



European judicial systems

Efficiency and quality of justice

2018 edition (2016 data)






45 Member states evaluated
+2 observers

17 Months to collect, check and analyse data, to draft the reports and to build the internet database

Definition: Judicial system budget



Public budget allocated to the judicial system per capita in €



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
2014	9 €	NA	NA	96 €	16 €	85 €	30 €	33 €	51 €	NA	45 €	83 €
2016	10 €	99 €	8 €	107 €	8 €	82 €	34 €	37 €	54 €	61 €	48 €	84 €

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
2014	40 €	71 €	64 €	10 €	NA	44 €	41 €	NA	48 €	73 €	37 €	33 €
2016	43 €	77 €	66 €	10 €	122 €	41 €	44 €	111 €	50 €	75 €	40 €	40 €

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
2014	139 €	35 €	8 €	NA	42 €	122 €	78 €	49 €	52 €	35 €	32 €	NA
2016	157 €	37 €	8 €	164 €	NA	119 €	81 €	52 €	57 €	30 €	24 €	NA

	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	K:ENG&WA	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
2014	NA	90 €	77 €	103 €	219 €	18 €	21 €	9 €	92 €	78 €	NA	
2016	50 €	90 €	79 €	119 €	215 €	20 €	18 €	8 €	79 €	79 €	83 €	16 €


	Average	Median
2014	58 €	46 €
2016	64 €	53 €

NA
Stable
+5% ↗
-5% ↘

Budgets of the judicial systems per capita and per capita GDP in 2016




► Figure 2.8



Budgets of the judicial systems per capita and per capita GDP in 2016




► Figure 2.8



Part of taxes and court fees in the judicial system budget



► Figure 2.33



Legal aid

► Figures 2.32 and 2.36

Number of States and entities which provide legal aid



Implemented budget of legal aid per capita in 2016


► Figure 2.39



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK		
2016	0,07 €	6,66 €	0,25 €	2,25 €	0,06 €	7,32 €	2,13 €	0,59 €	2,60 €	2,25 €	2,00 €	22,59 €		
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU		
2016	2,91 €	16,24 €	5,06 €	0,47 €	8,23 €	0,57 €	0,12 €	NA	19,61 €	3,85 €	1,03 €	1,93 €		
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB		
2016	NA	0,37 €	0,31 €	9,85 €	0,23 €	27,42 €	NA	0,71 €	5,85 €	0,52 €	NA	NA		
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	K:ENG&W	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR		
2016	NA	1,50 €	5,64 €	36,21 €	19,07 €	0,12 €	1,28 €	0,16 €	31,00 €	29,26 €	10,18 €	0,00 €		
Average		Median												
2016	6,96 €		2,19 €											

Implemented budget of legal aid and GDP per capita in 2016

► Figure 2.44



Implemented budget of legal aid and GDP per capita in 2016



► Figure 2.44





Number of cases per 100 000 inhabitants for which legal aid is granted and amount of the budget allocated to per case in 2016

► Figures 2.49 and 2.46



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
Nb of cases	NA	NA	335	234	301	NA	827	642	NA	NA	NA	NA
Budget per case	NA	NA	74 €	963 €	21 €	NA	257 €	92 €	NA	NA	NA	NA

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
Nb of cases	NA	NA	1231	NA	NA	NA	139	NA	1772	581	NA	3002
Budget per case	NA	NA	370 €	NA	NA	NA	83 €	NA	1 107 €	663 €	NA	64 €

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
Nb of cases	NA	210	1401	2149	228	2159	1447	NA	1503	417	NA	NA
Budget per case	NA	175 €	22 €	458 €	101 €	1 270 €	NA	NA	389 €	124 €	NA	NA


	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
Nb of cases	NA	356	NA	NA	NA	NA	177	832	2340	3535	NA	9
Budget per case	NA	420 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	721 €	20 €	1 325 €	828 €	NA	49 €

	Average	Median
Nb of cases	658	429
Budget per case	489 €	175 €

All cases Only brought to court cases


Professional judges per 100 000 inhabitants in 2016

► Table 3.6




Professional judges per 100 000 inhabitants in 2016

► Tables 3.6 and 3.45



Apart from professional judges

- Occasional professional judges (light blue square)
- Non-professional judges (orange square)
- Rechtspfleger (yellow square)



Average gross salaries of judges in relation with national average gross salary in 2016

