Strasbourg, 17/02/2025

CEPEJ(2024)6 rev1

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 2013 to 2023

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 17/2/25 15:55

Executive summary

English version

Since 2012 The European Commission has requested the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) of the Council of Europe, to conduct a study aimed at analysing the situation of the judicial systems in the EU member States based on the specific methodology developed and used by CEPEJ for evaluating the functioning of the judicial systems of 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 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, and 2023)

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

Structure of the study

Following the last proposed technical specifications provided in the framework of the contract No. JUST/2020/JACC/PR/RULE/0159 CEPEJ/European Commission, the study, based on 2023 data and also presenting the evolution in relation to 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017,2018, 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022 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 public system based on the elements, selected by the European Commission (EC) and which, according to the CEPEJ, are constitutive of the effectivity and quality of judicial systems.

Human resources

Different categories of judges (professional, occasional, non-professional) can contribute the justice system. The 2023 study focuses on professional judges sitting in courts and the European Union average for this category of judges is 22,2 judges per 100 000 inhabitants (the median is 21,5 judges per 100 000 inhabitants). The lowest number of professional judges per 100 000 inhabitants is 3.7 and the highest is 42,3. The average value has very slightly increased between 2022 and 2023.

It can be noted that compared with the previous cycle, the number of judges per 100 000 inhabitants increased for more than 1% in 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 2013, the average number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants has increased by 4,8% while the median increased by 4%. Compared with the last cycle, the average and median values showed 1% increase of the average and 0,3% increase of the median. The EU median of the non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants is 60,2 with the lowest as 24,2 and highest as 161,4.

It is worth noting that 11 countries reported to have staff with "*Rechspfleger* " functions (or equivalent) among non-judge staff.

In this cycle, for the fourth time, 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 of 11,3 and median of 10,6 prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitants. Compared to the previous cycle, both the average and median values increased by 3% and 1% respectively.
The prosecutors are assisted in their work by non-prosecutor staff attached to the prosecutors' offices. Their number

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 30,5% increase of average gross annual salary of judges at the beginning of their career and 27,6% 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 30,8% increase of the average gross annual salary of public prosecutors at the beginning of their career and 25,9% increase of the average gross annual salary of public prosecutors at the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance level.

When viewed in a national context, the judges at the beginning of career on average earn 2,2 average annual salaries in their respective countries, whereas this ratio is a bit lower for public prosecutors - 1,8. A similar disparity is observed among judges and prosecutors at the highest level, where the highest salary of a judge at the Supreme Court is on average 4,2 times higher than the average salary, while public prosecutors of the corresponding level earn 3,6 the average salary.

Lawyers

The average number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants in the EU member States has generally shown an upward trend since 2013. Between 2013 and 2023 the average number of lawyers in the EU member States increased by 21,2% and the median by 17,8%.

Although the southern states (such as Italy, Greece etc.) 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. These tasks include actions permitted under national law, such as pleading cases, representing clients, practicing law, participating in judicial proceedings, and providing legal advice. (Definition of the lawyers' legal practice in accordance with the Recommendation Rec(2000)21 of the Committee of Ministers, Council of Europe).

Judicial organisation

The study distinguishes three types of courts:

- 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 2013, 11 member States have reduced their number of geographical locations, 3 have the same number and 13 increased it. Between the last two cycles, 3 member States increased, and 6 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 1,52 per 100 000 inhabitants in 2013; 1,38 in 2016 and 1,45 in 2023 which is -4,61, % 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. Greece did not provide any data regarding its specialised courts at the 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 legislation (41%) and commercial cases (37%).

Significant number of countries have also other not mentioned specialised courts (41%). While the majority of countries have few types of specialised courts there are some that have many specialised courts for different matters like Spain and Portugal but also Austria, Cyprus, France, and Italy.

Portugal, Malta and Cyprus also have large number of specialised courts of 1st instance compared with all courts of 1st instance (75%, 64% 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.

This year for the fourth time the data on the higher instances specialised courts was collected. Expectedly, their number is smaller than the 1st instance. Few countries have many specialised courts dealing with different cases 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 courts users with alternatives to a regular judicial procedure.
There are different types of ADR in the member States:

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

Court-related mediation: 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 for 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 widely used for commercial disputes settlements 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 2013 (from 9,6 in 2013 to 19 in 2023). This may indicate an intent of the member States to support the policies of enhancement of ADR through increased number of trained mediators.

In this cycle, for the second time, the CEPEJ Study for the EU Justice Scoreboard includes 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 inhabitant varies in EU from minimum 0,7 to maximum 70 with an average of 11,7 and median of 7,3 notaries per 100 000 inhabitants.

Systems of measuring and evaluating the performance 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 In EU countries. Many fields of courts activity are being monitored particularly case flow data, courts' decisions and efficiency indicators. monitoring.

Looking at the level of individual judges and public prosecutors, it could be noted that quantitative performance targets are defined for each judge in 9 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 (Finland) and 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 11 member States whereas qualitative evaluation is used in 21 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 its evolution over time.

However, interpreting and comparing 2023 data with numbers from different cycles should be done with caution, due to the specific situation caused by the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and to some extent in 2021 and 2022. This is why further observations are required to fully understand tendencies on both the EU and individual countries' level.

Civil and commercial litigious cases

Looking at the CR for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases, it should be noted that almost every year since 2013 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 2023 the EU median is 97%, which is lower compared to the previous year (from 102,5% in 2021 to 100,5% in 2022).

Comparing individual countries' data for 2023 and 2022, most of them (19) show decreased CRs which is in line with the mentioned trend. The largest decrease was registered in Croatia (-41,95 percentage points). In 2022, Croatia's CR experienced a significant increase, but in 2023 it returned to its usual levels, resulting in a sharper decline in the CR for 2023 compared to 2022. On the other side, 5 member States experienced improvements of the CR with more notable increases in Italy and Malta (with 5,6 and 7,94 percentage points respectively).

To understand fully this comparison between the cycles, we need to look if the number of incoming and resolved cases increased or decreased during these two years. The data shows that in 2023, the number of incoming cases increased in 18 member States (by 6,4% in median). In some states the increase is as big as 22%. On the other side the number of resolved cases increased less than 1%, consequently causing the mentioned drop in CR.

As regards the Disposition Time, there are not such clear trends. Fifteen member States increased their DT compared to 2022. More specifically, 6 countries increased it by more than 10%, 2 countries from 5-10%, 7 countries from 0-5%. On the other hand, 7 countries decreased their DT, none of them by more than 10%, 3 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 7% and median DT increased by 3,1%. Generally, the situation slightly deteriorated because more than a half of the member states increased their DT, meaning that this cycle it takes longer 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 382 days on average. For example, they still take notably longer time than the civil and commercial cases that need 292 days on average in 2023.
The number of countries that decreased their Disposition Time for administrative cases is 12, whereas 13 countries increased disposition time. Five countries improved their performance by decreasing the DT significantly (more than 10%), among others, Cyprus, Poland and Portugal.
Increased CR is identified in 10 member States among which Cyprus and Poland had above +10 percent points increase. CR decreased in 15 countries, out of which significantly (above 10 percent points) in 8, among which Austria and Belgium.
This analysis shows that majority of states have demonstrated favourable developments in 2023 regarding administrative cases, since more than half of states have decreased their DT and increased their CR. However, more efforts will be required in future years to continue shortening the disposition time and come closer to DT levels of civil and criminal cases.

Criminal law cases

This is the fourth year in which criminal cases will be reported as part of this study. Consequently, the focus will be only on 2023, 2022, 2021 and 2020 data without comparison with previous data.

Looking at the efficiency indicators for the first instance criminal cases, it is immediately notable that CR was not very high in 2023 as EU average is 97,1% while median was 99,6%. This situation is almost identical as in 2022.

Regarding DT, the situation seems to be similar as in Civil and commercial litigious cases. In 2023 the average is 175 and median 134 days whereas in 2022 the average value was 162 days and median were at the level of 135 days. The improvements are only notable in the individual countries' DTs as 10 states reduced them. However, 12 countries increased its level of DT some of them significantly. The maximum values were observed in Malta (713 days) and Greece (460 days). The lowest DT was recorded in Estonia (30 days) and Hungary (45 days) even less than last year.

The level of CR lower than 100% was reported in almost half of the states which might lead to backlog formation and corresponding increase of DT in the future years. Therefore, affected states should put efforts to prevent such negative developments. Also, countries with very high DT should continue reducing it toward average or median EU levels in the future.

Public prosecutors: Total number of 1st instance criminal cases

This is the fourth year in which public prosecutors' cases will be reported as part of this study. Consequently, the focus will be only on 2023, 2022, 2021 and 2020 data without comparison with previous data.

During 2023, the average value of cases received by public prosecution services in the European Union was 3,3 cases per 100 inhabitants. The number of cases processed was at approximately same level (3,4). The similar tendency was recorded for average numbers in 2022 and 2021 but with slightly lower values. The identified tendency of median showed slightly higher number for resolved cases compared with incoming (3,0 for incoming and 3,2 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 10,4 incoming and Denmark with 9,32 processed cases.
Out of processed cases, there were 2,1 discontinued cases per 100 inhabitants and 0,6 cases brought to court (median values).

Looking at the individual countries, it is interesting to note that out of 21 that provided relevant data, 9 states have more processed then received cases, whereas in 12 states received outnumbered processed cases which might potentially lead to accumulation of backlogs in the respective prosecution services. Comparing the number of processed cases as percentage of received cases over the last cycle, it could be concluded that six countries managed to improve this ratio. Analysis of this indicator implies slight increase in efficiency of public prosecution services in 2023.

The information and communication technology (ICT) in courts

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

The questions related to ICT were reworked completely in 2022 and they consist 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 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 demandé à la Commission européenne pour l'efficacité de la justice (CEPEJ) du Conseil de l'Europe de réaliser une étude ayant pour objet l'analyse de la situation des systèmes judiciaires dans les Etats membres de l'UE, basée sur la méthodologie propre développée et utilisée par la CEPEJ dans le cadre de l'évaluation du fonctionnement des systèmes judiciaires des Etats membres du Conseil de l'Europe.

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

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

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

Structure du rapport

Conformément à la dernière proposition technique rédigée dans le cadre du contrat No JUST/2020/JACC/PR/RULE/0159 CEPEJ/Commission Européenne, l'étude porte sur les données de 2023 et leurs évolutions par rapport aux données de 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021 et 2022. Elle est divisée en deux parties :

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

Principaux éléments

L'étude, au travers de 8 indicateurs, dresse un état des lieux relatif au fonctionnement du service public de la justice sur la base des éléments sélectionnés par la Commission Européenne (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 2023 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 22,2 juges pour 100 000 habitants (la médiane est de 21,5 juges pour 100 000 habitants). Le nombre le plus faible de juges professionnels pour 100 000 habitants est de 3,7 et le plus élevé de 42,3. La moyennes a très légèrement augmenté entre 2022 et 2023.

On peut noter que, par rapport au cycle précédent, le nombre de juges pour 100 000 habitants a augmenté de plus de 1% dans 7 Etats membres, alors qu'il n'a diminué de plus de 1% que dans 7 pays, ce qui confirme la tendance mentionnée de la légère augmentation de la valeur moyenne. Les autres pays ont fait état de variations moins importantes, ce qui peut être interprété comme une fluctuation normale des ressources humaines au sein d'un système.
Ce nombre dépend considérablement de l'organisation du système judiciaire et de l'existence de juges occasionnels, de juges non professionnels ou même de *Rechtspfleger* .
L'existence aux côtés des juges professionnels d'un personnel compétent avec des fonctions définies et un statut reconnu est une condition essentielle pour la qualité et l'efficacité d'un système judiciaire.
Une distinction est opérée entre cinq types de personnels non-juges :

- la fonction de "Rechtspfleger",
- le personnel non-juge dont 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 2013, le nombre moyen de personnel non-juge pour 100 000 habitants a augmenté de 4,8% alors que la médiane a augmenté de 4%. Par rapport au dernier cycle, les valeurs médiane et moyenne ont augmenté de 1 % pour la moyenne et de 0,3 % pour la médiane. La médiane de l'Union européenne du personnel non-juge pour 100 000 habitants est de 60,2 avec un minimum de 24,2 et un maximum de 161,4.

Il convient de noter que 11 pays ont indiqué l'existence parmi les personnels non-juge des fonctions de "Rechspfleger" (ou équivalent).

Pour ce cycle, pour la quatrième fois, l'étude de la CEPEJ pour le tableau de bord de la justice de l'UE inclut les services des ministères publics. La diversité des activités des ministères publics est évidente et le nombre de procureurs pour 100 000 habitants varie dans l'Union européenne d'un minimum de 2,9 à un maximum de 24 avec une moyenne de 11,3 et une médiane de 10,6 procureurs pour 100 000 habitants. Par rapport au cycle précédent, la valeur moyenne, tout comme la médiane, ont augmenté respectivement de 3 % et 1 %.

Les procureurs sont assistés dans leurs fonctions par du personnel non-procureur attaché aux ministères publics. Leur nombre varie considérablement de 0,8 à 47,8 personnels non-procureurs pour 100 000 habitants avec une moyenne de 15,2 et une médiane de 14,5. Par rapport au cycle précédent, les valeurs moyenne et médiane ont légèrement augmenté (respectivement de 3,3% et 0,2%).

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 30,5 % de hausse du salaire annuel brut moyen des juges en début de carrière et 27,6 % de hausse du salaire annuel brut moyen des juges de la Cour suprême ou de la plus haute instance d'appel. Une tendance similaire est également observée pour les procureurs, avec une augmentation de 30,8 % du salaire annuel brut moyen des procureurs en début de carrière et une augmentation de 25,9 % du salaire annuel brut moyen des procureurs au niveau de la Cour suprême ou de la plus haute instance d'appel.

Dans un contexte national, les juges en début de carrière gagnent en moyenne 2,2 salaires annuels moyens dans leurs pays respectifs, alors que ce ratio est un peu plus faible pour les procureurs - 1,8. Une disparité similaire est observée entre les juges et les procureurs au plus haut niveau, où le salaire le plus élevé d'un juge à la Cour suprême est en moyenne 4,2 fois plus important que le salaire moyen, tandis que les procureurs au même niveau gagnent 3,6 fois le salaire moyen.

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 2013. Entre 2013 et 2023, le nombre moyen d'avocats dans les États membres de l'UE a augmenté de 21,2 % et leur nombre médian de 17,8 %.

Bien que les Etats du sud (tels que l'Italie, la Grèce, etc.) 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. Ces tâches comprennent les actions autorisées par le droit national, telles que plaider des affaires, représenter des clients, pratiquer le droit, participer à des procédures judiciaires et fournir des conseils juridiques. (Définition de l'activité d'avocat au regard de la Recommandation Rec(2000)21 du Comité des Ministres du Conseil de l'Europe).

Organisation judiciaire

L'étude distingue trois types de tribunaux :

- les tribunaux de droit commun compétents dans toutes les matières pour lesquelles la compétence n'a pas été 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 2013, 11 pays ont réduit leur nombre d'implantations géographiques, 3 ont conservé le même nombre, tandis que 13 pays ont augmenté ce nombre. Entre les deux derniers cycles, 3 pays ont augmenté et 6 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 1,52 tribunaux pour 100 000 habitants en 2013, 1,38 en 2016 et 1,45 en 2023, ce qui représente une baisse de 4,61 %).

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. La Grèce n'a pas fourni de données concernant ses tribunaux spécialisés en première instance.

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), de la législation de travail (41%) et des affaires commerciales (37%).

Un nombre significatif de pays dispose également d'autres tribunaux spécialisés non mentionnés (41%). Alors que la majorité des pays ont peu de types de tribunaux spécialisés, certains ont de nombreux tribunaux spécialisés dans différentes matières comme l'Espagne et le Portugal mais aussi l'Autriche, Chypre, la France et l'Italie.

Le Portugal et Malte ont également un grand nombre de tribunaux spécialisés de 1ère instance par rapport à l'ensemble des tribunaux de 1ère instance (75%, 64 % et 63% respectivement). Il existe quelques autres pays avec de nombreux types différents de tribunaux spécialisés, mais ils les ont qualifiés d'"autres", de sorte qu'ils ne peuvent pas être facilement comparés à d'autres systèmes.
Cette année, pour la quatrième fois, les données sur les tribunaux spécialisés d'instances supérieures ont été collectées

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 2013 (de 9,6 en 2013 à 19 en 2023). Cela peut indiquer une intention des États membres de soutenir les politiques de renforcement des ADR par l'augmentation du nombre de médiateurs formés.

Dans ce cycle, pour la deuxième fois, l'étude de la CEPEJ pour le tableau de bord de la justice de l'UE inclut 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 0,7 et un maximum de 70 avec une moyenne de 11,7 et une valeur médiane de 7,3 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.

Si l'on considère le niveau des juges et des procureurs individuellement, on peut noter que des objectifs quantitatifs de performance sont définis pour chaque juge dans 9 pays, tandis que 5 pays fixent ces objectifs pour les procureurs. Parmi ces pays, un seul n'envisage pas de sanctions si les objectifs ne sont pas atteints par les juges (Finlande) et les procureurs (Finlande), 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 11 pays, tandis que l'évaluation qualitative est utilisée dans 21 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.
Toutefois, l'interprétation et la comparaison des données 2023 avec celles de différents cycles doit être faite avec prudence, en raison de la situation spécifique causée par la pandémie de COVID-19 en 2020 et, dans une certaine mesure, en 2021 et 2022. C'est pourquoi des observations supplémentaires sont nécessaires pour comprendre pleinement les tendances au niveau de l'UE et des pays individuels.

Affaires civiles et commerciales contentieuses

Si l'on examine le Clearance rate (CR) des affaires civiles et commerciales de première instance, il convient de noter que la médiane de l'UE est égale ou supérieure à 100 % presque chaque année depuis 2013. 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 2023, la médiane de l'UE est de 97%, ce qui est inférieur aux années précédentes (de 102,5 % en 2021 à 100,5 % en 2022).

Si l'on compare les données des différents pays pour 2023 et 2022, la plupart d'entre eux (19) affichent des diminutions des CR, ce qui correspond à la tendance mentionnée. Les plus fortes diminutions étant enregistrées en Croatie (-41,95 points de pourcentage) et en Espagne (-13,81 points de pourcentage). En 2022, le CR de la Croatie a connu une augmentation significative, mais en 2023, ce taux est revenu à ses niveaux habituels, ce qui a entraîné une baisse plus marquée du CR pour 2023 par rapport à 2022. Cinq pays connaissent par ailleurs une amélioration de leur CR, avec une augmentation plus notable en Italie et à Malte (avec 5,6 et 7,94 points de pourcentage respectivement).

Pour mieux comprendre cette comparaison entre les cycles, nous devons examiner si le nombre d'affaires nouvelles et terminées a augmenté ou diminué au cours de ces deux années. Les données montrent qu'en 2023, le nombre d'affaires nouvelles a augmenté dans 18 Etats membres (avec une médiane de 6,4%). Dans certains États, l'augmentation atteint même 22 %. En revanche, le nombre d'affaires terminées a augmenté de moins de 1 %, ce qui a entraîné la baisse mentionnée du CR.

En ce qui concerne le Disposition Time (DT), il n'existe pas de tendance aussi marquée. 15 États membres ont vu leur DT augmenter par rapport à 2022. Plus précisément, 6 pays ont connu une augmentation de plus de 10%, 2 pays de 5 à 10%, 7 pays de 0 à 5%. Par ailleurs, 7 pays ont vu leur DT diminuer, aucun de plus de 10 %, 3 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 7% et le DT médian a augmenté de 3,1 %. D'une manière générale, la situation s'est légèrement détériorée car plus de la moitié des États membres ont augmenté leur DT, ce qui signifie que le traitement des affaires civiles et commerciales est plus long au cours de ce cycle.

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 382 jours en moyenne. Elles sont par exemple nettement plus longues que les affaires civiles et commerciales, qui nécessitent 292 jours en moyenne en 2023.

Le nombre de pays qui ont diminué leur DT pour les affaires administratives est de 12, tandis que 13 pays ont augmenté ce DT. 5 pays ont amélioré leurs performances en diminuant le DT de manière significative (plus de 10%), parmi lesquels Chypre, la Pologne et le Portugal.

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

Le Clearance Rate a diminué dans 15 pays, et de manière significative (plus de 10 points de pourcentage) dans 8 d'entre eux, dont l'Autriche et la Belgique.
Cette analyse montre que la majorité des États ont évolué favorablement en 2023 en ce qui concerne les affaires administratives, puisque plus de la moitié d'entre eux ont diminué leur DT et augmenté leur CR. Toutefois, des efforts supplémentaires seront nécessaires dans les années à venir pour continuer à réduire les DT et se rapprocher des niveaux des DT des affaires civiles et pénales.

Affaires de droit pénal

Il s'agit de la quatrième année pour laquelle des affaires pénales seront examinées dans le cadre de cette étude. Par
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 2023, la moyenne de l'UE étant de 97,1 % tandis que la médiane se situait à 99,6 %. La situation est quasiment identique à celle de 2022.

En ce qui concerne le DT, la situation semble être identique à celle des affaires civiles et commerciales. En 2023, la moyenne est de 175 jours et la médiane de 134 jours, alors qu'en 2022, la valeur moyenne était de 162 jours et la médiane de 135 jours. Les améliorations ne sont notables que pour les DT des différents pays, puisque 10 États les ont réduits. Cependant, 12 pays ont augmenté leur niveau de DT, dont certains de manière significative. Les valeurs maximales ont été observées à Malte (713 jours) et en Grèce (460 jours). Le DT le plus bas a été enregistré en Estonie (30 jours) et en Hongrie (45 jours), soit encore moins que l'année dernière.

Un niveau de CR inférieur à 100 % a été signalé dans près de la moitié des États, ce qui pourrait entraîner la création d'arriérés et une augmentation correspondante du DT dans les années à venir. Par conséquent, les États concernés doivent s'efforcer de prévenir de telles évolutions négatives. De même, les pays présentant un niveau de DT très élevé doivent continuer à le réduire pour atteindre les niveaux moyens ou médians de l'UE dans les années à venir.

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

Il s'agit de la quatrième année au cours de laquelle les affaires des procureurs seront traitées dans le cadre de cette étude. Par conséquent, l'accent sera mis uniquement sur les données de 2023, 2022, 2021 et 2020 sans comparaison avec les données précédentes.

En 2023, la valeur moyenne des affaires reçues par les services du ministère public dans l'Union européenne était de 3,3 affaires pour 100 habitants. Le nombre d'affaires traitées se situait approximativement au même niveau (3,4). La même tendance a été enregistrée pour les valeurs moyennes en 2022 et 2021, mais avec des valeurs légèrement inférieures. La tendance identifiée de la valeur médiane montre un nombre légèrement plus élevé d'affaires terminées que d'affaires nouvelles (3,0 pour les affaires nouvelles et 3,2 pour les affaires terminées). Les valeurs médianes étaient également inférieures aux nombres moyens, probablement parce que la moyenne était affectée par le très grand nombre d'affaires indiqués pour certains pays, tels que le Luxembourg avec 10,4 cas entrants et le Danemark avec 9,32 affaires traitées.

Parmi les affaires traitées, il y a eu 2,1 affaires classées pour 100 habitants (valeur médiane) et 0,6 affaire portée devant le tribunal (valeur médiane).

Si l'on considère les pays individuellement, il est intéressant de noter que sur les 21 qui ont fourni des données pertinentes, 9 Etats ont plus d'affaires traitées que d'affaires nouvelles, tandis que dans 12 Etats, les affaires nouvelles étaient plus nombreuses que les affaires traitées, ce qui pourrait potentiellement conduire à l'accumulation d'arriérés dans les services de poursuite respectifs. En comparant le nombre d'affaires traitées en pourcentage des affaires nouvelles au cours des derniers cycles, on peut conclure que 6 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 2023.

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) constituent toujours l'un des principaux leviers d'amélioration de l'efficacité des tribunaux. Le rôle croissant des TIC dans l'aide à la prise de décision stratégique et l'amélioration de la productivité et de l'efficacité, repose en effet sur les possibilités extraordinaires de l'automatisation des tâches et l'inévitable progrès technologique général.

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 biennial evaluation using a questionnaire for evaluating judicial systems. This Scheme is filled by the CEPEJ's national correspondents, whose responses are statistically processed and analysed by the Secretariat of the CEPEJ.
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 2023. 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 2023 data as well on previous cycles (every year, starting with 2013) 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 10th December 2024. 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(2024)6 rev1 - Part 1

General data: economic and demographic data

Table 0.1: General data: economic and demographic data in 2023 (Q1, Q3, Q4, Q5)

States	Population	GDP* per capita (in €)	Average gross annual salary (in €)	Exchange rate** in 2022 (on 1st Jan. 2022)
Austria	9 158 750	51 828 €	40 430 €	NAP
Belgium	11 763 650	49 704 €	51 369 €	NAP
Bulgaria	6 445 481	14 580 €	12 518 €	1,96
Croatia	3 853 270	19 686 €	19 008 €	NAP
Cyprus	933 505	29 807 €	28 200 €	NAP
Czech Republic	10 900 555	28 778 €	20 959 €	24,73
Denmark	5 932 654	63 403 €	44 793 €	7,44
Estonia	1 365 884	27 954 €	21 984 €	NAP
Finland	5 613 972	49 285 €	51 663 €	NAP
France	68 373 433	41 332 €	42 534 €	NAP
Germany	84 669 326	49 525 €	59 094 €	NAP
Greece	10 413 982	19 548 €	19 654 €	NAP
Hungary	9 584 627	20 495 €	19 304 €	382,12
Ireland	5 343 805	96 553 €	47 725 €	NAP
Italy	58 989 749	35 349 €	33 453 €	NAP
Latvia	1 871 882	21 444 €	18 444 €	NAP
Lithuania	2 885 891	25 066 €	24 165 €	NAP
Luxembourg	672 050	118 773 €	75 346 €	NAP
Malta	563 443	37 304 €	21 843 €	NAP
Netherlands	17 942 942	53 422 €	70 800 €	NAP
Poland	37 637 000	15 530 €	19 747 €	4,35
Portugal	10 639 726	25 735 €	21 465 €	NAP
Romania	19 064 409	17 034 €	17 083 €	4,97
Slovak Republic	5 424 687	22 520 €	17 160 €	NAP
Slovenia	2 123 949	29 753 €	26 651 €	NAP
Spain	48 610 458	30 320 €	26 555 €	NAP
Sweden	10 551 707	53 473 €	43 527 €	11,00
Average	16 715 955	38 822 €	33 166 €	
Median	9 158 750	29 807 €	26 555 €	
Minimum	563 443	14 580 €	12 518 €	
Maximum	84 669 326	118 773 €	75 346 €	
% 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 (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 (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 (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 (2022): State on 31 December 2022

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

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

Q001 (2017): Per January 1, 2018

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

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: https://pxweb2.stat.fi/PxWeb/pxweb/en/StatFin/StatFin__vaerak/statfin_vaerak_pxt_11ra.px/

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

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (2022): Source https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/portal/ext/home/!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfIjo8ziA809LZycDB0NLPyCXA08QxwD3IO8TAwNTEz1wwkpiAJKG-AAjgZA_VFgJc7ujh4m5j4GBhY-7qYGno4eoUGWgcbGBo7GUAV4zCjIjTDIdFRUBADse0bP/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/

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

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 (2023): Slovakia uses Euro as a currency

Slovenia

Q003 (2022): Per capita GDP is increasing (increase by 11% from 2020 to 2021 and by 13% from 2021 to 2022).

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

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

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 (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 2023 (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 for each judge and authority responsible in 2023 (Q83 and Q83-1)

States	Quantitative performance tagets 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	9	2	1	5	5	0
No	18	25	26	22	22	27

Table 1.3 Consequences for a judge if quantitative performance targets are not met in 2023 (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	9	5	2	6	3	4	2	3	5	1	0
No	18	22	25	21	24	23	25	24	22	26	27

Performance and Evaluation - public prosecutors

Table 1.4 Existence of quantitative performance targets for each public prosecutors, authority responsible as well as individual evaluation in 2023 (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	2	0		11	21	3	6	5	9
No and NAP	22	26	24	27	25	27		16	6	24	21	22	18

Table 1.5 Consequences for a prosecutor if quantitative performance targets are not met in 2023 (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 2023 (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	7	■	■	■	■	■					■	■			
Croatia	9	■	■	■	■	■	■				■		■	■	
Cyprus	8	■	■	■	■	■				■	■	■			
Czech Republic	7	■	■	■	■	■					■	■			
Denmark	10	■	■	■	■	■	■			■	■			■	■
Estonia	12	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	
Finland	12	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	
France	13	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■
Germany	10	■	■	■	■	■				■	■	■	■	■	
Greece	9	■	■	■	■	■	■				■	■	■		
Hungary	12	■	■	■	■	■	■		■		■	■	■	■	■
Ireland	10	■	■	■	■	■		■	■		■		■		■
Italy	8	■	■	■	■	■	■						■	■	
Latvia	12	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	
Lithuania	8	■	■	■	■	■	■		■				■		
Luxembourg	10	■	■	■	■	■				■	■	■	■	■	
Malta	9	■	■	■	■	■					■		■	■	■
Netherlands	13	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
Poland	11	■	■	■	■	■	■				■	■	■	■	■
Portugal	13	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
Romania	13	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■
Slovak Republic	10	■	■	■	■	■	■				■		■	■	■
Slovenia	13	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
Spain	12	■	■	■	■		■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Sweden	8	■	■	■	■	■	■				■				■
Yes		27	27	27	27	26	19	10	11	9	25	17	21	19	11
No		0	0	0	0	1	8	17	16	18	2	10	6	8	16

Table 1.7 Modalities for monitoring public prosecution services' activities (performance and quality) in 2023 (Q70-1)

States	Total number of monitoring elements (out of 13)	Modalities for monitoring public prosecution services' activities												
		Number of incoming cases	Length of proceedings (timeframes)	Number of resolved cases	Number of pending cases	Backlogs	Productivity of prosecutors and prosecution staff	Satisfaction of prosecution staff	Satisfaction of users (regarding the services delivered by the public prosecution)	Costs of the judicial procedures	Clearance rate	Disposition time	Percentage of convictions and aquittals	Other
Austria	9													
Belgium	7													
Bulgaria	10													
Croatia	8													
Cyprus	4													
Czech Republic	5													
Denmark	11													
Estonia	12													
Finland	8													
France	10													
Germany	8													
Greece	7													
Hungary	8													
Ireland	7													
Italy	9													
Latvia	9													
Lithuania	8													
Luxembourg	9													
Malta	6													
Netherlands	7													
Poland	9													
Portugal	9													
Romania	12													
Slovak Republic	8													
Slovenia	10													
Spain	6													
Sweden	6													
Yes		26	25	27	27	23	20	5	3	6	17	17	21	5
No		1	2	0	0	4	7	22	24	21	10	10	6	22

Table 1.8 Monitoring of the number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs) in 2023 (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 the waiting time during judicial proceedings within courts and the public prosecution services in 2023 (Q72)

States	Monitoring of the waiting time during judicial proceedings	
	Within the courts	Within the public prosecution services
Austria		
Belgium		
Bulgaria		
Croatia		
Cyprus		
Czech Republic		
Denmark		
Estonia		
Finland		
France		
Germany		
Greece		
Hungary		
Ireland		
Italy		
Latvia		
Lithuania		
Luxembourg		
Malta		
Netherlands		
Poland		
Portugal		
Romania		
Slovak Republic		
Slovenia		
Spain		
Sweden		
Yes	13	10
No	14	17

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

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

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

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

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

Q001 (2017): Per January 1, 2018

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

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: https://pxweb2.stat.fi/PxWeb/pxweb/en/StatFin/StatFin__vaerak/statfin_vaerak_pxt_11ra.px/

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

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (2022): Source https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/portal/ext/home/!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfIjo8ziA809LZycDB0NLPyCXA08QxwD3IO8TAwNTEz1wwkpiAJKG-AAjgZA_VFgJc7ujh4m5j4GBhY-7qYGno4eoUGWgcbGBo7GUAV4zCjIjTDIdFRUBADse0bP/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/

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

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 (2023): Slovakia uses Euro as a currency

Slovenia

Q003 (2022): Per capita GDP is increasing (increase by 11% from 2020 to 2021 and by 13% from 2021 to 2022).

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

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

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 (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 prosecution services

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by question no.

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:

Question 001

Austria

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

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

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.

Croatia

Q001 (2022): State on 31 December 2022

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

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

Denmark

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

Q001 (2017): Per January 1, 2018

Estonia

Q001 (2021): Statistics Estonia

Finland

Q001 (General Comment): Source: Population structure, Statistics Finland: https://pxweb2.stat.fi/PxWeb/pxweb/en/StatFin/StatFin__vaerak/statfin_vaerak_pxt_11ra.px/

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.

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)

Germany

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.

Greece

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.

Hungary

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)

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/

Latvia

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

Lithuania

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

Luxembourg

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

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.

Netherlands

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)

Poland

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

Romania

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).

Slovak Republic

Q001 (2022): Source https://slovak.statistics.sk/wps/portal/ext/home/!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfIjo8ziA809LZycDB0NLPyCXA08QxwD3IO8TAwNTEz1wwkpiAJKG-AAjgZA_VFgJc7ujh4m5j4GBhY-7qYGno4eoUGWgcbGBo7GUAV4zCjIjTDIdFRUBADse0bP/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/

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

Spain

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

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

Question 003

Belgium

Q003 (General Comment): Source: National Bank of Belgium, https://www.nbb.be

Q003 (2017): Gross domestic product at market prices

Bulgaria

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.

Croatia

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/

Cyprus

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.

Denmark

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

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

Finland

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.

France

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

Germany

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.

Greece

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.

Hungary

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.

Ireland

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.

Latvia

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.

Lithuania

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

Luxembourg

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)

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

Netherlands

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.

Poland

Q003 (2023): Data from Central Statistical Office

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

Portugal

Q003 (2023): The increase reflects the inflation

Romania

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.

Slovenia

Q003 (2022): Per capita GDP is increasing (increase by 11% from 2020 to 2021 and by 13% from 2021 to 2022).

Spain

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

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 (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 (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 (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.

Estonia

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

Q004 (2022): Inflation

Q004 (2020): Inflation

Q004 (2018): There is no specific reason.

Finland

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

Q004 (2016): NA

Portugal

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 005

Bulgaria

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

Croatia

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).

Czech Republic

Q005 (2021): Czech Statistical Office
Czech National Bank

Denmark

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

France

Q005 (2020): Euro zone

Hungary

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

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.

Lithuania

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

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

Poland

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

Slovak Republic

Q005 (2023): Slovakia uses Euro as a currency

Indicator 2: The judicial organisation

Table 2.1a Number of courts in 2023 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of 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	162	156
Belgium	235	207	201	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	NA	206	168	37	1	NA	NA	NA	842	789
Germany	1 075	778	752	25	1	297	245	52	1 075	997
Greece	NA	279	259	19	1	NA	NA	NA	320	289
Hungary	139	139	113	25	1	0	NAP	NAP	139	113
Ireland	7	5	3	1	1	2	2	NAP	155	152
Italy	803	544	517	26	1	259	236	23	833	762
Latvia	15	12	6	5	1	3	2	1	52	42
Lithuania	22	19	12	6	1	3	2	1	62	59
Luxembourg	13	7	5	1	1	6	3	3	8	3
Malta	16	8	4	4	NAP	8	7	1	4	2
Netherlands	19	16	11	4	1	3	2	1	43	33
Poland	404	378	366	11	1	26	23	3	496	434
Portugal	591	151	145	5	1	440	437	3	325	318
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	4 191	2 577	2 334	240	1	1 614	1 554	60	712	629
Sweden	94	55	48	6	1	39	31	8	99	84
Average	343	230	208	21	1	114	116	8	241	217
Median	67	60	55	6	1	9	9	2	139	113
Minimum	7	5	3	1	1	0	2	1	4	2
Maximum	4 191	2 577	2 334	240	1	1 614	1 554	60	1 075	997
% of NA	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	7%	7%	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.

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

Luxembourg: The methodology of presentation of data concerning 1st instance specialised courts was improved in 2020

Malta: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country.

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 2023 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of 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	1,64	1,43	1,38	0,04	0,01	0,21	0,20	0,01	1,77	1,70
Belgium	2,00	1,76	1,71	0,04	0,01	0,24	0,20	0,05	1,91	1,85
Bulgaria	2,79	2,28	1,75	0,51	0,02	0,51	0,48	0,03	2,84	2,25
Croatia	1,74	1,32	0,86	0,44	0,03	0,42	0,36	0,05	3,71	3,11
Cyprus	3,54	1,39	1,18	0,11	0,11	2,14	2,04	0,11	3,54	3,21
Czech Republic	0,90	0,89	0,79	0,09	0,01	0,01	NAP	0,01	0,98	0,82
Denmark	0,49	0,46	0,40	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,03	NAP	0,49	0,44
Estonia	0,66	0,51	0,29	0,15	0,07	0,15	0,15	NAP	1,46	1,24
Finland	0,64	0,46	0,36	0,09	0,02	0,18	0,16	0,02	0,93	0,80
France	NA	0,30	0,25	0,05	0,00	NA	NA	NA	1,23	1,15
Germany	1,27	0,92	0,89	0,03	0,00	0,35	0,29	0,06	1,27	1,18
Greece	NA	2,68	2,49	0,18	0,01	NA	NA	NA	3,07	2,78
Hungary	1,45	1,45	1,18	0,26	0,01	0,00	NAP	NAP	1,45	1,18
Ireland	0,13	0,09	0,06	0,02	0,02	0,04	0,04	NAP	2,90	2,84
Italy	1,36	0,92	0,88	0,04	0,00	0,44	0,40	0,04	1,41	1,29
Latvia	0,80	0,64	0,32	0,27	0,05	0,16	0,11	0,05	2,78	2,24
Lithuania	0,76	0,66	0,42	0,21	0,03	0,10	0,07	0,03	2,15	2,04
Luxembourg	1,93	1,04	0,74	0,15	0,15	0,89	0,45	0,45	1,19	0,45
Malta	2,84	1,42	0,71	0,71	NAP	1,42	1,24	0,18	0,71	0,35
Netherlands	0,11	0,09	0,06	0,02	0,01	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,24	0,18
Poland	1,07	1,00	0,97	0,03	0,00	0,07	0,06	0,01	1,32	1,15
Portugal	5,55	1,42	1,36	0,05	0,01	4,14	4,11	0,03	3,05	2,99
Romania	1,27	1,22	0,92	0,30	0,01	0,05	0,04	0,01	1,27	0,95
Slovak Republic	0,92	0,83	0,66	0,15	0,02	0,09	0,06	0,04	1,11	0,87
Slovenia	3,11	2,82	2,59	0,19	0,05	0,28	0,24	0,05	3,58	3,30
Spain	8,62	5,30	4,80	0,49	0,00	3,32	3,20	0,12	1,46	1,29
Sweden	0,89	0,52	0,45	0,06	0,01	0,37	0,29	0,08	0,94	0,80
Average	1,86	1,25	1,05	0,17	0,03	0,62	0,62	0,07	1,81	1,57
Median	1,27	1,00	0,86	0,11	0,01	0,21	0,20	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	8,62	5,30	4,80	0,71	0,15	4,14	4,11	0,45	3,71	3,30
% of NA	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	7%	7%	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.

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

Luxembourg: The methodology of presentation of data concerning 1st instance specialised courts was improved in 2020

Malta: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country

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 2013 to 2023 (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 2023 (1) + (2)	General jurisdiction											Specialised courts												
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023 (1)	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023 (2)	2021	2022	2023
Austria	**144**	132	129	129	129	129	128	128	128	128	128	**126**	7	19	19	19	19	18	18	18	18	18	**18**	158	158	156
Belgium	**224**	27	13	13	13	13	13	13	201	201	201	**201**	262	225	225	225	200	200	200	23	23	23	**23**	218	218	218
Bulgaria	**144**	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	**113**	34	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	31	**31**	145	145	145
Croatia	**47**	65	65	22	22	22	22	30	30	33	33	**33**	74	74	36	36	36	36	17	17	14	14	**14**	120	120	120
Cyprus	**30**	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	11	11	**11**	13	13	15	15	15	15	16	16	19	19	**19**	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
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
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
Finland	**29**	27	27	27	27	27	27	20	20	20	20	**20**	11	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	**9**	45	45	45
France	**NA**	783	786	786	786	786	168	168	168	168	168	**168**	1 089	1 094	1 094	1 086	1 086	1 463	1 186	851	848	847	**NA**	661	737	789
Germany	**997**	765	761	754	761	753	753	753	753	753	753	**752**	248	247	247	247	246	245	245	245	245	245	**245**	998	998	997
Greece	**NA**	NA	298	298	289	289	289	289	259	259	259	**259**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**NA**	289	289	289
Hungary	**113**	131	111	111	111	112	113	113	113	113	114	**113**	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	0	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	113	114	113
Ireland	**5**	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**3**	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	**2**	153	153	152
Italy	**753**	643	510	510	510	534	531	527	525	525	NA	**517**	116	245	245	245	245	237	237	236	236	NA	**236**	773	NA	762
Latvia	**8**	34	34	28	28	25	9	9	9	9	7	**6**	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	**2**	46	42	42
Lithuania	**14**	54	54	54	54	54	17	17	17	12	12	**12**	5	5	5	5	5	2	2	2	2	2	**2**	59	59	59
Luxembourg	**8**	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	**5**	23	-	2	13	13	13	13	3	3	3	**3**	3	3	3
Malta	**11**	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	**4**	7	7	7	7	8	9	9	7	7	7	**7**	3	2	2
Netherlands	**13**	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	**11**	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	**2**	34	34	33
Poland	**389**	-	287	-	363	363	363	363	364	364	365	**366**	-	26	-	26	25	25	25	23	23	23	**23**	433	434	434
Portugal	**582**	231	292	292	292	150	150	145	145	145	145	**145**	102	248	248	245	411	411	435	436	437	437	**437**	319	318	318
Romania	**183**	233	233	232	233	233	233	233	175	175	175	**175**	10	10	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	**8**	182	182	182
Slovak Republic	**39**	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	**36**	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	1	1	1	**3**	55	55	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
Spain	**3 888**	-	2 224	2 224	2 223	2 282	2 269	2 317	2 298	2 313	2 342	**2 334**	-	1 443	1 432	1 434	1 451	1 465	1 493	1 531	1 549	1 578	**1 554**	621	695	629
Sweden	**79**	60	60	60	60	60	48	48	48	48	48	**48**	12	12	12	10	10	31	31	31	31	31	**31**	84	84	84
Average	**315**	148	231	227	232	229	204	205	208	209	198	208	89	156	153	148	154	170	161	140	147	144	116	213	197	217
Median	**60**	55	60	55	55	55	54	54	55	55	55	55	11	13	11	13	13	15	16	9	12	9	9	113	102	113
Minimum	**5**	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	3	2	2
Maximum	**3 888**	783	2 224	2 224	2 223	2 282	2 269	2 317	2 298	2 313	2 342	2 334	1 089	1 443	1 432	1 434	1 451	1 465	1 493	1 531	1 549	1 578	1 554	998	998	997
% of NA	**7%**	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	7%	7%	0%	4%	0%
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	7%	7%	7%	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

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 2013 to 2023 (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 2023 (1) + (2)	General jurisdiction											Specialised courts													
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023 (1)	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023 (2)	2021	2022	2023
Austria	**1,57**	1,56	1,52	1,50	1,48	1,48	1,46	1,45	1,44	1,43	1,41	**1,38**	0,08	0,22	0,22	0,22	0,22	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	**0,20**	1,74	1,74	**1,70**
Belgium	**1,90**	0,24	0,12	0,12	0,12	0,11	0,11	0,11	1,76	1,74	1,72	**1,71**	2,35	2,02	2,01	2,00	1,77	1,76	1,75	0,20	0,20	0,20	**0,20**	1,86	1,86	**1,85**
Bulgaria	**2,23**	1,55	1,56	1,57	1,58	1,59	1,60	1,61	1,63	1,63	1,75	**1,75**	0,47	0,44	0,44	0,45	0,45	0,45	0,46	0,46	0,46	0,48	**0,48**	2,25	2,25	**2,25**
Croatia	**1,22**	1,53	1,53	0,52	0,52	0,53	0,54	0,74	0,74	0,82	0,86	**0,86**	1,74	1,74	0,85	0,86	0,87	0,88	0,42	0,42	0,35	0,36	**0,36**	3,12	3,12	**3,11**
Cyprus	**3,21**	0,69	0,70	0,70	0,71	0,71	0,70	0,69	0,68	1,23	1,19	**1,18**	1,50	1,52	1,75	1,77	1,77	1,75	1,83	1,80	2,12	2,06	**2,04**	3,26	3,26	**3,21**
Czech Republic	**0,79**	0,82	0,82	0,82	0,81	0,81	0,81	0,81	0,81	0,80	0,79	**0,79**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	0,82	0,82	**0,82**
Denmark	**0,44**	0,43	0,43	0,42	0,42	0,42	0,42	0,41	0,41	0,41	0,40	**0,40**	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	**0,03**	0,44	0,44	**0,44**
Estonia	**0,44**	0,31	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	**0,29**	0,16	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**
Finland	**0,52**	0,50	0,50	0,49	0,49	0,49	0,49	0,36	0,36	0,36	0,36	**0,36**	0,20	0,17	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16	**0,16**	0,81	0,81	**0,80**
France	**0,25**	1,19	1,19	1,19	1,18	1,17	0,25	0,25	0,25	0,25	0,25	**0,25**	1,66	1,66	1,65	1,63	1,62	2,18	1,77	1,27	1,26	1,24	**NA**	0,97	1,08	**1,15**
Germany	**1,18**	0,95	0,94	0,93	0,93	0,92	0,91	0,91	0,91	0,91	0,89	**0,89**	0,31	0,31	0,31	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,29	0,29	0,29	**0,29**	1,18	1,18	**1,18**
Greece	**2,49**	NA	2,69	2,75	2,66	2,68	2,68	2,69	2,42	2,42	2,43	**2,49**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**NA**	2,71	2,71	**2,78**
Hungary	**1,18**	1,32	1,12	1,13	1,13	1,14	1,14	1,18	1,16	1,14	1,19	**1,18**	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,21	0,00	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	1,18	1,19	**1,18**
Ireland	**0,09**	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	**0,06**	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	**0,04**	2,97	2,97	**2,84**
Italy	**1,28**	1,08	0,85	0,84	0,84	0,88	0,88	0,87	0,87	0,89	NA	**0,88**	0,19	0,41	0,40	0,40	0,40	0,39	0,39	0,39	0,40	NA	**0,40**	1,31	773,00	**1,29**
Latvia	**0,43**	1,66	1,68	1,40	1,42	1,27	0,46	0,47	0,47	0,48	0,37	**0,32**	0,05	0,05	0,25	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,11	0,11	**0,11**	2,44	2,23	**2,24**
Lithuania	**0,49**	1,80	1,83	1,85	1,87	1,90	0,61	0,61	0,61	0,43	0,42	**0,42**	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,18	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,07	**0,07**	2,06	2,06	**2,04**
Luxembourg	**1,19**	0,95	0,91	0,89	0,89	0,85	0,83	0,81	0,80	0,79	0,76	**0,74**	4,38	-	0,36	2,31	2,20	2,16	2,12	0,48	0,47	0,45	**0,45**	0,45	0,45	**0,45**
Malta	**1,95**	0,24	0,23	0,23	0,22	0,22	0,21	0,21	0,81	0,78	0,77	**0,71**	1,66	1,63	1,59	1,55	1,74	1,89	1,89	1,42	1,36	1,35	**1,24**	0,58	0,38	**0,35**
Netherlands	**0,07**	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	**0,06**	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	**0,01**	0,19	0,19	**0,18**
Poland	**1,03**	-	-	-	-	0,94	0,94	0,95	0,95	0,95	0,97	**0,97**	-	-	-	-	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	**0,06**	1,15	1,15	**1,15**
Portugal	**5,47**	2,20	2,80	2,81	2,82	1,45	1,46	1,41	1,41	1,41	1,39	**1,36**	0,97	2,38	2,39	2,37	3,99	3,99	4,23	4,23	4,24	4,17	**4,11**	3,05	3,04	**2,99**
Romania	**0,96**	1,09	1,17	1,04	1,18	1,19	1,19	1,20	0,90	0,91	0,92	**0,92**	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,04	**0,04**	0,96	0,96	**0,95**
Slovak Republic	**0,72**	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	0,99	0,99	0,99	0,99	0,99	0,99	**0,66**	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,02	0,02	0,02	**0,06**	1,01	1,01	**0,87**
Slovenia	**2,82**	2,67	2,67	2,67	2,66	2,66	2,66	2,64	2,62	2,61	2,60	**2,59**	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	**0,24**	3,31	3,31	**3,30**
Spain	**8,00**	-	-	4,79	4,79	4,90	4,86	4,93	4,84	4,89	4,87	**4,80**	-	-	3,08	3,09	3,12	3,14	3,18	3,23	3,27	3,28	**3,20**	1,29	1,45	**1,29**
Sweden	**0,75**	0,63	0,62	0,62	0,61	0,60	0,47	0,47	0,46	0,46	0,46	**0,45**	0,13	0,12	0,12	0,10	0,10	0,31	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,29	**0,29**	0,80	0,80	**0,80**
Average	**1,58**	1,02	1,09	1,18	1,18	1,12	1,00	1,01	1,06	1,08	1,08	**1,05**	0,73	0,62	0,69	0,76	0,80	0,83	0,80	0,62	0,66	0,67	**0,62**	1,60	30,18	**1,57**
Median	**1,18**	0,98	0,94	0,91	0,91	0,92	0,81	0,81	0,81	0,89	0,87	**0,86**	0,20	0,21	0,25	0,23	0,22	0,24	0,24	0,20	0,22	0,20	**0,20**	1,28	1,28	**1,24**
Minimum	**0,07**	0,07	0,07	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	0,00	0,01	0,01	**0,01**	0,19	0,19	**0,18**
Maximum	**8,00**	2,67	2,80	4,79	4,79	4,90	4,86	4,93	4,84	4,89	4,87	**4,80**	4,38	2,38	3,08	3,09	3,99	3,99	4,23	4,23	4,24	4,17	**4,11**	3,31	773,00	**3,30**
% of NA	**0%**	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	**0%**	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	7%	**7%**	0%	0%	**0%**
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	7%	**7%**	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

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 2013 to 2023 (Q44)

States	Number of all courts - Geographic locations (1)										
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	135	103	103	103	103	102	102	164	164	164	162
Belgium	288	288	288	267	264	253	232	225	225	225	225
Bulgaria	170	168	175	182	182	182	182	182	182	181	183
Croatia	192	203	203	203	203	205	143	143	143	143	143
Cyprus	19	21	22	22	22	21	22	23	31	31	33
Czech Republic	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	107	107	107	107
Denmark	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
Estonia	22	22	22	21	22	21	21	20	20	20	20
Finland	78	81	79	73	73	71	52	52	52	52	52
France	641	643	643	641	641	641	641	672	715	781	842
Germany	1 107	1 101	1 095	1 102	1 093	1 076	1 076	1 092	1 092	1 075	1 075
Greece	NA	329	329	319	319	319	319	320	320	320	320
Hungary	157	157	157	157	158	159	159	139	139	140	139
Ireland	100	94	94	95	95	95	95	156	156	156	155
Italy	790	836	836	836	831	828	828	844	844	NA	833
Latvia	48	48	49	42	47	52	56	55	53	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	2	3	3	3	4	4	4
Netherlands	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42	43	43	43
Poland	-	NA	-	401	401	401	401	494	494	496	496
Portugal	319	253	253	253	312	312	316	328	328	327	325
Romania	244	244	243	243	243	243	243	242	242	242	242
Slovak Republic	64	64	64	64	64	63	64	64	65	65	60
Slovenia	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	76	76	76	76
Spain	-	763	763	763	698	701	702	695	700	715	712
Sweden	95	95	95	95	95	99	99	99	99	99	99
Average	199	224	224	230	229	228	225	235	237	216	241
Median	97	97	97	98	98	99	99	139	139	124	139
Minimum	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4
Maximum	1 107	1 101	1 095	1 102	1 093	1 076	1 076	1 092	1 092	1 075	1 075
% of NA	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	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.

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 location per 100 000 inhabitants from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q44)

States	Number of all courts - Geographic locations per 100 000 inhabitants										
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	1,59	1,20	1,18	1,18	1,17	1,16	1,15	1,84	1,83	1,80	1,77
Belgium	2,58	2,57	2,56	2,36	2,32	2,21	2,03	1,95	1,94	1,92	1,91
Bulgaria	2,35	2,33	2,45	2,56	2,58	2,60	2,62	2,63	2,66	2,81	2,84
Croatia	4,52	4,80	4,84	4,89	4,94	5,03	3,52	3,54	3,69	3,71	3,71
Cyprus	2,21	2,45	2,59	2,59	2,57	2,40	2,48	2,57	3,43	3,37	3,54
Czech Republic	0,93	0,93	0,93	0,93	0,93	0,92	0,92	1,00	1,02	0,99	0,98
Denmark	0,52	0,51	0,51	0,50	0,50	0,50	0,50	0,50	0,49	0,49	0,49
Estonia	1,67	1,68	1,67	1,60	1,67	1,59	1,59	1,50	1,50	1,51	1,46
Finland	1,43	1,48	1,44	1,33	1,32	1,29	0,94	0,94	0,94	0,93	0,93
France	0,97	0,97	0,97	0,96	0,95	0,96	0,96	1,00	1,06	1,15	1,23
Germany	1,37	1,36	1,34	1,34	1,32	1,30	1,29	1,31	1,31	1,27	1,27
Greece	NA	3,03	3,03	2,96	2,96	2,97	2,97	2,99	3,00	3,00	3,07
Hungary	1,59	1,59	1,60	1,60	1,60	1,66	1,63	1,41	1,43	1,46	1,45
Ireland	2,17	2,03	2,02	2,03	1,98	1,96	1,93	3,13	3,04	3,03	2,90
Italy	1,32	1,38	1,38	1,38	1,37	1,37	1,37	1,42	1,43	NA	1,41
Latvia	2,37	2,40	2,49	2,13	2,41	2,71	2,94	2,91	2,83	2,76	2,78
Lithuania	2,11	2,12	2,15	2,18	2,21	2,22	2,22	2,22	2,21	2,17	2,15
Luxembourg	1,45	1,42	1,42	1,35	1,33	1,30	1,28	1,26	1,24	1,21	1,19
Malta	0,47	0,45	0,44	0,43	0,42	0,63	0,61	0,58	0,78	0,77	0,71
Netherlands	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,23	0,23	0,23	0,23	0,24	0,25	0,24	0,24
Poland	-	NA	-	1,04	1,04	1,04	1,04	1,29	1,30	1,31	1,32
Portugal	3,06	2,44	2,45	2,45	3,03	3,04	3,07	3,19	3,17	3,12	3,05
Romania	1,22	1,10	1,23	1,24	1,24	1,25	1,25	1,26	1,27	1,27	1,27
Slovak Republic	1,18	1,18	1,18	1,18	1,18	1,16	1,17	1,17	1,20	1,20	1,11
Slovenia	3,74	3,74	3,73	3,73	3,73	3,70	3,67	3,60	3,61	3,59	3,58
Spain	-	1,64	1,64	1,64	1,49	1,49	1,48	1,47	1,48	1,49	1,46
Sweden	0,98	0,97	0,96	0,95	0,94	0,97	0,96	0,95	0,95	0,94	0,94
Average	1,75	1,77	1,79	1,73	1,76	1,76	1,70	1,77	1,82	1,83	1,81
Median	1,52	1,54	1,52	1,38	1,37	1,37	1,37	1,42	1,43	1,47	1,45
Minimum	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,23	0,23	0,23	0,23	0,24	0,25	0,24	0,24
Maximum	4,52	4,80	4,84	4,89	4,94	5,03	3,67	3,60	3,69	3,71	3,71
% of NA	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	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.

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 2023 (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	**NA**	152	NAP	216	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	38	NAP	NAP	155	282
Germany	**245**	NAP	NAP	106	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	53	68	NAP	NAP	18
Greece	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	30	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP
Hungary	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**236**	22	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	58	NAP	NAP	20	NAP	4	29	103
Latvia	**2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NA	NAP	1
Lithuania	**2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	**3**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	1	1	NAP	NAP
Malta	**7**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	1	4
Netherlands	**2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Poland	**23**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	16	NAP	7	NAP	NAP
Portugal	**437**	23	NAP	45	53	NAP	5	NAP	1	17	NAP	NAP	NAP	293
Romania	**8**	3	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	4	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**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	**1 554**	102	NAP	389	140	NAP	17	7	NAP	243	NAP	NAP	82	574
Sweden	**31**	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	12	NAP	NAP	NAP	18
Average	**116**	32	-	71	-	-	-	-	-	23	-	-	-	118
Median	**9**	9	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	18
Minimum	**2**	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Maximum	**1 554**	152	-	389	-	-	-	-	-	243	-	-	-	574
% of NA	**7%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%
% of NAP	**7%**	63%	96%	59%	85%	93%	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 2023 (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	1	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	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	10	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**52**	NAP	NAP	19	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	16	15	NAP	NAP	2
Greece	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	10	NAP	NA	NAP	1
Hungary	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**23**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	1	NAP	21
Latvia	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	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	**60**	4	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	**8**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
Median	**2**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Minimum	**1**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Maximum	**60**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	-	-	-	-
% of NA	**7%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%
% of NAP	**15%**	93%	100%	85%	96%	100%	100%	93%	100%	26%	89%	74%	100%	81%

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 2013 to 2023 and their variations between 2013 and 2023 and between 2022 and 2023 (Q44)

States	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Variation 2022-2023	Variation 2013-2023
Austria	20	135	103	103	103	103	102	102	164	164	164	162	-1,2%	20,0%
Belgium	1	288	288	288	267	264	253	232	225	225	225	225	0,0%	-21,9%
Bulgaria	2	170	168	175	182	182	182	182	182	182	181	183	1,1%	7,6%
Croatia	11	192	203	203	203	203	205	143	143	143	143	143	0,0%	-25,5%
Cyprus	13	19	21	22	22	22	21	22	23	31	31	33	6,5%	73,7%
Czech Republic	3	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	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	22	21	22	21	21	20	20	20	20	0,0%	-9,1%
Finland	26	78	81	79	73	73	71	52	52	52	52	52	0,0%	-33,3%
France	10	641	643	643	641	641	641	641	672	715	781	842	7,8%	31,4%
Germany	5	1107	1101	1095	1102	1093	1076	1076	1092	1092	1075	1075	0,0%	-2,9%
Greece	8	NA	329	329	319	319	319	319	320	320	320	320	0,0%	-
Hungary	17	157	157	157	157	158	159	159	139	139	140	139	-0,7%	-11,5%
Ireland	7	100	94	94	95	95	95	95	156	156	156	155	-0,6%	55,0%
Italy	12	790	836	836	836	831	828	828	844	844	NA	833	83300,0%	5,4%
Latvia	14	48	48	49	42	47	52	56	55	53	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	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	0,0%	100,0%
Netherlands	19	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42	43	43	43	0,0%	7,5%
Poland	21	-	NA	-	401	401	401	401	494	494	496	496	0,0%	-
Portugal	22	319	253	253	253	312	312	316	328	328	327	325	-0,6%	1,9%
Romania	23	244	244	243	243	243	243	243	242	242	242	242	0,0%	-0,8%
Slovak Republic	25	64	64	64	64	64	63	64	64	65	65	60	-7,7%	-6,3%
Slovenia	24	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	76	76	76	76	0,0%	-1,3%
Spain	9	-	763	763	763	698	701	702	695	700	715	712	-0,4%	-
Sweden	27	95	95	95	95	95	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.

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 (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 (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 (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, 11 assize courts (one per province and two in Brussels), and 15 police courts.
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 jurisdictions 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. As from 2020, data include all eleven assize courts too.
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 (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 litigation section = 6
As in the previous cycle (2020 data), 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 courts of first instance (13) have a specialised family and youth section. The term ‘family court’ is used, but in reality, it is a specialised section.

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 Court of First Instance groups together the Court of First Instance, 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 (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 (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.

Q042 (2013): For 2013, the Ministry of Justice added to the number of geographic locations all offices of a specific court that are located outside of the seat of the court, in which judicial activities are undertaken. The number of courts did not increase in 2013. Also, 66 municipal courts (65 municipal courts and 1 Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb) were in function out of total 67 first instance courts prescribed by the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts. The Municipal Court in Novi Zagreb is still not in function.

Q043 (General Comment): 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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q043 (2013): The reduction of the number of specialised courts is primarily due to the suppression of 70 military pensions courts. The other specialised courts are: Children courts (155); Military pensions courts (36); the Rhine navigation court; commercial maritime courts (14); the National court for asylum right; the Court for the navigation on the Moselle. In contrast with 2010 and 2012 data, a part of the "other specialised courts" was distributed in the proposed categories, namely the agricultural land courts, the courts of rental cases, the Courts for enforcement of criminal sanctions and the courts of incapability litigation.The specialised interregional courts, competent to judge cases of organised crime were added.

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 (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 (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 (2020): In highest instance courts include the Supreme Court(Areios Pagos). In First instance courts of general jurisdiction are included in the number 259, 196 local and District Criminal Courts and 63 courts of first degree.

Q043 (General Comment): In Greece, there are no special courts for the fields of law described in the question 43, besides those already mentioned. The Greek Constitution is reluctant to provide in the Greek legal system special courts. Instead, within the Courts of First Instance and Courts of Appeal of large cities, we have special Chambers, where the task of adjudicating in special categories of law (e.g. family law, commercial law, etc.) is assigned. Judges entrusted with such duties have usually the correspondent specific studies. As far as other special courts are concerned, special provisions regulate the operation of courts for juveniles, military, navy and air force courts.We clarify that the military,navy and air force courts are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of National Defense, therefore we have no further information.

Q043 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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

Q043 (2013): In September 2013, the Italian judicial system implemented an extensive reorganization of the territorial distribution of offices with the closing (by merger) of 30 Tribunals, 30 Prosecution offices, 220 branches of Tribunals and 346 Peace Judges.

Q044 (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 (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 (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. 12 district courts;
1.2. 5 regional courts (regional courts are appeal instance for judgments, decisions, rulings and orders of district courts as well as first instance courts adjudicating certain categories of cases; in this table regional courts are counted only as second instance courts of general jurisdiction) and the Court of Appeal of Lithuania;
2. 2 regional administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.
Regional courts as the first instance courts examine criminal cases in which persons are accused of having committed serious and very serious crimes, as well as cases in which the accused were the President of the Republic of Lithuania, members of the Seimas (Parliament) or Government, judges, judges or prosecutors of the Constitutional Court at the time of the commission of the criminal act.
Regional courts as the first instance deal with civil cases in which the amount of the claim is greater than 28,510 EUR(except for family legal relations cases due to the division of property), copyright cases, civil public tender legal relations cases, bankruptcy and restructuring cases, according to the statement of the bank's temporary administrator on reduction of the bank's share capital, cases in which one of the parties is a foreign state, according to lawsuits regarding the forced sale of shares, due to the investigation of the activity of a legal entity, and other cases.
Only the Vilnius Regional Court, with exclusive rights, in accordance with the laws in force, as a court of first instance hears cases regarding disputes provided for in the Patent Law of the Republic of Lithuania, regarding disputes provided for in the Trademark Law of the Republic of Lithuania, regarding adoption based on requests of foreign citizens

Q042 (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: 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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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, 11 assize courts (one per province and two in Brussels), and 15 police courts.
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 jurisdictions 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. As from 2020, data include all eleven assize courts too.
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 (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 (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.

Q042 (2013): For 2013, the Ministry of Justice added to the number of geographic locations all offices of a specific court that are located outside of the seat of the court, in which judicial activities are undertaken. The number of courts did not increase in 2013. Also, 66 municipal courts (65 municipal courts and 1 Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb) were in function out of total 67 first instance courts prescribed by the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts. The Municipal Court in Novi Zagreb is still not in function.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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. 12 district courts;
1.2. 5 regional courts (regional courts are appeal instance for judgments, decisions, rulings and orders of district courts as well as first instance courts adjudicating certain categories of cases; in this table regional courts are counted only as second instance courts of general jurisdiction) and the Court of Appeal of Lithuania;
2. 2 regional administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.
Regional courts as the first instance courts examine criminal cases in which persons are accused of having committed serious and very serious crimes, as well as cases in which the accused were the President of the Republic of Lithuania, members of the Seimas (Parliament) or Government, judges, judges or prosecutors of the Constitutional Court at the time of the commission of the criminal act.
Regional courts as the first instance deal with civil cases in which the amount of the claim is greater than 28,510 EUR(except for family legal relations cases due to the division of property), copyright cases, civil public tender legal relations cases, bankruptcy and restructuring cases, according to the statement of the bank's temporary administrator on reduction of the bank's share capital, cases in which one of the parties is a foreign state, according to lawsuits regarding the forced sale of shares, due to the investigation of the activity of a legal entity, and other cases.
Only the Vilnius Regional Court, with exclusive rights, in accordance with the laws in force, as a court of first instance hears cases regarding disputes provided for in the Patent Law of the Republic of Lithuania, regarding disputes provided for in the Trademark Law of the Republic of Lithuania, regarding adoption based on requests of foreign citizens

Q042 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 litigation section = 6
As in the previous cycle (2020 data), 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 courts of first instance (13) have a specialised family and youth section. The term ‘family court’ is used, but in reality, it is a specialised section.

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 (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 (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 (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.

Q043 (2013): The reduction of the number of specialised courts is primarily due to the suppression of 70 military pensions courts. The other specialised courts are: Children courts (155); Military pensions courts (36); the Rhine navigation court; commercial maritime courts (14); the National court for asylum right; the Court for the navigation on the Moselle. In contrast with 2010 and 2012 data, a part of the "other specialised courts" was distributed in the proposed categories, namely the agricultural land courts, the courts of rental cases, the Courts for enforcement of criminal sanctions and the courts of incapability litigation.The specialised interregional courts, competent to judge cases of organised crime were added.

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 (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, military, navy and air force courts.We clarify that the military,navy and air force courts are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of National Defense, therefore we have no further information.

Q043 (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 (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 (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

Q043 (2013): In September 2013, the Italian judicial system implemented an extensive reorganization of the territorial distribution of offices with the closing (by merger) of 30 Tribunals, 30 Prosecution offices, 220 branches of Tribunals and 346 Peace Judges.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 Court of First Instance groups together the Court of First Instance, 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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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: 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 (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 (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 (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 (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: The 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. 2023

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	**535 854**	**28 408**	397 812	350 464	47 348	15 158	32 190	NAP	NAP	**43 686**	65 948
Belgium	**455 396**	**440 286**	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	**15 110**	NAP
Bulgaria	**87 849**	**69 909**	7 911	7 870	41	NAP	NAP	41	NAP	**10 029**	NAP
Croatia	**279 259**	**158 445**	115 489	77 077	NA	NA	2 471	NAP	NAP	**5 325**	NAP
Cyprus	**59 641**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**12 843**	NA
Czech Republic	**384 562**	**122 971**	154 177	150 184	3 417	NAP	3 417	NAP	576	**5 998**	101 416
Denmark	**137 019**	**32 553**	70 655	56 611	10 837	0	10 837	NAP	3 207	**NAP**	33 811
Estonia	**24 901**	**7 212**	16 451	12 519	3 932	2 010	1 922	NAP	NAP	**1 238**	NAP
Finland	**127 869**	**7 319**	98 051	98 051	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**17 044**	5 455
France	**1 882 880**	**1 302 725**	87 270	87 270	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**200 093**	292 792
Germany	**NA**	**684 752**	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 982 259	NA	NA	**626 586**	537 658
Greece	**375 034**	**265 990**	22 274	17 944	1 864	1 729	132	3	2 466	**84 902**	1 868
Hungary	**113 182**	**45 928**	42 390	13 548	28 593	NAP	26 634	1 959	249	**6 603**	18 261
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**3 216 293**	**2 084 917**	1 021 492	1 021 492	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**109 884**	NAP
Latvia	**34 096**	**17 191**	15 802	10 954	4 848	4 848	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 103**	NAP
Lithuania	**34 345**	**27 688**	1 051	731	NA	NA	NA	NA	320	**4 981**	625
Luxembourg	**5 869**	**3 328**	1 016	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1 016	**1 525**	NAP
Malta	**13 112**	**12 260**	455	455	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**397**	NAP
Netherlands	**242 318**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**64 877**	NAP
Poland	**2 840 993**	**863 180**	1 823 862	536 768	1 287 094	1 182 089	105 005	NAP	NAP	**34 155**	119 796
Portugal	**NA**	**175 717**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**55 207**	NAP
Romania	**653 161**	**563 035**	19 227	6 291	12 936	6 678	6 258	NAP	NAP	**70 899**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**174 917**	**49 427**	109 930	27 171	27 323	NAP	26 835	488	55 436	**8 501**	7 059
Slovenia	**86 201**	**27 663**	39 816	35 139	4 677	4 299	378	NAP	NAP	**3 946**	14 776
Spain	**2 104 420**	**1 322 998**	601 164	601 164	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**180 258**	NAP
Sweden	**83 088**	**25 801**	7 557	7 557	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**46 246**	3 484
Average	**581 344**	**347 488**	221 612	155 963	119 409	152 101	183 195	623	9 039	**64 457**	92 535
Median	**155 968**	**59 668**	42 390	31 155	7 843	4 574	8 548	265	1 016	**15 110**	18 261
Minimum	**5 869**	**3 328**	455	455	41	0	132	3	249	**397**	625
Maximum	**3 216 293**	**2 084 917**	1 823 862	1 021 492	1 287 094	1 182 089	1 982 259	1 959	55 436	**626 586**	537 658
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**22%**	19%	19%	15%	11%	11%	7%	**4%**	4%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	37%	56%	44%	74%	67%	**4%**	48%

Table 3.1.1.1b: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2023

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	**5,85**	**0,31**	4,34	3,83	0,52	0,17	0,35	NAP	NAP	**0,48**	0,72
Belgium	**3,87**	**3,74**	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	**0,13**	NAP
Bulgaria	**1,36**	**1,08**	0,12	0,12	0,00	NAP	NAP	0,00	NAP	**0,16**	NAP
Croatia	**7,25**	**4,11**	3,00	2,00	NA	NA	0,06	NAP	NAP	**0,14**	NAP
Cyprus	**6,39**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**1,38**	NA
Czech Republic	**3,53**	**1,13**	1,41	1,38	0,03	NAP	0,03	NAP	0,01	**0,06**	0,93
Denmark	**2,31**	**0,55**	1,19	0,95	0,18	0,00	0,18	NAP	0,05	**NAP**	0,57
Estonia	**1,82**	**0,53**	1,20	0,92	0,29	0,15	0,14	NAP	NAP	**0,09**	NAP
Finland	**2,28**	**0,13**	1,75	1,75	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,30**	0,10
France	**2,75**	**1,91**	0,13	0,13	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,29**	0,43
Germany	**NA**	**0,81**	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,34	NA	NA	**0,74**	0,64
Greece	**3,60**	**2,55**	0,21	0,17	0,02	0,02	0,00	0,00	0,02	**0,82**	0,02
Hungary	**1,18**	**0,48**	0,44	0,14	0,30	NAP	0,28	0,02	0,00	**0,07**	0,19
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**5,45**	**3,53**	1,73	1,73	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,19**	NAP
Latvia	**1,82**	**0,92**	0,84	0,59	0,26	0,26	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,06**	NAP
Lithuania	**1,19**	**0,96**	0,04	0,03	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,01	**0,17**	0,02
Luxembourg	**0,87**	**0,50**	0,15	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,15	**0,23**	NAP
Malta	**2,33**	**2,18**	0,08	0,08	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,07**	NAP
Netherlands	**1,35**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,36**	NAP
Poland	**7,55**	**2,29**	4,85	1,43	3,42	3,14	0,28	NAP	NAP	**0,09**	0,32
Portugal	**NA**	**1,65**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,52**	NAP
Romania	**3,43**	**2,95**	0,10	0,03	0,07	0,04	0,03	NAP	NAP	**0,37**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**3,22**	**0,91**	2,03	0,50	0,50	NAP	0,49	0,01	1,02	**0,16**	0,13
Slovenia	**4,06**	**1,30**	1,87	1,65	0,22	0,20	0,02	NAP	NAP	**0,19**	0,70
Spain	**4,33**	**2,72**	1,24	1,24	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,37**	NAP
Sweden	**0,79**	**0,24**	0,07	0,07	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,44**	0,03
Average	**3,27**	**1,56**	1,28	0,94	0,48	0,50	0,35	0,01	0,18	**0,31**	0,37
Median	**2,99**	**1,11**	1,19	0,75	0,24	0,16	0,16	0,00	0,02	**0,19**	0,32
Minimum	**0,79**	**0,13**	0,04	0,03	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,06**	0,02
Maximum	**7,55**	**4,11**	4,85	3,83	3,42	3,14	2,34	0,02	1,02	**1,38**	0,93
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	22%	19%	19%	15%	11%	11%	7%	**4%**	4%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	0%	7%	37%	56%	44%	74%	67%	**4%**	48%

Table 3.1.1.2a: First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2023

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	**3 227 078**	**80 628**	2 541 473	1 592 573	948 900	554 386	394 514	NAP	NAP	**50 610**	554 367
Belgium	**1 115 424**	**681 517**	409 422	NAP	409 422	NAP	409 422	NAP	NAP	**24 485**	NAP
Bulgaria	**328 867**	**129 124**	170 521	170 231	290	NAP	NAP	290	NAP	**29 222**	NAP
Croatia	**994 028**	**105 751**	872 279	187 311	NA	NA	109 506	NAP	NAP	**15 998**	NAP
Cyprus	**27 878**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**10 381**	NA
Czech Republic	**956 587**	**340 690**	587 563	463 851	121 216	NAP	121 216	NAP	2 496	**7 982**	20 352
Denmark	**2 388 978**	**54 486**	2 085 299	294 625	1 784 928	1 768 372	16 556	NAP	5 746	**NAP**	249 193
Estonia	**328 254**	**17 665**	307 508	68 523	238 985	105 938	133 047	NAP	NAP	**3 081**	NAP
Finland	**517 344**	**9 798**	475 057	475 057	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**21 317**	11 172
France	**2 642 957**	**1 461 353**	133 184	133 184	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**257 329**	791 091
Germany	**NA**	**1 074 315**	NA	2 114 422	NA	4 831 595	142 465	NA	NA	**501 171**	875 921
Greece	**219 416**	**143 045**	20 991	14 556	2 328	2 081	245	2	4 107	**51 130**	4 250
Hungary	**676 322**	**124 436**	500 722	183 406	315 558	NAP	309 655	5 903	1 758	**19 431**	31 733
Ireland	**199 589**	**113 457**	86 132	86 132	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**2 996 457**	**1 270 574**	1 675 559	1 675 559	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**50 324**	NAP
Latvia	**354 094**	**30 050**	322 478	84 003	238 475	238 475	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 566**	NAP
Lithuania	**183 124**	**83 997**	67 921	63 730	NA	NA	NA	NA	4 191	**21 425**	9 781
Luxembourg	**12 330**	**6 761**	4 363	833	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	3 530	**1 206**	NAP
Malta	**14 202**	**10 660**	3 393	3 393	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**149**	NAP
Netherlands	**1 091 103**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**123 615**	NAP
Poland	**10 215 282**	**978 903**	8 870 426	3 568 397	5 302 029	4 475 949	826 080	NAP	NAP	**70 158**	295 795
Portugal	**NA**	**263 831**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**25 607**	NAP
Romania	**1 614 973**	**1 495 992**	38 955	33 688	5 267	5 194	73	NAP	NAP	**80 026**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**653 664**	**90 807**	340 820	117 729	150 376	NAP	135 676	14 700	72 715	**4 613**	217 424
Slovenia	**576 612**	**28 710**	410 980	145 648	265 332	222 308	43 024	NAP	NAP	**2 648**	134 274
Spain	**3 088 809**	**1 519 906**	1 393 608	1 393 608	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**175 295**	NAP
Sweden	**253 507**	**67 827**	18 797	18 797	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**159 552**	7 331
Average	**1 387 075**	**407 371**	927 715	560 402	752 547	1 356 033	203 191	5 224	13 506	**68 333**	246 360
Median	**653 664**	**113 457**	340 820	145 648	238 985	238 475	133 047	3 097	4 107	**24 485**	134 274
Minimum	**12 330**	**6 761**	3 393	833	290	2 081	73	2	1 758	**149**	4 250
Maximum	**10 215 282**	**1 519 906**	8 870 426	3 568 397	5 302 029	4 831 595	826 080	14 700	72 715	**501 171**	875 921
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	15%	11%	15%	11%	7%	11%	7%	**4%**	4%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	0%	4%	37%	56%	44%	74%	67%	**4%**	48%

Table 3.1.1.2b: First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2023

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	**35,23**	**0,88**	27,75	17,39	10,36	6,05	4,31	NAP	NAP	**0,55**	6,05
Belgium	**9,48**	**5,79**	3,48	NAP	3,48	NAP	3,48	NAP	NAP	**0,21**	NAP
Bulgaria	**5,10**	**2,00**	2,65	2,64	0,00	NAP	NAP	0,00	NAP	**0,45**	NAP
Croatia	**25,80**	**2,74**	22,64	4,86	NA	NA	2,84	NAP	NAP	**0,42**	NAP
Cyprus	**2,99**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**1,11**	NA
Czech Republic	**8,78**	**3,13**	5,39	4,26	1,11	NAP	1,11	NAP	0,02	**0,07**	0,19
Denmark	**40,27**	**0,92**	35,15	4,97	30,09	29,81	0,28	NAP	0,10	**NAP**	4,20
Estonia	**24,03**	**1,29**	22,51	5,02	17,50	7,76	9,74	NAP	NAP	**0,23**	NAP
Finland	**9,22**	**0,17**	8,46	8,46	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,38**	0,20
France	**3,87**	**2,14**	0,19	0,19	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,38**	1,16
Germany	**NA**	**1,27**	NA	2,50	NA	5,71	0,17	NA	NA	**0,59**	1,03
Greece	**2,11**	**1,37**	0,20	0,14	0,02	0,02	0,00	0,00	0,04	**0,49**	0,04
Hungary	**7,06**	**1,30**	5,22	1,91	3,29	NAP	3,23	0,06	0,02	**0,20**	0,33
Ireland	**3,73**	**2,12**	1,61	1,61	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**5,08**	**2,15**	2,84	2,84	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,09**	NAP
Latvia	**18,92**	**1,61**	17,23	4,49	12,74	12,74	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,08**	NAP
Lithuania	**6,35**	**2,91**	2,35	2,21	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,15	**0,74**	0,34
Luxembourg	**1,83**	**1,01**	0,65	0,12	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,53	**0,18**	NAP
Malta	**2,52**	**1,89**	0,60	0,60	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Netherlands	**6,08**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,69**	NAP
Poland	**27,14**	**2,60**	23,57	9,48	14,09	11,89	2,19	NAP	NAP	**0,19**	0,79
Portugal	**NA**	**2,48**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,24**	NAP
Romania	**8,47**	**7,85**	0,20	0,18	0,03	0,03	0,00	NAP	NAP	**0,42**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**12,05**	**1,67**	6,28	2,17	2,77	NAP	2,50	0,27	1,34	**0,09**	4,01
Slovenia	**27,15**	**1,35**	19,35	6,86	12,49	10,47	2,03	NAP	NAP	**0,12**	6,32
Spain	**6,35**	**3,13**	2,87	2,87	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,36**	NAP
Sweden	**2,40**	**0,64**	0,18	0,18	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1,51**	0,07
Average	**12,08**	**2,18**	9,19	3,74	8,31	9,39	2,45	0,08	0,31	**0,39**	**1,90**
Median	**7,06**	**1,89**	3,48	2,64	3,48	7,76	2,19	0,03	0,10	**0,36**	**0,79**
Minimum	**1,83**	**0,17**	0,18	0,12	0,00	0,02	0,00	0,00	0,02	**0,03**	**0,04**
Maximum	**40,27**	**7,85**	35,15	17,39	30,09	29,81	9,74	0,27	1,34	**1,51**	**6,32**
% of NA	7%	7%	15%	11%	15%	11%	7%	11%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	4%	37%	56%	44%	74%	67%	4%	48%

