did not take the examination within the prescribed period.
The repeated examination had been ordered by the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic pursuant to Section 10a(3) of the Mediation Act, due to the mediator's failure to attend at least one professional seminar during the year, which constitutes a mandatory component of the mediator's continuing professional education.

**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.
**Q192 (General Comment):** The Act n. 323/1993 Col. on Notaries and Notarial Activities, regulates the status and activities of notaries. A notary is a person appointed and empowered by the State to practice as a notary and carry out other activities in accordance with the law. A notary is appointed by the Minister of Justice on the basis of selection procedure, as a general rule to hold office within the geographical jurisdiction of a court of first instance. Notary is holding public office until the age of 67. He/she is not part of state bureaucracy; he/she is not bounded by any instructions, but is subject to State supervision, performed by the Minister of Justice. State is thus entitled to issue legislation regulating the activities of the notaries, self-governance of the notaries, as well as designate the number of notarial offices within the district of Court of first instance. A notary is impartial and independent in the performance of his/her duties. He/she is bound only by the Constitution, laws and other general implementing legislation. The office of a notary is incompatible with entrepreneurial activities or other gainful activity, except for the management of the notary's own assets and those of his/her minor children, and academic, publishing, pedagogical, interpreting and artistic activity. A notary may not act as an expert in cases where he/she acts as a court commissioner.

**Q192 (2024):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2023):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2022):** Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic.

**Slovenia**

**Q166 (2021):** The procedures for listing (and un-listing) individual mediators are led by individual courts.

**Q192 (General Comment):** A notary is a legal official who has been entrusted by the public authority with the safeguarding of the freedom of consent and the protection of the rightful interests of individuals. The presence of the notary confers authenticity to legal acts. As a guarantor of legal security, the notary has an important role to play in limiting subsequent litigation. Thereby, he/she is a major actor in preventive justice.

**Spain**

**Q166 (2024):** The figure provided is the number of mediators (natural and legal persons) registered in the Registry of Mediators.
With the entry into force of Law 16/2022 of September 5th, which reformed the consolidated text of the Insolvency Act, the figure of the insolvency mediator has been eliminated. Consequently, the registration of insolvency mediators in the Mediators Registry, both natural persons and legal entities, has been annulled. Therefore, the total number of mediators is lower than that provided in previous years. It should be added that this Registry is not mandatory, so the number of mediators may be higher.
In 2025, Organic Law 1/2025 of January 2, on the efficiency of the Public Justice Service, came into force. This law implemented Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms (ADR) as a procedural requirement prior to the filing of lawsuits in civil and commercial matters. It does not apply in labor, criminal, or insolvency matters, nor in cases where one of the parties is a public sector entity as well as other cases in which the parties cannot freely dispose of the rights in dispute.
Mediation is a mandatory step prior to the indicated legal proceedings, which has led to a growing increase in the number of mediators.

**Q166 (2023):** The figure provided is the number of mediators (natural and legal persons) registered in the Registry of Mediators.
With the entry into force of Law 16/2022 of September 5th, which reformed the consolidated text of the Insolvency Act, the figure of the insolvency mediator has been eliminated. Consequently, the registration of insolvency mediators in the Mediators Registry, both natural persons and legal entities, has been annulled. Therefore, the total number of mediators is lower than that provided in previous years. It should be added that this Registry is not mandatory, so the number of mediators may be higher.

**Q166 (2022):** 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.

**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.

**Q192 (General Comment):** "The Notaries' regulation (Decree of 2 June 1944) states in article 1 that "notaries are both civil servants and legal professionals, corresponding to this double character the organization of Notaries. As officials, they exercise notarial public faith, which has and protects a double content:
a) In the field of facts, the accuracy of what the notary sees, hears or perceives through his senses.
b) And in the sphere of Law, the authenticity and probative force of the declarations of will of the parties in the public instrument drawn up in accordance with the laws.
As legal professionals, they have the mission of advising those who claim their ministry and advise them of the most appropriate legal means to achieve the lawful ends that they intend to achieve.
The Notary will enjoy full autonomy and independence in its function, and in its hierarchical organization it reports directly to the Ministry of Justice and the General Directorate of Registries and Notaries".

# 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 192. Number and status of notaries in your country.*

### Question 166

**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

**Belgium**

**Q166 (General Comment):** An individual may hold qualifications in various fields.

**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

**Bulgaria**

**Q166 (2024):** The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). The total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators, maintained by the Ministry of Justice until 31.12.2024, is 4844, including 925 mediators registered in 2024. Data on the sex/gender of mediators is not available.

**Q166 (2023):** The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of December 2023, the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 4692 (for 2023 the number of newly registered is 862).

**Q166 (2022):** The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of June 2023, the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 3463 (for 2022 the number of newly registered is 226).

**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**

**Q166 (2024):** The reasons for the increase are multifaceted. First and foremost, during the observed period several projects were carried out with the aim of enhancing the level of education and qualifications of professionals involved in conducting mediation. Furthermore, the project activities included basic training for mediators, which significantly increased the number of individuals who meet the requirements for entry into the Register of Mediators.
Another contributing factor is the adoption of the new Act on the Peaceful Resolution of Disputes (“Official Gazette”, No. 67/2023) and the Ordinance on the Register of Mediators (“Official Gazette”, No. 100/2023). Pursuant to Article 11 of this Ordinance, the Centre shall enter into the Register mediators who had already been recorded in the previous register of mediators. In addition, Article 12 allows individuals who had previously obtained a mediator’s certificate, but had not been registered, to submit a request for entry into the Register within one year. This has enabled the formal registration of previously trained mediators. Consequently, the number of mediators in the Register has also increased due to the inclusion of these existing mediators.
The proposal of the new legislative framework has encouraged greater public interest in mediation, resulting in increased demand for training and registration in the Register of Mediators. Since the new legislative proposal envisages a broader application of mediation, further growth in the number of registered mediators is expected.
In conclusion, the increase in the number of mediators is the result of systematic regulatory, educational, and project-based efforts aimed at developing the mediation system in the Republic of Croatia.

**Q166 (2023):** On June 29, 2023, the Law on the Peaceful Resolution of Disputes ("Official Gazette", number 67/23; hereinafter: ZMRS) entered into force, and it provides in Article 7, Paragraph 1 that the title of mediator is acquired by registration in the Register mediator who runs the Center for Peaceful Resolution of Disputes (https://cmrs.hr/) and eliminated by deletion from the Register.

**Q166 (2022):** Judges mediators are determined by the Annual Work Schedule.

**Czech Republic**

**Q166 (General Comment):** Registered mediators are people who have proven their knowledge and abilities by passing an exam and meet other conditions set by law. According to the law, upon one's request, the Ministry shall register a person who is capable of legal acts, is of good repute and integrity, has obtained a master's degree from university in the Czech Republic (or has obtained a similar higher education abroad, if according to an international treaty to which the Czech Republic is bound the recognition of such education is determined), has passed the mediator exam (or has been recognized as qualified), and has not been removed from the list of mediators in the last 5 years before submitting the application. Person of a good repute and integrity is one who has not been legally sentenced for an intentionally committed criminal offence or a crime committed due to negligence in connection with the performance of the mediator's activities.

**Q166 (2024):** From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 369 mediators in criminal cases and 375 mediators in non criminal cases (of which there are 307 active mediators).

**Q166 (2023):** From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 362 mediators in criminal cases and 364 mediators in non criminal cases (of which there are 313 active mediators).

**Q166 (2022):** From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 362 mediators in criminal cases and 350 mediators in non criminal cases (of which there are 307 active mediators).

**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.

**Denmark**

**Q166 (General Comment):** https://domstol.dk/alle-emner/retsmaegling/

**Q166 (2022):** The number of registered attorneys who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2022 is 54. The number of registred jugdes who serves as mediators in court mediation in 2022 is 84.