► Table 3.21



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
Beginning	2,1	2,7	4,3	1,6	4,0	1,7	3,0	3,2	1,9	3,4	2,5	2,9
Supreme Court	3,4	4,0	8,1	4,0	6,1	3,0	5,2	5,6	4,1	6,1	5,6	4,9

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
Beginning	3,0	1,5	1,3	NA	0,9	2,0	1,6	2,0	3,1	1,9	1,9	2,5
Supreme Court	3,9	3,2	3,4	NA	1,6	5,4	3,6	2,6	5,0	6,4	3,7	3,8

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
Beginning	1,3	4,0	2,8	1,1	2,3	1,3	2,1	NA	2,2	4,1	3,1	2,4
Supreme Court	2,6	4,4	4,7	2,3	4,3	NA	3,3	NA	5,3	8,3	NA	5,7

	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
Beginning	3,0	1,7	2,1	1,7	2,0	2,8	NA	3,1	3,7	4,0	3,9	1,7
Supreme Court	4,4	3,3	5,4	3,2	4,6	3,5	NA	4,0	7,5	6,2	5,6	3,7

	Average	Median
Beginning	2,5	2,3
Supreme Court	4,5	4,3

Recruit of judges among experienced legal experts

Distribution of professional judges by gender and by instance in 2016

► Figure 3.14



Total

1st instance

2nd instance

Supreme courts



Distribution by gender of 1st instance professional judges in 2016

► Figure 3.14



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
Men	49%	29%	75%	48%	88%	46%	37%	NA	27%	50%	33%	44%
Women	51%	71%	25%	52%	12%	54%	63%	NA	73%	50%	67%	56%

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
Men	30%	44%	33%	51%	NA	27%	28%	58%	64%	43%	19%	35%
Women	70%	56%	67%	49%	NA	73%	72%	42%	36%	57%	81%	65%

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
Men	34%	50%	53%	40%	42%	39%	56%	36%	33%	28%	NA	30%
Women	66%	50%	47%	60%	58%	61%	44%	64%	67%	72%	NA	70%

	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
Men	37%	18%	40%	51%	54%	39%	58%	NA	NA	74%	45%	68%
Women	63%	82%	60%	49%	46%	61%	42%	NA	NA	26%	55%	32%

	Average	Median
Men	43%	40%
Women	57%	60%

Distribution of court presidents by gender and instance

► Figure 3.16




Total

1st instance


2nd instance

Supreme courts



Distribution by gender of court presidents (all instances) in 2016

► Figure 3.16



Prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitants in 2016

► Table 3.25







	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
2016	11,2	6,8	10,6	4,1	11,3	7,6	10,9	21,3	14,6	13,7	11,7	12,1
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
2016	13,0	6,8	2,9	11,8	6,7	5,5	19,2	20,7	2,2	3,5	22,9	24,4
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
2016	8,0	4,1	19,2	13,3	16,6	5,4	13,8	15,2	14,5	13,4	25,2	8,8
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	K:ENG&W.	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
2016	17,1	10,5	5,3	9,6	10,4	8,3	6,0	23,8	3,6	8,7	14,2	2,8
	Average	Median										
2016	11,7	11,0										


Prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitants in 2016

► Tables 3.21 and 3.24



Status of prosecutors

-  Statutorily independent
-  Under the Ministry of Justice or another central authority
-  Other
-  Regulation to prevent specific instructions to prosecute or not, addressed to a prosecutor in a court





Average gross salaries of prosecutors in relation with national average gross salary in 2016



Table 3.38

	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
Beginning	2,1	2,7	2,4	1,7	1,0	1,7	3,0	3,2	1,9	1,5	2,2	1,2
Highest instance	2,6	4,0	NAP	4,0	3,3	3,1	5,2	5,6	4,1	NAP	4,8	2,1

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
Beginning	1,6	1,2	1,3	NA	0,9	2,0	1,6	NA	0,8	1,9	1,9	2,2
Highest instance	3,9	NAP	3,4	NA	1,6	5,4	3,3	2,0	NAP	6,4	2,3	3,2

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
Beginning	1,3	1,8	2,3	1,1	2,4	1,2	1,2	NA	2,2	4,1	NA	2,3
Highest instance	2,6	NAP	2,7	2,3	4,2	1,7	2,0	NA	5,3	6,2	NA	4,9