Table 3.1.1.3a: First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2023

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 248 665**	**78 693**	2 559 845	1 590 943	968 902	554 718	414 184	NAP	NAP	**50 758**	559 369
Belgium	**1 098 529**	**669 324**	409 422	NAP	409 422	NAP	409 422	NAP	NAP	**19 783**	NAP
Bulgaria	**332 640**	**131 762**	171 377	171 069	308	NAP	NAP	308	NAP	**29 501**	NAP
Croatia	**960 559**	**108 911**	837 730	175 150	NA	NA	106 042	NAP	NAP	**13 918**	NAP
Cyprus	**32 918**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**11 384**	NA
Czech Republic	**976 167**	**345 003**	593 594	470 395	120 402	NAP	120 402	NAP	2 797	**8 848**	28 722
Denmark	**2 378 373**	**50 453**	2 077 522	288 147	1 783 523	1 766 574	16 949	NAP	5 852	**NAP**	250 398
Estonia	**328 698**	**16 159**	309 616	71 326	238 290	106 451	131 839	NAP	NAP	**2 923**	NAP
Finland	**492 200**	**8 749**	450 218	450 218	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**22 366**	10 867
France	**2 446 309**	**1 402 464**	119 093	119 093	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**243 089**	681 663
Germany	**NA**	**1 046 066**	NA	NA	NA	NA	89 453	NA	NA	**544 561**	863 623
Greece	**215 413**	**131 447**	18 147	12 562	1 220	988	228	4	4 365	**61 780**	4 039
Hungary	**674 203**	**124 464**	506 957	183 431	321 802	NAP	316 130	5 672	1 724	**19 601**	23 181
Ireland	**161 406**	**81 902**	79 504	79 504	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**3 183 421**	**1 397 862**	1 724 643	1 724 643	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**60 916**	NAP
Latvia	**356 682**	**30 173**	324 800	85 398	239 402	239 402	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 709**	NAP
Lithuania	**183 956**	**84 043**	67 839	63 629	NA	NA	NA	NA	4 210	**22 453**	9 621
Luxembourg	**11 790**	**6 287**	4 322	833	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	3 489	**1 181**	NAP
Malta	**12 670**	**10 141**	2 413	2 413	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**116**	NAP
Netherlands	**1 089 945**	**124 533**	856 506	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**108 906**	NAP
Poland	**10 416 679**	**930 609**	9 117 760	3 594 269	5 523 491	4 691 744	831 747	NAP	NAP	**76 855**	291 455
Portugal	**NA**	**253 653**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**30 669**	NAP
Romania	**1 396 954**	**1 289 204**	34 477	30 581	3 896	3 722	174	NAP	NAP	**73 273**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**686 853**	**95 363**	371 320	121 639	171 334	NAP	156 698	14 636	78 347	**3 407**	216 424
Slovenia	**575 866**	**29 001**	411 313	145 392	265 921	222 810	43 111	NAP	NAP	**2 427**	133 125
Spain	**2 698 418**	**1 278 752**	1 252 629	1 252 629	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**167 037**	NAP
Sweden	**259 606**	**65 517**	18 888	18 888	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**167 765**	7 436
Average	**1 368 757**	**376 559**	929 997	484 189	772 916	948 301	202 798	5 155	14 398	**69 809**	236 917
Median	**674 203**	**116 688**	390 371	133 516	239 402	231 106	120 402	2 990	4 210	**22 453**	133 125
Minimum	**11 790**	**6 287**	2 413	833	308	988	174	4	1 724	**116**	4 039
Maximum	**10 416 679**	**1 402 464**	9 117 760	3 594 269	5 523 491	4 691 744	831 747	14 636	78 347	**544 561**	863 623
% of NA	7%	4%	11%	15%	15%	15%	7%	11%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	4%	37%	56%	44%	74%	67%	4%	48%

Table 3.1.1.3b: First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2023

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	**35,47**	**0,86**	27,95	17,37	10,58	6,06	4,52	NAP	NAP	**0,55**	6,11
Belgium	**9,34**	**5,69**	3,48	NAP	3,48	NAP	3,48	NAP	NAP	**0,17**	NAP
Bulgaria	**5,16**	**2,04**	2,66	2,65	0,00	NAP	NAP	0,00	NAP	**0,46**	NAP
Croatia	**24,93**	**2,83**	21,74	4,55	NA	NA	2,75	NAP	NAP	**0,36**	NAP
Cyprus	**3,53**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**1,22**	NA
Czech Republic	**8,96**	**3,17**	5,45	4,32	1,10	NAP	1,10	NAP	0,03	**0,08**	0,26
Denmark	**40,09**	**0,85**	35,02	4,86	30,06	29,78	0,29	NAP	0,10	**NAP**	4,22
Estonia	**24,06**	**1,18**	22,67	5,22	17,45	7,79	9,65	NAP	NAP	**0,21**	NAP
Finland	**8,77**	**0,16**	8,02	8,02	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,40**	0,19
France	**3,58**	**2,05**	0,17	0,17	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,36**	1,00
Germany	**NA**	**1,24**	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,11	NA	NA	**0,64**	1,02
Greece	**2,07**	**1,26**	0,17	0,12	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,04	**0,59**	0,04
Hungary	**7,03**	**1,30**	5,29	1,91	3,36	NAP	3,30	0,06	0,02	**0,20**	0,24
Ireland	**3,02**	**1,53**	1,49	1,49	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**5,40**	**2,37**	2,92	2,92	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,10**	NAP
Latvia	**19,05**	**1,61**	17,35	4,56	12,79	12,79	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,09**	NAP
Lithuania	**6,37**	**2,91**	2,35	2,20	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,15	**0,78**	0,33
Luxembourg	**1,75**	**0,94**	0,64	0,12	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,52	**0,18**	NAP
Malta	**2,25**	**1,80**	0,43	0,43	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Netherlands	**6,07**	**0,69**	4,77	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,61**	NAP
Poland	**27,68**	**2,47**	24,23	9,55	14,68	12,47	2,21	NAP	NAP	**0,20**	0,77
Portugal	**NA**	**2,38**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,29**	NAP
Romania	**7,33**	**6,76**	0,18	0,16	0,02	0,02	0,00	NAP	NAP	**0,38**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**12,66**	**1,76**	6,85	2,24	3,16	NAP	2,89	0,27	1,44	**0,06**	3,99
Slovenia	**27,11**	**1,37**	19,37	6,85	12,52	10,49	2,03	NAP	NAP	**0,11**	6,27
Spain	**5,55**	**2,63**	2,58	2,58	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,34**	NAP
Sweden	**2,46**	**0,62**	0,18	0,18	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1,59**	0,07
Average	**11,99**	**2,02**	9,00	3,75	8,40	9,93	2,49	0,08	0,33	**0,40**	1,89
Median	**7,03**	**1,68**	4,13	2,62	3,48	9,14	2,21	0,03	0,10	**0,34**	0,77
Minimum	**1,75**	**0,16**	0,17	0,12	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,02	**0,02**	0,04
Maximum	**40,09**	**6,76**	35,02	17,37	30,06	29,78	9,65	0,27	1,44	**1,59**	6,27
% of NA	7%	4%	11%	15%	15%	15%	7%	11%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	4%	37%	56%	44%	74%	67%	4%	48%

Table 3.1.1.4a: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2023

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	**470 535**	**451 034**	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	**19 501**	NAP
Bulgaria	**84 076**	**67 271**	7 055	7 032	23	NAP	NAP	23	NAP	**9 750**	NAP
Croatia	**293 649**	**158 947**	126 294	89 210	NA	NA	5 899	NAP	NAP	**8 408**	NAP
Cyprus	**54 601**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**11 840**	NA
Czech Republic	**364 482**	**118 658**	148 146	143 640	4 231	NAP	4 231	NAP	275	**5 132**	93 046
Denmark	**147 626**	**36 586**	78 434	63 089	12 244	1 800	10 444	NAP	3 101	**NAP**	32 606
Estonia	**25 218**	**8 657**	15 223	9 619	5 604	2 472	3 130	NAP	NAP	**1 338**	NAP
Finland	**153 144**	**8 368**	122 890	122 890	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**16 122**	5 764
France	**2 076 139**	**1 361 614**	98 013	98 013	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**214 292**	402 220
Germany	**NA**	**712 976**	NA	NA	NA	NA	2 035 276	NA	NA	**583 473**	552 533
Greece	**379 037**	**277 588**	25 118	19 938	2 972	2 822	149	1	2 208	**74 252**	2 079
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	**3 029 329**	**1 957 629**	972 408	972 408	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**99 292**	NAP
Latvia	**31 267**	**16 827**	13 480	9 559	3 921	3 921	NAP	NAP	NAP	**960**	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	**14 016**	**12 607**	980	980	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**429**	NAP
Netherlands	**243 476**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**79 586**	NAP
Poland	**2 639 596**	**911 474**	1 576 528	510 896	1 065 632	966 294	99 338	NAP	NAP	**27 458**	124 136
Portugal	**NA**	**185 895**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**50 145**	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	**86 853**	**27 372**	39 389	35 301	4 088	3 797	291	NAP	NAP	**4 167**	15 925
Spain	**2 491 452**	**1 555 495**	746 620	746 620	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**189 337**	NAP
Sweden	**76 989**	**28 111**	7 466	7 466	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**38 033**	3 379
Average	**597 671**	**367 488**	214 236	161 788	97 424	125 510	183 617	692	8 147	**63 054**	102 150
Median	**150 385**	**56 586**	39 389	29 281	5 985	3 859	6 028	288	1 057	**16 122**	26 813
Minimum	**6 409**	**3 802**	980	832	23	1 800	149	1	275	**429**	785
Maximum	**3 029 329**	**1 957 629**	1 576 528	972 408	1 065 632	966 294	2 035 276	2 190	49 804	**583 473**	552 533
% of NA	11%	11%	22%	19%	15%	11%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	7%	41%	59%	48%	78%	67%	4%	48%

Table 3.1.1.4b: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2023

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	**5,62**	**0,33**	4,14	3,84	0,30	*0,16*	*0,14*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,48**	0,67
Belgium	**4,00**	**3,83**	NA	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,17**	NAP
Bulgaria	**1,30**	**1,04**	0,11	0,11	0,00	*NAP*	*NAP*	*0,00*	NAP	**0,15**	NAP
Croatia	**7,62**	**4,12**	3,28	2,32	NA	*NA*	*0,15*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,22**	NAP
Cyprus	**5,85**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1,27**	NA
Czech Republic	**3,34**	**1,09**	1,36	1,32	0,04	*NAP*	*0,04*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,05**	0,85
Denmark	**2,49**	**0,62**	1,32	1,06	0,21	*0,03*	*0,18*	*NAP*	0,05	**NAP**	0,55
Estonia	**1,85**	**0,63**	1,11	0,70	0,41	*0,18*	*0,23*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,10**	NAP
Finland	**2,73**	**0,15**	2,19	2,19	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,29**	0,10
France	**3,04**	**1,99**	0,14	0,14	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,31**	0,59
Germany	**NA**	**0,84**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,40*	*NA*	NA	**0,69**	0,65
Greece	**3,64**	**2,67**	0,24	0,19	0,03	*0,03*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,02	**0,71**	0,02
Hungary	**1,20**	**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	**5,14**	**3,32**	1,65	1,65	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,17**	NAP
Latvia	**1,67**	**0,90**	0,72	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	**0,95**	**0,57**	0,16	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,16	**0,23**	NAP
Malta	**2,49**	**2,24**	0,17	0,17	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,08**	NAP
Netherlands	**1,36**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,44**	NAP
Poland	**7,01**	**2,42**	4,19	1,36	2,83	*2,57*	*0,26*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	0,33
Portugal	**NA**	**1,75**	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,47**	NAP
Romania	**4,57**	**4,04**	0,12	0,05	0,08	*0,04*	*0,03*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,41**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**2,62**	**0,83**	1,46	0,43	0,12	*NAP*	*0,11*	*0,01*	0,92	**0,18**	0,14
Slovenia	**4,09**	**1,29**	1,85	1,66	0,19	*0,18*	*0,01*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,20**	0,75
Spain	**5,13**	**3,20**	1,54	1,54	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	**3,32**	**1,65**	1,25	0,97	0,39	0,42	0,31	0,01	0,17	**0,31**	0,38
Median	**2,88**	**1,07**	1,11	0,61	0,20	0,17	0,14	0,01	0,02	**0,22**	0,33
Minimum	**0,73**	**0,15**	0,04	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,05**	0,02
Maximum	**7,62**	**4,12**	4,19	3,84	2,83	2,57	2,40	0,02	0,92	**1,27**	0,85
% of NA	11%	11%	22%	19%	15%	11%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	7%	41%	59%	48%	78%	67%	4%	48%

Table 3.1.1.5: First instance civil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2023

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q91)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	NA	NA	14 319	32,89%
Belgium	199 087	44,1%	1 546	7,93%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	52 964	33,3%	273	3,25%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	729	8,4%	76	5,68%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	25 625	11,96%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	1 980	0,7%	50 330	67,78%
Hungary	2 443	5,3%	57	0,89%
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	NA	NA	40 908	41,20%
Latvia	759	4,5%	10	1,04%
Lithuania	894	3,2%	387	9,79%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	5 193	41,2%	248	57,81%
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	712	2,59%
Portugal	37 803	20,3%	NA	NA
Romania	26 354	3,4%	1 915	2,47%
Slovak Republic	5 722	12,7%	NA	NA
Slovenia	9 198	33,6%	866	20,78%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	492	1,8%	97	0,26%
Average	**26 432**	**16,4%**	**9 158**	**17,8%**
Median	**5 193**	**8,4%**	**712**	**7,9%**
Minimum	**492**	**0,7%**	**10**	**0,3%**
Maximum	**199 087**	**44,1%**	**50 330**	**67,8%**
% of NA	**52%**	**52%**	**37%**	**37%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**7%**	**7%**

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. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	6,10	NA	5,55	6,00	6,04	5,92	5,87	5,95	5,72	5,76	5,85
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,87
Bulgaria	1,09	1,06	0,98	1,03	1,10	1,18	1,32	1,38	1,35	1,37	1,36
Croatia	9,79	9,27	8,46	7,99	7,64	7,30	6,34	8,21	7,80	8,60	7,25
Cyprus	NA	5,79	6,90	6,18	6,39	6,62	5,50	6,03	6,04	6,52	6,39
Czech Republic	2,82	3,57	5,18	4,89	4,40	4,19	3,98	3,82	4,05	3,71	3,53
Denmark	2,09	2,02	2,04	2,12	2,35	2,49	2,82	2,63	2,35	2,20	2,31
Estonia	NA	1,84	1,81	2,19	2,27	1,98	1,92	1,87	1,59	1,81	1,82
Finland	2,51	2,51	2,32	2,33	2,47	2,79	2,10	2,81	2,38	2,17	2,28
France	2,50	2,55	2,72	2,78	2,83	2,72	2,82	2,82	2,94	2,79	2,75
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,82	3,52	3,60
Hungary	NA	1,65	1,53	1,51	1,40	1,81	1,34	1,28	1,42	1,19	1,18
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	8,01	8,04	7,61	6,96	6,59	6,29	6,13	6,09	6,06	5,70	5,45
Latvia	2,05	1,79	1,90	1,64	1,51	1,32	1,30	1,26	1,53	1,67	1,82
Lithuania	1,15	1,44	1,58	1,55	1,37	1,18	1,11	1,02	1,25	1,16	1,19
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,77	0,85	0,85	0,87
Malta	2,28	2,47	2,35	2,05	NA	2,00	2,05	2,18	2,18	2,19	2,33
Netherlands	1,71	1,81	1,83	1,75	1,66	1,62	1,53	NA	NA	NA	1,35
Poland	-	4,47	-	4,11	6,22	6,05	6,29	9,84	8,71	8,36	7,55
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	3,90	4,12	3,71	3,31	3,23	3,29	3,05	3,06	3,31	3,14	3,43
Slovak Republic	6,28	7,52	7,30	5,90	4,85	4,94	3,64	4,95	3,37	3,33	3,22
Slovenia	14,71	13,84	12,20	9,30	7,19	5,89	5,23	4,65	4,93	4,31	4,06
Spain	-	3,17	3,11	2,97	2,74	3,03	3,41	3,74	4,24	4,10	4,33
Sweden	0,85	0,83	0,76	0,71	0,80	0,96	1,02	1,01	0,94	0,85	0,79
Average	4,24	3,99	3,99	3,68	3,65	3,50	3,27	3,59	3,49	3,42	3,27
Median	2,50	2,53	2,53	2,78	2,79	2,79	2,82	2,82	3,13	2,96	2,99
Minimum	0,85	0,83	0,76	0,71	0,80	0,96	1,02	0,77	0,85	0,85	0,79
Maximum	14,71	13,84	12,20	9,30	7,64	7,30	6,34	9,84	8,71	8,60	7,55
% of NA	33%	26%	22%	22%	26%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	11%
% 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 litigiousl cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,46	0,44	0,40	0,38	0,36	0,37	0,36	0,35	0,35	0,32	0,31
Belgium	NA	NA	1,61	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,74
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,08
Croatia	5,19	5,16	4,67	4,44	3,90	3,65	3,30	3,74	4,35	5,20	4,11
Cyprus	5,16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	1,63	2,36	2,04	1,76	1,54	1,40	1,34	1,21	1,29	1,15	1,13
Denmark	0,42	0,38	0,37	0,36	0,36	0,35	0,40	0,48	0,45	0,48	0,55
Estonia	0,64	0,52	0,46	0,44	0,47	0,48	0,46	0,53	0,53	0,53	0,53
Finland	0,18	0,17	0,16	0,17	0,13	0,12	0,12	0,12	0,13	0,13	0,13
France	2,17	2,22	2,36	2,41	2,43	2,37	2,46	2,46	2,56	1,87	1,91
Germany	0,91	0,97	0,96	0,92	0,87	0,85	0,89	0,91	0,93	0,85	0,81
Greece	4,32	2,57	2,27	2,24	2,27	2,35	2,63	NA	2,54	2,40	2,55
Hungary	0,79	0,83	0,76	0,78	0,80	0,89	0,65	0,59	0,60	0,53	0,48
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	5,77	5,04	4,93	4,44	4,10	3,86	3,83	3,77	3,76	3,54	3,53
Latvia	1,67	1,52	1,60	1,42	1,29	1,02	0,98	0,90	0,96	0,89	0,92
Lithuania	0,88	0,93	1,04	0,97	1,05	0,97	0,84	0,80	1,00	0,94	0,96
Luxembourg	0,91	0,22	0,25	0,19	0,19	0,21	0,26	0,40	0,49	0,49	0,50
Malta	2,15	2,30	2,19	1,96	NA	1,86	1,97	2,03	1,97	2,11	2,18
Netherlands	NA	NA	0,31	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	1,74	-	1,86	1,89	2,10	2,38	2,39	2,30	2,24	2,29
Portugal	3,47	NA	3,57	3,03	2,64	2,24	1,97	1,80	1,84	1,76	1,65
Romania	2,90	3,56	3,35	3,04	2,92	3,00	2,83	2,83	2,85	2,69	2,95
Slovak Republic	2,78	3,44	3,67	2,92	1,73	2,02	1,31	1,10	1,13	1,05	0,91
Slovenia	2,69	2,61	2,34	2,20	2,04	1,86	1,65	1,48	1,47	1,34	1,30
Spain	-	1,80	1,85	1,81	1,70	2,01	2,33	2,48	2,83	2,71	2,72
Sweden	0,33	0,32	0,29	0,26	0,26	0,26	0,28	0,29	0,27	0,25	0,24
Average	2,16	1,86	1,80	1,73	1,57	1,56	1,51	1,46	1,57	1,52	1,56
Median	1,67	1,74	1,61	1,78	1,54	1,63	1,33	1,10	1,21	1,10	1,11
Minimum	0,18	0,17	0,16	0,17	0,13	0,12	0,12	0,12	0,13	0,13	0,13
Maximum	5,77	5,16	4,93	4,44	4,10	3,86	3,83	3,77	4,35	5,20	4,11
% of NA	15%	22%	11%	19%	22%	19%	19%	22%	19%	19%	11%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3.1.2.3: Evolution of the first instance administrativel cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,55	0,65	*0,81*	*0,89*	*0,82*	0,68	0,54	0,48
Belgium	NA	0,29	0,33	0,28	0,24	*0,19*	*0,21*	*0,19*	0,18	0,13	0,13
Bulgaria	0,15	0,12	0,12	0,12	0,11	*0,13*	*0,14*	*0,14*	0,15	0,16	0,16
Croatia	0,17	0,28	0,33	0,36	0,33	*0,26*	*0,21*	*0,18*	0,17	0,16	0,14
Cyprus	0,63	0,95	0,95	0,91	0,88	*0,92*	*0,64*	*0,57*	0,62	1,24	1,38
Czech Republic	NAP	0,08	0,09	0,08	0,10	*0,10*	*0,11*	*0,10*	0,09	0,07	0,06
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,07	0,08	0,10	0,09	0,07	*0,07*	*0,06*	*0,07*	0,08	0,09	0,09
Finland	0,35	0,37	0,38	0,28	0,42	*0,38*	*0,32*	*0,33*	0,33	0,32	0,30
France	0,23	0,23	0,24	0,24	0,24	*0,24*	*0,25*	*0,26*	0,27	0,28	0,29
Germany	0,80	0,82	0,81	0,78	0,85	*1,02*	*1,04*	*0,97*	0,90	0,82	0,74
Greece	3,47	NA	2,84	2,44	2,23	*1,87*	*NA*	*1,31*	1,06	0,93	0,82
Hungary	0,06	0,05	0,07	0,06	0,06	*0,06*	*0,05*	*0,05*	0,08	0,07	0,07
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,58	0,50	0,44	0,40	0,35	*0,30*	*0,28*	*0,25*	0,23	0,21	0,19
Latvia	0,22	0,13	0,07	0,07	0,07	*0,07*	*0,07*	*0,06*	0,06	0,07	0,06
Lithuania	0,11	0,32	0,38	0,38	0,15	*0,10*	*0,16*	*0,14*	0,15	0,16	0,17
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*0,19*	0,21	0,22	0,23
Malta	0,13	0,17	0,15	0,09	0,09	*0,08*	*0,08*	*0,07*	0,07	0,07	0,07
Netherlands	0,30	0,29	0,30	0,28	0,31	*0,27*	*0,30*	*NA*	NA	NA	0,36
Poland	-	0,05	-	0,09	0,08	*0,07*	*0,06*	*0,06*	0,07	0,09	0,09
Portugal	NA	NA	0,66	0,73	0,71	*0,70*	*0,67*	*0,64*	0,59	0,56	0,52
Romania	0,67	0,49	0,31	0,21	0,26	*0,24*	*0,16*	*0,16*	0,38	0,36	0,37
Slovak Republic	0,33	0,34	0,30	0,12	0,10	*0,09*	*0,10*	*0,12*	0,13	0,15	0,16
Slovenia	0,09	0,09	0,08	0,08	0,10	*0,16*	*0,17*	*0,19*	0,18	0,18	0,19
Spain	-	0,49	0,44	0,38	0,34	*0,32*	*0,33*	*0,36*	0,36	0,36	0,37
Sweden	0,39	0,38	0,35	0,34	0,42	*0,58*	*0,63*	*0,59*	0,55	0,49	0,44
Average	0,48	0,31	0,44	0,39	0,38	0,38	0,30	0,33	0,32	0,32	0,31
Median	0,26	0,29	0,32	0,28	0,25	0,24	0,21	0,19	0,19	0,20	0,19
Minimum	0,06	0,05	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,05	0,05	0,06	0,07	0,06
Maximum	3,47	0,95	2,84	2,44	2,23	1,87	1,04	1,31	1,06	1,24	1,38
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**11%**	**7%**	**7%**	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**15%**	**11%**	**11%**	**7%**	**7%**	**7%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**

Table 3.1.3.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	39,91	NA	37,78	37,58	36,72	*37,03*	*36,21*	*34,97*	34,71	34,82	35,23
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	8,75	4,38	*9,28*	*8,6*	*8,56*	8,39	8,34	9,48
Bulgaria	4,88	4,43	4,83	4,79	5,64	*5,41*	*5,43*	*4,51*	5,1	5,01	5,1
Croatia	25,58	22,22	21,56	23,2	22,9	*21,65*	*24,63*	*22,05*	26,75	26,33	25,8
Cyprus	NA	2,79	3,5	2,4	1,77	*2,39*	*2,34*	*2,4*	3,14	3,06	2,99
Czech Republic	16,5	9,11	10,76	9,83	9,52	*8,8*	*9,*	*8,69*	8,57	8,59	8,78
Denmark	41,19	40,44	45,43	38,84	39,54	*39,22*	*49,28*	*47,51*	46,12	48,66	40,27
Estonia	NA	18,12	17,95	24,71	20,35	*22,58*	*22,7*	*23,39*	24,33	24,07	24,03
Finland	9,52	8,05	8,05	8,2	9,01	*9,05*	*9,47*	*8,46*	8,82	8,24	9,22
France	3,48	3,45	3,43	3,36	3,18	*2,81*	*2,69*	*2,08*	2,22	3,58	3,87
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	2,43	2,01	2,11
Hungary	11,79	8,61	9,18	8,88	8,58	*7,5*	*6,79*	*6,41*	6,39	6,81	7,06
Ireland	NA	5,41	5,26	4,99	4,7	*4,61*	*4,68*	*3,6*	2,7	3,57	3,73
Italy	6,99	6,58	5,74	6,04	5,71	*5,83*	*5,72*	*4,51*	5,12	5,23	5,08
Latvia	3,8	3,59	15,69	16,19	16,39	*16,52*	*18,72*	*19,28*	18,26	19,65	18,92
Lithuania	10,08	10,7	11,13	11,72	9,52	*7,54*	*7,18*	*6,96*	6,56	6,47	6,35
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	1,85	1,79	*1,93*	*2,27*	*2,1*	2,03	1,81	1,83
Malta	,99	1,54	1,55	1,46	2,29	*2,49*	*2,65*	*2,12*	2,58	2,63	2,52
Netherlands	7,35	7,46	7,39	7,29	7,24	*6,94*	*6,98*	*6,44*	6,18	6,11	6,08
Poland	-	25,96	-	28,04	30,26	*28,59*	*35,61*	*27,6*	27,55	26,79	27,14
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Romania	8,02	7,33	7,31	7,53	7,46	*6,98*	*7,27*	*6,68*	6,98	7,59	8,47
Slovak Republic	12,75	11,33	9,87	16,98	15,72	*10,88*	*14,71*	*12,42*	14,53	14,41	12,05
Slovenia	44,7	42,3	38,77	34,39	32,16	*30,66*	*30,07*	*26,17*	28,54	27,39	27,15
Spain	-	4,64	4,8	4,24	4,59	*4,94*	*5,3*	*4,93*	5,63	5,9	6,35
Sweden	2,08	2,03	1,92	2,32	2,5	*2,54*	*2,66*	*2,74*	2,57	2,28	2,4
Average	14,68	11,72	12,95	13,07	12,58	12,34	13,37	12,27	12,25	12,37	12,08
Median	9,52	7,46	8,05	8,47	8,02	7,52	7,22	6,82	6,56	6,81	7,06
Minimum	,99	1,54	1,55	1,46	1,77	1,93	2,27	2,08	2,03	1,81	1,83
Maximum	44,7	42,3	45,43	38,84	39,54	39,22	49,28	47,51	46,12	48,66	40,27
% of NA	**30%**	**22%**	**19%**	**11%**	**11%**	**11%**	**11%**	**11%**	**7%**	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**

Table 3.1.3.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigiousl cases - incoming 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	1,19	1,11	1,05	0,97	0,96	0,95	0,94	0,83	0,83	0,80	0,88
Belgium	6,69	6,72	6,81	6,42	1,89	6,71	6,13	6,06	5,87	5,72	5,79
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,00
Croatia	4,80	3,92	3,83	3,26	3,15	2,86	3,18	2,73	4,19	2,53	2,74
Cyprus	4,48	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	4,46	4,57	3,77	3,14	3,41	3,25	3,33	2,85	2,96	2,89	3,13
Denmark	0,78	0,74	0,74	0,72	0,71	0,72	0,84	0,70	0,74	0,79	0,92
Estonia	1,35	1,28	1,15	1,25	1,23	1,17	1,40	1,43	1,32	1,26	1,29
Finland	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,16	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,17	0,16	0,14	0,17
France	2,72	2,64	2,61	2,54	2,47	2,24	2,09	1,59	1,68	1,98	2,14
Germany	1,76	1,78	1,74	1,59	1,51	1,52	1,54	1,47	1,30	1,19	1,27
Greece	6,23	2,23	2,12	1,36	1,86	1,99	1,92	NA	1,73	1,31	1,37
Hungary	1,83	1,83	1,79	1,89	1,81	1,38	1,37	1,29	1,25	1,25	1,30
Ireland	4,24	3,11	2,97	2,73	2,69	2,70	2,75	2,67	2,09	2,00	2,12
Italy	2,69	2,61	2,55	2,57	2,47	2,55	2,44	1,92	2,13	2,23	2,15
Latvia	2,01	2,25	2,01	1,99	1,47	1,45	1,58	1,53	1,52	1,59	1,61
Lithuania	3,63	3,97	3,56	4,39	4,05	3,55	3,32	3,32	3,26	3,07	2,91
Luxembourg	0,84	0,90	0,81	0,77	0,76	0,85	1,22	1,21	1,19	1,03	1,01
Malta	0,92	1,51	1,54	1,44	1,61	1,82	1,81	1,44	1,88	2,01	1,89
Netherlands	NA	0,99	0,95	0,94	0,86	0,78	0,80	0,73	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	3,19	-	3,11	3,52	3,45	3,27	2,47	2,38	2,35	2,60
Portugal	3,09	NA	3,06	3,00	2,92	2,89	3,14	2,47	2,52	2,51	2,48
Romania	4,16	6,85	6,85	6,80	6,55	6,39	6,68	6,12	6,40	6,99	7,85
Slovak Republic	3,01	2,79	2,05	3,70	3,54	2,33	2,14	1,97	1,79	1,84	1,67
Slovenia	3,09	2,91	2,77	2,50	2,17	1,96	1,76	1,52	1,50	1,38	1,35
Spain	-	2,16	2,34	2,15	2,54	2,73	2,73	2,55	2,85	2,85	3,13
Sweden	0,68	0,66	0,61	0,60	0,61	0,63	0,66	0,60	0,61	0,58	0,64
Average	2,82	2,54	2,41	2,40	2,20	2,28	2,29	2,07	2,17	2,10	2,18
Median	2,72	2,24	2,09	2,15	1,89	1,99	1,92	1,56	1,76	1,91	1,89
Minimum	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,16	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,17	0,16	0,14	0,17
Maximum	6,69	6,85	6,85	6,80	6,55	6,71	6,68	6,12	6,40	6,99	7,85
% of NA	7%	11%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	11%	11%	11%	7%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3.1.3.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - incoming 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,65	0,84	*0,81*	*0,62*	*0,51*	0,52	0,55	0,55
Belgium	NA	0,22	0,20	0,17	0,17	*0,15*	*0,15*	*0,15*	0,15	0,17	0,21
Bulgaria	0,36	0,34	0,37	0,35	0,44	*0,44*	*0,50*	*0,42*	0,42	0,44	0,45
Croatia	0,33	0,33	0,34	0,35	0,29	*0,33*	*0,32*	*0,30*	0,35	0,33	0,42
Cyprus	0,78	0,19	0,20	0,18	0,22	*0,22*	*0,21*	*0,32*	1,19	1,26	1,11
Czech Republic	NAP	0,09	0,09	0,11	0,10	*0,11*	*0,10*	*0,09*	0,09	0,07	0,07
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,22	0,29	0,26	0,22	0,23	*0,19*	*0,19*	*0,21*	0,23	0,21	0,23
Finland	0,52	0,52	0,49	0,71	0,50	*0,45*	*0,46*	*0,45*	0,39	0,38	0,38
France	0,27	0,29	0,29	0,29	0,29	*0,32*	*0,34*	*0,31*	0,36	0,35	0,38
Germany	0,82	0,81	0,80	0,90	1,05	*0,90*	*0,82*	*0,70*	0,66	0,58	0,59
Greece	0,65	NA	0,50	0,50	0,56	*0,56*	*NA*	*0,42*	0,44	0,49	0,49
Hungary	0,16	0,18	0,18	0,20	0,17	*0,18*	*0,17*	*0,30*	0,21	0,20	0,20
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,09	0,10	0,10	0,09	0,08	*0,08*	*0,08*	*0,07*	0,08	0,09	0,09
Latvia	0,14	0,12	0,11	0,12	0,11	*0,10*	*0,10*	*0,09*	0,10	0,10	0,08
Lithuania	0,61	0,49	0,59	0,52	0,42	*0,53*	*0,51*	*0,51*	0,58	0,82	0,74
Luxembourg	0,25	0,24	0,22	0,20	0,20	*0,20*	*0,23*	*0,17*	0,17	0,17	0,18
Malta	0,08	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02	*0,03*	*0,03*	*0,03*	0,03	0,03	0,03
Netherlands	0,66	0,65	0,59	0,66	0,58	*0,58*	*0,61*	*0,57*	0,50	0,52	0,69
Poland	-	0,22	-	0,20	0,19	*0,17*	*0,18*	*0,18*	0,23	0,21	0,19
Portugal	NA	NA	0,34	0,25	0,24	*0,24*	*0,27*	*0,20*	0,25	0,23	0,24
Romania	0,98	0,35	0,33	0,60	0,75	*0,43*	*0,43*	*0,41*	0,42	0,44	0,42
Slovak Republic	0,21	0,21	0,20	0,16	0,09	*0,09*	*0,10*	*0,09*	0,10	0,09	0,09
Slovenia	0,25	0,26	0,23	0,14	0,19	*0,17*	*0,15*	*0,14*	0,13	0,13	0,12
Spain	-	0,39	0,37	0,35	0,35	*0,37*	*0,42*	*0,33*	0,39	0,38	0,36
Sweden	1,10	1,09	1,03	1,44	1,62	*1,63*	*1,72*	*1,85*	1,70	1,45	1,51
Average	0,45	0,34	0,34	0,38	0,39	0,37	0,36	0,35	0,39	0,39	0,39
Median	0,33	0,27	0,29	0,25	0,24	0,24	0,25	0,30	0,35	0,33	0,36
Minimum	0,08	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03
Maximum	1,10	1,09	1,03	1,44	1,62	1,63	1,72	1,85	1,70	1,45	1,51
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**7%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**15%**	**11%**	**11%**	**7%**	**7%**	**7%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**

Table 3.1.4.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	40,21	NA	37,86	37,74	36,94	*37,12*	*36,36*	*34,87*	34,64	34,70	35,47
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	8,94	NA	*10,06*	*8,67*	*8,42*	8,77	8,47	9,34
Bulgaria	4,92	4,52	4,78	4,73	5,49	*5,28*	*5,38*	*4,55*	5,16	5,01	5,16
Croatia	26,14	22,92	21,90	23,61	23,29	*22,64*	*22,85*	*22,85*	26,04	27,48	24,93
Cyprus	NA	2,47	3,15	2,55	2,01	*2,99*	*2,30*	*2,12*	2,55	3,11	3,53
Czech Republic	15,98	8,86	11,01	10,33	9,61	*9,00*	*9,07*	*8,53*	8,80	8,76	8,96
Denmark	41,31	40,43	45,42	38,70	39,44	*39,06*	*49,55*	*47,87*	46,27	48,57	40,09
Estonia	NA	17,79	25,07	24,15	21,17	*22,69*	*22,71*	*23,71*	24,08	24,00	24,06
Finland	9,52	8,23	7,95	8,04	8,68	*9,60*	*8,97*	*8,89*	9,03	8,12	8,77
France	3,41	3,27	3,36	3,31	3,30	*2,71*	*2,67*	*1,94*	2,34	3,46	3,58
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	2,22	2,02	2,07
Hungary	11,50	8,85	9,30	9,07	8,51	*7,95*	*6,84*	*6,30*	6,62	6,83	7,03
Ireland	NA	3,94	4,03	3,79	3,84	*3,62*	*3,53*	*2,01*	2,04	2,99	3,02
Italy	7,46	7,19	6,41	6,31	5,88	*6,00*	*5,90*	*4,63*	5,47	5,51	5,40
Latvia	4,01	3,61	15,85	16,35	16,57	*16,56*	*18,71*	*19,09*	18,30	19,52	19,05
Lithuania	9,81	10,57	11,18	11,92	9,71	*7,62*	*7,26*	*6,74*	6,63	6,42	6,37
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	1,88	1,77	*1,84*	*2,10*	*2,00*	2,01	1,78	1,75
Malta	1,04	1,57	1,72	1,57	2,20	*2,41*	*2,42*	*1,93*	2,30	2,28	2,25
Netherlands	7,25	7,39	7,43	7,31	7,20	*6,99*	*6,95*	*6,34*	6,40	6,02	6,07
Poland	-	26,44	-	26,06	30,43	*28,31*	*32,11*	*28,78*	28,02	27,60	27,68
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Romania	8,83	8,14	7,75	7,62	7,42	*7,23*	*7,28*	*6,46*	7,15	7,30	7,33
Slovak Republic	11,57	11,55	10,37	18,02	17,08	*12,12*	*13,40*	*14,03*	14,58	14,51	12,66
Slovenia	45,56	43,91	41,65	36,48	33,41	*31,28*	*30,60*	*25,89*	29,13	27,63	27,11
Spain	-	4,69	4,79	4,43	4,31	*4,54*	*4,96*	*4,43*	5,73	5,64	5,55
Sweden	2,09	2,09	1,99	2,22	2,34	*2,47*	*2,67*	*2,80*	2,66	2,34	2,46
Average	14,74	11,83	13,47	13,13	13,07	12,50	13,05	12,30	12,28	12,40	11,99
Median	9,52	8,14	7,95	8,49	8,51	7,78	7,27	6,60	6,63	6,83	7,03
Minimum	1,04	1,57	1,72	1,57	1,77	1,84	2,10	1,93	2,01	1,78	1,75
Maximum	45,56	43,91	45,42	38,70	39,44	39,06	49,55	47,87	46,27	48,57	40,09
% of NA	**30%**	**22%**	**19%**	**11%**	**15%**	**11%**	**11%**	**11%**	**7%**	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**

Table 3.1.4.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigiousl cases - resolved 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	1,20	1,14	1,07	0,99	0,95	0,95	0,94	0,82	0,86	0,80	0,86
Belgium	NA	6,57	6,74	6,58	2,12	7,55	6,18	5,99	6,20	5,86	5,69
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,04
Croatia	4,86	4,45	4,10	3,86	3,42	3,21	2,78	2,32	3,38	3,66	2,83
Cyprus	3,51	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	4,03	4,79	4,05	3,46	3,46	3,30	3,38	2,80	3,06	2,95	3,17
Denmark	0,84	0,75	0,75	0,73	0,73	0,68	0,77	0,78	0,72	0,73	0,85
Estonia	1,45	1,33	1,18	1,22	1,22	1,17	1,32	1,42	1,32	1,24	1,18
Finland	0,21	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,17	0,15	0,15	0,16	0,16	0,15	0,16
France	2,65	2,49	2,55	2,51	2,53	2,14	2,09	1,47	1,80	2,03	2,05
Germany	1,75	1,78	1,78	1,63	1,52	1,48	1,52	1,44	1,37	1,23	1,24
Greece	4,99	2,52	2,15	1,35	1,79	1,71	1,66	NA	1,43	1,22	1,26
Hungary	1,79	1,91	1,78	1,86	1,74	1,61	1,43	1,29	1,32	1,30	1,30
Ireland	NA	1,73	1,88	1,61	1,96	1,70	1,73	1,37	1,50	1,42	1,53
Italy	3,18	3,11	3,06	2,91	2,63	2,62	2,55	2,00	2,32	2,33	2,37
Latvia	2,20	2,22	2,18	2,14	1,75	1,50	1,62	1,47	1,56	1,58	1,61
Lithuania	3,59	3,87	3,65	4,32	4,14	3,68	3,37	3,12	3,30	3,05	2,91
Luxembourg	1,53	0,87	0,85	0,77	0,74	0,80	1,07	1,12	1,18	1,01	0,94
Malta	1,00	1,53	1,65	1,55	1,56	1,70	1,66	1,31	1,47	1,75	1,80
Netherlands	0,94	0,99	0,96	0,95	0,85	0,79	0,80	0,73	0,74	0,70	0,69
Poland	-	3,16	-	3,08	3,30	3,18	3,24	2,60	2,46	2,31	2,47
Portugal	3,19	NA	3,56	3,36	3,30	3,15	3,30	2,42	2,57	2,58	2,38
Romania	4,66	7,44	7,17	6,94	6,50	6,56	6,70	6,13	6,55	6,73	6,76
Slovak Republic	2,43	2,56	2,73	4,89	4,57	3,04	2,35	1,97	1,86	1,98	1,76
Slovenia	3,16	3,17	2,91	2,66	2,34	2,15	1,93	1,53	1,61	1,42	1,37
Spain	-	2,12	2,21	2,22	2,23	2,37	2,56	2,20	2,91	2,80	2,63
Sweden	0,69	0,68	0,64	0,59	0,61	0,61	0,64	0,62	0,63	0,59	0,62
Average	2,45	2,56	2,49	2,49	2,25	2,31	2,23	1,96	2,09	2,06	2,02
Median	2,31	2,17	2,17	2,14	1,96	1,71	1,73	1,47	1,56	1,58	1,68
Minimum	0,21	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,17	0,15	0,15	0,16	0,16	0,15	0,16
Maximum	4,99	7,44	7,17	6,94	6,50	7,55	6,70	6,13	6,55	6,73	6,76
% of NA	11%	11%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	11%	7%	7%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3.1.4.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - resolved 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,59	0,67	*0,73*	*0,68*	*0,65*	0,65	0,62	0,55
Belgium	NA	0,20	0,23	0,21	0,18	*0,17*	*0,17*	*0,16*	0,20	0,16	0,17
Bulgaria	0,40	0,35	0,37	0,37	0,42	*0,44*	*0,49*	*0,42*	0,42	0,44	0,46
Croatia	0,21	0,28	0,32	0,38	0,36	*0,38*	*0,35*	*0,32*	0,35	0,35	0,36
Cyprus	0,45	0,19	0,24	0,21	0,16	*0,49*	*0,36*	*0,26*	0,55	1,11	1,22
Czech Republic	NAP	0,08	0,08	0,09	0,10	*0,10*	*0,11*	*0,11*	0,11	0,09	0,08
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,20	0,26	0,27	0,24	0,23	*0,19*	*0,18*	*0,19*	0,21	0,21	0,21
Finland	0,49	0,50	0,50	0,56	0,54	*0,50*	*0,46*	*0,44*	0,40	0,40	0,40
France	0,28	0,28	0,28	0,29	0,30	*0,31*	*0,33*	*0,30*	0,34	0,34	0,36
Germany	0,82	0,81	0,82	0,83	0,88	*0,88*	*0,89*	*0,77*	0,72	0,66	0,64
Greece	0,99	NA	0,92	0,74	0,93	*0,92*	*NA*	*0,69*	0,57	0,62	0,59
Hungary	0,17	0,17	0,19	0,20	0,17	*0,18*	*0,17*	*0,26*	0,23	0,20	0,20
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,17	0,16	0,14	0,14	0,13	*0,11*	*0,11*	*0,10*	0,10	0,12	0,10
Latvia	0,23	0,17	0,12	0,11	0,11	*0,10*	*0,10*	*0,10*	0,09	0,11	0,09
Lithuania	0,40	0,44	0,58	0,76	0,47	*0,47*	*0,53*	*0,50*	0,57	0,81	0,78
Luxembourg	0,23	0,23	0,20	0,20	0,19	*0,17*	*0,17*	*0,15*	0,15	0,16	0,18
Malta	0,03	0,04	0,07	0,02	0,03	*0,03*	*0,03*	*0,03*	0,02	0,03	0,02
Netherlands	0,66	0,64	0,61	0,63	0,61	*0,55*	*0,57*	*0,49*	0,54	0,52	0,61
Poland	-	0,21	-	0,21	0,20	*0,18*	*0,18*	*0,17*	0,21	0,20	0,20
Portugal	NA	NA	0,27	0,28	0,26	*0,26*	*0,28*	*0,25*	0,26	0,26	0,29
Romania	1,28	0,57	0,44	0,55	0,77	*0,51*	*0,43*	*0,20*	0,45	0,42	0,38
Slovak Republic	0,18	0,27	0,25	0,18	0,11	*0,09*	*0,08*	*0,08*	0,08	0,09	0,06
Slovenia	0,26	0,27	0,24	0,13	0,13	*0,16*	*0,13*	*0,15*	0,12	0,13	0,11
Spain	-	0,44	0,43	0,40	0,37	*0,37*	*0,39*	*0,33*	0,38	0,37	0,34
Sweden	1,11	1,12	1,07	1,35	1,45	*1,58*	*1,74*	*1,89*	1,76	1,50	1,59
Average	0,45	0,35	0,38	0,39	0,39	0,39	0,37	0,36	0,38	0,40	0,40
Median	0,28	0,27	0,27	0,28	0,26	0,31	0,31	0,26	0,34	0,34	0,34
Minimum	0,03	0,04	0,07	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,02
Maximum	1,28	1,12	1,07	1,35	1,45	1,58	1,74	1,89	1,76	1,50	1,59
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**7%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**15%**	**11%**	**11%**	**7%**	**7%**	**7%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**

Table 3.1.5.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	5,79	NA	5,47	5,84	5,95	*5,84*	*5,84*	*6,04*	5,79	5,89	5,62
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	4,00
Bulgaria	1,05	0,97	1,03	1,09	1,25	*1,31*	*1,37*	*1,34*	1,29	1,36	1,30
Croatia	9,23	8,39	7,92	7,55	7,25	*6,31*	*8,16*	*7,48*	8,56	7,25	7,62
Cyprus	NA	6,11	7,25	6,03	6,15	*6,02*	*5,55*	*6,32*	6,62	6,48	5,85
Czech Republic	3,34	3,81	4,94	4,39	4,30	*3,98*	*3,91*	*3,98*	3,83	3,54	3,34
Denmark	2,04	2,09	2,10	2,26	2,43	*2,58*	*2,55*	*2,27*	2,19	2,29	2,49
Estonia	NA	1,62	2,68	2,67	1,41	*1,84*	*1,96*	*1,61*	1,81	1,87	1,85
Finland	2,52	2,33	2,42	2,49	2,80	*2,25*	*2,59*	*2,37*	2,17	2,29	2,73
France	2,56	2,73	2,80	2,83	2,71	*2,82*	*2,84*	*2,95*	2,82	2,81	3,04
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	4,03	3,51	3,64
Hungary	NA	1,52	1,49	1,41	1,47	*1,37*	*1,30*	*1,39*	1,18	1,18	1,20
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Italy	7,55	7,42	6,90	6,69	6,42	*6,13*	*5,94*	*5,98*	5,71	5,41	5,14
Latvia	1,83	1,77	1,64	1,49	1,30	*1,29*	*1,30*	*1,45*	1,50	1,80	1,67
Lithuania	1,43	1,57	1,53	1,35	1,18	*1,11*	*1,02*	*1,25*	1,18	1,20	1,16
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*0,87*	0,87	0,89	0,95
Malta	2,24	2,40	2,10	1,92	2,00	*2,13*	*2,28*	*2,18*	2,20	2,52	2,49
Netherlands	1,82	1,84	1,76	1,67	1,63	*1,54*	*1,52*	*1,58*	1,32	1,35	1,36
Poland	-	3,98	-	6,10	6,05	*6,34*	*9,78*	*8,67*	8,24	7,55	7,01
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Romania	3,09	3,31	3,27	3,21	3,27	*3,05*	*3,03*	*3,29*	3,14	3,43	4,57
Slovak Republic	7,46	7,30	6,80	4,86	5,02	*3,70*	*4,95*	*3,34*	3,32	3,22	2,62
Slovenia	13,83	12,22	9,31	7,20	5,93	*5,26*	*4,69*	*4,93*	4,33	4,07	4,09
Spain	-	3,12	3,13	2,76	3,04	*3,43*	*3,73*	*4,23*	4,15	4,35	5,13
Sweden	0,84	0,76	0,69	0,81	0,97	*1,03*	*1,01*	*0,95*	0,85	0,79	0,73
Average	4,16	3,76	3,76	3,55	3,45	3,30	3,59	3,38	3,35	3,26	3,32
Median	2,54	2,57	2,74	2,76	2,80	2,82	2,84	2,66	2,82	2,81	2,88
Minimum	0,84	0,76	0,69	0,81	0,97	1,03	1,01	0,87	0,85	0,79	0,73
Maximum	13,83	12,22	9,31	7,55	7,25	6,34	9,78	8,67	8,56	7,55	7,62
% of NA	**33%**	**26%**	**22%**	**22%**	**22%**	**22%**	**22%**	**19%**	**15%**	**15%**	**11%**
% 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 litigiousl cases - pending on 31st Dec.2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,45	0,41	0,38	0,36	0,37	0,36	0,35	0,35	0,32	0,31	0,33
Belgium	NA	NA	1,60	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,83
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,04
Croatia	5,13	4,63	4,40	3,84	3,63	3,29	3,72	4,17	5,17	4,11	4,12
Cyprus	6,13	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	2,07	2,14	1,76	1,45	1,49	1,34	1,29	1,26	1,18	1,08	1,09
Denmark	0,38	0,37	0,36	0,35	0,34	0,39	0,47	0,40	0,47	0,54	0,62
Estonia	0,52	0,46	0,44	0,46	0,47	0,46	0,53	0,53	0,53	0,54	0,63
Finland	0,16	0,16	0,17	0,13	0,12	0,11	0,12	0,13	0,13	0,13	0,15
France	2,24	2,37	2,42	2,43	2,36	2,47	2,47	2,57	2,44	1,85	1,99
Germany	0,92	0,97	0,92	0,88	0,85	0,89	0,91	0,93	0,87	0,81	0,84
Greece	5,56	2,28	2,23	2,25	2,35	2,63	2,89	NA	2,84	2,49	2,67
Hungary	0,83	0,75	0,77	0,81	0,86	0,67	0,59	0,58	0,53	0,48	0,48
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	5,29	4,54	4,41	4,10	3,94	3,79	3,72	3,69	3,56	3,45	3,32
Latvia	1,49	1,55	1,42	1,27	1,00	0,97	0,94	0,96	0,92	0,90	0,90
Lithuania	0,92	1,03	0,96	1,04	0,97	0,84	0,80	1,00	0,96	0,97	0,96
Luxembourg	0,22	0,25	0,20	0,19	0,22	0,27	0,41	0,49	0,50	0,50	0,57
Malta	2,06	2,25	2,01	1,83	1,86	2,04	2,11	1,97	2,13	2,36	2,24
Netherlands	NA	0,36	0,30	0,32	0,29	0,24	0,24	0,25	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	1,76	-	1,89	2,10	2,38	2,40	2,26	2,22	2,29	2,42
Portugal	3,37	NA	3,07	2,66	2,26	1,98	1,81	1,85	1,78	1,68	1,75
Romania	2,39	2,97	3,02	2,91	2,98	2,83	2,80	2,83	2,70	2,96	4,04
Slovak Republic	3,36	3,67	3,00	1,74	2,14	1,31	1,10	1,10	1,05	0,91	0,83
Slovenia	2,61	2,35	2,21	2,04	1,87	1,66	1,49	1,47	1,36	1,31	1,29
Spain	-	1,85	1,97	1,71	2,02	2,35	2,48	2,82	2,75	2,75	3,20
Sweden	0,32	0,29	0,27	0,27	0,27	0,28	0,29	0,27	0,26	0,24	0,27
Average	2,21	1,70	1,67	1,52	1,51	1,46	1,48	1,45	1,58	1,48	1,65
Median	2,06	1,66	1,60	1,45	1,49	1,31	1,10	1,05	1,12	1,03	1,07
Minimum	0,16	0,16	0,17	0,13	0,12	0,11	0,12	0,13	0,13	0,13	0,15
Maximum	6,13	4,63	4,41	4,10	3,94	3,79	3,72	4,17	5,17	4,11	4,12
% of NA	**15%**	**19%**	**11%**	**15%**	**15%**	**15%**	**15%**	**19%**	**19%**	**19%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**

Table 3.1.5.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,61	0,82	*0,90*	*0,82*	*0,69*	0,55	0,48	0,48
Belgium	NA	0,34	0,28	0,24	0,24	*0,18*	*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*	*0,14*	0,14	0,16	0,15
Croatia	0,28	0,33	0,36	0,33	0,26	*0,21*	*0,18*	*0,16*	0,16	0,14	0,22
Cyprus	0,95	0,94	0,91	0,89	0,94	*0,65*	*0,49*	*0,63*	1,27	1,40	1,27
Czech Republic	NAP	0,09	0,10	0,10	0,11	*0,11*	*0,10*	*0,09*	0,08	0,06	0,05
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,08	0,10	0,09	0,07	0,07	*0,06*	*0,07*	*0,07*	0,09	0,09	0,10
Finland	0,37	0,38	0,37	0,43	0,38	*0,32*	*0,32*	*0,33*	0,32	0,31	0,29
France	0,22	0,24	0,24	0,25	0,24	*0,24*	*0,26*	*0,27*	0,28	0,29	0,31
Germany	0,80	0,82	0,79	0,85	1,02	*1,04*	*0,97*	*0,90*	0,83	0,74	0,69
Greece	3,12	NA	2,43	2,20	1,87	*1,51*	*NA*	*1,04*	0,93	0,79	0,71
Hungary	0,05	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	*0,05*	*0,05*	*0,08*	0,06	0,07	0,07
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,50	0,44	0,40	0,35	0,30	*0,27*	*0,25*	*0,23*	0,21	0,18	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	0,37	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*	*NA*	*0,21*	0,22	0,23	0,23
Malta	0,18	0,16	0,09	0,09	0,08	*0,08*	*0,07*	*0,07*	0,08	0,08	0,08
Netherlands	0,30	0,30	0,28	0,31	0,28	*0,30*	*0,34*	*0,41*	0,39	0,36	0,44
Poland	-	0,08	-	0,08	0,07	*0,06*	*0,06*	*0,07*	0,09	0,09	0,07
Portugal	NA	NA	0,73	0,70	0,69	*0,67*	*0,65*	*0,59*	0,57	0,53	0,47
Romania	0,37	0,28	0,20	0,26	0,24	*0,16*	*0,16*	*0,38*	0,36	0,37	0,41
Slovak Republic	0,36	0,29	0,25	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	-	0,44	0,37	0,34	0,33	*0,33*	*0,36*	*0,36*	0,37	0,38	0,39
Sweden	0,38	0,35	0,31	0,43	0,59	*0,63*	*0,60*	*0,55*	0,49	0,44	0,36
Average	0,48	0,30	0,40	0,38	0,38	0,35	0,29	0,32	0,33	0,32	0,31
Median	0,31	0,29	0,28	0,25	0,24	0,19	0,19	0,21	0,21	0,19	0,22
Minimum	0,05	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,05	0,05	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,05
Maximum	3,12	0,94	2,43	2,20	1,87	1,51	0,97	1,04	1,27	1,40	1,27
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**11%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**15%**	**11%**	**11%**	**7%**	**7%**	**7%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**

Table 3.1.6.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,25	0,27	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	1,71
Bulgaria	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	1,75
Cyprus	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0,02	0,02	*0,03*	*0,03*	*0,04*	0,05	0,06	0,07
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	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,04	0,51
Hungary	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	NA	NA	*0,14*	*0,21*	*0,11*	0,07	0,04	0,04
Lithuania	0,08	0,06	*0,06*	*0,05*	*0,06*	0,06	0,05	0,04
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	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	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
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*0,49*	0,51	0,48	0,22
Slovenia	4,03	3,04	*2,13*	*1,47*	*1,11*	1,06	1,09	0,96
Spain	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
Average	0,75	0,59	0,41	0,32	0,28	0,28	0,24	0,55
Median	0,11	0,10	0,09	0,09	0,11	0,07	0,05	0,20
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01
Maximum	4,03	3,04	2,13	1,47	1,11	1,06	1,09	1,75
% of NA	78%	78%	78%	78%	74%	74%	70%	63%
% of NAP	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,05	0,05	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,69
Bulgaria	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
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,05
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,04	0,03	0,02
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,03
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	NA	NA	0,14	0,20	0,10	0,07	0,04	0,04
Lithuania	0,07	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,03	0,03
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	0,87	NA	0,77	0,90	0,93	0,92
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	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
Romania	0,13	0,13	0,09	0,09	0,11	0,12	0,11	0,14
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,34	0,33	0,28	0,11
Slovenia	0,47	0,51	0,51	0,46	0,40	0,42	0,45	0,43
Spain	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
Average	0,35	0,32	0,37	0,28	0,33	0,36	0,32	0,40
Median	0,10	0,09	0,14	0,15	0,22	0,12	0,11	0,11
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00
Maximum	1,26	1,20	1,16	1,07	1,16	1,62	1,21	1,69
% of NA	70%	70%	67%	70%	63%	59%	59%	52%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3.1.6.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,15	0,19	0,22	0,27	0,26	0,24	0,19	0,156
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,013
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,01	0,01	0,007
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,006
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	0,04	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,037
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,483
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,001
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	NA	NA	0,14	0,12	0,13	0,12	0,09	0,069
Latvia	NA	NA	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,001
Lithuania	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,013
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	0,06	0,06	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,044
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,002
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,01	0,010
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,03	0,04	0,05	NA
Slovenia	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,02	0,02	0,04	0,041
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,001
Average	0,03	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,059
Median	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,013
Minimum	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,001
Maximum	0,15	0,19	0,22	0,27	0,26	0,24	0,19	0,483
% of NA	67%	70%	59%	59%	52%	48%	48%	37%
% of NAP	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	7%

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 2023 (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	**100,7%**	**97,6%**	100,7%	99,9%	102,1%	100,1%	105,0%	NAP	NAP	**100,3%**	100,9%
Belgium	**98,5%**	**98,2%**	100,0%	NAP	100,0%	NAP	100,0%	NAP	NAP	**80,8%**	NAP
Bulgaria	**101,1%**	**102,0%**	100,5%	100,5%	106,2%	NAP	NAP	106,2%	NAP	**101,0%**	NAP
Croatia	**96,6%**	**103,0%**	96,0%	93,5%	NA	NA	96,8%	NAP	NAP	**87,0%**	NAP
Cyprus	**118,1%**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**109,7%**	NA
Czech Republic	**102,0%**	**101,3%**	101,0%	101,4%	99,3%	NAP	99,3%	NAP	112,1%	**110,8%**	141,1%
Denmark	**99,6%**	**92,6%**	99,6%	97,8%	99,9%	99,9%	102,4%	NAP	101,8%	**NAP**	100,5%
Estonia	**100,1%**	**91,5%**	100,7%	104,1%	99,7%	100,5%	99,1%	NAP	NAP	**94,9%**	NAP
Finland	**95,1%**	**89,3%**	94,8%	94,8%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**104,9%**	97,3%
France	**92,6%**	**96,0%**	89,4%	89,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**94,5%**	86,2%
Germany	**NA**	**97,4%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	62,8%	NA	NA	**108,7%**	98,6%
Greece	**98,2%**	**91,9%**	86,5%	86,3%	52,4%	47,5%	93,1%	200,0%	106,3%	**120,8%**	95,0%
Hungary	**99,7%**	**100,0%**	101,2%	100,0%	102,0%	NAP	102,1%	96,1%	98,1%	**100,9%**	73,1%
Ireland	**80,9%**	**72,2%**	92,3%	92,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**106,2%**	**110,0%**	102,9%	102,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**121,0%**	NAP
Latvia	**100,7%**	**100,4%**	100,7%	101,7%	100,4%	100,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP	**109,1%**	NAP
Lithuania	**100,5%**	**100,1%**	99,9%	99,8%	NA	NA	NA	NA	100,5%	**104,8%**	98,4%
Luxembourg	**95,6%**	**93,0%**	99,1%	100,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	98,8%	**97,9%**	NAP
Malta	**89,2%**	**95,1%**	71,1%	71,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**77,9%**	NAP
Netherlands	**99,9%**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**88,1%**	NAP
Poland	**102,0%**	**95,1%**	102,8%	100,7%	104,2%	104,8%	100,7%	NAP	NAP	**109,5%**	98,5%
Portugal	**NA**	**96,1%**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**119,8%**	NAP
Romania	**86,5%**	**86,2%**	88,5%	90,8%	74,0%	71,7%	238,4%	NAP	NAP	**91,6%**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**105,1%**	**105,0%**	108,9%	103,3%	113,9%	NAP	115,5%	99,6%	107,7%	**73,9%**	99,5%
Slovenia	**99,9%**	**101,0%**	100,1%	99,8%	100,2%	100,2%	100,2%	NAP	NAP	**91,7%**	99,1%
Spain	**87,4%**	**84,1%**	89,9%	89,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**95,3%**	NAP
Sweden	**102,4%**	**96,6%**	100,5%	100,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**105,1%**	101,4%
Average	**98,3%**	**95,8%**	96,8%	96,4%	96,5%	*90,6%*	*108,9%*	*125,5%*	103,6%	**100,0%**	99,2%
Median	**99,9%**	**96,6%**	100,0%	99,9%	100,2%	*100,1%*	*100,2%*	*102,9%*	101,8%	**100,9%**	98,6%
Minimum	**80,9%**	**72,2%**	71,1%	71,1%	52,4%	*47,5%*	*62,8%*	*96,1%*	98,1%	**73,9%**	73,1%
Maximum	**118,1%**	**110,0%**	108,9%	104,1%	113,9%	*104,8%*	*238,4%*	*200,0%*	112,1%	**121,0%**	141,1%
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	15%	15%	15%	*15%*	*7%*	*11%*	7%	**4%**	4%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	0%	4%	37%	*56%*	*44%*	*74%*	67%	**4%**	48%

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Table 3.2.1.2: Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in in 2023 (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	**58**	**141**	54	81	10	10	11	NAP	NAP	**313**	40
Belgium	**156**	**246**	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	**360**	NAP
Bulgaria	**92**	**186**	15	15	27	NAP	NAP	27	NAP	**121**	NAP
Croatia	**112**	**533**	55	186	NA	NA	20	NAP	NAP	**221**	NAP
Cyprus	**605**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**380**	NA
Czech Republic	**136**	**126**	91	111	13	NAP	13	NAP	36	**212**	1182
Denmark	**23**	**265**	14	80	3	0	225	NAP	193	**NAP**	48
Estonia	**28**	**196**	18	49	9	8	9	NAP	NAP	**167**	NAP
Finland	**114**	**349**	100	100	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**263**	194
France	**310**	**354**	300	300	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**322**	215
Germany	**NA**	**249**	NA	NA	NA	NA	8305	NA	NA	**391**	234
Greece	**642**	**771**	505	579	889	1043	239	91	185	**439**	188
Hungary	**62**	**135**	26	27	25	NAP	23	141	60	**120**	422
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**347**	**511**	206	206	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**595**	NAP
Latvia	**32**	**204**	15	41	6	6	NAP	NAP	NAP	**205**	NAP
Lithuania	**66**	**120**	6	5	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	26	**64**	30
Luxembourg	**198**	**221**	89	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	111	**479**	NAP
Malta	**404**	**454**	148	148	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1350**	NAP
Netherlands	**82**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**267**	NAP
Poland	**92**	**357**	63	52	70	75	44	NAP	NAP	**130**	155
Portugal	**NA**	**267**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**597**	NAP
Romania	**228**	**218**	251	112	1340	799	12916	NAP	NAP	**387**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**75**	**173**	78	70	14	NAP	14	14	232	**1040**	13
Slovenia	**55**	**344**	35	89	6	6	2	NAP	NAP	**627**	44
Spain	**337**	**444**	218	218	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**414**	NAP
Sweden	**108**	**157**	144	144	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**83**	166
Average	**182**	**292**	116	131	201	*243*	*1 818*	*68*	120	**382**	**225**
Median	**110**	**247**	78	94	13	*9*	*22*	*59*	111	**322**	**166**
Minimum	**23**	**120**	6	5	3	*0*	*2*	*14*	26	**64**	**13**
Maximum	**642**	**771**	505	579	1 340	*1 043*	*12 916*	*141*	232	**1 350**	**1 182**
% of NA	11%	11%	22%	19%	15%	*11%*	*7%*	*7%*	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	7%	41%	*59%*	*48%*	*78%*	67%	4%	48%

Table 3.2.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance total of other than criminal cases 2013 - 2023
(Q091)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	101%	NA	100%	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	102%	NA	108%	101%	98%	105%	102%	98%
Bulgaria	101%	102%	99%	99%	97%	98%	99%	101%	101%	100%	101%
Croatia	102%	103%	102%	102%	102%	105%	93%	104%	97%	104%	97%
Cyprus	NA	88%	90%	106%	113%	125%	98%	88%	81%	101%	118%
Czech Republic	97%	97%	102%	105%	101%	102%	101%	98%	103%	102%	102%
Denmark	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%	101%	100%	100%	100%
Estonia	NA	98%	140%	98%	104%	101%	100%	101%	99%	100%	100%
Finland	100%	102%	99%	98%	96%	106%	95%	105%	102%	99%	95%
France	98%	95%	98%	98%	104%	96%	99%	94%	105%	97%	93%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	91%	101%	98%
Hungary	98%	103%	101%	102%	99%	106%	101%	98%	104%	100%	100%
Ireland	NA	73%	77%	76%	82%	79%	75%	56%	75%	84%	81%
Italy	107%	109%	112%	105%	103%	103%	103%	103%	107%	106%	106%
Latvia	106%	100%	101%	101%	101%	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%	101%
Lithuania	97%	99%	100%	102%	102%	101%	101%	97%	101%	99%	100%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	102%	99%	96%	93%	95%	99%	98%	96%
Malta	104%	102%	111%	107%	96%	97%	91%	91%	89%	87%	89%
Netherlands	99%	99%	101%	100%	100%	101%	100%	98%	103%	98%	100%
Poland	-	102%	-	93%	101%	99%	90%	104%	102%	103%	102%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	110%	111%	106%	101%	99%	104%	100%	97%	102%	96%	87%
Slovak Republic	91%	102%	105%	106%	109%	111%	91%	113%	100%	101%	105%
Slovenia	102%	104%	107%	106%	104%	102%	102%	99%	102%	101%	100%
Spain	-	101%	100%	105%	94%	92%	94%	90%	102%	96%	87%
Sweden	101%	103%	103%	96%	93%	97%	100%	102%	103%	103%	102%
Average	101%	100%	103%	100%	100%	101%	97%	97%	99%	99%	98%
Median	101%	102%	101%	101%	101%	101%	100%	99%	101%	100%	100%
Minimum	91%	73%	77%	76%	82%	79%	75%	56%	75%	84%	81%
Maximum	110%	111%	140%	107%	113%	125%	103%	113%	107%	106%	118%
% of NA	**30%**	**22%**	**19%**	**11%**	**15%**	**11%**	**11%**	**11%**	**7%**	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Table 3.2.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance total of other than criminal cases 2013 - 2023 (Q091)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	53	NA	53	57	59	57	59	63	61	62	58
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	156
Bulgaria	78	78	78	84	83	91	93	107	91	99	92
Croatia	129	134	132	117	114	102	130	120	120	96	112
Cyprus	NA	903	839	862	1118	737	882	1087	947	761	605
Czech Republic	76	157	164	155	163	162	158	170	159	148	136
Denmark	18	19	17	21	22	24	19	17	17	17	23
Estonia	NA	33	39	40	24	30	32	25	27	28	28
Finland	97	103	111	113	118	86	105	97	88	103	114
France	274	304	304	312	300	381	388	554	440	297	310
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	664	634	642
Hungary	NA	63	59	57	63	63	69	80	65	63	62
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	369	377	393	387	399	373	367	471	381	358	347
Latvia	167	179	38	33	29	28	25	28	30	34	32
Lithuania	53	54	50	41	44	53	52	68	65	68	66
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	158	158	183	198
Malta	789	558	447	446	331	322	344	414	350	404	404
Netherlands	91	91	87	83	83	80	80	91	76	82	82
Poland	-	55	-	85	73	82	111	110	107	100	92
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	128	148	154	154	161	154	152	186	160	171	228
Slovak Republic	235	231	240	98	107	111	135	87	83	81	75
Slovenia	111	102	82	72	65	61	56	69	54	54	55
Spain	-	242	238	227	258	276	274	349	265	282	337
Sweden	146	133	126	133	151	152	138	123	117	123	108
Average	176	198	182	170	179	163	175	203	197	185	182
Median	119	133	119	98	107	91	111	109	107	100	110
Minimum	18	19	17	21	22	24	19	17	17	17	23
Maximum	789	903	839	862	1118	737	882	1087	947	761	642
% of NA	**33%**	**26%**	**22%**	**22%**	**22%**	**22%**	**22%**	**19%**	**15%**	**15%**	**11%**
% 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 2013 - 2023
(Q091)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	101%	103%	102%	102%	99%	101%	100%	100%	104%	101%	98%
Belgium	NA	98%	99%	102%	112%	112%	101%	99%	106%	102%	98%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	102%
Croatia	101%	113%	107%	118%	109%	112%	87%	85%	81%	145%	103%
Cyprus	78%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	90%	105%	107%	110%	101%	102%	101%	98%	103%	102%	101%
Denmark	107%	102%	102%	101%	102%	95%	92%	111%	98%	93%	93%
Estonia	108%	104%	102%	98%	99%	101%	94%	100%	100%	99%	91%
Finland	106%	105%	94%	125%	111%	102%	100%	94%	100%	100%	89%
France	98%	94%	98%	99%	103%	96%	100%	93%	107%	103%	96%
Germany	99%	100%	102%	103%	101%	97%	99%	98%	105%	104%	97%
Greece	80%	113%	102%	99%	96%	86%	86%	NA	82%	93%	92%
Hungary	98%	104%	99%	98%	96%	116%	104%	100%	106%	104%	100%
Ireland	NA	56%	63%	59%	73%	63%	63%	51%	72%	71%	72%
Italy	118%	119%	120%	113%	106%	103%	104%	104%	109%	104%	110%
Latvia	109%	98%	109%	107%	119%	103%	102%	96%	103%	99%	100%
Lithuania	99%	97%	102%	98%	102%	104%	101%	94%	101%	99%	100%
Luxembourg	182%	97%	105%	100%	96%	93%	88%	93%	99%	98%	93%
Malta	110%	101%	107%	107%	97%	93%	92%	91%	78%	87%	95%
Netherlands	NA	99%	100%	101%	99%	101%	100%	100%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	99%	-	99%	94%	92%	99%	105%	103%	98%	95%
Portugal	103%	NA	116%	112%	113%	109%	105%	98%	102%	103%	96%
Romania	112%	109%	105%	102%	99%	103%	100%	100%	102%	96%	86%
Slovak Republic	81%	92%	133%	132%	129%	131%	110%	100%	104%	108%	105%
Slovenia	102%	109%	105%	106%	108%	110%	109%	101%	107%	102%	101%
Spain	-	98%	95%	103%	88%	87%	94%	86%	102%	98%	84%
Sweden	101%	104%	104%	99%	100%	97%	97%	103%	103%	102%	97%
Average	104%	101%	103%	104%	102%	100%	97%	96%	99%	100%	96%
Median	101%	102%	102%	102%	101%	101%	100%	98%	103%	101%	97%
Minimum	78%	56%	63%	59%	73%	63%	63%	51%	72%	71%	72%
Maximum	182%	119%	133%	132%	129%	131%	110%	111%	109%	145%	110%
% of NA	15%	11%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	11%	11%	11%	7%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Table 3.2.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2013 - 2023
(Q091)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	135	130	131	133	141	138	137	156	135	142	141
Belgium	NA	NA	87	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	246
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	186
Croatia	386	380	391	364	387	374	488	655	559	410	533
Cyprus	638	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	187	163	159	153	157	149	140	165	141	134	126
Denmark	164	177	174	176	172	207	222	190	238	268	265
Estonia	130	125	136	139	140	143	147	135	146	158	196
Finland	288	289	332	252	258	273	280	300	305	327	349
France	308	348	346	353	341	420	432	637	495	333	354
Germany	192	198	190	196	204	220	217	237	231	241	249
Greece	407	330	378	610	479	559	637	NA	728	746	771
Hungary	169	144	159	159	181	151	152	165	145	134	135
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	608	532	527	514	548	527	532	674	560	540	511
Latvia	247	255	238	217	208	236	213	239	216	209	204
Lithuania	94	97	96	88	85	84	87	117	106	116	120
Luxembourg	53	103	86	91	108	123	139	161	154	182	221
Malta	750	536	445	432	435	440	465	550	529	491	454
Netherlands	NA	132	115	121	124	110	110	127	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	203	-	225	232	273	270	317	330	362	357
Portugal	386	NA	315	289	250	229	200	280	253	238	267
Romania	187	146	154	153	167	157	152	168	150	160	218
Slovak Republic	505	524	401	130	171	157	170	204	206	168	173
Slovenia	301	270	277	280	292	283	281	350	309	337	344
Spain	-	318	325	282	329	362	353	468	344	359	444
Sweden	171	157	152	164	159	166	167	161	148	152	157
Average	300	253	244	240	242	251	261	294	292	282	292
Median	247	201	190	196	204	220	213	221	234	239	247
Minimum	53	97	86	88	85	84	87	117	106	116	120
Maximum	750	536	527	610	548	559	637	674	728	746	771
% of NA	**15%**	**19%**	**11%**	**15%**	**15%**	**15%**	**15%**	**19%**	**19%**	**19%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**

Table 3.2.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance administrative cases 2013 - 2023
(Q091)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	91%	80%	90%	111%	126%	125%	112%	100%
Belgium	NA	88%	117%	121%	101%	119%	112%	108%	131%	97%	81%
Bulgaria	109%	101%	99%	104%	95%	100%	99%	100%	100%	101%	101%
Croatia	64%	86%	93%	109%	126%	116%	109%	107%	102%	107%	87%
Cyprus	58%	103%	120%	113%	74%	219%	170%	84%	46%	88%	110%
Czech Republic	NAP	91%	92%	80%	92%	88%	107%	113%	119%	126%	111%
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	91%	90%	105%	106%	99%	100%	94%	92%	90%	99%	95%
Finland	95%	97%	102%	79%	107%	112%	100%	99%	102%	104%	105%
France	104%	96%	98%	99%	102%	98%	97%	95%	97%	96%	94%
Germany	100%	100%	103%	92%	84%	97%	109%	110%	110%	114%	109%
Greece	153%	NA	183%	148%	166%	164%	NA	163%	130%	127%	121%
Hungary	104%	92%	105%	100%	102%	102%	103%	89%	108%	98%	101%
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	190%	156%	142%	153%	156%	136%	131%	136%	125%	134%	121%
Latvia	163%	144%	106%	95%	100%	105%	105%	107%	93%	107%	109%
Lithuania	65%	89%	100%	144%	113%	88%	105%	97%	98%	98%	105%
Luxembourg	94%	94%	91%	98%	94%	86%	75%	87%	92%	92%	98%
Malta	40%	149%	411%	114%	147%	91%	121%	106%	70%	95%	78%
Netherlands	100%	99%	103%	95%	105%	95%	94%	86%	108%	99%	88%
Poland	-	97%	-	103%	107%	105%	99%	95%	93%	99%	110%
Portugal	NA	NA	80%	112%	105%	111%	106%	126%	107%	112%	120%
Romania	130%	161%	133%	92%	102%	118%	100%	48%	105%	97%	92%
Slovak Republic	85%	125%	124%	112%	118%	96%	81%	87%	80%	93%	74%
Slovenia	102%	103%	101%	87%	67%	91%	89%	107%	95%	98%	92%
Spain	-	113%	117%	112%	104%	100%	92%	99%	99%	97%	95%
Sweden	101%	103%	104%	94%	90%	97%	102%	102%	103%	103%	105%
Average	103%	108%	123%	106%	105%	109%	105%	103%	101%	104%	100%
Median	100%	100%	104%	103%	102%	100%	102%	100%	102%	99%	101%
Minimum	40%	86%	80%	79%	67%	86%	75%	48%	46%	88%	74%
Maximum	190%	161%	411%	153%	166%	219%	170%	163%	131%	134%	121%
% of NA	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%
% of NAP	15%	11%	11%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%

Table 3.2.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance administrative cases 2013 - 2023
(Q091)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	380	446	449	440	388	312	285	313
Belgium	NA	625	444	429	497	370	418	399	235	288	360
Bulgaria	110	124	122	108	116	112	107	124	125	129	121
Croatia	493	426	413	319	258	197	187	179	166	143	221
Cyprus	775	1775	1391	1582	2162	487	495	863	844	461	380
Czech Republic	NAP	415	437	421	408	412	356	317	265	225	212
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	139	141	117	108	108	119	136	142	162	166	167
Finland	277	280	271	279	255	235	254	274	296	281	263
France	284	305	313	314	290	285	284	333	299	314	322
Germany	357	367	349	375	421	435	397	426	422	408	391
Greece	1148	NA	964	1086	735	601	NA	551	595	464	439
Hungary	115	148	110	109	116	109	103	110	103	125	120
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	1043	984	1008	925	887	889	821	862	756	574	595
Latvia	203	155	200	228	249	248	225	220	256	200	205
Lithuania	290	310	236	72	76	129	96	112	106	79	64
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	513	524	528	479
Malta	2036	1408	495	1464	1147	1057	839	924	1356	1081	1350
Netherlands	164	171	168	178	165	200	215	304	265	257	267
Poland	-	139	-	143	121	118	123	150	151	163	130
Portugal	NA	NA	989	911	988	928	846	847	792	747	597
Romania	106	179	170	170	114	117	138	690	293	321	387
Slovak Republic	746	397	374	203	317	401	518	585	679	648	1040
Slovenia	126	112	122	282	448	406	516	443	546	540	627
Spain	-	361	317	312	322	331	338	406	352	369	414
Sweden	126	114	105	115	147	146	125	107	102	107	83
Average	474	426	414	438	450	366	347	411	400	356	382
Median	281	305	315	297	303	308	284	388	296	288	322
Minimum	106	112	105	72	76	109	96	107	102	79	64
Maximum	2036	1775	1391	1582	2162	1057	846	924	1356	1081	1350
% of NA	11%	11%	4%	4%	4%	4%	11%	4%	4%	4%	4%
% of NAP	15%	11%	11%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%

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 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q91)