**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.

**Finland**

**Q166 (General Comment):** A specific training is required for judges who want to become mediators. The training is not an actual legal requirement, but it is a general rule to get special training in order to mediate.
In Finland when you mediate in the court, you do not have to be an accredited or registered mediator. Even the training is not actual legal requirement, but it’s a general rule to get a training before you can mediate. We have two different kind of training paths, depending which kind of cases are mediated, civil cases or custody dispute. We do not mediate criminal cases yet. In civil cases training is targeted to judges only and it consist of 3 parts, totally 6 days. First part is a 3-days training and is done before you start mediation, 2 others are done while you have mediated some time (year/ 2 years). First training includes basic theories about mediation, examples, structure of the process and practise. Two latter trainings are basically to deepen your skills.
Child dispute mediation training is meant for judges and auxiliaries. Training path consists from 5 different trainings, some targeted to judges, some to auxiliaries and some are joint trainings total 8 days. Training includes basic mediation theory, custody dispute theory/law, child law/ child rights, practise etc.

**Q166 (2023):** See comment to 166-1

**Q166 (2022):** See comment to 166-1

**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.

**France**

**Q166 (2024):** 2 989, including 353 legal entities and 2 636 individual mediators

**Q166 (2023):** 2 980 mediators (2 627 individuals/353 legal entities).

**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

**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 (2024):** Please refer to the general comment

**Q166 (2023):** 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 (2022):** see General Comment

**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.

**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.

**Hungary**

**Q166 (2024):** Discrepancy explanation:
The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value.

**Q166 (2023):** Discrepancy explanation: The percentage difference can be explained by the low numerical value.

**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.

**Ireland**

**Q166 (2024):** The Legal Aid Board has approximately 40 Mediators on staff, who are all fully accredited to do court related mediation. There is also a panel of 35 Private Practitioner Mediators who are accredited to do court based mediation. The Board does not have a list of additional Mediators that might practice outside of the above two categories.

**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.

**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.

**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

**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 an

d 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.

**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 (2022):** While no detailed analysis has been conducted on this matter, the use of mediation has emerged in recent years as a preferable alternative for resolving minor cases, such as disputes between neighbours. The increase observed since 2020 in the number of criminal cases where parties agree to initiate mediation could be attributed to positive experiences with the mediation centre, particularly with a view to avoiding such matters being referred to already burdened courts, notably following the health crisis.

**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.

**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).

**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.

**Poland**

**Q166 (2023):** Between 2020 and 2023, the Ministry of Justice implemented a project entitled ‘Dissemination of Alternative Dispute Resolution Methods by Increasing the Competence of Mediators, Establishment of the National Register of Mediators (NCM) and Outreach Activities’. One of the objectives of the project was to professionalise the mediation profession and increase the number of qualified mediators. As part of the project, training courses on the conduct of judicial and extrajudicial mediation in civil cases were organised (most of the training took place in 2022 and 2023) for mediator candidates and mediators. The trainings were attended by more than 1,600 people
For 2023, there is no gender-disaggregated data - confirmed by the head of the mediation department.

**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.

**Portugal**

**Q166 (2024):** There is a national registry managed by the Ministry of Justice, 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 of private mediators is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation

**Q166 (2023):** There is a national registry managed by the Ministry of Justice, 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 of private mediators is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation

**Q166 (2022):** There is a national registry managed by the Ministry of Justice, 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 of private mediators is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation

**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.

**Romania**

**Q166 (2022):** The data is provided 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 the persons who meet the conditions provided by law.

**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.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q166 (2024):** The decrease in the number of mediators was caused by the fact that in 2024, the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic, in administrative proceedings, removed a significant number of mediators from the official register pursuant to Section 5, letter (f) of Act No. 420/2004 Coll. on Mediation and on the Amendment of Certain Acts, on the grounds that they either failed to pass a repeated professional examination or did not take the examination within the prescribed period.
The repeated examination had been ordered by the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic pursuant to Section 10a(3) of the Mediation Act, due to the mediator’s failure to attend at least one professional seminar during the year, which constitutes a mandatory component of the mediator’s continuing professional education.

**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.

**Slovenia**

**Q166 (2021):** The procedures for listing (and un-listing) individual mediators are led by individual courts.

**Spain**

**Q166 (2024):** The figure provided is the number of mediators (natural and legal persons) registered in the Registry of Mediators.
With the entry into force of Law 16/2022 of September 5th, which reformed the consolidated text of the Insolvency Act, the figure of the insolvency mediator has been eliminated. Consequently, the registration of insolvency mediators in the Mediators Registry, both natural persons and legal entities, has been annulled. Therefore, the total number of mediators is lower than that provided in previous years. It should be added that this Registry is not mandatory, so the number of mediators may be higher.
In 2025, Organic Law 1/2025 of January 2, on the efficiency of the Public Justice Service, came into force. This law implemented Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms (ADR) as a procedural requirement prior to the filing of lawsuits in civil and commercial matters. It does not apply in labor, criminal, or insolvency matters, nor in cases where one of the parties is a public sector entity as well as other cases in which the parties cannot freely dispose of the rights in dispute.
Mediation is a mandatory step prior to the indicated legal proceedings, which has led to a growing increase in the number of mediators.

**Q166 (2023):** The figure provided is the number of mediators (natural and legal persons) registered in the Registry of Mediators.
With the entry into force of Law 16/2022 of September 5th, which reformed the consolidated text of the Insolvency Act, the figure of the insolvency mediator has been eliminated. Consequently, the registration of insolvency mediators in the Mediators Registry, both natural persons and legal entities, has been annulled. Therefore, the total number of mediators is lower than that provided in previous years. It should be added that this Registry is not mandatory, so the number of mediators may be higher.

**Q166 (2022):** 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.

**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.

### Question 192

**Austria**

**Q192 (General Comment):** Civil law notaries are appointed by the Federal Minister of Justice. They are entrusted with official functions but practice within the framework of a liberal profession. The number of notary offices continues to grow in Austria.

**Q192 (2023):** Federal Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2022):** Federal Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2020):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2018):** Notaries in Austria are public office holders.

**Belgium**

**Q192 (General Comment):** The notary is a public official who has been delegated by the State to give authenticity to the deeds that s/he draws up, while ensuring that these deeds are preserved, have probative value and are enforceable. To ensure the necessary independence, notaries practise as self-employed professionals.
Notaries: public officers appointed by the State: the Ministry of Justice is responsible for the appointment procedure (Federal Public Service JUSTICE).

**Q192 (2023):** The Ministry of Justice (Federal Public Service Justice) is responsible for the appointment procedure.

**Q192 (2022):** The Ministry of Justice is competent with regard to the appointment procedure.

**Q192 (2016):** The notary is a public official who has received delegation from the State authority to confer authenticity on the acts of which he is the author, while ensuring the conservation, probative force and enforceability of the said acts. In order to ensure the necessary independence of his activity, the notary exercises it within the framework of a liberal profession.

**Q192 (2014):** In 2014, the figure given corresponded to the number of notaries, associated notaries and alternate notaries.

**Bulgaria**

**Q192 (General Comment):** Notaries and Notarial Practice Act regulates the legal status of notaries and of the Notary Chamber, the organisation of the notarial practice and notarial fees. Notaries are private persons who are entrusted by the State with the performance of notarial acts as provided for in the laws. They are independent in the performance of their duties and comply solely with the law. The Minister of Justice exercises control over the practice of each notary as to the implementation of the law and the Statute of the Notary Chamber of Bulgaria. The Council of Notaries also has the power to monitor compliance with the obligations of the notaries and the assistant notaries, and may take part through its representatives in disciplinary proceedings against such notaries and assistants in the prescribed cases. The notary procedures are stipulated by the Civil Procedure Code (Articles 569-594).