	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
Beginning	2,9	1,7	2,1	1,3	1,7	2,9	NA	1,7	1,2	0,9	1,0	1,7
Highest instance	4,4	2,8	5,0	2,5	2,4	3,2	NA	4,4	NAP	NA	3,4	3,7

	Average	Median
Beginning	2,5	2,3
Highest instance	4,5	4,3

Roles and power of prosecutors in 2016

(number of States)


► Figures 3.26 and 3.27



Other persons with duties similar to those of prosecutors in 2016

(number of States)

► Table 3.31



Workload of prosecutors in 2016

► Table 3.29



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
Number /100 000 inhab.	11,2	6,8	10,6	4,1	11,3	7,6	10,9	21,3	14,6	13,7	11,7	12,1
Cases received /100 inhab.	1,5	6,5	0,1	5,9	NA	NA	1,9	1,8	1,7	NA	2,3	3,0
Roles	11	9	9	10	9	12	12	13	12	7	12	7
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
Number /100 000 inhab.	13,0	6,8	2,9	11,8	6,7	5,5	19,2	20,7	2,2	3,5	22,9	24,4
Cases received /100 inhab.	NA	1,5	7,5	1,2	6,3	NA	1,9	2,0	0,3	5,2	0,7	2,7
Roles	10	6	13	10	10	10	14	9	6	8	13	13
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
Number /100 000 inhab.	8,0	4,1	19,2	13,3	16,6	5,4	13,8	15,2	14,5	13,4	25,2	8,8
Cases received /100 inhab.	9,7	NA	1,9	6,2	1,5	1,1	6,5	2,3	4,3	3,5	0,6	1,6
Roles	12	6	11	14	12	12	8	11	13	12	6	11
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
Number /100 000 inhab.	17,1	10,5	5,3	9,6	10,4	8,3	6,0	23,8	3,6	8,7	14,2	2,8
Cases received /100 inhab.	1,4	3,3	NA	4,6	6,9	1,4	4,2	NA	0,9	3,6	4,0	4,2
Roles	13	11	11	8	10	7	11	10	5	8	11	12
	Average Median											
Number /100 000 inhab.	11,7	11,0										
Cases received /100 inhab.	3,1	2,2										

Non-judge staff per professional judge in 2016

► Table 3.43



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK		
2016	2,5	4,1	10,1	2,3	5,1	3,2	3,1	2,7	3,2	3,9	3,2	4,4		
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU		
2016	3,8	2,0	3,2	5,1	2,7	1,5	2,8	1,1	6,0	3,3	3,1	3,5		
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB		
2016	1,1	8,5	4,4	1,2	3,0	3,1	1,6	4,3	2,8	2,2	3,7	3,5		
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG&W	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR		
2016	3,4	3,8	9,2	4,1	3,6	3,9	NA	3,8	9,0	7,7	5,2	3,2		
Average		Median												
2016	3,9		3,4											

Non-judge staff per professional judge in 2016

► Tables 3.43 and 3.45


cepej

European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice

Commission européenne pour l'efficacité de la justice



 Rechtspfleger



Non-prosecutor staff per public prosecutor in 2016

► Table 3.50



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
2016	NA	0,8	0,5	1,0	NA	3,0	1,8	NA	1,6	0,6	1,2	0,5
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
2016	0,6	0,4	NA	0,9	2,1	2,7	1,4	NA	0,8	4,1	0,9	0,8
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
2016	2,4	1,2	0,5	1,4	1,8	4,0	NA	1,3	1,1	1,2	NA	2,0
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	K:ENG&W	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
2016	1,1	1,4	0,8	0,5	1,9	2,3	NA	0,4	1,6	1,9	0,7	3,7

Average Median

Lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants in 2016


► Table 3.52



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
2016	79,4	273,6	61,9	70,2	9,5	163,7	45,6	190,1	112,9	425,0	106,9	108,5
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
2016	75,5	68,9	97,7	120,2	200,1	390,3	114,2	321,3	261,8	378,4	62,5	77,7
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
2016	403,1	301,3	56,7	93,2	134,0	102,4	147,2	125,7	295,6	118,2	49,4	128,6
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
2016	113,0	82,8	305,3	57,7	141,6	120,7	125,9	82,5	259,3	209,5	737,9	34,7
	Average	Median										
2016	161,5	119,2										