States	Variations of incoming 2013 - 2023			Variations of incoming 2022 - 2023		
	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	-4,7%	-20,3%	NAP	1,8%	10,6%	1,0%
Belgium	NA	-8,6%	NA	14,3%	1,8%	24,1%
Bulgaria	-6,9%	NA	10,5%	1,9%	NA	3,6%
Croatia	-8,5%	-48,1%	15,8%	-2,0%	8,7%	25,7%
Cyprus	NA	NA	56,0%	-1,1%	NA	-10,2%
Czech Republic	-44,8%	-27,4%	NAP	2,7%	8,7%	3,6%
Denmark	3,1%	24,2%	NAP	-17,2%	15,9%	NAP
Estonia	NA	-0,5%	4,2%	2,7%	5,5%	11,2%
Finland	-0,3%	-7,9%	-24,4%	12,9%	22%.	0,5%
France	15,5%	-18,4%	46,4%	8,6%	8,5%	6,7%
Germany	NA	-24,6%	-24,3%	NA	7,2%	1,7%
Greece	NA	-79,2%	-28,6%	2,2%	2,2%	-2,5%
Hungary	-41,9%	-31,2%	20,0%	3,4%	3,9%	-0,6%
Ireland	NA	-41,9%	NA	8,7%	10,2%	NA
Italy	-28,2%	-20,9%	-8,3%	-2,6%	-3,2%	-2,4%
Latvia	360,6%	-26,3%	-45,3%	-4,3%	0,2%	-16,4%
Lithuania	-38,3%	-21,4%	19,5%	-0,9%	-4,4%	-8,3%
Luxembourg	NA	45,6%	-12,1%	2,9%	-0,7%	4,8%
Malta	232,4%	170,9%	-55,8%	4,0%	1,9%	5,7%
Netherlands	-11,8%	NA	12,1%	0,2%	NA	33,3%
Poland				1,0%	10,4%	-9,7%
Portugal	NA	-18,2%	NA	NA	0,4%	5,8%
Romania	0,9%	80,4%	-59,2%	11,7%	12,3%	-4,1%
Slovak Republic	-5,4%	-44,4%	-59,2%	-16,4%	-8,9%	-10,4%
Slovenia	-37,4%	-54,9%	-49,4%	-0,5%	-2,0%	-2,6%
Spain				9,0%	10,3%	-4,7%
Sweden	26,3%	3,6%	50,4%	5,6%	11,5%	4,7%
Average	24,2%	-7,7%	-6,9%	1,9%	4,9%	2,4%
Median	-5,4%	-20,6%	-8,3%	2,2%	5,5%	1,0%
Minimum	-44,8%	-79,2%	-59,2%	-17,2%	-8,9%	-16,4%
Maximum	360,6%	170,9%	56,0%	14,3%	15,9%	33,3%
% of NA	30%	11%	11%	7%	11%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	11%	0%	0%	4%

Table 3.3.2: First instance courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q91)

States	Variations of resolved 2013 - 2023			Variations of resolved 2022 - 2023		
	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	-4,8%	-23,0%	NAP	2,8%	7,4%	-9,4%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	10,9%	-2,3%	3,3%
Bulgaria	-6,7%	NA	2,7%	2,9%	NA	3,7%
Croatia	-13,5%	-47,2%	56,6%	-9,2%	-22,8%	2,4%
Cyprus	NA	NA	197,4%	15,1%	NA	11,9%
Czech Republic	-41,9%	-18,5%	NAP	2,7%	7,7%	-9,1%
Denmark	2,4%	7,3%	NAP	-17,4%	15,8%	NAP
Estonia	NA	-15,4%	8,8%	3,1%	-2,1%	6,8%
Finland	-5,1%	-22,7%	-16,4%	8,9%	8,2%	1,2%
France	8,9%	-19,7%	32,7%	3,9%	1,6%	4,6%
Germany	NA	-26,1%	-17,4%	NA	0,8%	-2,9%
Greece	NA	-76,2%	-43,7%	-0,2%	1,0%	-7,3%
Hungary	-40,6%	-29,7%	16,1%	2,8%	-0,3%	2,0%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	4,8%	12,3%	NA
Italy	-28,5%	-26,3%	-41,7%	-1,9%	1,9%	-11,6%
Latvia	339,1%	-32,2%	-63,5%	-2,9%	1,4%	-14,9%
Lithuania	-36,3%	-20,5%	91,4%	0,3%	-3,4%	-2,4%
Luxembourg	NA	-25,4%	-8,0%	0,4%	-6,0%	12,0%
Malta	184,9%	135,2%	-14,1%	6,9%	11,2%	-13,4%
Netherlands	-10,6%	-21,5%	-1,5%	1,7%	0,4%	18,4%
Poland				-0,1%	6,8%	0,2%
Portugal	NA	-23,8%	NA	NA	-6,2%	13,4%
Romania	-20,7%	38,6%	-71,3%	0,4%	0,5%	-9,1%
Slovak Republic	9,6%	-27,5%	-64,4%	-12,8%	-11,3%	-28,9%
Slovenia	-38,7%	-55,5%	-54,5%	-1,5%	-3,4%	-9,1%
Spain				-0,5%	-4,8%	-6,2%
Sweden	28,5%	-0,9%	57,0%	5,4%	6,0%	6,4%
Average	19,2%	-15,8%	3,5%	1,1%	0,8%	-1,5%
Median	-6,7%	-23,0%	-8,0%	1,7%	0,8%	0,2%
Minimum	-41,9%	-76,2%	-71,3%	-17,4%	-22,8%	-28,9%
Maximum	339,1%	135,2%	197,4%	15,1%	15,8%	18,4%
% of NA	**30%**	**15%**	**11%**	**7%**	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**

Table 3.3.3: First instance courts, variation of pending 31 Dec. other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q91)

States	Variations of pending 31 Dec. 2013 - 2023			Variations of pending 31 Dec. 2022 - 2023		
	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	4,7%	-19,9%	NAP	-4,0%	6,8%	-0,3%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	28,9%
Bulgaria	10,8%	NA	13,1%	-4,3%	NA	-2,7%
Croatia	-25,1%	-27,1%	-30,0%	5,2%	0,3%	57,9%
Cyprus	NA	NA	45,6%	-8,5%	NA	-7,8%
Czech Republic	3,8%	-45,3%	NAP	-5,2%	0,8%	-14,4%
Denmark	28,9%	73,2%	NAP	8,7%	14,4%	NAP
Estonia	NA	27,1%	30,4%	1,7%	21,1%	7,6%
Finland	11,4%	-6,2%	-20,7%	20,2%	15,5%	-5,2%
France	23,2%	-7,6%	50,4%	8,4%	8,2%	7,1%
Germany	NA	-4,2%	-9,5%	NA	4,1%	-6,9%
Greece	NA	-54,9%	-78,5%	1,1%	4,4%	-12,4%
Hungary	NA	-44,1%	20,9%	1,9%	-0,1%	-2,6%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-32,7%	-38,0%	-66,7%	-4,9%	-3,4%	-8,3%
Latvia	-15,7%	-44,0%	-63,2%	-7,8%	-1,1%	-13,0%
Lithuania	-20,2%	1,6%	-57,6%	-2,4%	-0,2%	-20,6%
Luxembourg	NA	212,2%	NA	9,2%	14,2%	1,6%
Malta	45,8%	42,3%	-43,0%	6,9%	2,8%	8,1%
Netherlands	-20,3%	NA	59,8%	1,6%	NA	22,7%
Poland				-7,4%	5,6%	-19,9%
Portugal	NA	-47,2%	NA	NA	5,5%	-9,4%
Romania	41,2%	61,3%	4,6%	33,4%	36,7%	9,5%
Slovak Republic	-64,9%	-75,2%	-50,4%	-18,8%	-8,8%	14,2%
Slovenia	-69,5%	-49,1%	126,3%	0,9%	-1,1%	5,6%
Spain				19,1%	17,6%	5,0%
Sweden	-4,4%	-9,4%	2,8%	-7,3%	9,1%	-17,7%
Average	-5,2%	-2,7%	-3,6%	2,1%	6,9%	1,1%
Median	-0,3%	-14,7%	-3,4%	1,1%	4,9%	-2,6%
Minimum	-69,5%	-75,2%	-78,5%	-18,8%	-8,8%	-20,6%
Maximum	45,8%	212,2%	126,3%	33,4%	36,7%	57,9%
% of NA	**33%**	**19%**	**15%**	**15%**	**19%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**

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 Clearence Rate of other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percent points (Q91)

States	Variations of Clearence Rate 2013 - 2023			Variations of Clearence Rate 2022 - 2023		
	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	-0,10	-3,42	NAP	1,03	-2,95	-11,48
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	-3,06	-4,13	-16,24
Bulgaria	0,22	NA	-7,69	1,03	NA	0,16
Croatia	-5,58	1,78	22,67	-7,73	-41,95	-19,80
Cyprus	NA	NA	52,12	16,67	NA	21,64
Czech Republic	5,21	11,06	NAP	0,06	-0,92	-15,47
Denmark	-0,73	-14,54	NAP	-0,26	-0,03	NAP
Estonia	NA	-16,14	4,00	0,42	-7,15	-3,90
Finland	-4,78	-17,05	10,13	-3,42	-11,18	0,72
France	-5,60	-1,56	-9,76	-4,17	-6,55	-1,86
Germany	NA	-2,04	8,97	NA	-6,21	-5,18
Greece	NA	11,80	-32,55	-2,43	-1,08	-6,18
Hungary	2,15	2,08	-3,44	-0,53	-4,22	2,54
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	-2,99	1,32	NA
Italy	-0,39	-8,06	-69,13	0,72	5,60	-12,57
Latvia	-4,94	-8,80	-54,18	1,40	1,14	1,98
Lithuania	3,18	1,17	39,40	1,18	0,97	6,33
Luxembourg	NA	-88,62	4,41	-2,33	-5,26	6,35
Malta	-14,88	-14,45	37,79	2,40	7,94	-17,18
Netherlands	1,35	NA	-12,16	1,42	NA	-11,05
Poland				-1,05	-3,14	10,86
Portugal	NA	-7,04	NA	NA	-6,77	8,04
Romania	-23,57	-25,98	-38,63	-9,68	-10,08	-5,08
Slovak Republic	14,34	24,37	-10,78	4,35	-2,81	-19,19
Slovenia	-2,04	-1,43	-10,16	-1,00	-1,45	-6,54
Spain				-8,27	-13,81	-1,57
Sweden	1,73	-4,39	4,45	-0,15	-5,03	1,72
Average	-2,03	-8,06	-3,40	-0,66	-4,91	-3,72
Median	-0,39	-3,91	-3,44	-0,26	-3,64	-3,90
Minimum	-23,57	-88,62	-69,13	-9,68	-41,95	-19,80
Maximum	14,34	24,37	52,12	16,67	7,94	21,64
% of NA	**30%**	**19%**	**11%**	**7%**	**11%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**

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 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q91)

States	Variations of Disposition Time 2013 - 2023			Variations s of Disposition Time 2022 - 2023		
	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	9,9%	4,0%	NAP	-6,7%	-0,5%	10,0%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24,8%
Bulgaria	18,8%	NA	10,1%	-7,0%	NA	-6,2%
Croatia	-13,4%	38,2%	-55,3%	15,8%	29,9%	54,2%
Cyprus	NA	NA	-51,0%	-20,5%	NA	-17,6%
Czech Republic	78,6%	-33,0%	NAP	-7,7%	-6,4%	-5,9%
Denmark	25,9%	61,4%	NAP	31,6%	-1,2%	NAP
Estonia	NA	50,2%	19,9%	-1,3%	23,8%	0,8%
Finland	17,4%	21,3%	-5,1%	10,4%	6,7%	-6,4%
France	13,1%	15,0%	13,3%	4,4%	6,5%	2,4%
Germany	NA	29,6%	9,6%	NA	3,3%	-4,1%
Greece	NA	89,4%	-61,8%	1,3%	3,3%	-5,5%
Hungary	NA	-20,5%	4,2%	-0,9%	0,2%	-4,4%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-6,0%	-15,9%	-42,9%	-3,0%	-5,3%	3,7%
Latvia	-80,8%	-17,5%	0,8%	-5,0%	-2,4%	2,3%
Lithuania	25,3%	27,8%	-77,9%	-2,7%	3,4%	-18,7%
Luxembourg	NA	318,7%	NA	8,7%	21,5%	-9,3%
Malta	-48,8%	-39,5%	-33,7%	0,0%	-7,5%	24,8%
Netherlands	-10,8%	NA	62,2%	0,0%	NA	3,6%
Poland				-7,3%	-1,2%	-20,1%
Portugal	NA	-30,6%	NA	NA	12,4%	-20,1%
Romania	78,0%	16,4%	264,5%	32,8%	36,0%	20,5%
Slovak Republic	-67,9%	-65,8%	39,3%	-6,9%	2,8%	60,5%
Slovenia	-50,3%	14,3%	397,0%	2,4%	2,3%	16,1%
Spain				19,7%	23,6%	12,0%
Sweden	-25,6%	-8,6%	-34,5%	-12,1%	2,9%	-22,7%
Average	-2,3%	22,7%	25,5%	2,0%	7,0%	3,8%
Median	2,0%	14,7%	2,5%	-0,9%	3,1%	0,8%
Minimum	-80,8%	-65,8%	-77,9%	-20,5%	-7,5%	-22,7%
Maximum	78,6%	318,7%	397,0%	32,8%	36,0%	60,5%
% of NA	**33%**	**19%**	**15%**	**15%**	**19%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**11%**	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**

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 categories and by case status

Table 3.4.1.1a: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2023

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**4 801**	**3 353**	1 448	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	**37 219**	**37 219**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**17 629**	**15 681**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 948**	NAP
Croatia	**29 188**	**NA**	NA	NA	692	680	12	NAP	NA	**2 639**	NAP
Cyprus	**3 665**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**960**	NA
Czech Republic	**9 822**	**9 822**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Denmark	**2 384**	**2 384**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 663**	**814**	313	313	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**536**	NAP
Finland	**1 317**	**1 167**	150	150	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**273 217**	**234 993**	1 810	1 810	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**28 845**	7 569
Germany	**NA**	**104 878**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**50 450**	17 709
Greece	**48 290**	**14 305**	314	261	30	30	0	0	23	**33 627**	44
Hungary	**6 328**	**2 982**	2 588	2 516	60	NAP	44	16	12	**454**	304
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**249 035**	**244 407**	4 628	4 628	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**1 820**	**1 244**	30	1	29	29	NAP	NAP	NAP	**546**	NAP
Lithuania	**4 387**	**1 834**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**2 413**	140
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 567**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**174**	NA
Malta	**1 662**	**1 662**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**24 436**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**15 126**	NAP
Poland	**107 294**	**76 284**	4 991	4 858	133	NAP	133	NAP	NAP	NAP	26 019
Portugal	**16 047**	**5 107**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**10 940**	NAP
Romania	**99 480**	**98 145**	1 335	333	1 002	1 002	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**9 919**	**7 991**	1 928	1 928	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**1 789**	**1 391**	398	376	22	21	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**196 421**	**166 614**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**29 807**	NAP
Sweden	**10 834**	**892**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**7 552**	2 390
Average	**48 277**	**44 989**	1 661	1 561	281	352	38	8	18	**12 401**	6 772
Median	**10 377**	**5 107**	1 392	376	60	30	12	8	18	**2 639**	1 347
Minimum	**1 317**	**814**	30	1	22	21	0	0	12	**174**	0
Maximum	**273 217**	**244 407**	4 991	4 858	1 002	1 002	133	16	23	**50 450**	26 019
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	26%	30%	19%	*15%*	*19%*	*15%*	26%	**7%**	11%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	30%	30%	56%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**37%**	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 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,05**	**0,04**	0,02	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	**0,32**	**0,32**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,27**	**0,24**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Croatia	**0,76**	**NA**	NA	NA	0,02	0,02	0,00	NAP	NA	**0,07**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,39**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,10**	NA
Czech Republic	**0,09**	**0,09**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,00
Denmark	**0,04**	**0,04**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,12**	**0,06**	0,02	0,02	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Finland	**0,02**	**0,02**	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**0,40**	**0,34**	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	**0,46**	**0,14**	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	**0,00**	0,00
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,42**	**0,41**	0,01	0,01	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**0,10**	**0,07**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Lithuania	**0,15**	**0,06**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**0,08**	0,00
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,23**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**0,03**	NA
Malta	**0,29**	**0,29**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,14**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,08**	NAP
Poland	**0,29**	**0,20**	0,01	0,01	0,00	NAP	0,00	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	0,07
Portugal	**0,15**	**0,05**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,10**	NAP
Romania	**0,52**	**0,51**	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,18**	**0,15**	0,04	0,04	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,08**	**0,07**	0,02	0,02	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Spain	**0,40**	**0,34**	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	**0,24**	**0,17**	0,01	0,01	0,00	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,08**	0,02
Median	**0,17**	**0,12**	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	**0,00**	0,00
Maximum	**0,76**	**0,51**	0,04	0,04	0,02	*0,02*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,32**	0,07
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	26%	30%	19%	*15%*	*19%*	*15%*	26%	**7%**	11%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	30%	30%	56%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**37%**	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 2023

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**25 538**	**15 760**	9 778	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	**18 291**	**18 291**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**51 377**	**38 622**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**12 755**	NAP
Croatia	**47 062**	**NA**	NA	NA	1 710	1 616	94	NAP	NA	**4 773**	NAP
Cyprus	**450**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**167**	NA
Czech Republic	**47 770**	**47 770**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Denmark	**5 140**	**5 140**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**4 072**	**1 510**	1 075	1 075	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 487**	NAP
Finland	**2 446**	**1 907**	539	539	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**221 881**	**154 668**	1 505	1 505	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**31 586**	34 122
Germany	**NA**	**80 147**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**34 244**	32 589
Greece	**30 981**	**13 703**	533	494	12	9	3	0	27	**16 640**	105
Hungary	**32 503**	**8 861**	20 195	19 317	659	NAP	554	105	219	**1 938**	1 509
Ireland	**1 741**	**1 741**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**97 287**	**91 275**	6 012	6 012	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**4 030**	**3 054**	135	58	77	77	NAP	NAP	NAP	**841**	NAP
Lithuania	**12 484**	**8 594**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**2 693**	1 197
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 215**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**270**	NA
Malta	**1 173**	**1 173**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**21 533**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**11 489**	NAP
Poland	**210 805**	**162 325**	18 598	18 269	329	NAP	329	NAP	NAP	NAP	29 882
Portugal	**24 596**	**19 283**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**5 313**	NAP
Romania	**168 309**	**166 117**	2 192	1 050	1 142	1 142	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**22 718**	**14 342**	8 376	8 376	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**10 231**	**6 267**	3 964	3 679	285	236	49	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**204 504**	**181 642**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**22 862**	NAP
Sweden	**59 017**	**3 095**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**36 027**	19 895
Average	**53 038**	**43 604**	6 075	5 489	602	616	206	53	123	**12 206**	14 912
Median	**24 596**	**14 023**	3 078	1 505	329	236	94	53	123	**5 313**	10 702
Minimum	**450**	**1 173**	135	58	12	9	3	0	27	**167**	0
Maximum	**221 881**	**181 642**	20 195	19 317	1 710	1 616	554	105	219	**36 027**	34 122
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	26%	30%	19%	15%	19%	15%	26%	**7%**	11%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	30%	30%	56%	67%	63%	78%	67%	**37%**	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 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,28**	**0,17**	0,11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	**0,16**	**0,16**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,80**	**0,60**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,20**	NAP
Croatia	**1,22**	**NA**	NA	NA	0,04	0,04	0,00	NAP	NA	**0,12**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,05**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,02**	NA
Czech Republic	**0,44**	**0,44**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,00
Denmark	**0,09**	**0,09**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,30**	**0,11**	0,08	0,08	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,11**	NAP
Finland	**0,04**	**0,03**	0,01	0,01	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**0,32**	**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	**0,30**	**0,13**	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,16**	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	**0,03**	**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	**0,22**	**0,16**	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Lithuania	**0,43**	**0,30**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**0,09**	0,04
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,18**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**0,04**	NA
Malta	**0,21**	**0,21**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,12**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,06**	NAP
Poland	**0,56**	**0,43**	0,05	0,05	0,00	NAP	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,08
Portugal	**0,23**	**0,18**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,05**	NAP
Romania	**0,88**	**0,87**	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,42**	**0,26**	0,15	0,15	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**0,48**	**0,30**	0,19	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	**0,56**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,34**	0,19
Average	**0,36**	**0,23**	0,07	0,06	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,09**	**0,05**
Median	**0,30**	**0,18**	0,03	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,05**	**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	**1,22**	**0,87**	0,21	0,20	0,04	*0,04*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,34**	**0,19**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	26%	30%	19%	*15%*	*19%*	*15%*	26%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	30%	30%	56%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**37%**	**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 2023

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	**24 946**	**15 434**	9 512	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	**19 133**	**19 133**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**51 783**	**39 425**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**12 358**	NAP
Croatia	**47 929**	**NA**	NA	NA	1 444	1 342	102	NAP	NA	**4 664**	NAP
Cyprus	**330**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**71**	NA
Czech Republic	**48 961**	**48 961**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Denmark	**4 694**	**4 694**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**4 028**	**1 586**	1 079	1 079	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 363**	NAP
Finland	**2 527**	**1 947**	580	580	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**231 611**	**163 506**	1 681	1 681	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**32 144**	34 280
Germany	**NA**	**87 631**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**37 108**	34 158
Greece	**27 720**	**9 849**	599	541	16	13	3	0	42	**17 177**	95
Hungary	**32 129**	**9 159**	19 944	19 086	646	NAP	538	108	212	**1 577**	1 449
Ireland	**1 479**	**1 479**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**121 890**	**114 756**	7 134	7 134	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**3 987**	**3 059**	146	49	97	97	NAP	NAP	NAP	**782**	NAP
Lithuania	**13 131**	**8 726**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**3 199**	1 206
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 178**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**248**	NA
Malta	**1 305**	**1 305**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**22 825**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**12 445**	NAP
Poland	**177 161**	**128 718**	16 860	16 560	300	NAP	300	NAP	NAP	NAP	31 583
Portugal	**23 294**	**19 503**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**3 791**	NAP
Romania	**171 662**	**169 383**	2 279	1 075	1 204	1 204	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**22 843**	**14 363**	8 480	8 480	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**9 887**	**6 050**	3 837	3 558	279	234	45	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**196 879**	**171 331**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**25 548**	NAP
Sweden	**58 970**	**3 074**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**36 394**	19 502
Average	**52 844**	**43 510**	6 011	5 438	569	*578*	*198*	*54*	127	**12 591**	15 284
Median	**23 294**	**12 106**	3 058	1 681	300	*234*	*102*	*54*	127	**4 664**	10 476
Minimum	**330**	**1 178**	146	49	16	*13*	*3*	*0*	42	**71**	0
Maximum	**231 611**	**171 331**	19 944	19 086	1 444	*1 342*	*538*	*108*	212	**37 108**	34 280
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	26%	30%	19%	*15%*	*19%*	*15%*	26%	**7%**	11%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	30%	30%	56%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**37%**	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 2023

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**	**0,17**	0,10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	**0,16**	**0,16**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,80**	**0,61**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,19**	NAP
Croatia	**1,24**	**NA**	NA	NA	0,04	0,03	0,00	NAP	NA	**0,12**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,04**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,01**	NA
Czech Republic	**0,45**	**0,45**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,00
Denmark	**0,08**	**0,08**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,29**	**0,12**	0,08	0,08	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,10**	NAP
Finland	**0,05**	**0,03**	0,01	0,01	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**0,34**	**0,24**	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,05**	0,05
Germany	**NA**	**0,10**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,04**	0,04
Greece	**0,27**	**0,09**	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,16**	0,00
Hungary	**0,34**	**0,10**	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	**0,21**	**0,19**	0,01	0,01	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**0,21**	**0,16**	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Lithuania	**0,46**	**0,30**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**0,11**	0,04
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,18**	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**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,07**	NAP
Poland	**0,47**	**0,34**	0,04	0,04	0,00	NAP	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,08
Portugal	**0,22**	**0,18**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Romania	**0,90**	**0,89**	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,42**	**0,26**	0,16	0,16	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**0,47**	**0,28**	0,18	0,17	0,01	0,01	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**0,41**	**0,35**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,05**	NAP
Sweden	**0,56**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,34**	0,18
Average	**0,36**	**0,23**	0,07	0,06	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,09**	**0,05**
Median	**0,29**	**0,18**	0,03	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,05**	**0,04**
Minimum	**0,03**	**0,03**	0,00	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,01**	**0,00**
Maximum	**1,24**	**0,89**	0,21	0,20	0,04	*0,03*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,34**	**0,18**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	26%	30%	19%	*15%*	*19%*	*15%*	26%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	30%	30%	56%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**37%**	**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. 2023

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	**36 377**	**36 377**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**17 223**	**14 878**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**2 345**	NAP
Croatia	**28 321**	**NA**	NA	NA	958	954	4	NAP	NA	**2 749**	NAP
Cyprus	**3 785**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**1 056**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**8 631**	**8 631**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0**
Denmark	**2 830**	**2 830**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 704**	**735**	309	309	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**660**	NAP
Finland	**1 236**	**1 127**	109	109	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**264 485**	**227 006**	1 658	1 658	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**28 303**	**7 518**
Germany	**NA**	**97 394**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**47 613**	**15 990**
Greece	**51 551**	**18 159**	248	214	26	26	0	0	8	**33 090**	**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	**224 432**	**220 926**	3 506	3 506	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	NAP	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**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**14 170**	NAP
Poland	**140 938**	**109 891**	6 729	6 567	162	NAP	162	NAP	NAP	NAP	**24 318**
Portugal	**17 349**	**4 887**	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	**2 133**	**1 608**	525	497	28	23	5	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**205 285**	**177 883**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**27 402**	NAP
Sweden	**10 881**	**913**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**7 185**	**2 783**
Average	**48 556**	**45 149**	1 727	1 614	314	390	46	7	14	**12 037**	**6 395**
Median	**10 338**	**4 887**	1 453	497	73	26	5	7	14	**2 749**	**1 574**
Minimum	**1 236**	**735**	19	10	9	9	0	0	8	**196**	**0**
Maximum	**264 485**	**227 006**	6 729	6 567	958	954	162	13	19	**47 613**	**24 318**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	26%	26%	19%	15%	19%	15%	26%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	30%	33%	56%	67%	63%	78%	67%	**37%**	**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. 2023

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	**0,31**	**0,31**	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**	**NA**	NA	NA	0,02	0,02	0,00	NAP	NA	**0,07**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,41**	**NA**	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	NAP	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**	**0,37**	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	NAP	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**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,08**	NAP
Poland	**0,37**	**0,29**	0,02	0,02	0,00	NAP	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,06
Portugal	**0,16**	**0,05**	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**	**0,37**	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**	**0,17**	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,08**	**0,02**
Median	**0,17**	**0,12**	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**	**0,50**	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,32**	**0,06**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	26%	26%	19%	15%	19%	15%	26%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	30%	33%	56%	67%	63%	78%	67%	**37%**	**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 2023

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	3	0,1%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	15 996	44,0%	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	10	1,4%	3	0,5%
Finland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	1 310	4,6%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	1 226	6,8%	19 290	58,3%
Hungary	5	0,2%	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	86 586	39,2%	NAP	NAP
Latvia	27	2,4%	3	0,5%
Lithuania	12	0,7%	26	1,4%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	1 069	70,0%	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	1 859	2,0%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	319	4,0%	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	6	0,4%	NAP	NAP
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	26	2,8%	84	1,2%
Average	**8 242**	**13,4%**	**3 453**	**11,1%**
Median	**27**	**2,4%**	**55**	**1,3%**
Minimum	**3**	**0,1%**	**3**	**0,5%**
Maximum	**86 586**	**70,0%**	**19 290**	**58,3%**
% of NA	**52%**	**52%**	**37%**	**37%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**41%**	**41%**

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. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,066	0,062	0,060	0,060	0,057	0,057	0,053	0,052	0,048	0,057	0,052
Belgium	NA	NA	0,392	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,316
Bulgaria	0,213	0,226	0,207	0,180	0,177	0,179	0,196	0,230	0,274	0,296	0,274
Croatia	2,253	2,126	1,940	1,763	1,562	1,346	1,159	0,971	0,760	0,712	0,757
Cyprus	NA	0,291	0,338	0,381	0,446	0,478	0,475	0,492	0,534	0,532	0,393
Czech Republic	NA	0,194	0,188	0,171	0,157	0,133	0,124	0,106	0,108	0,089	0,090
Denmark	0,057	0,058	0,054	0,045	0,037	0,033	0,037	0,042	0,043	0,041	0,040
Estonia	NA	0,115	0,103	0,109	0,092	0,086	0,075	0,087	0,086	0,114	0,122
Finland	0,025	0,034	0,035	0,035	0,025	0,026	0,023	0,025	0,023	0,024	0,023
France	0,404	0,443	0,442	0,458	0,473	0,463	0,452	0,438	NA	0,420	0,400
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,452	0,433	0,464
Hungary	0,144	0,150	0,126	0,116	0,119	0,130	0,110	0,087	0,070	0,066	0,066
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,837	0,724	0,700	0,659	0,637	0,602	0,565	0,520	0,500	0,463	0,422
Latvia	0,275	0,222	0,160	0,157	0,138	0,113	0,096	0,115	0,091	0,089	0,097
Lithuania	0,255	0,220	0,222	0,273	0,279	0,308	0,286	0,262	0,193	0,177	0,152
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	0,367	0,419	0,432	NA	0,404	0,378	0,395	0,363	0,341	0,303	0,295
Netherlands	NA	0,165	0,154	0,161	0,163	0,162	0,161	NA	NA	NA	0,136
Poland	-	0,197	-	0,224	0,245	0,254	0,271	0,343	0,323	0,258	0,285
Portugal	NA	0,048	0,107	0,114	0,125	0,137	0,144	0,145	0,135	0,136	0,151
Romania	0,059	0,138	0,392	0,465	0,402	0,432	0,376	0,380	0,411	0,450	0,522
Slovak Republic	0,396	0,480	0,678	0,574	0,399	0,353	0,319	0,249	0,213	0,217	0,183
Slovenia	0,315	0,299	0,233	0,204	0,200	0,163	0,134	0,115	0,056	0,069	0,084
Spain	-	0,210	0,190	0,204	0,211	0,238	0,294	0,347	0,300	0,358	0,404
Sweden	0,122	0,114	0,137	0,152	0,157	0,105	0,133	0,154	0,115	0,126	0,103
Average	0,386	0,315	0,331	0,310	0,296	0,281	0,267	0,263	0,242	0,247	0,243
Median	0,255	0,204	0,199	0,180	0,189	0,171	0,178	0,230	0,193	0,197	0,167
Minimum	0,025	0,034	0,035	0,035	0,025	0,026	0,023	0,025	0,023	0,024	0,023
Maximum	2,253	2,126	1,940	1,763	1,562	1,346	1,159	0,971	0,760	0,712	0,757
% of NA	37%	19%	15%	22%	19%	19%	19%	22%	22%	19%	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. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,034	0,031	0,039	0,037
Belgium	NA	NA	0,392	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,316
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,243
Croatia	1,455	1,409	1,477	1,450	1,267	1,052	0,858	0,695	0,496	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,415	0,404	NA
Czech Republic	0,159	0,187	0,174	0,157	0,143	0,124	0,115	0,098	0,102	0,082	0,090
Denmark	0,057	0,058	0,054	0,045	0,037	0,033	0,037	0,042	0,043	0,041	0,040
Estonia	0,040	0,056	0,045	0,046	0,038	0,042	0,046	0,048	0,044	0,058	0,060
Finland	0,018	NA	0,030	0,029	0,021	0,023	0,020	0,021	0,020	0,022	0,021
France	0,346	0,384	0,382	0,397	0,411	0,401	0,389	0,368	NA	0,360	0,344
Germany	0,081	0,081	NA	0,083	0,081	0,078	0,080	0,101	0,098	0,117	0,124
Greece	NA	0,362	0,350	0,355	0,402	0,363	0,386	NA	0,150	0,103	0,137
Hungary	0,082	0,080	0,060	0,057	0,056	0,060	0,050	0,038	0,032	0,033	0,031
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,833	0,720	0,691	0,649	0,627	0,593	0,556	0,511	0,490	0,454	0,414
Latvia	0,145	0,118	0,064	0,084	0,087	0,080	0,069	0,079	0,064	0,059	0,066
Lithuania	0,197	0,147	0,138	0,148	0,147	0,170	0,140	0,118	0,077	0,070	0,064
Luxembourg	0,334	0,354	0,375	0,357	0,338	0,295	0,269	0,260	0,247	0,245	0,233
Malta	0,367	0,419	0,432	0,438	0,404	0,378	0,395	0,363	0,341	0,303	0,295
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	0,075	-	0,089	0,103	0,117	0,134	0,174	0,160	0,170	0,203
Portugal	0,050	NA	0,046	0,056	0,062	0,064	0,060	0,056	0,044	0,041	0,048
Romania	0,056	0,132	0,385	0,458	0,395	0,424	0,370	0,375	0,405	0,443	0,515
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	0,430	0,266	0,270	0,248	0,206	0,162	0,132	0,147
Slovenia	0,190	0,190	0,152	0,140	0,139	0,115	0,095	0,077	0,038	0,049	0,065
Spain	-	0,160	0,145	0,159	0,166	0,193	0,245	0,274	0,224	0,280	0,343
Sweden	0,010	0,011	0,009	0,008	0,007	0,008	0,007	0,008	0,009	0,009	0,008
Average	0,260	0,275	0,284	0,268	0,248	0,233	0,218	0,188	0,168	0,160	0,167
Median	0,145	0,154	0,152	0,148	0,143	0,124	0,134	0,101	0,100	0,092	0,124
Minimum	0,010	0,011	0,009	0,008	0,007	0,008	0,007	0,008	0,009	0,009	0,008
Maximum	1,455	1,409	1,477	1,450	1,267	1,052	0,858	0,695	0,496	0,454	0,515
% of NA	30%	33%	26%	22%	22%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	15%
% 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. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	0,050	0,055	0,045	0,041	0,038	0,036	0,035	0,033	0,033	0,035	0,030
Croatia	0,439	0,191	0,037	0,017	0,034	0,047	0,068	0,082	0,074	0,055	0,068
Cyprus	NA	0,093	0,103	0,104	0,112	0,104	0,106	0,108	0,119	0,127	0,103
Czech Republic	0,085	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,055	0,049	0,049	0,054	0,047	0,035	0,024	0,022	0,026	0,034	0,039
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,042	0,041	0,041	0,042	0,043	0,043	0,044	0,046	NA	0,045	0,042
Germany	0,069	0,069	NA	0,061	0,063	0,065	0,069	0,070	0,066	0,064	0,060
Greece	NA	NA	0,437	0,403	0,393	0,339	NA	0,266	0,299	0,327	0,323
Hungary	0,003	0,004	0,005	0,004	0,005	0,005	0,006	0,004	0,000	0,000	0,005
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	0,126	0,099	0,095	0,073	0,050	0,034	0,026	0,035	0,025	0,029	0,029
Lithuania	0,043	0,057	0,070	0,110	0,121	0,132	0,139	0,137	0,111	0,101	0,084
Luxembourg	0,031	0,030	0,030	0,027	0,025	0,026	0,025	0,026	0,037	0,028	0,026
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	0,085	0,084	0,088	0,085	0,085	0,080	NA	NA	NA	0,084
Poland	-	0,050	-	0,067	0,072	0,069	0,072	0,074	0,070	NAP	NAP
Portugal	NA	NA	0,061	0,059	0,063	0,073	0,084	0,088	0,091	0,095	0,103
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	0,000	0,039	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
Sweden	0,095	0,085	0,110	0,124	0,133	0,076	0,108	0,120	0,081	0,091	0,072
Average	0,087	0,064	0,081	0,078	0,078	0,071	0,058	0,074	0,074	0,077	0,075
Median	0,053	0,055	0,049	0,059	0,050	0,047	0,059	0,071	0,070	0,055	0,061
Minimum	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,005
Maximum	0,439	0,191	0,437	0,403	0,393	0,339	0,139	0,266	0,299	0,327	0,323
% of NA	22%	11%	7%	4%	4%	4%	11%	11%	15%	11%	7%
% of NAP	26%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	30%	30%	30%	33%	37%

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 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,343	0,330	0,320	0,313	0,300	0,289	0,287	0,258	0,278	0,262	0,279
Belgium	NA	NA	0,247	0,227	0,206	0,224	0,211	0,193	0,205	0,188	0,155
Bulgaria	0,940	0,893	0,843	0,835	0,830	0,818	0,862	0,819	0,807	0,784	0,797
Croatia	2,252	2,078	1,992	1,912	1,662	1,604	1,531	1,427	1,590	1,465	1,221
Cyprus	NA	0,101	0,093	0,108	0,092	0,096	0,105	0,114	0,127	0,129	0,048
Czech Republic	NA	0,899	0,806	0,798	0,645	0,599	0,556	0,497	0,484	0,478	0,438
Denmark	0,131	0,112	0,091	0,088	0,083	0,083	0,086	0,090	0,083	0,078	0,087
Estonia	NA	0,349	0,360	0,335	0,336	0,320	0,288	0,305	0,343	0,313	0,298
Finland	0,065	0,070	0,069	0,056	0,052	0,050	0,051	0,045	0,048	0,043	0,044
France	0,418	0,426	0,420	0,422	0,407	0,393	0,392	0,299	NA	0,333	0,325
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,269	0,314	0,297
Hungary	0,540	0,531	0,482	0,524	0,498	0,491	0,411	0,337	0,348	0,318	0,339
Ireland	0,045	0,050	0,057	0,057	0,056	0,058	0,055	0,028	0,028	0,026	0,033
Italy	0,261	0,222	0,209	0,223	0,221	0,210	0,192	0,164	0,178	0,172	0,165
Latvia	0,440	0,377	0,350	0,354	0,335	0,293	0,276	0,239	0,240	0,236	0,215
Lithuania	0,805	0,806	0,881	0,809	0,735	0,656	0,611	0,563	0,586	0,529	0,433
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	0,193	0,184	0,171	NA	0,147	0,167	0,141	0,111	0,161	0,217	0,208
Netherlands	0,166	0,157	0,164	0,172	0,150	0,136	0,132	0,111	0,132	0,134	0,120
Poland	-	0,588	-	0,610	0,603	0,592	0,625	0,473	0,548	0,476	0,560
Portugal	NA	0,176	0,235	0,240	0,252	0,242	0,238	0,195	0,217	0,241	0,231
Romania	0,213	0,636	0,986	1,044	1,054	1,017	0,984	0,882	1,043	0,993	0,883
Slovak Republic	1,278	1,617	1,616	1,254	0,862	0,781	0,630	0,495	0,432	0,462	0,419
Slovenia	1,094	1,080	0,996	0,904	0,800	0,711	0,636	0,530	0,531	0,505	0,482
Spain	-	0,327	0,364	0,396	0,408	0,440	0,473	0,375	0,496	0,490	0,421
Sweden	0,409	0,433	0,407	0,506	0,562	0,622	0,625	0,600	0,584	0,530	0,559
Average	0,564	0,541	0,529	0,530	0,471	0,454	0,433	0,381	0,407	0,389	0,362
Median	0,409	0,377	0,360	0,396	0,372	0,356	0,340	0,302	0,310	0,314	0,298
Minimum	0,045	0,050	0,057	0,056	0,052	0,050	0,051	0,028	0,028	0,026	0,033
Maximum	2,252	2,078	1,992	1,912	1,662	1,604	1,531	1,427	1,590	1,465	1,221
% of NA	30%	15%	11%	15%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%	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 litigiousl cases - incoming 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,144	0,161	0,156	0,172
Belgium	0,263	0,253	0,247	0,227	0,206	0,224	0,211	0,193	0,205	0,188	0,155
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,599
Croatia	1,476	1,242	1,248	1,197	1,007	0,915	0,853	0,728	0,934	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,102	0,101	NA
Czech Republic	0,789	0,860	0,758	0,748	0,599	0,554	0,511	0,463	0,446	0,443	0,438
Denmark	0,131	0,112	0,091	0,088	0,083	0,083	0,086	0,090	0,083	0,078	0,087
Estonia	0,162	0,154	0,147	0,136	0,144	0,146	0,139	0,131	0,143	0,132	0,111
Finland	0,031	NA	0,051	0,043	0,041	0,039	0,040	0,033	0,037	0,034	0,034
France	0,327	0,332	0,323	0,324	0,303	0,290	0,284	0,204	NA	0,242	0,226
Germany	0,126	0,126	NA	0,121	0,111	0,112	0,146	0,131	0,141	0,123	0,095
Greece	NA	0,246	0,233	0,169	0,191	0,209	0,216	NA	0,087	0,146	0,132
Hungary	0,228	0,174	0,167	0,171	0,161	0,156	0,121	0,092	0,105	0,104	0,092
Ireland	0,045	0,050	0,057	0,057	0,056	0,058	0,055	0,028	0,028	0,026	0,033
Italy	0,255	0,216	0,193	0,208	0,207	0,196	0,177	0,152	0,164	0,159	0,155
Latvia	0,288	0,259	0,280	0,290	0,273	0,233	0,219	0,181	0,178	0,180	0,163
Lithuania	0,485	0,503	0,519	0,513	0,496	0,447	0,410	0,386	0,362	0,322	0,298
Luxembourg	0,236	0,224	0,228	0,214	0,200	0,183	0,191	0,175	0,187	0,179	0,181
Malta	0,193	0,184	0,171	0,188	0,147	0,167	0,141	0,111	0,161	0,217	0,208
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	0,362	-	0,375	0,370	0,367	0,404	0,294	0,339	0,350	0,431
Portugal	0,186	NA	0,200	0,203	0,211	0,201	0,195	0,154	0,170	0,195	0,181
Romania	0,192	0,626	0,973	1,031	1,037	1,002	0,970	0,868	1,028	0,978	0,871
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	0,643	0,506	0,466	0,388	0,287	0,239	0,275	0,264
Slovenia	0,584	0,627	0,579	0,523	0,452	0,410	0,365	0,310	0,312	0,311	0,295
Spain	-	0,282	0,313	0,344	0,356	0,384	0,386	0,309	0,429	0,437	0,374
Sweden	0,030	0,029	0,028	0,026	0,027	0,027	0,028	0,028	0,030	0,030	0,029
Average	0,317	0,343	0,340	0,341	0,312	0,299	0,284	0,239	0,253	0,225	0,234
Median	0,228	0,249	0,231	0,214	0,207	0,209	0,211	0,175	0,167	0,179	0,176
Minimum	0,030	0,029	0,028	0,026	0,027	0,027	0,028	0,028	0,028	0,026	0,029
Maximum	1,476	1,242	1,248	1,197	1,037	1,002	0,970	0,868	1,028	0,978	0,871
% of NA	22%	26%	22%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	11%	11%	11%
% 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 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	0,278	0,244	0,209	0,218	0,210	*0,210*	*0,207*	*0,184*	0,196	0,190	0,198
Croatia	0,062	0,043	0,082	0,121	0,123	*0,148*	*0,156*	*0,145*	0,141	0,144	0,124
Cyprus	NA	0,021	0,016	0,007	0,014	*0,022*	*0,026*	*0,023*	0,025	0,028	0,018
Czech Republic	0,077	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,095	0,126	0,136	0,125	0,118	*0,099*	*0,084*	*0,094*	0,112	0,103	0,109
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,044	0,045	0,046	0,047	0,047	*0,050*	*0,053*	*0,045*	NA	0,045	0,046
Germany	0,086	0,086	NA	0,053	0,058	*0,061*	*0,061*	*0,054*	0,051	0,043	0,040
Greece	NA	NA	0,175	0,146	0,171	*0,178*	*NA*	*0,167*	0,171	0,162	0,160
Hungary	0,018	0,018	0,017	0,022	0,020	*0,024*	*0,023*	*0,009*	0,000	0,000	0,020
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	0,124	0,095	0,070	0,063	0,061	*0,060*	*0,058*	*0,048*	0,051	0,049	0,045
Lithuania	0,145	0,135	0,195	0,157	0,147	*0,139*	*0,132*	*0,118*	0,150	0,164	0,093
Luxembourg	0,063	0,062	0,048	0,041	0,048	*0,040*	*0,035*	*0,045*	0,037	0,041	0,040
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,072	0,073	0,082	0,087	0,071	*0,062*	*0,061*	*0,047*	0,064	0,075	0,064
Poland	-	0,046	-	0,049	0,046	*0,053*	*0,044*	*0,038*	0,071	NAP	NAP
Portugal	NA	NA	0,035	0,037	0,042	*0,041*	*0,042*	*0,041*	0,047	0,046	0,050
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,001	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	*0,000*	*0,000*	*0,000*	0,000	0,037	NAP
Slovenia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	-	0,045	0,051	0,052	0,052	*0,055*	*0,088*	*0,066*	0,067	0,053	0,047
Sweden	0,237	0,255	0,237	0,341	0,386	*0,446*	*0,431*	*0,395*	0,371	0,323	0,341
Average	0,100	0,086	0,093	0,092	0,095	0,099	0,094	0,089	0,097	0,094	0,093
Median	0,077	0,062	0,070	0,053	0,058	0,060	0,059	0,048	0,066	0,051	0,050
Minimum	0,001	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,018
Maximum	0,278	0,255	0,237	0,341	0,386	0,446	0,431	0,395	0,371	0,323	0,341
% of NA	19%	11%	7%	4%	4%	4%	11%	7%	11%	7%	7%
% of NAP	26%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	30%	30%	30%	33%	37%

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 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,347	0,332	0,319	0,315	0,300	*0,291*	*0,287*	*0,263*	0,267	0,267	0,272
Belgium	NA	NA	0,260	0,250	0,227	*0,233*	*0,233*	*0,200*	0,216	0,206	0,163
Bulgaria	0,928	0,913	0,865	0,840	0,829	*0,803*	*0,829*	*0,778*	0,802	0,807	0,803
Croatia	2,377	2,280	2,184	2,131	1,888	*1,796*	*1,722*	*1,669*	1,645	1,421	1,244
Cyprus	NA	0,051	0,050	0,054	0,062	*0,084*	*0,091*	*0,088*	0,117	0,109	0,035
Czech Republic	NA	0,908	0,823	0,813	0,668	*0,608*	*0,574*	*0,496*	0,500	0,476	0,449
Denmark	0,129	0,116	0,100	0,096	0,088	*0,080*	*0,081*	*0,089*	0,085	0,079	0,079
Estonia	NA	0,362	0,353	0,352	0,340	*0,321*	*0,283*	*0,302*	0,315	0,302	0,295
Finland	0,065	0,069	0,069	0,066	0,051	*0,053*	*0,049*	*0,047*	0,046	0,044	0,045
France	0,398	0,403	0,402	0,406	0,419	*0,403*	*0,395*	*0,308*	NA	0,349	0,339
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,240	0,295	0,266
Hungary	0,539	0,545	0,493	0,521	0,490	*0,509*	*0,432*	*0,355*	0,353	0,323	0,335
Ireland	0,040	0,038	0,048	0,047	0,037	*0,044*	*0,051*	*0,029*	0,021	0,024	0,028
Italy	0,332	0,264	0,251	0,246	0,257	*0,249*	*0,246*	*0,185*	0,217	0,214	0,207
Latvia	0,491	0,377	0,352	0,366	0,362	*0,307*	*0,270*	*0,264*	0,242	0,228	0,213
Lithuania	0,842	0,806	0,834	0,807	0,707	*0,679*	*0,635*	*0,632*	0,598	0,552	0,455
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Malta	0,132	0,160	0,164	NA	0,173	*0,134*	*0,158*	*0,144*	0,196	0,207	0,232
Netherlands	0,162	0,166	0,156	0,171	0,153	*0,145*	*0,135*	*0,121*	0,127	0,128	0,127
Poland	-	0,579	-	0,589	0,593	*0,568*	*0,566*	*0,480*	0,519	0,450	0,471
Portugal	NA	0,179	0,247	0,230	0,240	*0,235*	*0,237*	*0,203*	0,214	0,224	0,219
Romania	0,141	0,427	0,915	1,110	1,027	*1,072*	*0,985*	*0,854*	1,004	0,921	0,900
Slovak Republic	1,194	1,419	1,585	1,429	1,044	*0,814*	*0,700*	*0,533*	0,466	0,456	0,421
Slovenia	1,110	1,145	1,026	0,908	0,837	*0,739*	*0,654*	*0,589*	0,518	0,489	0,466
Spain	-	0,347	0,351	0,389	0,379	*0,384*	*0,422*	*0,423*	0,435	0,439	0,405
Sweden	0,417	0,409	0,398	0,499	0,613	*0,593*	*0,603*	*0,638*	0,572	0,553	0,559
Average	0,567	0,534	0,532	0,549	0,491	0,464	0,443	0,404	0,405	0,382	0,361
Median	0,398	0,377	0,352	0,389	0,371	0,352	0,341	0,305	0,291	0,302	0,295
Minimum	0,040	0,038	0,048	0,047	0,037	0,044	0,049	0,029	0,021	0,024	0,028
Maximum	2,377	2,280	2,184	2,131	1,888	1,796	1,722	1,669	1,645	1,421	1,244
% of NA	30%	15%	11%	15%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%	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 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,147	0,152	0,158	0,169
Belgium	NA	0,260	0,260	0,250	0,227	0,233	0,233	0,200	0,216	0,206	0,163
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,612
Croatia	1,395	1,190	1,298	1,395	1,231	1,113	1,017	0,942	0,915	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,102	0,088	NA
Czech Republic	0,793	0,873	0,775	0,762	0,618	0,563	0,527	0,462	0,464	0,440	0,449
Denmark	0,129	0,116	0,100	0,096	0,088	0,080	0,081	0,089	0,085	0,079	0,079
Estonia	0,148	0,165	0,146	0,144	0,139	0,142	0,135	0,134	0,128	0,129	0,116
Finland	0,032	NA	0,052	0,051	0,039	0,042	0,038	0,035	0,036	0,035	0,035
France	0,309	0,310	0,306	0,309	0,314	0,303	0,290	0,215	NA	0,258	0,239
Germany	0,126	0,126	NA	0,122	0,113	0,111	0,124	0,135	0,120	0,116	0,103
Greece	NA	0,252	0,218	0,126	0,216	0,203	0,219	NA	0,089	0,116	0,095
Hungary	0,230	0,194	0,170	0,171	0,159	0,165	0,133	0,098	0,104	0,107	0,096
Ireland	0,040	0,038	0,048	0,047	0,037	0,044	0,051	0,029	0,021	0,024	0,028
Italy	0,325	0,258	0,236	0,230	0,242	0,234	0,232	0,174	0,202	0,200	0,195
Latvia	0,311	0,262	0,300	0,280	0,283	0,243	0,217	0,196	0,183	0,172	0,163
Lithuania	0,535	0,513	0,511	0,516	0,474	0,477	0,432	0,427	0,368	0,328	0,302
Luxembourg	0,243	0,194	0,228	0,227	0,236	0,210	0,197	0,184	0,183	0,186	0,175
Malta	0,132	0,160	0,164	0,199	0,173	0,134	0,158	0,144	0,196	0,207	0,232
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	0,351	-	0,360	0,358	0,352	0,364	0,309	0,330	0,318	0,342
Portugal	0,188	NA	0,190	0,197	0,209	0,205	0,199	0,166	0,172	0,188	0,183
Romania	0,126	0,416	0,902	1,096	1,010	1,056	0,970	0,841	0,989	0,906	0,888
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	0,807	0,587	0,488	0,430	0,332	0,268	0,260	0,265
Slovenia	0,584	0,665	0,591	0,524	0,475	0,429	0,383	0,349	0,301	0,293	0,285
Spain	-	0,297	0,299	0,336	0,328	0,333	0,359	0,361	0,370	0,369	0,352
Sweden	0,029	0,031	0,029	0,027	0,027	0,028	0,027	0,027	0,030	0,031	0,029
Average	0,315	0,334	0,341	0,360	0,330	0,312	0,296	0,261	0,251	0,217	0,233
Median	0,209	0,259	0,232	0,230	0,236	0,233	0,219	0,184	0,183	0,187	0,179
Minimum	0,029	0,031	0,029	0,027	0,027	0,028	0,027	0,027	0,021	0,024	0,028
Maximum	1,395	1,190	1,298	1,395	1,231	1,113	1,017	0,942	0,989	0,906	0,888
% of NA	26%	26%	22%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	11%	11%	11%
% 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 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	0,273	0,255	0,214	0,221	0,212	0,212	0,210	0,184	0,196	0,194	0,192
Croatia	0,308	0,198	0,102	0,104	0,111	0,127	0,142	0,156	0,163	0,131	0,121
Cyprus	NA	0,013	0,014	0,014	0,020	0,018	0,023	0,016	0,015	0,021	0,008
Czech Republic	0,081	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,101	0,126	0,129	0,132	0,128	0,110	0,086	0,089	0,103	0,097	0,100
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,044	0,045	0,046	0,046	0,047	0,049	0,051	0,046	NA	0,047	0,047
Germany	0,080	0,080	NA	0,051	0,055	0,057	0,060	0,058	0,052	0,047	0,044
Greece	NA	NA	0,214	0,156	0,235	0,203	NA	0,164	0,142	0,174	0,165
Hungary	0,017	0,018	0,017	0,021	0,020	0,023	0,024	0,013	0,000	0,000	0,016
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	0,154	0,096	0,096	0,086	0,079	0,064	0,053	0,058	0,048	0,049	0,042
Lithuania	0,132	0,123	0,157	0,147	0,136	NA	0,134	0,144	0,157	0,181	0,111
Luxembourg	0,064	0,062	0,050	0,041	0,046	0,041	0,033	0,033	0,046	0,042	0,037
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,065	0,074	0,076	0,090	0,071	0,067	0,061	0,055	0,060	0,063	0,069
Poland	-	0,039	-	0,044	0,050	0,049	0,043	0,041	0,045	NAP	NAP
Portugal	NA	NA	0,037	0,032	0,032	0,030	0,038	0,038	0,042	0,036	0,036
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	0,000	0,035	NAP
Slovenia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	-	0,050	0,051	0,052	0,051	0,051	0,063	0,062	0,064	0,070	0,053
Sweden	0,246	0,228	0,229	0,331	0,442	0,413	0,418	0,435	0,360	0,342	0,345
Average	0,120	0,094	0,095	0,092	0,102	0,095	0,090	0,094	0,093	0,096	0,092
Median	0,081	0,074	0,076	0,052	0,055	0,054	0,056	0,058	0,056	0,056	0,053
Minimum	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,008
Maximum	0,308	0,255	0,229	0,331	0,442	0,413	0,418	0,435	0,360	0,342	0,345
% of NA	19%	11%	7%	4%	4%	7%	11%	7%	11%	7%	7%
% of NAP	26%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	30%	30%	30%	33%	37%

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. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,063	0,060	0,060	0,057	0,057	*0,054*	*0,053*	*0,048*	0,058	0,053	0,059
Belgium	NA	NA	0,385	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	0,309
Bulgaria	0,225	0,206	0,185	0,175	0,178	*0,194*	*0,228*	*0,270*	0,279	0,273	0,267
Croatia	2,127	1,924	1,747	1,544	1,336	*1,154*	*0,966*	*0,729*	0,709	0,758	0,735
Cyprus	NA	0,341	0,381	0,435	0,476	*0,490*	*0,488*	*0,526*	0,543	0,552	0,405
Czech Republic	NA	0,185	0,171	0,157	0,134	*0,124*	*0,106*	*0,107*	0,092	0,090	0,079
Denmark	0,059	0,054	0,045	0,037	0,033	*0,037*	*0,043*	*0,044*	0,041	0,040	0,048
Estonia	NA	0,102	0,109	0,092	0,087	*0,085*	*0,084*	*0,086*	0,114	0,125	0,125
Finland	0,026	0,035	0,035	0,025	0,026	*0,023*	*0,025*	*0,023*	0,025	0,024	0,022
France	0,423	0,466	0,460	0,474	0,462	*0,452*	*0,449*	*0,429*	NA	0,404	0,387
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*0,615*	0,482	0,453	0,495
Hungary	0,145	0,136	0,116	0,120	0,127	*0,112*	*0,088*	*0,069*	0,066	0,061	0,070
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,766	0,682	0,658	0,636	0,601	*0,563*	*0,511*	*0,498*	0,461	0,421	0,380
Latvia	0,223	0,223	0,157	0,145	0,110	*0,099*	*0,102*	*0,090*	0,089	0,097	0,094
Lithuania	0,218	0,220	0,269	0,275	0,307	*0,286*	*0,262*	*0,193*	0,181	0,154	0,130
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Malta	0,429	0,442	0,437	NA	0,378	*0,410*	*0,379*	*0,331*	0,305	0,320	0,271
Netherlands	0,166	0,154	0,162	0,164	0,163	*0,162*	*0,158*	*0,140*	0,142	0,152	0,129
Poland	-	0,206	-	0,245	0,255	*0,278*	*0,330*	*0,336*	0,352	0,284	0,374
Portugal	NA	0,046	0,114	0,125	0,137	*0,144*	*0,145*	*0,136*	0,138	0,153	0,163
Romania	0,132	0,347	0,462	0,399	0,429	*0,376*	*0,376*	*0,408*	0,450	0,522	0,504
Slovak Republic	0,481	0,678	0,709	0,399	0,353	*0,320*	*0,249*	*0,212*	0,178	0,224	0,181
Slovenia	0,299	0,234	0,204	0,201	0,164	*0,135*	*0,116*	*0,056*	0,069	0,085	0,100
Spain	-	0,190	0,204	0,212	0,240	*0,296*	*0,346*	*0,301*	0,363	0,409	0,422
Sweden	0,115	0,138	0,146	0,159	0,106	*0,134*	*0,155*	*0,116*	0,126	0,103	0,103
Average	0,368	0,321	0,328	0,289	0,280	0,269	0,257	0,251	0,239	0,250	0,244
Median	0,221	0,206	0,195	0,175	0,171	0,178	0,193	0,193	0,160	0,154	0,172
Minimum	0,026	0,035	0,035	0,025	0,026	0,023	0,025	0,023	0,025	0,024	0,022
Maximum	2,127	1,924	1,747	1,544	1,336	1,154	0,966	0,729	0,709	0,758	0,735
% of NA	33%	19%	15%	22%	19%	19%	19%	15%	19%	15%	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. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,031	0,040	0,037	0,040
Belgium	NA	NA	0,385	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,309
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,231
Croatia	1,537	1,460	1,427	1,253	1,044	0,854	0,692	0,476	0,515	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,414	0,418	NA
Czech Republic	0,155	0,174	0,157	0,143	0,125	0,115	0,099	0,100	0,084	0,085	0,079
Denmark	0,059	0,054	0,045	0,037	0,033	0,037	0,043	0,044	0,041	0,040	0,048
Estonia	0,055	0,045	0,045	0,038	0,042	0,046	0,048	0,044	0,058	0,061	0,054
Finland	0,017	NA	0,029	0,021	0,023	0,020	0,022	0,020	0,022	0,021	0,020
France	0,364	0,405	0,399	0,412	0,400	0,387	0,382	0,357	NA	0,345	0,332
Germany	0,081	0,081	NA	0,082	0,079	0,080	0,101	0,098	0,119	0,124	0,115
Greece	NA	0,351	0,350	0,397	0,378	0,368	0,383	0,326	0,148	0,134	0,174
Hungary	0,080	0,060	0,057	0,057	0,058	0,051	0,038	0,031	0,033	0,031	0,028
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,762	0,678	0,649	0,627	0,592	0,555	0,502	0,489	0,452	0,414	0,375
Latvia	0,121	0,115	0,084	0,095	0,078	0,069	0,071	0,064	0,059	0,066	0,060
Lithuania	0,146	0,137	0,146	0,145	0,169	0,140	0,118	0,077	0,071	0,064	0,059
Luxembourg	0,331	0,384	0,375	0,344	0,301	0,269	0,263	0,251	0,251	0,237	0,239
Malta	0,429	0,442	0,437	0,428	0,378	0,410	0,379	0,331	0,305	0,320	0,271
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	0,085	-	0,104	0,116	0,132	0,175	0,159	0,169	0,202	0,292
Portugal	0,048	NA	0,055	0,062	0,064	0,060	0,056	0,045	0,042	0,049	0,046
Romania	0,122	0,342	0,456	0,393	0,422	0,370	0,370	0,402	0,444	0,515	0,498
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	0,267	0,269	0,248	0,206	0,161	0,132	0,147	0,147
Slovenia	0,190	0,152	0,140	0,139	0,116	0,096	0,077	0,038	0,049	0,066	0,076
Spain	-	0,145	0,159	0,167	0,194	0,247	0,274	0,224	0,284	0,347	0,366
Sweden	0,011	0,009	0,008	0,007	0,008	0,007	0,009	0,010	0,009	0,008	0,009
Average	0,265	0,284	0,284	0,248	0,233	0,217	0,205	0,172	0,170	0,170	0,168
Median	0,122	0,149	0,157	0,143	0,125	0,132	0,118	0,099	0,101	0,104	0,115
Minimum	0,011	0,009	0,008	0,007	0,008	0,007	0,009	0,010	0,009	0,008	0,009
Maximum	1,537	1,460	1,427	1,253	1,044	0,854	0,692	0,489	0,515	0,515	0,498
% of NA	30%	33%	26%	22%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	19%	15%
% 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. 2013 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	0,055	0,045	0,041	0,038	0,036	0,034	0,033	0,032	0,033	0,030	0,036
Croatia	0,192	0,037	0,017	0,034	0,046	0,068	0,082	0,071	0,055	0,069	0,071
Cyprus	NA	0,102	0,104	0,098	0,106	0,107	0,109	0,115	0,129	0,133	0,113
Czech Republic	0,081	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,049	0,049	0,055	0,047	0,036	0,024	0,022	0,026	0,034	0,040	0,048
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,042	0,041	0,041	0,043	0,043	0,044	0,046	0,045	NA	0,042	0,041
Germany	0,070	0,070	NA	0,063	0,065	0,069	0,070	0,066	0,065	0,060	0,056
Greece	NA	NA	0,400	0,392	0,328	0,313	NA	0,269	0,328	0,315	0,318
Hungary	0,004	0,005	0,004	0,005	0,005	0,006	0,004	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,009
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	0,096	0,098	0,073	0,050	0,033	0,030	0,031	0,025	0,029	0,029	0,032
Lithuania	0,056	0,069	0,108	0,119	0,131	NA	0,137	0,111	0,103	0,084	0,066
Luxembourg	0,031	0,030	0,028	0,026	0,027	0,025	0,026	0,038	0,028	0,026	0,029
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,085	0,084	0,089	0,086	0,086	0,080	0,080	0,071	0,075	0,085	0,079
Poland	-	0,057	-	0,073	0,069	0,072	0,073	0,070	0,096	NAP	NAP
Portugal	NA	NA	0,058	0,063	0,073	0,084	0,088	0,091	0,096	0,105	0,117
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	0,000	0,041	NAP
Slovenia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	-	0,045	0,045	0,046	0,046	0,049	0,073	0,077	0,079	0,062	0,056
Sweden	0,085	0,111	0,118	0,134	0,077	0,109	0,121	0,081	0,091	0,072	0,068
Average	0,065	0,056	0,079	0,077	0,071	0,070	0,062	0,070	0,078	0,075	0,076
Median	0,056	0,049	0,055	0,050	0,046	0,059	0,071	0,070	0,070	0,061	0,056
Minimum	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,009
Maximum	0,192	0,111	0,400	0,392	0,328	0,313	0,137	0,269	0,328	0,315	0,318
% of NA	19%	11%	7%	4%	4%	7%	11%	7%	11%	7%	7%
% of NAP	26%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	30%	30%	30%	33%	37%

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	NA	NA	0,000	0,000
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,136
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,029	0,035	0,060
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,001	0,001
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,017	0,197
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,000
Ireland	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
Latvia	0,000	NA	0,008	NA	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,002
Lithuania	0,001	0,001	0,002	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001
Luxembourg	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
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,002	0,003	0,003	0,003	0,009	0,011	0,011	0,010
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,011	0,013	0,013	0,006
Slovenia	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
Sweden	0,022	0,001	0,001	0,005	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001
Average	0,077	0,055	0,050	0,054	0,047	0,051	0,040	0,054
Median	0,001	0,001	0,002	0,002	0,001	0,006	0,006	0,004
Minimum	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
% of NA	67%	70%	67%	70%	67%	63%	56%	48%
% of NAP	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,136
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	0,221	0,152	0,109	0,061	0,026	0,024	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,001	0,001
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,004	0,017	0,012
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,000
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,306	0,272	0,249	0,223	0,227	0,205	0,171	0,147
Latvia	0,000	NA	0,005	NA	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001
Lithuania	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,000	0,001	0,000	0,000	0,000
Luxembourg	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
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,002	0,003	0,003	0,003	0,009	0,011	0,011	0,010
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,011	0,013	0,011	0,006
Slovenia	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
Sweden	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	0,039
Median	0,001	0,002	0,003	0,002	0,001	0,003	0,001	0,001
Minimum	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
% of NA	67%	70%	67%	70%	59%	56%	59%	52%
% of NAP	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,000	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Finland	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	0,001	0,002	NA	0,002	0,002
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,185
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	0,000	NA	0,003	NA	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Lithuania	0,000	0,000	0,001	0,000	0,000	0,001	0,001	0,001
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,018	0,032	NAP	NAP
Portugal	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,000	0,000	0,002	NAP
Slovenia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	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
Average	0,006	0,000	0,001	0,002	0,003	0,005	0,001	0,032
Median	0,000	0,000	0,001	0,001	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,001
Minimum	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
% of NA	52%	56%	56%	59%	44%	44%	41%	37%
% of NAP	33%	33%	30%	26%	30%	30%	37%	41%

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 2023 (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	**98%**	**98%**	97%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	**105%**	**105%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**101%**	**102%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**97%**	NAP
Croatia	**102%**	**NA**	NA	NA	84%	83%	109%	NAP	NA	**98%**	NAP
Cyprus	**73%**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**43%**	NA
Czech Republic	**102%**	**102%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0%
Denmark	**91%**	**91%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**99%**	**105%**	100%	100%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**92%**	NAP
Finland	**103%**	**102%**	108%	108%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**104%**	**106%**	112%	112%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**102%**	100%
Germany	**NA**	**109%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**108%**	105%
Greece	**89%**	**72%**	112%	110%	133%	144%	100%	0%	156%	**103%**	90%
Hungary	**99%**	**103%**	99%	99%	98%	NAP	97%	103%	97%	**81%**	96%
Ireland	**85%**	**85%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**125%**	**126%**	119%	119%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**99%**	**100%**	108%	84%	126%	126%	NAP	NAP	NAP	**93%**	NAP
Lithuania	**105%**	**102%**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**119%**	101%
Luxembourg	**NA**	**97%**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**92%**	NA
Malta	**111%**	**111%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**106%**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**108%**	NAP
Poland	**84%**	**79%**	91%	91%	91%	NAP	91%	NAP	NAP	NAP	106%
Portugal	**95%**	**101%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**71%**	NAP
Romania	**102%**	**102%**	104%	102%	105%	105%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**101%**	**100%**	101%	101%	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**97%**	**97%**	97%	97%	98%	99%	92%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**96%**	**94%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**112%**	NAP
Sweden	**100%**	**99%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**101%**	98%
Average	**99%**	**100%**	104%	102%	105%	*112%*	*98%*	*51%*	126%	**95%**	**87%**
Median	**100%**	**101%**	103%	101%	98%	*105%*	*97%*	*51%*	126%	**98%**	**99%**
Minimum	**73%**	**72%**	91%	84%	84%	*83%*	*91%*	*0%*	97%	**43%**	**0%**
Maximum	**125%**	**126%**	119%	119%	133%	*144%*	*109%*	*103%*	156%	**119%**	**106%**
% of NA	**7%**	11%	26%	30%	19%	*15%*	*19%*	*15%*	26%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	30%	30%	56%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**37%**	**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 2023

(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	**79**	**87**	66	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	**694**	**694**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**121**	**138**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**69**	NAP
Croatia	**216**	**NA**	NA	NA	242	259	14	NAP	NA	**215**	NAP
Cyprus	**4186**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**5429**	NA
Czech Republic	**64**	**64**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Denmark	**220**	**220**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**154**	**169**	105	105	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**177**	NAP
Finland	**179**	**211**	69	69	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**417**	**507**	360	360	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**321**	80
Germany	**NA**	**406**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**468**	171
Greece	**679**	**673**	151	144	593	730	0	0	70	**703**	207
Hungary	**76**	**107**	52	53	41	NAP	41	44	33	**189**	92
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**672**	**703**	179	179	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**160**	**134**	48	74	34	34	NAP	NAP	NAP	**282**	NAP
Lithuania	**104**	**71**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**218**	40
Luxembourg	**NA**	**497**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**288**	NA
Malta	**427**	**427**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**370**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**416**	NAP
Poland	**290**	**312**	146	145	197	NAP	197	NAP	NAP	NAP	281
Portugal	**272**	**91**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1200**	NAP
Romania	**204**	**204**	200	105	285	285	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**156**	**203**	79	79	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**79**	**97**	50	51	37	36	41	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**381**	**379**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**391**	NAP
Sweden	**67**	**108**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**72**	52
Average	**428**	**283**	125	124	204	*269*	*59*	*22*	51	**696**	**115**
Median	**210**	**204**	92	105	197	*259*	*41*	*22*	51	**288**	**86**
Minimum	**64**	**64**	48	51	34	*34*	*0*	*0*	33	**69**	**0**
Maximum	**4 186**	**703**	360	360	593	*730*	*197*	*44*	70	**5 429**	**281**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	26%	26%	19%	*15%*	*19%*	*15%*	26%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	30%	33%	56%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**37%**	**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 2013 - 2023 (Q097)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	101%	100%	100%	101%	100%	101%	100%	102%	96%	102%	98%
Belgium	NA	NA	105%	110%	110%	104%	110%	104%	105%	109%	105%
Bulgaria	99%	102%	103%	101%	100%	98%	96%	95%	99%	103%	101%
Croatia	106%	110%	110%	111%	114%	112%	112%	117%	103%	97%	102%
Cyprus	NA	51%	54%	50%	67%	87%	87%	77%	92%	85%	73%
Czech Republic	NA	101%	102%	102%	104%	102%	103%	100%	103%	100%	102%
Denmark	99%	104%	109%	109%	105%	96%	94%	98%	102%	101%	91%
Estonia	NA	104%	98%	105%	101%	100%	98%	99%	92%	97%	99%
Finland	99%	98%	100%	118%	97%	106%	96%	104%	96%	101%	103%
France	95%	95%	96%	96%	103%	103%	101%	103%	NA	105%	104%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	89%	94%	89%
Hungary	100%	103%	102%	99%	98%	104%	105%	105%	101%	102%	99%
Ireland	89%	75%	84%	82%	66%	75%	93%	105%	77%	91%	85%
Italy	127%	119%	120%	110%	116%	118%	128%	113%	122%	124%	125%
Latvia	112%	100%	101%	104%	108%	105%	98%	110%	101%	97%	99%
Lithuania	105%	100%	95%	100%	96%	103%	104%	112%	102%	105%	105%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	68%	87%	96%	NA	118%	80%	112%	130%	122%	96%	111%
Netherlands	98%	106%	95%	100%	102%	106%	102%	110%	96%	96%	106%
Poland	-	98%	-	97%	98%	96%	90%	101%	95%	95%	84%
Portugal	NA	102%	105%	96%	95%	97%	100%	104%	99%	93%	95%
Romania	66%	67%	93%	106%	97%	105%	100%	97%	96%	93%	102%
Slovak Republic	93%	88%	98%	114%	121%	104%	111%	108%	108%	99%	101%
Slovenia	101%	106%	103%	100%	105%	104%	103%	111%	98%	97%	97%
Spain	-	106%	96%	98%	93%	87%	89%	113%	88%	90%	96%
Sweden	102%	94%	98%	99%	109%	95%	97%	106%	98%	104%	100%
Average	98%	96%	98%	100%	101%	100%	101%	105%	99%	99%	99%
Median	99%	100%	100%	101%	102%	102%	100%	105%	98%	97%	100%
Minimum	66%	51%	54%	50%	66%	75%	87%	77%	77%	85%	73%
Maximum	127%	119%	120%	118%	121%	118%	128%	130%	122%	124%	125%
% of NA	30%	15%	11%	15%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%	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 2013 - 2023 (Q097)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	66	66	69	66	69	68	67	67	79	72	79
Belgium	NA	NA	541	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	694
Bulgaria	89	82	78	76	78	88	100	127	127	124	121
Croatia	327	308	292	264	258	234	205	159	157	195	216
Cyprus	NA	2446	2767	2920	2810	2126	1953	2176	1693	1847	4186
Czech Republic	NA	74	76	70	73	74	67	78	67	69	64
Denmark	166	170	166	141	136	168	193	180	176	185	220
Estonia	NA	103	113	95	93	96	108	104	132	151	154
Finland	145	186	185	138	189	162	188	180	199	197	179
France	388	422	418	426	402	409	415	509	NA	422	417
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	735	561	679
Hungary	98	91	86	84	94	80	75	71	68	69	76
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	842	941	959	945	855	827	759	981	777	718	672
Latvia	165	216	163	145	111	118	138	124	134	155	160
Lithuania	95	99	118	124	158	154	151	112	110	101	104
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	1189	1010	973	NA	796	1120	875	838	567	563	427
Netherlands	374	341	379	348	389	408	427	422	407	434	370
Poland	-	130	-	151	157	178	213	255	248	231	290
Portugal	NA	93	168	198	208	224	223	244	234	250	272
Romania	342	297	184	131	153	128	139	174	164	207	204
Slovak Republic	147	174	163	102	124	143	130	145	140	179	156
Slovenia	98	75	73	81	71	66	65	35	49	63	79
Spain	-	200	212	199	231	282	300	260	305	340	381
Sweden	101	123	134	116	63	83	94	66	81	68	67
Average	289	348	378	325	342	329	313	332	302	313	428
Median	156	172	167	138	155	158	169	167	160	195	210
Minimum	66	66	69	66	63	66	65	35	49	63	64
Maximum	1189	2446	2767	2920	2810	2126	1953	2176	1693	1847	4186
% of NA	33%	19%	15%	22%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	15%	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 2013 - 2023 (Q097)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	102%	94%	102%	98%
Belgium	NA	103%	105%	110%	110%	104%	110%	104%	105%	109%	105%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	102%
Croatia	94%	96%	104%	116%	122%	122%	119%	129%	98%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100%	87%	NA
Czech Republic	100%	102%	102%	102%	103%	102%	103%	100%	104%	99%	102%
Denmark	99%	104%	109%	109%	105%	96%	94%	98%	102%	101%	91%
Estonia	91%	107%	100%	106%	97%	97%	97%	102%	90%	98%	105%
Finland	103%	NA	101%	119%	95%	107%	97%	104%	95%	102%	102%
France	94%	93%	95%	95%	104%	105%	102%	105%	NA	106%	106%
Germany	100%	100%	NA	101%	102%	99%	85%	103%	85%	94%	109%
Greece	NA	102%	93%	75%	113%	97%	101%	NA	102%	79%	72%
Hungary	101%	111%	102%	100%	99%	106%	110%	107%	99%	102%	103%
Ireland	89%	75%	84%	82%	66%	75%	93%	105%	77%	91%	85%
Italy	128%	119%	122%	111%	117%	120%	131%	115%	123%	126%	126%
Latvia	108%	101%	107%	96%	103%	104%	99%	108%	103%	96%	100%
Lithuania	110%	102%	99%	101%	96%	107%	105%	111%	102%	102%	102%
Luxembourg	103%	87%	100%	106%	118%	115%	103%	105%	98%	104%	97%
Malta	68%	87%	96%	106%	118%	80%	112%	130%	122%	96%	111%
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	97%	-	96%	97%	96%	90%	105%	97%	91%	79%
Portugal	101%	NA	95%	97%	99%	102%	102%	108%	102%	96%	101%
Romania	66%	67%	93%	106%	97%	105%	100%	97%	96%	93%	102%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	125%	116%	105%	111%	116%	112%	95%	100%
Slovenia	100%	106%	102%	100%	105%	105%	105%	112%	97%	94%	97%
Spain	-	105%	96%	98%	92%	87%	93%	117%	86%	85%	94%
Sweden	96%	106%	102%	103%	98%	102%	95%	96%	101%	102%	99%
Average	97%	99%	100%	103%	103%	101%	103%	108%	100%	98%	100%
Median	100%	102%	101%	102%	103%	104%	102%	105%	100%	97%	101%
Minimum	66%	67%	84%	75%	66%	75%	85%	96%	77%	79%	72%
Maximum	128%	119%	122%	125%	122%	122%	131%	130%	123%	126%	126%
% of NA	26%	26%	22%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	11%	11%	11%
% 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 2013 - 2023
(Q097)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	77	96	85	87
Belgium	NA	NA	541	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	694
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	138
Croatia	402	448	401	328	310	280	248	184	205	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1481	1736	NA
Czech Republic	71	73	74	69	74	75	68	79	66	70	64
Denmark	166	170	166	141	136	168	193	180	176	185	220
Estonia	136	100	113	95	111	119	130	120	166	172	169
Finland	198	NA	206	150	212	177	205	210	222	218	211
France	431	477	476	487	464	466	481	607	NA	489	507
Germany	233	233	NA	245	254	262	299	265	362	391	406
Greece	NA	509	588	1149	640	662	638	NA	610	422	673
Hungary	127	114	123	121	133	112	105	116	116	106	107
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	855	959	1005	993	893	863	791	1026	817	753	703
Latvia	142	160	102	124	100	104	119	118	117	140	134
Lithuania	100	97	104	103	130	107	100	66	70	72	71
Luxembourg	498	722	601	553	466	467	488	497	501	464	497
Malta	1189	1010	973	783	796	1120	875	838	567	563	427
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	89	-	105	119	137	175	188	187	232	312
Portugal	94	NA	106	114	111	107	104	99	89	95	91
Romania	353	299	185	131	152	128	139	174	164	207	204
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	121	168	186	175	177	180	206	203
Slovenia	119	84	86	97	89	82	73	40	59	82	97
Spain	-	178	194	181	216	271	279	227	280	343	379
Sweden	135	106	107	100	109	96	117	128	111	101	108
Average	309	324	324	295	271	285	276	258	302	324	283
Median	166	174	185	131	152	168	175	177	178	207	204
Minimum	71	73	74	69	74	75	68	40	59	70	64
Maximum	1189	1010	1005	1149	893	1120	875	1026	1481	1736	703
% of NA	30%	33%	26%	22%	22%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	15%
% 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 2013 - 2023
(Q097)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	98%	104%	102%	102%	101%	101%	101%	100%	100%	102%	97%
Croatia	500%	454%	124%	86%	90%	86%	91%	108%	116%	91%	98%
Cyprus	NA	61%	89%	190%	140%	84%	88%	69%	60%	76%	43%
Czech Republic	105%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	107%	100%	95%	106%	108%	111%	103%	95%	92%	94%	92%
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	97%	96%	102%	NA	105%	102%
Germany	93%	93%	NA	96%	96%	94%	98%	107%	102%	111%	108%
Greece	NA	NA	122%	107%	138%	114%	NA	98%	83%	107%	103%
Hungary	94%	99%	102%	97%	99%	97%	106%	146%	131%	225%	81%
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	124%	101%	136%	137%	129%	107%	91%	120%	93%	100%	93%
Lithuania	91%	91%	80%	94%	93%	NA	101%	122%	105%	110%	119%
Luxembourg	101%	101%	104%	102%	97%	103%	96%	73%	124%	103%	92%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	90%	101%	93%	103%	99%	108%	100%	119%	93%	85%	108%
Poland	-	84%	-	89%	108%	93%	97%	110%	64%	NAP	NAP
Portugal	NA	NA	107%	88%	76%	74%	90%	92%	89%	78%	71%
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	93%	111%	90%	92%	500%	250%	0%	-	0%	94%	NAP
Slovenia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	-	110%	100%	100%	98%	92%	72%	94%	96%	130%	112%
Sweden	104%	90%	97%	97%	114%	93%	97%	110%	97%	106%	101%
Average	131%	120%	103%	105%	129%	107%	89%	104%	90%	107%	95%
Median	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	97%	96%	104%	95%	103%	98%
Minimum	90%	61%	80%	86%	76%	74%	0%	69%	0%	76%	43%
Maximum	500%	454%	136%	190%	500%	250%	106%	146%	131%	225%	119%
% of NA	19%	11%	7%	4%	4%	7%	11%	7%	11%	7%	7%
% of NAP	26%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	30%	30%	30%	33%	37%