**Q192 (2022):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2020):** According to the current Bulgarian legislation, notaries carry out activities that are explicitly assigned to them through a legal delegation by the state. According to Art. 2, para. 1 of the Law on Notaries and Notarial Activity “the notary is a person to whom the state assigns the performance of the notarial actions provided for in the laws". They are private professionals, who perform their activity independently, with a public function that is given to them by the State. Notaries in Bulgaria are appointed after a national competition organized by the Ministry of Justice and on the basis of an Order of the Minister of Justice. The ministry that is mainly engaged in the procedure is the Ministry of Justice.

**Q192 (2018):** According to the Bulgarian legislation in force, notaries carry out activities that are explicitly assigned to them through a statutory delegation by the state. According to art.2 para 1 of the Notaries and Notarial Activity/Practice Act “A notary is a person, to whom the state assigns the notary activities stipulated by the law.”

**Croatia**

**Q192 (2020):** Public notaries in the Republic of Croatia are appointed by the minister competent for judicial affairs.

**Cyprus**

**Q192 (General Comment):** Cyprus does not have notaries but certifying officers whose competences are to authenticate as true copies of documents.

**Q192 (2020):** We only have certifying officers authenticating documents

**Czech Republic**

**Q192 (2023):** Ministry of Justice

**Denmark**

**Q192 (General Comment):** The function of a notary is an integrated function of the district courts. All 24 district courts have one or more notaries which can confirm signatures on important documents or confirm that a copy is identical to the original document. Thus, a notary can confirm the identity of a person who signs a will or another document. With its endorsement, the notary guarantees that the signer understands what it means to make a will. A notary can also witness and confirm that a certain person has signed a special document.
The number of notaries in Denmark is uncertain. The Danish Court Administration does not have precise information regarding the total number of notaries employed by the Danish Courts or the gender of the notaries. However, it is possible to make an approximate statement of the number of notaries in the courts in 2024 based on accounting figures and average costs per year. On this basis, it is estimated that in 2024 there have been approx. 53 full-time notary positions in the district courts.
Please note, that 'notary' is not an occupation, but a function typically carried out by clerical workers or student assistants at the court. Consequently, at some courts, the function is performed by part-time employees, which means that the number of full-time equivalent positions may not accurately reflect the actual number of individuals serving as notaries.

**Q192 (2024):** The number of notaries in Denmark is uncertain. The Danish Court Administration does not have precise information regarding the total number of notaries employed by the Danish Courts or the gender of the notaries. However, it is possible to make an approximate statement of the number of notaries in the courts in 2024 based on of accounting figures and average costs per year. On this basis, it is estimated that in 2024 there have been approx. 53 full-time notary positions in the district courts.
Please note , that 'notary' is not an occupation, but a function typically carried out by clerical workers or student assistants at the court. Consequently, at some courts, the function is performed by part-time employees, which means that the number of full-time equivalent positions may not accurately reflect the actual number of individuals serving as notaries.

**Q192 (2023):** The amount of notaries is uncertain. The Danish Court Administration does not have precise information regarding the total number of notaries employed by the Danish Courts or the gender of the notaries. However, it is possible to make an approximate statement of the number of notaries in the courts in 2023 on the basis of accounting figures and average costs per year. On this basis, it is estimated that in 2023 there have been approx. 41 notary annual works in the district courts.

**Estonia**

**Q192 (General Comment):** A notary is an independent holder of office in public law, to whom the State has delegated the duty of ensuring the security of legal relationships and prevention of legal disputes. A notary executes his/her office as a liberal profession in his/her own name and at his/her own responsibility. Notaries are not proprietors but for accounting and taxation purposes, provisions applying to sole proprietors are applied. Notaries are appointed to office by the Minister of Justice according to the number of notaries and their corresponding territorial jurisdiction determined by the Regulation of the Minister of Justice. The Ministry of Justice supervises the professional activities of notaries.

**Finland**

**Q192 (General Comment):** In Finland, the notary system is not similar to some other European countries. Notaries do not work in the courts but in the local register offices.
The law on public notaries applies to them: https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/2014/20140420 (FI) or https://www.finlex.fi/sv/laki/ajantasa/2014/20140420 (SE)

**Q192 (2016):** In Finland there is not a notary system as in other European countries. Notaries do not work in courts and their competences are limited.

**Q192 (2014):** In 2014, there were 70 notaries public working in 11 local register offices. According to the Act on Notary Public (420/2014), the heads of Local Register Offices and the officers appointed by them as well as the officials appointed by the State Department of Åland are notaries public.
The number of notaries for 2012 and 2014 was provided by local register offices. Possible reasons/ factors explaining the observed decrease of 48% are the new Act on Public Notaries (420/2014) and the reform of local register offices. The number of the latter has decreased since 2014 (currently their number is 9) and the number of branch offices has decreased as well.

**France**

**Q192 (General Comment):** The status of notaries as public and ministerial officers is defined by the provisions of article 1 of Order no. 45-2590 of 2 November 1945 relating to the status of notaries and article 3 of the amended Act of 25 Ventôse Year XI concerning the organisation of the notarial profession. Article 1 bis of Order no. 45-2590 of 2 November 1945 on the status of notaries defines the various legal forms in which the profession of notary may be practised.

**Q192 (2024):** Source(s): SSER, statistical analysis of data from the OPM portal

**Q192 (2022):** As of 30/04/2023, out of a total of 17 429 notaries, 9 880 were women. As of 31/12/2022, these data are not available.

The status of notaries as public and ministerial officers is defined by the provisions of article 1 of Order no. 45-2590 of 2 November 1945 relating to the status of notaries and article 3 of the amended Act of 25 Ventôse Year XI concerning the organisation of the notarial profession. Article 1 bis of Order no. 45-2590 of 2 November 1945 on the status of notaries defines the various legal forms in which the profession of notary may be practised.

**Germany**

**Q192 (General Comment):** The number of appointments as notary is in keeping with the number of notaries required in order to ensure the due and proper administration of the law (section 4 of the Federal Code for Notaries). The applicants are to be identified by advertisement (section 4a of the Federal Code for Notaries). Generally, the notary may not pursue any other profession (section 8 paragraphs (1) and (2) of the Federal Code for Notaries).

**Q192 (2024):** Number of notaries as of 1 January 2025
Notaries hold a public office. They are appointed by the Ministry of Justice of the respective state (“Land”), cf. sec. 12 Federal Code for Notaries.

**Q192 (2023):** Notaries hold a public office. They are appointed by the Ministry of Justice of the respective state (“Land”), cf. sec. 12 Federal Code for Notaries.

**Q192 (2022):** Notaries hold a public office. They are appointed by the Ministry of Justice of the respective state (“Land”), cf. sec. 12 Federal Code for Notaries.

**Q192 (2020):** Notaries hold a public office. They are appointed by the Ministry of Justice of the respective state (“Land”), cf. sec. 12 Federal Code for Notaries

**Greece**

**Q192 (General Comment):** Notaries are professionals appointed by the state and in particular, by the Minister of Justice after successful participation in certain public competition. They are considered by our Constitution as public servants without receiving any salary from the State and they practice their profession as in private sector.

**Q192 (2024):** It should be noted that in 2024, a large number of notaries ceased to perform their duties, either due to resignation or unilateral termination due to reaching the age limit.
In addition, it should be highlighted that the competent service is not computerized, which prevents the accurate reporting of statistical data( Notary Department of the Ministry of Justice).

**Q192 (2020):** 2813 active notaries in a total of 3500 organic positions

**Q192 (2018):** Notaries are professionals appointed by the state and in particular, by the Minister of Justice after successful participation in certain public competition. They are considered by our Constitution as public servants without receiving any salary from the State and they practice their profession as in private sector.