Monopoly of lawyers per instance in 2016

► Figures 3.54, 3.55, 3.56





Number of all courts (geographic location) per 100 000 inhabitants in 2016 and variation 2014-2016

► Tables 4.1 and 4.11




	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
Number	1,3	4,1	0,7	1,2	1,2	2,4	2,8	2,6	4,9	2,6	0,9	0,5
Variation						-7%		8%		5%		
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
Number	1,6	1,3	1,0	0,8	1,3	3,0	1,6	3,3	2,0	1,4	2,1	2,2
Variation	-5%	-10%	0%		0%	-3%		10%	1%		-13%	
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
Number	1,4	0,5	1,5	2,7	4,0	0,2	1,4	1,0	2,5	1,2	2,6	2,3
Variation					1%		-1%	NA		0%	1%	
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
Number	1,2	3,7	1,6	1,0	3,4	1,6	0,8	1,8	0,7	NA	0,8	0,3
Variation					-4%		2%	0%	-18%	NA	77%	
	Average Median											
Number	1,9	1,6										



Number of all courts (geographic location) per 100 000 inhabitants in 2016 and variation between 2010 and 2016

► Tables 4.1 and 4.11




↑ Increase in the number of courts (geographic locations) between 2010-2016 (+15% and more)

↓ Decrease in the number of courts (geographic locations) between 2010-2016 (-15% and more)

Indices used for IT evaluation



Global IT evaluation of equipment, legal framework and governance



Global level of development of information technology in courts in 2016

► Figure 4.14



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
Equipment	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
Legal framework	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Governance	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
Equipment	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2
Legal framework	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
Governance	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	2

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
Equipment	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2
Legal framework	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	1
Governance	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	1


	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
Equipment	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2
Legal framework	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	1
Governance	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2

Sum of global IT indices in each field in 2016

► Figure 4.14

cepej


European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice
Commission européenne pour l'efficacité de la justice



Obligation to provide information to courts users

(Number of States / entities)

► Figure 4.17




Existence of surveys to measure the trust in justice and the satisfaction with the services for:

(Number of States / entities)


► Figure 4.22




Judges




Court staff




Public prosecutors




Lawyers




Parties



Victims



Definition: Clearance Rate (CR)



Definition: Disposition Time (DT)



Pending cases on 31 Dec.

Resolved cases

X 365

Theoretical processing capacity
of the court (during 1 year)

CR and DT for 1st instance civil and commercial litigious cases in 2016

► Table 5.5



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
CR (%)	99%	NA	94%	102%	98%	102%	115%	NA	118%	NA	110%	101%
DT (days)	159	NA	188	133	25	NA	574	NA	364	NA	153	176

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
CR (%)	98%	125%	99%	77%	103%	99%	98%	NA	59%	113%	101%	98%
DT (days)	139	252	353	242	196	610	159	NA	NA	514	247	88

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
CR (%)	100%	107%	97%	99%	98%	101%	102%	99%	112%	102%	102%	94%
DT (days)	91	432	140	372	267	121	161	225	289	153	42	315

	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
CR (%)	132%	106%	103%	99%	101%	95%	86%	97%	NA	79%	97%	103%
DT (days)	130	280	282	164	107	223	399	96	NA	NA	333	86

	Average	Median
CR (%)	101%	100%
DT (days)	233	192

CR and DT of 1st instance litigious divorce cases in 2016

► Table 5.12



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
CR (%)	104%	NA	99%	103%	95%	105%	96%	99%	148%	97%	105%	99%
DT (days)	97	NA	156	161	93	NA	178	154	180	202	125	137
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
CR (%)	109%	107%	101%	95%	NA	NA	98%	NA	78%	85%	100%	103%
DT (days)	67	227	NA	112	NA	NA	154	NA	NA	511	290	28
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
CR (%)	130%	103%	98%	156%	104%	NA	NA	99%	109%	100%	101%	NA
DT (days)	355	120	91	352	99	NA	NA	196	163	159	33	NA
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
CR (%)	79%	105%	97%	99%	99%	100%	89%	97%	95%	NA	102%	98%
DT (days)	208	163	298	218	280	140	318	53	NA	NA	301	145
	Average	Median										
CR (%)	102%	99%										
DT (days)	180	160										