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 2013 - 2023
(Q097)

States	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	73	65	70	62	62	59	57	64	61	57	69
Croatia	228	68	62	119	153	195	210	165	122	191	215
Cyprus	NA	2890	2741	2522	1975	2156	1724	2688	3132	2310	5429
Czech Republic	366	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	176	143	154	130	102	81	92	105	122	152	177
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	345	334	329	341	334	327	329	362	NA	329	321
Germany	320	320	NA	452	430	443	427	419	456	460	468
Greece	NA	NA	683	915	509	564	NA	599	841	661	703
Hungary	91	94	87	83	91	91	64	4	48	0	189
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	227	371	277	210	152	169	215	158	223	215	282
Lithuania	156	204	252	295	352	NA	375	282	240	170	218
Luxembourg	175	175	202	228	211	222	285	421	225	228	288
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	478	411	427	348	444	437	476	465	460	488	416
Poland	-	537	-	607	502	537	625	618	778	NAP	NAP
Portugal	NA	NA	573	714	842	1016	849	877	836	1064	1200
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	135	110	154	299	292	73	-	0	0	431	NAP
Slovenia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	-	332	321	319	329	355	418	452	450	325	391
Sweden	126	178	188	148	63	96	106	68	92	77	72
Average	223	415	435	458	403	426	417	456	505	447	696
Median	176	204	252	299	329	275	329	362	232	277	288
Minimum	73	65	62	62	62	59	57	0	0	0	69
Maximum	478	2890	2741	2522	1975	2156	1724	2688	3132	2310	5429
% of NA	19%	11%	7%	4%	4%	7%	11%	7%	11%	7%	7%
% of NAP	26%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	30%	30%	30%	33%	37%

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 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q97)

States	Variations 2013 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-12,4%	NA	NAP	6,9%	11,1%	NAP
Belgium	NA	-37,7%	NAP	-17,0%	-17,0%	NAP
Bulgaria	-24,6%	NA	-36,6%	1,6%	NA	4,3%
Croatia	-50,8%	NA	82,7%	-16,6%	NA	-14,2%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	-62,0%	NA	-34,5%
Czech Republic	NA	-42,4%	NAP	-7,8%	-0,6%	NAP
Denmark	-30,3%	-30,3%	NAP	11,2%	11,2%	NAP
Estonia	NA	-29,3%	19,3%	-2,0%	-13,7%	8,9%
Finland	-31,3%	13,7%	NAP	1,5%	-0,5%	NAP
France	-19,3%	-28,2%	9,4%	-2,0%	-6,2%	3,7%
Germany	NA	-21,4%	-50,6%	NA	-22,8%	-5,3%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	-7,7%	-12,4%	-3,8%
Hungary	-39,0%	-60,7%	8,2%	6,4%	-11,6%	48350,0%
Ireland	-16,5%	-16,5%	NA	30,2%	30,2%	NA
Italy	-37,6%	-40,0%	NAP	-4,1%	-2,7%	NAP
Latvia	-54,8%	-47,5%	-66,5%	-9,2%	-9,8%	-9,7%
Lithuania	-47,3%	-39,7%	-36,8%	-17,3%	-6,6%	-42,6%
Luxembourg	NA	-6,3%	-22,4%	NA	2,8%	0,0%
Malta	41,5%	41,5%	NA	4,0%	4,0%	NA
Netherlands	-22,8%	NA	-5,8%	-9,9%	NA	-13,4%
Poland			NAP	17,4%	22,8%	NAP
Portugal	NA	-0,6%	NA	-2,6%	-5,7%	11,0%
Romania	295,4%	334,6%	NAP	-11,0%	-10,9%	NAP
Slovak Republic	-67,2%	NA	NAP	-9,4%	-3,9%	NAP
Slovenia	-54,6%	-47,9%	NAP	-4,3%	-4,7%	NAP
Spain				-13,2%	-13,4%	-11,1%
Sweden	49,5%	5,3%	57,8%	5,8%	-1,2%	6,1%
Average	-7,2%	-3,0%	-3,7%	-4,5%	-2,7%	3216,6%
Median	-30,3%	-28,7%	-5,8%	-4,1%	-4,7%	-3,8%
Minimum	-67,2%	-60,7%	-66,5%	-62,0%	-22,8%	-42,6%
Maximum	295,4%	334,6%	82,7%	30,2%	30,2%	48350,0%
% of NA	30%	26%	19%	7%	15%	7%
% of NAP	0%	0%	37%	0%	0%	37%

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 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q97)

States	Variations 2013 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-15,3%	NA	NAP	2,6%	7,1%	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	-20,5%	-20,5%	NAP
Bulgaria	-23,0%	NA	-37,5%	-0,5%	NA	-1,2%
Croatia	-52,5%	NA	-64,3%	-12,4%	NA	-7,4%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	-67,1%	NA	-63,4%
Czech Republic	NA	-41,3%	NAP	-5,2%	2,6%	NAP
Denmark	-35,4%	-35,4%	NAP	0,5%	0,5%	NAP
Estonia	NA	-18,3%	2,7%	0,4%	-7,5%	5,9%
Finland	-28,6%	12,5%	NAP	3,6%	-0,2%	NAP
France	-11,7%	-19,5%	10,8%	-2,6%	-6,9%	0,5%
Germany	NA	-14,2%	-42,5%	NA	-10,5%	-7,4%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	-11,9%	-20,3%	-7,7%
Hungary	-39,7%	-59,7%	-6,2%	3,6%	-10,7%	17422,2%
Ireland	-20,0%	-20,0%	NA	22,0%	22,0%	NA
Italy	-38,5%	-40,9%	NAP	-3,3%	-2,7%	NAP
Latvia	-59,9%	-51,4%	-75,0%	-7,0%	-5,7%	-15,9%
Lithuania	-47,0%	-44,6%	-17,4%	-16,8%	-6,8%	-38,2%
Luxembourg	NA	-11,8%	-29,1%	NA	-4,4%	-10,8%
Malta	131,0%	131,0%	NA	21,1%	21,1%	NA
Netherlands	-16,2%	NA	13,7%	0,0%	NA	10,1%
Poland			NAP	4,3%	7,1%	NAP
Portugal	NA	-0,5%	NA	-0,6%	-0,9%	1,0%
Romania	512,1%	573,7%	NAP	-2,1%	-1,9%	NAP
Slovak Republic	-64,7%	NA	NAP	-7,6%	1,7%	NAP
Slovenia	-56,8%	-49,8%	NAP	-4,5%	-2,6%	NAP
Spain				-6,7%	-3,5%	-23,7%
Sweden	46,8%	8,5%	53,1%	1,4%	-4,3%	1,2%
Average	10,6%	18,7%	-17,4%	-4,4%	-2,0%	1151,0%
Median	-28,6%	-19,5%	-17,4%	-2,1%	-2,7%	-7,4%
Minimum	-64,7%	-59,7%	-75,0%	-67,1%	-20,5%	-63,4%
Maximum	512,1%	573,7%	53,1%	22,0%	22,0%	17422,2%
% of NA	30%	30%	19%	7%	15%	7%
% of NAP	0%	0%	37%	0%	0%	37%

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 other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q97)

States	Variations 2013 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	1,5%	NA	NAP	12,3%	9,7%	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	5,6%	NA	-41,0%	-2,3%	NA	20,3%
Croatia	-68,7%	NA	-66,3%	-3,0%	NA	4,2%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	-25,5%	NA	-14,0%
Czech Republic	NA	-47,1%	NAP	-12,1%	-6,0%	NAP
Denmark	-14,5%	-14,5%	NAP	19,8%	19,8%	NAP
Estonia	NA	1,7%	3,1%	2,7%	-9,3%	23,1%
Finland	-12,2%	20,1%	NAP	-6,2%	-3,4%	NAP
France	-5,1%	-5,3%	3,2%	-3,8%	-3,4%	-1,9%
Germany	NA	49,3%	-15,7%	NA	-7,1%	-5,6%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	6,6%	26,9%	-1,7%
Hungary	-53,0%	-66,0%	93,6%	14,1%	-10,0%	
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-50,9%	-51,4%	NAP	-9,5%	-9,2%	NAP
Latvia	-61,2%	-53,9%	-68,9%	-3,8%	-9,4%	10,6%
Lithuania	-41,8%	-60,4%	15,2%	-14,7%	-7,2%	-21,0%
Luxembourg	NA	-12,0%	16,7%	NA	2,4%	12,6%
Malta	-17,1%	-17,1%	NA	-8,1%	-8,1%	NA
Netherlands	-17,1%	NA	-1,3%	-14,7%	NA	-6,3%
Poland			NAP	31,3%	44,1%	NAP
Portugal	NA	-2,9%	NA	8,1%	-4,3%	13,9%
Romania	266,3%	290,7%	NAP	-3,4%	-3,3%	NAP
Slovak Republic	-62,4%	NA	NAP	-19,4%	-0,3%	NAP
Slovenia	-65,4%	-59,0%	NAP	19,2%	15,6%	NAP
Spain				4,5%	6,7%	-8,1%
Sweden	-1,8%	-12,6%	-12,7%	0,5%	2,5%	-4,8%
Average	-12,3%	-2,5%	-6,7%	-0,3%	2,2%	1,5%
Median	-17,1%	-13,6%	-1,3%	-3,0%	-3,4%	-1,8%
Minimum	-68,7%	-66,0%	-68,9%	-25,5%	-10,0%	-21,0%
Maximum	266,3%	290,7%	93,6%	31,3%	44,1%	23,1%
% of NA	33%	33%	19%	15%	22%	7%
% of NAP	0%	0%	37%	0%	0%	37%

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 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percent points (Q97)

States	Variations 2013 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-3,4	NA	NAP	-4,01	-3,63	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	-4,71	-4,71	NAP
Bulgaria	+2,1	NA	-1,40	-2,08	NA	-5,41
Croatia	-3,7	NA	-402,78	+4,84	NA	+7,21
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	-11,39	NA	-33,56
Czech Republic	NA	+2,03	NAP	+2,83	+3,18	NAP
Denmark	-7,2	-7,21	NAP	-9,72	-9,72	NAP
Estonia	NA	+14,12	-14,84	+2,41	+7,09	-2,62
Finland	+4,0	-1,06	NAP	+2,11	+0,27	NAP
France	+9,0	+11,34	+1,32	-0,60	-0,75	-3,28
Germany	NA	+9,12	+15,29	NA	+15,07	-2,40
Greece	NA	NA	NA	-4,27	-7,19	-4,26
Hungary	-1,1	+2,46	-12,54	-2,72	+1,12	-143,63
Ireland	-3,8	-3,77	NA	-5,70	-5,70	NA
Italy	-1,9	-2,05	NAP	+0,96	+0,11	NAP
Latvia	-12,7	-7,93	-31,44	+2,33	+4,36	-6,91
Lithuania	+0,6	-8,88	+27,85	+0,67	-0,19	+8,46
Luxembourg	NA	-6,05	-8,72	NA	-7,28	-11,11
Malta	+43,1	+43,10	NA	+15,69	+15,69	NA
Netherlands	+8,3	NA	+18,56	+10,46	NA	+23,13
Poland			NAP	-10,53	-11,67	NAP
Portugal	NA	+0,12	NA	+1,86	+4,92	-7,06
Romania	+36,1	+36,18	NAP	+9,29	+9,29	NAP
Slovak Republic	+7,2	NA	NAP	+1,94	+5,53	NAP
Slovenia	-4,8	-3,46	NAP	-0,22	+2,04	NAP
Spain				+6,69	+9,71	-18,45
Sweden	-1,9	+2,96	-3,10	-4,37	-3,17	-4,87
Average	4,1	4,8	-37,4	0,1	1,1	-13,7
Median	-1,1	0,1	-3,1	0,7	0,3	-4,9
Minimum	-12,7	-8,9	-402,8	-11,4	-11,7	-143,6
Maximum	43,1	43,1	27,9	15,7	15,7	23,1
% of NA	30%	30%	19%	7%	15%	7%
% of NAP	0%	0%	37%	0%	0%	37%

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 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q97)

States	Variations 2013 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	19,8%	NA	NAP	9,4%	2,4%	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	37,0%	NA	-5,6%	-1,8%	NA	21,8%
Croatia	-34,0%	NA	-5,6%	10,8%	NA	12,4%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	126,7%	NA	135,0%
Czech Republic	NA	-10,0%	NAP	-7,2%	-8,4%	NAP
Denmark	32,4%	32,4%	NAP	19,2%	19,2%	NAP
Estonia	NA	24,5%	0,4%	2,3%	-1,9%	16,3%
Finland	23,0%	6,8%	NAP	-9,4%	-3,2%	NAP
France	7,5%	17,7%	-6,8%	-1,2%	3,7%	-2,4%
Germany	NA	74,1%	46,6%	NA	3,7%	1,9%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	21,0%	59,4%	6,4%
Hungary	-22,1%	-15,6%	106,5%	10,2%	0,7%	
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-20,2%	-17,8%	NAP	-6,4%	-6,7%	NAP
Latvia	-3,1%	-5,1%	24,2%	3,4%	-4,0%	31,5%
Lithuania	9,9%	-28,6%	39,5%	2,5%	-0,5%	28,0%
Luxembourg	NA	-0,3%	64,7%	NA	7,1%	26,3%
Malta	-64,1%	-64,1%	NA	-24,1%	-24,1%	NA
Netherlands	-1,1%	NA	-13,1%	-14,6%	NA	-14,9%
Poland			NAP	25,9%	34,6%	NAP
Portugal	NA	-2,3%	NA	8,8%	-3,4%	12,8%
Romania	-40,2%	-42,0%	NAP	-1,3%	-1,4%	NAP
Slovak Republic	6,4%	NA	NAP	-12,7%	-1,9%	NAP
Slovenia	-19,9%	-18,5%	NAP	24,9%	18,7%	NAP
Spain				12,0%	10,6%	20,4%
Sweden	-33,1%	-19,5%	-43,0%	-0,9%	7,0%	-5,9%
Average	-6,4%	-4,3%	18,9%	8,6%	5,3%	20,7%
Median	-2,1%	-7,6%	0,4%	2,5%	0,7%	14,5%
Minimum	-64,1%	-64,1%	-43,0%	-24,1%	-24,1%	-14,9%
Maximum	37,0%	74,1%	106,5%	126,7%	59,4%	135,0%
% of NA	33%	33%	19%	15%	22%	7%
% of NAP	0%	0%	37%	0%	0%	37%

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 2023

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**	**736**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**3 185**	NA
Belgium	**1 720**	**438**	31	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	31	**1 227**	24
Bulgaria	**8 884**	**4 776**	1	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**4 107**	NAP
Croatia	**8 625**	**8 000**	470	381	86	86	NAP	NAP	3	**155**	NAP
Cyprus	**1 165**	**910**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**255**	NA
Czech Republic	**4 807**	**1 813**	37	37	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**2 957**	0
Denmark	**151**	**151**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Estonia	**72**	**32**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**40**	NAP
Finland	**2 508**	**287**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**2 091**	130
France	**25 620**	**20 131**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**5 387**	102
Germany	**10 268**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**3 458**	924
Greece	**14 607**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**11 879**	NA
Hungary	**1 101**	**653**	49	35	13	NAP	8	5	1	**310**	89
Ireland	**68**	**68**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**123 406**	**104 471**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**18 534**	401
Latvia	**851**	**360**	5	NAP	5	5	NAP	NAP	0	**486**	0
Lithuania	**389**	**366**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	23
Luxembourg	**61**	**61**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Netherlands	**1 193**	**410**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**783**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**7 984**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**37 993**	1 150
Portugal	**1 653**	**739**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**914**	NAP
Romania	**29 803**	**12 314**	73	1	72	72	NAP	NAP	NAP	**17 416**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**4 464**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**2 231**	NAP
Slovenia	**434**	**306**	22	20	2	2	NAP	NAP	NAP	**106**	NAP
Spain	**36 472**	**27 447**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**9 025**	NAP
Sweden	**3 114**	**88**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 928**	1 098
Average	**11 727**	**8 371**	86	79	36	41	8	5	9	**5 658**	**358**
Median	**2 114**	**653**	34	28	13	39	8	5	2	**2 161**	**102**
Minimum	**61**	**32**	1	1	2	2	8	5	0	**40**	**0**
Maximum	**123 406**	**104 471**	470	381	86	86	8	5	31	**37 993**	**1 150**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	**26%**	26%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	**44%**	52%	63%	67%	78%	78%	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 3.7.1.1b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2023

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**	**0,01**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,03**	NA
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,01**	0,00
Bulgaria	**0,14**	**0,07**	0,00	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,06**	NAP
Croatia	**0,22**	**0,21**	0,01	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,00**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,12**	**0,10**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,03**	NA
Czech Republic	**0,04**	**0,02**	0,00	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	0,00
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Estonia	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Finland	**0,04**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	0,00
France	**0,04**	**0,03**	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	0,00
Germany	**0,01**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,00**	0,00
Greece	**0,14**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,11**	NA
Hungary	**0,01**	**0,01**	0,00	0,00	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	0,00
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,21**	**0,18**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	0,00
Latvia	**0,05**	**0,02**	0,00	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,03**	0,00
Lithuania	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	0,00
Luxembourg	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**0,02**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,10**	0,00
Portugal	**0,02**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Romania	**0,16**	**0,06**	0,00	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,09**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,08**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,02**	**0,01**	0,00	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Spain	**0,08**	**0,06**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Sweden	**0,03**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	0,01
Average	**0,06**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Median	**0,03**	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,22**	**0,21**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,11**	**0,01**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	**26%**	26%	19%	*19%*	*19%*	*19%*	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	**44%**	52%	63%	*67%*	*78%*	*78%*	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 3.7.1.2a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - incoming in 2023

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**	**2 237**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**6 261**	NA
Belgium	**1 470**	**433**	220	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	220	**799**	18
Bulgaria	**20 270**	**7 460**	174	174	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**12 636**	NAP
Croatia	**6 183**	**5 741**	416	352	53	53	NAP	NAP	11	**26**	NAP
Cyprus	**144**	**132**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**12**	NA
Czech Republic	**7 829**	**4 281**	206	206	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**3 342**	0
Denmark	**209**	**209**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Estonia	**139**	**94**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**45**	NAP
Finland	**4 495**	**649**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**3 570**	276
France	**23 982**	**14 189**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**9 574**	219
Germany	**12 595**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**5 330**	1 368
Greece	**5 427**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**3 028**	NA
Hungary	**3 797**	**1 772**	385	359	13	NAP	9	4	13	**1 408**	232
Ireland	**175**	**175**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**35 951**	**24 300**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**11 271**	380
Latvia	**1 535**	**951**	7	NAP	7	7	NAP	NAP	0	**577**	0
Lithuania	**321**	**261**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	60
Luxembourg	**104**	**104**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Netherlands	**1 536**	**334**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 202**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**10 292**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**19 492**	6 172
Portugal	**3 463**	**2 655**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**808**	NAP
Romania	**41 909**	**16 802**	338	63	275	275	NAP	NAP	NAP	**24 769**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**4 497**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 326**	NAP
Slovenia	**2 071**	**1 577**	91	74	17	17	NAP	NAP	NAP	**403**	NAP
Spain	**27 010**	**15 493**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**11 517**	NAP
Sweden	**12 933**	**280**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**8 085**	4 568
Average	**9 085**	**4 801**	**230**	205	73	88	9	4	61	**5 704**	**1 208**
Median	**4 146**	**1 577**	**213**	190	17	35	9	4	12	**3 185**	**232**
Minimum	**104**	**94**	**7**	63	7	7	9	4	0	**12**	**0**
Maximum	**41 909**	**24 300**	**416**	359	275	275	9	4	220	**24 769**	**6 172**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	**26%**	26%	19%	*19%*	*19%*	*19%*	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	**44%**	52%	63%	*67%*	*78%*	*78%*	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 3.7.1.2b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - incoming cases in 2023

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**	**0,02**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,07**	NA
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,00	**0,01**	0,00
Bulgaria	**0,31**	**0,12**	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,20**	NAP
Croatia	**0,16**	**0,15**	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	0,00	**0,00**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,02**	**0,01**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,00**	NA
Czech Republic	**0,07**	**0,04**	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,03**	0,00
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Estonia	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Finland	**0,08**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,06**	0,00
France	**0,04**	**0,02**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,01**	0,00
Germany	**0,01**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,01**	0,00
Greece	**0,05**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,03**	NA
Hungary	**0,04**	**0,02**	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,01**	0,00
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,06**	**0,04**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	0,00
Latvia	**0,08**	**0,05**	0,00	NAP	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	0,00	**0,03**	0,00
Lithuania	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	0,00
Luxembourg	**0,02**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**0,03**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,05**	0,02
Portugal	**0,03**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Romania	**0,22**	**0,09**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,13**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,08**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,10**	**0,07**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Spain	**0,06**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Sweden	**0,12**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,08**	0,04
Average	**0,07**	**0,03**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,01**
Median	**0,05**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,31**	**0,15**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,20**	**0,04**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	**26%**	26%	19%	*19%*	*19%*	*19%*	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	**44%**	52%	63%	*67%*	*78%*	*78%*	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 3.7.1.3a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - resolved cases in 2023

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**	**2 282**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**6 422**	NA
Belgium	**1 388**	**419**	222	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	222	**729**	18
Bulgaria	**20 534**	**7 278**	175	175	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 081**	NAP
Croatia	**9 356**	**8 698**	594	489	95	*95*	*NAP*	*NAP*	10	**64**	NAP
Cyprus	**502**	**363**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**139**	NA
Czech Republic	**8 524**	**4 404**	205	205	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 915**	0
Denmark	**235**	**235**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Estonia	**160**	**98**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**62**	NAP
Finland	**4 717**	**629**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 837**	251
France	**24 299**	**14 315**	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 746**	238
Germany	**12 404**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**5 590**	1 486
Greece	**5 322**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 407**	NA
Hungary	**4 001**	**1 872**	409	371	24	*NAP*	*15*	*9*	14	**1 479**	241
Ireland	**147**	**147**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**49 380**	**34 367**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**14 587**	426
Latvia	**1 695**	**998**	12	NAP	12	*12*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0	**685**	0
Lithuania	**396**	**330**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	66
Luxembourg	**76**	**76**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Netherlands	**1 053**	**399**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**654**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**8 888**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**20 497**	5 867
Portugal	**3 809**	**2 800**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 009**	NAP
Romania	**44 559**	**17 738**	372	58	314	*314*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 449**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**4 943**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 867**	NAP
Slovenia	**2 056**	**1 553**	85	68	17	*17*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**418**	NAP
Spain	**26 291**	**14 837**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**11 454**	NAP
Sweden	**12 820**	**261**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**8 108**	4 451
Average	**9 944**	**5 347**	**259**	228	92	*110*	*15*	*9*	62	**6 100**	**1 186**
Median	**4 359**	**1 553**	**214**	190	24	*56*	*15*	*9*	12	**3 622**	**241**
Minimum	**76**	**76**	**12**	58	12	*12*	*15*	*9*	0	**62**	**0**
Maximum	**49 380**	**34 367**	**594**	489	314	*314*	*15*	*9*	222	**26 449**	**5 867**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	**26%**	26%	19%	*19%*	*19%*	*19%*	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	**44%**	52%	63%	*67%*	*78%*	*78%*	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 3.7.1.3b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - resolved cases per 100 inhabitants in 2023

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**	**0,02**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,07**	NA
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,00	**0,01**	0,00
Bulgaria	**0,32**	**0,11**	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,20**	NAP
Croatia	**0,24**	**0,23**	0,02	0,01	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	0,00	**0,00**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,05**	**0,04**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,01**	NA
Czech Republic	**0,08**	**0,04**	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,04**	0,00
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Estonia	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Finland	**0,08**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,07**	0,00
France	**0,04**	**0,02**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,01**	0,00
Germany	**0,01**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,01**	0,00
Greece	**0,05**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,03**	NA
Hungary	**0,04**	**0,02**	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,02**	0,00
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,08**	**0,06**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	0,00
Latvia	**0,09**	**0,05**	0,00	NAP	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	0,00	**0,04**	0,00
Lithuania	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	0,00
Luxembourg	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**0,02**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,05**	0,02
Portugal	**0,04**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Romania	**0,23**	**0,09**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,14**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,09**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,10**	**0,07**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Spain	**0,05**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Sweden	**0,12**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,08**	0,04
Average	**0,07**	**0,04**	0,00	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,01**
Median	**0,05**	**0,02**	0,00	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,32**	**0,23**	0,02	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,20**	**0,04**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	26%	26%	19%	*19%*	*19%*	*19%*	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	44%	52%	63%	*67%*	*78%*	*78%*	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 3.7.1.4a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023

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	**3 026**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 811**	**452**	29	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	29	**1 306**	**24**
Bulgaria	**8 621**	**4 958**	0	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 663**	**NAP**
Croatia	**5 436**	**5 027**	292	244	44	*44*	*NAP*	*NAP*	4	**117**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**807**	**679**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**128**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**4 112**	**1 690**	38	38	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 384**	**0**
Denmark	**125**	**125**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**51**	**28**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**23**	**NAP**
Finland	**2 286**	**307**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 824**	**155**
France	**25 293**	**20 005**	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 205**	**83**
Germany	**10 458**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 198**	**805**
Greece	**14 716**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**11 504**	**NA**
Hungary	**897**	**553**	25	23	2	*NAP*	*2*	*0*	0	**239**	**80**
Ireland	**101**	**101**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**109 977**	**94 404**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**15 218**	**355**
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**	**9 388**	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**36 988**	**1 455**
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	**4 018**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 690**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**449**	**330**	28	26	2	*2*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**91**	**NAP**
Spain	**38 143**	**28 103**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 040**	**NAP**
Sweden	**3 227**	**107**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 905**	**1 215**
Average	**10 889**	**7 823**	56	56	16	*20*	*2*	*0*	8	**5 287**	**381**
Median	**2 049**	**553**	29	25	2	*18*	*2*	*0*	2	**1 865**	**83**
Minimum	**51**	**28**	0	0	0	*0*	*2*	*0*	0	**23**	**0**
Maximum	**109 977**	**94 404**	292	244	44	*44*	*2*	*0*	29	**36 988**	**1 455**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	26%	26%	19%	*19%*	*19%*	*19%*	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	44%	52%	63%	*67%*	*78%*	*78%*	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 3.7.1.4b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023

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**	**0,01**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,03**	NA
Belgium	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,00	**0,01**	0,00
Bulgaria	**0,13**	**0,08**	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,06**	NAP
Croatia	**0,14**	**0,13**	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	0,00	**0,00**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,09**	**0,07**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,01**	NA
Czech Republic	**0,04**	**0,02**	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	0,00
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Estonia	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Finland	**0,04**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,03**	0,00
France	**0,04**	**0,03**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,01**	0,00
Germany	**0,01**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,00**	0,00
Greece	**0,14**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,11**	NA
Hungary	**0,01**	**0,01**	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,00**	0,00
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,19**	**0,16**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,03**	0,00
Latvia	**0,04**	**0,02**	0,00	NAP	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	0,00	**0,02**	0,00
Lithuania	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	0,00
Luxembourg	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**0,02**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**0,10**	0,00
Portugal	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Romania	**0,14**	**0,06**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,08**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,07**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,02**	**0,02**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Spain	**0,08**	**0,06**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Sweden	**0,03**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,02**	0,01
Average	**0,05**	**0,03**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Median	**0,03**	**0,01**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,19**	**0,16**	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	**0,11**	**0,01**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	26%	26%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	44%	52%	63%	67%	78%	78%	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 3.7.1.5: Supreme court civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - pending more than 2 years in 2023

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%	278	9,2%
Belgium	83	18,4%	360	27,6%
Bulgaria	146	2,9%	139	3,8%
Croatia	1 522	30,3%	73	62,4%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	781	3,9%	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	49 598	52,5%	4 653	30,6%
Latvia	15	4,8%	49	13,0%
Lithuania	3	1,0%	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	10 617	28,7%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	411	3,6%	307	2,0%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	82	4,9%
Slovenia	11	3,3%	10	11,0%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	0	0,0%	15	0,8%
Average	**4 381**	**10,1%**	**1 382**	**16,1%**
Median	**49**	**3,5%**	**111**	**10,1%**
Minimum	**0**	**0,0%**	**0**	**0,0%**
Maximum	**49 598**	**52,5%**	**10 617**	**62,4%**
% of NA	**52%**	**52%**	**41%**	**41%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	**15%**	**15%**

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: 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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,01	0,01	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,01	0,01
Bulgaria	0,12	0,13	0,14	0,15	0,14	0,14	0,13	0,11	0,13	0,14
Croatia	0,27	0,35	0,42	0,40	0,41	0,35	0,33	0,31	0,29	0,22
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,12
Czech Republic	0,04	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,04
Denmark	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
Finland	0,08	0,08	0,09	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,05	0,04
France	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	NA	0,04	0,04
Germany	NA	NA	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
Hungary	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,01
Ireland	NA	NA	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	NA	0,00	NA	0,00
Italy	0,20	0,21	0,22	0,22	0,22	0,23	0,24	0,24	0,23	0,21
Latvia	0,11	0,13	NA	0,09	0,08	0,09	0,08	0,06	0,05	0,05
Lithuania	0,01	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,01
Luxembourg	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01
Malta	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
Poland	NA	-	0,08	0,08	0,08	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
Romania	0,69	0,42	0,20	0,17	0,22	0,20	0,21	0,19	0,18	0,16
Slovak Republic	0,17	0,22	0,24	0,15	0,10	0,08	0,07	0,08	0,05	0,08
Slovenia	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,04	0,03	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
Sweden	0,04	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,02	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
Median	0,04	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,02	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
Maximum	0,69	0,42	0,42	0,40	0,41	0,35	0,33	0,31	0,29	0,22
% of NA	22%	11%	7%	4%	0%	4%	11%	11%	11%	7%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.7.2.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	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
Bulgaria	NA	NA	0,05	0,06	0,05	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,07	0,07
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,31	0,29	0,27	0,21
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,10
Czech Republic	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,02
Denmark	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
Finland	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01
France	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,03	NA	0,03	0,03
Germany	0,00	0,01	NA	0,01	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01
Ireland	NA	NA	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	NA	0,00	NA	0,00
Italy	0,16	0,17	0,17	0,18	0,18	0,18	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,18
Latvia	0,09	0,11	0,08	0,05	0,04	0,03	0,03	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
Luxembourg	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01
Malta	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
Poland	0,01	-	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,02
Portugal	NA	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	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
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	0,08	0,06	0,04	0,04	0,04	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,02	0,01	0,02	0,01
Spain	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,05	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
Average	0,06	0,04	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04
Median	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02	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
Maximum	0,46	0,26	0,17	0,18	0,18	0,18	0,31	0,29	0,27	0,21
% of NA	33%	26%	22%	11%	11%	11%	7%	11%	15%	11%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.7.2.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,03
Belgium	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	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
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,00
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,03
Czech Republic	0,01	NA	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	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
France	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
Greece	NA	NA	0,15	0,14	0,13	0,13	0,12	0,11	0,12	0,11
Hungary	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	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
Latvia	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,03
Lithuania	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	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
Poland	NA	-	0,07	0,07	0,07	NA	NA	NA	0,10	0,10
Portugal	NA	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
Slovak Republic	0,04	0,06	0,08	0,07	0,05	0,04	0,03	0,03	NAP	0,04
Slovenia	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00
Spain	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,01	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
Average	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03
Median	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	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
Maximum	0,23	0,16	0,15	0,14	0,16	0,13	0,12	0,11	0,12	0,11
% of NA	22%	15%	11%	7%	4%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	22%	26%	19%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,03	0,03	0,08	0,09	0,10	0,10	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Bulgaria	0,38	0,35	0,33	0,33	0,35	0,33	0,30	0,30	0,31	0,31
Croatia	0,19	0,20	0,19	0,17	0,17	0,15	0,15	0,21	0,18	0,16
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,02
Czech Republic	0,08	0,06	0,09	0,10	0,09	0,09	0,08	0,08	0,07	0,07
Denmark	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Estonia	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Finland	0,11	0,10	0,11	0,14	0,13	0,13	0,11	0,09	0,08	0,08
France	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,03	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
Greece	0,02	0,02	0,06	0,05	0,06	0,05	NA	0,06	0,05	0,05
Hungary	0,06	0,06	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,05	0,06	0,08	0,05	0,04
Ireland	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Italy	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,08	0,08	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,06
Latvia	0,14	0,13	NA	0,12	0,11	0,11	0,10	0,10	0,08	0,08
Lithuania	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01
Luxembourg	NA	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,02
Malta	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
Poland	NA	-	0,07	0,07	0,07	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,02	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,03
Romania	0,71	0,40	0,30	0,49	0,40	0,31	0,26	0,27	0,23	0,22
Slovak Republic	0,33	0,38	0,25	0,17	0,14	0,11	0,10	0,07	0,05	0,08
Slovenia	0,13	0,13	0,13	0,12	0,12	0,11	0,10	0,10	0,09	0,10
Spain	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,06	0,06	0,06
Sweden	0,12	0,12	0,11	0,12	0,11	0,11	0,12	0,13	0,12	0,12
Average	0,12	0,10	0,09	0,10	0,09	0,08	0,08	0,08	0,07	0,07
Median	0,06	0,05	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,05	0,05	0,06	0,05	0,05
Minimum	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Maximum	0,71	0,40	0,33	0,49	0,40	0,33	0,30	0,30	0,31	0,31
% of NA	15%	7%	7%	4%	0%	4%	11%	7%	7%	7%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.7.3.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - incoming 2014 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02
Belgium	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00
Bulgaria	NA	NA	0,12	0,12	0,12	0,12	0,10	0,11	0,12	0,12
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,14	0,19	0,17	0,15
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,01
Czech Republic	0,05	0,05	0,06	0,06	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
Estonia	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
France	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Germany	0,01	0,01	NA	0,01	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	0,02	0,02	0,02	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03	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
Italy	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,06	0,06	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,04
Latvia	0,08	0,07	0,08	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,05	0,05
Lithuania	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	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
Malta	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
Poland	0,02	-	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	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
Romania	0,35	0,18	0,11	0,10	0,17	0,15	0,12	0,12	0,10	0,09
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	0,14	0,10	0,07	0,07	0,06	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,09	0,09	0,09	0,09	0,10	0,09	0,08	0,08	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
Sweden	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
Median	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,03	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
Maximum	0,35	0,18	0,12	0,14	0,17	0,15	0,14	0,19	0,17	0,15
% of NA	30%	22%	22%	11%	11%	11%	7%	7%	11%	11%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.7.3.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - incoming 2014 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	0,05	0,07	*0,08*	*0,08*	*0,07*	0,07	0,06	0,07
Belgium	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,01*	0,00	0,01	0,01
Bulgaria	0,22	0,21	0,21	0,21	*0,23*	*0,22*	*0,20*	0,19	0,19	0,20
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*0,00*	0,00	0,00	0,00
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	0,00
Czech Republic	0,03	NA	0,03	0,04	*0,04*	*0,04*	*0,04*	0,04	0,03	0,03
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*0,01*	*0,01*	0,01	0,00	0,00
Finland	0,08	0,08	0,09	0,12	*0,11*	*0,11*	*0,09*	0,07	0,07	0,06
France	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*0,02*	*0,01*	0,02	0,01	0,01
Germany	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*0,01*	*0,01*	0,01	0,01	0,01
Greece	NA	NA	0,04	0,03	*0,03*	*0,03*	*0,03*	0,03	0,03	0,03
Hungary	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	*0,02*	*0,02*	*0,03*	0,05	0,02	0,01
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	*0,02*	*0,02*	*0,02*	0,02	0,02	0,02
Latvia	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,05	*0,04*	*0,04*	*0,04*	0,04	0,03	0,03
Lithuania	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	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
Poland	NA	-	0,05	0,05	*0,05*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,06	0,05
Portugal	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*0,01*	*0,01*	0,01	0,01	0,01
Romania	0,36	0,22	0,18	0,39	*0,22*	*0,16*	*0,13*	0,15	0,13	0,13
Slovak Republic	0,09	0,09	0,07	0,04	*0,04*	*0,04*	*0,03*	0,02	NAP	0,02
Slovenia	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,03	*0,02*	*0,02*	*0,02*	0,02	0,02	0,02
Spain	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02	*0,02*	*0,02*	*0,02*	0,02	0,02	0,02
Sweden	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,07	*0,07*	*0,07*	*0,07*	0,07	0,07	0,08
Average	0,07	0,06	0,05	0,06	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04
Median	0,02	0,02	0,04	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Maximum	0,36	0,22	0,21	0,39	0,23	0,22	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,20
% of NA	19%	15%	11%	7%	4%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	22%	26%	19%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,03	0,03	0,08	0,09	0,10	0,10	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
Bulgaria	0,37	0,34	0,32	0,34	0,34	0,36	0,32	0,29	0,30	0,32
Croatia	0,11	0,13	0,22	0,19	0,23	0,18	0,18	0,23	0,25	0,24
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,05
Czech Republic	0,08	0,06	0,09	0,10	0,09	0,09	0,08	0,08	0,08	0,08
Denmark	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Estonia	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	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
France	0,05	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,05	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
Greece	0,02	0,02	0,06	0,07	0,06	0,06	NA	0,05	0,06	0,05
Hungary	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,07	0,08	0,06	0,04
Ireland	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,01	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
Latvia	0,12	0,15	NA	0,13	0,11	0,11	0,12	0,10	0,09	0,09
Lithuania	0,02	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	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
Malta	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
Poland	NA	-	0,07	0,07	0,07	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
Romania	1,03	0,62	0,34	0,43	0,41	0,31	0,27	0,28	0,25	0,23
Slovak Republic	0,28	0,36	0,34	0,23	0,16	0,11	0,09	0,07	0,05	0,09
Slovenia	0,13	0,14	0,13	0,13	0,13	0,13	0,11	0,10	0,10	0,10
Spain	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,05
Sweden	0,13	0,12	0,11	0,11	0,12	0,11	0,11	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
Median	0,05	0,05	0,06	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05
Minimum	0,01	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
% of NA	7%	7%	7%	4%	0%	4%	11%	7%	7%	7%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,02
Belgium	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00
Bulgaria	NA	NA	0,12	0,12	0,11	0,11	0,10	0,10	0,12	0,11
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,18	0,21	0,23	0,23
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,04
Czech Republic	0,05	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,05	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
Estonia	0,01	0,02	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
France	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Germany	0,01	0,01	NA	0,01	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	0,02	0,02	0,02	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03	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
Italy	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,07	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
Lithuania	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	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
Malta	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
Poland	0,02	-	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Portugal	NA	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03
Romania	0,58	0,34	0,14	0,11	0,14	0,15	0,13	0,13	0,11	0,09
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	0,17	0,11	0,07	0,06	0,05	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,10	0,10	0,09	0,09	0,10	0,10	0,09	0,08	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
Sweden	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
Median	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
Maximum	0,58	0,34	0,14	0,17	0,14	0,15	0,18	0,21	0,23	0,23
% of NA	26%	22%	22%	11%	11%	11%	7%	7%	11%	11%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	0,053	0,062	0,077	0,072	0,071	0,065	0,066	0,070
Belgium	0,007	0,006	0,005	0,004	0,003	0,004	0,004	0,004	0,007	0,006
Bulgaria	0,213	0,200	0,198	0,224	0,228	0,248	0,223	0,188	0,183	0,203
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,001	0,001	0,003	0,002
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,015
Czech Republic	0,026	NA	0,028	0,033	0,033	0,036	0,035	0,036	0,036	0,036
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,008	0,007	0,007	0,006	0,006	0,006	0,005	0,006	0,004	0,005
Finland	0,078	0,073	0,098	0,120	0,107	0,111	0,097	0,092	0,068	0,068
France	0,018	0,014	0,014	0,015	0,014	0,015	0,014	0,017	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
Greece	NA	NA	0,056	0,046	0,036	0,035	0,037	0,032	0,033	0,033
Hungary	0,023	0,020	0,021	0,018	0,020	0,026	0,035	0,044	0,027	0,015
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	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
Latvia	0,049	0,054	0,052	0,045	0,040	0,050	0,050	0,045	0,039	0,037
Lithuania	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	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
Poland	NA	-	0,044	0,050	0,049	NA	NA	NA	0,058	0,054
Portugal	NA	0,013	0,012	0,014	0,010	0,010	0,012	0,012	0,011	0,009
Romania	0,448	0,274	0,192	0,322	0,274	0,155	0,140	0,153	0,143	0,139
Slovak Republic	0,072	0,074	0,072	0,062	0,047	0,040	0,033	0,016	NAP	0,034
Slovenia	0,037	0,038	0,043	0,039	0,025	0,021	0,017	0,019	0,019	0,020
Spain	0,012	0,013	0,012	0,020	0,030	0,026	0,018	0,025	0,021	0,024
Sweden	0,081	0,076	0,069	0,071	0,075	0,069	0,069	0,072	0,074	0,077
Average	0,069	0,059	0,053	0,062	0,055	0,050	0,045	0,043	0,042	0,041
Median	0,025	0,020	0,043	0,039	0,031	0,026	0,027	0,024	0,027	0,024
Minimum	0,006	0,006	0,005	0,004	0,003	0,004	0,001	0,001	0,003	0,002
Maximum	0,448	0,274	0,198	0,322	0,274	0,248	0,223	0,188	0,183	0,203
% of NA	19%	15%	11%	7%	4%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	22%	26%	19%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,01	0,01	0,03	0,03	*0,03*	*0,04*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*0,01*	*0,02*	0,01	0,01	0,02
Bulgaria	0,13	0,14	0,15	0,14	*0,14*	*0,12*	*0,11*	0,12	0,14	0,13
Croatia	0,35	0,42	0,40	0,38	*0,35*	*0,33*	*0,30*	0,29	0,22	0,14
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	0,09
Czech Republic	0,04	0,03	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
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,01*	0,01	0,01	0,00
Finland	0,08	0,09	0,07	0,07	*0,07*	*0,07*	*0,06*	0,05	0,05	0,04
France	0,04	0,05	0,04	0,05	*0,04*	*0,04*	*0,04*	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
Greece	0,02	0,02	0,16	0,14	*0,14*	*0,14*	*0,13*	0,14	0,14	0,14
Hungary	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,04	*0,04*	*0,03*	*0,02*	0,02	0,01	0,01
Ireland	NA	NA	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*NA*	0,00	0,00	0,00
Italy	0,21	0,22	0,22	0,22	*0,23*	*0,24*	*0,24*	0,23	0,21	0,19
Latvia	0,13	0,12	NA	0,08	*0,09*	*0,08*	*0,06*	0,05	0,05	0,04
Lithuania	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	0,02	*0,02*	*0,02*	*0,02*	0,01	0,01	0,01
Malta	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
Poland	NA	-	0,08	0,08	*0,08*	*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
Romania	0,37	0,20	0,16	0,22	*0,20*	*0,20*	*0,19*	0,18	0,16	0,14
Slovak Republic	0,22	0,24	0,15	0,09	*0,08*	*0,07*	*0,08*	0,08	0,04	0,07
Slovenia	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	*0,04*	*0,03*	*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
Sweden	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	*0,02*	*0,02*	*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
Median	0,04	0,03	0,04	0,05	0,04	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
Maximum	0,37	0,42	0,40	0,38	0,35	0,33	0,30	0,29	0,22	0,19
% of NA	22%	11%	7%	4%	0%	4%	11%	7%	7%	7%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.7.5.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	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
Bulgaria	NA	NA	0,06	0,05	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,07	0,07	0,08
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,28	0,26	0,21	0,13
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,07
Czech Republic	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,02
Denmark	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
Finland	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,01
France	0,03	0,04	0,03	0,04	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
Greece	NA	NA	NA	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	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
Italy	0,17	0,17	0,18	0,18	0,18	0,19	0,20	0,19	0,18	0,16
Latvia	0,10	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
Luxembourg	NA	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
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	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
Portugal	NA	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Romania	0,23	0,09	0,07	0,06	0,09	0,09	0,09	0,08	0,06	0,06
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,05	NA	NA
Slovenia	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	0,03	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
Average	0,04	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,04	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
Minimum	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
% of NA	33%	26%	22%	11%	11%	11%	7%	7%	11%	11%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.7.5.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,04	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
Bulgaria	0,08	0,09	0,10	0,09	0,09	0,06	0,05	0,05	0,06	0,06
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,00
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,01
Czech Republic	0,01	NA	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	NAP	NAP
Estonia	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
France	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
Greece	NA	NA	0,14	0,13	0,13	0,12	0,11	0,12	0,11	0,11
Hungary	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
Italy	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,04	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,03
Latvia	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,03	0,02
Lithuania	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	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
Poland	NA	-	0,07	0,07	0,07	NA	NA	NA	0,10	0,10
Portugal	NA	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
Slovak Republic	0,06	0,08	0,07	0,05	0,04	0,03	0,03	0,04	NAP	0,03
Slovenia	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00
Spain	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,01	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
Average	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,04	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
Minimum	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
% of NA	22%	15%	11%	7%	4%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	22%	26%	19%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	0,0006	0,0011	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,0019	0,0019	NA	0,0038
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,0031	0,0044
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,1401	0,1504	0,0924	0,0432
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	NAP	0	NAP	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	NA	NA	0,0799	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,0010
Hungary	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000	0,0000	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	NA	0,1111	0,1063	0,1186	0,1125	0,1040	0,0951
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,0072	0,0092	0,0067	0,0034
Lithuania	0,0000	0,0002	0,0000	0,0000	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
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	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,0077	0,0074	0,0049	0,0049	0,0046	0,0109	0,0065	0,0038
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,0040	0,0086	0,0010	0,0023
Slovenia	0,0004	0,0022	0,0004	0,0014	0,0015	0,0010	0,0012	0,0010
Spain	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
Average	0,0017	0,0016	0,0246	0,0142	0,0278	0,0295	0,0215	0,0132
Median	0,0002	0,0001	0,0005	0,0005	0,0030	0,0053	0,0022	0,0029
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	0,0077	0,0074	0,1111	0,1063	0,1401	0,1504	0,1040	0,0951
% of NA	70%	70%	59%	63%	56%	56%	56%	52%
% of NAP	11%	7%	11%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,002	0,002
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,136	0,141	0,087	0,039
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	NAP	0	NAP	0	0	0	0	0
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,001
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,087	0,090	0,089	0,087	0,097	0,094	0,091	0,084
Latvia	0,026	NA	NA	NA	0,001	0,000	0,000	0,001
Lithuania	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
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	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,006	0,006	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
Slovenia	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,001	0,001	0,001
Spain	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
Average	0,017	0,014	0,015	0,013	0,024	0,022	0,015	0,011
Median	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	0,087	0,090	0,089	0,087	0,136	0,141	0,091	0,084
% of NA	63%	67%	67%	67%	56%	52%	48%	52%
% of NAP	11%	7%	11%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.7.6.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,002	0,004	0,003	0,003
Belgium	NAP	0,000	NA	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,002	0,003
Bulgaria	0,007	0,004	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,002	0,002
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,001	0,002	0,001	0,002
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	NAP	0	NAP	0	0	0	0	0
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	0,000	0,000	0,000	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	0,080	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	NA	NA	0,022	0,019	0,021	0,018	0,013	0,008
Latvia	0,000	NA	NA	NA	0,007	0,009	0,006	0,003
Lithuania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,028
Portugal	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,002	0,002	0,003	0,003	0,002	0,009	0,005	0,002
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,003	0,006	NAP	0,002
Slovenia	0,000	0,002	0,000	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,000
Spain	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
Average	0,001	0,001	0,013	0,003	0,003	0,004	0,003	0,004
Median	0,000	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,002	0,002
Minimum	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
% of NA	44%	44%	52%	44%	41%	41%	44%	41%
% of NAP	30%	26%	19%	19%	15%	15%	19%	15%

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 2023 (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	102%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	103%	NA
Belgium	94%	97%	101%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	101%	91%	100%
Bulgaria	101%	98%	101%	101%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	104%	NAP
Croatia	151%	152%	143%	139%	179%	179%	NAP	NAP	91%	246%	NAP
Cyprus	349%	275%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1158%	NA
Czech Republic	109%	103%	100%	100%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	117%	0%
Denmark	112%	112%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	115%	104%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	138%	NAP
Finland	105%	97%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	107%	91%
France	101%	101%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	102%	109%
Germany	98%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	105%	109%
Greece	98%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	113%	NA
Hungary	105%	106%	106%	103%	185%	NAP	167%	225%	108%	105%	104%
Ireland	84%	84%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP
Italy	137%	141%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	129%	112%
Latvia	110%	105%	171%	NAP	171%	171%	NAP	NAP	0%	119%	0%
Lithuania	123%	126%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	110%
Luxembourg	73%	73%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	69%	119%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	54%	NAP
Poland	NA	86%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	105%	95%
Portugal	110%	105%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	125%	NAP
Romania	106%	106%	110%	92%	114%	114%	NAP	NAP	NAP	107%	NAP
Slovak Republic	110%	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	141%	NAP
Slovenia	99%	98%	93%	92%	100%	100%	NAP	NAP	NAP	104%	NAP
Spain	97%	96%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	99%	NAP
Sweden	99%	93%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	100%	97%
Average	115%	112%	116%	104%	150%	141%	167%	225%	75%	162%	84%
Median	105%	103%	104%	100%	171%	143%	167%	225%	96%	106%	100%
Minimum	69%	73%	93%	92%	100%	100%	167%	225%	0%	54%	0%
Maximum	349%	275%	171%	139%	185%	179%	167%	225%	108%	1158%	112%
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	26%	26%	19%	*19%*	*19%*	*19%*	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	44%	52%	63%	*67%*	*78%*	*78%*	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 2023

(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**	**111**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**172**	NA
Belgium	**476**	**394**	48	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	48	**654**	487
Bulgaria	**153**	**249**	0	0	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**102**	NAP
Croatia	**212**	**211**	179	182	169	169	NAP	NAP	146	**667**	NAP
Cyprus	**587**	**683**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**336**	NA
Czech Republic	**176**	**140**	68	68	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**222**	0
Denmark	**194**	**194**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Estonia	**116**	**104**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**135**	NAP
Finland	**177**	**178**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**174**	225
France	**380**	**510**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**195**	127
Germany	**308**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**209**	198
Greece	**1009**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**1232**	NA
Hungary	**82**	**108**	22	23	30	NAP	49	0	0	**59**	121
Ireland	**251**	**251**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**813**	**1003**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**381**	304
Latvia	**149**	**114**	0	NAP	0	0	NAP	NAP	0	**201**	0
Lithuania	**289**	**329**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	94
Luxembourg	**427**	**427**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Netherlands	**437**	**287**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**529**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**386**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**659**	91
Portugal	**125**	**77**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**258**	NAP
Romania	**222**	**234**	38	38	38	38	NAP	NAP	NAP	**217**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**297**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**330**	NAP
Slovenia	**80**	**78**	120	140	43	43	NAP	NAP	NAP	**79**	NAP
Spain	**530**	**691**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**320**	NAP
Sweden	**92**	**150**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**86**	100
Average	**316**	**300**	59	75	56	*63*	*49*	*0*	48	**328**	**159**
Median	**237**	**234**	43	53	38	*41*	*49*	*0*	24	**220**	**121**
Minimum	**80**	**77**	0	0	0	*0*	*49*	*0*	0	**59**	**0**
Maximum	**1 009**	**1 003**	179	182	169	*169*	*49*	*0*	146	**1 232**	**487**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	26%	26%	19%	*19%*	*19%*	*19%*	19%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**4%**	**4%**	44%	52%	63%	*67%*	*78%*	*78%*	67%	**15%**	**48%**

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 - 2023 (Q099)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	93%	104%	107%	96%	100%	93%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	104%	110%	104%	79%	91%	91%	102%	95%	94%
Bulgaria	97%	98%	96%	103%	99%	109%	108%	96%	97%	101%
Croatia	60%	65%	114%	115%	137%	116%	120%	112%	135%	151%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	349%
Czech Republic	98%	100%	95%	96%	99%	101%	101%	99%	105%	109%
Denmark	132%	120%	93%	110%	92%	90%	105%	95%	102%	112%
Estonia	102%	101%	94%	108%	97%	106%	87%	97%	92%	115%
Finland	100%	96%	111%	105%	98%	101%	103%	118%	103%	105%
France	96%	94%	103%	94%	115%	102%	101%	103%	99%	101%
Germany	NA	NA	100%	103%	100%	101%	100%	101%	95%	98%
Greece	104%	77%	106%	128%	102%	102%	NA	90%	107%	98%
Hungary	105%	98%	89%	93%	104%	116%	118%	99%	112%	105%
Ireland	152%	481%	190%	123%	90%	106%	130%	110%	117%	84%
Italy	94%	88%	93%	101%	93%	92%	97%	123%	128%	137%
Latvia	85%	112%	NA	104%	98%	108%	118%	108%	111%	110%
Lithuania	85%	123%	98%	96%	112%	87%	85%	95%	111%	123%
Luxembourg	NA	90%	100%	78%	95%	96%	100%	126%	136%	73%
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	93%	NA	NA	NA	91%	81%	96%	74%	87%	69%
Poland	NA	-	94%	108%	92%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	101%	96%	98%	104%	99%	93%	98%	103%	102%	110%
Romania	144%	155%	113%	89%	104%	100%	105%	106%	110%	106%
Slovak Republic	85%	94%	136%	130%	118%	108%	93%	91%	116%	110%
Slovenia	100%	103%	102%	102%	111%	113%	108%	99%	101%	99%
Spain	83%	73%	73%	90%	109%	100%	81%	90%	90%	97%
Sweden	109%	103%	102%	97%	107%	99%	97%	97%	100%	99%
Average	101%	117%	105%	103%	102%	100%	102%	101%	107%	115%
Median	98%	99%	100%	103%	99%	101%	101%	99%	103%	105%
Minimum	60%	65%	73%	78%	79%	81%	81%	74%	87%	69%
Maximum	152%	481%	190%	130%	137%	116%	130%	126%	136%	349%
% of NA	15%	7%	7%	4%	0%	4%	11%	7%	7%	7%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023 (Q099)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	145	110	127	134	118	152	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	342	351	347	486	458	472	362	445	476
Bulgaria	132	147	177	149	154	117	120	152	168	153
Croatia	1129	1169	666	717	553	677	594	455	333	212
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	587
Czech Republic	184	180	181	185	207	206	219	231	213	176
Denmark	187	151	207	170	187	219	257	248	329	194
Estonia	110	111	147	105	112	100	187	184	196	116
Finland	289	318	213	165	195	190	204	159	194	177
France	333	408	324	376	295	322	378	331	373	380
Germany	NA	NA	244	232	253	247	237	258	293	308
Greece	402	540	900	767	926	938	NA	967	883	1009
Hungary	136	156	184	213	205	160	92	85	73	82
Ireland	NA	NA	219	226	275	171	NA	205	142	251
Italy	1192	1335	1294	1206	1124	1119	1247	911	858	813
Latvia	399	286	NA	239	280	254	184	191	182	149
Lithuania	230	108	157	192	142	236	320	365	339	289
Luxembourg	NA	287	276	398	408	358	368	312	216	427
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	306	405	370	425	371	437
Poland	NA	-	461	398	461	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	66	139	142	122	136	167	183	154	156	125
Romania	132	120	179	186	181	239	259	231	226	222
Slovak Republic	286	248	160	150	177	221	297	457	276	297
Slovenia	182	167	162	164	125	83	71	79	78	80
Spain	479	574	645	559	390	420	635	531	537	530
Sweden	94	85	84	96	67	71	81	88	88	92
Average	321	332	326	312	310	314	323	321	303	316
Median	187	180	207	202	207	229	257	248	226	237
Minimum	66	85	84	96	67	71	71	79	73	80
Maximum	1192	1335	1294	1206	1124	1119	1247	967	883	1009
% of NA	22%	11%	7%	4%	0%	4%	15%	7%	7%	7%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	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 2015 - 2023 (Q099)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	104%	93%	108%	102%
Belgium	107%	107%	111%	102%	96%	89%	97%	115%	104%	97%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	97%	101%	96%	98%	103%	89%	98%	98%
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	123%	116%	134%	152%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	275%
Czech Republic	96%	101%	98%	101%	110%	110%	108%	102%	100%	103%
Denmark	132%	120%	93%	110%	92%	90%	105%	95%	102%	112%
Estonia	98%	105%	93%	107%	98%	101%	84%	90%	99%	104%
Finland	93%	103%	107%	115%	108%	97%	108%	92%	106%	97%
France	92%	88%	105%	90%	123%	102%	105%	104%	98%	101%
Germany	97%	102%	NA	109%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	119%	95%	95%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	102%	96%	86%	88%	110%	111%	132%	104%	112%	106%
Ireland	152%	481%	190%	123%	90%	106%	130%	110%	117%	84%
Italy	93%	87%	92%	100%	88%	85%	89%	130%	122%	141%
Latvia	85%	129%	146%	95%	108%	104%	121%	100%	107%	105%
Lithuania	83%	128%	95%	97%	115%	83%	82%	103%	105%	126%
Luxembourg	NA	90%	100%	78%	95%	96%	100%	126%	136%	73%
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	100%	84%	90%	93%	107%	119%
Poland	94%	-	104%	108%	88%	98%	126%	66%	75%	86%
Portugal	NA	100%	99%	104%	98%	95%	89%	100%	103%	105%
Romania	166%	190%	126%	109%	80%	101%	105%	109%	112%	106%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	122%	117%	106%	90%	90%	NA	NA
Slovenia	111%	106%	102%	97%	106%	111%	111%	98%	101%	98%
Spain	77%	78%	84%	79%	82%	80%	75%	74%	89%	96%
Sweden	99%	105%	106%	110%	96%	108%	101%	95%	101%	93%
Average	105%	129%	107%	103%	100%	98%	103%	100%	106%	112%
Median	97%	104%	100%	103%	97%	98%	104%	100%	105%	103%
Minimum	77%	78%	84%	78%	80%	80%	75%	66%	75%	73%
Maximum	166%	481%	190%	123%	123%	111%	132%	130%	136%	275%
% of NA	30%	22%	22%	11%	11%	11%	7%	7%	11%	11%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	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 2015 - 2023 (Q099)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	118	153	102	111
Belgium	480	482	464	414	473	545	504	394	378	394
Bulgaria	NA	NA	172	161	184	190	205	247	237	249
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	586	450	334	211
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	683
Czech Republic	201	178	179	171	167	151	143	149	149	140
Denmark	187	151	207	170	187	219	257	248	329	194
Estonia	114	88	132	85	66	72	172	209	148	104
Finland	224	219	165	132	131	163	127	173	151	178
France	425	516	376	469	337	402	485	442	487	510
Germany	358	349	NA	261	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	279	331	352	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	158	181	203	246	229	232	155	151	115	108
Ireland	NA	NA	219	226	256	171	NA	205	142	251
Italy	1316	1469	1442	1299	1266	1302	1526	1002	1063	1003
Latvia	559	329	153	206	204	187	115	144	138	114
Lithuania	268	133	184	218	160	284	389	403	451	329
Luxembourg	NA	287	276	398	408	358	368	312	216	427
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	320	459	427	450	371	287
Poland	187	-	180	158	250	234	156	261	361	386
Portugal	NA	58	58	44	49	70	126	106	98	77
Romania	143	102	170	193	246	215	242	217	216	234
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	104	127	172	249	344	NA	NA
Slovenia	167	146	150	164	119	78	59	74	73	78
Spain	496	541	513	604	608	681	888	826	691	691
Sweden	159	139	112	98	117	96	127	134	124	150
Average	340	316	282	277	283	301	337	308	290	300
Median	212	181	180	199	216	217	224	247	216	234
Minimum	114	58	58	44	49	70	59	74	73	77
Maximum	1316	1469	1442	1299	1266	1302	1526	1002	1063	1003
% of NA	33%	26%	22%	11%	11%	11%	11%	7%	11%	11%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	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 2015 - 2023 (Q099)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	109%	94%	100%	92%	100%	97%	110%	103%
Belgium	113%	101%	107%	109%	81%	95%	82%	79%	91%	91%
Bulgaria	95%	96%	95%	105%	100%	114%	110%	100%	96%	104%
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	144%	27%	323%	246%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1158%
Czech Republic	102%	NA	91%	88%	85%	91%	94%	95%	113%	117%
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	110%	95%	96%	110%	95%	117%	92%	108%	85%	138%
Finland	102%	93%	112%	104%	95%	100%	103%	124%	101%	107%
France	101%	109%	100%	103%	100%	101%	96%	103%	102%	102%
Germany	100%	107%	107%	100%	98%	103%	106%	110%	98%	105%
Greece	NA	NA	130%	133%	107%	107%	118%	93%	115%	113%
Hungary	108%	96%	99%	96%	90%	118%	109%	98%	115%	105%
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	96%	89%	96%	107%	108%	113%	117%	107%	145%	129%
Latvia	84%	86%	92%	89%	90%	113%	114%	121%	117%	119%
Lithuania	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	98%	NA	NA	NA	87%	80%	99%	68%	80%	54%
Poland	NA	-	89%	108%	93%	NA	NA	NA	93%	105%
Portugal	NA	89%	96%	104%	100%	88%	120%	108%	99%	125%
Romania	124%	126%	105%	83%	123%	100%	106%	103%	108%	107%
Slovak Republic	79%	84%	108%	162%	120%	111%	99%	96%	NAP	141%
Slovenia	79%	98%	101%	115%	139%	126%	100%	101%	103%	104%
Spain	93%	67%	60%	103%	142%	126%	89%	116%	91%	99%
Sweden	112%	101%	99%	95%	110%	101%	97%	97%	102%	100%
Average	100%	96%	100%	106%	103%	105%	105%	98%	114%	162%
Median	101%	96%	99%	104%	100%	103%	102%	100%	102%	106%
Minimum	79%	67%	60%	83%	81%	80%	82%	27%	80%	54%
Maximum	124%	126%	130%	162%	142%	126%	144%	124%	323%	1158%
% of NA	19%	15%	11%	7%	4%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	22%	26%	19%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	22%	15%

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 2015 - 2023 (Q099)

States	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	138	147	119	157	176	212	182	172
Belgium	148	159	176	195	316	299	415	501	589	654
Bulgaria	133	159	181	143	141	84	83	103	127	102
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	928	1895	439	667
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	336
Czech Republic	156	NA	176	200	262	271	302	318	279	222
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	126	162	173	150	207	147	204	150	265	135
Finland	312	358	225	169	207	197	214	154	203	174
France	185	206	207	184	200	188	221	175	200	195
Germany	206	185	172	198	228	219	197	213	229	209
Greece	NA	NA	893	1014	1265	1283	1107	1324	1239	1232
Hungary	129	169	168	201	228	116	58	55	43	59
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	886	1003	971	950	792	694	667	645	416	381
Latvia	189	231	270	359	459	327	286	254	241	201
Lithuania	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	299	382	344	414	370	529
Poland	NA	-	607	504	535	NA	NA	NA	647	659
Portugal	NA	299	322	272	364	431	291	261	300	258
Romania	117	142	185	184	149	264	276	244	234	217
Slovak Republic	311	371	354	275	297	314	388	828	NAP	330
Slovenia	220	220	188	159	152	103	122	109	97	79
Spain	458	614	854	515	233	196	350	238	321	320
Sweden	92	94	105	122	82	83	94	99	90	86
Average	245	291	335	313	327	303	336	410	326	328
Median	185	206	188	198	231	219	281	241	253	220
Minimum	92	94	105	122	82	83	58	55	43	59
Maximum	886	1003	971	1014	1265	1283	1107	1895	1239	1232
% of NA	22%	15%	11%	7%	4%	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	22%	26%	19%	22%	22%	22%	19%	19%	22%	15%

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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q99)

States	Variations incoming 2016 - 2023			Variations incoming 2022 - 2023		
	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	47,3%	NA	-8,2%	15,8%
Belgium	8,9%	-46,7%	48,5%	-1,4%	5,9%	-4,9%
Bulgaria	-13,5%	-13,3%	-14,8%	0,9%	-1,6%	2,5%
Croatia	-22,4%	NA	NA	-11,8%	-11,8%	-35,0%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-21,2%	-29,4%	3,0%	-1,2%	10,0%	-4,3%
Denmark	-15,7%	-15,7%	NAP	24,4%	24,4%	NAP
Estonia	-51,2%	-48,9%	-55,4%	-4,1%	17,5%	-30,8%
Finland	-27,4%	-35,0%	-25,4%	-2,4%	-0,6%	-3,9%
France	-20,1%	-30,4%	-0,5%	-5,5%	-8,3%	-1,0%
Germany	-19,2%	NA	-21,1%	-6,4%	NA	-5,1%
Greece	-17,7%	NA	-35,2%	-3,2%	NA	-0,3%
Hungary	-46,3%	-46,3%	-30,6%	-22,2%	-4,0%	-38,2%
Ireland	6,7%	6,7%	NA	10,8%	10,8%	NA
Italy	-12,5%	-17,0%	-1,2%	-12,4%	-17,6%	1,3%
Latvia	NA	-39,3%	-48,3%	-0,5%	6,5%	-8,4%
Lithuania	-54,7%	-54,7%	NAP	-14,9%	-7,4%	NAP
Luxembourg	-2,8%	-2,8%	NAP	36,8%	36,8%	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	14,1%	-11,2%	23,9%
Poland	NA	23,2%	2,9%	NA	-4,0%	-17,0%
Portugal	-14,9%	-3,4%	-38,8%	-8,9%	-0,9%	-28,0%
Romania	-27,8%	-24,0%	-30,6%	-4,8%	-9,9%	-1,6%
Slovak Republic	-66,6%	NA	-63,6%	75,7%	NA	NAP
Slovenia	-23,8%	-12,8%	-54,7%	4,0%	4,6%	4,7%
Spain	35,3%	45,5%	23,7%	-1,7%	-4,1%	1,7%
Sweden	14,6%	-19,3%	15,7%	-0,5%	8,9%	5,0%
Average	-18,7%	-19,1%	-14,7%	2,8%	1,6%	-6,2%
Median	-19,2%	-19,3%	-21,1%	-1,7%	-1,3%	-2,7%
Minimum	-66,6%	-54,7%	-63,6%	-22,2%	-17,6%	-38,2%
Maximum	35,3%	45,5%	48,5%	75,7%	36,8%	23,9%
% of NA	15%	22%	11%	7%	11%	4%
% of NAP	7%	7%	19%	7%	7%	22%

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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q99)

States	Variations 2016 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	38,3%	NA	-13,0%	7,6%
Belgium	-6,4%	-53,7%	26,1%	-2,5%	-1,9%	-4,5%
Bulgaria	-8,6%	-13,2%	-7,1%	5,6%	-2,1%	10,6%
Croatia	3,2%	NA	NA	-1,1%	-0,5%	-50,4%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-10,1%	-26,2%	32,5%	2,1%	13,7%	-0,7%
Denmark	1,7%	1,7%	NAP	37,4%	37,4%	NAP
Estonia	-40,5%	-43,0%	-36,1%	19,4%	24,1%	12,7%
Finland	-31,7%	-41,0%	-28,7%	-0,3%	-8,7%	2,1%
France	-21,6%	-33,1%	1,4%	-3,5%	-5,6%	-0,9%
Germany	-20,8%	NA	-22,4%	-2,9%	NA	1,4%
Greece	-23,7%	NA	-44,0%	-11,6%	NA	-2,4%
Hungary	-36,6%	-34,2%	-26,4%	-27,0%	-9,6%	-43,6%
Ireland	-52,7%	-52,7%	NA	-20,5%	-20,5%	NA
Italy	28,7%	27,6%	32,8%	-5,9%	-4,2%	-9,8%
Latvia	NA	-56,3%	-33,3%	-0,8%	4,7%	-6,9%
Lithuania	-42,8%	-40,0%	NAP	-5,5%	11,5%	NAP
Luxembourg	-29,0%	-29,0%	NAP	-26,2%	-26,2%	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	-10,4%	-1,0%	-15,3%
Poland	NA	1,9%	21,8%	NA	10,1%	-6,5%
Portugal	-4,8%	2,6%	-20,8%	-1,4%	1,9%	-9,3%
Romania	-32,3%	-36,3%	-29,7%	-7,6%	-14,9%	-2,7%
Slovak Republic	-72,9%	NA	-52,4%	67,2%	NA	NAP
Slovenia	-25,8%	-15,9%	-53,4%	1,7%	1,7%	5,0%
Spain	81,3%	66,8%	104,2%	6,3%	2,6%	11,4%
Sweden	11,8%	-29,3%	17,4%	-1,0%	0,8%	3,6%
Average	-15,9%	-21,2%	-4,2%	0,5%	0,0%	-4,9%
Median	-21,6%	-29,3%	-20,8%	-1,4%	-0,7%	-1,7%
Minimum	-72,9%	-56,3%	-53,4%	-27,0%	-26,2%	-50,4%
Maximum	81,3%	66,8%	104,2%	67,2%	37,4%	12,7%
% of NA	15%	22%	11%	7%	11%	4%
% of NAP	7%	7%	19%	7%	7%	22%

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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q99)

States	Variations pending 31 Dec. 2016 - 2023			Variations pending 31 Dec. 2022 - 2023		
	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	72,3%	NA	-6,1%	1,4%
Belgium	26,8%	-60,7%	369,8%	4,4%	2,3%	6,1%
Bulgaria	-21,1%	25,4%	-47,5%	-3,6%	2,6%	-10,8%
Croatia	-67,1%	NA	NA	-37,0%	-37,2%	-24,5%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-12,3%	-42,3%	67,7%	-15,6%	6,6%	-21,0%
Denmark	-4,6%	-4,6%	NAP	-18,8%	-18,8%	NAP
Estonia	-52,8%	-54,8%	-50,0%	-29,2%	-12,5%	-42,5%
Finland	-43,4%	-36,3%	-45,0%	-8,9%	7,7%	-12,9%
France	-8,1%	-9,3%	-4,7%	-1,7%	-1,1%	-3,4%
Germany	-0,3%	NA	-5,7%	1,9%	NA	-7,4%
Greece	-14,4%	NA	-22,7%	1,0%	NA	-3,0%
Hungary	-71,8%	-65,0%	-74,1%	-18,5%	-15,3%	-22,9%
Ireland	-46,0%	-46,0%	NA	40,3%	40,3%	NA
Italy	-19,2%	-11,3%	-47,9%	-10,8%	-9,6%	-17,4%
Latvia	NA	-67,3%	-50,3%	-18,8%	-13,1%	-22,2%
Lithuania	5,4%	6,8%	NAP	-19,3%	-18,9%	NAP
Luxembourg	9,9%	9,9%	NAP	45,9%	45,9%	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	5,8%	-23,4%	21,1%
Poland	NA	118,6%	32,2%	NA	17,6%	-4,9%
Portugal	-16,2%	36,2%	-36,5%	-20,9%	-19,6%	-22,0%
Romania	-15,7%	-12,4%	-17,7%	-8,9%	-7,6%	-9,6%
Slovak Republic	-49,7%	NA	-55,6%	79,9%	NA	NAP
Slovenia	-63,5%	-56,5%	-80,3%	3,5%	7,8%	-14,2%
Spain	48,9%	125,0%	-23,5%	4,7%	2,6%	11,2%
Sweden	21,8%	-5,3%	-4,1%	3,6%	21,6%	-1,2%
Average	-18,7%	-7,9%	-1,3%	-0,9%	-1,3%	-10,0%
Median	-15,7%	-11,3%	-23,5%	-3,6%	-3,6%	-10,2%
Minimum	-71,8%	-67,3%	-80,3%	-37,0%	-37,2%	-42,5%
Maximum	48,9%	125,0%	369,8%	79,9%	45,9%	21,1%
% of NA	15%	22%	11%	7%	11%	4%
% of NAP	7%	7%	19%	7%	7%	22%

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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percent points (Q99)

States	Variations of Clearence Rate 2016 - 2023			Variations of Clearence Rate 2022 - 2023		
	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	-6,7	NA	-5,6	-7,8
Belgium	-15,4	-14,7	-16,2	-1,0	-7,6	+0,4
Bulgaria	+5,4	+0,1	+8,6	+4,5	-0,5	+7,5
Croatia	+37,4	NA	NA	+16,4	+17,3	-76,3
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	+13,4	+4,4	+26,1	+3,5	+3,3	+4,3
Denmark	+19,3	+19,3	NAP	+10,7	+10,7	NAP
Estonia	+20,7	+10,8	+41,7	+22,7	+5,5	+53,2
Finland	-6,5	-9,8	-5,0	+2,2	-8,6	+6,3
France	-1,9	-4,0	+1,9	+2,1	+2,9	+0,1
Germany	-2,0	NA	-1,7	+3,6	NA	+6,7
Greece	-7,7	NA	-17,6	-9,4	NA	-2,4
Hungary	+16,1	+19,5	+6,1	-7,0	-6,5	-10,0
Ireland	-105,6	-105,6	NA	-33,1	-33,1	NA
Italy	+44,0	+49,4	+33,1	+9,5	+19,8	-16,0
Latvia	NA	-40,6	+26,7	-0,3	-1,8	+1,9
Lithuania	+25,8	+31,0	NAP	+12,2	+21,5	NAP
Luxembourg	-26,9	-26,9	NAP	-62,4	-62,4	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	-18,7	+12,3	-25,2
Poland	NA	-18,0	+16,3	NA	+11,1	+11,8
Portugal	+11,6	+6,2	+28,4	+8,4	+2,9	+25,8
Romania	-7,1	-20,5	+1,3	-3,3	-6,2	-1,2
Slovak Republic	-25,8	NA	+33,1	-5,6	NA	NAP
Slovenia	-2,6	-3,7	+2,8	-2,2	-2,8	+0,3
Spain	+24,7	+12,3	+39,2	+7,3	+6,3	+8,7
Sweden	-2,5	-13,1	+1,5	-0,6	-7,6	-1,3
Average	+0,7	-5,5	+11,6	-1,8	-1,3	-0,7
Median	-1,9	-3,7	+6,1	+2,1	+1,2	+0,4
Minimum	-105,6	-105,6	-17,6	-62,4	-62,4	-76,3
Maximum	+44,0	+49,4	+41,7	+22,7	+21,5	+53,2
% of NA	15%	22%	11%	7%	11%	4%
% of NAP	7%	7%	19%	7%	7%	22%

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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q99)

States	Variations of Disposition Time 2016 - 2023			Variations of Disposition Time 2022 - 2023		
	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	24,6%	NA	7,9%	-5,7%
Belgium	35,5%	-15,1%	272,5%	7,1%	4,2%	11,0%
Bulgaria	-13,6%	44,6%	-43,4%	-8,7%	4,8%	-19,3%
Croatia	-68,1%	NA	NA	-36,3%	-36,9%	52,1%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-2,5%	-21,8%	26,5%	-17,3%	-6,2%	-20,5%
Denmark	-6,2%	-6,2%	NAP	-40,9%	-40,9%	NAP
Estonia	-20,6%	-20,7%	-21,8%	-40,7%	-29,5%	-49,0%
Finland	-17,1%	7,9%	-22,9%	-8,6%	18,0%	-14,7%
France	17,3%	35,5%	-6,0%	1,9%	4,8%	-2,5%
Germany	26,0%	NA	21,4%	4,9%	NA	-8,7%
Greece	12,2%	NA	38,0%	14,3%	NA	-0,5%
Hungary	-55,6%	-46,8%	-64,9%	11,6%	-6,4%	36,8%
Ireland	14,3%	14,3%	NA	76,5%	76,5%	NA
Italy	-37,2%	-30,5%	-60,8%	-5,2%	-5,7%	-8,4%
Latvia	NA	-25,2%	-25,4%	-18,1%	-17,0%	-16,4%
Lithuania	84,1%	78,1%	NAP	-14,6%	-27,2%	NAP
Luxembourg	54,7%	54,7%	NAP	97,7%	97,7%	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	18,0%	-22,6%	42,9%
Poland	NA	114,6%	8,5%	NA	6,8%	1,8%
Portugal	-11,9%	32,7%	-19,8%	-19,8%	-21,1%	-14,0%
Romania	24,4%	37,6%	17,2%	-1,4%	8,6%	-7,2%
Slovak Republic	85,8%	NA	-6,8%	7,6%	NA	NAP
Slovenia	-50,9%	-48,3%	-57,8%	1,7%	6,0%	-18,3%
Spain	-17,9%	34,9%	-62,5%	-1,4%	0,0%	-0,2%
Sweden	9,0%	33,9%	-18,3%	4,6%	20,7%	-4,6%
Average	2,9%	14,4%	-0,1%	1,4%	1,9%	-2,3%
Median	-2,5%	14,3%	-18,3%	-1,4%	2,1%	-6,5%
Minimum	-68,1%	-48,3%	-64,9%	-40,9%	-40,9%	-49,0%
Maximum	85,8%	114,6%	272,5%	97,7%	97,7%	52,1%
% of NA	15%	22%	11%	7%	11%	4%
% of NAP	7%	7%	19%	7%	7%	22%

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 instance cases

Table 3.10.1 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance of other than criminal cases**, from 2013 to 2023 (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	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	53	NA	53	57	59	57	59	63	61	62	58
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	156
Bulgaria	*2*	78	78	78	84	83	91	93	107	91	99	92
Croatia	*11*	129	134	132	117	114	102	130	120	120	96	112
Cyprus	*13*	NA	903	839	862	1 118	737	882	1 087	947	761	605
Czech Republic	*3*	76	157	164	155	163	162	158	170	159	148	136
Denmark	*4*	18	19	17	21	22	24	19	17	17	17	23
Estonia	*6*	NA	33	39	40	24	30	32	25	27	28	28
Finland	*26*	97	103	111	113	118	86	105	97	88	103	114
France	*10*	274	304	304	312	300	381	388	554	440	297	310
Germany	*5*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	*8*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	664	634	642
Hungary	*17*	NA	63	59	57	63	63	69	80	65	63	62
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	369	377	393	387	399	373	367	471	381	358	347
Latvia	*14*	167	179	38	33	29	28	25	28	30	34	32
Lithuania	*15*	53	54	50	41	44	53	52	68	65	68	66
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	158	158	183	198
Malta	*18*	789	558	447	446	331	322	344	414	350	404	404
Netherlands	*19*	91	91	87	83	83	80	80	91	76	82	82
Poland	*21*	-	55	-	85	73	82	111	110	107	100	92
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	*23*	128	148	154	154	161	154	152	186	160	171	228
Slovak Republic	*25*	235	231	240	98	107	111	135	87	83	81	75
Slovenia	*24*	111	102	82	72	65	61	56	69	54	54	55
Spain	*9*	-	242	238	227	258	276	274	349	265	282	337
Sweden	*27*	146	133	126	133	151	152	138	123	117	123	108

$$*CEPEJ\ Calculated\ Disposition\ Time\ (days) = \frac{Number\ of\ pending\ cases\ at\ the\ end\ of\ a\ period}{Number\ of\ resolved\ cases\ in\ a\ period} \times 365$$