**Hungary**

**Q192 (General Comment):** .

**Q192 (2024):** In Hungary due to the official nature and constitutional status of a civil law notary in exercising public authority a notary may only assume office as a result of a successful application procedure and the appointment of the Minister of Justice. The appointment is the sole event when the notary is commissioned by the State to fulfil tasks forming part of the justice system upon the formal request of clients. The number of notaries and their tariffs is governed by a regulation of the Minister of Justice.
The total number of the Hungarian notarial seats is 313. This is a numerus clausus. Concerning the difference between the total of the notarial seats (313) and the added number of the male and female notaries (310), the following has to be remarked. On the seats which are vacant (generally because on the given seat a notary retired and the selection procedure is still ongoing or the newly appointed notary has not taken up the activity yet), the notarial services are fulfilled by another notaries or deputy notaries who act as “substitute notaries”. As this is a temporary status, their number based on genders isn’t included in our calculations.

**Q192 (2023):** In Hungary due to the official nature and constitutional status of a civil law notary in exercising public authority a notary may only assume office as a result of a successful application procedure and the appointment of the Minister of Justice. The appointment is the sole event when the notary is commissioned by the State to fulfil tasks forming part of the justice system upon the formal request of clients. The number of notaries and their tariffs is governed by a regulation of the Minister of Justice.
The total number of the Hungarian notarial seats is 313. This is a numerus clausus. In the near future, this number is expected to be reduced by 3. Concerning the difference between the total of the notarial seats (313) and the added number of the male and female notaries (310), the following has to be remarked. On the seats which are vacant (generally because on the given seat a notary retired and the selection procedure is still ongoing or the newly appointed notary has not taken up the activity yet) , the notarial services are fulfilled by another notaries or deputy notaries who act as ‘substitute notaries’. This is a temporary status in both cases. In case of inclusion of the notary acting as susbstitute, his/her gender would be counted twice, giving a false image on the proportion of genders. In case of a deputy notary acting as substitute, it is not sure that the given person will be appointed as a notary to the given seat (it can be a person with the opposite gender). Therefore, we did not find it adequate to include their number into the data provided.

**Q192 (2022):** In Hungary due to the official nature and constitutional status of a civil law notary in exercising public authority a notary may only assume office as a result of a successful application procedure and the appointment of the Minister of Justice. The appointment is the sole event when the notary is commissioned by the State to fulfil tasks forming part of the justice system upon the formal request of clients. The number of notaries and their tariffs is governed by a regulation of the Minister of Justice.
The total number of the Hungarian notarial seats is 313. This is a numerus clausus. In the near future, this number is expected to be reduced by 3. Concerning the difference between the total of the notarial seats (313) and the added number of the male and female notaries (304), the following has to be remarked. On the seats which are vacant (generally because on the given seat a notary retired and the selection procedure is still ongoing or the newly appointed notary has not taken up the activity yet) , the notarial services are fulfilled by another notaries or deputy notaries who act as ‘substitute notaries’. As this is a temporary status, their number based on genders isn’t included in our calculations.

**Q192 (2020):** Act XLI of 1991 on Civil Law Notaries

**Q192 (2014):** According to 2014 data, notaries are appointed by the Minister of Justice for indefinite term. The number of notary positions is regulated by ministerial decree in such a way as to facilitate the access to notarial services in the whole country and to ensure the sustainability of all notarial offices. Civil law notaries are supervised by regional chambers and the Hungarian National Chamber, which is also obliged to provide various supporting IT-systems and to manage the notarial archives. The Minister of Justice has judicial supervisory competence over civil law notaries. The president of the competent Budapest or county court for the seat of the notary public has legal supervision over the actions of the notary, as part of that, he/she may order that the activities of the notary shall be reviewed by the chamber and may also initiate disciplinary proceedings.
Civil law notaries exercise as part of the State judicature official legal authority in accordance with the legal rules of their competence. Therefore, they have public authority. This is the reason why only Hungarian citizens can be appointed public notaries and this is why some elements of the notaries' obligations are similar to those of judges. Namely, the appointment is only possible as a result of an open selection procedure, and it is restricted to the jurisdiction of the local court; in case of notary's absence, a substitute may only be assigned by the local notaries' chamber; the notary is to act personally, impartially, in accordance with the acts regulating his/her competence; the notary is obliged to cooperate which means that he/she can refuse to proceed only if permitted by law, the form of the refusal shall be a writ; in order to facilitate an impartial procedure, the notary, in accordance with the requirement to provide equal opportunities, is obliged to inform the parties of their rights and obligations; the notary is only subject to legal rules; the notary is entitled to use the arms of the

country; the rules on the liability and exclusion of judges are also applicable to notaries; the remuneration of civil law notaries is fixed by law.

**Ireland**

**Q192 (General Comment):** Notaries in Ireland are recognised in other countries.

**Italy**

**Q192 (General Comment):** The Notary as existing in Italy belongs to the "Latin (roman) notarial system". The Latin notary is a public officer and a specialized counselor; his/her expertise must cover estate contracts, loans and mortgages, company law, family law, wills law, the relevant sections of fiscal law. The Latin notary also performs other judicial duties as a judicial auxiliary/assistant. Notaries as public officers are professionals who perform public functions. They are vested by the State with public authority and faith, which allows them to draw authentic deeds (or public deeds). Put differently, a notary can be defined as a public officer to whom the State delegates a specific public power, the power to assert (to affirm) the authenticity of a document. The profession of notary is characterized by the qualities of independence and impartiality. A full description of the responsibilities of the notary can be found at the following link: http://www.notariato.it/en/italian-notaries/who-we-are/responsibilities-of-the-notary.html

**Latvia**

**Q192 (General Comment):** In respect of their official duties, sworn notaries are equivalent to State officials, belonging to the court system.

**Q192 (2018):** The number of professional notaries (98) is indicated based on the number of actually practising notaries. Previously, there was indicated the number of the work positions, what is according to the regulation of the Cabinet of Ministers.

**Lithuania**

**Q192 (2024):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2020):** The Ministry of Justice.

**Luxembourg**

**Q192 (2024):** Notary Chamber (https://www.notariat.lu/trouver-notaire)

**Q192 (2023):** Ministry of Justice (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/professions-droit/le-notaire.html)

**Q192 (2022):** Ministry of Justice (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/en/legal-professions/the-notary.html)

Chamber of Notaries (http://www.notariat.lu/find-a-notary/notaries-directory/)

**Q192 (2020):** Ministère de la justice (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/professions-droit/le-notaire.html#:~:text=Le%20nombre%20des%20notaires%20est,pour%20l'ensemble%20du%20pays)
Chambre des notairs (http://www.notariat.lu/trouver-un-notaire/annuaire-des-notaires/)

**Q192 (2014):** In 2014, there were in total 36 notaries with a hybrid status of regulateed liberal profession and public officer.

**Malta**

**Q192 (General Comment):** The Notary is a Public Officer and as such is an emanation of the State. At the same time he/she is a free professional with his/her own personal office, independent of the State and of the parties. This dual-nature ensures the right balance between the legal-fiscal functions for which the Notary is the ultimate reference point.
Conveyance (property sales, purchase, leasing, etc.), financing collateral (hypothecation of immovable), succession (wills, trusts, etc.) and matters pertaining to civil status (matrimonial regimes, personal separations, etc.) are all within the ambit of the profession and form the portfolio of a notary's day-to-day work. It is only through a notarial act that most transactions related to the above are given legal effect and this adds certainty and improves efficiency. Being a necessary passage at Law, the notarial requirement makes for a very cost-effective way of crystallizing a state of certainty in that notarial tariffs are stipulated by law and the citizen is all the more protected. The notarial intervention is thus imposed by law to safeguard legality and ensuring at all times that the autonomy of the private citizen never goes beyond what is legally and statutorily permitted.