CR and DT of administrative cases in 2016

► Tables 5.25 and 5.26



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
CR (%)	98%	NA	109%	91%	91%	121%	118%	104%	109%	113%	80%	NAP
DT (days)	115	NA	242	380	105	429	339	108	319	1582	421	NAP
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
CR (%)	106%	79%	99%	108%	92%	148%	100%	NA	NAP	153%	95%	144%
DT (days)	108	279	314	101	375	1086	109	NA	NAP	925	217	72
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
CR (%)	98%	114%	104%	NA	88%	95%	NA	103%	112%	92%	100%	89%
DT (days)	NA	1464	155	NA	240	178	NA	143	911	170	6	539
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
CR (%)	112%	87%	112%	100%	101%	94%	98%	87%	90%	NA	100%	100%
DT (days)	203	282	312	108	180	370	150	138	383	NA	101	89
	Average	Median										
CR (%)	102%	99%										
DT (days)	180	160										

Cases handled by public prosecutors in 2016

► Table 5.40

	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
Dismissed	82%	NAP	158%	81%	NA	NA	16%	94%	44%	NA	68%	15%
Concluded by penalty*	NAP	NA	NAP	4%	NAP	NA	21%	NAP	0%	NA	8%	29%
Charged before court	31%	NA	81%	13%	NA	NA	20%	27%	26%	NA	29%	82%
Total	113%	NA	239%	98%	NA	NA	58%	121%	71%	NA	105%	125%
	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
Dismissed	NA	32%	66%	51%	59%	NA	14%	12%	35%	70%	8%	38%
Concluded by penalty*	NA	1%	12%	26%	3%	NA	6%	NA	NA	0%	12%	NAP
Charged before court	NA	64%	12%	33%	19%	NA	86%	83%	51%	17%	70%	44%
Total	NA	97%	90%	110%	82%	NA	106%	NA	NA	88%	89%	82%
	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
Dismissed	37%	NAP	19%	59%	35%	22%	44%	34%	NA	76%	0%	59%
Concluded by penalty*	NA	NAP	11%	6%	8%	22%	21%	16%	NA	13%	NAP	22%
Charged before court	20%	NA	22%	20%	38%	55%	22%	31%	11%	7%	94%	37%
Total	NA	NA	51%	85%	81%	99%	87%	82%	NA	96%	94%	118%
	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
Dismissed	34%	25%	NAP	37%	17%	36%	32%	NA	10%	26%	34%	35%
Concluded by penalty*	3%	3%	NA	13%	80%	2%	NA	NAP	NAP	26%	0%	15%
Charged before court	34%	15%	NA	39%	2%	61%	21%	NA	107%	NA	47%	38%
Total	71%	42%	NA	89%	100%	98%	NA	NA	17%	NA	81%	88%

CR and DT of 1st instance criminal cases in 2016

► Tables 5.46 and 5.47



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
CR (%)	104%	NA	99%	103%	95%	105%	96%	99%	148%	97%	105%	99%
DT (days)	97	NA	156	161	93	NA	178	154	180	202	125	137

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
CR (%)	109%	107%	101%	95%	NA	NA	98%	NA	78%	85%	100%	103%
DT (days)	67	227	NA	112	NA	NA	154	NA	NA	511	290	28

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
CR (%)	130%	103%	98%	156%	104%	NA	NA	99%	109%	100%	101%	NA
DT (days)	355	120	91	352	99	NA	NA	196	163	159	33	NA

	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
CR (%)	79%	105%	97%	99%	99%	100%	89%	97%	95%	NA	102%	98%
DT (days)	208	163	298	218	280	140	318	53	NA	NA	301	145

	Average	Median
CR (%)	102%	99%
DT (days)	180	160

CR of civil and commercial litigious cases in all instances in 2016

► Tables 5.7, 5.16 and 5.20



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
1st instance	99%	NA	94%	102%	98%	102%	115%	NA	118%	NA	110%	101%
2nd instance	NA	NA	103%	NA	95%	110%	95%	NA	116%	NAP	102%	109%
Highest instance	NA	NAP	101%	NA	91%	111%	109%	97%	NA	NA	98%	93%

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
1st instance	98%	125%	99%	77%	103%	99%	98%	NA	59%	113%	101%	98%
2nd instance	106%	119%	95%	99%	101%	75%	100%	NAP	82%	111%	96%	101%
Highest instance	93%	107%	105%	96%	NA	NA	86%	NA	190%	92%	146%	95%