Table 3.10.2 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases, from 2013 to 2023 (Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	135	130	131	133	141	138	137	156	135	142	141
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	87	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	246
Bulgaria	*2*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	186
Croatia	*11*	386	380	391	364	387	374	488	655	559	410	533
Cyprus	*13*	638	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	*3*	187	163	159	153	157	149	140	165	141	134	126
Denmark	*4*	164	177	174	176	172	207	222	190	238	268	265
Estonia	*6*	130	125	136	139	140	143	147	135	146	158	196
Finland	*26*	288	289	332	252	258	273	280	300	305	327	349
France	*10*	308	348	346	353	341	420	432	637	495	333	354
Germany	*5*	192	198	190	196	204	220	217	237	231	241	249
Greece	*8*	407	330	378	610	479	559	637	NA	728	746	771
Hungary	*17*	169	144	159	159	181	151	152	165	145	134	135
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	608	532	527	514	548	527	532	674	560	540	511
Latvia	*14*	247	255	238	217	208	236	213	239	216	209	204
Lithuania	*15*	94	97	96	88	85	84	87	117	106	116	120
Luxembourg	*16*	53	103	86	91	108	123	139	161	154	182	221
Malta	*18*	750	536	445	432	435	440	465	550	529	491	454
Netherlands	*19*	NA	132	115	121	124	110	110	127	NA	NA	NA
Poland	*21*	-	203	-	225	232	273	270	317	330	362	357
Portugal	*22*	386	NA	315	289	250	229	200	280	253	238	267
Romania	*23*	187	146	154	153	167	157	152	168	150	160	218
Slovak Republic	*25*	505	524	401	130	171	157	170	204	206	168	173
Slovenia	*24*	301	270	277	280	292	283	281	350	309	337	344
Spain	*9*	-	318	325	282	329	362	353	468	344	359	444
Sweden	*27*	171	157	152	164	159	166	167	161	148	152	157

$$*CEPEJ\ Calculated\ Disposition\ Time\ (days) = \frac{Number\ of\ \ pending\ cases\ at\ the\ end\ of\ a\ period}{Number\ of\ resolved\ cases\ in\ a\ period} \times 365$$

Table 3.10.3 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance administrative law cases, from 2013 to 2023 (Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	NAP	NAP	NAP	380	446	449	440	388	312	285	313
Belgium	*1*	NA	625	444	429	497	370	418	399	235	288	360
Bulgaria	*2*	110	124	122	108	116	112	107	124	125	129	121
Croatia	*11*	493	426	413	319	258	197	187	179	166	143	221
Cyprus	*13*	775	1 775	1 391	1 582	2 162	487	495	863	844	461	380
Czech Republic	*3*	NAP	415	437	421	408	412	356	317	265	225	212
Denmark	*4*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	*6*	139	141	117	108	108	119	136	142	162	166	167
Finland	*26*	277	280	271	279	255	235	254	274	296	281	263
France	*10*	284	305	313	314	290	285	284	333	299	314	322
Germany	*5*	357	367	349	375	421	435	397	426	422	408	391
Greece	*8*	1 148	NA	964	1 086	735	601	NA	551	595	464	439
Hungary	*17*	115	148	110	109	116	109	103	110	103	125	120
Ireland	*7*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	1 043	984	1 008	925	887	889	821	862	756	574	595
Latvia	*14*	203	155	200	228	249	248	225	220	256	200	205
Lithuania	*15*	290	310	236	72	76	129	96	112	106	79	64
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	513	524	528	479
Malta	*18*	2 036	1 408	495	1 464	1 147	1 057	839	924	1 356	1 081	1 350
Netherlands	*19*	164	171	168	178	165	200	215	304	265	257	267
Poland	*21*	-	139	-	143	121	118	123	150	151	163	130
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	989	911	988	928	846	847	792	747	597
Romania	*23*	106	179	170	170	114	117	138	690	293	321	387
Slovak Republic	*25*	746	397	374	203	317	401	518	585	679	648	1 040
Slovenia	*24*	126	112	122	282	448	406	516	443	546	540	627
Spain	*9*	-	361	317	312	322	331	338	406	352	369	414
Sweden	*27*	126	114	105	115	147	146	125	107	102	107	83

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

$$* \, CEPEJ\ Calculated\ Disposition\ Time\ (days) = \frac{Number\ of\ pending\ cases\ at\ the\ end\ of\ a\ period}{Number\ of\ resolved\ cases\ in\ a\ period} \times 365$$

Table 3.10.4 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) of first instance total of other than criminal cases**, from 2013 to 2023 (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	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	101%	NA	100%	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	102%	NA	108%	101%	98%	105%	102%	98%
Bulgaria	*2*	101%	102%	99%	99%	97%	98%	99%	101%	101%	100%	101%
Croatia	*11*	102%	103%	102%	102%	102%	105%	93%	104%	97%	104%	97%
Cyprus	*13*	NA	88%	90%	106%	113%	125%	98%	88%	81%	101%	118%
Czech Republic	*3*	97%	97%	102%	105%	101%	102%	101%	98%	103%	102%	102%
Denmark	*4*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%	101%	100%	100%	100%
Estonia	*6*	NA	98%	140%	98%	104%	101%	100%	101%	99%	100%	100%
Finland	*26*	100%	102%	99%	98%	96%	106%	95%	105%	102%	99%	95%
France	*10*	98%	95%	98%	98%	104%	96%	99%	94%	105%	97%	93%
Germany	*5*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	*8*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	91%	101%	98%
Hungary	*17*	98%	103%	101%	102%	99%	106%	101%	98%	104%	100%	100%
Ireland	*7*	NA	73%	77%	76%	82%	79%	75%	56%	75%	84%	81%
Italy	*12*	107%	109%	112%	105%	103%	103%	103%	103%	107%	106%	106%
Latvia	*14*	106%	100%	101%	101%	101%	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%	101%
Lithuania	*15*	97%	99%	100%	102%	102%	101%	101%	97%	101%	99%	100%
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	102%	99%	96%	93%	95%	99%	98%	96%
Malta	*18*	104%	102%	111%	107%	96%	97%	91%	91%	89%	87%	89%
Netherlands	*19*	99%	99%	101%	100%	100%	101%	100%	98%	103%	98%	100%
Poland	*21*	-	102%	-	93%	101%	99%	90%	104%	102%	103%	102%
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	*23*	110%	111%	106%	101%	99%	104%	100%	97%	102%	96%	87%
Slovak Republic	*25*	91%	102%	105%	106%	109%	111%	91%	113%	100%	101%	105%
Slovenia	*24*	102%	104%	107%	106%	104%	102%	102%	99%	102%	101%	100%
Spain	*9*	-	101%	100%	105%	94%	92%	94%	90%	102%	96%	87%
Sweden	*27*	101%	103%	103%	96%	93%	97%	100%	102%	103%	103%	102%

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 2013 to 2023 (Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	101%	103%	102%	102%	99%	101%	100%	100%	104%	101%	98%
Belgium	*1*	NA	98%	99%	102%	112%	112%	101%	99%	106%	102%	98%
Bulgaria	*2*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	102%
Croatia	*11*	101%	113%	107%	118%	109%	112%	87%	85%	81%	145%	103%
Cyprus	*13*	78%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	*3*	90%	105%	107%	110%	101%	102%	101%	98%	103%	102%	101%
Denmark	*4*	107%	102%	102%	101%	102%	95%	92%	111%	98%	93%	93%
Estonia	*6*	108%	104%	102%	98%	99%	101%	94%	100%	100%	99%	91%
Finland	*26*	106%	105%	94%	125%	111%	102%	100%	94%	100%	100%	89%
France	*10*	98%	94%	98%	99%	103%	96%	100%	93%	107%	103%	96%
Germany	*5*	99%	100%	102%	103%	101%	97%	99%	98%	105%	104%	97%
Greece	*8*	80%	113%	102%	99%	96%	86%	86%	NA	82%	93%	92%
Hungary	*17*	98%	104%	99%	98%	96%	116%	104%	100%	106%	104%	100%
Ireland	*7*	NA	56%	63%	59%	73%	63%	63%	51%	72%	71%	72%
Italy	*12*	118%	119%	120%	113%	106%	103%	104%	104%	109%	104%	110%
Latvia	*14*	109%	98%	109%	107%	119%	103%	102%	96%	103%	99%	100%
Lithuania	*15*	99%	97%	102%	98%	102%	104%	101%	94%	101%	99%	100%
Luxembourg	*16*	182%	97%	105%	100%	96%	93%	88%	93%	99%	98%	93%
Malta	*18*	110%	101%	107%	107%	97%	93%	92%	91%	78%	87%	95%
Netherlands	*19*	NA	99%	100%	101%	99%	101%	100%	100%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	*21*	-	99%	-	99%	94%	92%	99%	105%	103%	98%	95%
Portugal	*22*	103%	NA	116%	112%	113%	109%	105%	98%	102%	103%	96%
Romania	*23*	112%	109%	105%	102%	99%	103%	100%	100%	102%	96%	86%
Slovak Republic	*25*	81%	92%	133%	132%	129%	131%	110%	100%	104%	108%	105%
Slovenia	*24*	102%	109%	105%	106%	108%	110%	109%	101%	107%	102%	101%
Spain	*9*	-	98%	95%	103%	88%	87%	94%	86%	102%	98%	84%
Sweden	*27*	101%	104%	104%	99%	100%	97%	97%	103%	103%	102%	97%

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 2013 to 2023 (Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	NAP	NAP	NAP	91%	80%	90%	111%	126%	125%	112%	100%
Belgium	*1*	NA	88%	117%	121%	101%	119%	112%	108%	131%	97%	81%
Bulgaria	*2*	109%	101%	99%	104%	95%	100%	99%	100%	100%	101%	101%
Croatia	*11*	64%	86%	93%	109%	126%	116%	109%	107%	102%	107%	87%
Cyprus	*13*	58%	103%	120%	113%	74%	219%	170%	84%	46%	88%	110%
Czech Republic	*3*	NAP	91%	92%	80%	92%	88%	107%	113%	119%	126%	111%
Denmark	*4*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	*6*	91%	90%	105%	106%	99%	100%	94%	92%	90%	99%	95%
Finland	*26*	95%	97%	102%	79%	107%	112%	100%	99%	102%	104%	105%
France	*10*	104%	96%	98%	99%	102%	98%	97%	95%	97%	96%	94%
Germany	*5*	100%	100%	103%	92%	84%	97%	109%	110%	110%	114%	109%
Greece	*8*	153%	NA	183%	148%	166%	164%	NA	163%	130%	127%	121%
Hungary	*17*	104%	92%	105%	100%	102%	102%	103%	89%	108%	98%	101%
Ireland	*7*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	190%	156%	142%	153%	156%	136%	131%	136%	125%	134%	121%
Latvia	*14*	163%	144%	106%	95%	100%	105%	105%	107%	93%	107%	109%
Lithuania	*15*	65%	89%	100%	144%	113%	88%	105%	97%	98%	98%	105%
Luxembourg	*16*	94%	94%	91%	98%	94%	86%	75%	87%	92%	92%	98%
Malta	*18*	40%	149%	411%	114%	147%	91%	121%	106%	70%	95%	78%
Netherlands	*19*	100%	99%	103%	95%	105%	95%	94%	86%	108%	99%	88%
Poland	*21*	-	97%	-	103%	107%	105%	99%	95%	93%	99%	110%
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	80%	112%	105%	111%	106%	126%	107%	112%	120%
Romania	*23*	130%	161%	133%	92%	102%	118%	100%	48%	105%	97%	92%
Slovak Republic	*25*	85%	125%	124%	112%	118%	96%	81%	87%	80%	93%	74%
Slovenia	*24*	102%	103%	101%	87%	67%	91%	89%	107%	95%	98%	92%
Spain	*9*	-	113%	117%	112%	104%	100%	92%	99%	99%	97%	95%
Sweden	*27*	101%	103%	104%	94%	90%	97%	102%	102%	103%	103%	105%

$$* \, CEPEJ \; Clearance \; Rate \; (\%) = \frac{Resolved \; cases \; in \; a \; period}{Incoming \; Cases \; in \; a \; period} \times 100$$

Table 3.10.7 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (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	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	5,8	NA	5,5	5,8	5,9	5,8	5,8	6,0	5,8	5,9	5,6
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,0
Bulgaria	*2*	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,1	1,2	1,3	1,4	1,3	1,3	1,4	1,3
Croatia	*11*	9,2	8,4	7,9	7,5	7,2	6,3	8,2	7,5	8,6	7,3	7,6
Cyprus	*13*	NA	6,1	7,2	6,0	6,2	6,0	5,5	6,3	6,6	6,5	5,8
Czech Republic	*3*	3,3	3,8	4,9	4,4	4,3	4,0	3,9	4,0	3,8	3,5	3,3
Denmark	*4*	2,0	2,1	2,1	2,3	2,4	2,6	2,5	2,3	2,2	2,3	2,5
Estonia	*6*	NA	1,6	2,7	2,7	1,4	1,8	2,0	1,6	1,8	1,9	1,8
Finland	*26*	2,5	2,3	2,4	2,5	2,8	2,3	2,6	2,4	2,2	2,3	2,7
France	*10*	2,6	2,7	2,8	2,8	2,7	2,8	2,8	3,0	2,8	2,8	3,0
Germany	*5*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	*8*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,0	3,5	3,6
Hungary	*17*	NA	1,5	1,5	1,4	1,5	1,4	1,3	1,4	1,2	1,2	1,2
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	7,5	7,4	6,9	6,7	6,4	6,1	5,9	6,0	5,7	5,4	5,1
Latvia	*14*	1,8	1,8	1,6	1,5	1,3	1,3	1,3	1,5	1,5	1,8	1,7
Lithuania	*15*	1,4	1,6	1,5	1,4	1,2	1,1	1,0	1,3	1,2	1,2	1,2
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,9	0,9	0,9	1,0
Malta	*18*	2,2	2,4	2,1	1,9	2,0	2,1	2,3	2,2	2,2	2,5	2,5
Netherlands	*19*	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,7	1,6	1,5	1,5	1,6	1,3	1,3	1,4
Poland	*21*	-	4,0	-	6,1	6,0	6,3	9,8	8,7	8,2	7,5	7,0
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	*23*	3,1	3,3	3,3	3,2	3,3	3,0	3,0	3,3	3,1	3,4	4,6
Slovak Republic	*25*	7,5	7,3	6,8	4,9	5,0	3,7	5,0	3,3	3,3	3,2	2,6
Slovenia	*24*	13,8	12,2	9,3	7,2	5,9	5,3	4,7	4,9	4,3	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
Sweden	*27*	0,8	0,8	0,7	0,8	1,0	1,0	1,0	0,9	0,9	0,8	0,7

Table 3.10.8 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,3
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	1,6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,8
Bulgaria	*2*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,0
Croatia	*11*	5,1	4,6	4,4	3,8	3,6	3,3	3,7	4,2	5,2	4,1	4,1
Cyprus	*13*	6,1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	*3*	2,1	2,1	1,8	1,4	1,5	1,3	1,3	1,3	1,2	1,1	1,1
Denmark	*4*	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,4	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,6
Estonia	*6*	0,5	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,6
Finland	*26*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
France	*10*	2,2	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,5	2,5	2,6	2,4	1,8	2,0
Germany	*5*	0,9	1,0	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,8	0,8
Greece	*8*	5,6	2,3	2,2	2,3	2,3	2,6	2,9	NA	2,8	2,5	2,7
Hungary	*17*	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,5	0,5	0,5
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	5,3	4,5	4,4	4,1	3,9	3,8	3,7	3,7	3,6	3,4	3,3
Latvia	*14*	1,5	1,6	1,4	1,3	1,0	1,0	0,9	1,0	0,9	0,9	0,9
Lithuania	*15*	0,9	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	0,8	0,8	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0
Luxembourg	*16*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,6
Malta	*18*	2,1	2,2	2,0	1,8	1,9	2,0	2,1	2,0	2,1	2,4	2,2
Netherlands	*19*	NA	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,3	NA	NA	NA
Poland	*21*	-	1,8	-	1,9	2,1	2,4	2,4	2,3	2,2	2,3	2,4
Portugal	*22*	3,4	NA	3,1	2,7	2,3	2,0	1,8	1,9	1,8	1,7	1,7
Romania	*23*	2,4	3,0	3,0	2,9	3,0	2,8	2,8	2,8	2,7	3,0	4,0
Slovak Republic	*25*	3,4	3,7	3,0	1,7	2,1	1,3	1,1	1,1	1,1	0,9	0,8
Slovenia	*24*	2,6	2,3	2,2	2,0	1,9	1,7	1,5	1,5	1,4	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
Sweden	*27*	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,3

Table 3.10.9 (EC): Number of first instance administrative cases pending on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,6	0,8	0,9	0,8	0,7	0,6	0,5	0,5
Belgium	*1*	NA	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,2
Bulgaria	*2*	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2
Croatia	*11*	0,3	0,3	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,2
Cyprus	*13*	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,7	0,5	0,6	1,3	1,4	1,3
Czech Republic	*3*	NAP	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,0
Denmark	*4*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
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	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3
France	*10*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3
Germany	*5*	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9	1,0	1,0	1,0	0,9	0,8	0,7	0,7
Greece	*8*	3,1	NA	2,4	2,2	1,9	1,5	NA	1,0	0,9	0,8	0,7
Hungary	*17*	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Ireland	*7*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	0,5	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
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*	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Malta	*18*	0,2	0,2	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	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4
Poland	*21*	-	0,1	-	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,5	0,5
Romania	*23*	0,4	0,3	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4
Slovak Republic	*25*	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2
Slovenia	*24*	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	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
Sweden	*27*	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,4	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,5	0,4	0,4

Table 3.10.10 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (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	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	39,9	NA	37,8	37,6	36,7	37,0	36,2	35,0	34,7	34,8	35,2
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	8,7	4,4	9,3	8,6	8,6	8,4	8,3	9,5
Bulgaria	*2*	4,9	4,4	4,8	4,8	5,6	5,4	5,4	4,5	5,1	5,0	5,1
Croatia	*11*	25,6	22,2	21,6	23,2	22,9	21,7	24,6	22,1	26,8	26,3	25,8
Cyprus	*13*	NA	2,8	3,5	2,4	1,8	2,4	2,3	2,4	3,1	3,1	3,0
Czech Republic	*3*	16,5	9,1	10,8	9,8	9,5	8,8	9,0	8,7	8,6	8,6	8,8
Denmark	*4*	41,2	40,4	45,4	38,8	39,5	39,2	49,3	47,5	46,1	48,7	40,3
Estonia	*6*	NA	18,1	18,0	24,7	20,3	22,6	22,7	23,4	24,3	24,1	24,0
Finland	*26*	9,5	8,1	8,1	8,2	9,0	9,1	9,5	8,5	8,8	8,2	9,2
France	*10*	3,5	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,2	2,8	2,7	2,1	2,2	3,6	3,9
Germany	*5*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	*8*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,4	2,0	2,1
Hungary	*17*	11,8	8,6	9,2	8,9	8,6	7,5	6,8	6,4	6,4	6,8	7,1
Ireland	*7*	NA	5,4	5,3	5,0	4,7	4,6	4,7	3,6	2,7	3,6	3,7
Italy	*12*	7,0	6,6	5,7	6,0	5,7	5,8	5,7	4,5	5,1	5,2	5,1
Latvia	*14*	3,8	3,6	15,7	16,2	16,4	16,5	18,7	19,3	18,3	19,6	18,9
Lithuania	*15*	10,1	10,7	11,1	11,7	9,5	7,5	7,2	7,0	6,6	6,5	6,3
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	1,8	1,8	1,9	2,3	2,1	2,0	1,8	1,8
Malta	*18*	1,0	1,5	1,6	1,5	2,3	2,5	2,6	2,1	2,6	2,6	2,5
Netherlands	*19*	7,4	7,5	7,4	7,3	7,2	6,9	7,0	6,4	6,2	6,1	6,1
Poland	*21*	-	26,0	-	28,0	30,3	28,6	35,6	27,6	27,6	26,8	27,1
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	*23*	8,0	7,3	7,3	7,5	7,5	7,0	7,3	6,7	7,0	7,6	8,5
Slovak Republic	*25*	12,8	11,3	9,9	17,0	15,7	10,9	14,7	12,4	14,5	14,4	12,0
Slovenia	*24*	44,7	42,3	38,8	34,4	32,2	30,7	30,1	26,2	28,5	27,4	27,1
Spain	*9*	-	4,6	4,8	4,2	4,6	4,9	5,3	4,9	5,6	5,9	6,4
Sweden	*27*	2,1	2,0	1,9	2,3	2,5	2,5	2,7	2,7	2,6	2,3	2,4

Table 3.10.11 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	1,2	1,1	1,0	1,0	1,0	0,9	0,9	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9
Belgium	*1*	6,7	6,7	6,8	6,4	1,9	6,7	6,1	6,1	5,9	5,7	5,8
Bulgaria	*2*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,0
Croatia	*11*	4,8	3,9	3,8	3,3	3,1	2,9	3,2	2,7	4,2	2,5	2,7
Cyprus	*13*	4,5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	*3*	4,5	4,6	3,8	3,1	3,4	3,3	3,3	2,9	3,0	2,9	3,1
Denmark	*4*	0,8	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,8	0,7	0,7	0,8	0,9
Estonia	*6*	1,3	1,3	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,4	1,4	1,3	1,3	1,3
Finland	*26*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,2
France	*10*	2,7	2,6	2,6	2,5	2,5	2,2	2,1	1,6	1,7	2,0	2,1
Germany	*5*	1,8	1,8	1,7	1,6	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,3	1,2	1,3
Greece	*8*	6,2	2,2	2,1	1,4	1,9	2,0	1,9	NA	1,7	1,3	1,4
Hungary	*17*	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,9	1,8	1,4	1,4	1,3	1,3	1,2	1,3
Ireland	*7*	4,2	3,1	3,0	2,7	2,7	2,7	2,7	2,7	2,1	2,0	2,1
Italy	*12*	2,7	2,6	2,5	2,6	2,5	2,6	2,4	1,9	2,1	2,2	2,2
Latvia	*14*	2,0	2,3	2,0	2,0	1,5	1,4	1,6	1,5	1,5	1,6	1,6
Lithuania	*15*	3,6	4,0	3,6	4,4	4,1	3,6	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,1	2,9
Luxembourg	*16*	0,8	0,9	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,0	1,0
Malta	*18*	0,9	1,5	1,5	1,4	1,6	1,8	1,8	1,4	1,9	2,0	1,9
Netherlands	*19*	NA	1,0	1,0	0,9	0,9	0,8	0,8	0,7	NA	NA	NA
Poland	*21*	-	3,2	-	3,1	3,5	3,4	3,3	2,5	2,4	2,3	2,6
Portugal	*22*	3,1	NA	3,1	3,0	2,9	2,9	3,1	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,5
Romania	*23*	4,2	6,9	6,8	6,8	6,6	6,4	6,7	6,1	6,4	7,0	7,8
Slovak Republic	*25*	3,0	2,8	2,1	3,7	3,5	2,3	2,1	2,0	1,8	1,8	1,7
Slovenia	*24*	3,1	2,9	2,8	2,5	2,2	2,0	1,8	1,5	1,5	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
Sweden	*27*	0,7	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,6

Table 3.10.12 (EC): Number of first instance administrative incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,6	0,8	0,8	0,6	0,5	0,5	0,6	0,6
Belgium	*1*	NA	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,2
Bulgaria	*2*	0,4	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,5	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,5
Croatia	*11*	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,4
Cyprus	*13*	0,8	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,3	1,2	1,3	1,1
Czech Republic	*3*	NAP	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	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	*6*	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Finland	*26*	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,7	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4
France	*10*	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,4
Germany	*5*	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9	1,0	0,9	0,8	0,7	0,7	0,6	0,6
Greece	*8*	0,6	NA	0,5	0,5	0,6	0,6	NA	0,4	0,4	0,5	0,5
Hungary	*17*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2
Ireland	*7*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	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*	0,6	0,5	0,6	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,6	0,8	0,7
Luxembourg	*16*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Malta	*18*	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Netherlands	*19*	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,5	0,5	0,7
Poland	*21*	-	0,2	-	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Romania	*23*	1,0	0,4	0,3	0,6	0,7	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4
Slovak Republic	*25*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Slovenia	*24*	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,2	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
Sweden	*27*	1,1	1,1	1,0	1,4	1,6	1,6	1,7	1,8	1,7	1,4	1,5

First instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.11.1a: First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2023

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	**22 885**	5 259	8 094	NAP
Belgium	**35 437**	15 288	20 149	NA
Bulgaria	**21 006**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**113 008**	30 902	73 168	8 938
Cyprus	**58 385**	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	**10 152**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**35 973**	18 568	17 405	NAP
Estonia	**1 706**	564	630	512
Finland	**28 149**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	244 499	112 223	NA
Greece	**113 323**	665	112 522	136
Hungary	**44 923**	23 027	21 896	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**1 061 869**	980 532	81 337	NAP
Latvia	**4 442**	3 291	837	314
Lithuania	**3 110**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Malta	**16 499**	103	16 396	NA
Netherlands	**60 750**	33 594	27 156	NAP
Poland	**383 289**	177 991	85 321	119 977
Portugal	**44 785**	40 486	2 840	1 459
Romania	**111 047**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**23 645**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**29 724**	10 904	11 142	7 678
Spain	**419 946**	296 839	123 107	NAP
Sweden	**46 457**	29 495	2 230	14 732
Average	**116 979**	112 471	42 144	19 218
Median	**35 973**	23 027	20 149	4 569
Minimum	**1 706**	103	630	136
Maximum	**1 061 869**	980 532	123 107	119 977
% of NA	**15%**	33%	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. 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

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	0,25	0,06	0,09	NAP
Belgium	0,30	0,13	0,17	NA
Bulgaria	0,33	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	2,93	0,80	1,90	0,23
Cyprus	6,25	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	0,09	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,61	0,31	0,29	NAP
Estonia	0,12	0,04	0,05	0,04
Finland	0,50	NA	NA	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,29	0,13	NA
Greece	1,09	0,01	1,08	0,00
Hungary	0,47	0,24	0,23	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	1,80	1,66	0,14	NAP
Latvia	0,24	0,18	0,04	0,02
Lithuania	0,11	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	2,93	0,02	2,91	NA
Netherlands	0,34	0,19	0,15	NAP
Poland	1,02	0,47	0,23	0,32
Portugal	0,42	0,38	0,03	0,01
Romania	0,58	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,44	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	1,40	0,51	0,52	0,36
Spain	0,86	0,61	0,25	NAP
Sweden	0,44	0,28	0,02	0,14
Average	**1,02**	0,36	0,48	0,14
Median	**0,47**	0,28	0,17	0,09
Minimum	**0,09**	0,01	0,02	0,00
Maximum	**6,25**	1,66	2,91	0,36
% of NA	**15%**	33%	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 2023

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	**72 123**	22 941	27 568	NAP
Belgium	**194 339**	43 062	151 277	NA
Bulgaria	**131 222**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**160 011**	17 026	113 367	29 618
Cyprus	**71 877**	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	**67 941**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**160 955**	29 355	131 600	NAP
Estonia	**16 289**	3 370	4 875	8 044
Finland	**69 860**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**970 491**	562 066	408 425	16 629
Germany	**1 087 237**	590 915	346 156	150 166
Greece	**198 751**	979	190 820	6 952
Hungary	**371 864**	131 395	240 469	NAP
Ireland	**349 283**	19 569	329 714	NAP
Italy	**1 106 619**	1 000 420	106 199	NAP
Latvia	**9 350**	4 835	2 566	1 949
Lithuania	**15 258**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	2 695
Malta	**13 716**	63	13 653	NA
Netherlands	**256 295**	158 591	97 704	NAP
Poland	**2 009 191**	357 670	344 861	1 306 660
Portugal	**78 536**	62 533	7 094	8 909
Romania	**373 810**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**65 612**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**73 754**	8 702	24 276	40 776
Spain	**795 592**	326 732	468 860	NAP
Sweden	**126 223**	69 037	9 115	48 071
Average	**340 238**	179 435	158 874	147 315
Median	**145 617**	43 062	113 367	16 629
Minimum	**9 350**	63	2 566	1 949
Maximum	**2 009 191**	1 000 420	468 860	1 306 660
% 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 2023

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	0,25	0,30	NAP
Belgium	1,65	0,37	1,29	NA
Bulgaria	2,04	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	4,15	0,44	2,94	0,77
Cyprus	7,70	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	0,62	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	2,71	0,49	2,22	NAP
Estonia	1,19	0,25	0,36	0,59
Finland	1,24	NA	NA	NAP
France	1,42	0,82	0,60	0,02
Germany	1,28	0,70	0,41	0,18
Greece	1,91	0,01	1,83	0,07
Hungary	3,88	1,37	2,51	NAP
Ireland	6,54	0,37	6,17	NAP
Italy	1,88	1,70	0,18	NAP
Latvia	0,50	0,26	0,14	0,10
Lithuania	0,53	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	0,40
Malta	2,43	0,01	2,42	NA
Netherlands	1,43	0,88	0,54	NAP
Poland	5,34	0,95	0,92	3,47
Portugal	0,74	0,59	0,07	0,08
Romania	1,96	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1,21	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	3,47	0,41	1,14	1,92
Spain	1,64	0,67	0,96	NAP
Sweden	1,20	0,65	0,09	0,46
Average	2,29	0,59	1,32	0,73
Median	1,64	0,49	0,92	0,40
Minimum	0,50	0,01	0,07	0,02
Maximum	7,70	1,70	6,17	3,47
% 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.

Table 3.11.3a: First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2023

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	**73 402**	23 327	27 703	NAP
Belgium	**193 588**	42 320	151 268	NA
Bulgaria	**132 382**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**156 254**	16 637	110 429	29 188
Cyprus	**75 962**	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	**68 250**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**155 976**	26 321	129 655	NAP
Estonia	**16 484**	3 476	4 862	8 146
Finland	**66 434**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**942 408**	569 951	372 457	14 860
Germany	**NA**	586 406	357 270	NA
Greece	**138 028**	547	130 692	6 789
Hungary	**370 639**	129 726	240 913	NAP
Ireland	**320 586**	26 486	294 100	NAP
Italy	**1 224 476**	1 111 039	113 437	NAP
Latvia	**9 186**	4 700	2 462	2 024
Lithuania	**15 359**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**14 455**	4 206	8 174	2 075
Malta	**10 164**	24	10 140	NA
Netherlands	**257 769**	161 463	96 306	NAP
Poland	**2 016 887**	365 288	345 975	1 305 624
Portugal	**75 661**	60 208	6 698	8 755
Romania	**366 736**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**65 353**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**72 593**	8 425	25 053	39 115
Spain	**742 983**	302 421	440 562	NAP
Sweden	**126 312**	71 749	9 677	44 886
Average	**296 474**	175 736	143 892	146 146
Median	**129 347**	34 403	111 933	11 808
Minimum	**9 186**	24	2 462	2 024
Maximum	**2 016 887**	1 111 039	440 562	1 305 624
% 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.

Table 3.11.3b: First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2023

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	0,80	0,25	0,30	NAP
Belgium	1,65	0,36	1,29	NA
Bulgaria	2,05	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	4,06	0,43	2,87	0,76
Cyprus	8,14	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	0,63	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	2,63	0,44	2,19	NAP
Estonia	1,21	0,25	0,36	0,60
Finland	1,18	NA	NA	NAP
France	1,38	0,83	0,54	0,02
Germany	NA	0,69	0,42	NA
Greece	1,33	0,01	1,25	0,07
Hungary	3,87	1,35	2,51	NAP
Ireland	6,00	0,50	5,50	NAP
Italy	2,08	1,88	0,19	NAP
Latvia	0,49	0,25	0,13	0,11
Lithuania	0,53	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	2,15	0,63	1,22	0,31
Malta	1,80	0,00	1,80	NA
Netherlands	1,44	0,90	0,54	NAP
Poland	5,36	0,97	0,92	3,47
Portugal	0,71	0,57	0,06	0,08
Romania	1,92	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1,20	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	3,42	0,40	1,18	1,84
Spain	1,53	0,62	0,91	NAP
Sweden	1,20	0,68	0,09	0,43
Average	**2,26**	0,60	1,21	0,77
Median	**1,59**	0,53	0,91	0,37
Minimum	**0,49**	0,00	0,06	0,02
Maximum	**8,14**	1,88	5,50	3,47
% 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.

Table 3.11.4a: First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2023

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	**36 188**	16 030	20 158	NA
Bulgaria	**19 846**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**119 723**	31 459	78 817	9 447
Cyprus	**54 300**	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	**9 843**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**40 952**	21 602	19 350	NAP
Estonia	**1 372**	432	530	410
Finland	**31 575**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	249 005	101 079	NA
Greece	**174 083**	1 097	172 650	336
Hungary	**46 148**	24 696	21 452	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**944 012**	869 913	74 099	NAP
Latvia	**4 542**	3 359	940	243
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	**47 660**	42 811	3 236	1 613
Romania	**118 121**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**23 904**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**30 885**	11 181	10 365	9 339
Spain	**484 486**	327 539	156 947	NAP
Sweden	**46 368**	26 783	1 668	17 917
Average	**117 972**	107 766	47 161	20 040
Median	**40 952**	24 696	20 158	5 476
Minimum	**1 372**	142	530	243
Maximum	**944 012**	869 913	172 650	121 013
% of NA	**15%**	33%	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. 2023

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	0,24	0,05	0,09	NAP
Belgium	0,31	0,14	0,17	NA
Bulgaria	0,31	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	3,11	0,82	2,05	0,25
Cyprus	5,82	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	0,09	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,69	0,36	0,33	NAP
Estonia	0,10	0,03	0,04	0,03
Finland	0,56	NA	NA	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,29	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	1,60	1,47	0,13	NAP
Latvia	0,24	0,18	0,05	0,01
Lithuania	0,10	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	3,52	0,03	3,50	NA
Netherlands	0,33	0,17	0,16	NAP
Poland	1,00	0,45	0,22	0,32
Portugal	0,45	0,40	0,03	0,02
Romania	0,62	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,44	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	1,45	0,53	0,49	0,44
Spain	1,00	0,67	0,32	NAP
Sweden	0,44	0,25	0,02	0,17
Average	1,07	0,36	0,56	0,15
Median	0,48	0,26	0,17	0,10
Minimum	0,09	0,01	0,02	0,00
Maximum	5,82	1,47	3,50	0,44
% of NA	15%	33%	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 2023

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	**647**	**3,0%**	149	3,1%	287	3,6%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**14 027**	**38,8%**	2 994	18,7%	11 033	54,7%	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Croatia	**14 303**	**11,9%**	13 488	42,9%	NA	NA	815	8,6%
Cyprus	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**528**	**5,4%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	**42**	**3,1%**	31	7,2%	2	0,4%	9	2,2%
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	**6 190**	**3,6%**	21	1,9%	6 157	3,6%	12	3,6%
Hungary	**1 322**	**2,9%**	1 322	5,4%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	**NA**	**NA**	259 450	29,8%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**704**	**15,5%**	674	20,1%	15	1,6%	15	6,2%
Lithuania	**226**	**7,5%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**14 495**	**30,4%**	13 837	32,3%	201	6,2%	457	28,3%
Romania	**3 972**	**3,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 587**	**6,6%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**6 251**	**20,2%**	5 061	45,3%	468	4,5%	722	7,7%
Spain	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Sweden	**2 774**	**6,0%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	**4 791**	**11,3%**	29 703	20,7%	2 270	9,3%	338	9,4%
Median	**2 181**	**6,3%**	2 158	19,4%	244	3,6%	236	7,0%
Minimum	**42**	**2,9%**	21	1,9%	0	0,0%	9	2,2%
Maximum	**14 495**	**38,8%**	259 450	45,3%	11 033	54,7%	815	28,3%
% of NA	**48%**	**48%**	59%	59%	67%	67%	37%	37%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	4%	4%	4%	4%	41%	41%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible**.**

Evolution of the 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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,26	0,27	0,26	0,25
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,30
Bulgaria	0,31	0,34	0,36	0,33
Croatia	2,04	2,73	3,08	2,93
Cyprus	5,10	5,48	4,66	6,25
Czech Republic	0,12	0,12	0,10	0,09
Denmark	0,33	0,46	0,53	0,61
Estonia	0,14	0,13	0,12	0,12
Finland	0,37	0,51	0,52	0,50
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,22	0,32	1,09
Hungary	0,43	0,54	0,53	0,47
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	2,01	2,10	1,98	1,80
Latvia	0,31	0,33	0,24	0,24
Lithuania	0,10	0,12	0,11	0,11
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	2,31	3,08	3,04	2,93
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	0,34
Poland	0,98	1,08	1,06	1,02
Portugal	0,40	0,43	0,43	0,42
Romania	0,56	0,56	0,53	0,58
Slovak Republic	0,41	0,41	0,43	0,44
Slovenia	1,37	1,51	1,48	1,40
Spain	0,76	0,85	0,82	0,86
Sweden	0,41	0,45	0,45	0,44
Average	0,94	1,03	1,00	1,02
Median	0,41	0,46	0,52	0,47
Minimum	0,10	0,12	0,10	0,09
Maximum	5,10	5,48	4,66	6,25
% of NA	26%	22%	22%	15%
% of NAP	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 3.12.2: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,13
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,67	0,76	0,81	0,80
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,17	0,24	0,25	0,31
Estonia	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,04
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	0,40	NA
Germany	0,30	0,31	0,29	0,29
Greece	NA	0,001	0,001	0,006
Hungary	0,21	0,24	0,24	0,24
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	1,85	1,92	1,82	1,66
Latvia	0,21	0,29	0,18	0,18
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	0,02	0,02
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	0,19
Poland	0,45	0,50	0,50	0,47
Portugal	0,37	0,40	0,39	0,38
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,43	0,53	0,53	0,51
Spain	0,54	0,58	0,59	0,61
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	0,28
Average	0,44	0,45	0,41	0,36
Median	0,33	0,31	0,29	0,28
Minimum	0,04	0,00	0,00	0,01
Maximum	1,85	1,92	1,82	1,66
% of NA	48%	44%	37%	33%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.12.3: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,09	0,10	0,08	0,09
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,17
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	1,11	1,70	2,02	1,90
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,16	0,22	0,29	0,29
Estonia	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,05
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,13	0,14	0,13	0,13
Greece	NA	0,22	0,32	1,08
Hungary	0,22	0,30	0,29	0,23
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,17	0,18	0,16	0,14
Latvia	0,10	0,04	0,05	0,04
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	3,02	2,91
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	0,15
Poland	0,21	0,23	0,23	0,23
Portugal	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,03
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,59	0,58	0,58	0,52
Spain	0,22	0,26	0,23	0,25
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	0,02
Average	0,26	0,31	0,53	0,48
Median	0,16	0,22	0,23	0,17
Minimum	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Maximum	1,11	1,70	3,02	2,91
% of NA	48%	44%	41%	33%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 3.12.4: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,75	0,73	0,75	0,79
Belgium	1,66	2,01	1,83	1,65
Bulgaria	1,88	1,92	1,93	2,04
Croatia	4,87	5,16	4,19	4,15
Cyprus	6,62	6,29	8,88	7,70
Czech Republic	0,61	0,59	0,60	0,62
Denmark	2,79	2,37	2,59	2,71
Estonia	1,53	1,46	1,32	1,19
Finland	1,03	1,27	1,16	1,24
France	1,43	NA	1,44	1,42
Germany	1,43	1,36	1,28	1,28
Greece	NA	1,58	2,48	1,91
Hungary	3,65	4,46	3,82	3,88
Ireland	7,24	7,33	6,99	6,54
Italy	1,76	1,91	1,87	1,88
Latvia	0,79	0,51	0,47	0,50
Lithuania	0,62	0,55	0,54	0,53
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	2,15	2,25	2,37	2,43
Netherlands	1,28	1,45	1,46	1,43
Poland	4,87	5,32	5,37	5,34
Portugal	0,62	0,72	0,75	0,74
Romania	1,78	1,90	1,92	1,96
Slovak Republic	1,21	1,15	1,20	1,21
Slovenia	3,48	3,43	3,43	3,47
Spain	1,32	1,52	1,59	1,64
Sweden	1,16	1,17	1,16	1,20
Average	2,26	2,34	2,36	2,29
Median	1,53	1,58	1,71	1,64
Minimum	0,61	0,51	0,47	0,50
Maximum	7,24	7,33	8,88	7,70
% of NA	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	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.

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,25	0,24	0,25	0,25
Belgium	0,29	0,35	0,37	0,37
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,44	0,48	0,46	0,44
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,46	0,38	0,40	0,49
Estonia	0,39	0,36	0,29	0,25
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	0,74	0,82	0,81	0,82
Germany	0,77	0,70	0,68	0,70
Greece	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01
Hungary	1,27	1,35	1,37	1,37
Ireland	0,43	0,43	0,41	0,37
Italy	1,56	1,71	1,69	1,70
Latvia	0,44	0,35	0,24	0,26
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	0,01	0,01
Netherlands	0,91	0,96	0,86	0,88
Poland	0,92	1,00	0,98	0,95
Portugal	0,50	0,57	0,59	0,59
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,45	0,42	0,41	0,41
Spain	0,53	0,65	0,68	0,67
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	0,65
Average	0,65	0,63	0,58	0,59
Median	0,48	0,48	0,44	0,49
Minimum	0,25	0,01	0,01	0,01
Maximum	1,56	1,71	1,69	1,70
% of NA	33%	30%	26%	26%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	4%

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,27	0,24	0,27	0,30
Belgium	1,37	1,66	1,47	1,29
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	3,14	3,30	2,95	2,94
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	2,33	1,99	2,19	2,22
Estonia	0,45	0,41	0,38	0,36
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	0,69	0,67	0,63	0,60
Germany	0,47	0,48	0,43	0,41
Greece	NA	1,54	2,43	1,83
Hungary	2,38	3,11	2,45	2,51
Ireland	7,68	6,90	6,58	6,17
Italy	0,20	0,20	0,18	0,18
Latvia	0,35	0,16	0,13	0,14
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	2,36	2,42
Netherlands	0,37	0,49	0,60	0,54
Poland	0,87	0,95	1,00	0,92
Portugal	0,04	0,06	0,08	0,07
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	1,33	1,32	1,24	1,14
Spain	0,79	0,87	0,92	0,96
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	0,09
Average	1,42	1,43	1,46	1,32
Median	0,74	0,87	0,96	0,92
Minimum	0,04	0,06	0,08	0,07
Maximum	7,68	6,90	6,58	6,17
% of NA	33%	30%	26%	26%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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.

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,73	0,74	0,76	0,80
Belgium	1,57	2,00	1,84	1,65
Bulgaria	1,85	1,92	1,96	2,05
Croatia	4,29	4,80	4,54	4,06
Cyprus	6,27	7,02	7,19	8,14
Czech Republic	0,61	0,61	0,61	0,63
Denmark	2,66	2,29	2,57	2,63
Estonia	1,53	1,45	1,30	1,21
Finland	0,92	1,24	1,16	1,18
France	1,31	NA	1,37	1,38
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	1,06	1,74	1,33
Hungary	3,55	4,48	3,89	3,87
Ireland	4,50	5,54	5,65	6,00
Italy	1,60	1,92	1,96	2,08
Latvia	0,72	0,55	0,49	0,49
Lithuania	0,60	0,56	0,54	0,53
Luxembourg	2,18	2,21	2,12	2,15
Malta	1,42	1,98	2,20	1,80
Netherlands	1,22	1,46	1,40	1,44
Poland	4,78	5,35	5,41	5,36
Portugal	0,58	0,71	0,75	0,71
Romania	1,79	1,92	1,87	1,92
Slovak Republic	1,21	1,14	1,19	1,20
Slovenia	3,34	3,45	3,51	3,42
Spain	1,25	1,57	1,57	1,53
Sweden	1,11	1,17	1,17	1,20
Average	2,06	2,28	2,26	2,26
Median	1,53	1,92	1,79	1,59
Minimum	0,58	0,55	0,49	0,49
Maximum	6,27	7,02	7,19	8,14
% of NA	7%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	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.

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,25	0,24	0,25	0,25
Belgium	0,30	0,35	0,36	0,36
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,39	0,44	0,47	0,43
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,39	0,37	0,37	0,44
Estonia	0,38	0,35	0,30	0,25
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	0,73	NA	0,81	0,83
Germany	0,76	0,72	0,68	0,69
Greece	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01
Hungary	1,24	1,35	1,37	1,35
Ireland	0,35	0,37	0,47	0,50
Italy	1,41	1,70	1,75	1,88
Latvia	0,42	0,39	0,25	0,25
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,67	0,73	0,68	0,63
Malta	NA	NA	0,00	0,00
Netherlands	0,91	0,95	0,86	0,90
Poland	0,87	1,00	1,01	0,97
Portugal	0,47	0,57	0,60	0,57
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,36	0,42	0,43	0,40
Spain	0,49	0,66	0,67	0,62
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	0,68
Average	0,61	0,63	0,60	0,60
Median	0,47	0,44	0,47	0,53
Minimum	0,25	0,01	0,00	0,00
Maximum	1,41	1,70	1,75	1,88
% of NA	30%	30%	22%	22%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	4%

Ireland: The resolved criminal cases are generally counted by penalty imposed rather than by case.

Table 3.12.9: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,27	0,26	0,27	0,30
Belgium	1,27	1,65	1,48	1,29
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	2,61	3,01	3,28	2,87
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	2,27	1,93	2,20	2,19
Estonia	0,45	0,41	0,37	0,36
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	0,58	0,57	0,56	0,54
Germany	0,46	0,48	0,42	0,42
Greece	NA	1,04	1,70	1,25
Hungary	2,31	3,12	2,51	2,51
Ireland	3,91	5,16	5,18	5,50
Italy	0,19	0,22	0,20	0,19
Latvia	0,30	0,16	0,13	0,13
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	1,26	1,22	1,18	1,22
Malta	NA	NA	2,19	1,80
Netherlands	0,31	0,50	0,55	0,54
Poland	0,84	0,95	1,00	0,92
Portugal	0,04	0,06	0,07	0,06
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	1,34	1,31	1,30	1,18
Spain	0,76	0,91	0,90	0,91
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	0,09
Average	1,13	1,28	1,34	1,21
Median	0,76	0,93	1,00	0,91
Minimum	0,04	0,06	0,07	0,06
Maximum	3,91	5,16	5,18	5,50
% of NA	30%	26%	22%	22%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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.

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,27	0,26	0,25	0,24
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,31
Bulgaria	0,34	0,34	0,33	0,31
Croatia	2,62	3,12	2,93	3,11
Cyprus	5,45	4,74	6,34	5,82
Czech Republic	0,12	0,10	0,09	0,09
Denmark	0,46	0,53	0,54	0,69
Estonia	0,13	0,12	0,13	0,10
Finland	0,48	0,54	0,52	0,56
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,36	1,06	1,67
Hungary	0,53	0,53	0,47	0,48
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	2,18	2,09	1,90	1,60
Latvia	0,38	0,29	0,23	0,24
Lithuania	0,12	0,12	0,11	0,10
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	3,09	3,06	3,17	3,52
Netherlands	0,46	0,40	0,34	0,33
Poland	1,07	1,05	1,01	1,00
Portugal	0,44	0,44	0,43	0,45
Romania	0,55	0,53	0,58	0,62
Slovak Republic	0,41	0,43	0,44	0,44
Slovenia	1,51	1,49	1,40	1,45
Spain	0,85	0,83	0,87	1,00
Sweden	0,45	0,45	0,44	0,44
Average	1,04	0,99	1,07	1,07
Median	0,46	0,49	0,50	0,48
Minimum	0,12	0,10	0,09	0,09
Maximum	5,45	4,74	6,34	5,82
% of NA	22%	19%	19%	15%
% of NAP	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.

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,05
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,14
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,73	0,80	0,80	0,82
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,24	0,25	0,27	0,36
Estonia	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,03
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	0,41	NA
Germany	0,31	0,29	0,29	0,29
Greece	NA	0,00	0,01	0,01
Hungary	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,26
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	1,99	1,93	1,76	1,47
Latvia	0,24	0,24	0,17	0,18
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	0,02	0,03
Netherlands	0,32	0,27	0,19	0,17
Poland	0,50	0,50	0,47	0,45
Portugal	0,41	0,40	0,39	0,40
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,53	0,53	0,52	0,53
Spain	0,58	0,60	0,62	0,67
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	0,25
Average	0,48	0,44	0,39	0,36
Median	0,32	0,28	0,28	0,26
Minimum	0,05	0,00	0,01	0,01
Maximum	1,99	1,93	1,76	1,47
% of NA	44%	41%	33%	33%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.12.12: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,10	0,08	0,09	0,09
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,17
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	1,63	2,01	1,90	2,05
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,22	0,28	0,27	0,33
Estonia	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,04
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,14	0,14	0,13	0,12
Greece	NA	0,34	1,05	1,66
Hungary	0,29	0,29	0,23	0,22
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,18	0,17	0,14	0,13
Latvia	0,14	0,04	0,04	0,05
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	3,15	3,50
Netherlands	0,14	0,13	0,15	0,16
Poland	0,23	0,22	0,23	0,22
Portugal	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,57	0,59	0,53	0,49
Spain	0,26	0,23	0,26	0,32
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	0,02
Average	0,31	0,33	0,55	0,56
Median	0,18	0,20	0,23	0,17
Minimum	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,02
Maximum	1,63	2,01	3,15	3,50
% of NA	44%	41%	37%	33%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 3.12.13: Evolution of the first instance total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,12
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	NA	0,60	0,34	0,37
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,19	0,10	0,06
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	0,01
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	0,05	0,05	0,03	0,04
Lithuania	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,15	0,16	0,14	0,14
Romania	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Slovak Republic	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,03
Slovenia	0,20	0,22	0,27	0,29
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,03
Average	0,05	0,11	0,08	0,08
Median	0,02	0,04	0,03	0,03
Minimum	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Maximum	0,20	0,60	0,34	0,37
% of NA	**63%**	56%	56%	48%
% of NAP	**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 3.12.14: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,03
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,36	0,39	0,32	0,35
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,00	0,00	0,00
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	0,01
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,69	0,70	0,60	0,44
Latvia	0,05	0,05	0,03	0,04
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,15	0,15	0,14	0,13
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,15	0,17	0,21	0,24
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,20	0,18	0,16	0,12
Median	0,15	0,10	0,09	0,03
Minimum	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Maximum	0,69	0,70	0,60	0,44
% of NA	**67%**	63%	63%	59%
% of NAP	**7%**	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.12.15: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,0045	0,0040	0,0035	0,0031
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,0938
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	NA	0,1650	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0,0014	0,0002	0,0002	0,0001
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,1889	0,0963	0,0591
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	0,0000
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	0,0008	0,0005	0,0002	0,0008
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,0008	0,0017	0,0017	0,0019
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,0247	0,0164	0,0221	0,0220
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,0065	0,0538	0,0207	0,0226
Median	0,0014	0,0040	0,0026	0,0025
Minimum	0,0008	0,0002	0,0002	0,0000
Maximum	0,0247	0,1889	0,0963	0,0938
% of NA	**74%**	67%	70%	67%
% of NAP	**7%**	7%	7%	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.

Clearance rate and Disposition time for first instance criminal cases

Table 3.13.1: Clearance rate (%) of first instance criminal cases in 2023 (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	101,8%	101,7%	100,5%	NAP
Belgium	99,6%	98,3%	100,0%	NA
Bulgaria	100,9%	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	97,7%	97,7%	97,4%	98,5%
Cyprus	105,7%	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	100,5%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	96,9%	89,7%	98,5%	NAP
Estonia	101,2%	103,1%	99,7%	101,3%
Finland	95,1%	NA	NA	NAP
France	97,1%	101,4%	91,2%	89,4%
Germany	NA	99,2%	103,2%	NA
Greece	69,4%	55,9%	68,5%	97,7%
Hungary	99,7%	98,7%	100,2%	NAP
Ireland	91,8%	135,3%	89,2%	NAP
Italy	110,7%	111,1%	106,8%	NAP
Latvia	98,2%	97,2%	95,9%	103,8%
Lithuania	100,7%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	77,0%
Malta	74,1%	38,1%	74,3%	NA
Netherlands	100,6%	101,8%	98,6%	NAP
Poland	100,4%	102,1%	100,3%	99,9%
Portugal	96,3%	96,3%	94,4%	98,3%
Romania	98,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	99,6%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	98,4%	96,8%	103,2%	95,9%
Spain	93,4%	92,6%	94,0%	NAP
Sweden	100,1%	103,9%	106,2%	93,4%
Average	97,1%	95,8%	95,9%	95,5%
Median	99,6%	98,7%	98,6%	98,0%
Minimum	69,4%	38,1%	68,5%	77,0%
Maximum	110,7%	135,3%	106,8%	103,8%
% 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 2023 (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	107	76	105	NAP
Belgium	68	138	49	NA
Bulgaria	55	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	280	690	261	118
Cyprus	261	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	53	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	96	300	54	NAP
Estonia	30	45	40	18
Finland	173	NA	NA	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	155	103	NA
Greece	460	732	482	18
Hungary	45	69	33	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	281	286	238	NAP
Latvia	180	261	139	44
Lithuania	72	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	713	2160	710	NA
Netherlands	84	69	108	NAP
Poland	68	170	89	34
Portugal	230	260	176	67
Romania	118	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	134	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	155	484	151	87
Spain	238	395	130	NAP
Sweden	134	136	63	146
Average	175	378	172	67
Median	134	260	108	56
Minimum	30	45	33	18
Maximum	713	2 160	710	146
% of NA	15%	33%	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 - 2023

(Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	98,2%	100,3%	101,3%	101,8%
Belgium	94,7%	99,7%	100,1%	99,6%
Bulgaria	98,4%	99,9%	101,8%	100,9%
Croatia	88,1%	93,0%	108,2%	97,7%
Cyprus	94,7%	111,7%	81,0%	105,7%
Czech Republic	100,2%	103,2%	101,1%	100,5%
Denmark	95,2%	96,7%	99,5%	96,9%
Estonia	100,0%	99,4%	98,6%	101,2%
Finland	89,3%	97,5%	100,0%	95,1%
France	91,3%	NA	94,7%	97,1%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	67,2%	70,2%	69,4%
Hungary	97,3%	100,3%	101,6%	99,7%
Ireland	62,1%	75,5%	80,9%	91,8%
Italy	90,7%	100,5%	104,5%	110,7%
Latvia	91,2%	107,7%	103,0%	98,2%
Lithuania	97,4%	100,7%	100,9%	100,7%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	66,0%	87,7%	92,8%	74,1%
Netherlands	95,2%	100,1%	96,1%	100,6%
Poland	98,0%	100,5%	100,8%	100,4%
Portugal	93,5%	99,3%	99,4%	96,3%
Romania	100,2%	101,2%	97,5%	98,1%
Slovak Republic	99,9%	99,0%	99,2%	99,6%
Slovenia	96,0%	100,6%	102,3%	98,4%
Spain	95,1%	103,1%	98,6%	93,4%
Sweden	96,0%	99,7%	100,7%	100,1%
Average	92,9%	97,7%	97,4%	97,1%
Median	95,2%	100,0%	100,0%	99,6%
Minimum	62,1%	67,2%	70,2%	69,4%
Maximum	100,2%	111,7%	108,2%	110,7%
% of NA	11%	11%	7%	7%
% of NAP	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 3.13.4: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2023

(Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	133	131	120	107
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	68
Bulgaria	66	65	61	55
Croatia	223	238	236	280
Cyprus	317	246	322	261
Czech Republic	72	62	56	53
Denmark	64	85	77	96
Estonia	30	31	36	30
Finland	189	160	164	173
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	123	223	460
Hungary	54	43	44	45
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	498	399	355	281
Latvia	192	192	171	180
Lithuania	73	76	73	72
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	792	566	527	713
Netherlands	139	100	89	84
Poland	82	72	68	68
Portugal	280	224	211	230
Romania	113	102	114	118
Slovak Republic	125	136	133	134
Slovenia	165	158	146	155
Spain	247	194	203	238
Sweden	149	142	138	134
Average	191	161	162	175
Median	139	134	136	134
Minimum	30	31	36	30
Maximum	792	566	527	713
% of NA	22%	19%	19%	15%
% of NAP	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 3.13.5: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2023

(Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	100,7%	101,0%	99,3%	101,7%
Belgium	104,5%	100,0%	97,8%	98,3%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	87,9%	91,4%	101,8%	97,7%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	84,2%	97,0%	93,8%	89,7%
Estonia	98,2%	98,7%	100,9%	103,1%
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	98,5%	NA	99,6%	101,4%
Germany	98,2%	102,8%	99,6%	99,2%
Greece	NA	77,7%	55,6%	55,9%
Hungary	97,9%	100,1%	100,2%	98,7%
Ireland	82,2%	87,1%	114,3%	135,3%
Italy	90,5%	99,6%	103,7%	111,1%
Latvia	94,6%	112,1%	104,7%	97,2%
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	38,5%	38,1%
Netherlands	99,6%	98,8%	99,7%	101,8%
Poland	95,0%	100,3%	103,3%	102,1%
Portugal	93,0%	99,9%	100,3%	96,3%
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	79,0%	99,2%	104,1%	96,8%
Spain	94,2%	101,0%	98,9%	92,6%
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	103,9%
Average	93,6%	97,9%	95,3%	95,8%
Median	94,8%	99,8%	99,9%	98,7%
Minimum	79,0%	77,7%	38,5%	38,1%
Maximum	104,5%	112,1%	114,3%	135,3%
% of NA	33%	33%	26%	26%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 3.13.6: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2023

(Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	88	86	85	76
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	138
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	679	668	626	690
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	226	246	265	300
Estonia	46	50	52	45
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	184	NA
Germany	150	148	156	155
Greece	NA	73	366	732
Hungary	70	65	64	69
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	517	414	366	286
Latvia	207	228	243	261
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	2506	2160
Netherlands	130	104	80	69
Poland	209	182	170	170
Portugal	317	254	239	260
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	540	464	441	484
Spain	430	331	336	395
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	136
Average	278	237	386	378
Median	209	205	241	260
Minimum	46	50	52	45
Maximum	679	668	2506	2160
% of NA	44%	41%	33%	33%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 3.13.7: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2023

(Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	98,0%	105,7%	97,7%	100,5%
Belgium	92,6%	99,6%	100,7%	100,0%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	83,2%	91,2%	110,9%	97,4%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	97,4%	96,7%	100,5%	98,5%
Estonia	99,6%	99,0%	95,4%	99,7%
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	83,7%	85,1%	88,5%	91,2%
Germany	97,7%	99,9%	99,1%	103,2%
Greece	NA	67,4%	69,9%	68,5%
Hungary	96,9%	100,4%	102,5%	100,2%
Ireland	50,9%	74,8%	78,8%	89,2%
Italy	92,1%	107,5%	112,1%	106,8%
Latvia	86,8%	98,1%	105,2%	95,9%
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	93,0%	74,3%
Netherlands	84,5%	102,7%	90,9%	98,6%
Poland	97,4%	100,5%	99,9%	100,3%
Portugal	89,5%	95,1%	93,5%	94,4%
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	101,0%	99,2%	104,6%	103,2%
Spain	95,7%	104,6%	98,4%	94,0%
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	106,2%
Average	90,4%	95,7%	96,8%	95,9%
Median	94,1%	99,2%	98,7%	98,6%
Minimum	50,9%	67,4%	69,9%	68,5%
Maximum	101,0%	107,5%	112,1%	106,8%
% of NA	33%	30%	26%	26%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 3.13.8: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2023

(Q94)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	134	119	122	105
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	49
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	227	244	212	261
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	36	54	45	54
Estonia	35	34	47	40
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	113	109	111	103
Greece	NA	121	226	482
Hungary	46	33	33	33
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	356	282	257	238
Latvia	172	102	120	139
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	524	710
Netherlands	164	91	102	108
Poland	98	85	83	89
Portugal	196	144	142	176
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	157	163	148	151
Spain	127	94	104	130
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	63
Average	143	120	152	172
Median	134	106	120	108
Minimum	35	33	33	33
Maximum	356	282	524	710
% of NA	44%	41%	37%	33%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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.

Variations for first instance criminal cases

Table 3.14.1: First instance courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q94)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	8,0%	4,4%	12,7%	5,2%	0,9%	11,4%
Belgium	1,7%	28,4%	-4,0%	-9,4%	0,8%	-11,9%
Bulgaria	0,7%	NA	NA	5,7%	NA	NA
Croatia	-18,6%	-5,1%	-10,5%	-0,9%	-3,8%	-0,4%
Cyprus	21,2%	NA	NA	-12,0%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	4,3%	NA	NA	4,0%	NA	NA
Denmark	-1,2%	9,2%	-3,2%	4,9%	25,0%	1,3%
Estonia	-20,1%	-35,3%	-18,1%	-7,0%	-13,3%	-4,7%
Finland	22,7%	NA	NA	8,0%	NA	NA
France	0,5%	13,0%	-12,8%	-1,0%	2,1%	-5,0%
Germany	-8,4%	-7,7%	-11,4%	0,3%	2,9%	-3,6%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	-24,9%	-18,1%	-26,5%
Hungary	3,1%	5,0%	2,0%	1,3%	-0,2%	2,1%
Ireland	-3,1%	-8,2%	-13,8%	-3,0%	-7,7%	-2,7%
Italy	6,1%	8,5%	-11,8%	0,5%	0,5%	0,5%
Latvia	-37,8%	-42,4%	-61,3%	4,7%	6,2%	6,7%
Lithuania	-11,4%	NA	NA	-1,0%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	23,7%	NA	NA	11,4%	61,5%	11,2%
Netherlands	14,6%	-0,6%	52,1%	-1,6%	3,3%	-8,6%
Poland	7,9%	1,8%	4,2%	-0,9%	-3,5%	-8,5%
Portugal	23,8%	21,0%	60,6%	-0,2%	0,7%	-10,5%
Romania	9,3%	NAP	NAP	2,0%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-0,4%	NA	NA	0,6%	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,5%	-8,9%	-13,2%	1,6%	0,5%	-7,7%
Spain	27,5%	31,4%	25,0%	3,8%	0,1%	6,5%
Sweden	5,2%	NA	NA	3,4%	NA	NA
Average	3,2%	0,9%	-0,2%	-0,2%	3,2%	-2,8%
Median	3,1%	3,1%	-7,2%	0,5%	0,6%	-3,1%
Minimum	-37,8%	-42,4%	-61,3%	-24,9%	-18,1%	-26,5%
Maximum	27,5%	31,4%	60,6%	11,4%	61,5%	11,4%
% of NA	7%	37%	37%	4%	30%	30%
% 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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q94)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	12,0%	5,5%	15,6%	5,7%	3,3%	14,6%
Belgium	7,0%	20,8%	3,7%	-9,8%	1,3%	-12,5%
Bulgaria	3,3%	NA	NA	4,8%	NA	NA
Croatia	-9,8%	5,5%	4,8%	-10,6%	-7,7%	-12,5%
Cyprus	35,3%	NA	NA	14,8%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	4,6%	NA	NA	3,4%	NA	NA
Denmark	0,6%	16,2%	-2,1%	2,2%	19,5%	-0,7%
Estonia	-19,1%	-32,0%	-18,0%	-4,6%	-11,3%	-0,3%
Finland	30,7%	NA	NA	2,7%	NA	NA
France	6,8%	16,3%	-5,0%	1,5%	3,9%	-2,1%
Germany	NA	-6,7%	-6,5%	NA	2,6%	0,4%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	-25,7%	-17,6%	-27,9%
Hungary	5,6%	5,9%	5,5%	-0,6%	-1,6%	-0,1%
Ireland	43,1%	51,0%	51,0%	10,1%	9,3%	10,2%
Italy	29,5%	33,1%	2,3%	6,4%	7,6%	-4,3%
Latvia	-32,9%	-40,8%	-57,2%	-0,2%	-1,4%	-2,7%
Lithuania	-8,5%	NA	NA	-1,2%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	4,3%	-1,5%	2,2%	3,1%	-6,1%	4,6%
Malta	38,8%	NA	NA	-11,1%	60,0%	-11,2%
Netherlands	21,0%	1,7%	77,5%	3,0%	5,5%	-0,9%
Poland	10,4%	9,4%	7,3%	-1,4%	-4,6%	-8,1%
Portugal	27,6%	25,2%	69,5%	-3,3%	-3,4%	-9,6%
Romania	7,0%	NAP	NAP	2,7%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-0,7%	NA	NA	0,9%	NA	NA
Slovenia	3,1%	11,6%	-11,3%	-2,2%	-6,6%	-8,9%
Spain	25,2%	29,0%	22,7%	-1,7%	-6,3%	1,7%
Sweden	9,7%	NA	NA	2,8%	NA	NA
Average	10,2%	8,8%	9,5%	-0,3%	2,4%	-3,7%
Median	7,0%	9,4%	3,7%	1,2%	-1,4%	-2,1%
Minimum	-32,9%	-40,8%	-57,2%	-25,7%	-17,6%	-27,9%
Maximum	43,1%	51,0%	77,5%	14,8%	60,0%	14,6%
% of NA	7%	33%	33%	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 3.14.3: First instance courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q94)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-9,9%	-8,3%	-9,2%	-5,6%	-7,3%	-1,7%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	-14,8%	NA	NA	-5,5%	NA	NA
Croatia	13,3%	7,2%	20,1%	5,9%	1,8%	7,7%
Cyprus	11,2%	NA	NA	-7,0%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-23,6%	NA	NA	-3,0%	NA	NA
Denmark	51,8%	54,1%	49,4%	27,0%	34,9%	19,2%
Estonia	-18,7%	-32,7%	-7,7%	-19,0%	-22,4%	-15,6%
Finland	19,9%	NA	NA	8,5%	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	-3,7%	-14,3%	NA	1,8%	-6,7%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	53,6%	65,0%	53,4%
Hungary	-11,9%	5,5%	-26,0%	2,7%	7,2%	-2,0%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-26,8%	-26,4%	-31,5%	-15,6%	-15,9%	-11,1%
Latvia	-37,1%	-25,4%	-65,4%	5,4%	5,7%	13,0%
Lithuania	-10,3%	NA	NA	-3,2%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	25,0%	NA	NA	20,4%	37,9%	20,3%
Netherlands	-26,8%	-45,7%	17,0%	-2,4%	-8,5%	5,2%
Poland	-8,5%	-10,9%	-3,2%	-2,0%	-4,3%	-1,3%
Portugal	4,7%	2,4%	52,8%	5,2%	4,9%	12,0%
Romania	11,6%	NAP	NAP	6,4%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	6,2%	NA	NA	1,1%	NA	NA
Slovenia	-2,9%	0,1%	-14,5%	3,9%	2,5%	-7,0%
Spain	20,9%	18,7%	25,7%	15,4%	10,3%	27,5%
Sweden	-1,3%	NA	NA	-0,1%	NA	NA
Average	-1,3%	-5,0%	-0,5%	4,2%	7,6%	7,5%
Median	-2,9%	-3,7%	-7,7%	1,9%	2,5%	5,2%
Minimum	-37,1%	-45,7%	-65,4%	-19,0%	-22,4%	-15,6%
Maximum	51,8%	54,1%	52,8%	53,6%	65,0%	53,4%
% of NA	22%	48%	48%	19%	41%	41%
% 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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage points (Q94)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	+3,6	+1,0	+2,5	+0,5	+2,4	+2,8
Belgium	+4,9	-6,2	+7,4	-0,5	+0,5	-0,7
Bulgaria	+2,5	NA	NA	-0,9	NA	NA
Croatia	+9,6	+9,8	+14,2	-10,5	-4,1	-13,5
Cyprus	+11,0	NA	NA	+24,7	NA	NA
Czech Republic	+0,3	NA	NA	-0,6	NA	NA
Denmark	+1,7	+5,4	+1,2	-2,6	-4,1	-2,0
Estonia	+1,2	+5,0	+0,2	+2,6	+2,3	+4,3
Finland	+5,8	NA	NA	-4,9	NA	NA
France	+5,8	+2,9	+7,5	+2,4	+1,8	+2,7
Germany	NA	+1,0	+5,5	NA	-0,3	+4,1
Greece	NA	NA	NA	-0,8	+0,3	-1,4
Hungary	+2,4	+0,9	+3,3	-2,0	-1,5	-2,3
Ireland	+29,6	+53,1	+38,3	+10,9	+21,0	+10,4
Italy	+19,9	+20,5	+14,7	+6,1	+7,3	-5,3
Latvia	+7,1	+2,6	+9,2	-4,8	-7,4	-9,2
Lithuania	+3,3	NA	NA	-0,2	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	+8,1	NA	NA	-18,7	-0,4	-18,7
Netherlands	+5,3	+2,2	+14,1	+4,5	+2,1	+7,6
Poland	+2,3	+7,1	+2,9	-0,5	-1,1	+0,4
Portugal	+2,8	+3,3	+4,9	-3,1	-4,0	+0,9
Romania	-2,1	NAP	NAP	+0,7	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-0,3	NA	NA	+0,4	NA	NA
Slovenia	+2,4	+17,8	+2,2	-3,8	-7,3	-1,4
Spain	-1,7	-1,7	-1,7	-5,2	-6,4	-4,4
Sweden	+4,1	NA	NA	-0,7	NA	NA
Average	+5,4	+7,8	+7,9	-0,3	+0,1	-1,4
Median	+3,4	+3,1	+5,2	-0,6	-0,3	-1,0
Minimum	-2,1	-6,2	-1,7	-18,7	-7,4	-18,7
Maximum	+29,6	+53,1	+38,3	+24,7	+21,0	+10,4
% of NA	11%	37%	37%	7%	30%	30%
% 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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q94)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-19,5%	-13,1%	-21,5%	-10,7%	-10,3%	-14,2%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	-17,5%	NA	NA	-9,8%	NA	NA
Croatia	25,6%	1,6%	14,6%	18,5%	10,3%	23,1%
Cyprus	-17,8%	NA	NA	-19,0%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-26,9%	NA	NA	-6,2%	NA	NA
Denmark	50,9%	32,6%	52,5%	24,2%	12,9%	20,0%
Estonia	0,5%	-1,0%	12,5%	-15,1%	-12,5%	-15,3%
Finland	-8,2%	NA	NA	5,6%	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	3,3%	-8,4%	NA	-0,7%	-7,0%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	106,8%	100,2%	112,9%
Hungary	-16,6%	-0,4%	-29,8%	3,4%	9,0%	-1,9%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-43,5%	-44,7%	-33,1%	-20,6%	-21,9%	-7,2%
Latvia	-6,2%	26,1%	-19,2%	5,6%	7,2%	16,1%
Lithuania	-2,0%	NA	NA	-2,1%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	-9,9%	NA	NA	35,4%	-13,8%	35,4%
Netherlands	-39,5%	-46,6%	-34,1%	-5,3%	-13,3%	6,2%
Poland	-17,1%	-18,6%	-9,8%	-0,7%	0,3%	7,4%
Portugal	-17,9%	-18,2%	-9,9%	8,8%	8,5%	23,9%
Romania	4,2%	NAP	NAP	3,6%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	7,0%	NA	NA	0,2%	NA	NA
Slovenia	-5,8%	-10,4%	-3,7%	6,2%	9,8%	2,1%
Spain	-3,5%	-8,0%	2,4%	17,4%	17,8%	25,3%
Sweden	-10,0%	NA	NA	-2,8%	NA	NA
Average	-8,3%	-7,5%	-6,7%	6,5%	6,9%	15,1%
Median	-9,9%	-8,0%	-9,8%	1,8%	7,2%	7,4%
Minimum	-43,5%	-46,6%	-34,1%	-20,6%	-21,9%	-15,3%
Maximum	50,9%	32,6%	52,5%	106,8%	100,2%	112,9%
% of NA	22%	48%	48%	19%	41%	41%
% 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. 2023

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	**1 411**	854	557	NAP
Belgium	**9 519**	6 291	3 228	NA
Bulgaria	**1 825**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**19 275**	3 594	15 631	50
Cyprus	**268**	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	**1 621**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**3 198**	3 198	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**144**	71	11	62
Finland	**2 928**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**41 807**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	20 112	1 222	NA
Greece	**19 730**	15 696	3 987	47
Hungary	**4 924**	4 895	29	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**250 369**	247 119	3 250	NAP
Latvia	**881**	634	224	23
Lithuania	**695**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	**767**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**21 315**	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	**28 883**	15 704	1 070	12 109
Portugal	**4 023**	NA	NA	NA
Romania	**8 496**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 220**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**928**	340	582	6
Spain	**10 665**	7 971	2 694	NAP
Sweden	**5 455**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**18 348**	25 114	2 707	2 050
Median	**3 611**	4 895	1 146	49
Minimum	**144**	71	11	6
Maximum	**250 369**	247 119	15 631	12 109
% of NA	**11%**	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	4%	7%	48%

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. 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

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	0,02	0,01	0,01	NAP
Belgium	0,08	0,05	0,03	NA
Bulgaria	0,03	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	0,50	0,09	0,41	0,0013
Cyprus	0,03	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	0,01	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,05	0,05	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,0045
Finland	0,05	NA	NA	NAP
France	0,06	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,02	0,00	NA
Greece	0,19	0,15	0,04	0,0005
Hungary	0,05	0,05	0,00	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	0,42	0,42	0,01	NAP
Latvia	0,05	0,03	0,01	0,0012
Lithuania	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	0,14	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,12	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	0,08	0,04	0,00	0,0322
Portugal	0,04	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,04	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,04	0,02	0,03	0,0003
Spain	0,02	0,02	0,01	NAP
Sweden	0,05	NA	NA	NA
Average	**0,09**	0,07	0,04	0,0067
Median	**0,05**	0,04	0,01	0,0013
Minimum	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	0,0003
Maximum	**0,50**	0,42	0,41	0,0322
% of NA	**11%**	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	4%	7%	48%

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.

Table 3.15.2a: Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2023

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	**9 927**	6 482	3 445	NAP
Belgium	**21 245**	6 874	14 371	NA
Bulgaria	**10 624**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**22 662**	9 714	12 054	894
Cyprus	**132**	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	**20 056**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**6 046**	6 046	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 700**	358	168	1 174
Finland	**5 351**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**42 927**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**54 830**	43 872	10 758	200
Greece	**28 259**	16 172	9 247	2 840
Hungary	**36 174**	35 696	478	NAP
Ireland	**17 773**	2 742	15 031	NAP
Italy	**98 874**	95 901	2 973	NAP
Latvia	**2 474**	1 543	702	229
Lithuania	**4 519**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**425**	381	44	NAP
Malta	**452**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**25 934**	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	**192 604**	50 361	5 588	136 655
Portugal	**9 868**	NA	NA	NA
Romania	**25 021**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**8 890**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**6 795**	3 899	2 543	353
Spain	**50 982**	36 837	14 145	NAP
Sweden	**14 580**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**26 634**	21 125	6 539	20 335
Median	**14 580**	6 874	4 517	894
Minimum	**132**	358	44	200
Maximum	**192 604**	95 901	15 031	136 655
% of NA	**0%**	41%	41%	26%
% of NAP	**0%**	4%	7%	48%

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.

Table 3.15.2b: Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2023

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	0,16	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	0,59	0,25	0,31	0,0232
Cyprus	0,01	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	0,18	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,10	0,10	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,12	0,03	0,01	0,0860
Finland	0,10	NA	NA	NAP
France	0,06	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,06	0,05	0,01	0,0002
Greece	0,27	0,16	0,09	0,0273
Hungary	0,38	0,37	0,00	NAP
Ireland	0,33	0,05	0,28	NAP
Italy	0,17	0,16	0,01	NAP
Latvia	0,13	0,08	0,04	0,0122
Lithuania	0,16	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,06	0,06	0,01	NAP
Malta	0,08	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,14	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	0,51	0,13	0,01	0,3631
Portugal	0,09	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,13	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,16	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,32	0,18	0,12	0,0166
Spain	0,10	0,08	0,03	NAP
Sweden	0,14	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,18	0,12	0,08	0,0755
Median	0,14	0,08	0,03	0,0232
Minimum	0,01	0,03	0,00	0,0002
Maximum	0,59	0,37	0,31	0,3631
% of NA	0%	41%	41%	26%
% of NAP	0%	4%	7%	48%

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.

Table 3.15.3a: Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2023

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	**9 672**	6 452	3 220	NAP
Belgium	**20 753**	6 711	14 042	NA
Bulgaria	**10 808**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**22 624**	8 734	12 992	898
Cyprus	**97**	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	**20 129**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**5 672**	5 672	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 699**	348	174	1 177
Finland	**5 239**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**40 117**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	43 048	10 889	NA
Greece	**16 540**	7 824	7 192	1 524
Hungary	**36 430**	35 944	486	NAP
Ireland	**17 806**	1 892	15 914	NAP
Italy	**126 238**	122 836	3 402	NAP
Latvia	**2 164**	1 211	731	222
Lithuania	**4 535**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**485**	433	52	NAP
Malta	**659**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**26 296**	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	**192 791**	50 353	5 554	136 884
Portugal	**10 004**	NA	NA	NA
Romania	**25 687**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**8 875**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**6 735**	3 834	2 563	338
Spain	**51 788**	37 376	14 412	NAP
Sweden	**14 089**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**26 074**	22 178	6 545	23 507
Median	**12 449**	6 711	4 478	1 038
Minimum	**97**	348	52	222
Maximum	**192 791**	122 836	15 914	136 884
% of NA	**4%**	41%	41%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	4%	7%	48%

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.

Table 3.15.3b: Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2023

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	**0,59**	0,23	0,34	0,02
Cyprus	**0,01**	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	**0,18**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**0,10**	0,10	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,12**	0,03	0,01	0,09
Finland	**0,09**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**0,06**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	0,05	0,01	NA
Greece	**0,16**	0,08	0,07	0,01
Hungary	**0,38**	0,38	0,01	NAP
Ireland	**0,33**	0,04	0,30	NAP
Italy	**0,21**	0,21	0,01	NAP
Latvia	**0,12**	0,06	0,04	0,01
Lithuania	**0,16**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**0,07**	0,06	0,01	NAP
Malta	**0,12**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**0,15**	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	**0,51**	0,13	0,01	0,36
Portugal	**0,09**	NA	NA	NA
Romania	**0,13**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,16**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**0,32**	0,18	0,12	0,02
Spain	**0,11**	0,08	0,03	NAP
Sweden	**0,13**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**0,18**	0,12	0,08	0,09
Median	**0,14**	0,08	0,03	0,02
Minimum	**0,01**	0,03	0,01	0,01
Maximum	**0,59**	0,38	0,34	0,36
% of NA	**4%**	41%	41%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	4%	7%	48%

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.

Table 3.15.4a: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2023

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	**10 011**	6 454	3 557	NA
Bulgaria	**1 641**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**19 308**	4 574	14 688	46
Cyprus	**303**	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	**1 548**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**3 572**	3 572	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**145**	81	5	59
Finland	**3 040**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**42 291**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	20 928	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	**223 005**	220 184	2 821	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	NAP
Poland	**28 696**	15 712	1 104	11 880
Portugal	**3 887**	NA	NA	NA
Romania	**7 830**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 235**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**988**	405	562	21
Spain	**9 861**	7 432	2 429	NAP
Sweden	**5 946**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**17 675**	23 822	2 775	2 233
Median	**3 730**	4 647	1 097	53
Minimum	**145**	81	5	21
Maximum	**223 005**	220 184	14 688	11 880
% of NA	**11%**	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	4%	7%	48%

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.