**Q192 (2020):** All Public Notaries are appointed by the state even if they practice in their professional capacity. In previous evaluations we used to list the notaries as 'Public officials' but as from this evaluation, following changes in this question, we are marking them as 'Holders of public offices appointed by the State'.

**Q192 (2018):** The full list of practising Notaries is published in the Government Gazette every year in January. The above number of Notaries has been derived from the publication issued on the 31st January 2019 accessible at (https://www.gov.mt/en/Government/DOI/Government%20Gazette/Documents/2019/01/Government%20Gazette%20-%2031st%20January.pdf)

**Netherlands**

**Q192 (General Comment):** Dutch notaries are civil law notaries.
There are three types of notaries: notaries (or notaries entrepreneurs), assigned notaries, and deputy notaries.
Deputy notaries (or deputy civil law notaries) are persons in training to become a notary, or persons who choose to work under a notary. They are not entitled to sign notarial acts in their own name.
Notaries (notary entrepreneur) are formally appointed by the King. They are also entrepreneurs, running their own business.
Assigned notaries are formally appointed by the Minister and are employed by a notary. Both are entitled to sign notarial acts.

**Q192 (2024):** These numbers can be divided into the following categories (see General comment for an explanation on the type of notaries)
Notary entrepreneurs: 1 227 (F 383; M 844)
Assigned notaries: 242 (F 176; M 66)
Deputy notaries: 1 958 (F 1375; M 583)
These are numbers from January 2024.

**Q192 (2023):** These numbers can be divided into the following categories (see General comment for an explanation on the type of notaries)
Notary entrepreneurs: 1 234
Assigned notaries: 224
Deputy notaries: 1 972

**Q192 (2022):** These are numbers on January 1st 2022.
Notaries (or notary-entrepreneurs) are formally appointed by the King. A notary is also an entrepreneur, running his/her own business. The notary may hire ‘assigned notaries’. An assigned notary is formally appointed by the Minister, and is employed by a notary. Both notaries and assigned notaries are entitled to sign notarial acts.
Additionally, there are deputy (civil law) notaries, who are either a person in training to become a notary, or people who choose to continue working under a notary (they are not entitled to sign notarial acts (in their own name). One can remain a deputy notary forever.

**Q192 (2020):** The count of notaries includes the so-called ‘’candidate’-notaries; they do not hold the full professional status, and a notary with full professional status remains responsible for the work of the candidate. People can remain a ‘çandidate’ for many years, even a life time. Notaries are entrepreneurs, work in/ as private enterprises, and are formally appointed by the King; their profession is regulated by law. There are also ‘added notaries’ (toegevoegde notarissen’): they have fulll responsibility like a notary, but they are not entrepreneurs, they are employees.

**Q192 (2018):** The count of notaries includes so-called 'candidates'. They do not hold the full professional status and a notary with full professional status remains responsible for the work of a candidate. People can remain 'candidate' for many years, or even a life time.
Notaries can work in private enterprises, but are formally appointed by the King, and their profession is regulated by Law.

**Q192 (2014):** In 2014, there were 1 336 notaries and 1 631 junior notaries. Notaries are private professionals under the authority (control) of public authorities. Dutch notaries are civil law notaries, meaning that they are fully qualified legal professionals. A notary is not only a sworn official but also an entrepreneur. As of 1 January 2013, it is also possible to become a public official without being an entrepreneur: the assigned notary. To become an assigned notary may be an alternative for junior notaries who do not have entrepreneurial ambition. Other than that the assigned notary has the same competences as the notary entrepreneur. An assigned notary has an employment contract with the notary to whom he/she is assigned and thus he/she is not an entrepreneur; is entitled to sign notarial acts within the protocol of the notary to whom he/she is assigned; acts under the authority of the notary to whom he/she is assigned; is by law the regular replacement of the notary to whom he/she is assigned.

**Poland**

**Q192 (General Comment):** The profession of notary is governed in Poland by the Law of 14 February 1991 on notary (OJ 2020, Item 1192, rev.).
The Polish legislator conferred the power to appoint notaries solely on the Minister of Justice. The decision on this matter shall be the decision of the administrative authority on a case-by-case basis, is taken under the provisions of the Code of Administrative Conduct and is discretionary. The Minister of Justice has the competence to select candidates to practice the profession of notary, as well as the designation of their office. Before a decision is taken, the provisions only provide for the obligation to consult the board of the competent board of the notary chamber. The Minister of Justice issues an administrative decision under Article 10 of the Law on notary, is not bound in any way by the content of this opinion, which is assessed like any other evidence. The scope of the discretion granted to the Minister of Justice under Article 10(1) of the Act is limited only by the provisions of articles 10(3) and 11 to 13 of the act. The candidates for notaries, when applying for the appointment of a notary and the appointment of a registry, make an autonomous choice as to the path of life, as well as the place where the profession is to be performed. It is their responsibility only to decide on the specific location of the office. In this respect, the Minister of Justice is bound by the content of the proposal. The law provisions - the notarial law also doesn’t make the creation of another office dependant on the non-exceeding of a specified number of registries in a given registry. There is no numerical restriction of access to the profession of notary in Poland (numerus clausus).
Notariat in Poland belongs to the group of Latin-type notariats, however the status of notaries is not uniform. On the one hand, notaries conduct their activities at their own risk, and the service nature of this activity can be considered to fall within the scope of freed

om of economic activity. In its resolution of 23 March 2016 (III CZP 4/16), the Supreme Court stated, that the notary is an entrepreneur within the meaning of Article 431 of the Civil Code. On the other hand, the notary is a person of public trust who guarantees security of commerce and shall ensure that the rights of the parties to the acts and of third parties are duly safeguarded. Notaries play an important role in the structure of the bodies responsible for applying the law and building the trust of citizens in the state, its institutions and legal trading entities.
A notary shall be appointed to carry out the acts which the parties are obliged or willing to give a notarial form (notarial activities) acts as a public trust person within the scope of these powers, by exercising the protection of public officers (Article 1(1) and Article 2(1) of the Law of 14 February 1991 on notary). The notarial acts, made by a notary in accordance with the law, are authentic (Article 2(2) of the Law - notary Law). When performing notarized activities, the notary collects taxes and court fees related to the notary activity of the parties, which is then transferred to the account of the competent institution. The notary is remunerated for the notarized activities, determined by agreement with the parties. However, the maximum rates of remuneration are determined officially by means of a regulation of the Minister of Justice, issued in agreement with the minister responsible for financial institutions (OJ of 2020, item 1473, rev.).
The notary is responsible for the damage caused in the performance of the notarial procedure and in this respect, is subject to compulsory civil liability insurance. In addition, a notary may be held liable for disciplinary action. Disciplinary courts are called upon to rule on disciplinary matters – at first instance, disciplinary courts of notary chambers, At second instance, a higher disciplinary Court at the National Notarial Council. The appeal of the Court of first Instance is also served by a surety against the Supreme Court. Disciplinary proceedings shall be open, however, the most severe disciplinary penalty is that the law of the law firm is not allowed to run. Notaries are established by a notary public authority to which membership is mandatory. The local government comprises the notarial chambers and the National Council of Notarial. The notarial Chamber is a notary who leads a registry in the district of the appellate court. The number of notary chambers in Poland therefore corresponds to the number of appellate courts (11). The National Notarial Council is the representative of the notary and consists of notaries selected by general meetings of notaries of notary houses.

**Q192 (2018):** Notaries are appointed by Minister of Justice.

**Portugal**

**Q192 (General Comment):** In 2004, a new status of the notarial profession was approved. Since, the notaries are private professionals under the authority (control) of public authorities. They compete for licenses and take office before the Minister of Justice and the president of the Chamber of Notaries. As a transition period is still running, some notaries work as public agents (before 2004, notaries were exclusively public officials). Since 2018, with Decree Law 115/2018, 21st December, "public notaries" ceased to exist and were transfered to the special carrear of registrar.