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
1st instance	100%	107%	97%	99%	98%	101%	102%	99%	112%	102%	102%	94%
2nd instance	106%	106%	99%	97%	NA	NA	NA	96%	97%	106%	100%	92%
Highest instance	100%	NAP	101%	120%	104%	NA	NA	104%	99%	126%	102%	84%

	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
1st instance	132%	106%	103%	99%	101%	95%	86%	97%	NA	79%	97%	103%
2nd instance	125%	100%	98%	103%	102%	111%	77%	100%	NA	NA	98%	NA
Highest instance	NA	102%	84%	106%	98%	101%	69%	NA	NA	NAP	98%	88%

DT of civil and commercial litigious cases in all instances in 2016

► Tables 5.8, 5.17 and 5.21



	ALB	AND	ARM	AUT	AZE	BEL	BIH	BGR	HRV	CYP	CZE	DNK
1st instance	159	NA	188	133	25	NA	574	NA	364	NA	153	176
2nd instance	NA	NA	60	NA	72	NA	462	NA	328	NAP	69	141
Highest instance	NA	NAP	49	NA	70	464	368	172	NA	NA	179	207

	EST	FIN	FRA	GEO	DEU	GRC	HUN	ISL	IRL	ITA	LVA	LTU
1st instance	139	252	353	242	196	610	159	NA	NA	514	247	88
2nd instance	95	150	487	153	245	1 149	121	NAP	NA	993	124	103
Highest instance	132	165	376	126	NA	NA	203	NA	219	1 442	153	184

	LUX	MLT	MDA	MCO	MNE	NLD	NOR	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB
1st instance	91	432	140	372	267	121	161	225	289	153	42	315
2nd instance	553	783	100	435	NA	NA	NA	105	114	131	31	180
Highest instance	276	NAP	27	198	35	NA	NA	180	58	170	48	290


	SVK	SVN	ESP	SWE	CHE	MKD	TUR	UKR	UK:ENG & WAL	UK:SCO	ISR	MAR
1st instance	130	280	282	164	107	223	399	96	NA	NA	333	86
2nd instance	121	97	181	100	97	111	109	54	NA	NA	205	NA
Highest instance	NA	150	513	112	128	350	437	125	NA	NAP	182	455

Cases older than two years in 2016


► Table 5.65




First instance



Second instance



Highest instance



CR and DT of cases relating to asylum seekers and cases relating to right of entry and stay for aliens in 2016

► Table 5.38



AUT 99%	63
AZE NAP	NAP
BEL 90%	174
BIH 75%	122
EST 100%	16
FIN 34%	769
FRA 107%	NA
GEO 63%	394
GRC 207%	330
HUN 105%	40
LTU NA	NA
LUX 90%	NA
MDA 167%	1424
MCO	..
ROU 101%	157
SVN 97%	39
ESP 95%	434
SWE 62%	280

Average 93% 371
Median 95% 231

AUT 66%	387
AZE 143%	37
BEL 148%	502
BIH 75%	119
EST 84%	168
FIN 120%	205
FRA 99%	NA
GEO 52%	NA
GRC 508%	886
HUN 96%	120
LTU 101%	88
LUX 155%	NA
MDA 96%	80
MCO 100%	365
ROU 99%	128
SVN 110%	232
ESP 111%	186
SWE 91%	84

Average 125% 239
Median 100% 168

CEPEJ-STAT update

CEPEJ-STAT
CEPEJ Statistical dynamic database

BETA VERSION 1.0

European Judicial Systems | 2014 Overview

You can choose up to 3 countries on the map (CTRL+click) to compare. European median is shown if you do not select a country or if you select more than 3.

All countries or entities

PROFESSIONALS IN COURTS AND BUDGET

PROFESSIONALS per 100 000 inhabitants		BUDGET €, per inhabitant			
Professional judges	17.82	Judicial System 44.70	Court 30.96	Prosecution Services 9.21	Legal Aid 2.21
Prosecutors	10.27				

Main page

DASHBOARDS

Overview

- Data explorer (per year for quantitative and qualitative data)
- Data explorer (variations for quantitative data)
- Country fiches
- Focus on the budget of judicial systems

Tutorial to use the dashboards

PAPER REPORTS

- CEPEJ Report 2012 (2010 data)
- CEPEJ Report 2014 (2012 data)
- CEPEJ Report 2016 (2014 data)



Keep in touch



<http://www.coe.int/cepej/>



CEPEJ Council of Europe



@CEPEJ_CoE