Table 3.15.4b: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2023

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	0,50	0,12	0,38	0,001
Cyprus	0,03	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	0,01	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,06	0,06	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,004
Finland	0,05	NA	NA	NAP
France	0,06	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,02	0,00	NA
Greece	0,30	0,23	0,06	0,013
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	0,002
Lithuania	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	0,09	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,12	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	0,08	0,04	0,00	0,032
Portugal	0,04	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,04	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,05	0,02	0,03	0,001
Spain	0,02	0,02	0,00	NAP
Sweden	0,06	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,09	0,08	0,04	0,009
Median	0,05	0,04	0,01	0,003
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,001
Maximum	0,50	0,37	0,38	0,032
% of NA	11%	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	0%	4%	7%	48%

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.

Table 3.15.5: Second instance criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2023

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	**3**	**0,2%**	3	0,3%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**1 771**	**17,7%**	1 409	21,8%	362	10,2%	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Croatia	**1 886**	**9,8%**	236	5,2%	1 649	11,2%	1	2,2%
Cyprus	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**22**	**1,4%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0**	**0,0%**	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	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	**431**	**1,4%**	228	0,9%	203	3,4%	0	0,0%
Hungary	**4**	**0,1%**	4	0,1%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	**98 562**	**44,2%**	98 186	44,6%	376	13,3%	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**10**	**1,0%**	10	1,3%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Lithuania	**7**	**1,0%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	**130**	**1,7%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**15**	**1,2%**	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	**76**	**1,3%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	**7 351**	**5,8%**	11 120	8,3%	324	4,8%	0	0,4%
Median	**19**	**1,2%**	10	0,9%	102	1,7%	0	0,0%
Minimum	**0**	**0,0%**	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Maximum	**98 562**	**44,2%**	98 186	44,6%	1 649	13,3%	1	2,2%
% of NA	**48%**	**48%**	63%	63%	63%	63%	37%	37%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	4%	4%	7%	7%	44%	44%

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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Belgium	NA	0,07	NA	0,08
Bulgaria	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03
Croatia	0,34	0,37	0,44	0,50
Cyprus	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03
Czech Republic	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01
Denmark	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,05
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Finland	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05
France	0,06	NA	0,06	0,06
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,06	0,06	0,19
Hungary	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,45	0,46	0,45	0,42
Latvia	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,05
Lithuania	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	0,16	0,13	0,14	0,14
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	0,12
Poland	0,07	0,07	0,08	0,08
Portugal	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,04
Romania	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04
Slovak Republic	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Slovenia	0,03	0,02	0,04	0,04
Spain	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Sweden	0,03	0,04	0,05	0,05
Average	0,07	0,07	0,08	0,09
Median	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,05
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Maximum	0,45	0,46	0,45	0,50
% of NA	22%	19%	19%	11%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3.16.2: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Belgium	NA	0,06	0,05	0,05
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,06	0,06	0,07	0,09
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,05
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02
Greece	NA	0,04	0,04	0,15
Hungary	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05
Ireland	NA	NA	0,01	NA
Italy	0,44	0,45	0,44	0,42
Latvia	0,02	0,02	0,03	0,03
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,02	0,01	0,02	0,02
Spain	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,07
Median	0,02	0,04	0,03	0,04
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Maximum	0,44	0,45	0,44	0,42
% of NA	48%	44%	41%	48%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,0075	0,0074	0,0071	0,0061
Belgium	NA	0,0029	NA	0,0274
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,2802	0,3134	0,3701	0,4057
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,0008	0,0005	0,0006	0,0008
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,0019	0,0015	0,0015	0,0014
Greece	NA	0,0182	0,0193	0,0383
Hungary	0,0002	0,0002	0,0002	0,0003
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,0078	0,0064	0,0055	0,0055
Latvia	0,0106	0,0091	0,0091	0,0120
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,0030	0,0031	0,0033	0,0028
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,0049	0,0015	0,0234	0,0274
Spain	0,0053	0,0045	0,0064	0,0055
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,0322	0,0307	0,0406	0,0444
Median	0,0051	0,0038	0,0064	0,0058
Minimum	0,0002	0,0002	0,0002	0,0003
Maximum	0,2802	0,3134	0,3701	0,4057
% of NA	52%	44%	48%	48%
% of NAP	11%	11%	11%	7%

Table 3.16.4: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,11	0,11	0,11	0,11
Belgium	0,23	0,27	0,27	0,18
Bulgaria	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16
Croatia	0,56	0,65	0,66	0,59
Cyprus	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,01
Czech Republic	0,21	0,20	0,19	0,18
Denmark	0,10	0,11	0,11	0,10
Estonia	0,15	0,15	0,13	0,12
Finland	0,09	0,10	0,10	0,10
France	0,06	NA	0,06	0,06
Germany	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06
Greece	0,17	0,26	0,36	0,27
Hungary	0,34	0,38	0,39	0,38
Ireland	0,25	0,31	0,33	0,33
Italy	0,15	0,17	0,18	0,17
Latvia	0,14	0,14	0,14	0,13
Lithuania	0,16	0,15	0,15	0,16
Luxembourg	0,07	0,06	0,07	0,06
Malta	0,06	0,10	0,11	0,08
Netherlands	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,14
Poland	0,45	0,51	0,51	0,51
Portugal	0,09	0,09	0,10	0,09
Romania	0,12	0,13	0,13	0,13
Slovak Republic	0,17	0,15	0,16	0,16
Slovenia	0,22	0,30	0,30	0,32
Spain	0,09	0,12	0,11	0,10
Sweden	0,10	0,12	0,13	0,14
Average	0,17	0,19	0,19	0,18
Median	0,15	0,15	0,14	0,14
Minimum	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,01
Maximum	0,56	0,65	0,66	0,59
% of NA	0%	4%	0%	0%
% of NAP	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,08	0,07	0,07	0,07
Belgium	0,14	0,06	0,06	0,06
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,21	0,24	0,24	0,25
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,10	0,11	0,11	0,10
Estonia	0,14	0,14	0,12	0,03
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05
Greece	NA	0,15	0,24	0,16
Hungary	0,34	0,38	0,38	0,37
Ireland	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,05
Italy	0,15	0,16	0,18	0,16
Latvia	0,07	0,08	0,08	0,08
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,06	0,05	0,06	0,06
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,11	0,13	0,14	0,13
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,17	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,16	0,17	0,17	0,18
Spain	0,06	0,08	0,08	0,08
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,12	0,13	0,13	0,12
Median	0,11	0,11	0,11	0,08
Minimum	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,03
Maximum	0,34	0,38	0,38	0,37
% of NA	37%	37%	37%	41%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	4%

Greece: The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

Table 3.16.6: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,04
Belgium	0,09	0,11	0,11	0,12
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,33	0,38	0,39	0,31
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01
Greece	NA	0,10	0,11	0,09
Hungary	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,00
Ireland	0,22	0,28	0,30	0,28
Italy	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,01
Latvia	0,07	0,05	0,05	0,04
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,05	0,12	0,11	0,12
Spain	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,03
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,07	0,08	0,09	0,08
Median	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,03
Minimum	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,00
Maximum	0,33	0,38	0,39	0,31
% of NA	41%	37%	37%	41%
% of NAP	11%	11%	11%	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,11	0,11	0,11	0,11
Belgium	0,23	0,27	0,27	0,18
Bulgaria	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,17
Croatia	0,76	0,58	0,60	0,59
Cyprus	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,01
Czech Republic	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,18
Denmark	0,10	0,10	0,10	0,10
Estonia	0,15	0,15	0,14	0,12
Finland	0,09	0,09	0,10	0,09
France	0,06	NA	0,06	0,06
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	0,19	0,16	0,23	0,16
Hungary	0,35	0,38	0,38	0,38
Ireland	0,27	0,30	0,34	0,33
Italy	0,14	0,18	0,21	0,21
Latvia	0,15	0,13	0,13	0,12
Lithuania	0,16	0,15	0,15	0,16
Luxembourg	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,07
Malta	0,09	0,09	0,10	0,12
Netherlands	0,15	0,17	0,15	0,15
Poland	0,45	0,50	0,51	0,51
Portugal	0,09	0,09	0,10	0,09
Romania	0,11	0,13	0,13	0,13
Slovak Republic	0,17	0,15	0,16	0,16
Slovenia	0,23	0,28	0,30	0,32
Spain	0,10	0,11	0,11	0,11
Sweden	0,10	0,11	0,12	0,13
Average	0,18	0,19	0,19	0,18
Median	0,15	0,15	0,14	0,14
Minimum	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,01
Maximum	0,76	0,58	0,60	0,59
% of NA	4%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,07	0,08	0,07	0,07
Belgium	0,14	0,06	0,06	0,06
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,21	0,22	0,22	0,23
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,10	0,10	0,10	0,10
Estonia	0,14	0,14	0,12	0,03
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05
Greece	NA	0,09	0,13	0,08
Hungary	0,35	0,38	0,38	0,38
Ireland	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,04
Italy	0,14	0,18	0,20	0,21
Latvia	0,07	0,08	0,07	0,06
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,06	0,06	0,05	0,06
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,10	0,13	0,13	0,13
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,17	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,16	0,17	0,17	0,18
Spain	0,07	0,08	0,08	0,08
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,13	0,12	0,12	0,12
Median	0,10	0,09	0,10	0,08
Minimum	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,03
Maximum	0,35	0,38	0,38	0,38
% of NA	37%	37%	37%	41%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	4%

Greece: The methodology to present data in line with CEPEJ categories was updated and the comparison with previous cycles can not be made.

Table 3.16.9: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04
Belgium	0,09	0,11	0,12	0,12
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,31	0,33	0,35	0,34
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01
Greece	NA	0,06	0,09	0,07
Hungary	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,01
Ireland	0,23	0,27	0,31	0,30
Italy	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Latvia	0,08	0,05	0,05	0,04
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,05	0,09	0,11	0,12
Spain	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,03
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,07	0,08	0,08	0,08
Median	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,03
Minimum	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,01
Maximum	0,31	0,33	0,35	0,34
% of NA	41%	37%	37%	41%
% of NAP	11%	11%	11%	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Belgium	NA	0,08	NA	0,09
Bulgaria	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03
Croatia	0,36	0,44	0,50	0,50
Cyprus	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03
Czech Republic	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01
Denmark	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,06
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Finland	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05
France	0,06	NA	0,06	0,06
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,06	0,18	0,30
Hungary	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,46	0,45	0,43	0,38
Latvia	0,03	0,04	0,05	0,05
Lithuania	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,02
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	0,13	0,14	0,15	0,09
Netherlands	0,14	0,12	0,12	0,12
Poland	0,07	0,08	0,08	0,08
Portugal	0,03	0,03	0,04	0,04
Romania	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04
Slovak Republic	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Slovenia	0,02	0,04	0,04	0,05
Spain	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Sweden	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,06
Average	0,08	0,08	0,09	0,09
Median	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,05
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Maximum	0,46	0,45	0,50	0,50
% of NA	19%	15%	15%	11%
% of NAP	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Belgium	NA	0,05	0,05	0,05
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,06	0,07	0,09	0,12
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,04	0,04	0,05	0,06
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,02
Greece	NA	0,04	0,15	0,23
Hungary	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,46	0,44	0,42	0,37
Latvia	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,04
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,02
Spain	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,02
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,06	0,06	0,07	0,08
Median	0,02	0,04	0,04	0,04
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Maximum	0,46	0,44	0,42	0,37
% of NA	48%	44%	44%	48%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Belgium	NA	0,003	NA	0,03
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,30	0,37	0,41	0,38
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,0004
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,001	0,002	0,001	0,001
Greece	NA	0,02	0,04	0,06
Hungary	0,0002	0,0002	0,0003	0,0002
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,005
Latvia	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,003	0,003	0,003	0,003
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,002	0,02	0,03	0,03
Spain	0,005	0,01	0,01	0,00
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,03	0,04	0,05	0,04
Median	0,004	0,01	0,01	0,01
Minimum	0,0002	0,0002	0,0003	0,0002
Maximum	0,30	0,37	0,41	0,38
% of NA	52%	44%	48%	48%
% of NAP	11%	11%	11%	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 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,00001	0,00001	0,00003	0,00003
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	0,02
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	NA	0,04	0,03	0,05
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,0003	0,0002	0,0002	0,0002
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0	0	0
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,01	0,002	0,004
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	0,00
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,22	0,21	0,19	0,17
Latvia	0,0011	0,0003	0,0005	0,0005
Lithuania	0,0003	0,0006	0,0004	0,0002
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,0006	0,0006	0,0006	0,0007
Slovak Republic	0,0001	0,0003	0,0002	0,0003
Slovenia	0,0001	0,0001	0,00005	0
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	0,0004	0,0005	0,0006	0,0007
Average	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Median	0,0003	0,0004	0,0005	0,0004
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	0,22	0,21	0,19	0,17
% of NA	63%	56%	56%	48%
% of NAP	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 3.16.14: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,00001	0,00001	0,00001	0,00003
Belgium	NA	0,01	0,01	0,01
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	0,003	0,002	0,003	0,01
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0	0	0
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,003	0,002	0,002
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	0,00004
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,22	0,21	0,19	0,17
Latvia	0,001	0,0003	0,0005	0,0005
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,0001	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0	0	0	0
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,02
Median	0,0001	0,001	0,001	0,0005
Minimum	0,0	0,0	0,0	0
Maximum	0,22	0,21	0,19	0,17
% of NA	67%	63%	63%	63%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	4%

Table 3.16.15: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0	0	0,00002	0
Belgium	NA	0,001	0,001	0,0031
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	NA	0,03	0,03	0,04
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0	0	0	0
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0,002	0,0004	0,002
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,001	0,001	0,0008	0,0006
Latvia	0	0	0	0
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,0001	0,0001	0,00005	0
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,0003	0,0048	0,0042	0,0061
Median	0	0,0006	0,0002	0
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	0,0014	0,0334	0,0313	0,0428
% of NA	70%	59%	59%	63%
% of NAP	11%	11%	11%	7%

Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance criminal cases

Table 3.17.1: Clearance rate (%) of second instance criminal cases in 2023 (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	97,4%	99,5%	93,5%	NAP
Belgium	97,7%	97,6%	97,7%	NA
Bulgaria	101,7%	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	99,8%	89,9%	107,8%	100,4%
Cyprus	73,5%	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	100,4%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	93,8%	93,8%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	99,9%	97,2%	103,6%	100,3%
Finland	97,9%	NA	NA	NAP
France	93,5%	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	98,1%	101,2%	NA
Greece	58,5%	48,4%	77,8%	53,7%
Hungary	100,7%	100,7%	101,7%	NAP
Ireland	100,2%	69,0%	105,9%	NAP
Italy	127,7%	128,1%	114,4%	NAP
Latvia	87,5%	78,5%	104,1%	96,9%
Lithuania	100,4%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	114,1%	113,6%	118,2%	NAP
Malta	145,8%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	101,4%	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	100,1%	100,0%	99,4%	100,2%
Portugal	101,4%	NA	NA	NA
Romania	102,7%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	99,8%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	99,1%	98,3%	100,8%	95,8%
Spain	101,6%	101,5%	101,9%	NAP
Sweden	96,6%	NA	NA	NA
Average	99,7%	94,3%	102,0%	91,2%
Median	100,0%	98,1%	101,8%	98,6%
Minimum	58,5%	48,4%	77,8%	53,7%
Maximum	145,8%	128,1%	118,2%	100,4%
% of NA	4%	41%	41%	30%
% of NAP	0%	4%	7%	48%

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 2023 (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	63	50	89	NAP
Belgium	176	351	92	NA
Bulgaria	55	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	312	191	413	19
Cyprus	1 140	NA	NA	NAP
Czech Republic	28	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	230	230	NAP	NAP
Estonia	31	85	10	18
Finland	212	NA	NA	NAP
France	385	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	177	37	NA
Greece	694	1122	307	326
Hungary	47	47	16	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	645	654	303	NAP
Latvia	168	233	97	49
Lithuania	55	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	266	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	291	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	54	114	73	32
Portugal	142	NA	NA	NA
Romania	111	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	51	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	54	39	80	23
Spain	69	73	62	NAP
Sweden	154	NA	NA	NA
Average	226	259	131	78
Median	148	177	84	27
Minimum	28	39	10	18
Maximum	1 140	1 122	413	326
% of NA	11%	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	0%	4%	7%	48%

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 - 2023

(Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	99,5%	101,1%	100,1%	97,4%
Belgium	100,6%	100,7%	101,2%	97,7%
Bulgaria	99,2%	98,5%	100,4%	101,7%
Croatia	136,9%	89,8%	91,4%	99,8%
Cyprus	108,4%	105,8%	92,8%	73,5%
Czech Republic	98,5%	101,0%	100,8%	100,4%
Denmark	97,6%	98,1%	87,6%	93,8%
Estonia	99,4%	99,5%	100,7%	99,9%
Finland	104,5%	94,5%	98,7%	97,9%
France	102,4%	NA	95,3%	93,5%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	108,9%	60,5%	64,1%	58,5%
Hungary	102,4%	100,0%	99,0%	100,7%
Ireland	108,8%	97,5%	102,9%	100,2%
Italy	93,8%	107,5%	112,5%	127,7%
Latvia	101,4%	97,6%	92,6%	87,5%
Lithuania	98,9%	100,6%	102,1%	100,4%
Luxembourg	109,8%	114,1%	87,4%	114,1%
Malta	148,9%	94,6%	90,6%	145,8%
Netherlands	94,5%	109,0%	100,0%	101,4%
Poland	99,0%	99,6%	100,2%	100,1%
Portugal	101,3%	98,5%	95,9%	101,4%
Romania	99,2%	95,6%	99,8%	102,7%
Slovak Republic	99,7%	99,7%	99,1%	99,8%
Slovenia	105,5%	91,1%	100,0%	99,1%
Spain	103,0%	95,6%	98,9%	101,6%
Sweden	92,5%	92,5%	97,8%	96,6%
Average	104,4%	97,7%	96,6%	99,7%
Median	101,0%	98,5%	99,0%	100,0%
Minimum	92,5%	60,5%	64,1%	58,5%
Maximum	148,9%	114,1%	112,5%	145,8%
% of NA	4%	7%	4%	4%
% of NAP	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 - 2023

(Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	55	51	54	63
Belgium	NA	105	NA	176
Bulgaria	56	63	66	55
Croatia	171	276	304	312
Cyprus	347	354	344	1140
Czech Republic	34	31	29	28
Denmark	141	143	202	230
Estonia	27	29	29	31
Finland	182	197	198	212
France	399	NA	366	385
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	144	294	694
Hungary	48	45	49	47
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	1167	897	750	645
Latvia	81	99	135	168
Lithuania	67	66	59	55
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	545	542	551	266
Netherlands	348	272	295	291
Poland	61	56	54	54
Portugal	142	137	146	142
Romania	122	128	123	111
Slovak Republic	45	50	52	51
Slovenia	26	58	54	54
Spain	59	67	71	69
Sweden	156	169	154	154
Average	194	173	190	226
Median	101	105	135	148
Minimum	26	29	29	28
Maximum	1167	897	750	1140
% of NA	19%	15%	15%	11%
% of NAP	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 - 2023

(Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	99,2%	101,5%	98,7%	99,5%
Belgium	100,7%	104,4%	99,9%	97,6%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	102,8%	95,0%	91,5%	89,9%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	97,6%	98,1%	87,6%	93,8%
Estonia	99,3%	99,6%	100,9%	97,2%
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	100,4%	101,7%	98,3%	98,1%
Greece	NA	56,2%	54,3%	48,4%
Hungary	102,4%	100,0%	99,0%	100,7%
Ireland	122,3%	101,0%	92,6%	69,0%
Italy	92,7%	107,3%	112,9%	128,1%
Latvia	100,6%	96,9%	89,8%	78,5%
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	106,4%	110,4%	86,4%	113,6%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	98,9%	98,4%	99,1%	100,0%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	99,7%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	105,5%	96,9%	102,3%	98,3%
Spain	103,1%	96,0%	97,9%	101,5%
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	102,1%	97,6%	94,1%	94,3%
Median	100,6%	99,6%	98,3%	98,1%
Minimum	92,7%	56,2%	54,3%	48,4%
Maximum	122,3%	110,4%	112,9%	128,1%
% of NA	37%	37%	37%	41%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

(Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	48	42	49	50
Belgium	NA	331	353	351
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	96	118	154	191
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	141	143	202	230
Estonia	27	29	29	85
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	168	162	178	177
Greece	NA	168	410	1122
Hungary	48	45	49	47
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	1196	913	760	654
Latvia	119	119	179	233
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	132	113	113	114
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	45	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	33	44	34	39
Spain	60	69	77	73
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	176	177	199	259
Median	78	118	154	177
Minimum	27	29	29	39
Maximum	1196	913	760	1122
% of NA	48%	44%	44%	48%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

(Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	100,2%	100,4%	102,9%	93,5%
Belgium	100,4%	100,2%	103,5%	97,7%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	93,8%	85,8%	90,7%	107,8%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	102,5%	99,3%	98,0%	103,6%
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	102,8%	99,9%	100,5%	101,2%
Greece	NA	64,1%	83,9%	77,8%
Hungary	98,9%	100,2%	99,0%	101,7%
Ireland	107,1%	97,2%	104,4%	105,9%
Italy	129,5%	111,1%	98,8%	114,4%
Latvia	102,2%	98,8%	94,4%	104,1%
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	138,6%	146,2%	95,6%	118,2%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	99,2%	98,7%	103,4%	99,4%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	107,4%	81,2%	96,3%	100,8%
Spain	102,7%	94,9%	101,1%	101,9%
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	106,6%	98,4%	98,0%	102,0%
Median	102,5%	99,0%	98,9%	101,8%
Minimum	93,8%	64,1%	83,9%	77,8%
Maximum	138,6%	146,2%	104,4%	118,2%
% of NA	41%	37%	37%	41%
% of NAP	11%	11%	11%	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 - 2023

(Q98)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	70	69	62	89
Belgium	NA	9	NA	92
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	356	407	423	413
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	21	21	28	10
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	35	38	38	37
Greece	NA	129	146	307
Hungary	23	15	13	16
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	435	376	369	303
Latvia	44	68	94	97
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	100	82	69	73
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	11	91	93	80
Spain	57	64	57	62
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	115	114	127	131
Median	50	69	69	84
Minimum	11	9	13	10
Maximum	435	407	423	413
% of NA	52%	44%	48%	48%
% of NAP	11%	11%	11%	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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q98)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-2,8%	-4,0%	-0,5%	3,5%	1,2%	8,2%
Belgium	-19,8%	-58,4%	44,2%	-32,0%	5,3%	9,9%
Bulgaria	-5,7%	NA	NA	5,0%	NA	NA
Croatia	0,5%	16,4%	-9,2%	-10,3%	4,1%	-18,9%
Cyprus	-47,0%	NA	NA	-54,9%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-8,6%	NA	NA	-0,9%	NA	NA
Denmark	0,8%	0,8%	NAP	-8,4%	-8,4%	NAP
Estonia	-14,7%	-80,9%	41,2%	-4,6%	-78,1%	14,3%
Finland	9,7%	NA	NA	-2,0%	NA	NA
France	13,5%	NA	NA	-2,0%	NA	NA
Germany	-5,3%	-2,5%	-15,7%	1,7%	4,5%	-8,3%
Greece	53,8%	NA	NA	-26,0%	-37,2%	-22,4%
Hungary	7,4%	7,0%	37,4%	-3,0%	-2,1%	-42,3%
Ireland	45,5%	95,2%	39,0%	3,1%	35,6%	-1,0%
Italy	8,3%	8,0%	19,0%	-9,1%	-9,1%	-9,5%
Latvia	-9,6%	14,8%	-49,6%	-3,6%	7,3%	-23,8%
Lithuania	1,2%	NA	NA	7,1%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	1,7%	1,9%	0,0%	-4,1%	-4,3%	-2,2%
Malta	45,3%	NA	NA	-19,4%	NA	NA
Netherlands	-3,8%	NA	NA	-1,7%	NA	NA
Poland	11,9%	24,8%	28,3%	-0,5%	-1,8%	2,3%
Portugal	12,4%	NA	NA	-5,7%	NA	NA
Romania	12,5%	NAP	NAP	-1,1%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-2,1%	NA	NA	2,6%	NA	NA
Slovenia	47,8%	18,3%	159,8%	8,3%	9,1%	6,9%
Spain	15,6%	19,7%	6,1%	-7,3%	-3,2%	-16,5%
Sweden	35,4%	NA	NA	9,9%	NA	NA
Average	7,6%	4,4%	23,1%	-5,8%	-5,1%	-7,4%
Median	1,7%	7,5%	19,0%	-2,0%	-1,8%	-5,3%
Minimum	-47,0%	-80,9%	-49,6%	-54,9%	-78,1%	-42,3%
Maximum	53,8%	95,2%	159,8%	9,9%	35,6%	14,3%
% 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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q98)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-4,9%	-3,7%	-7,2%	0,8%	2,1%	-1,7%
Belgium	-22,1%	-59,7%	40,3%	-34,4%	2,9%	3,8%
Bulgaria	-3,3%	NA	NA	6,4%	NA	NA
Croatia	-26,7%	1,8%	4,3%	-2,1%	2,2%	-3,6%
Cyprus	-64,1%	NA	NA	-64,3%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-6,9%	NA	NA	-1,4%	NA	NA
Denmark	-3,2%	-3,2%	NAP	-1,9%	-1,9%	NAP
Estonia	-14,3%	-81,3%	42,6%	-5,3%	-78,9%	20,8%
Finland	2,8%	NA	NA	-2,8%	NA	NA
France	3,6%	NA	NA	-3,9%	NA	NA
Germany	NA	-4,7%	-17,0%	NA	4,3%	-7,6%
Greece	-17,3%	NA	NA	-32,4%	-44,0%	-28,0%
Hungary	5,6%	5,2%	41,3%	-1,3%	-0,4%	-40,8%
Ireland	34,0%	10,1%	37,5%	0,3%	1,1%	0,4%
Italy	47,5%	49,1%	5,1%	3,2%	3,2%	4,8%
Latvia	-22,0%	-10,4%	-48,6%	-9,0%	-6,2%	-15,9%
Lithuania	2,6%	NA	NA	5,3%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	5,7%	8,8%	-14,8%	25,3%	25,9%	20,9%
Malta	42,3%	NA	NA	29,7%	NA	NA
Netherlands	3,2%	NA	NA	-0,3%	NA	NA
Poland	13,2%	26,1%	28,7%	-0,6%	-0,9%	-1,6%
Portugal	12,5%	NA	NA	-0,4%	NA	NA
Romania	16,4%	NAP	NAP	1,7%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-2,0%	NA	NA	3,4%	NA	NA
Slovenia	38,8%	10,2%	143,9%	7,3%	4,8%	11,9%
Spain	14,0%	17,8%	5,3%	-4,7%	0,3%	-15,8%
Sweden	41,5%	NA	NA	8,7%	NA	NA
Average	3,7%	-2,4%	20,1%	-2,8%	-5,7%	-3,7%
Median	3,0%	3,5%	5,3%	-0,5%	1,1%	-1,7%
Minimum	-64,1%	-81,3%	-48,6%	-64,3%	-78,9%	-40,8%
Maximum	47,5%	49,1%	143,9%	29,7%	25,9%	20,9%
% 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 3.18.3: Second instance courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q98)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	8,6%	1,3%	18,3%	18,1%	3,5%	40,4%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,3%	NA
Bulgaria	-3,8%	NA	NA	-10,1%	NA	NA
Croatia	33,7%	103,3%	21,1%	0,2%	27,3%	-6,0%
Cyprus	17,9%	NA	NA	18,4%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-22,3%	NA	NA	-4,4%	NA	NA
Denmark	58,3%	58,3%	NAP	11,8%	11,8%	NAP
Estonia	-0,7%	-41,7%	-28,6%	2,1%	-38,2%	-54,5%
Finland	19,6%	NA	NA	3,8%	NA	NA
France	-0,2%	NA	NA	1,2%	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,6%	-12,6%	NA	4,1%	-10,9%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	59,4%	53,2%	51,5%
Hungary	2,6%	2,7%	-4,5%	-5,2%	-5,1%	-27,6%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-18,5%	-18,4%	-26,9%	-11,3%	-11,2%	-14,2%
Latvia	63,1%	74,9%	14,7%	13,3%	21,9%	-12,9%
Lithuania	-15,9%	NA	NA	-2,3%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	-30,5%	NA	NA	-37,4%	NA	NA
Netherlands	-13,7%	NA	NA	-1,7%	NA	NA
Poland	0,9%	8,9%	-6,3%	-0,7%	0,1%	3,1%
Portugal	12,3%	NA	NA	-3,4%	NA	NA
Romania	6,6%	NAP	NAP	-7,8%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	11,2%	NA	NA	1,2%	NA	NA
Slovenia	181,5%	29,8%	1656,3%	6,8%	19,1%	-3,6%
Spain	34,6%	43,0%	14,0%	-6,8%	-5,8%	-9,8%
Sweden	39,9%	NA	NA	9,0%	NA	NA
Average	17,5%	23,9%	164,5%	2,4%	6,4%	-4,1%
Median	7,6%	8,9%	4,7%	0,2%	3,5%	-9,8%
Minimum	-30,5%	-41,7%	-28,6%	-37,4%	-38,2%	-54,5%
Maximum	181,5%	103,3%	1656,3%	59,4%	53,2%	51,5%
% of NA	19%	56%	56%	15%	48%	52%
% 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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage points (Q98)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-2,1	+0,3	-6,7	-2,7	+0,8	-9,4
Belgium	-2,9	-3,1	-2,7	-3,5	-2,3	-5,8
Bulgaria	+2,6	NA	NA	+1,4	NA	NA
Croatia	-37,0	-12,9	+14,0	+8,4	-1,6	+17,1
Cyprus	-34,9	NA	NA	-19,3	NA	NA
Czech Republic	+1,8	NA	NA	-0,4	NA	NA
Denmark	-3,8	-3,8	NAP	+6,2	+6,2	NAP
Estonia	+0,5	-2,0	+1,1	-0,7	-3,7	+5,6
Finland	-6,6	NA	NA	-0,8	NA	NA
France	-9,0	NA	NA	-1,8	NA	NA
Germany	NA	-2,2	-1,6	NA	-0,1	+0,7
Greece	-50,3	NA	NA	-5,5	-5,9	-6,1
Hungary	-1,7	-1,7	+2,8	+1,7	+1,7	+2,6
Ireland	-8,6	-53,3	-1,2	-2,7	-23,6	+1,5
Italy	+33,9	+35,3	-15,1	+15,2	+15,2	+15,6
Latvia	-13,9	-22,1	+2,0	-5,1	-11,3	+9,8
Lithuania	+1,4	NA	NA	-1,7	NA	NA
Luxembourg	+4,3	+7,2	-20,5	+26,8	+27,2	+22,6
Malta	-3,1	NA	NA	+55,2	NA	NA
Netherlands	+6,9	NA	NA	+1,4	NA	NA
Poland	+1,1	+1,1	+0,2	-0,1	+0,9	-4,0
Portugal	+0,1	NA	NA	+5,4	NA	NA
Romania	+3,5	NAP	NAP	+2,8	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	+0,1	NA	NA	+0,8	NA	NA
Slovenia	-6,4	-7,2	-6,6	-0,9	-4,0	+4,5
Spain	-1,4	-1,7	-0,8	+2,7	+3,5	+0,8
Sweden	+4,1	NA	NA	-1,1	NA	NA
Average	-4,7	-4,7	-2,7	+3,1	+0,2	+4,0
Median	-1,6	-2,1	-1,2	-0,3	-0,1	+2,1
Minimum	-50,3	-53,3	-20,5	-19,3	-23,6	-9,4
Maximum	+33,9	+35,3	+14,0	+55,2	+27,2	+22,6
% 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 3.18.5: Second instance courts, variation of the Disposition Time of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q98)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	14,2%	5,1%	27,5%	17,2%	1,4%	42,9%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	-0,7%	NA
Bulgaria	-0,5%	NA	NA	-15,5%	NA	NA
Croatia	82,3%	99,7%	16,0%	2,3%	24,5%	-2,5%
Cyprus	228,2%	NA	NA	231,9%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-16,5%	NA	NA	-3,1%	NA	NA
Denmark	63,4%	63,4%	NAP	13,9%	13,9%	NAP
Estonia	15,9%	211,5%	-49,9%	7,8%	193,2%	-62,4%
Finland	16,3%	NA	NA	6,8%	NA	NA
France	-3,6%	NA	NA	5,2%	NA	NA
Germany	NA	5,5%	5,3%	NA	-0,3%	-3,5%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	135,8%	173,7%	110,5%
Hungary	-2,8%	-2,4%	-32,4%	-3,9%	-4,7%	22,3%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-44,7%	-45,3%	-30,4%	-14,0%	-14,0%	-18,1%
Latvia	109,0%	95,2%	123,1%	24,4%	30,0%	3,5%
Lithuania	-18,0%	NA	NA	-7,3%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	-51,2%	NA	NA	-51,8%	NA	NA
Netherlands	-16,3%	NA	NA	-1,4%	NA	NA
Poland	-10,9%	-13,6%	-27,2%	-0,1%	1,0%	4,7%
Portugal	-0,2%	NA	NA	-3,0%	NA	NA
Romania	-8,5%	NAP	NAP	-9,4%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	13,4%	NA	NA	-2,1%	NA	NA
Slovenia	102,8%	17,8%	620,2%	-0,5%	13,7%	-13,9%
Spain	18,0%	21,4%	8,2%	-2,2%	-6,1%	7,1%
Sweden	-1,1%	NA	NA	0,3%	NA	NA
Average	22,2%	41,7%	66,0%	14,4%	32,7%	8,2%
Median	-0,3%	17,8%	6,8%	-0,5%	1,4%	3,5%
Minimum	-51,2%	-45,3%	-49,9%	-51,8%	-14,0%	-62,4%
Maximum	228,2%	211,5%	620,2%	231,9%	193,2%	110,5%
% of NA	19%	56%	56%	15%	48%	52%
% 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. 2023

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	**590**	138	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**465**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**261**	207	18	36
Croatia	**113**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**0**	0	0	0
Czech Republic	**140**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**41**	41	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**14**	14	NAP	NAP
Finland	**343**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**3 178**	NAP	NAP	22
Germany	**769**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**882**	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**442**	442	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**15**	15	NAP	NAP
Italy	**18 318**	16 042	365	1 911
Latvia	**160**	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	**161**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**26**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**2 183**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**1 435**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**179**	179	NAP	NAP
Romania	**42**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**336**	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**188**	180	8	NAP
Spain	**7 198**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**443**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**1 459**	1 726	98	492
Median	**299**	159	13	29
Minimum	**0**	0	0	0
Maximum	**18 318**	16 042	365	1 911
% of NA	**0%**	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	**4%**	15%	37%	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. 2023

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	**0,006**	0,002	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**0,004**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**0,004**	0,003	0,0003	0,0006
Croatia	**0,003**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**0**	0	0	0
Czech Republic	**0,001**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**0,001**	0,001	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,001**	0,001	NAP	NAP
Finland	**0,006**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**0,005**	NAP	NAP	0,00003
Germany	**0,001**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**0,008**	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**0,005**	0,005	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**0,0003**	0,0003	NAP	NAP
Italy	**0,031**	0,027	0,0006	0,0032
Latvia	**0,009**	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	**0,006**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**0,004**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**0,012**	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	**0,009**	0,008	0,0004	NAP
Spain	**0,015**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**0,004**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**0,006**	0,005	0,0003	0,001
Median	**0,004**	0,002	0,0003	0,0003
Minimum	**0**	0	0	0
Maximum	**0,031**	0,027	0,001	0,003
% of NA	**0%**	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	**4%**	15%	37%	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 2023

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	**1 340**	718	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**1 796**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**1 190**	488	94	608
Croatia	**335**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**0**	0	0	0
Czech Republic	**1 203**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**80**	80	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**61**	61	NAP	NAP
Finland	**908**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**7 255**	NAP	NAP	229
Germany	**3 181**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**1 405**	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**1 577**	1 577	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**41**	41	NAP	NAP
Italy	**47 157**	39 938	632	6 587
Latvia	**505**	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	**279**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**57**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**3 454**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**4 234**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**1 069**	1 069	NAP	NAP
Romania	**212**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**986**	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**805**	777	28	NAP
Spain	**10 529**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**4 295**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**3 614**	4 475	189	1 856
Median	**1 130**	603	61	419
Minimum	**0**	0	0	0
Maximum	**47 157**	39 938	632	6 587
% of NA	**0%**	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	**4%**	15%	37%	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 2023

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	0,008	NAP	NAP
Belgium	0,015	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	0,018	0,008	0,001	0,009
Croatia	0,009	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	0	0	0	0
Czech Republic	0,011	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,004	0,004	NAP	NAP
Finland	0,016	NA	NA	NAP
France	0,011	NAP	NAP	0,0003
Germany	0,004	NA	NA	NA
Greece	0,013	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,016	0,016	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Italy	0,080	0,068	0,001	0,011
Latvia	0,027	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	0,010	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,008	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	0,019	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,011	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,010	0,010	NAP	NAP
Romania	0,001	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,018	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	0,038	0,037	0,001	NAP
Spain	0,022	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	0,041	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,016	0,015	0,001	0,005
Median	0,012	0,008	0,001	0,005
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	0,080	0,068	0,001	0,011
% of NA	0%	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	4%	15%	37%	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 2023

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	**1 327**	699	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**1 798**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**1 157**	478	81	598
Croatia	**381**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**0**	0	0	0
Czech Republic	**1 188**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**74**	74	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**61**	61	NAP	NAP
Finland	**849**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**7 623**	NAP	NAP	217
Germany	**3 170**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**1 614**	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**1 561**	1 561	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**45**	45	NAP	NAP
Italy	**50 350**	42 272	754	7 324
Latvia	**518**	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	**274**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**51**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**2 979**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**4 254**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**1 074**	1 074	NAP	NAP
Romania	**219**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**972**	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**771**	747	24	NAP
Spain	**9 078**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**3 765**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**3 660**	4 701	215	2 035
Median	**1 116**	589	53	408
Minimum	**0**	0	0	0
Maximum	**50 350**	42 272	754	7 324
% of NA	**0%**	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	**4%**	15%	37%	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 2023

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	0,000	0,000	0,000
Czech Republic	0,011	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,004	0,004	NAP	NAP
Finland	0,015	NA	NA	NAP
France	0,011	NAP	NAP	0,000
Germany	0,004	NA	NA	NA
Greece	0,015	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,016	0,016	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Italy	0,085	0,072	0,001	0,012
Latvia	0,028	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	0,009	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,008	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	0,017	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,011	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,010	0,010	NAP	NAP
Romania	0,001	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,018	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	0,036	0,035	0,001	NAP
Spain	0,019	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	0,036	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,016	0,015	0,001	0,006
Median	0,013	0,008	0,001	0,005
Minimum	0	0,000	0,000	0,000
Maximum	0,085	0,072	0,001	0,012
% of NA	0%	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	4%	15%	37%	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. 2023

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	**603**	157	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**463**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**294**	217	31	46
Croatia	**67**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**0**	0	0	0
Czech Republic	**155**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**47**	47	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**14**	14	NAP	NAP
Finland	**402**	NA	NA	NAP
France	**2 810**	NAP	NAP	34
Germany	**780**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**673**	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**458**	458	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**16**	16	NAP	NAP
Italy	**15 125**	13 708	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**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**1 406**	1 500	72	314
Median	**322**	166	22	40
Minimum	**0**	0	0	0
Maximum	**15 125**	13 708	243	1 174
% of NA	**0%**	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	**4%**	15%	37%	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. 2023

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	0,007	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	0,000	0	0	0
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	NAP	NAP	0,00005
Germany	0,001	NA	NA	NA
Greece	0,006	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,005	0,005	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,000	0,000	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	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,006	0,005	0,0004	0,0007
Median	0,005	0,002	0,0004	0,0004
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	0,026	0,023	0,0006	0,0020
% of NA	0%	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	4%	15%	37%	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 2023

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	48	8,0%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	18	3,9%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	9	3,1%	9	4,1%	0	0%	0	0%
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	36	1,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	10	29,4%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	13	1,9%	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	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	1	2,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	10	2,9%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	1	0,5%	1	0,5%	0	0%	NAP	NAP
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Sweden	0	0,0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	10	1,9%	2	0,9%	0	0%	3	9,8%
Median	1	1,3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Minimum	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Maximum	48	8,0%	9	4,1%	0	0%	10	29,4%
% of NA	44%	46%	59%	62%	48%	50%	33%	35%
% of NAP	4%	4%	19%	19%	37%	38%	52%	54%

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

Table 3.20.1: Supreme courts, Evolution of the total of criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	621	610	600	590
Belgium	380	301	390	465
Bulgaria	293	266	296	261
Croatia	724	704	274	113
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	183	150	147	140
Denmark	35	33	28	41
Estonia	10	23	28	14
Finland	205	243	308	343
France	3302	2998	3300	3178
Germany	784	658	801	769
Greece	NA	16	680	882
Hungary	325	265	414	442
Ireland	25	26	16	15
Italy	23583	24478	23735	18318
Latvia	141	177	235	160
Lithuania	93	89	140	161
Luxembourg	39	31	31	26
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	2363	2318	2015	2183
Poland	1819	1487	1372	1435
Portugal	156	173	153	179
Romania	145	134	143	42
Slovak Republic	268	278	316	336
Slovenia	303	278	201	188
Spain	4373	6302	6379	7198
Sweden	188	268	324	443
Average	1682	1692	1693	1459
Median	281	266	308	299
Minimum	10	16	16	0
Maximum	23583	24478	23735	18318
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	165	146	178	138
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	231	215	239	207
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	35	33	28	41
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	14
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0	NA	NA
Hungary	325	265	414	442
Ireland	25	26	16	15
Italy	21261	21398	20822	16042
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	156	173	153	179
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	268	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	294	266	183	180
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	2529	2502	2754	1726
Median	231	173	181	159
Minimum	25	0	16	0
Maximum	21261	21398	20822	16042
% of NA	41%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	26%	26%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	22	29	23	18
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	16	NA	NA
Hungary	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	510	550	479	365
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	9	12	18	8
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	180	152	173	98
Median	22	23	23	13
Minimum	9	12	18	0
Maximum	510	550	479	365
% of NA	44%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	44%	44%	41%	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 3.20.4: Supreme courts, Evolution of the total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	1393	1336	1404	1340
Belgium	1353	1698	1780	1796
Bulgaria	1035	1141	1027	1190
Croatia	2100	704	440	335
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	1410	1383	1207	1203
Denmark	60	49	63	80
Estonia	101	81	136	61
Finland	833	889	921	908
France	7199	7360	7500	7255
Germany	2984	3257	3026	3181
Greece	NA	1323	1260	1405
Hungary	1414	1527	1549	1577
Ireland	33	35	33	41
Italy	38508	46298	45363	47157
Latvia	686	662	558	505
Lithuania	261	303	288	279
Luxembourg	42	50	39	57
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	3414	3346	3174	3454
Poland	3226	3915	4224	4234
Portugal	959	986	1024	1069
Romania	353	408	205	212
Slovak Republic	1016	1099	942	986
Slovenia	663	714	714	805
Spain	7506	8990	9467	10529
Sweden	2236	2649	3184	4295
Average	3283	3608	3581	3614
Median	1194	1141	1027	1130
Minimum	33	35	33	0
Maximum	38508	46298	45363	47157
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	679	741	655	718
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	525	609	468	488
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	60	49	63	80
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	61
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	1260	NA	NA
Hungary	1414	1527	1549	1577
Ireland	33	35	33	41
Italy	31695	38544	37990	39938
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	959	986	1024	1069
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1016	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	622	671	650	777
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	4111	4936	5304	4475
Median	679	741	653	603
Minimum	33	35	33	0
Maximum	31695	38544	37990	39938
% of NA	41%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	26%	26%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	88	68	72	94
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	63	NA	NA
Hungary	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	598	687	697	632
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	42	43	64	28
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	243	215	278	189
Median	88	66	72	61
Minimum	42	43	64	0
Maximum	598	687	697	632
% of NA	44%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	44%	44%	41%	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 3.20.7: Evolution of the total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	1428	1348	1418	1327
Belgium	1372	1609	1704	1798
Bulgaria	1062	1110	1062	1157
Croatia	2120	1133	600	381
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	1443	1386	1214	1188
Denmark	62	54	50	74
Estonia	88	62	134	61
Finland	778	800	856	849
France	7503	7382	7622	7623
Germany	3110	3114	3058	3170
Greece	NA	1162	1058	1614
Hungary	1474	1378	1521	1561
Ireland	34	46	28	45
Italy	37618	47040	50775	50350
Latvia	650	604	633	518
Lithuania	265	252	267	274
Luxembourg	50	50	44	51
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	3246	3417	2849	2979
Poland	3570	4018	4161	4254
Portugal	942	1006	998	1074
Romania	364	399	306	219
Slovak Republic	1006	1061	922	972
Slovenia	688	791	728	771
Spain	5577	8834	8648	9078
Sweden	2156	2592	3065	3765
Average	3192	3626	3749	3660
Median	1217	1133	1058	1116
Minimum	34	46	28	0
Maximum	37618	47040	50775	50350
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 3.20.8: Supreme courts, Evolution of the severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	698	709	695	699
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	541	584	500	478
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	62	54	50	74
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	61
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	1106	NA	NA
Hungary	1474	1378	1521	1561
Ireland	34	46	28	45
Italy	31558	39119	42765	42272
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	942	1006	998	1074
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1006	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	650	754	653	747
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	4107	4973	5901	4701
Median	698	754	674	589
Minimum	34	46	28	0
Maximum	31558	39119	42765	42272
% of NA	41%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	26%	26%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	81	74	77	81
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	56	NA	NA
Hungary	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	558	758	811	754
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	38	37	75	24
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	226	231	321	215
Median	81	65	77	53
Minimum	38	37	75	0
Maximum	558	758	811	754
% of NA	44%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	44%	44%	41%	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 3.20.10: Supreme courts, Evolution of the total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	586	598	586	603
Belgium	361	390	466	463
Bulgaria	266	297	261	294
Croatia	704	274	113	67
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	150	147	140	155
Denmark	33	28	41	47
Estonia	23	42	30	14
Finland	260	332	373	402
France	2998	2976	3178	2810
Germany	658	801	769	780
Greece	NA	177	882	673
Hungary	265	414	442	458
Ireland	24	15	21	16
Italy	24473	23736	18323	15125
Latvia	177	235	160	147
Lithuania	86	140	161	166
Luxembourg	31	31	26	32
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	2318	2015	2183	2479
Poland	1475	1384	1435	1415
Portugal	173	153	179	174
Romania	134	143	42	35
Slovak Republic	278	316	336	350
Slovenia	278	201	188	222
Spain	6302	6379	7198	8649
Sweden	268	325	443	973
Average	1763	1662	1519	1406
Median	267	297	336	322
Minimum	23	15	21	0
Maximum	24473	23736	18323	15125
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 3.20.11: Supreme courts, Evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	146	178	138	157
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	215	240	207	217
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	33	28	41	47
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	14
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	154	NA	NA
Hungary	265	414	442	458
Ireland	24	15	21	16
Italy	21398	20823	16047	13708
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	173	153	179	174
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	278	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	266	183	180	210
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	2533	2465	2157	1500
Median	215	178	180	166
Minimum	24	15	21	0
Maximum	21398	20823	16047	13708
% of NA	41%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	26%	26%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	29	23	18	31
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	23	NA	NA
Hungary	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	550	479	365	243
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	12	18	8	12
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	197	136	130	72
Median	29	23	18	22
Minimum	12	18	8	0
Maximum	550	479	365	243
% of NA	44%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	44%	44%	41%	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 3.20.13: Supreme courts, Evolution of the total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	9	25	47	48
Belgium	61	1	9	18
Bulgaria	4	5	4	9
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0	NAP	0
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	54	36
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0	5	13
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	48	99	0	0
Latvia	0	0	1	0
Lithuania	0	0	0	0
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	4	2	1	1
Slovak Republic	NA	7	9	10
Slovenia	2	5	3	1
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	1	0	0	0
Average	13	12	11	10
Median	3	2	4	1
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	61	99	54	48
% of NA	**56%**	48%	44%	44%
% of NAP	**7%**	7%	11%	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 3.20.14: Supreme courts, Evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0	0	0	0
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	4	5	4	9
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0	5	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	43	91	0	0
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	2	5	3	1
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	12	20	2	2
Median	3	5	3	0
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	43	91	5	9
% of NA	56%	52%	56%	59%
% of NAP	30%	30%	26%	19%

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 3.20.15:Supreme courts, Evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Absolute values (Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	0	0	0	0
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	0	NA	NA
Hungary	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	5	4	0	0
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0	0	0	0
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	2	1	0	0
Median	0	0	0	0
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	5	4	0	0
% of NA	44%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	44%	44%	41%	37%

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 2023 (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	99,0%	97,4%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	100,1%	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	97,2%	98,0%	86,2%	98,4%
Croatia	113,7%	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%
Czech Republic	98,8%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	92,5%	92,5%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	100,0%	100,0%	NAP	NAP
Finland	93,5%	NA	NA	NAP
France	105,1%	NAP	NAP	94,8%
Germany	99,7%	NA	NA	NA
Greece	114,9%	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	99,0%	99,0%	NAP	NAP
Ireland	109,8%	109,8%	NAP	NAP
Italy	106,8%	105,8%	119,3%	111,2%
Latvia	102,6%	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	98,2%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	89,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	86,2%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	100,5%	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	100,5%	100,5%	NAP	NAP
Romania	103,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	98,6%	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	95,8%	96,1%	85,7%	NAP
Spain	86,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	87,7%	NA	NA	NA
Average	95,3%	89,9%	72,8%	76,1%
Median	99,0%	98,5%	85,9%	96,6%
Minimum	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%
Maximum	114,9%	109,8%	119,3%	111,2%
% of NA	0%	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	4%	15%	37%	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 2023 (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	166	82	NAP	NAP
Belgium	94	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	93	166	140	28
Croatia	64	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	0	0	0	0
Czech Republic	48	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	232	232	NAP	NAP
Estonia	84	84	NAP	NAP
Finland	173	NA	NA	NAP
France	135	NAP	NAP	57
Germany	90	NA	NA	NA
Greece	152	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	107	107	NAP	NAP
Ireland	130	130	NAP	NAP
Italy	110	118	118	59
Latvia	104	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	221	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	229	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	304	NA	NA	NA
Poland	121	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	59	59	NAP	NAP
Romania	58	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	131	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	105	103	183	NAP
Spain	348	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	94	NA	NA	NA
Average	133	108	110	36
Median	108	105	129	43
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	348	232	183	59
% of NA	0%	48%	48%	30%
% of NAP	4%	15%	37%	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 - 2023

(Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	102,5%	100,9%	101,0%	99,0%
Belgium	101,4%	94,8%	95,7%	100,1%
Bulgaria	102,6%	97,3%	103,4%	97,2%
Croatia	101,0%	160,9%	136,4%	113,7%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,0%
Czech Republic	102,3%	100,2%	100,6%	98,8%
Denmark	103,3%	110,2%	79,4%	92,5%
Estonia	87,1%	76,5%	98,5%	100,0%
Finland	93,4%	90,0%	92,9%	93,5%
France	104,2%	100,3%	101,6%	105,1%
Germany	104,2%	95,6%	101,1%	99,7%
Greece	NA	87,8%	84,0%	114,9%
Hungary	104,2%	90,2%	98,2%	99,0%
Ireland	103,0%	131,4%	84,8%	109,8%
Italy	97,7%	101,6%	111,9%	106,8%
Latvia	94,8%	91,2%	113,4%	102,6%
Lithuania	101,5%	83,2%	92,7%	98,2%
Luxembourg	119,0%	100,0%	112,8%	89,5%
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	95,1%	102,1%	89,8%	86,2%
Poland	110,7%	102,6%	98,5%	100,5%
Portugal	98,2%	102,0%	97,5%	100,5%
Romania	103,1%	97,8%	149,3%	103,3%
Slovak Republic	99,0%	96,5%	97,9%	98,6%
Slovenia	103,8%	110,8%	102,0%	95,8%
Spain	74,3%	98,3%	91,3%	86,2%
Sweden	96,4%	97,8%	96,3%	87,7%
Average	100,1%	100,8%	101,2%	95,3%
Median	101,9%	98,3%	98,5%	99,0%
Minimum	74,3%	76,5%	79,4%	0,0%
Maximum	119,0%	160,9%	149,3%	114,9%
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

(Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	150	162	151	166
Belgium	96	88	100	94
Bulgaria	91	98	90	93
Croatia	121	88	69	64
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	38	39	42	48
Denmark	194	189	299	232
Estonia	95	247	82	84
Finland	122	151	159	173
France	146	147	152	135
Germany	77	94	92	90
Greece	NA	56	304	152
Hungary	66	110	106	107
Ireland	258	119	274	130
Italy	237	184	132	110
Latvia	99	142	92	104
Lithuania	118	203	220	221
Luxembourg	226	226	216	229
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	261	215	280	304
Poland	151	126	126	121
Portugal	67	56	65	59
Romania	134	131	50	58
Slovak Republic	101	109	133	131
Slovenia	147	93	94	105
Spain	412	264	304	348
Sweden	45	46	53	94
Average	144	135	147	133
Median	122	126	126	108
Minimum	38	39	42	0
Maximum	412	264	304	348
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	7%	7%	7%	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 - 2023

(Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	102,8%	95,7%	106,1%	97,4%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	103,0%	95,9%	106,8%	98,0%
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,0%
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	103,3%	110,2%	79,4%	92,5%
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	100,0%
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	87,8%	NA	NA
Hungary	104,2%	90,2%	98,2%	99,0%
Ireland	103,0%	131,4%	84,8%	109,8%
Italy	99,6%	101,5%	112,6%	105,8%
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	98,2%	102,0%	97,5%	100,5%
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	99,0%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	104,5%	112,4%	100,5%	96,1%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	102,0%	103,0%	98,2%	89,9%
Median	103,0%	101,5%	99,3%	98,5%
Minimum	98,2%	87,8%	79,4%	0,0%
Maximum	104,5%	131,4%	112,6%	109,8%
% of NA	41%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	26%	26%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

(Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	76	92	72	82
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	145	150	151	166
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	194	189	299	232
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	84
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	51	NA	NA
Hungary	66	110	106	107
Ireland	258	119	274	130
Italy	247	194	137	118
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	67	56	65	59
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	101	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	149	89	101	103
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	145	117	151	108
Median	145	110	122	105
Minimum	66	51	65	0
Maximum	258	194	299	232
% of NA	41%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	26%	26%	22%	15%

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 - 2023

(Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	92,0%	108,8%	106,9%	86,2%
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,0%
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	88,9%	NA	NA
Hungary	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	93,3%	110,3%	116,4%	119,3%
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	90,5%	86,0%	117,2%	85,7%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	91,9%	98,5%	113,5%	72,8%
Median	92,0%	98,9%	116,4%	85,9%
Minimum	90,5%	86,0%	106,9%	0,0%
Maximum	93,3%	110,3%	117,2%	119,3%
% of NA	44%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	44%	44%	41%	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 3.21.8: Supreme courts, Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2023

(Q100)

States	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	131	113	85	140
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
France	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	150	NA	NA
Hungary	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	360	231	164	118
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	115	178	39	183
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	202	168	96	110
Median	131	164	85	129
Minimum	115	113	39	0
Maximum	360	231	164	183
% of NA	44%	41%	48%	48%
% of NAP	44%	44%	41%	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.

Supreme courts, Variations for criminal cases

Table 3.22.1: Supreme courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q100)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-3,8%	5,7%	NAP	-4,6%	9,6%	NAP
Belgium	32,7%	NA	NA	0,9%	NA	NA
Bulgaria	15,0%	-7,0%	6,8%	15,9%	4,3%	30,6%
Croatia	-84,0%	NA	NA	-23,9%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-14,7%	NA	NA	-0,3%	NA	NA
Denmark	33,3%	33,3%	NAP	27,0%	27,0%	NAP
Estonia	-39,6%	NAP	NAP	-55,1%	NAP	NAP
Finland	9,0%	NA	NA	-1,4%	NA	NA
France	0,8%	NAP	NAP	-3,3%	NAP	NAP
Germany	6,6%	NA	NA	5,1%	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	11,5%	NA	NA
Hungary	11,5%	11,5%	NAP	1,8%	1,8%	NAP
Ireland	24,2%	24,2%	NAP	24,2%	24,2%	NAP
Italy	22,5%	26,0%	5,7%	4,0%	5,1%	-9,3%
Latvia	-26,4%	NA	NA	-9,5%	NA	NA
Lithuania	6,9%	NA	NA	-3,1%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	35,7%	NAP	NAP	46,2%	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	1,2%	NA	NA	8,8%	NA	NA
Poland	31,2%	NA	NA	0,2%	NA	NA
Portugal	11,5%	11,5%	NAP	4,4%	4,4%	NAP
Romania	-39,9%	NAP	NAP	3,4%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-3,0%	NA	NA	4,7%	NA	NA
Slovenia	21,4%	24,9%	-33,3%	12,7%	19,5%	-56,3%
Spain	40,3%	NA	NA	11,2%	NA	NA
Sweden	92,1%	NA	NA	34,9%	NA	NA
Average	7,7%	16,3%	-6,9%	4,6%	12,0%	-11,7%
Median	10,2%	17,9%	5,7%	4,0%	7,4%	-9,3%
Minimum	-84,0%	-7,0%	-33,3%	-55,1%	1,8%	-56,3%
Maximum	92,1%	33,3%	6,8%	46,2%	27,0%	30,6%
% of NA	4%	48%	48%	0%	48%	48%
% of NAP	7%	22%	41%	7%	22%	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 3.22.2: Supreme courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q100)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-7,1%	0,1%	NAP	-6,4%	0,6%	NAP
Belgium	31,0%	NA	NA	5,5%	NA	NA
Bulgaria	8,9%	-11,6%	0,0%	8,9%	-4,4%	5,2%
Croatia	-82,0%	NA	NA	-36,5%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-17,7%	NA	NA	-2,1%	NA	NA
Denmark	19,4%	19,4%	NAP	48,0%	48,0%	NAP
Estonia	-30,7%	NAP	NAP	-54,5%	NAP	NAP
Finland	9,1%	NA	NA	-0,8%	NA	NA
France	1,6%	NAP	NAP	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Germany	1,9%	NA	NA	3,7%	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	52,6%	NA	NA
Hungary	5,9%	5,9%	NAP	2,6%	2,6%	NAP
Ireland	32,4%	32,4%	NAP	60,7%	60,7%	NAP
Italy	33,8%	34,0%	35,1%	-0,8%	-1,2%	-7,0%
Latvia	-20,3%	NA	NA	-18,2%	NA	NA
Lithuania	3,4%	NA	NA	2,6%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	2,0%	NAP	NAP	15,9%	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	-8,2%	NA	NA	4,6%	NA	NA
Poland	19,2%	NA	NA	2,2%	NA	NA
Portugal	14,0%	14,0%	NAP	7,6%	7,6%	NAP
Romania	-39,8%	NAP	NAP	-28,4%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-3,4%	NA	NA	5,4%	NA	NA
Slovenia	12,1%	14,9%	-36,8%	5,9%	14,4%	-68,0%
Spain	62,8%	NA	NA	5,0%	NA	NA
Sweden	74,6%	NA	NA	22,8%	NA	NA
Average	5,1%	13,6%	-0,6%	4,3%	16,0%	-23,3%
Median	4,6%	14,5%	0,0%	3,7%	5,1%	-7,0%
Minimum	-82,0%	-11,6%	-36,8%	-54,5%	-4,4%	-68,0%
Maximum	74,6%	34,0%	35,1%	60,7%	60,7%	5,2%
% of NA	4%	48%	48%	0%	48%	48%
% of NAP	7%	22%	41%	7%	22%	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 3.22.3: Supreme courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q100)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	2,9%	7,5%	NAP	2,9%	13,8%	NAP
Belgium	28,3%	NA	NA	-0,6%	NA	NA
Bulgaria	10,5%	0,9%	6,9%	12,6%	4,8%	72,2%
Croatia	-90,5%	NA	NA	-40,7%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	3,3%	NA	NA	10,7%	NA	NA
Denmark	42,4%	42,4%	NAP	14,6%	14,6%	NAP
Estonia	-39,1%	NAP	NAP	-53,3%	NAP	NAP
Finland	54,6%	NA	NA	7,8%	NA	NA
France	-6,3%	NAP	NAP	-11,6%	NAP	NAP
Germany	18,5%	NA	NA	1,4%	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	-23,7%	NA	NA
Hungary	72,8%	72,8%	NAP	3,6%	3,6%	NAP
Ireland	-33,3%	-33,3%	NAP	-23,8%	-23,8%	NAP
Italy	-38,2%	-35,9%	-55,8%	-17,5%	-14,6%	-33,4%
Latvia	-16,9%	NA	NA	-8,1%	NA	NA
Lithuania	93,0%	NA	NA	3,1%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	3,2%	NAP	NAP	23,1%	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	6,9%	NA	NA	13,6%	NA	NA
Poland	-4,1%	NA	NA	-1,4%	NA	NA
Portugal	0,6%	0,6%	NAP	-2,8%	-2,8%	NAP
Romania	-73,9%	NAP	NAP	-16,7%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	25,9%	NA	NA	4,2%	NA	NA
Slovenia	-20,1%	-21,1%	0,0%	18,1%	16,7%	50,0%
Spain	37,2%	NA	NA	20,2%	NA	NA
Sweden	263,1%	NA	NA	119,6%	NA	NA
Average	14,2%	4,2%	-16,3%	2,2%	1,5%	29,6%
Median	3,3%	0,8%	0,0%	2,9%	4,2%	50,0%
Minimum	-90,5%	-35,9%	-55,8%	-53,3%	-23,8%	-33,4%
Maximum	263,1%	72,8%	6,9%	119,6%	16,7%	72,2%
% of NA	4%	48%	48%	0%	48%	48%
% of NAP	7%	22%	41%	7%	22%	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.

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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage points (Q100)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	-3,5	-5,4	NAP	-2,0	-8,8	NAP
Belgium	-1,3	NA	NA	+4,4	NA	NA
Bulgaria	-5,4	-5,1	-5,9	-6,2	-8,9	-20,8
Croatia	+12,8	NA	NA	-22,6	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-3,6	NA	NA	-1,8	NA	NA
Denmark	-10,8	-10,8	NAP	+13,1	+13,1	NAP
Estonia	+12,9	NAP	NAP	+1,5	NAP	NAP
Finland	+0,1	NA	NA	+0,6	NA	NA
France	+0,8	NAP	NAP	+3,4	NAP	NAP
Germany	-4,6	NA	NA	-1,4	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	+30,9	NA	NA
Hungary	-5,3	-5,3	NAP	+0,8	+0,8	NAP
Ireland	+6,7	+6,7	NAP	+24,9	+24,9	NAP
Italy	+9,1	+6,3	+26,0	-5,2	-6,7	+2,9
Latvia	+7,8	NA	NA	-10,9	NA	NA
Lithuania	-3,3	NA	NA	+5,5	NA	NA
Luxembourg	-29,6	NAP	NAP	-23,3	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	-8,8	NA	NA	-3,5	NA	NA
Poland	-10,2	NA	NA	+2,0	NA	NA
Portugal	+2,2	+2,2	NAP	+3,0	+3,0	NAP
Romania	+0,2	NAP	NAP	-46,0	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-0,4	NA	NA	+0,7	NA	NA
Slovenia	-8,0	-8,4	-4,8	-6,2	-4,3	-31,5
Spain	+11,9	NA	NA	-5,1	NA	NA
Sweden	-8,8	NA	NA	-8,6	NA	NA
Average	-1,6	-2,5	+5,1	-2,1	+1,6	-16,4
Median	-2,3	-5,2	-4,8	-1,4	-1,8	-20,8
Minimum	-29,6	-10,8	-5,9	-46,0	-8,9	-31,5
Maximum	+12,9	+6,7	+26,0	+30,9	+24,9	+2,9
% of NA	4%	48%	48%	0%	48%	48%
% of NAP	7%	22%	41%	7%	22%	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 3.22.5: Supreme courts, variation of the Disposition Time of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

in percentage (Q100)

States	Variations 2020 - 2023			Variations 2022 - 2023		
	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	10,7%	7,4%	NAP	10,0%	13,1%	NAP
Belgium	-2,1%	NA	NA	-5,8%	NA	NA
Bulgaria	1,5%	14,2%	6,9%	3,4%	9,7%	63,7%
Croatia	-47,0%	NA	NA	-6,6%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	25,5%	NA	NA	13,1%	NA	NA
Denmark	19,3%	19,3%	NAP	-22,5%	-22,5%	NAP
Estonia	-12,2%	NAP	NAP	2,5%	NAP	NAP
Finland	41,7%	NA	NA	8,7%	NA	NA
France	-7,7%	NAP	NAP	-11,6%	NAP	NAP
Germany	16,3%	NA	NA	-2,2%	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	-50,0%	NA	NA
Hungary	63,2%	63,2%	NAP	1,0%	1,0%	NAP
Ireland	-49,6%	-49,6%	NAP	-52,6%	-52,6%	NAP
Italy	-53,8%	-52,2%	-67,3%	-16,8%	-13,6%	-28,4%
Latvia	4,2%	NA	NA	12,3%	NA	NA
Lithuania	86,7%	NA	NA	0,5%	NA	NA
Luxembourg	1,2%	NAP	NAP	6,2%	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	16,5%	NA	NA	8,6%	NA	NA
Poland	-19,5%	NA	NA	-3,5%	NA	NA
Portugal	-11,8%	-11,8%	NAP	-9,7%	-9,7%	NAP
Romania	-56,6%	NAP	NAP	16,4%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	30,3%	NA	NA	-1,2%	NA	NA
Slovenia	-28,7%	-31,3%	58,3%	11,5%	2,0%	368,8%
Spain	-15,7%	NA	NA	14,5%	NA	NA
Sweden	107,9%	NA	NA	78,8%	NA	NA
Average	5,0%	-5,1%	-0,7%	0,2%	-9,1%	134,7%
Median	1,3%	-2,2%	6,9%	1,0%	-4,4%	63,7%
Minimum	-56,6%	-52,2%	-67,3%	-52,6%	-52,6%	-28,4%
Maximum	107,9%	63,2%	58,3%	78,8%	13,1%	368,8%
% of NA	4%	48%	48%	0%	48%	48%
% of NAP	7%	22%	41%	7%	22%	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.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (General Comment): With regard to “administrative cases”, the total number of cases includes figures for the Council of State, the Aliens Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts (Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen).
On this point, it should also be noted that one judgment may close different cases, hence the lack of consistency in the table.

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".

Q092 (General Comment): Point 2 (civil and commercial non-litigious matters): this category concerns the following deeds: (free publication) deed of incorporation and amendment of (non)ASBL, (amendment of) statutes, directors, persons - day-to-day management, commissioners, dissolution, liquidation, liquidators, copy of register of members, annual accounts, general meeting, miscellaneous and coordinated text of statutes. For documents filed electronically, the incorporation and amendment deeds have been included.
Q094 (General Comment): Youth cases are not included in the table (data for the various columns of the table are not available).
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: Number of 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 offences: cases appealed to the Court of Appeal (criminal matters).
*Minor criminal offences: cases brought on appeal before the Court of First Instance - criminal courts - for cases dealt with by the Police Court (therefore dealt with at 2nd instance by the criminal courts).
*Youth protection cases: included under minor criminal offences.
*Point 3 'Other criminal cases': since the last cycle, this category includes cases heard by the Indictments Chamber. The latter (a division of the Court of Appeal) is involved in the judicial investigation oversight, supervises pre-trial detention in particular, and decides on referral to the trial judge. The data are provided within the specific comment.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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).

Q091 (2013): The implementation of the ICMS system resulted in unification of data into one reporting system. The category “general civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes inheritance cases but excludes company registry cases. The increase of the incoming “civil and commercial litigious cases” was mostly due to the continuity of the negative economic situation, while the efforts of judges, as well as broadening the scope of powers of court advisors resulted in the increase of resolved cases. The implementation of the enforcement on pecuniary means carried out by the Financial Agency (FINA) led to decreases in respect of “non-litigious enforcement cases”. Since 2013, court advisors deliver a decision in land registry cases, while the judge supervises its content. The competence of other persons for issuing land registry was also established, electronic delivery of submissions and e-notice board were introduced.

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.

Q092 (2013): For 2013 and 2014, the provided examples concern only question 92: exercise of the parental care; meeting and spending time with parent; obtaining the capacity to exercise rights of minor that became parent; decision with whom the child will be living; issuing of the permit for entering into marriage before age of majority; deprivation/returning of capacity to exercise rights; deprivation/returning /prolongation of parental care; deprivation of parents’ right to live with the child and raise the child; content of court will; security of evidence; setting-up/derogation of necessary passage; setting-up of court deposit, opening of a safe; verification of a contract on life-long support; amortization of documents; trust of a child with behavioural disorder; the recognition of foreign court decisions; declaring a missing person dead; co-ownership dissolution; meetings and spending time with grandmother, grandfather, sister, brother, half-sister, step-brother; land borders; regulation of relations between co-owners; restraining a child; providing legal aid; conclusion of court settlement; inheritance statement; proof of death; regulation of co-ownership relationships; boundaries and necessary passage; determination of extramarital union; other- family non-litigious proceedings; storage of the testament; providing international legal assistance; verification; other –the rest of non-litigious proceedings; international child abduction; other - proclamation of the deceased and proof of death; the appointment of members of the companies body; the appointment of auditors, temporary/interim administrator; the safeguard of evidence; the establishment of a court deposit; opening of the safe deposit box; registry cases; previous measures; forcible establishment of lien; temporary measure; temporary and previous measures, recognition of arbitration decisions; recognition of a foreign court decision; cases entering in the scope of Article 4 point 2 of the Companies Act; court insurance by the transfer of ownership and rights.

Q093 (2014): In 2013 and 2014 the reply NAP in respect of the category “other” is due to the fact that a bankruptcy registry has not been established in the Republic of Croatia.
Q093 (2013): In 2013 and 2014 the reply NAP in respect of the category “other” is due to the fact that a bankruptcy registry has not been established in the Republic of Croatia.
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 (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.

Q097 (2013): In the frame of the 2013 exercise it has been explained that the discrepancies that can be observed in respect of the category “total of other than criminal cases” between the number of pending cases indicated for December 2012 and the number of pending cases communicated for January 2013, result from an administrative correction of a specific small number of cases by the second instance courts after the closure of the statistic period, which the reporting system then generates as a difference concerning previously rendered data.
As to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, owing to a different methodology of presentation of data, the number of pending cases in the end of 2012 does not coincide with the number of pending cases in the beginning of 2013. The number of pending cases on 31 December 2012 included second instance-civil and commercial courts’ cases, bankruptcy cases, general non-litigious cases, enforcement cases, land registry cases and company registry cases. Since 2013, it is possible to provide data on the second-instance civil and commercial litigation cases and bankruptcy cases separately from the general non-litigious cases, enforcement cases, land registry cases and company registry cases.
The variations observed with regard to the category “total of other than non-criminal law cases” for the period 2010-2013 can be explained by the negative economic situation in Croatia, which resulted in the increase of incoming commercial and civil cases before first instance courts and consequently led to the increase of the second instance cases.

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).

Q098 (2013): Generally speaking, the decrease of the total number of misdemeanour cases at all levels was the main goal and purpose of adopting the Act on the Amendments of the Misdemeanour Act in 2013 (OG 39/13) in which the definition of misdemeanour act was changed, the principle of opportunity as well as the simplification of the procedure were introduced, the more active role was given to the plaintiff. Moreover, specific measures were introduced: if the fine is paid when caught in committing a misdemeanour offence, it is considered as paid if the half of the amount was paid immediately, and if the deadline was prescribed, it is considered as paid if the 2/3 of the amount was paid. Moreover, the enforcement procedure conducted on monetary assets is more efficient. The Register of Unpaid Fines was established.
According to the new misdemeanour provisions, there is no suspension of the proceedings because of the statute of limitations. Every court decision is being enforced, fines are being paid, therefore strengthening the general prevention and withdraw of committing misdemeanour offences. All of the above said leads to the reduction of the number of misdemeanour cases at both courts' instances: misdemeanour courts and High Misdemeanour Court of the Republic of Croatia

Q099 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): For 2013, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts. In 2014, these cases (and also some litigious cases) are subsumed within the table of question 91.

For 2012, the category of enforcement cases concerns exclusively enforcement carried out by the court itself, while for 2013, this category encompasses also enforcement ensured by private executors (in this procedure, the court authorizes the private executor to proceed to the enforcement and decides about remedial measures against executor’s decision). For 2012, the category “other” includes electronic payment orders and probate proceedings, while for 2013 it encompasses only electronic payment proceedings. Moreover, in respect of the electronic payment orders, there was a switchover to another register and 174.067 cases were transferred to a new register. The discribes evolutions affect the total.

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 (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.
Q097 (2013): For the 2013 exercise, the totals do not include the number of non-litigious business registry cases which is not available.

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 methodolgy (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.

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.
Q091 (2013): The successive decrease observed in the number of civil and commercial litigious cases stems from the possibility to reopen cases and the missing data on pending cases before the Maritime and Commercial Court. As for the land registry cases, following the digitalizing in 2009 of land registry, the number of pending cases decreased markedly.

Q092 (General Comment): Paternity, adoption, guardianship and others in the same category; cases under inquisitorial procedures.
Q093 (General Comment): Estate after a deceased person, notary, insolvency cases not included under 2.2.2. above.

Q094 (General Comment): Danish Court Administration has not worked out a statistics on pending cases older than 2 years. When we categorize cases as "severe", it does not mean that privation of liberty is the end result, but based on the category chosen by the court to deal with the case could include severe cases. Minor cases are typically fines that will never have as a result of privation of liberty. Probably there are too many cases under the category "severe" then, but that is the figures we have.
Q094 (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.

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 (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)
The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19.

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 (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 (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”.

Q091 (2013): As to non-litigious business registry cases and the observed decreases, in 2012 it was impossible to separate supervisory proceedings from general proceedings and therefore 2012 data included supervisory proceedings as well. The number of pending “civil and commercial litigious cases” decreased on account of the enhanced efficiency of the first instance courts, while the decrease in the number of incoming cases is due to the reestablishment of the normal case-flow after the economic crises.
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 (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".

Q097 (2013): In the frame of the 2012 and 2013 exercises, several clarifications were provided.
Firstly, in respect of the civil and commercial litigious cases, the observed variations were deemed to be normal, as a part of the ordinary dynamics of the case-flow.
Secondly, in respect of the civil and commercial non-litigious cases, the increase in the number of pending cases resulted from the implementation of an efficiency-raising project in 2013 in Harju County Court. Accordingly, the efficiency of the latter increased significantly in civil cases. Owing to the fact that this court is the largest 1st instance court dealing with 1/3 of all of the cases in Estonia, it had an impact on the case-flow of the second instance courts (only 2 appeal courts competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters). Owing to that, in 2014 one civil judge's position was given to the Tallinn Appeal Court in order to raise their efficiency.
As to the enforcement procedures, they are in the competence of public bailiffs who are completely independent from the judicial system but act as public authorities. The reply NA is justified by the impossibility to distinguish in the bailiffs' information system the enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is court decision from all the other enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is for example a fine made by police, an administrative act made by the tax authority etc.
In respect of the land registry and business registry cases, it should be recalled that they are within the competence of the 1st instance courts. If the decision of the registry is appealed, it goes to the first instance court as a regular civil case.
As to the administrative cases, it is noteworthy that as there are only 2 appeal courts in Estonia competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters, every change in the number of 2nd instance judges influences the statistics of the Courts of appeal. Between 2010 and 2012 there were a few vacant administrative judges' positions in one of the appeal courts which had an impact on the number of pending cases.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.
Q097 (2013): The category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases includes petitions for the 2012 exercise, divorce cases and petitions (without cases included in the other sub-categories) for the 2013 exercise. As for the category “other”, according to the provided comments, in 2012 it encompasses cases, which Appeal Courts resolve as 1st instance, military justice cases and cases concerning prisoners. In 2013 it subsumes temporary procedural remedy cases, adjustment of the debts of a private individual - cases, restructuring of enterprises cases and bankruptcy cases and complaints.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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.
Q097 (2013): 2012, 2013: The 'non-litigious matters relating to the implementation' (which answer is NA) exist but are included in the category 'non-litigious civil cases'.
Q098 (General Comment): 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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): Two Lander did not provide data with regard to the number of other than criminal law cases, while one Land did not provide information about the number of non-litigious land registry cases.The information is incomplete and the following legal cases were not taken into account: Incoming cases - payment order procedure (civil courts: 4 751 355 cases; labour courts: 56 053 cases), insolvency cases (143 662), cases concerning the civil registry office, wills, estates, accommodations, agriculture, escrow, and public notice proceedings (1 469 273); Pending legal cases on 31 December 2013 - guardianship and curator cases (12 795); insolvency cases (303 654).

Q093 (2014): For the 2013 and 2014 exercises, the category “other” includes: Local Court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.
Q093 (2013): For the 2013 and 2014 exercises, the category “other” includes: Local Court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.
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 (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 (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.

Q097 (2013): For 2013, two Landers did not provide any information.
The category “other “ includes proceedings on complaints on appeal in family cases at the Higher Regional Courts and appellate proceedings on fact and law and proceedings on complaints on appeal at the Regional Labour Courts. In addition, given a lack of complete data, a total of 164 272 new legal cases or proceedings on complaints on appeal (in custodianship, accommodation, insolvency, estate, and costs cases, along with other complaints on appeal) were not considered in the category “other”.
Regarding the slight horizontal inconsistency for the category “administrative law cases”, it can partly be explained by the federal State structure of Germany. Moreover, data regarding incoming administrative law cases also reflected the number of appeals against decisions to grant provisional legal protection in the higher administrative regional courts and in the higher social courts; and appeals in matters of legal aid and other proceedings. In comparison with the previous years, the 2013 data are more accurate. The same applies regarding resolved cases even though no data was available for the appeals in matters of legal aid and other proceedings.
With regard to the sub-category “civil and commercial litigious cases” and the meaningful increase of the number of resolved cases, it should be noticed that in the frame of the 2013 exercise, the indicated figure encompassed the number of resolved civil and commercial litigious and not-litigious cases. For this cycle, it was impossible to distinguish between these two sub-categories.

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 (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 (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.
Q099 (2013): For 2013, two Landers did not provide any information. Data provided for the civil (and commercial) litigious cases include all appeals lodged encompassing litigious and non-litigious cases as well as family law cases.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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): It is not possible to distinguish between civil litigious and civil non-litigious cases dealt with by the Supreme Court and that the only available data is the sum of all non-criminal cases dealt with by the Supreme Court.

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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): Till 2013, the data-provider for non-litigious enforcement cases was the Ministry of Justice. Since 2013, the data-collecting system of courts covers also this group of cases (general non-litigious cases). Before 2013, non-litigious administrative law cases were counted as “non-litigious civil and commercial cases”. Since 2013, non-litigious and litigious administrative law cases are provided together. As for the subcategory “civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, it encompasses different categories of cases for 2012 and 2013.

Q093 (2013): In 2010, 2012 and 2014 the category “other” encompasses insolvency registry cases and labour litigious cases. In 2012, additionally it includes misdemeanour cases. In 2013, the category subsumes insolvency cases and non-litigious labour cases.