**Q192 (2022):** The increase in the number of notaries was due to the takeovers that took place during 2021 and 2022. Specifically, we refer to the grant of licenses for the installation of notary offices, awarded under the 8th Competition (Notice 4822/2022, of March 8) and the competitions for the award of the title of notary (Notice 3552/2021, of February 26 and Notice 3251/2022, of February 17).

**Romania**

**Q192 (2018):** Notaries public are not differentiated by gender within the records of the Ministry of Justice.

**Slovak Republic**

**Q192 (General Comment):** The Act n. 323/1993 Col. on Notaries and Notarial Activities, regulates the status and activities of notaries. A notary is a person appointed and empowered by the State to practice as a notary and carry out other activities in accordance with the law. A notary is appointed by the Minister of Justice on the basis of selection procedure, as a general rule to hold office within the geographical jurisdiction of a court of first instance. Notary is holding public office until the age of 67. He/she is not part of state bureaucracy; he/she is not bounded by any instructions, but is subject to State supervision, performed by the Minister of Justice. State is thus entitled to issue legislation regulating the activities of the notaries, self-governance of the notaries, as well as designate the number of notarial offices within the district of Court of first instance. A notary is impartial and independent in the performance of his/her duties. He/she is bound only by the Constitution, laws and other general implementing legislation. The office of a notary is incompatible with entrepreneurial activities or other gainful activity, except for the management of the notary's own assets and those of his/her minor children, and academic, publishing, pedagogical, interpreting and artistic activity. A notary may not act as an expert in cases where he/she acts as a court commissioner.

**Q192 (2024):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2023):** Ministry of Justice

**Q192 (2022):** Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic.

**Slovenia**

**Q192 (General Comment):** A notary is a legal official who has been entrusted by the public authority with the safeguarding of the freedom of consent and the protection of the rightful interests of individuals. The presence of the notary confers authenticity to legal acts. As a guarantor of legal security, the notary has an important role to play in limiting subsequent litigation. Thereby, he/she is a major actor in preventive justice.

**Spain**

**Q192 (General Comment):** "The Notaries' regulation (Decree of 2 June 1944) states in article 1 that "notaries are both civil servants and legal professionals, corresponding to this double character the organization of Notaries. As officials, they exercise notarial public faith, which has and protects a double content:
a) In the field of facts, the accuracy of what the notary sees, hears or perceives through his senses.
b) And in the sphere of Law, the authenticity and probative force of the declarations of will of the parties in the public instrument drawn up in accordance with the laws.
As legal professionals, they have the mission of advising those who claim their ministry and advise them of the most appropriate legal means to achieve the lawful ends that they intend to achieve.
The Notary will enjoy full autonomy and independence in its function, and in its hierarchical organization it reports directly to the Ministry of Justice and the General Directorate of Registries and Notaries".

# Annex 1

List of the tables presented in the Study


**General data: economic and demographic data**

Table 0.1: General data: economic and demographic data in 2024 (Q1, Q3, Q4, Q5)

**General data**

**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 determined in courts and public prosecution services in 2024 (Q66 and Q67)

**Performance and Evaluation for each individual judge**

Table 1.2 Existence of quantitative performance targets defined for each judge and authority responsible in 2024 (Q83 and Q83-1)

Table 1.3 Consequences for a judge if quantitative performance targets are not met in 2024 (Q83 and Q83-1-1)

**Performance and Evaluation - public prosecutors**

Table 1.4 Existence of quantitative performance targets for each public prosecutor, authority responsible as well as individual evaluation in 2024 (Q83-2, Q83-3, Q120 and Q120-1)

Table 1.5 Consequences for a prosecutor if quantitative performance targets are not met in 2024 (Q83-2 and Q83-3-1)

**Monitoring**

Table 1.6 Modalities for monitoring court activities (performance and quality) in 2024 (Q70)

Table 1.7 Modalities for monitoring public prosecution services' activities (performance and quality) in 2024 (Q70-1)

Table 1.8 Monitoring of the number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs) in 2024 (Q71)

Table 1.9 Monitoring of waiting time during judicial proceedings within courts and the public prosecution services in 2024 (Q72)

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

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

**Indicator 2: The judicial organisation**

Table 2.1a Number of courts in 2024 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of first instance and all courts as geographic locations) (Q42, Q43 and Q44)

Table 2.1b Number of courts per 100 000 inhabitants in 2024 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of first instance and all courts as geographic locations) (Q1, Q42, Q43 and Q44)

Table 2.2a Number of first instance courts from 2014 to 2024 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and first instance courts as geographic locations) (Q42, Q43 and Q44)

Table 2.2b Number of first instance courts per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and first instance courts as geographic locations) (Q1, Q42, Q43 and Q44)

Table 2.3a Number of all courts as geographic locations from 2014 to 2024 (Q44)

Table 2.3b Number of all courts as geographic locations per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q44)

Table 2.4a Number and distribution of first instance specialised courts as legal entities in 2024 (Q43)

Table 2.4b Number and distribution of higher instance specialised courts as legal entities in 2024 (Q43)

Table 2.5 (EC) Absolute number of all courts (geographic locations) from 2014 to 2024 and their variations between 2014 and 2024 and between 2023 and 2024 (Q44)

**Indicator 2: The judicial organisation**

**Indicator 2: The judicial organisation**

**Indicator 3: Performance of courts at all stages of the proceedings**

**Other than criminal cases - First instance cases by case categories and by case status**

Table 3.1.1.1a: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

Table 3.1.1.1b: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

Table 3.1.1.2a: First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2024

Table 3.1.1.2b: First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2024

Table 3.1.1.3a: First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2024

Table 3.1.1.3b: First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2024

Table 3.1.1.4a: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2024
Table 3.1.1.4b: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2024
Table 3.1.1.5: First instance othen than criminal cases, civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2024

**Evolution of first instance other than criminal cases**

Table 3.1.2.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.2.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.2.3: Evolution of the first instance administrativel cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.3.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.3.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - incoming 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.3.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - incoming 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.4.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.4.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - resolved 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.4.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - resolved 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.5.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.5.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 31st Dec.2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.5.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.1.6.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

Table 3.1.6.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024
Table 3.1.6.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

**Clearance Rate and Disposition Time for first instance other than criminal cases**

Table 3.2.1.1: Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2024 (Q91)
Table 3.2.1.2: Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in in 2024 (Q91)
Table 3.2.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.2.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.2.3.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.2.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.2.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance administrative cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.2.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance administrative cases 2014 - 2024

**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 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.3.2: First instance courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.3.3: First instance courts, variation of pending 31 Dec. other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.3.4: First instance courts, variation of Clearance Rate of other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.3.5: First instance courts, variation of Disposition time of other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**Second instance other than criminal cases by case category and by case status**

Table 3.4.1.1a: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2024
Table 3.4.1.1b: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2024
Table 3.4.1.2a: Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2024
Table 3.4.1.2b: Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming cases in 2024
Table 3.4.1.3a: Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved cases in 2024
Table 3.4.1.3b: Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved cases per 100 inhabitants in 2024
Table 3.4.1.4a: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024
Table 3.4.1.4b: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024

Table 3.4.1.5: Second instance civil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - pending more than 2 years in 2024

**Evolution of second instance other than criminal cases**

Table 3.4.2.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

Table 3.4.2.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.2.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.3.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.3.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - incoming 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.3.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - incoming 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.4.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.4.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - resolved 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.4.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - resolved 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.5.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.5.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.5.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.4.6.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024
Table 3.4.6.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024
Table 3.4.6.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

**Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases**

Table 3.5.1.1: Clearance rate for second instance other than criminal cases in 2024
Table 3.5.1.2: Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases in 2024
Table 3.5.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of second instance total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.5.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of second instance total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.5.3.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of second instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.5.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of second instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.5.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of second instance administrative cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.5.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of second instance administrative cases 2014 - 2024

**Variations of second instance other than criminal cases by case categories**

Table 3.6.1: Second instance courts, variation of incoming other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.6.2: Second instance courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.6.3: Second instance courts, variation of pending 31 Dec. other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.6.4: Second instance courts, variation of Clearance rate of other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.6.5: Second instance courts, variation of Disposition time for other than criminal cases between 2014 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**Supreme court other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status**

Table 3.7.1.1a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2024
Table 3.7.1.1b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2024
Table 3.7.1.2a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - incoming in 2024
Table 3.7.1.2b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - incoming cases in 2024
Table 3.7.1.3a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - resolved cases in 2024
Table 3.7.1.3b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - resolved cases per 100 inhabitants in 2024
Table 3.7.1.4a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024
Table 3.7.1.4b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2024
Table 3.7.1.5: Supreme court civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - pending more than 2 years in 2024

**Evolution of Supreme court other than criminal cases for total, civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases**

Table 3.7.2.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.2.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.2.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2024

Table 3.7.3.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.3.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - incoming 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.3.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - incoming 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.4.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.4.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - resolved 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.4.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - resolved 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.5.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.5.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024
Table 3.7.5.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2024

Table 3.7.6.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

Table 3.7.6.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024
Table 3.7.6.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2024

**Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court other than criminal cases**

Table 3.8.1.1: Clearance rate for Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2024
Table 3.8.1.2: Disposition time for Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2024
Table 3.8.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of Supreme court total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.8.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of Supreme court total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.8.3.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.8.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.8.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of Supreme court administrative cases 2014 - 2024
Table 3.8.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of Supreme court administrative cases 2014 - 2024

**Variations of Supreme court other than criminal cases by case categories**

Table 3.9.1: Supreme courts, variation of incoming other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.9.2: Supreme court, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

Table 3.9.3: Supreme court, variation of pending 31st Dec. other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

Table 3.9.4: Supreme court, variation of Clearance rate of other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

Table 3.9.5: Supreme court, variation of Disposition Time for other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

**European Comission templates for first instance data on other than criminal cases**

Table 3.10.1 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance of other than criminal cases**, from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)

Table 3.10.2 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases, from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)
Table 3.10.3 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance administrative law cases, from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)
Table 3.10.4 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) of first instance total of other than criminal cases**, from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)
Table 3.10.5 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)
Table 3.10.6 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) for first instance administrative cases, from 2014 to 2024 (Q91)
Table 3.10.7 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q91)
Table 3.10.8 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q91)
Table 3.10.9 (EC): Number of first instance administrative cases pending on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q91)
Table 3.10.10 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q91)
Table 3.10.11 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q91)

Table 3.10.12 (EC): Number of first instance administrative incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q91)

**First instance criminal cases by case category and by case status**
Table 3.11.1a: First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024
Table 3.11.1b: First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024
Table 3.11.2a: First instance criminal cases - incoming in 2024
Table 3.11.2b: First instance criminal cases - incoming in 2024
Table 3.11.3a: First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2024
Table 3.11.3b: First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2024
Table 3.11.4a: First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024
Table 3.11.4b: First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024
Table 3.11.5: First instance criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2024
**Evolution of first instance total of criminal cases, severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases**
Table 3.12.1: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.2: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.3: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.4: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.5: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.6: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.7: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.8: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.9: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.10: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.11: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.12: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.13: Evolution of the first instance total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.14: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024
Table 3.12.15: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024
**Clearance rate and Disposition time for first instance criminal cases**
Table 3.13.1: Clearance rate (%) of first instance criminal cases in 2024 (Q94)
Table 3.13.2: Disposition time (in days) of first instance criminal cases in 2024 (Q94)
Table 3.13.3: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)
Table 3.13.4: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)
Table 3.13.5: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)
Table 3.13.6: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)
Table 3.13.7: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)
Table 3.13.8: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q94)
**Variations for first instance criminal cases**
Table 3.14.1: First instance courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.14.2: First instance courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.14.3: First instance courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.14.4: First instance courts, variation of the Clearance Rate of criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.14.5: First instance courts, variation of the Disposition Time criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
**Second instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status**
Table 3.15.1a: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024
Table 3.15.1b: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024

Table 3.15.2a: Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2024
Table 3.15.2b: Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2024
Table 3.15.3a: Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2024
Table 3.15.3b: Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2024
Table 3.15.4a: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024
Table 3.15.4b: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024
Table 3.15.5: Second instance criminal cases - pending for more than 2 years in 2024
**Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases, severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases**
Table 3.16.1: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.2: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.3: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.4: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.5: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.6: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.7: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.8: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.9: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.10: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.11: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.12: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.13: Evolution of the second instance total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.14: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024
Table 3.16.15: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024
**Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance criminal cases**
Table 3.17.1: Clearance rate (%) of second instance criminal cases in 2024 (Q98)
Table 3.17.2: Disposition time (in days) of second instance criminal cases in 2024 (Q98)
Table 3.17.3: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the second instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)
Table 3.17.4: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the second instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)
Table 3.17.5: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the second instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)
Table 3.17.6: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the second instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)
Table 3.17.7: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)
Table 3.17.8: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q98)
**Variations for second instance criminal cases**
Table 3.18.1: Second instance courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.18.2: Second instance courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.18.3: Second instance courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.18.4: Second instance courts, variation of the Clearance Rate of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.18.5: Second instance courts, variation of the Disposition Time of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
**Supreme courts, criminal cases by case categories and by case status**
Table 3.19.1a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024
Table 3.19.1b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2024
Table 3.19.2a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - incoming in 2024
Table 3.19.2b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - incoming in 2024

Table 3.19.3a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - resolved in 2024
Table 3.19.3b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - resolved in 2024
Table 3.19.4a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024
Table 3.19.4b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2024
Table 3.19.5: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2024

**Supreme courts, evolution of the absolute number of criminal cases**

Table 3.20.1: Supreme courts, evolution of the total of criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.2: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.3: Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.4: Supreme courts, evolution of the total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.5: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.6: Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.7: Supreme courts, evolution of the total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.8: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.9: Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.10: Supreme courts, evolution of the total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.11: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.12: Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.13: Supreme courts, evolution of the total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.14: Supreme courts, evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024
Table 3.20.15:Supreme courts, evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2024

**Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court criminal cases**

Table 3.21.1: Supreme courts, Clearance rate (%) of criminal cases in 2024 (Q100)
Table 3.21.2: Supreme courts, Disposition time (in days) of criminal cases in 2024 (Q100)
Table 3.21.3: Supreme courts, evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)
Table 3.21.4: Supreme courts, evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the total criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)
Table 3.21.5: Supreme courts, evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)
Table 3.21.6: Supreme courts, evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the severe criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)
Table 3.21.7: Supreme courts, evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)
Table 3.21.8: Supreme courts, evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2024 (Q100)

**Supreme courts, Variations for criminal cases**

Table 3.22.1: Supreme courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.22.2: Supreme courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.22.3: Supreme courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.22.4: Supreme courts, variation of the Clearance Rate of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024
Table 3.22.5: Supreme courts, variation of the Disposition Time of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2024 and 2023 - 2024

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

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

**Indicator 4: Public prosecution services - Case flow**

Table 4.1.1a: Public prosecution services: Case flow in 2024
Absolute values (Q107 and Q109)
Table 4.1.1b: Public prosecution services: Case flow in 2024
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107 and Q109)
Table 4.1.2: Public prosecution services: Distribution of different categories of processed cases within all processed cases in 2024 (Q107)