Q094 (General Comment): Criminal offences are severe or minor crimes. Severe crimes (bűntett) are committed intentionally and are punishable with at least two years of imprisonment. All other criminal offences are minor crimes (vétség). Crimes that are not committed intentionally are always considered as minor crimes, despite the possible punishment.
Misdemeanours (szabálysértés) are not considered as criminal offences, but are unlawful acts that are endangering the society. The authorities intervening in their respect are the police, the district office, or the National Tax and Customs Office. Their decisions can be reviewed by the relevant section of the respective district court upon request of the accused person. Generally, the court rules without oral hearings, based upon the available documents. However, it can set a hearing if it finds it necessary or if the person charged by a misdemeanor requests it. The judgment is a final and enforceable decision.
It is noteworthy that the Hungarian law identifies also the category of civil offences encompassing offences mainly against public administration. However some criminal offenses, such as property crimes involving objects of small value (under 50000 HUF), are classified in this category as well. Civil offences fall under the jurisdiction of various administrative agencies, local governments or traffic police, but not the courts.
Concerning the methodology of presentation of data, as according to the Hungarian Criminal Code not only severe crimes (bűntett), but also almost every minor crime (vétség) are punishable with imprisonment, both categories were included into the category “severe criminal cases”. Thus misdemeanors (szabálysértés) were included into the category “minor criminal cases”.

Q094 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): The number of enforcement cases has been reported for the first time. The Courts Service has sought to create a category of cases under the Irish system that would be equivalent to non-litigious enforcement cases under other justice systems. The figure consists of the following steps leading to enforcement measures by court judgments and orders: Execution orders, Registered Judgments, Judgment Mortgage Certificates.

Q092 (2014): Starting 2014 the category: "Appointment of care representatives" was added to the "Civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases"
Q093 (2014): From 2014, the range of 'Other cases' has been revised to incorporate the category 'certificates of taxation of legal costs issued'. This can explain the fact that different elements have been included in the category 'other' in 2013 and 2014.
Q094 (General Comment): Except for the Supreme Court, criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case due to the various ICT systems used. This is due to data collection/ ICT systems that are in use by the Court Service.
Akin to question 91, the number of pending criminal law cases cannot be provided within the frame of question 94, provided that it is not recorded in caseload data.
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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): In 2013 and 2014, the Italian judicial system has gone through a historical geographic reorganization with the closing of almost 1000 courts. Thus, the statistics regarding flows of cases at the end of 2013 may show some anomalies that will be adjusted with the following data gathering. A constant reduction in the incoming civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases is observed from the end of 2009. The number of ADR cases is constantly increasing with a filter effect on the litigious incoming files.

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 425% 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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): Amendments to the Civil Procedure Law introduce new long-pending forms for insolvency cases such as judicial protection proceedings, insolvency proceedings for individuals, etc., whose proportion increased. The insolvency process begins with a court ruling but the case cannot be closed until the end of the insolvency process. Besides, quick pending cases have been transferred from courts to the Land Registry offices from January 2012. The micro-enterprise development opportunities have increased the number of long-pending insolvency cases in the court. From July 2012, appealed administrative decisions of institutions are handed to District courts.

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 (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.

Q097 (2013): In the frame of the 2013 and 2014 exercises it has been indicated that the category “other” includes the following types of cases from the Supreme Court : cases related to moral and physical damages; copyright related cases; family relationship; deprivation of citizenship; labour law cases; cases in respect of inheritance rights.

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 (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 (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.

Q092 (2013): For 2013 and 2014, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes court orders.

Q093 (2013): For 2010, this category encompasses only cases of administrative offence, while since 2012 it subsumes also the administrative offence cases in the process of execution.
Q094 (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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): Data concerns (except for the Administrative Court) district courts. Uniform statistical data for both types of courts (district courts and justice of peace) are not yet available. The District Court of Diekirch rendered 580 decisions and registered 664 new cases. The three justices of peace ruled 69 859 payment orders and resolved a total of 5 682 cases for a total of 6 508 new cases. The increase in the number of civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases between 2010 and 2013 is partly explained by the establishment in 2011 of the judiciary statistics office. The increase in the number of administrative law cases mainly stems from the increase in the asylum-related disputes.

Q092 (2014): 2014: Category 2 (civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases) refers to european payment orders issued by two district courts. They are handled almost immediately, so that there is no stock at the end of the period. That is why the pending cases as well as incoming cases are classified as NAP.
Q092 (2013): 2012: Category 2 (civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases) refers to payment orders issued by district courts. They are handled almost immediately, so that there is no stock at the end of the period.

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 (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.

Q097 (2013): 2013: because of the international events that have increased the number of asylum seekers, the administrative courts that have jurisdiction in case of appeal against a refusal of refugee status, have, in particular in 2013 but already during the 3-4 previous years, known a significant increase in this very specific litigation both at first instance level and appeal level.

Q098 (2018): Concernant le nombre d'affaire résolues en matière d'affaire pénales grave, une baisse des recours introduits à la Cour d’appel est observée depuis ces dernières années, en conséquence les affaires terminées ont diminué en 2018. Concernant le nombre d'affaire résolues en matière d'affaire pénales mineures, le chiffre plus élevé des affaires d'infractions mineures s’explique par le fait qu’en 2017, 59 recours avaient été introduits sur des jugements du tribunal de police et que ces recours ont été traités pour partie en 2018 seulement.

Q099 (General Comment): The pending files are now detailed between criminal and civil/commercial cases, thus this additional information is now available. There is no cassation possibility against the decisions of the administrative court of appeal.
Q099 (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): The Court of cassation makes a legality control, independant from the severity of the infraction. The pending files are now detailed between criminal and civil/commercial cases, thus this additional information is now available.
Q100 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): In 2013, the number of administrative law cases continued increasing. The Administrative Court was created in 2010. Over the time, the number of areas of competence of the Administrative Court has increased, which resulted in an increased caseload.

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.

Q094 (2013): The 2014 data is derived from the official court statistics that are also available online at www.justiceservices.com. The horizontal discrepancy in the data at point 6 cannot be verified since the data collection in the criminal courts is not as yet automated.
Q097 (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 (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.
Q097 (2013): The significant increase of the number of civil and commercial litigious cases between 2010 and 2013 was due to the fact that the number of appeals has increased substantially in the past few years and the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal has been extended to include also appeals from large public contract awards. Accordingly, the Court of Appeal was not in a position to manage the considerable influx of cases.
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 (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): It is not possible to differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases at second instance. The financial registrations at first instance make a clear distinction between types of cases (that the answer for first instance can be based upon), but for second instances this differentiation does not exist (and thus, the registration is all the same).
As to the lack of horizontal consistency that can be observed, the reason is that the official number of cases pending on January 1st is determined at different time then the other 3 categories (official incoming, official resolved, official pending on December 31st). Due to time lags in registration and dynamics in the data systems, if the cases pending on January 1st are measured at the same time as the others, the result would be different.

Q097 (2021): The number of incoming administrative law cases increased between 2020 and 2021, most probably due to the pandemic. Especially, the number of appeals for tax cases is higher in 2021.
Q097 (2020): It is not possible for us to differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases at second instance. In short, we can provide this for first instance because the financial registrations makes clear distinction between types of cases (finances differ) that we can base that answer on, but for second instances, this differentiation in finances does not exist and thus, the registration is all the same.
Q097 (2019): .

Q097 (2018): If there is an appeal, cases are litigious in my view. I would tend to enter the value "0", but since the question is being asked, you probably see things differently. So I chose the answer "NA"

Q097 (2017): Administrative law cases, litigeous plus non-litigeous.

Q097 (2016): Administrative law cases, litigeous plus non-litigeous.

Q098 (2014): The reason for the horizontal inconsistency in 2014 is that the figures from the 4 columns of the table are not retrieved at the same time. The number of pending cases on Jan 1st is determined one year before the other 3 columns can be filled. One year later it is possible to determine the number of incoming cases, the number of resolved cases and the number of pending cases on Dec 31st. The definition of 'pending' together with dynamic changes in the registration system mean that the number of pending cases on Jan 1st will have changed. To ensure horizontal consistency, all the 4 columns should be determined after the years' end which would imply to overrule a previously determined and official (i.e. published) number of pending cases on Jan 1st.

Q099 (General Comment): The formula for horizontal consistency might not work satisfactory – the number of pending cases on Dec 31 might be different (usually lower) than when calculated with (Pending cases Jan 1 + Incoming cases) – Resolved cases. The number of resolved cases presented in the table only includes cases that are resolved with the decision of a judge. 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 cannot be counted separately. Therefore, their number is not included in the number of Resolved cases. However, that number is included in the number of Pending cases Dec 31. We have included the number of those cases in the comment, to account for the discrepancies.
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 (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 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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): Portugal took important measures in order to improve the courts clearance rate and backlogs which resulted in an increased number of resolved non-criminal and enforcement cases. Some measures were focused primarily on enforcement cases, since they represent 70% of the total of pending cases. For example, the government adopted measures with the purpose to eliminate cases where there are no assets to execute or no procedural momentum, as well as measures with the aim to limit the number of incoming cases, establishing initial court fees. Courts with excessive number of pending cases were subject to particular assistance of specialized teams.

Q092 (2013): On the occasion of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises, it has been specified that the category of civil (and commercial cases) litigious cases includes the case flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): With regard to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, because of the delays between hearings that are often very long (usually the first hearing is determined by an electronic system after a long period of time, in relation with the actual workload of judges), the new entered files are not usually finalised within a year.
With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, all the indicators kept a growing trend in 2012 and 2013. As for the stock of files (pending on 31.12), the increase between 2012 and 2013 is due to the fact that during the same period the number of resolved files has also decreased.
As to the trends observed in 2013 in respect of the “non-litigious enforcement cases” and “non-litigious land registry cases”, data are correct.
As to the category “administrative law cases”, the big differences have always been a reason for concern and continuous analysis. In the report on the status of Judiciary on 2012, it was noted that “in the administrative contentious and fiscal matters, the most of the cases were related to the restitution of the tax for pollution, but also to the obligation of the authorities to register the vehicles, without the payment of the tax for pollution (obligation to perform)”. It should be mentioned that the actions of the legislative have led to the growth of the number of administrative cases in the past 5 years, at tribunals with more than 400% and at the courts of appeal with around 200%.

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.

Q097 (2013): With regard to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, the observed evolutions between 2010 and 2013 are due to the fact that following the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes, the jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the new Civil Procedure Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the old Code. Thus, even if the number of solved files in second instance is higher in 2013 than in the previous year, the number of new appeals (incoming cases in second instance) is higher. This explains the growth of the workload in the last period of time on these courts, although previously the trend was descending.
With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, the analysis of data and the noticed evolutions and variations between 2010 and 2013 should be qualified. In fact, the figures are not so high and the growth and regress of a few cases during one year lead to relatively important variations. For example, a growth of only 8 cases at the end of the year will reflect a growth of 35%. The same reasoning should be applied with regard to the category “non-litigious land registry cases” where a growth of only 122 cases at the beginning of the year will reflect a growth of over 40%.
In respect of the category “non-litigious enforcement cases”, the considerable increases between 2010 and 2013 with regard to all the items (pending cases, incoming and resolved) were the consequence of the new distribution of competences between courts. Since 2013, all the enforcement cases are in the jurisdiction of the courts of appeal. The number of cases in third instance decreased correlatively.
Following the changes in the procedural provisions made in 2013, the second appeal, as means of review in the field of non-litigious business registry, became appeal, in accordance with the new principles of the Civil Procedure Code as regards the means of review.

Q098 (General Comment): There is no classification of severe and less severe offences in the Romanian statistics.

Q098 (2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on categories of pending cases as follows: - 0-1/2 years;
- 1/2-1 year;
- 1 - 1 and 1/2 years;
- 1 and 1/2 - 3 years;
- 3 - 5 years;
In the table above, last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years.

Q098 (2014): The significant increase of the total of criminal cases in respect of all the enumerated categories (pending, incoming and resolved cases) in 2014 is due to the entry into force of the new Codes and the changes of jurisdiction.

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.

Q099 (2013): In respect of the administrative law cases, until 2013, there was only a second appeal that is encompassed in the answers to question 99.

Q100 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): The Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called “non-bank loan companies” where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

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 (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.

Q097 (2013): For 2013, a general remark was provided in respect of questions 91, 97 and 101, explaining that there were no specific reasons justifying the variations in the numbers of cases of the particular categories. It was stressed that the Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called “non-bank loan companies” where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. The capacity of the court staff to resolve all of the filed cases in the appropriate time period was limited despite the measures which have been taken. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

Q098 (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.
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.

Q099 (2013): For 2013, a general remark was provided in respect of questions 91, 97 and 101, explaining that there were no specific reasons justifying the variations in the numbers of cases of the particular categories. It was stressed that the Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called "non-bank loan companies" where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. The capacity of the court staff to resolve all of the filed cases in the appropriate time period was limited despite the measures which have been taken. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

Q100 (General Comment): The collected statistical data does not distinguish between the two types of criminal offences.

Q100 (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 (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.
Q091 (2013): "Civil and commercial litigious cases" include labour law and social law cases that are proceeded by specialised labour and social law courts. Cases that do not fit exactly to the determined types of civil, commercial, non-litigious, land and business registry, enforcement and administrative law cases, were previously included in other cases. For 2014, 'Other cases' include only cases outside of the above mentioned legal fields, while the various cases are distributed among the other items. With regard to the category 'non-litigious business registry cases', the increase of the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 can be explained with the fact that there were 8.000 more incoming cases in 2013 than in 2012, but courts were not able to handle the case-load.

Q092 (General Comment): Categories used in “Civil and commercial non-litigious cases”: all non-litigious civil cases at local and district courts, non-litigious commercial cases at district courts (different kinds of personal and family status, property and other disputes, provided by the Non Contentious Procedure Act or other law, procedures for issuing a payment order at local and district courts in civil matters, procedures for issuing a payment order in commercial matters at district courts, cases pursuant to the Inheritance Act at local courts, cases pursuant to the Mental Health Act at local courts; and civil enforcement cases on the basis of an enforcement title, commercial enforcement cases on the basis of an enforcement title, cases for enforcement on real-estate property, enforcement cases on the basis of authentic document in civil matters after the writ for the execution became final, temporary injunctions in civil matters, temporary injunctions in commercial matters, various enforcement cases.
The above listed cases are classified into CEPEJ categories slightly differently over the years.

Q092 (2014): 2014 Category 2.1 „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“at the first instance includes
1. (former category 2. „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“): N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D, Pr; and 2. (former category 3. ' Non litigious enforcement cases'): I, Ig, In, VL, Z, Zg and R-i.

Q092 (2013): 2013 Civil and commercial non-litigious cases at first instance include: N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D, Pr.

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'."

Q093 (2013): 2013 "Other" civil law cases at first instance include: Bpp, COVL, Ov-i, Ov-H."

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 (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 (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.

Q097 (2013): 2013 The area of land registry cases has been in constant improvement since a successful computerisation project in 2003 – the average disposition times have fallen from 18 months to 2 weeks. The lowering of the number of pending cases is the consequence of a better organisation of work and of the totally electronic procedure.

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 (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.
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.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (General Comment): With regard to "administrative cases", the total number of cases includes figures for the Council of State, the Aliens Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts (Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen).
On this point, it should also be noted that one judgment may close different cases, hence the lack of consistency in the table.

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 (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).

Q091 (2013): The implementation of the ICMS system resulted in unification of data into one reporting system. The category “general civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes inheritance cases but excludes company registry cases. The increase of the incoming “civil and commercial litigious cases” was mostly due to the continuity of the negative economic situation, while the efforts of judges, as well as broadening the scope of powers of court advisors resulted in the increase of resolved cases. The implementation of the enforcement on pecuniary means carried out by the Financial Agency (FINA) led to decreases in respect of “non-litigious enforcement cases”. Since 2013, court advisors deliver a decision in land registry cases, while the judge supervises its content. The competence of other persons for issuing land registry was also established, electronic delivery of submissions and e-notice board were introduced.

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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): For 2013, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts. In 2014, these cases (and also some litigious cases) are subsumed within the table of question 91.

For 2012, the category of enforcement cases concerns exclusively enforcement carried out by the court itself, while for 2013, this category encompasses also enforcement ensured by private executors (in this procedure, the court authorizes the private executor to proceed to the enforcement and decides about remedial measures against executor's decision). For 2012, the category "other" includes electronic payment orders and probate proceedings, while for 2013 it encompasses only electronic payment proceedings. Moreover, in respect of the electronic payment orders, there was a switchover to another register and 174.067 cases were transferred to a new register. The discribes evolutions affect the total.

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.

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.

Q091 (2013): The successive decrease observed in the number of civil and commercial litigious cases stems from the possibility to reopen cases and the missing data on pending cases before the Maritime and Commercial Court. As for the land registry cases, following the digitalizing in 2009 of land registry, the number of pending cases decreased markedly.

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 (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”.

Q091 (2013): As to non-litigious business registry cases and the observed decreases, in 2012 it was impossible to separate supervisory proceedings from general proceedings and therefore 2012 data included supervisory proceedings as well. The number of pending “civil and commercial litigious cases” decreased on account of the enhanced efficiency of the first instance courts, while the decrease in the number of incoming cases is due to the reestablishment of the normal case-flow after the economic crises.

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 (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 (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 (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.

Q091 (2013): Two Lander did not provide data with regard to the number of other than criminal law cases, while one Land did not provide information about the number of non-litigious land registry cases.The information is incomplete and the following legal cases were not taken into account: Incoming cases - payment order procedure (civil courts: 4 751 355 cases; labour courts: 56 053 cases), insolvency cases (143 662), cases concerning the civil registry office, wills, estates, accommodations, agriculture, escrow, and public notice proceedings (1 469 273); Pending legal cases on 31 December 2013 - guardianship and curator cases (12 795); insolvency cases (303 654).

Greece

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 (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.

Q091 (2013): Till 2013, the data-provider for non-litigious enforcement cases was the Ministry of Justice. Since 2013, the data-collecting system of courts covers also this group of cases (general non-litigious cases). Before 2013, non-litigious administrative law cases were counted as “non-litigious civil and commercial cases”. Since 2013, non-litigious and litigious administrative law cases are provided together. As for the subcategory “civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, it encompasses different categories of cases for 2012 and 2013.

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 (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.

Q091 (2013): The number of enforcement cases has been reported for the first time. The Courts Service has sought to create a category of cases under the Irish system that would be equivalent to non-litigious enforcement cases under other justice systems. The figure consists of the following steps leading to enforcement measures by court judgments and orders: Execution orders, Registered Judgments, Judgment Mortgage Certificates.

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.

Q091 (2013): In 2013 and 2014, the Italian judicial system has gone through a historical geographic reorganization with the closing of almost 1000 courts. Thus, the statistics regarding flows of cases at the end of 2013 may show some anomalies that will be adjusted with the following data gathering. A constant reduction in the incoming civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases is observed from the end of 2009. The number of ADR cases is constantly increasing with a filter effect on the litigious incoming files.

Latvia

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.

Q091 (2013): Amendments to the Civil Procedure Law introduce new long-pending forms for insolvency cases such as judicial protection proceedings, insolvency proceedings for individuals, etc., whose proportion increased. The insolvency process begins with a court ruling but the case cannot be closed until the end of the insolvency process. Besides, quick pending cases have been transferred from courts to the Land Registry offices from January 2012. The micro-enterprise development opportunities have increased the number of long-pending insolvency cases in the court. From July 2012, appealed administrative decisions of institutions are handed to District courts.

Lithuania

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 (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.

Q091 (2013): Data concerns (except for the Administrative Court) district courts. Uniform statistical data for both types of courts (district courts and justice of peace) are not yet available. The District Court of Diekirch rendered 580 decisions and registered 664 new cases. The three justices of peace ruled 69 859 payment orders and resolved a total of 5 682 cases for a total of 6 508 new cases. The increase in the number of civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases between 2010 and 2013 is partly explained by the establishment in 2011 of the judiciary statistics office. The increase in the number of administrative law cases mainly stems from the increase in the asylum-related disputes.

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 (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.

Q091 (2013): In 2013, the number of administrative law cases continued increasing. The Administrative Court was created in 2010. Over the time, the number of areas of competence of the Administrative Court has increased, which resulted in an increased caseload.

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 (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.

Q091 (2013): Portugal took important measures in order to improve the courts clearance rate and backlogs which resulted in an increased number of resolved non-criminal and enforcement cases. Some measures were focused primarily on enforcement cases, since they represent 70% of the total of pending cases. For example, the government adopted measures with the purpose to eliminate cases where there are no assets to execute or no procedural momentum, as well as measures with the aim to limit the number of incoming cases, establishing initial court fees. Courts with excessive number of pending cases were subject to particular assistance of specialized teams.

Romania

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.

Q091 (2013): With regard to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, because of the delays between hearings that are often very long (usually the first hearing is determined by an electronic system after a long period of time, in relation with the actual workload of judges), the new entered files are not usually finalised within a year.
With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, all the indicators kept a growing trend in 2012 and 2013. As for the stock of files (pending on 31.12), the increase between 2012 and 2013 is due to the fact that during the same period the number of resolved files has also decreased.
As to the trends observed in 2013 in respect of the “non-litigious enforcement cases” and “non-litigious land registry cases”, data are correct.
As to the category “administrative law cases”, the big differences have always been a reason for concern and continuous analysis. In the report on the status of Judiciary on 2012, it was noted that “in the administrative contentious and fiscal matters, the most of the cases were related to the restitution of the tax for pollution, but also to the obligation of the authorities to register the vehicles, without the payment of the tax for pollution (obligation to perform)”. It should be mentioned that the actions of the legislative have led to the growth of the number of administrative cases in the past 5 years, at tribunals with more than 400% and at the courts of appeal with around 200%.

Slovak Republic

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.

Q091 (2013): The Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called “non-bank loan companies” where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

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 (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.

Q091 (2013): "Civil and commercial litigious cases" include labour law and social law cases that are proceeded by specialised labour and social law courts. Cases that do not fit exactly to the determined types of civil, commercial, non-litigious, land and business registry, enforcement and administrative law cases, were previously included in other cases. For 2014, 'Other cases' include only cases outside of the above mentioned legal fields, while the various cases are distributed among the other items. With regard to the category 'non-litigious business registry cases', the increase of the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 can be explained with the fact that there were 8.000 more incoming cases in 2013 than in 2012, but courts were not able to handle the case-load.

Spain

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.

Belgium

Q092 (General Comment): Point 2 (civil and commercial non-litigious matters): this category concerns the following deeds: (free publication) deed of incorporation and amendment of (non)ASBL, (amendment of) statutes, directors, persons - day-to-day management, commissioners, dissolution, liquidation, liquidators, copy of register of members, annual accounts, general meeting, miscellaneous and coordinated text of statutes. For documents filed electronically, the incorporation and amendment deeds have been included.

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.

Q092 (2013): For 2013 and 2014, the provided examples concern only question 92: exercise of the parental care; meeting and spending time with parent; obtaining the capacity to exercise rights of minor that became parent; decision with whom the child will be living; issuing of the permit for entering into marriage before age of majority; deprivation/returning of capacity to exercise rights; deprivation/returning /prolongation of parental care; deprivation of parents' right to live with the child and raise the child; content of court will; security of evidence; setting-up/derogation of necessary passage; setting-up of court deposit, opening of a safe; verification of a contract on life-long support; amortization of documents; trust of a child with behavioural disorder; the recognition of foreign court decisions; declaring a missing person dead; co-ownership dissolution; meetings and spending time with grandmother, grandfather, sister, brother, half-sister, step-brother; land borders; regulation of relations between co-owners; restraining a child; providing legal aid; conclusion of court settlement; inheritance statement; proof of death; regulation of co-ownership relationships; boundaries and necessary passage; determination of extramarital union; other- family non-litigious proceedings; storage of the testament; providing international legal assistance; verification; other –the rest of non-litigious proceedings; international child abduction; other - proclamation of the deceased and proof of death; the appointment of members of the companies body; the appointment of auditors, temporary/interim administrator; the safeguard of evidence; the establishment of a court deposit; opening of the safe deposit box; registry cases; previous measures; forcible establishment of lien; temporary measure; temporary and previous measures, recognition of arbitration decisions; recognition of a foreign court decision; cases entering in the scope of Article 4 point 2 of the Companies Act; court insurance by the transfer of ownership and rights.

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.

Q092 (2013): 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.

Q092 (2013): 2012: Category 2 (civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases) refers to payment orders issued by district courts. They are handled almost immediately, so that there is no stock at the end of the period.

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).

Portugal

Q092 (2013): On the occasion of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises, it has been specified that the category of civil (and commercial cases) litigious cases includes the case flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice.

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.
The above listed cases are classified into CEPEJ categories slightly differently over the years.

Q092 (2014): 2014 Category 2.1 „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“at the first instance includes
1. (former category 2. „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“): N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D, Pr; and 2. (former category 3. ' Non litigious enforcement cases'): I, Ig, In, VL, Z, Zg and R-i.

Q092 (2013): 2013 Civil and commercial non-litigious cases at first instance include: N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D, Pr.

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.

Q093 (2013): In 2013 and 2014 the reply NAP in respect of the category “other” is due to the fact that a bankruptcy registry has not been established in the Republic of Croatia.

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.

Q093 (2013): For the 2013 and 2014 exercises, the category “other” includes: Local Court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.

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.

Hungary

Q093 (2013): In 2010, 2012 and 2014 the category “other” encompasses insolvency registry cases and labour litigious cases. In 2012, additionally it includes misdemeanour cases. In 2013, the category subsumes insolvency cases and non-litigious labour cases.

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.

Lithuania

Q093 (2013): For 2010, this category encompasses only cases of administrative offence, while since 2012 it subsumes also the administrative offence cases in the process of execution.

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.

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'."

Q093 (2013): 2013 "Other" civil law cases at first instance include: Bpp, COVL, Ov-i, Ov-H."

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 (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 (General Comment): Youth cases are not included in the table (data for the various columns of the table are not available).

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 425% 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 (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 (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.

Q094 (2013): The 2014 data is derived from the official court statistics that are also available online at www.justiceservices.com. The horizontal discrepancy in the data at point 6 cannot be verified since the data collection in the criminal courts is not as yet automated.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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: Number of 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 (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 (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.

Q097 (2013): In the frame of the 2013 exercise it has been explained that the discrepancies that can be observed in respect of the category “total of other than criminal cases” between the number of pending cases indicated for December 2012 and the number of pending cases communicated for January 2013, result from an administrative correction of a specific small number of cases by the second instance courts after the closure of the statistic period, which the reporting system then generates as a difference concerning previously rendered data.
As to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, owing to a different methodology of presentation of data, the number of pending cases in the end of 2012 does not coincide with the number of pending cases in the beginning of 2013. The number of pending cases on 31 December 2012 included second instance-civil and commercial courts’ cases, bankruptcy cases, general non-litigious cases, enforcement cases, land registry cases and company registry cases. Since 2013, it is possible to provide data on the second-instance civil and commercial litigation cases and bankruptcy cases separately from the general non-litigious cases, enforcement cases, land registry cases and company registry cases.
The variations observed with regard to the category “total of other than non-criminal law cases” for the period 2010-2013 can be explained by the negative economic situation in Croatia, which resulted in the increase of incoming commercial and civil cases before first instance courts and consequently led to the increase of the second instance cases.

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 (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 (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.

Q097 (2013): For the 2013 exercise, the totals do not include the number of non-litigious business registry cases which is not available.

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.

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 (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".

Q097 (2013): In the frame of the 2012 and 2013 exercises, several clarifications were provided.
Firstly, in respect of the civil and commercial litigious cases, the observed variations were deemed to be normal, as a part of the ordinary dynamics of the case-flow.
Secondly, in respect of the civil and commercial non-litigious cases, the increase in the number of pending cases resulted from the implementation of an efficiency-raising project in 2013 in Harju County Court. Accordingly, the efficiency of the latter increased significantly in civil cases. Owing to the fact that this court is the largest 1st instance court dealing with 1/3 of all of the cases in Estonia, it had an impact on the case-flow of the second instance courts (only 2 appeal courts competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters). Owing to that, in 2014 one civil judge's position was given to the Tallinn Appeal Court in order to raise their efficiency.
As to the enforcement procedures, they are in the competence of public bailiffs who are completely independent from the judicial system but act as public authorities. The reply NA is justified by the impossibility to distinguish in the bailiffs' information system the enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is court decision from all the other enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is for example a fine made by police, an administrative act made by the tax authority etc.
In respect of the land registry and business registry cases, it should be recalled that they are within the competence of the 1st instance courts. If the decision of the registry is appealed, it goes to the first instance court as a regular civil case.
As to the administrative cases, it is noteworthy that as there are only 2 appeal courts in Estonia competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters, every change in the number of 2nd instance judges influences the statistics of the Courts of appeal. Between 2010 and 2012 there were a few vacant administrative judges' positions in one of the appeal courts which had an impact on the number of pending cases.

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 (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.

Q097 (2013): The category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases includes petitions for the 2012 exercise, divorce cases and petitions (without cases included in the other sub-categories) for the 2013 exercise. As for the category “other”, according to the provided comments, in 2012 it encompasses cases, which Appeal Courts resolve as 1st instance, military justice cases and cases concerning prisoners. In 2013 it subsumes temporary procedural remedy cases, adjustment of the debts of a private individual - cases, restructuring of enterprises cases and bankruptcy cases and complaints.

France

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.

Q097 (2013): 2012, 2013: The 'non-litigious matters relating to the implementation' (which answer is NA) exist but are included in the category 'non-litigious civil cases'.

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 (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.

Q097 (2013): For 2013, two Landers did not provide any information.
The category “other “ includes proceedings on complaints on appeal in family cases at the Higher Regional Courts and appellate proceedings on fact and law and proceedings on complaints on appeal at the Regional Labour Courts. In addition, given a lack of complete data, a total of 164 272 new legal cases or proceedings on complaints on appeal (in custodianship, accommodation, insolvency, estate, and costs cases, along with other complaints on appeal) were not considered in the category “other”.
Regarding the slight horizontal inconsistency for the category “administrative law cases”, it can partly be explained by the federal State structure of Germany. Moreover, data regarding incoming administrative law cases also reflected the number of appeals against decisions to grant provisional legal protection in the higher administrative regional courts and in the higher social courts; and appeals in matters of legal aid and other proceedings. In comparison with the previous years, the 2013 data are more accurate. The same applies regarding resolved cases even though no data was available for the appeals in matters of legal aid and other proceedings.
With regard to the sub-category “civil and commercial litigious cases” and the meaningful increase of the number of resolved cases, it should be noticed that in the frame of the 2013 exercise, the indicated figure encompassed the number of resolved civil and commercial litigious and not-litigious cases. For this cycle, it was impossible to distinguish between these two sub-categories.

Greece

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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q097 (2013): In the frame of the 2013 and 2014 exercises it has been indicated that the category “other” includes the following types of cases from the Supreme Court : cases related to moral and physical damages; copyright related cases; family relationship; deprivation of citizenship; labour law cases; cases in respect of inheritance rights.

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.

Q097 (2013): 2013: because of the international events that have increased the number of asylum seekers, the administrative courts that have jurisdiction in case of appeal against a refusal of refugee status, have, in particular in 2013 but already during the 3-4 previous years, known a significant increase in this very specific litigation both at first instance level and appeal level.

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 (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.

Q097 (2013): The significant increase of the number of civil and commercial litigious cases between 2010 and 2013 was due to the fact that the number of appeals has increased substantially in the past few years and the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal has been extended to include also appeals from large public contract awards. Accordingly, the Court of Appeal was not in a position to manage the considerable influx of cases.

Netherlands

Q097 (General Comment): It is not possible to differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases at second instance. The financial registrations at first instance make a clear distinction between types of cases (that the answer for first instance can be based upon), but for second instances this differentiation does not exist (and thus, the registration is all the same).
As to the lack of horizontal consistency that can be observed, the reason is that the official number of cases pending on January 1st is determined at different time then the other 3 categories (official incoming, official resolved, official pending on December 31st). Due to time lags in registration and dynamics in the data systems, if the cases pending on January 1st are measured at the same time as the others, the result would be different.

Q097 (2021): The number of incoming administrative law cases increased between 2020 and 2021, most probably due to the pandemic. Especially, the number of appeals for tax cases is higher in 2021.

Q097 (2020): It is not possible for us to differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases at second instance. In short, we can provide this for first instance because the financial registrations makes clear distinction between types of cases (finances differ) that we can base that answer on, but for second instances, this differentiation in finances does not exist and thus, the registration is all the same.

Q097 (2019): .

Q097 (2018): If there is an appeal, cases are litigious in my view. I would tend to enter the value "0", but since the question is being asked, you probably see things differently. So I chose the answer "NA"

Q097 (2017): Administrative law cases, litigeous plus non-litigeous.

Q097 (2016): Administrative law cases, litigeous plus non-litigeous.

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 (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 (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.

Q097 (2013): With regard to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, the observed evolutions between 2010 and 2013 are due to the fact that following the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes, the jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the new Civil Procedure Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the old Code. Thus, even if the number of solved files in second instance is higher in 2013 than in the previous year, the number of new appeals (incoming cases in second instance) is higher. This explains the growth of the workload in the last period of time on these courts, although previously the trend was descending.
With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, the analysis of data and the noticed evolutions and variations between 2010 and 2013 should be qualified. In fact, the figures are not so high and the growth and regress of a few cases during one year lead to relatively important variations. For example, a growth of only 8 cases at the end of the year will reflect a growth of 35%. The same reasoning should be applied with regard to the category “non-litigious land registry cases” where a growth of only 122 cases at the beginning of the year will reflect a growth of over 40%.
In respect of the category “non-litigious enforcement cases”, the considerable increases between 2010 and 2013 with regard to all the items (pending cases, incoming and resolved) were the consequence of the new distribution of competences between courts. Since 2013, all the enforcement cases are in the jurisdiction of the courts of appeal. The number of cases in third instance decreased correlatively. Following the changes in the procedural provisions made in 2013, the second appeal, as means of review in the field of non-litigious business registry, became appeal, in accordance with the new principles of the Civil Procedure Code as regards the means of review.

Slovak Republic

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.

Q097 (2013): For 2013, a general remark was provided in respect of questions 91, 97 and 101, explaining that there were no specific reasons justifying the variations in the numbers of cases of the particular categories. It was stressed that the Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called “non-bank loan companies” where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. The capacity of the court staff to resolve all of the filed cases in the appropriate time period was limited despite the measures which have been taken. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

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 (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.

Q097 (2013): 2013 The area of land registry cases has been in constant improvement since a successful computerisation project in 2003 – the average disposition times have fallen from 18 months to 2 weeks. The lowering of the number of pending cases is the consequence of a better organisation of work and of the totally electronic procedure.

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 (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 (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 offences: cases appealed to the Court of Appeal (criminal matters).
*Minor criminal offences: cases brought on appeal before the Court of First Instance - criminal courts - for cases dealt with by the Police Court (therefore dealt with at 2nd instance by the criminal courts).
*Youth protection cases: included under minor criminal offences.
*Point 3 ‘Other criminal cases’: since the last cycle, this category includes cases heard by the Indictments Chamber. The latter (a division of the Court of Appeal) is involved in the judicial investigation oversight, supervises pre-trial detention in particular, and decides on referral to the trial judge. The data are provided within the specific comment.

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).

Q098 (2013): Generally speaking, the decrease of the total number of misdemeanour cases at all levels was the main goal and purpose of adopting the Act on the Amendments of the Misdemeanour Act in 2013 (OG 39/13) in which the definition of misdemeanour act was changed, the principle of opportunity as well as the simplification of the procedure were introduced, the more active role was given to the plaintiff. Moreover, specific measures were introduced: if the fine is paid when caught in committing a misdemeanour offence, it is considered as paid if the half of the amount was paid immediately, and if the deadline was prescribed, it is considered as paid if the 2/3 of the amount was paid. Moreover, the enforcement procedure conducted on monetary assets is more efficient. The Register of Unpaid Fines was established.
According to the new misdemeanour provisions, there is no suspension of the proceedings because of the statute of limitations. Every court decision is being enforced, fines are being paid, therefore strengthening the general prevention and withdraw of committing misdemeanour offences. All of the above said leads to the reduction of the number of misdemeanour cases at both courts' instances: misdemeanour courts and High Misdemeanour Court of the Republic of Croatia

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 (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 (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 (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 (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): 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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 methodolgy (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)
The higher number of cases in 2023 is due to the comparison of 2021, where there was lower activity due to COVID-19.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q099 (2013): For 2013, two Landers did not provide any information. Data provided for the civil (and commercial) litigious cases include all appeals lodged encompassing litigious and non-litigious cases as well as family law cases.

Greece

Q099 (General Comment): It is not possible to distinguish between civil litigious and civil non-litigious cases dealt with by the Supreme Court and that the only available data is the sum of all non-criminal cases dealt with by the Supreme Court.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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): The pending files are now detailed between criminal and civil/commercial cases, thus this additional information is now available. There is no cassation possibility against the decisions of the administrative court of appeal.

Q099 (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 formula for horizontal consistency might not work satisfactory – the number of pending cases on Dec 31 might be different (usually lower) than when calculated with (Pending cases Jan 1 + Incoming cases) – Resolved cases. The number of resolved cases presented in the table only includes cases that are resolved with the decision of a judge. 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 cannot be counted separately. Therefore, their number is not included in the number of Resolved cases. However, that number is included in the number of Pending cases Dec 31. We have included the number of those cases in the comment, to account for the discrepancies.
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 (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 (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 (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.

Q099 (2013): In respect of the administrative law cases, until 2013, there was only a second appeal that is encompassed in the answers to question 99.

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.

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.

Q099 (2013): For 2013, a general remark was provided in respect of questions 91, 97 and 101, explaining that there were no specific reasons justifying the variations in the numbers of cases of the particular categories. It was stressed that the Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called "non-bank loan companies" where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. The capacity of the court staff to resolve all of the filed cases in the appropriate time period was limited despite the measures which have been taken. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

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.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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): The Court of cassation makes a legality control, independant from the severity of the infraction. The pending files are now detailed between criminal and civil/commercial cases, thus this additional information is now available.

Q100 (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 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 (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 (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 (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: Case flow in 2023
Absolute values (Q107 and Q109)

States	Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases in 2023											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	20 258	500 062	499 760	415 284	*224 854*	*109 279*	*NA*	*81 151*	35 468	49 008	20 560	
Belgium	182 956	572 199	568 128	473 050	*85 165*	*137 745*	*123 516*	*126 624*	60 912	34 166	187 027	
Bulgaria	4 208	95 471	176 116	148 471	*NAP*	*113 687*	*NAP*	*34 784*	NAP	27 645	4 163	
Croatia	54 800	41 140	37 327	19 089	*NA*	*NA*	*584*	*3 455*	NAP	18 238	56 550	
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	
Czech Republic	43 904	201 493	202 003	140 332	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*44 217*	2 334	59 337	43 394	
Denmark	54 743	229 975	552 839	307 699	*92 786*	*207 492*	*5 071*	*2 247*	65 461	176 654	32 458	
Estonia	2 220	27 418	7 198	3 647	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	3 551	2 236	
Finland	18 895	87 931	89 503	35 126	*NAP*	*113*	*18 285*	*16 728*	4	54 373	17 323	
France	NA	4 705 322	4 370 113	3 375 290	*2 437 843*	*732 377*	*205 070*	*NAP*	400 458	594 365	NA	
Germany	856 969	5 569 896	5 503 431	4 432 132	*NA*	*1 683 110*	*1 422 693*	*1 326 329*	164 327	906 972	923 452	
Greece	217 921	435 591	440 653	212 774	*117 273*	*56 952*	*2 205*	*36 344*	2 324	225 555	236 595	
Hungary	NA	77 585	151 785	22 836	*73*	*8 099*	*12 075*	*2 589*	3 786	125 163	NA	
Ireland	NA	11 184	NA	3 529	*39*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	
Italy	1 316 749	2 689 296	2 579 077	2 152 397	*1 095 605*	*714 620*	*6 469*	*335 703*	9 295	417 385	1 426 968	
Latvia	556	10 911	9 886	394	*0*	*84*	*284*	*26*	5 104	4 462	597	
Lithuania	25 498	45 256	43 795	19 679	*1 671*	*16 421*	*1 563*	*24*	NAP	24 116	25 352	
Luxembourg	NA	69 866	41 526	27 578	*4 056*	*5 324*	*18 098*	*100*	991	12 957	NA	
Malta	16 499	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	13 716	19 860	
Netherlands	55 760	186 800	195 000	56 700	*NAP*	*38 000*	*15 300*	*3 400*	53 000	85 100	54 401	
Poland	116 118	1 113 206	1 099 217	834 876	*159 806*	*62 616*	*138 855*	*473 599*	41 512	222 829	130 177	
Portugal	277 858	504 547	452 396	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	45 743	330 162	
Romania	1 139 406	619 737	613 919	497 262	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	68 319	48 338	1 145 224	
Slovak Republic	22 337	56 644	54 636	9 908	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	*NA*	1 316	22 679	22 881	
Slovenia	289 384	61 822	67 015	57 382	*NAP*	*54 512*	*2 870*	*NAP*	1 449	8 184	286 202	
Spain	NA	2 277 683	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	
Sweden	108 062	429 320	430 903	221 478	*NA*	*30 542*	*35 030*	*155 906*	40 033	169 392	113 490	
Average	229 767	824 814	790 705	585 518	351 598	233 587	125 498	155 484	53 116	139 580	241 861	
Median	54 800	201 493	202 003	140 332	88 976	56 952	13 688	34 784	22 382	48 673	54 401	
Minimum	556	10 911	7 198	394	0	84	284	24	4	3 551	597	
Maximum	1 316 749	5 569 896	5 503 431	4 432 132	2 437 843	1 683 110	1 422 693	1 326 329	400 458	906 972	1 426 968	
% of NA	22%	7%	11%	15%	37%	37%	30%	30%	19%	11%	22%	# 0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	0%	19%	0%	11%	7%	15%	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: Case flow in 2023
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107 and Q109)

States	Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases per 100 inhabitants in 2023											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	5,46	5,46	4,53	2,46	1,19	NA	0,89	0,39	0,54	0,22	
Belgium	1,56	4,86	4,83	4,02	*0,72*	*1,17*	*1,05*	*1,08*	0,52	0,29	1,59	
Bulgaria	0,07	1,48	2,73	2,30	*NAP*	*1,76*	*NAP*	*0,54*	NAP	0,43	0,06	
Croatia	1,42	1,07	0,97	0,50	*NA*	*NA*	*0,02*	*0,09*	NAP	0,47	1,47	
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	
Czech Republic	0,40	1,85	1,85	1,29	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*0,41*	0,02	0,54	0,40	
Denmark	0,92	3,88	9,32	5,19	*1,56*	*3,50*	*0,09*	*0,04*	1,10	2,98	0,55	
Estonia	0,16	2,01	0,53	0,27	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,26	0,16	
Finland	0,34	1,57	1,59	0,63	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,33*	*0,30*	0,00	0,97	0,31	
France	NA	6,88	6,39	4,94	*3,57*	*1,07*	*0,30*	*NAP*	0,59	0,87	NA	
Germany	1,01	6,58	6,50	5,23	*NA*	*1,99*	*1,68*	*1,57*	0,19	1,07	1,09	
Greece	2,09	4,18	4,23	2,04	*1,13*	*0,55*	*0,02*	*0,35*	0,02	2,17	2,27	
Hungary	NA	0,81	1,58	0,24	*0,00*	*0,08*	*0,13*	*0,03*	0,04	1,31	NA	
Ireland	NA	0,21	NA	0,07	*0,00*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	
Italy	2,23	4,56	4,37	3,65	*1,86*	*1,21*	*0,01*	*0,57*	0,02	0,71	2,42	
Latvia	0,03	0,58	0,53	0,02	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,02*	*0,00*	0,27	0,24	0,03	
Lithuania	0,88	1,57	1,52	0,68	*0,06*	*0,57*	*0,05*	*0,00*	NAP	0,84	0,88	
Luxembourg	NA	10,40	6,18	4,10	*0,60*	*0,79*	*2,69*	*0,01*	0,15	1,93	NA	
Malta	2,93	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	2,43	3,52	
Netherlands	0,31	1,04	1,09	0,32	*NAP*	*0,21*	*0,09*	*0,02*	0,30	0,47	0,30	
Poland	0,31	2,96	2,92	2,22	*0,42*	*0,17*	*0,37*	*1,26*	0,11	0,59	0,35	
Portugal	2,61	4,74	4,25	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,43	3,10	
Romania	5,98	3,25	3,22	2,61	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,36	0,25	6,01	
Slovak Republic	0,41	1,04	1,01	0,18	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	*NA*	0,02	0,42	0,42	
Slovenia	13,62	2,91	3,16	2,70	*NAP*	*2,57*	*0,14*	*NAP*	0,07	0,39	13,47	
Spain	NA	4,69	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	
Sweden	1,02	4,07	4,08	2,10	*NA*	*0,29*	*0,33*	*1,48*	0,38	1,61	1,08	
Average	1,8	3,3	3,4	2,2	*1,0*	*1,0*	*0,5*	*0,5*	0,3	0,9	1,9	
Median	0,9	3,0	3,2	2,1	*0,7*	*0,8*	*0,1*	*0,3*	0,2	0,6	0,9	
Minimum	0,0	0,2	0,5	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	0,2	0,0	
Maximum	13,6	10,4	9,3	5,2	*3,6*	*3,5*	*2,7*	*1,6*	1,1	3,0	13,5	
% of NA	22%	7%	11%	15%	37%	37%	30%	30%	19%	11%	22%	
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	0%	19%	0%	11%	7%	15%	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: Distribution of different categories of processed cases within all processed cases in 2023 (Q107)

States	Public prosecution: 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%	26%	NA	20%	7%	10%
Belgium	83%	18%	29%	26%	27%	11%	6%
Bulgaria	84%	NAP	77%	NAP	23%	NAP	16%
Croatia	51%	NA	NA	3%	18%	NAP	49%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	69%	NA	NA	NA	32%	1%	29%
Denmark	56%	30%	67%	2%	1%	12%	32%
Estonia	51%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	49%
Finland	39%	NAP	0%	52%	48%	0%	61%
France	77%	72%	22%	6%	NAP	9%	14%
Germany	81%	NA	38%	32%	30%	3%	16%
Greece	48%	55%	27%	1%	17%	1%	51%
Hungary	15%	0%	35%	53%	11%	2%	82%
Ireland	NA	1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	83%	51%	33%	0%	16%	0%	16%
Latvia	4%	0%	21%	72%	7%	52%	45%
Lithuania	45%	8%	83%	8%	0%	NAP	55%
Luxembourg	66%	15%	19%	66%	0%	2%	31%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Netherlands	29%	NAP	67%	27%	6%	27%	44%
Poland	76%	19%	8%	17%	57%	4%	20%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10%
Romania	81%	NA	NA	NA	NA	11%	8%
Slovak Republic	18%	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	2%	42%
Slovenia	86%	NAP	95%	5%	NAP	2%	12%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	51%	NA	14%	16%	70%	9%	39%
Average	58%	27%	39%	24%	22%	9%	32%
Median	61%	19%	29%	16%	18%	3%	31%
Minimum	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%
Maximum	86%	72%	95%	72%	70%	52%	82%
% of NA	19%	37%	37%	30%	30%	19%	15%
% of NAP	0%	19%	0%	11%	7%	15%	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: Ratio of processed cases and pending cases with incoming cases in 2023 (Q107)

States	Public prosecution cases in 2023	
	Ratio between processed and incoming cases	Ratio between Pending cases 31 Dec and incoming cases
Austria	1,00	0,04
Belgium	0,99	0,33
Bulgaria	1,84	0,04
Croatia	0,91	1,37
Cyprus	NA	NA
Czech Republic	1,00	0,22
Denmark	2,40	0,14
Estonia	0,26	0,08
Finland	1,02	0,20
France	0,93	NA
Germany	0,99	0,17
Greece	1,01	0,54
Hungary	1,96	NA
Ireland	NA	NA
Italy	0,96	0,53
Latvia	0,91	0,05
Lithuania	0,97	0,56
Luxembourg	0,59	NA
Malta	NA	NA
Netherlands	1,04	0,29
Poland	0,99	0,12
Portugal	0,90	0,65
Romania	0,99	1,85
Slovak Republic	0,96	0,40
Slovenia	1,08	4,63
Spain	NAP	NA
Sweden	1,00	0,26
Average	1,07	0,62
Median	0,99	0,28
Minimum	0,26	0,04
Maximum	2,40	4,63
% of NA	11%	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: Evolution of the total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor between 2020 and 2023 (Q55, Q057, Q107 and Q109)

States	Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor												Other persons have similar duties to those of public prosecutors in 2023	Figures provided include traffic offence cases in 2023
	Incoming/ received cases				Variation		Processed cases				Variation			
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023		
Austria	1 023,0	987,4	1 173,2	1 237,8	21%	6%	1 040,0	990,2	1 170,3	1 237,0	19%	6%		
Belgium	733,7	667,1	639,3	595,4	-19%	-7%	685,5	676,5	658,8	591,2	-14%	-10%		
Bulgaria	66,1	65,9	62,9	61,6	-7%	-2%	93,6	110,4	105,0	113,7	21%	8%		
Croatia	64,2	66,8	66,7	65,6	2%	-2%	54,4	65,3	63,7	59,5	9%	-6%		
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Czech Republic	148,6	137,1	162,3	161,7	9%	0%	153,9	136,6	156,0	162,1	5%	4%		
Denmark	NA	254,6	298,1	280,8	NA	-6%	NA	538,4	588,6	675,0	NA	15%		
Estonia	152,8	146,8	151,4	152,3	0%	1%	55,5	49,5	44,9	40,0	-28%	-11%		
Finland	234,0	210,5	192,9	192,4	-18%	0%	224,4	209,9	190,9	195,8	-13%	3%		
France	1 917,3	2 009,6	2 027,1	1 965,5	3%	-3%	1 819,6	1 888,0	1 891,4	1 825,4	0%	-3%		
Germany	804,3	779,7	804,6	822,0	2%	2%	807,6	774,8	786,5	812,2	1%	3%		
Greece	NA	609,0	664,9	699,2	NA	5%	NA	501,9	715,2	707,3	NA	-1%		
Hungary	40,1	40,0	42,3	41,6	4%	-2%	73,5	78,2	76,9	81,4	11%	6%		
Ireland	98,5	102,2	83,1	71,7	-27%	-14%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Italy	1 103,3	1 149,3	1 192,8	1 240,5	12%	4%	1 096,5	1 117,3	1 154,0	1 189,6	8%	3%		
Latvia	27,6	25,7	23,6	26,3	-5%	11%	26,6	24,8	23,0	23,8	-10%	4%		
Lithuania	72,0	68,4	76,0	75,8	5%	0%	79,0	69,5	72,8	73,4	-7%	1%		
Luxembourg	1 001,9	925,6	1 003,1	998,1	0%	0%	573,6	578,0	584,1	593,2	3%	2%		
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Netherlands	195,7	191,8	182,8	174,4	-11%	-5%	189,9	186,6	182,1	182,1	-4%	0%		
Poland	181,0	188,4	184,9	189,9	5%	3%	185,7	197,7	194,5	187,5	1%	-4%		
Portugal	307,1	280,8	300,5	332,8	8%	11%	284,1	NA	282,8	298,4	5%	6%		
Romania	233,6	250,8	277,9	300,3	29%	8%	230,6	258,5	279,4	297,4	29%	6%		
Slovak Republic	62,1	54,4	55,3	55,7	-10%	1%	NA	NA	NA	53,7	NA	NA		
Slovenia	299,9	258,0	289,1	306,0	2%	6%	138,2	269,7	262,6	331,8	140%	26%		
Spain	723,3	758,2	775,5	828,2	15%	7%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP		
Sweden	476,3	410,2	362,6	383,7	-19%	6%	493,2	421,8	369,2	385,1	-22%	4%		
Average	433,3	425,5	443,7	450,4		1,1%	415,3		447,8	439,9		2,7%		
Median	233,6	250,8	277,9	280,8		0,6%	207,2		271,0	297,4		3,2%		
Minimum	27,6	25,7	23,6	26,3		-13,8%	26,6		23,0	23,8		-11,0%		
Maximum	1 917,3	2 009,6	2 027,1	1 965,5		11,4%	1 819,6		1 891,4	1 825,4		26,3%		
% of NA	15%	7%	7%	7%		7%	22%		15%	11%		15%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%		0%	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: Evolution of the ratio of processed cases as well as pending cases with incoming cases from 2020 to 2023 (Q107)

States	Ratio between processed and incoming cases				Variation		Ratio between pending cases 31 Dec and incoming cases				Variation	
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023
Austria	1,02	1,00	1,00	1,00	-2%	0%	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,04	-18%	-8%
Belgium	0,93	1,01	1,03	0,99	6%	-4%	0,36	0,36	0,33	0,33	-9%	0%
Bulgaria	1,42	1,68	1,67	1,84	30%	10%	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	6%	0%
Croatia	0,85	0,98	0,95	0,91	7%	-5%	1,31	1,29	1,32	1,37	5%	4%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	1,04	1,00	0,96	1,00	-3%	4%	0,20	0,21	0,22	0,22	10%	-1%
Denmark	1,88	2,11	1,97	2,40	28%	22%	0,27	0,27	0,23	0,14	-48%	-39%
Estonia	0,36	0,34	0,30	0,26	-28%	-12%	0,09	0,08	0,09	0,08	-12%	-6%
Finland	0,96	1,00	0,99	1,02	6%	3%	0,19	0,20	0,22	0,20	2%	-11%
France	0,95	0,94	0,93	0,93	-2%	0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	1,00	0,99	0,98	0,99	-2%	1%	0,14	0,15	0,16	0,17	16%	1%
Greece	NA	0,82	1,08	1,01	NA	-6%	NA	0,17	0,59	0,54	NA	-8%
Hungary	1,83	1,96	1,82	1,96	7%	8%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,99	0,97	0,97	0,96	-4%	-1%	0,64	0,60	0,55	0,53	-17%	-3%
Latvia	0,96	0,97	0,97	0,91	-6%	-7%	0,03	0,05	0,05	0,05	92%	6%
Lithuania	1,10	1,02	0,96	0,97	-12%	1%	0,50	0,56	0,55	0,56	13%	3%
Luxembourg	0,57	0,62	0,58	0,59	4%	2%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,97	0,97	1,00	1,04	8%	5%	0,32	0,34	0,30	0,29	-9%	-2%
Poland	1,03	1,05	1,05	0,99	-4%	-6%	0,12	0,11	0,11	0,12	0%	10%
Portugal	0,92	NA	0,94	0,90	-3%	-5%	0,57	0,61	0,61	0,65	14%	7%
Romania	0,99	1,03	1,01	0,99	0%	-1%	2,03	1,92	1,85	1,85	-9%	0%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	0,96	NA	NA	0,36	NA	NA	0,40	13%	NA
Slovenia	0,46	1,05	0,91	1,08	135%	19%	4,55	5,58	4,84	4,63	2%	-4%
Spain	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	1,04	1,03	1,02	1,00	-3%	-1%	0,23	0,23	0,25	0,26	17%	4%
Average	1,01	1,07	1,05	1,07	8%	1%	0,63	0,68	0,65	0,62	4%	-3%
Median	0,99	1,00	0,98	0,99	-2%	0%	0,27	0,23	0,25	0,28	2%	0%
Minimum	0,36	0,34	0,30	0,26	-28%	-12%	0,03	0,04	0,04	0,04	-48%	-39%
Maximum	1,88	2,11	1,97	2,40	135%	22%	4,55	5,58	4,84	4,63	92%	10%
% of NA	19%	19%	15%	11%	19%	15%	30%	30%	30%	26%	30%	30%
% of NAP	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	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: Evolution of the incoming/received, processed, discontinued cases as well as cases brought to court from 2020 to 2023
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107)

States	Incoming/received cases				Variation		Processed cases				Variation		Discontinued cases				Variation		Cases brought to court				Variation	
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023
Austria	4,56	4,34	5,08	5,46	20%	8%	4,63	4,36	5,06	5,46	18%	8%	3,44	3,23	4,18	4,53	32%	8%	0,50	0,46	0,50	0,54	8%	6%
Belgium	5,58	5,30	4,83	4,86	-13%	1%	5,21	5,37	4,97	4,83	-7%	-3%	2,97	2,95	4,10	4,02	35%	-2%	0,41	0,48	0,31	0,29	-29%	-6%
Bulgaria	1,45	1,47	1,50	1,48	2%	-2%	2,06	2,47	2,51	2,73	33%	9%	1,08	1,49	2,07	2,30	114%	11%	0,40	0,42	0,44	0,43	6%	-3%
Croatia	0,99	1,06	1,08	1,07	8%	-1%	0,84	1,04	1,03	0,97	16%	-6%	0,36	0,44	0,55	0,50	39%	-10%	0,46	0,50	0,48	0,47	3%	-1%
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
Czech Republic	1,70	1,61	1,86	1,85	9%	-1%	1,76	1,60	1,79	1,85	5%	4%	0,89	0,91	0,84	1,29	45%	53%	0,53	0,52	0,53	0,54	3%	3%
Denmark	3,83	3,31	4,02	3,88	1%	-4%	7,20	7,00	7,94	9,32	30%	17%	3,55	3,54	4,13	5,19	46%	25%	2,83	2,61	2,83	2,98	5%	5%
Estonia	1,94	1,95	1,93	2,01	3%	4%	0,71	0,66	0,57	0,53	-25%	-8%	0,29	0,28	0,26	0,27	-9%	4%	0,41	0,38	0,32	0,26	-37%	-18%
Finland	1,65	1,61	1,53	1,57	-5%	2%	1,58	1,60	1,51	1,59	1%	5%	0,47	0,50	0,59	0,63	34%	6%	1,02	1,02	0,92	0,97	-5%	5%
France	6,12	6,37	6,42	6,88	12%	7%	5,81	5,98	5,99	6,39	10%	7%	4,31	4,41	4,52	4,94	14%	9%	0,79	0,87	0,86	0,87	11%	2%
Germany	5,99	5,92	6,20	6,58	10%	6%	6,02	5,88	6,06	6,50	8%	7%	3,23	3,16	3,35	5,23	62%	56%	1,16	1,06	1,06	1,07	-7%	1%
Greece	NA	3,48	3,78	4,18	NA	11%	NA	2,87	4,07	4,23	NA	4%	NA	1,36	1,75	2,04	NA	17%	NA	1,44	2,29	2,17	NA	-5%
Hungary	0,76	0,77	0,83	0,81	6%	-2%	1,39	1,51	1,50	1,58	14%	5%	0,18	0,21	0,25	0,24	31%	-3%	1,13	1,23	1,22	1,31	15%	7%
Ireland	0,25	0,25	0,22	0,21	-17%	-5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,08	0,09	0,07	0,07	-21%	-5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	4,22	4,35	4,57	4,56	8%	0%	4,20	4,23	4,42	4,37	4%	-1%	2,80	2,84	3,04	3,65	30%	20%	0,73	0,78	0,77	0,71	-4%	-8%
Latvia	0,67	0,61	0,57	0,58	-13%	2%	0,65	0,59	0,56	0,53	-18%	-5%	0,08	0,08	0,07	0,02	-74%	-70%	0,43	0,32	0,23	0,24	-44%	2%
Lithuania	1,66	1,52	1,60	1,57	-5%	-2%	1,82	1,54	1,53	1,52	-17%	-1%	0,88	0,68	0,69	0,68	-23%	-1%	0,93	0,86	0,85	0,84	-10%	-1%
Luxembourg	9,79	9,04	9,87	10,40	6%	5%	5,60	5,64	5,75	6,18	10%	8%	3,68	3,72	3,78	4,10	11%	9%	1,82	1,79	1,82	1,93	6%	6%
Malta	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	13%	3%
Netherlands	1,06	1,07	1,05	1,04	-2%	-1%	1,03	1,04	1,05	1,09	6%	4%	0,32	0,31	0,33	0,32	0%	-4%	0,43	0,46	0,45	0,47	9%	6%
Poland	2,77	2,92	2,89	2,96	7%	2%	2,84	3,06	3,05	2,92	3%	-4%	1,01	1,07	2,18	2,22	119%	2%	0,72	0,75	0,73	0,59	-17%	-19%
Portugal	4,22	4,01	4,34	4,74	12%	9%	3,91	NA	4,09	4,25	9%	4%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,39	0,44	0,42	0,43	10%	1%
Romania	2,98	3,12	3,23	3,25	9%	1%	2,94	3,22	3,25	3,22	10%	-1%	2,31	2,51	2,55	2,61	13%	2%	0,24	0,27	0,26	0,25	6%	-4%
Slovak Republic	1,05	0,98	1,03	1,04	0%	1%	NA	NA	NA	1,01	NA	NA	0,19	0,28	NA	0,18	-3%	NA	0,42	0,39	0,45	0,42	-1%	-6%
Slovenia	2,93	2,46	2,83	2,91	-1%	3%	1,35	2,57	2,57	3,16	134%	23%	1,84	2,06	2,08	2,70	47%	30%	0,43	0,40	0,37	0,39	-11%	4%
Spain	3,89	4,21	4,32	4,69	21%	8%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	4,79	4,45	4,04	4,07	-15%	1%	4,96	4,57	4,12	4,08	-18%	-1%	1,87	1,76	2,13	2,10	12%	-1%	1,93	1,76	1,59	1,61	-17%	1%
Average	3,12	3,05	3,19	3,31	3%	2%	3,17	3,18	3,34	3,40	11%	3%	1,63	1,65	1,98	2,17	25%	7%	0,88	0,89	0,92	0,92	-4%	-1%
Median	2,85	2,92	2,89	2,96	5%	1%	2,84	2,87	3,15	3,16	8%	4%	1,05	1,36	2,08	2,10	31%	5%	0,53	0,64	0,63	0,57	3%	1%
Minimum	0,25	0,25	0,22	0,21	-17%	-5%	0,65	0,59	0,56	0,53	-25%	-8%	0,08	0,08	0,07	0,02	-74%	-70%	0,24	0,27	0,23	0,24	-44%	-19%
Maximum	9,79	9,04	9,87	10,40	21%	11%	7,20	7,00	7,94	9,32	134%	23%	4,31	4,41	4,52	5,23	119%	56%	2,83	2,61	2,83	2,98	15%	7%
% of NA	11%	7%	7%	7%	11%	7%	19%	19%	15%	11%	19%	15%	0,19	0,15	0,19	0,15	19%	19%	0,15	0,11	0,11	0,11	15%	11%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0%	0%	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	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: Evolution of the pending cases at the beginning and at the end of the reference year from 2020 to 2023
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107)

States	Pending cases 1 Jan.				Variation		Pending cases 31 Dec.				Variation	
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023
Austria	0,31	0,23	0,21	0,22	-28%	4%	0,23	0,22	0,23	0,22	-2%	-1%
Belgium	1,64	1,98	1,73	1,56	-5%	-10%	2,01	1,91	1,58	1,59	-21%	1%
Bulgaria	0,07	0,06	0,07	0,07	-4%	0%	0,06	0,06	0,07	0,06	8%	-1%
Croatia	1,20	1,35	1,38	1,42	18%	3%	1,29	1,37	1,42	1,47	13%	3%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,39	0,34	0,33	0,40	3%	21%	0,33	0,34	0,40	0,40	20%	-2%
Denmark	1,04	1,04	0,88	0,92	-11%	5%	1,04	0,89	0,92	0,55	-48%	-41%
Estonia	0,18	0,18	0,16	0,16	-10%	3%	0,18	0,16	0,17	0,16	-9%	-2%
Finland	0,25	0,32	0,32	0,34	33%	4%	0,32	0,32	0,34	0,31	-4%	-9%
France	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,88	0,85	0,88	1,01	15%	15%	0,86	0,89	1,02	1,09	27%	7%
Greece	NA	0,41	2,29	2,09	NA	-8%	NA	0,58	2,24	2,27	NA	2%
Hungary	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
Italy	2,68	2,48	2,36	2,23	-17%	-5%	2,71	2,60	2,51	2,42	-11%	-4%
Latvia	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,03	15%	-10%	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03	67%	8%
Lithuania	0,91	0,83	0,86	0,88	-3%	3%	0,82	0,85	0,87	0,88	7%	0%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	2,31	3,08	3,04	2,93	27%	-4%	3,09	3,06	3,17	3,52	14%	11%
Netherlands	0,42	0,30	0,36	0,31	-26%	-14%	0,34	0,37	0,31	0,30	-11%	-3%
Poland	0,33	0,32	0,33	0,31	-6%	-5%	0,32	0,32	0,31	0,35	7%	12%
Portugal	2,11	2,38	2,41	2,61	24%	8%	2,43	2,45	2,66	3,10	28%	16%
Romania	5,97	6,10	6,00	5,98	0%	0%	6,05	6,00	5,98	6,01	-1%	0%
Slovak Republic	0,38	NA	NA	0,41	9%	NA	0,37	NA	NA	0,42	13%	NA
Slovenia	13,07	13,35	13,36	13,62	4%	2%	13,34	13,73	13,67	13,47	1%	-1%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	1,15	1,07	1,03	1,02	-11%	-1%	1,08	1,04	1,03	1,08	-1%	5%
Average	1,77	1,83	1,90	1,83	1%	1%	1,84	1,86	1,95	1,89	5%	0%
Median	0,89	0,84	0,88	0,92	-1%	1%	0,84	0,87	0,97	0,88	4%	0%
Minimum	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,03	-28%	-14%	0,02	0,03	0,03	0,03	-48%	-41%
Maximum	13,07	13,35	13,36	13,62	33%	21%	13,34	13,73	13,67	13,47	67%	16%
% of NA	26%	26%	26%	22%	26%	26%	26%	26%	26%	22%	26%	26%
% of NAP	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 with the guilty plea procedure

Table 4.2.1 Number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure in 2023 (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	21 806	NA	NA	11 115	NA	NA	10 691	NA	NA
Croatia	607	230	377	607	230	377	NAP	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	1 604	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	24 582	NAP	NAP	24 582	NAP	NAP	0	NAP	NAP
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	114 774	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	114 774	NAP	NAP
Germany	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Greece	152	7	145	123	4	119	29	3	26
Hungary	12 658	NA	NA	11 425	NA	NA	1 233	NA	NA
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	1 183	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	15 401	NA	NA	15 401	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	59	NAP	59	59	NAP	59	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	41 512	NA	NA	NA	39 073	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	1 820	NAP	NAP	1 820	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1 512	NA	NA	1 444	NA	NA	68	NA	NA
Slovenia	401	401	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	16 281	213	194	9 934	-	185	18 114	-	-
Median	1 712	230	145	1 820	-	119	68	-	-
Minimum	59	7	59	59	-	59	0	-	-
Maximum	114 774	401	377	41 512	-	377	114 774	-	-
% of NA	26%	44%	44%	26%	48%	44%	33%	41%	41%
% of NAP	30%	44%	44%	33%	44%	44%	41%	52%	52%

Table 4.2.2 Evolution of the number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure from 2020 to 2023 (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	2020-2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023
Austria	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
Bulgaria	19 155	21 346	21 326	21 806	14%	2%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	504	521	612	607	20%	-1%	238	279	294	230	-3%	-22%	266	242	318	377	42%	19%
Cyprus	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	623%	6%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	28 468	20 941	27 224	24 582	-14%	-10%	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
Finland	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	46%	7%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	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	NA	-89%	NA	728	19	7	NA	-63%	NA	2 374	1 422	145	NA	-90%
Hungary	9 675	10 978	11 825	12 658	31%	7%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	29 259	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	10 583	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	18 676	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	16 672	14 365	15 181	15 401	-8%	1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	32	64	70	59	84%	-16%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	32	64	70	59	84%	-16%
Malta	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
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	96 189	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
Romania	2 175	2 171	1 848	1 820	-16%	-2%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1 356	1 422	1 961	1 512	12%	-23%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	255	342	294	401	57%	36%	NA	342	294	401	NA	36%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	152 254	204 177	NA	NA	NA	NA	149 904	201 286	NA	NA	NA	NA	2 350	2 891	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	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	77%	-7%	-	42 644	24 199	213	-	-16%	883	4 849	603	194	-	-29%
Median	5 925	7 040	1 905	1 712	20%	0%	-	728	294	230	-	-22%	266	2 374	318	145	-	-16%
Minimum	32	64	70	59	-16%	-89%	-	279	19	7	-	-63%	32	64	70	59	-	-90%
Maximum	152 254	204 177	107 005	114 774	623%	36%	-	201 286	96 189	401	-	36%	2 350	18 676	1 422	377	-	19%
% of NA	30%	22%	30%	26%	30%	26%	56%	44%	44%	44%	52%	44%	52%	44%	48%	44%	48%	44%
% of NAP	26%	26%	26%	30%	30%	30%	37%	37%	41%	44%	44%	44%	37%	37%	41%	44%	44%	44%

Budget of the public prosecution services

Table 4.3.1 (a) Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q13)

States	Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution										
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	263 148 000 €	297 252 000 €
Bulgaria	83 191 279 €	93 698 490 €	95 590 817 €	103 474 815 €	111 702 235 €	117 132 394 €	137 635 835 €	152 917 818 €	168 983 884 €	180 015 668 €	204 259 036 €
Croatia	40 667 128 €	40 820 393 €	40 018 315 €	45 315 977 €	46 536 649 €	48 037 039 €	57 035 536 €	58 737 144 €	55 773 565 €	55 976 788 €	65 256 837 €
Cyprus	16 600 696 €	15 798 704 €	18 562 103 €	21 953 972 €	18 184 425 €	20 478 203 €	22 640 515 €	21 117 635 €	34 446 594 €	62 341 935 €	35 035 000 €
Czech Republic	83 826 142 €	85 213 339 €	93 199 782 €	93 217 029 €	110 580 595 €	115 530 744 €	126 534 122 €	133 683 358 €	136 195 988 €	138 055 286 €	149 375 120 €
Denmark	94 400 000 €	97 116 986 €	99 140 896 €	99 406 787 €	110 570 966 €	93 961 349 €	111 398 062 €	121 432 125 €	134 145 358 €	122 677 280 €	133 880 186 €
Estonia	9 798 246 €	10 627 825 €	11 042 407 €	11 533 359 €	11 525 880 €	12 936 652 €	14 146 518 €	15 159 770 €	16 002 372 €	18 312 029 €	21 240 091 €
Finland	45 947 000 €	46 223 000 €	43 800 000 €	46 243 000 €	44 000 000 €	45 042 000 €	48 848 000 €	51 540 000 €	57 320 000 €	56 577 000 €	59 038 000 €
France	742 704 493 €	780 762 888 €	774 262 280 €	809 515 806 €	816 441 201 €	848 000 592 €	886 722 963 €	894 309 558 €	744 155 981 €	925 997 116 €	994 821 129 €
Germany	510 067 405 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	128 848 473 €	119 744 000 €	126 336 480 €	128 900 776 €	139 697 479 €	134 304 383 €	131 117 610 €	137 313 106 €	154 484 011 €	156 186 293 €	160 709 546 €
Ireland	38 389 000 €	37 813 000 €	37 834 000 €	38 886 000 €	41 094 000 €	43 502 000 €	43 502 000 €	44 813 000 €	44 704 000 €	51 277 000 €	59 818 000 €
Italy	1 302 805 287 €	1 460 367 057 €	1 582 477 640 €	1 400 480 991 €	1 490 299 039 €	1 556 454 804 €	1 552 866 070 €	1 599 418 728 €	1 675 736 480 €	1 837 859 138 €	1 710 949 709 €
Latvia	20 498 625 €	21 771 366 €	22 491 558 €	22 557 706 €	24 121 346 €	26 921 451 €	32 256 193 €	35 924 143 €	39 947 984 €	42 389 284 €	48 705 038 €
Lithuania	25 428 485 €	28 563 485 €	28 810 734 €	34 962 778 €	31 042 246 €	31 620 164 €	35 043 782 €	37 323 466 €	36 818 727 €	40 542 711 €	42 191 509 €
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	1 757 000 €	1 900 000 €	2 116 000 €	2 200 000 €	2 500 000 €	2 630 000 €	2 750 000 €	2 500 000 €	2 250 000 €	3 400 000 €	3 500 000 €
Netherlands	627 057 000 €	568 734 000 €	525 593 000 €	549 596 000 €	NA	566 176 000 €	576 365 000 €	535 469 000 €	557 302 000 €	582 473 000 €	681 395 000 €
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 €
Portugal	96 640 967 €	88 786 150 €	96 054 391 €	110 412 452 €	106 000 000 €	109 000 000 €	111 132 465 €	113 728 078 €	114 613 180 €	115 613 038 €	115 613 038 €
Romania	169 122 126 €	238 801 232 €	228 155 155 €	194 760 300 €	263 489 280 €	269 902 871 €	293 276 421 €	322 119 974 €	385 786 430 €	364 383 312 €	400 941 181 €
Slovak Republic	65 324 149 €	70 099 751 €	76 888 494 €	83 121 003 €	95 273 918 €	98 894 576 €	106 705 475 €	113 790 569 €	115 422 855 €	119 509 809 €	128 154 457 €
Slovenia	17 086 402 €	16 730 967 €	18 276 528 €	19 383 835 €	20 309 563 €	21 348 447 €	22 418 592 €	22 442 890 €	23 933 518 €	24 204 262 €	26 919 284 €
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 €
Sweden	142 719 691 €	138 456 474 €	151 769 003 €	156 090 472 €	154 793 265 €	149 975 424 €	NA	232 518 046 €	250 676 000 €	248 743 236 €	295 947 091 €
Average	202 994 266 €	212 269 714 €	206 624 054 €	214 770 253 €	214 987 250 €	235 080 777 €	249 184 435 €	253 775 074 €	263 157 352 €	281 492 569 €	300 509 120 €
Median	83 191 279 €	86 999 745 €	93 199 782 €	96 311 908 €	106 000 000 €	103 947 288 €	111 132 465 €	117 611 347 €	124 784 107 €	122 677 280 €	133 880 186 €
Minimum	1 757 000 €	1 900 000 €	2 116 000 €	2 200 000 €	2 500 000 €	2 630 000 €	2 750 000 €	2 500 000 €	2 250 000 €	3 400 000 €	3 500 000 €
Maximum	1 302 805 287 €	1 460 367 057 €	1 582 477 640 €	1 400 480 991 €	1 490 299 039 €	1 556 454 804 €	1 552 866 070 €	1 599 418 728 €	1 675 736 480 €	1 837 859 138 €	1 710 949 709 €
% of NA	16%	19%	19%	19%	22%	19%	22%	19%	19%	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 per inhabitant from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q13)

States	Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution per inhabitant										
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	22,50 €	25,27 €
Bulgaria	11,48 €	13,01 €	13,36 €	14,57 €	15,84 €	16,73 €	19,80 €	22,11 €	24,71 €	27,92 €	31,69 €
Croatia	9,58 €	9,66 €	9,55 €	10,91 €	11,34 €	11,78 €	14,05 €	14,55 €	14,40 €	14,54 €	16,94 €
Cyprus	19,35 €	18,41 €	21,88 €	25,88 €	21,27 €	23,38 €	25,50 €	23,57 €	38,08 €	67,71 €	37,53 €
Czech Republic	7,98 €	8,10 €	8,83 €	8,81 €	10,44 €	10,85 €	11,86 €	12,49 €	12,95 €	12,72 €	13,70 €
Denmark	16,79 €	17,16 €	17,37 €	17,29 €	19,13 €	16,18 €	19,13 €	20,79 €	22,84 €	20,69 €	22,57 €
Estonia	7,45 €	8,09 €	8,39 €	8,77 €	8,76 €	9,81 €	10,68 €	11,40 €	12,03 €	13,78 €	15,55 €
Finland	8,43 €	8,45 €	7,98 €	8,40 €	7,98 €	8,16 €	8,84 €	9,31 €	10,33 €	10,17 €	10,52 €
France	11,28 €	11,77 €	11,62 €	12,08 €	12,15 €	12,66 €	13,22 €	13,27 €	11,00 €	13,61 €	14,55 €
Germany	6,31 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	13,04 €	12,15 €	12,85 €	13,16 €	14,14 €	14,00 €	13,42 €	13,88 €	15,94 €	16,27 €	16,77 €
Ireland	8,34 €	8,17 €	8,11 €	8,32 €	8,57 €	8,96 €	8,84 €	9,00 €	8,73 €	9,96 €	11,19 €
Italy	21,83 €	24,02 €	26,09 €	23,11 €	24,64 €	25,79 €	25,78 €	26,99 €	28,41 €	31,23 €	29,00 €
Latvia	10,13 €	10,88 €	11,42 €	11,46 €	12,37 €	14,02 €	16,91 €	18,98 €	21,30 €	22,51 €	26,02 €
Lithuania	8,64 €	9,78 €	9,97 €	12,28 €	11,05 €	11,32 €	12,54 €	13,35 €	13,12 €	14,19 €	14,62 €
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	4,09 €	4,32 €	4,70 €	4,78 €	5,26 €	5,53 €	5,57 €	4,86 €	4,36 €	6,54 €	6,21 €
Netherlands	37,26 €	33,65 €	30,96 €	32,17 €	NA	32,76 €	33,11 €	30,64 €	31,83 €	32,70 €	37,98 €
Poland	-	11,36 €	-	12,49 €	15,31 €	14,76 €	16,23 €	16,52 €	18,04 €	18,52 €	23,47 €
Portugal	9,27 €	8,56 €	9,29 €	10,71 €	10,30 €	10,61 €	10,79 €	11,05 €	11,07 €	11,05 €	10,87 €
Romania	8,48 €	10,72 €	11,55 €	9,92 €	13,50 €	13,91 €	15,11 €	16,79 €	20,26 €	19,13 €	21,03 €
Slovak Republic	12,06 €	12,93 €	14,17 €	15,29 €	17,50 €	18,14 €	19,55 €	20,84 €	21,24 €	22,01 €	23,62 €
Slovenia	8,29 €	8,12 €	8,85 €	9,38 €	9,83 €	10,26 €	10,70 €	10,64 €	11,36 €	11,43 €	12,67 €
Spain	-	5,82 €	5,74 €	5,86 €	6,17 €	6,24 €	6,26 €	6,45 €	7,45 €	7,60 €	8,10 €
Sweden	14,80 €	14,20 €	15,41 €	15,62 €	15,30 €	14,66 €	NA	22,40 €	23,98 €	23,64 €	28,05 €
Average	12,14 €	12,24 €	12,77 €	13,24 €	12,90 €	14,11 €	15,14 €	15,90 €	17,43 €	19,58 €	19,91 €
Median	9,58 €	10,80 €	11,42 €	11,77 €	12,15 €	13,28 €	13,42 €	14,22 €	15,17 €	16,27 €	16,94 €
Minimum	4,09 €	4,32 €	4,70 €	4,78 €	5,26 €	5,53 €	5,57 €	4,86 €	4,36 €	6,54 €	6,21 €
Maximum	37,26 €	33,65 €	30,96 €	32,17 €	24,64 €	32,76 €	33,11 €	30,64 €	38,08 €	67,71 €	37,98 €
% of NA	0,16 €	0,19 €	0,19 €	0,19 €	0,22 €	0,19 €	0,22 €	0,19 €	0,19 €	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 from 2014 to 2023 (Q13)

States	Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution									
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
Luxembourg	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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	309 499 786 €	336 445 888 €	373 399 744 €	409 297 675 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
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 €
% of NA	30%	31%	22%	30%	22%	30%	19%	15%	15%	15%
% of NAP	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 per inhabitant from 2014 to 2023 (Q1, Q13)

States	Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution per inhabitant									
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	21,08 €	22,28 €	25,20 €
Bulgaria	12,96 €	13,28 €	14,49 €	15,66 €	16,63 €	19,62 €	21,58 €	24,29 €	27,69 €	30,66 €
Croatia	9,65 €	9,53 €	10,90 €	11,33 €	11,78 €	14,05 €	14,55 €	14,39 €	14,46 €	16,85 €
Cyprus	NA	NA	42,60 €	37,29 €	22,50 €	15,55 €	22,46 €	36,83 €	64,18 €	36,93 €
Czech Republic	8,10 €	10,15 €	10,13 €	10,43 €	10,90 €	12,20 €	12,32 €	13,35 €	13,74 €	14,80 €
Denmark	20,47 €	17,83 €	19,21 €	18,72 €	19,36 €	20,73 €	22,82 €	24,30 €	22,45 €	24,35 €
Estonia	7,44 €	8,18 €	8,61 €	8,62 €	9,81 €	10,56 €	11,50 €	11,86 €	13,33 €	15,68 €
Finland	8,45 €	7,69 €	8,40 €	8,13 €	8,16 €	8,84 €	9,07 €	9,33 €	9,94 €	10,77 €
France	11,96 €	11,69 €	12,05 €	12,08 €	12,44 €	13,06 €	13,12 €	10,89 €	13,58 €	14,41 €
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	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 €
Ireland	8,14 €	8,07 €	8,26 €	8,37 €	8,77 €	8,65 €	8,89 €	8,68 €	9,72 €	10,96 €
Italy	23,50 €	25,54 €	22,56 €	23,37 €	24,67 €	23,12 €	22,88 €	25,04 €	27,07 €	26,68 €
Latvia	10,69 €	11,42 €	11,44 €	12,33 €	13,99 €	16,62 €	18,15 €	19,85 €	19,47 €	23,81 €
Lithuania	9,80 €	9,97 €	12,27 €	11,03 €	11,31 €	12,52 €	13,28 €	12,99 €	13,94 €	14,41 €
Luxembourg	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 €
Netherlands	34,70 €	35,76 €	35,05 €	NA	35,35 €	36,59 €	34,55 €	35,49 €	37,69 €	41,84 €
Poland	11,48 €	-	12,46 €	15,30 €	14,67 €	16,23 €	16,51 €	18,04 €	18,52 €	23,43 €
Portugal	11,03 €	11,79 €	12,26 €	12,43 €	12,75 €	12,81 €	13,86 €	13,07 €	13,11 €	13,66 €
Romania	10,62 €	11,42 €	9,79 €	13,30 €	13,80 €	14,95 €	16,24 €	19,38 €	18,52 €	20,40 €
Slovak Republic	15,42 €	15,46 €	17,52 €	17,94 €	18,58 €	21,20 €	21,01 €	21,83 €	23,60 €	25,96 €
Slovenia	8,37 €	8,79 €	9,37 €	9,79 €	10,23 €	10,66 €	10,42 €	11,04 €	11,02 €	12,29 €
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6,54 €	7,09 €	7,77 €	8,42 €
Sweden	14,25 €	14,96 €	15,05 €	15,17 €	14,41 €	NA	22,42 €	23,77 €	22,91 €	27,61 €
Average	13,10 €	13,15 €	14,82 €	14,03 €	14,83 €	15,46 €	16,00 €	17,58 €	19,48 €	20,26 €
Median	11,03 €	11,42 €	12,26 €	12,33 €	13,80 €	14,05 €	14,52 €	15,84 €	16,32 €	17,20 €
Minimum	7,44 €	5,22 €	5,08 €	5,22 €	5,58 €	5,85 €	5,34 €	5,82 €	6,69 €	8,42 €
Maximum	34,70 €	35,76 €	42,60 €	37,29 €	35,35 €	36,59 €	34,55 €	36,83 €	64,18 €	41,84 €
% of NA	30%	31%	22%	30%	22%	30%	19%	15%	15%	15%
% of NAP	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: Systems for measuring and evaluating the performance of courts

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 (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". In order 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.
Reference should also be made to the Act of 13 March 1973 on compensation for inoperative preventive 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 Preventive Detention.