**Ratios of public prosecution cases**

Table 4.1.3: Public prosecution services: Ratio of processed cases and pending cases with incoming cases in 2024 (Q107)
Table 4.1.4: Public prosecution services: Evolution of the total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor between 2020 and 2024 (Q55, Q057, Q107 and Q109)
Table 4.1.5: Public prosecution services: Evolution of the ratio of processed cases as well as pending cases with incoming cases from 2020 to 2024 (Q107)

**Evolution of the number of cases in public prosecution services**

Table 4.1.6: Public prosecution services: Evolution of the incoming/received, processed, discontinued cases, as well as cases brought to court from 2020 to 2024
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107)
Table 4.1.7: Public prosecution services: Evolution of the pending cases at the beginning and at the end of the reference year from 2020 to 2024
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107)

**Number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure**

Table 4.2.1 Number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure in 2024 (Q107-1)
Table 4.2.2 Evolution of the number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure from 2020 to 2024 (Q107-1)

**Budget of the public prosecution services**

Table 4.3.1 (a) Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution services from 2014 to 2024 (Q13)

Table 4.3.1 (b) Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution services per inhabitant from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q13)
Table 4.3.2 (a) Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution services from 2014 to 2024 (Q13)
Table 4.3.2 (b) Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution services per inhabitant from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q13)

**Indicator 4: Public prosecution services - Case flow**
**Indicator 4: Public prosecution services - Case flow**
**Indicator 5: System for compensation of users**

Table 5.1 System for compensating users: number of requests for compensations and number of granted compensations by specific circumstances in 2024 (Q37)

Table 5.2 System for compensating users: amounts of granted compensations by specific circumstances in 2024 (Q37)
Table 5.3 Evolution of the system for compensating users: total number of requests for compensations, number of granted compensations and amount paid from 2020 to 2024 (Q37)

**Indicator 5: Legal aid**
**Indicator 5: Legal aid**
**Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and court users**

Table 6.1 Deployment and usage rate of the writing assistance tools in 2024 (Q62-23)
Table 6.2 Functionalities of the writing assistance tools in 2024 (Q62-24)
Table 6.3 Deployment and usage rate of the recording of court hearings in 2024 (Q62-25)
Table 6.4 Functionalities of the tool to record court hearings in 2024 (Q62-26)

**Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and for court users**
**Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and for court users**
**Indicator 7: Professionals of justice**
**Professional judges and non-judge staff**

Table 7.1.1 Total number of professional judges, non-professional judges and judges working on ocasional basis in 2024
Absolute number (Q46, Q48, Q48-1,Q49 and Q49-1)
Table 7.1.2 Evolution of the total number of professional judges from 2014 to 2024
Absolute number (Q46)
Table 7.1.2a Evolution of the total number of professional judges from 2014 to 2024 and their variations
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q46)
Table 7.1.3 Total number of professional judges by instance in 2014, 2023 and 2024 and their variations
Absolute number (Q46)
Table 7.1.3a Total number of professional judges by instance in 2014, 2023 and 2024
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q46)

Table 7.1.4 Total number of professional judges by case category in 2024 (Q46-2)
Table 7.1.5 Total professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2014, 2023 and 2024 (Q46)
Table 7.1.6 First instance professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2014, 2023 and 2024 (Q46)
Table 7.1.7 Second instance judges: distribution of males and females in 2014, 2023 and 2024 (Q46)
Table 7.1.8 Supreme court professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2014, 2023 and 2024 (Q46)
Table 7.2.1 Total number of non-judge staff (absolute number and per 100 000 inhabitants) and their distribution by category in 2024 (Q1, Q52)
Table 7.2.2 Evolution of the total number of non-judge staff (absolute number) from 2014 to 2024 (Q52)
Table 7.2.2a Evolution of the total number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 and their variations (Q1, Q52)
Table 7.2.3 Number of non-judge staff by instance in 2024 (Q52-1)
Table 7.2.4 Non-judge staff: distribution of males and females by instance in 2024 (Q52-1)
Table 7.2.5 Number of professional judges and number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants, from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q46, Q52)
Table 7.2.6 Ratio between non-judge staff and judges from 2014 to 2024 (Q46, Q52)
Public prosecutors and non-prosecutor staff

Table 7.3.1 Evolution of the total number of public prosecutors from 2020 to 2024 and persons with similar duties in 2024
Absolute number (Q55, Q57, Q57-1)
Table 7.3.1a Evolution of the total number of public prosecutors from 2020 to 2024 and their variation
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q55)
Table 7.3.2 Total number of public prosecutors by instance from 2020 to 2024 and their variations
Absolute number (Q55)
Table 7.3.2a Total number of public prosecutors by instance from 2020 to 2024
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q55)
Table 7.3.3 Total number of public prosecutors: distribution of males and females in 2020 - 2024 (Q55)

Table 7.3.4 Public prosecutors at the first instance level: distribution of males and females from 2020 to 2024 (Q55)

Table 7.3.5 Public prosecutors at the second instance level: distribution of males and females from 2020 to 2024 (Q55)

Table 7.3.6 Public prosecutors at the Supreme court level: distribution of males and females from 2020 to 2024 (Q55)
Table 7.4.1 Total number of non-prosecutor staff and their distribution in males and females in 2024 (Q1, Q60)
Table 7.4.2 Total number of non-prosecutor staff (absolute number) from 2020 to 2024 (Q60)

Table 7.4.3 Total number of non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants from 2020 to 2024 and their variations (Q1, Q60)
Table 7.4.4 Number of public prosecutors and number of non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants, from 2020 to 2024 (Q1, Q55, Q60)
Table 7.4.5 Ratio between non-prosecutors staff and public prosecutors from 2020 to 2024 (Q55, Q60)
Court presidents and Heads of prosecution services

Table 7.5.1 Total number of Court presidents by instance and their distribution in males and females in 2024 (Q47)
Table 7.5.2 Total number of Heads of prosecution services by instance and their distribution in males and females in 2024 (Q56)
Salaries of judges and public prosecutors
Table 7.6.1 Annual salaries of judges and public prosecutors in 2024 (Q4 and Q132)
Table 7.6.2 Evolution of the gross annual salaries of professional judges from 2018 to 2024 (Q132)
Table 7.6.3 Evolution of the gross annual salaries of public prosecutors from 2018 to 2024 (Q132)
Table 7.6.4 Ratio of annual salaries of judges and public prosecutors with annual gross salary in the country in 2024 (Q4 and Q132)
Table 7.6.5: Existence of additional benefits for judges and public prosecutors in 2024 (Q133)
Lawyers

Table 7.7.1 Evolution of the number of lawyers from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q146)

Table 7.7.1a Evolution of the number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 and their variations (Q1, Q146)
Table 7.7.2 Evolution of the number of professional judges and lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q46, Q146)
EC Templates - Professional judges and lawyers

Table 7.8 (EC) Total number of professional judges sitting in courts per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q46)
Table 7.9 (EC) Number of lawyers* per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q1, Q146)
Indicator 7: Professionals of justice
Indicator 7: Professionals of justice
Indicator 8: Mediators and notaries
Table 8.1 Evolution of the absolute number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation from 2014 to 2024 (Q166)
Table 8.2 Evolution of the number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation per 100 000 inhabitants from 2014 to 2024 (Q166)
Table 8.3 Number of notaries in 2024 (Q1 and Q192)
Table 8.4 Number of notaries and their distribution in males and female in 2024 (Q192)
Indicator 8: The existence and use of alternative dispute resolution methods
Indicator 8: The existence and use of alternative dispute resolution methods

# 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. CEPEJ invites 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 978-92-68-11777-4 10.2838/71237 DS-03-24-022-EN-N

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2026

© European Union, 2026