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.

Q037 (2019): 1. Reference should also be made to the Law of 13 March 1973 relating to compensation in the event of inoperative preventive detention. Article 28 stipulates the following:
Any person who has been held in preventive detention for more than eight days without this detention or its extension having been caused by his/her own conduct is entitled to compensation:
a) if s/he has been exonerated directly or indirectly by a court decision that has the force of res judicata;
(b) if s/he has benefited from an order or judgment of dismissal;
(c) if s/he has been arrested or detained after the termination of the prosecution by prescription;
The amount of such compensation shall be fixed in equity and taking into account all circumstances of public and private interest.
If the person concerned is unable to bring an action for compensation before the ordinary courts, the compensation must be requested by written request addressed to the Minister of Justice, who shall decide within six months. If compensation or imputation is refused, if the amount of compensation or the number of days imputed is deemed insufficient, or if the Minister of Justice has not made a decision within six months of the request, the interested party may apply to the "Inoperative Preventive Detention" Commission.
2. Compensation through the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the State liability for damage resulting from faults made by the public prosecutor office or judges, falls under the article 1382 of the Civil Code (claims on the basis of tort). According to article 1382 Civil Code: “Any act whatever of man which cause damage to another obliges him by whose fault it occurred to make reparation”. To obtain compensation, the plaintiff must demonstrate the existence of a fault, of damage and of a causal link between the fault and damage. According to the Constitutional Court a constitutionally correct interpretation of article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that the State may be held liable for a fault of a judicial body deciding in last instance, even if the decision is not repealed, amended, annulled or revoked. It is required that the fault consists in a sufficiently serious breach of the applicable legal rule and that, given the limited legal remedies available against the wrongful decision, it is not possible to obtain an annulment of the decision. These claims are brought before the civil courts.
Exceeding a reasonable time is also to be considered as a fault. However, article 21ter of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that as a consequence of a violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time, the courts can either impose a penalty below the statutory minimum or simply pronounce a guilty verdict without imposing a sentence. In addition, the Court of Cassation has ruled that the Chambre du conseil (which is the investigative court that intervenes in case of a judicial inquiry) can declare the criminal claim inadmissible if the rights of the defence have been seriously and irretrievably damaged due to the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time. In other less serious cases, the Chambre du conseil may establish the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time and commit the case for trial, after which the trial court is bound to give a proper response to this violation, in accordance with Article 21ter of the Preliminary Title of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Bulgaria

Q037 (General Comment): The Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities sets out the procedure for liability for activity of the Administration, law-enforcement authorities, Commission for Forfeiture of Unlawfully Acquired Assets and Liability for actions of the judiciary bodies, for violation of the right to a hearing and pronouncement of judgment within a reasonable time.
Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Q037 (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.

Q037 (2019): Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Croatia

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.

Cyprus

Q037 (2019): The law providing effective remedies for exceeding reasonable time in identifying civil rights and obligations provides for the filing of an action against the government for undue delay in the hearing of a case. The cases are still pending.

Czech Republic

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 (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).

Q037 (2019): The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains rules concerning the possibility to obtain compensation for criminal prosecution. These rules allow for compensation under certain circumstances for example due to the excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction. The Prosecution Service decide on requests for compensation for criminal prosecution and these decisions can be brought before the courts. The Prosecution Service annually decides on approximately 2000 requests for compensation of which approximately 100 are brought before the courts. The budget for the total amount of compensation due criminal prosecution paid in accordance with the rules of the Danish Administration of Justice Act was approximately DKK 31.400.000. This amount is however revised at the end of the year.

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.

Q037 (2019): Correction: Excessive length of proceedings number of Number of condemnations in year 2018 should have been 41, not reported 28. The number reported was the number of rejected.

France

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.
- 27 appeals to the CNRD in 2020 (4 at the initiative of the AJE and 23 at the initiative of the claimants).

Q037 (2019): 1) The Legal Affairs Sub-Directorate of the Ministry of Justice monitors, in conjunction with the State's judicial agent, liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public service of justice. The vast majority of them are based on Art. L. 141-1 of the Judicial Organization Code. The State is required to repair the damage caused by the defective functioning of the justice system. Except in the case of special provisions, this liability is engaged in respect of court users in case of gross negligence or denial of justice. The third party in the proceedings can engage only the no-fault liability of the State for breach of equality.
In 2019, the number of new liability actions brought against the State for gross negligence or denial of justice is 510, compared with 482 in 2018. 352 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the justice against 393 in 2018 (out of a total of 513). Of the 352 convictions, 302 decisions involved State responsibility due to the excessive length of proceedings (20 in criminal matters and 283 in civil matters) and the amount of 1,599,340 euros was paid out of a total amount of 5 292 676, 47 euros.
2)Article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code entitles the accused to full compensation from the State, under certain conditions, for damages suffered as a result of detention in connection with proceedings that have been dismissed, discharged or acquitted. It is the first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision of dismissal/ acquittal was pronounced, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a motivated decision that can be appealed to the national commission for reparation of detentions before the Court of Cassation (CNRD). The State's judicial officer directly follows such actions for compensation. The key data for the year 2019 are as follows: 519 new cases registered; 408 decisions handed down by the first presidents of courts of appeal; 4 transactions concluded. 83 decisions handed down by CNRD with an average compensated detention period of less than 400 days. 55 appeals to the CNRD in 2019 (7 at the initiative of the AJE and 48 at the initiative of the claimants).

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

Q037 (2019): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation. The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non-pecuniary disadvantages.
If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence.
Anyone who has suffered damage from a criminal conviction is compensated by the Treasury if the conviction is quashed or reduced in reopened proceedings or otherwise in criminal proceedings after having become final and binding (Section 1(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures [Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen – StrEG]). The same applies if a measure of correction and prevention or an ancillary measure has been ordered without a conviction (Section 1(2) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, Section 2(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures provides for compensation for the damage suffered due to the execution of remand detention or temporary arrest. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation may be granted ex bono (Section 3 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures).
The subject of the compensation is the property damage caused by the criminal prosecuti

on measure. In cases of deprivation of liberty on the basis of a court ruling, this can also be immaterial damage (section 7(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). The current immaterial compensation is €25 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced. Currently, legislative proceedings are ongoing to raise this amount of compensation up to €75 per day (BT-Drs. 19/17035).

Greece

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): Excessive length:
If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. The governement given before the Paliament in october 2018 a bill proposal on the financial compensation related to the prolongation of certain court proceedings.
Non-execution of court decisions:
Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day.
Wrongful arrest:
The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated.
Wrongful condemnation:
If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included.
Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

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.
Q037 (2019): Unfortunately, the total amount in € is not available at this stage. This is a figure whose source is external to our administration (Ministry of Economy and Finance), hence we cannot guarantee its reliability.

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 (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”.

Q037 (2019): For 2019 the number of requests is almost the same than for 2018, while the amount decreased considerably. In 2018, in respect of separate legal proceedings and damages decisions, significant amounts of compensation have been determined compared to other cases. In 5 cases the amount of compensations was bigger than 10 000 euro, representing together 118,687.31 euro. Among those 5 cases, one compensation amount was 50 000 euro. Important compensations are an exception, not a routine, but sometimes they are and have a significant impact on the amount of reimbursement paid.

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;

Q037 (2019): In category “other” the data on the number of requests for compensation is from the Ministry of Justice only, and the number of condemnations data is related to the judgements of all the State institutions, thus the number of condemnations is that much higher. The major part of applicants apply against the State to the court directly, thus the Ministry of Justice has information about the claims against the State in cases where it is the representative of the State only. Also the Ministry of Justice has data on satisfied claims in courts as it is responsible for the enforcement of these judgements.
Category “other” includes damage awarded because of the illegal actions of state institutions or officers and damage awarded because of improper imprisonment conditions.

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): The law of September 1, 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a litigant considers that s/he has been the victim of a malfunctioning of the judicial bodies. An excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such a malfunction could motivate such an action. Such complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings may also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of article 6 of the ECHR) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these latter steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes the identification of claims and compensation decisions for the different categories difficult and does not allow for the provision of figures reflecting reality. However, it was possible for us to complete the table concerning compensation for unjustified arrest, provided for by the law of December 30, 1981 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. The figures available for compensation for unjustified arrest represent the claims and decisions granting compensation in the context of inoperative preventive detention (IPR) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detention-preventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. However, we would like to point out that, in the framework of the above-mentioned law of December 30, 1981, we should not speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions.

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 (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 (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.

Q037 (2019): It's not possible to give specific numbers for these categories.
Compensation may involve people who were in custody, but were not accused or found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest, or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or have gone missing.
Numbers for compensation for wrongful arrest or wrongful conviction used to be generated by the Statistics Bureau (CBS), but that line of research was discontinued after 2016.

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 (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 invalidrulings issued against persons repressed for activities for the benefit of the independent state of Poland - EUR 13 123 0002 On the basis of Article 552 of the Act of 6 June 1997 Code of Criminal Procedure (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1987) 4 552 000 euro3. pursuant to the Act of 17 June 2004 on a complaint for violationof a party's right to examine a case in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and court proceedings without undue delay (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 75) EUR 1 005 0004. other compensations: inter alia, compensatory pensions, compensation in property damage, unlawful eviction 114 000 euro
5. under the Act of 7 July 2005 on State Compensationto victims of certain criminal acts 32 000 euro
Total compensations from chapter 75595 - 18 826 000 euro
The amount of funds spent on compensation payments to entitled persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the legitimacy of claims and the amount of awarded compensation. The course of implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the budget year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial branch of the court, occurs only on the basis of a final court decision to pay compensation to the entitled person.

Q037 (2019): The course of the implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the financial year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial department of the court takes place only on the basis of a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the entitled person.
*Non execution of decision - 317- number of persons
*Wrongful conviction - 26- number of persons

Portugal

Q037 (General Comment): There is no data with these levels of disaggregation in Portugal.
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 (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 (2020): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as a compensation. In criminal matters, the only possibility to obtain damages in case of procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, based on the provisions of the Civil Code. The new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010) provides for a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, he/she solicits the adoption of legal measures remedying to this situation. Please, refer to the regulations of the NCPC as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and a case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Illegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010). For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, common law rules laid down by the Civil Code apply. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trial, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation. The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person. The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile. The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Q037 (2019): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Ilegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

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.

Q037 (2019): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time. The compensation was awarded in the amount of 375 912 eur in 2019.
The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction, non-execution of court decisions can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.
The number of requests for compensation delivered on the Ministry of Justice of the SVK was 214. Out of these only 4 request were satisfied:
one non-execution of court decisions (allocated amount 8.640,65 €),
one wrongful conviction (167,78 €),
two other (administrative mistake of the court, allocated amount 980,16 €).
Some of the unsatisfied request end up on the court in the civil procedure. During 2019 Ministry of Justice of SVK compensated in addition (due the court decision) in 45 cases in the amount of 553 395 euros. In these cases, we do not provide precise information on the reason for compensation, but we can say that in most cases it was compensation for wrongful conviction, in which the applicant was not found guilty.

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.

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.

Q037 (2019): *The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed in 2019, with compensations to be paid in 2019 or later. The figures above represent cases
before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2019 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 69;
Number of settlements: 22;
Total amount (in €): 35.956;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 44;
Number of settlements: 16;
Total amount (in €): 99.493;
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 36.460.

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): In 2019, 347 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 151 for preventive detention, 79 for judicial error. € 3.484.896 were paid for administrative condemnations and €934.491,7 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. The answer tries to group the Spanish categories into those of the CEPEJ. In the section 'wrongful conviction', we give the cases of the Spanish category of 'judicial error'. Possibly, other years these cases have simply been included in 'other'. It is a change of criteria with no effect on the total.

Indicator 4: Systems for measuring and evaluating the performance of courts

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 (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". In order 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.
Reference should also be made to the Act of 13 March 1973 on compensation for inoperative preventive 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 Preventive Detention.

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.

Q037 (2019): 1. Reference should also be made to the Law of 13 March 1973 relating to compensation in the event of inoperative preventive detention. Article 28 stipulates the following:
Any person who has been held in preventive detention for more than eight days without this detention or its extension having been caused by his/her own conduct is entitled to compensation:
a) if s/he has been exonerated directly or indirectly by a court decision that has the force of res judicata;
(b) if s/he has benefited from an order or judgment of dismissal;
(c) if s/he has been arrested or detained after the termination of the prosecution by prescription;
The amount of such compensation shall be fixed in equity and taking into account all circumstances of public and private interest.
If the person concerned is unable to bring an action for compensation before the ordinary courts, the compensation must be requested by written request addressed to the Minister of Justice, who shall decide within six months. If compensation or imputation is refused, if the amount of compensation or the number of days imputed is deemed insufficient, or if the Minister of Justice has not made a decision within six months of the request, the interested party may apply to the "Inoperative Preventive Detention" Commission.
2. Compensation through the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the State liability for damage resulting from faults made by the public prosecutor office or judges, falls under the article 1382 of the Civil Code (claims on the basis of tort). According to article 1382 Civil Code: “Any act whatever of man which cause damage to another obliges him by whose fault it occurred to make reparation”. To obtain compensation, the plaintiff must demonstrate the existence of a fault, of damage and of a causal link between the fault and damage. According to the Constitutional Court a constitutionally correct interpretation of article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that the State may be held liable for a fault of a judicial body deciding in last instance, even if the decision is not repealed, amended, annulled or revoked. It is required that the fault consists in a sufficiently serious breach of the applicable legal rule and that, given the limited legal remedies available against the wrongful decision, it is not possible to obtain an annulment of the decision. These claims are brought before the civil courts.
Exceeding a reasonable time is also to be considered as a fault. However, article 21ter of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that as a consequence of a violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time, the courts can either impose a penalty below the statutory minimum or simply pronounce a guilty verdict without imposing a sentence. In addition, the Court of Cassation has ruled that the Chambre du conseil (which is the investigative court that intervenes in case of a judicial inquiry) can declare the criminal claim inadmissible if the rights of the defence have been seriously and irretrievably damaged due to the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time. In other less serious cases, the Chambre du conseil may establish the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time and commit the case for trial, after which the trial court is bound to give a proper response to this violation, in accordance with Article 21ter of the Preliminary Title of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Bulgaria

Q037 (General Comment): The Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities sets out the procedure for liability for activity of the Administration, law-enforcement authorities, Commission for Forfeiture of Unlawfully Acquired Assets and Liability for actions of the judiciary bodies, for violation of the right to a hearing and pronouncement of judgment within a reasonable time.
Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Q037 (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.

Q037 (2019): Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Croatia

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.

Cyprus

Q037 (2019): The law providing effective remedies for exceeding reasonable time in identifying civil rights and obligations provides for the filing of an action against the government for undue delay in the hearing of a case. The cases are still pending.

Czech Republic

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 (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).

Q037 (2019): The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains rules concerning the possibility to obtain compensation for criminal prosecution. These rules allow for compensation under certain circumstances for example due to the excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction. The Prosecution Service decide on requests for compensation for criminal prosecution and these decisions can be brought before the courts. The Prosecution Service annually decides on approximately 2000 requests for compensation of which approximately 100 are brought before the courts. The budget for the total amount of compensation due criminal prosecution paid in accordance with the rules of the Danish Administration of Justice Act was approximately DKK 31.400.000. This amount is however revised at the end of the year.

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.

Q037 (2019): Correction: Excessive length of proceedings number of Number of condemnations in year 2018 should have been 41, not reported 28. The number reported was the number of rejected.

France

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)

Q037 (2019): 1) The Legal Affairs Sub-Directorate of the Ministry of Justice monitors, in conjunction with the State's judicial agent, liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public service of justice. The vast majority of them are based on Art. L. 141-1 of the Judicial Organization Code. The State is required to repair the damage caused by the defective functioning of the justice system. Except in the case of special provisions, this liability is engaged in respect of court users in case of gross negligence or denial of justice. The third party in the proceedings can engage only the no-fault liability of the State for breach of equality.
In 2019, the number of new liability actions brought against the State for gross negligence or denial of justice is 510, compared with 482 in 2018. 352 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the justice against 393 in 2018 (out of a total of 513). Of the 352 convictions, 302 decisions involved State responsibility due to the excessive length of proceedings (20 in criminal matters and 283 in civil matters) and the amount of 1,599,340 euros was paid out of a total amount of 5 292 676, 47 euros.
2)Article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code entitles the accused to full compensation from the State, under certain conditions, for damages suffered as a result of detention in connection with proceedings that have been dismissed, discharged or acquitted. It is the first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision of dismissal/ acquittal was pronounced, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a motivated decision that can be appealed to the national commission for reparation of detentions before the Court of Cassation (CNRD). The State's judicial officer directly follows such actions for compensation. The key data for the year 2019 are as follows: 519 new cases registered; 408 decisions handed down by the first presidents of courts of appeal; 4 transactions concluded. 83 decisions handed down by CNRD with an average compensated detention period of less than 400 days. 55 appeals to the CNRD in 2019 (7 at the initiative of the AJE and 48 at the initiative of the claimants).

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

Q037 (2019): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation. The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non-pecuniary disadvantages.
If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence.
Anyone who has suffered damage from a criminal conviction is compensated by the Treasury if the conviction is quashed or reduced in reopened proceedings or otherwise in criminal proceedings after having become final and binding (Section 1(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures [Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen – StrEG]). The same applies if a measure of correction and prevention or an ancillary measure has been ordered without a conviction (Section 1(2) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, Section 2(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures provides for compensation for the damage suffered due to the execution of remand detention or temporary arrest. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation may be granted ex bono (Section 3 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures).
The subject of the compensation is the property damage caused by the criminal prosecuti

on measure. In cases of deprivation of liberty on the basis of a court ruling, this can also be immaterial damage (section 7(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). The current immaterial compensation is €25 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced. Currently, legislative proceedings are ongoing to raise this amount of compensation up to €75 per day (BT-Drs. 19/17035).

Greece

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): Excessive length:
If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. The governement given before the Paliament in october 2018 a bill proposal on the financial compensation related to the prolongation of certain court proceedings.
Non-execution of court decisions:
Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day.
Wrongful arrest:
The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated.
Wrongful condemnation:
If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included.
Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

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.

Q037 (2019): Unfortunately, the total amount in € is not available at this stage. This is a figure whose source is external to our administration (Ministry of Economy and Finance), hence we cannot guarantee its reliability.

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 (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”.

Q037 (2019): For 2019 the number of requests is almost the same than for 2018, while the amount decreased considerably. In 2018, in respect of separate legal proceedings and damages decisions, significant amounts of compensation have been determined compared to other cases. In 5 cases the amount of compensations was bigger than 10 000 euro, representing together 118,687.31 euro. Among those 5 cases, one compensation amount was 50 000 euro. Important compensations are an exception, not a routine, but sometimes they are and have a significant impact on the amount of reimbursement paid.

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;

Q037 (2019): In category “other” the data on the number of requests for compensation is from the Ministry of Justice only, and the number of condemnations data is related to the judgements of all the State institutions, thus the number of condemnations is that much higher. The major part of applicants apply against the State to the court directly, thus the Ministry of Justice has information about the claims against the State in cases where it is the representative of the State only. Also the Ministry of Justice has data on satisfied claims in courts as it is responsible for the enforcement of these judgements.
Category “other” includes damage awarded because of the illegal actions of state institutions or officers and damage awarded because of improper imprisonment conditions.

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): The law of September 1, 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a litigant considers that s/he has been the victim of a malfunctioning of the judicial bodies. An excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such a malfunction could motivate such an action. Such complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings may also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of article 6 of the ECHR) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these latter steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes the identification of claims and compensation decisions for the different categories difficult and does not allow for the provision of figures reflecting reality. However, it was possible for us to complete the table concerning compensation for unjustified arrest, provided for by the law of December 30, 1981 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. The figures available for compensation for unjustified arrest represent the claims and decisions granting compensation in the context of inoperative preventive detention (IPR) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detention-preventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. However, we would like to point out that, in the framework of the above-mentioned law of December 30, 1981, we should not speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions.

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 (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 (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.

Q037 (2019): It's not possible to give specific numbers for these categories.
Compensation may involve people who were in custody, but were not accused or found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest, or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or have gone missing.
Numbers for compensation for wrongful arrest or wrongful conviction used to be generated by the Statistics Bureau (CBS), but that line of research was discontinued after 2016.

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 (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 invalidrulings issued against persons repressed for activities for the benefit of the independent state of Poland - EUR 13 123 0002 On the basis of Article 552 of the Act of 6 June 1997 Code of Criminal Procedure (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1987) 4 552 000 euro3. pursuant to the Act of 17 June 2004 on a complaint for violationof a party's right to examine a case in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and court proceedings without undue delay (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 75) EUR 1 005 0004. other compensations: inter alia, compensatory pensions, compensation in property damage, unlawful eviction 114 000 euro
5. under the Act of 7 July 2005 on State Compensationto victims of certain criminal acts 32 000 euro
Total compensations from chapter 75595 - 18 826 000 euro
The amount of funds spent on compensation payments to entitled persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the legitimacy of claims and the amount of awarded compensation. The course of implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the budget year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial branch of the court, occurs only on the basis of a final court decision to pay compensation to the entitled person.

Q037 (2019): The course of the implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the financial year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial department of the court takes place only on the basis of a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the entitled person.
*Non execution of decision - 317- number of persons
*Wrongful conviction - 26- number of persons

Portugal

Q037 (General Comment): There is no data with these levels of disaggregation in Portugal.
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 (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 (2020): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as a compensation. In criminal matters, the only possibility to obtain damages in case of procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, based on the provisions of the Civil Code. The new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010) provides for a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, he/she solicits the adoption of legal measures remedying to this situation. Please, refer to the regulations of the NCPC as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and a case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Illegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010). For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, common law rules laid down by the Civil Code apply. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trial, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation. The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person. The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile. The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Q037 (2019): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
llegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

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.

Q037 (2019): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time. The compensation was awarded in the amount of 375 912 eur in 2019.
The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction, non-execution of court decisions can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.
The number of requests for compensation delivered on the Ministry of Justice of the SVK was 214. Out of these only 4 request were satisfied:
one non-execution of court decisions (allocated amount 8.640,65 €),
one wrongful conviction (167,78 €),
two other (administrative mistake of the court, allocated amount 980,16 €).
Some of the unsatisfied request end up on the court in the civil procedure. During 2019 Ministry of Justice of SVK compensated in addition (due the court decision) in 45 cases in the amount of 553 395 euros. In these cases, we do not provide precise information on the reason for compensation, but we can say that in most cases it was compensation for wrongful conviction, in which the applicant was not found guilty.

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.

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.

Q037 (2019): *The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed in 2019, with compensations to be paid in 2019 or later. The figures above represent cases
before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2019 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 69;
Number of settlements: 22;
Total amount (in €): 35.956;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 44;
Number of settlements: 16;
Total amount (in €): 99.493;
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 36.460.

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): In 2019, 347 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 151 for preventive detention, 79 for judicial error. € 3.484.896 were paid for administrative condemnations and €934.491,7 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. The answer tries to group the Spanish categories into those of the CEPEJ. In the section 'wrongful conviction', we give the cases of the Spanish category of 'judicial error'. Possibly, other years these cases have simply been included in 'other'. It is a change of criteria with no effect on the total.

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 2023 (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	72	7	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	NA	567	213	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	410	162	203	85	NAP	NAP	207	77	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	4 511	2 082	NA	1 190	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 225	NA	175
Denmark	3 400	1 654	NA	NA	NA	NA	235	145	165	22	3 000	1 487
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Finland	NA	NA	162	104	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	3 995	2 040	1 472	626	NA	NA	602	520	NA	NA	1 921	894
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	13	10	438	42	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	136	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	25 719	18 881	17 459	14 163	6 973	4 167	1 271	543	16	8	NAP	NAP
Latvia	24	33	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	12	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	6	0
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	15	10	0	0	NA	NA
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4 293	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	10 842	2 082	NA	NA	NA	270	NA	23	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	24	17	4	5	NAP	NAP	16	11	4	1	NAP	NAP
Spain	648	88	NA	NA	NA	NA	167	64	71	NA	410	24
Sweden	2 240	2 273	5	0	0	0	2 235	2 273	0	0	NAP	NAP
Average	4 098	2 723	2 806	1 680	1 853	1 052	482	684	37	160	1 334	516
Median	1 444	908	162	104	219	21	187	111	4	5	1 166	175
Minimum	12	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	0
Maximum	25 719	18 881	17 459	14 163	6 973	4 167	2 235	4 293	165	1 225	3 000	1 487
% of NA	59%	59%	56%	56%	59%	59%	59%	52%	70%	67%	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 2023 (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	1 537 311 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	26 620 €	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	311 320 €	NA	NA	NA	1 443 937 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	1 114 614 €	18 083 €	1,6%	NAP	NAP	1 096 531 €	98,4%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	14 641 780 €	4 046 107 €	27,6%	NA	NA	NA	NA	4 563 397 €	31,2%	5 940 587 €	40,6%
Denmark	3 973 934 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	196 986 €	5,0%	31 691 €	0,8%	3 744 886 €	94,2%
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Finland	NA	262 660 €	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	21 270 877 €	3 728 832 €	17,5%	NA	NA	14 448 388 €	67,9%	NA	NA	3 093 657 €	14,5%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	25 900 €	NA	226 800 €	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	76 368 €	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	850 €	0 €	0,0%	0 €	0,0%	0 €	0,0%	850 €	100,0%	0 €	0,0%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	168 900 €	NA	0 €	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 074 175 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	1 383 365 €	NA	NA	NA	4 248 365 €	NA	258 598 €	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	532 315 €	206 700 €	38,8%	NAP	NAP	314 499 €	59,1%	11 116 €	2,1%	NAP	NAP
Spain	2 795 290 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	9 120 181 €	0 €	0,0%	0 €	0,0%	9 120 181 €	100,0%	0 €	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Average	5 506 352 €	998 297 €	14,3%	75 600 €	-	3 739 871 €	55,1%	695 093 €	26,8%	3 194 783 €	37,3%
Median	2 166 301 €	234 680 €	9,6%	0 €	-	1 096 531 €	63,5%	11 116 €	2,1%	3 419 272 €	27,6%
Minimum	850 €	0 €	0,0%	0 €	-	0 €	0,0%	0 €	0,0%	0 €	0,0%
Maximum	21 270 877 €	4 046 107 €	38,8%	226 800 €	-	14 448 388 €	100,0%	4 563 397 €	100,0%	5 940 587 €	94,2%
% of NA	59%	59%	74%	1 €	67%	56%	74%	70%	78%	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 2023 (Q37)

States	Number of requests for compensation				Variation	Number of granted compensations				Variation	Amount paid in compensations				Variation
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2022-2023	2020	2021	2022	2023	2022-2023
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 310 376 €	1 288 715 €	1 253 752 €	1 537 311 €	23%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	332	332	380	410	8%	180	131	149	162	9%	1 290 594 €	1 106 447 €	3 224 053 €	1 114 614 €	-65%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	5 356	4 762	4 511	-5%	NA	2 490	2 153	2 082	-3%	NA	9 617 860 €	11 446 891 €	14 641 780 €	28%
Denmark	NA	3 400	2 921	3 400	16%	NA	1 499	1 529	1 654	8%	NA	2 742 529 €	3 705 779 €	3 973 934 €	7%
Estonia	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
France	908	NA	2 545	3 995	57%	249	NA	1 648	2 040	24%	1 975 018 €	NA	15 729 100 €	21 270 877 €	35%
Germany	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
Hungary	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
Italy	NAP	26 964	25 523	25 719	1%	NAP	25 853	24 563	18 881	-23%	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	45	39	22	24	9%	NAP	NAP	50	33	-34%	103 420 €	97 212 €	104 314 €	76 368 €	-27%
Lithuania	78	73	93	12	-87%	35	47	67	1	-99%	26 705 €	133 818 €	343 767 €	850 €	-100%
Luxembourg	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
Netherlands	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
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	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	NA	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	32	18	17	24	41%	11	21	17	17	0%	389 871 €	994 446 €	1 007 737 €	532 315 €	-47%
Spain	605	656	673	648	-4%	29	113	84	88	5%	569 858 €	2 289 703 €	841 296 €	2 795 290 €	232%
Sweden	2 125	2 085	2 508	2 240	-11%	1 880	1 812	2 246	2 273	1%	7 170 985 €	7 036 964 €	8 832 545 €	9 120 181 €	3%
Average	589	4 325	3 944	4 098	3%	397	3 996	3 251	2 723	-11%	1 604 603 €	2 811 966 €	4 648 923 €	5 506 352 €	9%
Median	332	656	1 591	1 444	4%	108	815	839	908	1%	930 226 €	1 288 715 €	2 238 903 €	2 166 301 €	5%
Minimum	32	18	17	12	-87%	11	21	17	1	-99%	26 705 €	97 212 €	104 314 €	850 €	-100%
Maximum	2 125	26 964	25 523	25 719	57%	1 880	25 853	24 563	18 881	24%	7 170 985 €	9 617 860 €	15 729 100 €	21 270 877 €	232%
% of NA	67%	63%	59%	59%	59%	67%	63%	59%	59%	59%	63%	63%	59%	59%	59%
% of NAP	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%	11%	7%	4%	4%	4%	7%	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 (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". In order 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.
Reference should also be made to the Act of 13 March 1973 on compensation for inoperative preventive 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 Preventive Detention.

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.

Q037 (2019): 1. Reference should also be made to the Law of 13 March 1973 relating to compensation in the event of inoperative preventive detention. Article 28 stipulates the following:
Any person who has been held in preventive detention for more than eight days without this detention or its extension having been caused by his/her own conduct is entitled to compensation:
a) if s/he has been exonerated directly or indirectly by a court decision that has the force of res judicata;
(b) if s/he has benefited from an order or judgment of dismissal;
(c) if s/he has been arrested or detained after the termination of the prosecution by prescription;
The amount of such compensation shall be fixed in equity and taking into account all circumstances of public and private interest.
If the person concerned is unable to bring an action for compensation before the ordinary courts, the compensation must be requested by written request addressed to the Minister of Justice, who shall decide within six months. If compensation or imputation is refused, if the amount of compensation or the number of days imputed is deemed insufficient, or if the Minister of Justice has not made a decision within six months of the request, the interested party may apply to the "Inoperative Preventive Detention" Commission.
2. Compensation through the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the State liability for damage resulting from faults made by the public prosecutor office or judges, falls under the article 1382 of the Civil Code (claims on the basis of tort). According to article 1382 Civil Code: “Any act whatever of man which cause damage to another obliges him by whose fault it occurred to make reparation”. To obtain compensation, the plaintiff must demonstrate the existence of a fault, of damage and of a causal link between the fault and damage. According to the Constitutional Court a constitutionally correct interpretation of article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that the State may be held liable for a fault of a judicial body deciding in last instance, even if the decision is not repealed, amended, annulled or revoked. It is required that the fault consists in a sufficiently serious breach of the applicable legal rule and that, given the limited legal remedies available against the wrongful decision, it is not possible to obtain an annulment of the decision. These claims are brought before the civil courts.
Exceeding a reasonable time is also to be considered as a fault. However, article 21ter of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that as a consequence of a violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time, the courts can either impose a penalty below the statutory minimum or simply pronounce a guilty verdict without imposing a sentence. In addition, the Court of Cassation has ruled that the Chambre du conseil (which is the investigative court that intervenes in case of a judicial inquiry) can declare the criminal claim inadmissible if the rights of the defence have been seriously and irretrievably damaged due to the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time. In other less serious cases, the Chambre du conseil may establish the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time and commit the case for trial, after which the trial court is bound to give a proper response to this violation, in accordance with Article 21ter of the Preliminary Title of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Bulgaria

Q037 (General Comment): The Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities sets out the procedure for liability for activity of the Administration, law-enforcement authorities, Commission for Forfeiture of Unlawfully Acquired Assets and Liability for actions of the judiciary bodies, for violation of the right to a hearing and pronouncement of judgment within a reasonable time.
Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Q037 (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.

Q037 (2019): Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Croatia

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.

Cyprus

Q037 (2019): The law providing effective remedies for exceeding reasonable time in identifying civil rights and obligations provides for the filing of an action against the government for undue delay in the hearing of a case. The cases are still pending.

Czech Republic

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 (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).

Q037 (2019): The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains rules concerning the possibility to obtain compensation for criminal prosecution. These rules allow for compensation under certain circumstances for example due to the excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction. The Prosecution Service decide on requests for compensation for criminal prosecution and these decisions can be brought before the courts. The Prosecution Service annually decides on approximately 2000 requests for compensation of which approximately 100 are brought before the courts. The budget for the total amount of compensation due criminal prosecution paid in accordance with the rules of the Danish Administration of Justice Act was approximately DKK 31.400.000. This amount is however revised at the end of the year.

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.

Q037 (2019): Correction: Excessive length of proceedings number of Number of condemnations in year 2018 should have been 41, not reported 28. The number reported was the number of rejected.

France

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.
- 27 appeals to the CNRD in 2020 (4 at the initiative of the AJE and 23 at the initiative of the claimants).

Q037 (2019): 1) The Legal Affairs Sub-Directorate of the Ministry of Justice monitors, in conjunction with the State's judicial agent, liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public service of justice. The vast majority of them are based on Art. L. 141-1 of the Judicial Organization Code. The State is required to repair the damage caused by the defective functioning of the justice system. Except in the case of special provisions, this liability is engaged in respect of court users in case of gross negligence or denial of justice. The third party in the proceedings can engage only the no-fault liability of the State for breach of equality.
In 2019, the number of new liability actions brought against the State for gross negligence or denial of justice is 510, compared with 482 in 2018. 352 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the justice against 393 in 2018 (out of a total of 513). Of the 352 convictions, 302 decisions involved State responsibility due to the excessive length of proceedings (20 in criminal matters and 283 in civil matters) and the amount of 1,599,340 euros was paid out of a total amount of 5 292 676, 47 euros.
2)Article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code entitles the accused to full compensation from the State, under certain conditions, for damages suffered as a result of detention in connection with proceedings that have been dismissed, discharged or acquitted. It is the first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision of dismissal/ acquittal was pronounced, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a motivated decision that can be appealed to the national commission for reparation of detentions before the Court of Cassation (CNRD). The State's judicial officer directly follows such actions for compensation. The key data for the year 2019 are as follows: 519 new cases registered; 408 decisions handed down by the first presidents of courts of appeal; 4 transactions concluded. 83 decisions handed down by CNRD with an average compensated detention period of less than 400 days. 55 appeals to the CNRD in 2019 (7 at the initiative of the AJE and 48 at the initiative of the claimants).

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

Q037 (2019): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation. The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non-pecuniary disadvantages.
If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence.
Anyone who has suffered damage from a criminal conviction is compensated by the Treasury if the conviction is quashed or reduced in reopened proceedings or otherwise in criminal proceedings after having become final and binding (Section 1(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures [Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen – StrEG]). The same applies if a measure of correction and prevention or an ancillary measure has been ordered without a conviction (Section 1(2) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, Section 2(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures provides for compensation for the damage suffered due to the execution of remand detention or temporary arrest. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation may be granted ex bono (Section 3 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures).
The subject of the compensation is the property damage caused by the criminal prosecuti

on measure. In cases of deprivation of liberty on the basis of a court ruling, this can also be immaterial damage (section 7(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). The current immaterial compensation is €25 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced. Currently, legislative proceedings are ongoing to raise this amount of compensation up to €75 per day (BT-Drs. 19/17035).

Greece

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): Excessive length:
If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. The governement given before the Paliament in october 2018 a bill proposal on the financial compensation related to the prolongation of certain court proceedings.
Non-execution of court decisions:
Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day.
Wrongful arrest:
The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated.
Wrongful condemnation:
If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included.
Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

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.
Q037 (2019): Unfortunately, the total amount in € is not available at this stage. This is a figure whose source is external to our administration (Ministry of Economy and Finance), hence we cannot guarantee its reliability.

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 (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”.

Q037 (2019): For 2019 the number of requests is almost the same than for 2018, while the amount decreased considerably. In 2018, in respect of separate legal proceedings and damages decisions, significant amounts of compensation have been determined compared to other cases. In 5 cases the amount of compensations was bigger than 10 000 euro, representing together 118,687.31 euro. Among those 5 cases, one compensation amount was 50 000 euro. Important compensations are an exception, not a routine, but sometimes they are and have a significant impact on the amount of reimbursement paid.

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;

Q037 (2019): In category “other” the data on the number of requests for compensation is from the Ministry of Justice only, and the number of condemnations data is related to the judgements of all the State institutions, thus the number of condemnations is that much higher. The major part of applicants apply against the State to the court directly, thus the Ministry of Justice has information about the claims against the State in cases where it is the representative of the State only. Also the Ministry of Justice has data on satisfied claims in courts as it is responsible for the enforcement of these judgements.
Category “other” includes damage awarded because of the illegal actions of state institutions or officers and damage awarded because of improper imprisonment conditions.

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): The law of September 1, 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a litigant considers that s/he has been the victim of a malfunctioning of the judicial bodies. An excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such a malfunction could motivate such an action. Such complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings may also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of article 6 of the ECHR) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these latter steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes the identification of claims and compensation decisions for the different categories difficult and does not allow for the provision of figures reflecting reality. However, it was possible for us to complete the table concerning compensation for unjustified arrest, provided for by the law of December 30, 1981 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. The figures available for compensation for unjustified arrest represent the claims and decisions granting compensation in the context of inoperative preventive detention (IPR) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detention-preventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. However, we would like to point out that, in the framework of the above-mentioned law of December 30, 1981, we should not speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions.

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 (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 (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.

Q037 (2019): It's not possible to give specific numbers for these categories.
Compensation may involve people who were in custody, but were not accused or found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest, or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or have gone missing.
Numbers for compensation for wrongful arrest or wrongful conviction used to be generated by the Statistics Bureau (CBS), but that line of research was discontinued after 2016.

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 (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 invalidrulings issued against persons repressed for activities for the benefit of the independent state of Poland - EUR 13 123 0002 On the basis of Article 552 of the Act of 6 June 1997 Code of Criminal Procedure (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1987) 4 552 000 euro3. pursuant to the Act of 17 June 2004 on a complaint for violationof a party's right to examine a case in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and court proceedings without undue delay (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 75) EUR 1 005 0004. other compensations: inter alia, compensatory pensions, compensation in property damage, unlawful eviction 114 000 euro
5. under the Act of 7 July 2005 on State Compensationto victims of certain criminal acts 32 000 euro
Total compensations from chapter 75595 - 18 826 000 euro
The amount of funds spent on compensation payments to entitled persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the legitimacy of claims and the amount of awarded compensation. The course of implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the budget year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial branch of the court, occurs only on the basis of a final court decision to pay compensation to the entitled person.

Q037 (2019): The course of the implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the financial year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial department of the court takes place only on the basis of a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the entitled person.
*Non execution of decision - 317- number of persons
*Wrongful conviction - 26- number of persons

Portugal

Q037 (General Comment): There is no data with these levels of disaggregation in Portugal.
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 (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 (2020): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as a compensation. In criminal matters, the only possibility to obtain damages in case of procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, based on the provisions of the Civil Code. The new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010) provides for a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, he/she solicits the adoption of legal measures remedying to this situation. Please, refer to the regulations of the NCPC as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and a case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Illegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010). For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, common law rules laid down by the Civil Code apply. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trial, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation. The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person. The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile. The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Q037 (2019): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Ilegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

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.

Q037 (2019): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time. The compensation was awarded in the amount of 375 912 eur in 2019.
The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction, non-execution of court decisions can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.
The number of requests for compensation delivered on the Ministry of Justice of the SVK was 214. Out of these only 4 request were satisfied:
one non-execution of court decisions (allocated amount 8.640,65 €),
one wrongful conviction (167,78 €),
two other (administrative mistake of the court, allocated amount 980,16 €).
Some of the unsatisfied request end up on the court in the civil procedure. During 2019 Ministry of Justice of SVK compensated in addition (due the court decision) in 45 cases in the amount of 553 395 euros. In these cases, we do not provide precise information on the reason for compensation, but we can say that in most cases it was compensation for wrongful conviction, in which the applicant was not found guilty.

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.

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.

Q037 (2019): *The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed in 2019, with compensations to be paid in 2019 or later. The figures above represent cases
before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2019 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 69;
Number of settlements: 22;
Total amount (in €): 35.956;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 44;
Number of settlements: 16;
Total amount (in €): 99.493;
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 36.460.

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): In 2019, 347 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 151 for preventive detention, 79 for judicial error. € 3.484.896 were paid for administrative condemnations and €934.491,7 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. The answer tries to group the Spanish categories into those of the CEPEJ. In the section 'wrongful conviction', we give the cases of the Spanish category of 'judicial error'. Possibly, other years these cases have simply been included in 'other'. It is a change of criteria with no effect on the total.

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 (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". In order 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.
Reference should also be made to the Act of 13 March 1973 on compensation for inoperative preventive 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 Preventive Detention.

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.

Q037 (2019): 1. Reference should also be made to the Law of 13 March 1973 relating to compensation in the event of inoperative preventive detention. Article 28 stipulates the following:
Any person who has been held in preventive detention for more than eight days without this detention or its extension having been caused by his/her own conduct is entitled to compensation:
a) if s/he has been exonerated directly or indirectly by a court decision that has the force of res judicata;
(b) if s/he has benefited from an order or judgment of dismissal;
(c) if s/he has been arrested or detained after the termination of the prosecution by prescription;
The amount of such compensation shall be fixed in equity and taking into account all circumstances of public and private interest.
If the person concerned is unable to bring an action for compensation before the ordinary courts, the compensation must be requested by written request addressed to the Minister of Justice, who shall decide within six months. If compensation or imputation is refused, if the amount of compensation or the number of days imputed is deemed insufficient, or if the Minister of Justice has not made a decision within six months of the request, the interested party may apply to the "Inoperative Preventive Detention" Commission.
2. Compensation through the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the State liability for damage resulting from faults made by the public prosecutor office or judges, falls under the article 1382 of the Civil Code (claims on the basis of tort). According to article 1382 Civil Code: “Any act whatever of man which cause damage to another obliges him by whose fault it occurred to make reparation”. To obtain compensation, the plaintiff must demonstrate the existence of a fault, of damage and of a causal link between the fault and damage. According to the Constitutional Court a constitutionally correct interpretation of article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that the State may be held liable for a fault of a judicial body deciding in last instance, even if the decision is not repealed, amended, annulled or revoked. It is required that the fault consists in a sufficiently serious breach of the applicable legal rule and that, given the limited legal remedies available against the wrongful decision, it is not possible to obtain an annulment of the decision. These claims are brought before the civil courts.
Exceeding a reasonable time is also to be considered as a fault. However, article 21ter of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that as a consequence of a violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time, the courts can either impose a penalty below the statutory minimum or simply pronounce a guilty verdict without imposing a sentence. In addition, the Court of Cassation has ruled that the Chambre du conseil (which is the investigative court that intervenes in case of a judicial inquiry) can declare the criminal claim inadmissible if the rights of the defence have been seriously and irretrievably damaged due to the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time. In other less serious cases, the Chambre du conseil may establish the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time and commit the case for trial, after which the trial court is bound to give a proper response to this violation, in accordance with Article 21ter of the Preliminary Title of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Bulgaria

Q037 (General Comment): The Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities sets out the procedure for liability for activity of the Administration, law-enforcement authorities, Commission for Forfeiture of Unlawfully Acquired Assets and Liability for actions of the judiciary bodies, for violation of the right to a hearing and pronouncement of judgment within a reasonable time.
Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Q037 (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.

Q037 (2019): Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Croatia

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.

Cyprus

Q037 (2019): The law providing effective remedies for exceeding reasonable time in identifying civil rights and obligations provides for the filing of an action against the government for undue delay in the hearing of a case. The cases are still pending.

Czech Republic

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 (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).

Q037 (2019): The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains rules concerning the possibility to obtain compensation for criminal prosecution. These rules allow for compensation under certain circumstances for example due to the excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction. The Prosecution Service decide on requests for compensation for criminal prosecution and these decisions can be brought before the courts. The Prosecution Service annually decides on approximately 2000 requests for compensation of which approximately 100 are brought before the courts. The budget for the total amount of compensation due criminal prosecution paid in accordance with the rules of the Danish Administration of Justice Act was approximately DKK 31.400.000. This amount is however revised at the end of the year.

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.

Q037 (2019): Correction: Excessive length of proceedings number of Number of condemnations in year 2018 should have been 41, not reported 28. The number reported was the number of rejected.

France

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).

Q037 (2019): 1) The Legal Affairs Sub-Directorate of the Ministry of Justice monitors, in conjunction with the State's judicial agent, liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public service of justice. The vast majority of them are based on Art. L. 141-1 of the Judicial Organization Code. The State is required to repair the damage caused by the defective functioning of the justice system. Except in the case of special provisions, this liability is engaged in respect of court users in case of gross negligence or denial of justice. The third party in the proceedings can engage only the no-fault liability of the State for breach of equality.
In 2019, the number of new liability actions brought against the State for gross negligence or denial of justice is 510, compared with 482 in 2018. 352 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the justice against 393 in 2018 (out of a total of 513). Of the 352 convictions, 302 decisions involved State responsibility due to the excessive length of proceedings (20 in criminal matters and 283 in civil matters) and the amount of 1,599,340 euros was paid out of a total amount of 5 292 676, 47 euros.
2)Article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code entitles the accused to full compensation from the State, under certain conditions, for damages suffered as a result of detention in connection with proceedings that have been dismissed, discharged or acquitted. It is the first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision of dismissal/ acquittal was pronounced, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a motivated decision that can be appealed to the national commission for reparation of detentions before the Court of Cassation (CNRD). The State's judicial officer directly follows such actions for compensation. The key data for the year 2019 are as follows: 519 new cases registered; 408 decisions handed down by the first presidents of courts of appeal; 4 transactions concluded. 83 decisions handed down by CNRD with an average compensated detention period of less than 400 days. 55 appeals to the CNRD in 2019 (7 at the initiative of the AJE and 48 at the initiative of the claimants).

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

Q037 (2019): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation. The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non-pecuniary disadvantages.
If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence.
Anyone who has suffered damage from a criminal conviction is compensated by the Treasury if the conviction is quashed or reduced in reopened proceedings or otherwise in criminal proceedings after having become final and binding (Section 1(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures [Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen – StrEG]). The same applies if a measure of correction and prevention or an ancillary measure has been ordered without a conviction (Section 1(2) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, Section 2(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures provides for compensation for the damage suffered due to the execution of remand detention or temporary arrest. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation may be granted ex bono (Section 3 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures).
The subject of the compensation is the property damage caused by the criminal prosecuti

on measure. In cases of deprivation of liberty on the basis of a court ruling, this can also be immaterial damage (section 7(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). The current immaterial compensation is €25 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced. Currently, legislative proceedings are ongoing to raise this amount of compensation up to €75 per day (BT-Drs. 19/17035).

Greece

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): Excessive length:
If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. The governement given before the Paliament in october 2018 a bill proposal on the financial compensation related to the prolongation of certain court proceedings.
Non-execution of court decisions:
Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day.
Wrongful arrest:
The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated.
Wrongful condemnation:
If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included.
Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

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.

Q037 (2019): Unfortunately, the total amount in € is not available at this stage. This is a figure whose source is external to our administration (Ministry of Economy and Finance), hence we cannot guarantee its reliability.

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 (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”.

Q037 (2019): For 2019 the number of requests is almost the same than for 2018, while the amount decreased considerably. In 2018, in respect of separate legal proceedings and damages decisions, significant amounts of compensation have been determined compared to other cases. In 5 cases the amount of compensations was bigger than 10 000 euro, representing together 118,687.31 euro. Among those 5 cases, one compensation amount was 50 000 euro. Important compensations are an exception, not a routine, but sometimes they are and have a significant impact on the amount of reimbursement paid.

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;

Q037 (2019): In category “other” the data on the number of requests for compensation is from the Ministry of Justice only, and the number of condemnations data is related to the judgements of all the State institutions, thus the number of condemnations is that much higher. The major part of applicants apply against the State to the court directly, thus the Ministry of Justice has information about the claims against the State in cases where it is the representative of the State only. Also the Ministry of Justice has data on satisfied claims in courts as it is responsible for the enforcement of these judgements.
Category “other” includes damage awarded because of the illegal actions of state institutions or officers and damage awarded because of improper imprisonment conditions.

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): The law of September 1, 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a litigant considers that s/he has been the victim of a malfunctioning of the judicial bodies. An excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such a malfunction could motivate such an action. Such complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings may also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of article 6 of the ECHR) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these latter steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes the identification of claims and compensation decisions for the different categories difficult and does not allow for the provision of figures reflecting reality. However, it was possible for us to complete the table concerning compensation for unjustified arrest, provided for by the law of December 30, 1981 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. The figures available for compensation for unjustified arrest represent the claims and decisions granting compensation in the context of inoperative preventive detention (IPR) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detention-preventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. However, we would like to point out that, in the framework of the above-mentioned law of December 30, 1981, we should not speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions.

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 (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 (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.

Q037 (2019): It's not possible to give specific numbers for these categories.
Compensation may involve people who were in custody, but were not accused or found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest, or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or have gone missing.
Numbers for compensation for wrongful arrest or wrongful conviction used to be generated by the Statistics Bureau (CBS), but that line of research was discontinued after 2016.

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 (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 invalidrulings issued against persons repressed for activities for the benefit of the independent state of Poland - EUR 13 123 0002 On the basis of Article 552 of the Act of 6 June 1997 Code of Criminal Procedure (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1987) 4 552 000 euro3. pursuant to the Act of 17 June 2004 on a complaint for violationof a party's right to examine a case in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and court proceedings without undue delay (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 75) EUR 1 005 0004. other compensations: inter alia, compensatory pensions, compensation in property damage, unlawful eviction 114 000 euro
5. under the Act of 7 July 2005 on State Compensationto victims of certain criminal acts 32 000 euro
Total compensations from chapter 75595 - 18 826 000 euro
The amount of funds spent on compensation payments to entitled persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the legitimacy of claims and the amount of awarded compensation. The course of implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the budget year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial branch of the court, occurs only on the basis of a final court decision to pay compensation to the entitled person.

Q037 (2019): The course of the implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the financial year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial department of the court takes place only on the basis of a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the entitled person.
*Non execution of decision - 317- number of persons
*Wrongful conviction - 26- number of persons

Portugal

Q037 (General Comment): There is no data with these levels of disaggregation in Portugal.
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 (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 (2020): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as a compensation. In criminal matters, the only possibility to obtain damages in case of procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, based on the provisions of the Civil Code. The new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010) provides for a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, he/she solicits the adoption of legal measures remedying to this situation. Please, refer to the regulations of the NCPC as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and a case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Illegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010). For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, common law rules laid down by the Civil Code apply. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trial, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation. The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person. The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile. The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Q037 (2019): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
llegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

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.

Q037 (2019): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time. The compensation was awarded in the amount of 375 912 eur in 2019.
The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction, non-execution of court decisions can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.
The number of requests for compensation delivered on the Ministry of Justice of the SVK was 214. Out of these only 4 request were satisfied:
one non-execution of court decisions (allocated amount 8.640,65 €),
one wrongful conviction (167,78 €),
two other (administrative mistake of the court, allocated amount 980,16 €).
Some of the unsatisfied request end up on the court in the civil procedure. During 2019 Ministry of Justice of SVK compensated in addition (due the court decision) in 45 cases in the amount of 553 395 euros. In these cases, we do not provide precise information on the reason for compensation, but we can say that in most cases it was compensation for wrongful conviction, in which the applicant was not found guilty.

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.

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.

Q037 (2019): *The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed in 2019, with compensations to be paid in 2019 or later. The figures above represent cases
before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2019 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 69;
Number of settlements: 22;
Total amount (in €): 35.956;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 44;
Number of settlements: 16;
Total amount (in €): 99.493;
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 36.460.

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 (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.

Q037 (2019): In 2019, 347 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 151 for preventive detention, 79 for judicial error. € 3.484.896 were paid for administrative condemnations and €934.491,7 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. The answer tries to group the Spanish categories into those of the CEPEJ. In the section 'wrongful conviction', we give the cases of the Spanish category of 'judicial error'. Possibly, other years these cases have simply been included in 'other'. It is a change of criteria with no effect on the total.

Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and court users

Table 6.1 Deployment and usage rate of the writing assistance tools in 2023 (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 %	95-100 %	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	12	19	13
75-95 %	5	4	3	2	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 2023 (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	No	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	No	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	No	No
France	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	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	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Poland	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	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	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	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	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Yes	26	20	2	13	17	4	23	17	2	13	15	3	26	21	3	12	16	3
No	0	6	24	13	9	22	0	6	21	10	8	20	0	5	23	14	10	23
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	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 6.3 Deployment and usage rate of the recording of court hearings in 2023 (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	1-25 %	0%	1-25 %	0%	75-95 %	50-75 %
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	75-95 %	75-95 %	75-95 %	75-95 %	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	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Germany	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	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 %	95-100 %	95-100 %	95-100 %	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 %	16	13	16	13	16	14
75-95 %	2	3	1	2	2	2
50-75 %	0	0	0	0	2	1
25-50 %	0	0	0	0	0	1
1-25 %	2	2	1	0	1	2
0%	0	1	0	2	0	0
NAP	4	4	7	7	3	3
NA	3	4	2	3	3	4

Table 6.4 Functionalities of the tool to record court hearings in 2023 (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	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
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	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
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	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Germany	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	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	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	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	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
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	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Portugal	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
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	20	8	11	7	5	15	4	16	7	8	6	4	13	4	21	10	11	6	6	18	5
No	1	13	10	14	16	6	17	0	9	8	10	12	3	12	1	12	11	16	16	4	17
NAP	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	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 (2023): Administrative: Numbers above are for the Federal Administrative Court
Regional administrative courts: NA
Supreme administrative court: 25-50 % deployment and usage rate
Q062-25 (2023): Tools were just recently introduced in Civil Law Courts and the Federal Administrative court.

Q062-26 (2023): Possibility to tag relevant positions in the recording.
Administrative only refers to the Federal Administrative Court.

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 rulings have been written in direct style. This generalisation has ensured greater uniformity in the presentation of rulings. 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 (rulings, 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. voice/text conversation)
For voice/text conversion: this is possible in the WORD application.
Limitation: text generated automatically according to CMS, Case Management Systems
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.

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 SPF 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 remembered 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.

Bulgaria

Q062-23 (2023): In 2023, the administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court started to use the Unified Case Management Information System, which allows for the relevant functionalities.
Q062-24 (2023): By Decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council under protocol No. 25/29.09.2023, the designed 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 are approved and implemented in all judicial bodies.

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 is compulsory in all matters in the form of audio or audiovisual recordings since 2009. The recording of court hearing projects have been implemented slowly in terms of both hardware and software. The crucial aspect has been ensuring appropriate funding. In the previous three years, the court hearings projects have reached their peak.

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 (2023): Civil: The system has a function that replaces a physical signature through an approval flow, but it is NOT a digital signature.
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.

Q062-25 (2023): 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): 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 hos basis).

Q062-26 (2023): Other special functionality: playback during court proceedings for jurors. Automatic transcript from recording is planned in the future when quality i reliable (currently done by court clerks on ad hos basis).

Estonia

Q062-23 (2023): Extension of the digitalisation in all the legal matters in 2023.

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.

Q062-25 (General Comment): In criminal and civil matters only the witness testimonial is recorded.

France

Q062-23 (2023):
The templates are available in civil applications and can be modified locally if necessary. As in criminal matters, pending their integration into the applications, new or modified templates are made available on the ministerial intranet. In addition, in civil matters, a drafting tool for judges (OARM) was created by a working group set up in 2011, and has enabled the establishment of a "bible" of standard decisions for family law judges litigation by providing judges with a library of paragraphs and model decisions allowing them to enrich their editions according to the case to be dealt with. The first integrated bible concerns the disputes handled by family law judges, but the tool is intended to be used by any judge, as updating allows for easier management of several bibles.

Q062-24 (2023): In civil matters, the courts have an electronic minute-book to record electronically signed decisions.

Germany

Q062-23 (2023): The responses of the federal states were not consistent. Deployment rate:
The majority of the respondent federal states reported a deployment rate of 95 - 100% (civil, administrative and criminal). A minority including two larger federal states reported deployment rates of 75 - 95%
Usage rate:
Half of the respondent federal states reported a usage rate of 95 - 100% (civil, administrative and criminal). The other half reported usage rates between 50% and 95% or "NA".

Q062-24 (2023): One federal states reported ongoing testing of AI systems with the following functionalities:
- extract content data from files (e.g. flight number, airport, duration of flight delay or engine type, cut-off device, limitation period in mass proceedings; nationality, reason for entry, education in asylum court proceedings)
- create case categories and automatically assign cases to categories
- suggest suitable decision patterns
- create summaries, relation tables or draft facts, even in standard proceedings (not mass proceedings)

Q062-25 (2023): Criminal:
One federal state reported, that a tool to record court hearings exists in criminal proceedings (usage and deployment rate 1-25%, audio and video recording). The remaining federal states reported "NAP".

Q062-26 (2023): Criminal:
Audio and video recording in criminal hearings exists in one federal state. The remaining federal states answered "NAP".

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

Q062-23 (2023): Usage rate decrease: in 2022, we provided writing assistance tools to all employees in the entire court system. These were licensed tools that staff tried out and tested. Based on user feedback, it was determined by 2023 that, considering the specific characteristics of the Hungarian language and legal terminology, these tools did not make court work more efficient. The language recognition functions were not scalable enough, so the tools 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. Although these tools were fewer in number than in the past, half of the staff used them.

Q062-24 (2023): A new feature has been introduced in the Judgement Support System that, during the anonymisation of specific court rulings, automatically suggests options for standardising roles and legal phrases consistently throughout the document. Another such feature allows for the automatic insertion of data available in the court system into designated sections of ruling templates during the editing process.
Q062-25 (2023): Deployment rate decrease: the procurement of technical equipment for recording court hearings varies depending on the available budgetary resources. There is an ongoing intent to expand and a continuous search for opportunities. Once the equipment is procured and installed, the courts strive for maximum utilization across all case types.

Q062-26 (2023): In 2022, courts had access to a licensed transcription tool that allowed for creating transcripts from recordings in both civil and criminal cases. These tools have since been phased out. While less commonly used in civil cases, the ViaVideo system is widely utilised in criminal cases and offers numerous functionalities.
Not all court hearings are recorded, even in criminal cases; however, when a hearing is conducted using the ViaVideo system, it is almost always recorded without exception. The installation of the ViaVideo system for courtroom video and audio recording began in 2018. The number of remote hearings has been steadily increasing year by year and month by month. On average, approximately 85% of all remote hearings are held in criminal cases.

Ireland

Q062-23 (2023): 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).

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.

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 (2023): (see general comment)

Malta

Q062-26 (2023): Under 'Other special functionality' we are referring to the possibility to request a copy of the transcript in all civil, administrative and criminal cases.

Netherlands

Q062-23 (2023): In principle, there is some type of support for every case type.

Q062-24 (General Comment): The tool 'Schrijfhulp' ('Writing Assistance') e.g. helps people write a response to a summons. Templates for the courts are approved centrally, so if they are available, they would be available for all courts, but no specific information is available.
Q062-24 (2023): Automatically fill in data from CMS, like names, dates, and type of case.
The electronic signature has become available since last cycle.

Poland

Q062-25 (2023): 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 (2023): Comment: recording of hearings, even if it is obligatory, requires a court decision. Systematic recording is not possible. There is also no automatically indexed recording. Indexing of the recording is performed by a court official during the hearing.

Romania

Q062-24 (2023): The user can select or remove irrelevant paragraphs or words from the documents to be edited. This allows for quick interactions, either by simply clicking on a paragraph/word, or by dragging across the document to mark up multiple sections at once. Relevant paragraphs are highlighted in green and the final document generated in Word format contains only these selected paragraphs.

Slovak Republic

Q062-24 (General Comment): Function of converting dictaphone recordings into written text - software developed for the Supreme Court by the Slovak Academy of Sciences

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.

Q062-23 (2023): 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: N/A
- family cases (Q91:2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: N/A
- 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: N/A
- 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 (2023): Speech-to-text system (TIPKO) is in implementation phase in all Slovenian courts.

Q062-25 (2023): 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 (2023): Voice recording: available in all courtrooms. Currently in implementation a new system for central collection of recordings (ASOD II), enabling (secure) remote access to recordings and providing interoperability with newly implemented speech-to-text system (TIPKO).

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 (2023): (See general comments)

Q062-26 (2023): (See general comments)

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 (2023): Administrative: Numbers above are for the Federal Administrative Court
Regional administrative courts: NA
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 rulings have been written in direct style. This generalisation has ensured greater uniformity in the presentation of rulings. 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 (rulings, orders, reports, etc.). It is called Documap.
d. The Council of State's website also offers numerous search options: www.raadvst-consetat.be.

Bulgaria

Q062-23 (2023): In 2023, the administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court started to use the Unified Case Management Information System, which allows for the relevant functionalities.

Estonia

Q062-23 (2023): Extension of the digitalisation in all the legal matters in 2023.

Finland

Q062-23 (General Comment): Our case management systems HAIPA and AIPA use Word as the writing assistance tool.

France

Q062-23 (2023):
The templates are available in civil applications and can be modified locally if necessary. As in criminal matters, pending their integration into the applications, new or modified templates are made available on the ministerial intranet. In addition, in civil matters, a drafting tool for judges (OARM) was created by a working group set up in 2011, and has enabled the establishment of a "bible" of standard decisions for family law judges litigation by providing judges with a library of paragraphs and model decisions allowing them to enrich their editions according to the case to be dealt with. The first integrated bible concerns the disputes handled by family law judges, but the tool is intended to be used by any judge, as updating allows for easier management of several bibles.

Germany

Q062-23 (2023): The responses of the federal states were not consistent. Deployment rate:
The majority of the respondent federal states reported a deployment rate of 95 - 100% (civil, administrative and criminal). A minority including two larger federal states reported deployment rates of 75 - 95%
Usage rate:
Half of the respondent federal states reported a usage rate of 95 - 100% (civil, administrative and criminal). The other half reported usage rates between 50% and 95% or "NA".

Hungary

Q062-23 (2023): Usage rate decrease: in 2022, we provided writing assistance tools to all employees in the entire court system. These were licensed tools that staff tried out and tested. Based on user feedback, it was determined by 2023 that, considering the specific characteristics of the Hungarian language and legal terminology, these tools did not make court work more efficient. The language recognition functions were not scalable enough, so the tools 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. Although these tools were fewer in number than in the past, half of the staff used them.

Ireland

Q062-23 (2023): 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).

Netherlands

Q062-23 (2023): In principle, there is some type of support for every case type.

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.

Q062-23 (2023): 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: N/A
- family cases (Q91:2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases)
Deployment rate: 95-100%/ Usage rate: N/A
- 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: N/A
- 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

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. voice/text conversation)
For voice/text conversion: this is possible in the WORD application.
Limitation: text generated automatically according to CMS, Case Management Systems
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.

Bulgaria

Q062-24 (2023): By Decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council under protocol No. 25/29.09.2023, the designed 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 are approved and implemented in all judicial bodies.

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 (2023): Civil: The system has a function that replaces a physical signature through an approval flow, but it is NOT a digital signature.

France

Q062-24 (2023): In civil matters, the courts have an electronic minute-book to record electronically signed decisions.

Germany

Q062-24 (2023): One federal states reported ongoing testing of AI systems with the following functionalities:
- extract content data from files (e.g. flight number, airport, duration of flight delay or engine type, cut-off device, limitation period in mass proceedings; nationality, reason for entry, education in asylum court proceedings)
- create case categories and automatically assign cases to categories
- suggest suitable decision patterns
- create summaries, relation tables or draft facts, even in standard proceedings (not mass proceedings)

Hungary

Q062-24 (2023): A new feature has been introduced in the Judgement Support System that, during the anonymisation of specific court rulings, automatically suggests options for standardising roles and legal phrases consistently throughout the document. Another such feature allows for the automatic insertion of data available in the court system into designated sections of ruling templates during the editing process.

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).

Netherlands

Q062-24 (General Comment): The tool ‘Schrijfhulp’ (‘Writing Assistance’) e.g. helps people write a response to a summons. Templates for the courts are approved centrally, so if they are available, they would be available for all courts, but no specific information is available.

Q062-24 (2023): Automatically fill in data from CMS, like names, dates, and type of case.
The electronic signature has become available since last cycle.

Romania

Q062-24 (2023): The user can select or remove irrelevant paragraphs or words from the documents to be edited. This allows for quick interactions, either by simply clicking on a paragraph/word, or by dragging across the document to mark up multiple sections at once. Relevant paragraphs are highlighted in green and the final document generated in Word format contains only these selected paragraphs.

Slovak Republic

Q062-24 (General Comment): Function of converting dictaphone recordings into written text - software developed for the Supreme Court by the Slovak Academy of Sciences

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 (2023): Speech-to-text system (TIPKO) is in implementation phase in all Slovenian courts.

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 (2023): (See general comments)

Question 062-25

Austria

Q062-25 (2023): Tools were just recently introduced in Civil Law Courts and the Federal Administrative court.

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 SPF 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 remembered 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 is compulsory in all matters in the form of audio or audiovisual recordings since 2009. The recording of court hearing projects have been implemented slowly in terms of both hardware and software. The crucial aspect has been ensuring appropriate funding. In the previous three years, the court hearings projects have reached their peak.

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.

Q062-25 (2023): 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 (2023): Criminal:
One federal state reported, that a tool to record court hearings exists in criminal proceedings (usage and deployment rate 1-25%, audio and video recording). The remaining federal states reported "NAP".

Greece

Q062-25 (General Comment): There are no witness testimony in administrative cases.

Hungary

Q062-25 (2023): Deployment rate decrease: the procurement of technical equipment for recording court hearings varies depending on the available budgetary resources. There is an ongoing intent to expand and a continuous search for opportunities. Once the equipment is procured and installed, the courts strive for maximum utilization across all case types.

Poland

Q062-25 (2023): 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 (2023): 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 (2023): Possibility to tag relevant positions in the recording.
Administrative only refers to the Federal Administrative Court.

Denmark

Q062-26 (General Comment): 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 hos basis).

Q062-26 (2023): Other special functionality: playback during court proceedings for jurors. Automatic transcript from recording is planned in the future when quality i reliable (currently done by court clerks on ad hos basis).

Estonia

Q062-26 (General Comment): If there is a virtual hearing, then it's possible to record video as well.

Germany

Q062-26 (2023): Criminal:
Audio and video recording in criminal hearings exists in one federal state. The remaining federal states answered "NAP".

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 (2023): In 2022, courts had access to a licensed transcription tool that allowed for creating transcripts from recordings in both civil and criminal cases. These tools have since been phased out. While less commonly used in civil cases, the ViaVideo system is widely utilised in criminal cases and offers numerous functionalities.
Not all court hearings are recorded, even in criminal cases; however, when a hearing is conducted using the ViaVideo system, it is almost always recorded without exception. The installation of the ViaVideo system for courtroom video and audio recording began in 2018. The number of remote hearings has been steadily increasing year by year and month by month. On average, approximately 85% of all remote hearings are held in criminal 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.

Lithuania

Q062-26 (General Comment): In criminal cases, interviews of minors are videotaped.

Q062-26 (2023): (see general comment)

Malta

Q062-26 (2023): Under 'Other special functionality' we are referring to the possibility to request a copy of the transcript in all civil, administrative and criminal cases.

Poland

Q062-26 (2023): Comment: recording of hearings, even if it is obligatory, requires a court decision. Systematic recording is not possible. There is also no automatically indexed recording. Indexing of the recording is performed by a court official during the hearing.

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 (2023): Voice recording: available in all courtrooms. Currently in implementation a new system for central collection of recordings (ASOD II), enabling (secure) remote access to recordings and providing interoperability with newly implemented speech-to-text system (TIPKO).

Spain

Q062-26 (2023): (See general comments)

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 2023
Absolute number (Q1, 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								
		Gross figure	Full time equivalent	Deal with a significant part of cases	Gross figure	Full time equivalent	Work without professional judge for the certain types of cases						
							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	2 614	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA								
Belgium	1 805	134	NA	No	3 846	NA								
Bulgaria	2 234	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP								
Croatia	1 629	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP								
Cyprus	154	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP								
Czech Republic	3 001	NAP	NAP	NAP	5 037	NAP								
Denmark	389	NA	NA	No	15 000	NA								
Estonia	246	NAP	NAP	NAP	502	NAP								
Finland	1 180	NAP	NAP	NAP	1 303	NAP								
France	7 573	415	NA	No	22 938	NA								
Germany	21 054	NAP	NAP	NAP	108 967	NA								
Greece	4 012	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP								
Hungary	2 657	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA								
Ireland	196	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP								
Italy	7 198	NAP	NAP	NAP	3 291	NA								
Latvia	527	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP								
Lithuania	689	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP								
Luxembourg	238	NAP	NAP	NAP	30	NAP								
Malta	51	30	NAP	Yes	NAP	NAP								
Netherlands	2 695	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA								
Poland	10 553	NAP	NAP	NAP	13 900	NA								
Portugal	2 087	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP								
Romania	4 091	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP								
Slovak Republic	1 455	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA								
Slovenia	845	NAP	NAP	NAP	2 038	NA								
Spain	5 416	913	NA	Yes	7 700	NA								
Sweden	1 248	112	15	No	9 035	NA								
Number of Yes				2			1	3	2	2	1	2	2	3
Average	3 179	321	NA		14 891	NA								
Median	1 805	134	NA		5 037	NA								
Minimum	51	30	NA		30	NA								
Maximum	21 054	913	NA		108 967	NA								
% of NA	0%	4%	15%	0%	15%	48%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	78%	81%	78%	37%	52%	37%	37%	37%	37%	37%	37%	37%	37%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Legend
Yes
No/NAP

Table 7.1.2 Evolution of the total number of professional judges from 2013 to 2023
Absolute number (Q46)

States	Total number of professional judges										
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	1 565	1 620	1 621	2 397	2 478	2 411	2 625	2 589	2 387	2 677	2 614
Belgium	1 604	1 602	1 614	1 600	1 566	1 523	1 526	1 524	1 669	1 684	1 805
Bulgaria	2 191	2 220	2 225	2 255	2 235	2 223	2 215	2 184	2 192	2 188	2 234
Croatia	1 912	1 875	1 864	1 797	1 775	1 660	1 682	1 643	1 643	1 631	1 629
Cyprus	101	97	113	111	119	118	115	126	129	143	154
Czech Republic	3 054	3 028	3 018	3 005	3 012	3 029	3 006	3 007	2 990	3 057	3 001
Denmark	355	377	374	372	377	375	375	388	388	385	389
Estonia	226	231	234	232	227	233	229	234	236	237	246
Finland	986	988	991	1 068	1 045	1 081	1 087	1 077	1 158	1 148	1 180
France	7 054	6 935	6 967	6 995	7 066	7 277	7 427	7 522	7 574	7 690	7 573
Germany	19 323	19 323	19 282	19 867	20 069	20 323	20 570	20 793	20 998	20 863	21 054
Greece	3 877	2 231	2 206	2 780	2 861	2 874	2 884	3 861	4 018	3 981	4 012
Hungary	2 807	2 813	2 813	2 811	2 828	2 892	2 878	2 789	2 710	2 660	2 657
Ireland	148	160	159	162	160	160	167	163	170	171	196
Italy	6 579	6 939	6 590	6 395	6 508	7 015	7 127	7 027	7 154	7 166	7 198
Latvia	481	488	493	503	490	NA	521	550	545	533	527
Lithuania	772	754	762	778	767	758	750	740	718	746	689
Luxembourg	180	184	183	187	198	222	226	229	230	232	238
Malta	42	41	42	45	43	45	43	42	47	47	51
Netherlands	2 378	2 359	2 357	2 331	2 538	2 522	2 523	2 597	2 644	2 671	2 695
Poland	-	10 096	-	9 980	10 047	9 776	9 736	9 650	9 815	10 560	10 553
Portugal	2 025	1 990	1 990	1 986	2 059	1 979	1 999	1 999	2 021	2 043	2 087
Romania	4 511	4 577	4 608	4 628	4 664	4 677	4 753	4 600	4 590	4 367	4 091
Slovak Republic	1 342	1 322	1 292	1 311	1 376	1 378	1 370	1 306	1 386	1 397	1 455
Slovenia	951	924	897	880	859	867	873	875	860	862	845
Spain	-	5 353	5 367	5 367	5 377	5 419	5 341	5 320	5 408	5 728	5 416
Sweden	1 132	1 150	1 159	1 179	1 199	1 217	1 184	1 200	1 240	1 229	1 248
Average	2 624	2 951	2 662	3 001	3 035	3 156	3 083	3 112	3 145	3 189	3 179
Median	1 565	1 620	1 618	1 797	1 775	1 820	1 682	1 643	1 669	1 684	1 805
Minimum	42	41	42	45	43	45	43	42	47	47	51
Maximum	19 323	19 323	19 282	19 867	20 069	20 323	20 570	20 793	20 998	20 863	21 054
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	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.

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 2013 to 2023 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	
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2013-2023	2022-2023
Austria	18,4	18,9	18,6	27,4	28,2	27,3	29,5	29,0	26,6	29,4	28,5	54,8%	-2,9%
Belgium	14,4	14,3	14,3	14,1	13,8	13,3	13,3	13,2	14,4	14,4	15,3	6,7%	6,6%
Bulgaria	30,2	30,8	31,1	31,8	31,7	31,8	31,9	31,6	32,1	33,9	34,7	14,6%	2,1%
Croatia	45,0	44,4	44,5	43,3	43,2	40,7	41,4	40,7	42,4	42,4	42,3	-6,1%	-0,2%
Cyprus	11,8	11,3	13,3	13,1	13,9	13,5	13,0	14,1	14,3	15,5	16,5	40,1%	6,2%
Czech Republic	29,1	28,8	28,6	28,4	28,4	28,4	28,2	28,1	28,4	28,2	27,5	-5,2%	-2,3%
Denmark	6,3	6,7	6,6	6,5	6,5	6,5	6,4	6,6	6,6	6,5	6,6	3,9%	1,0%
Estonia	17,2	17,6	17,8	17,6	17,3	17,7	17,3	17,6	17,7	17,8	18,0	4,9%	1,0%
Finland	18,1	18,1	18,1	19,4	19,0	19,6	19,7	19,5	20,9	20,6	21,0	16,2%	1,9%
France	10,7	10,5	10,5	10,4	10,5	10,9	11,1	11,2	11,2	11,3	11,1	3,3%	-2,0%
Germany	23,9	23,9	23,6	24,2	24,3	24,5	24,7	25,0	25,2	24,7	24,9	4,0%	0,5%
Greece	35,0	20,6	20,3	25,8	26,6	26,8	26,9	36,0	37,6	37,3	38,5	9,9%	3,3%
Hungary	28,4	28,5	28,6	28,7	28,6	30,2	29,5	28,2	28,0	27,7	27,7	-2,5%	0,0%
Ireland	3,2	3,5	3,4	3,5	3,3	3,3	3,4	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,7	14,0%	10,4%
Italy	11,0	11,4	10,9	10,6	10,8	11,6	11,8	11,9	12,1	12,2	12,2	10,7%	0,2%
Latvia	23,8	24,4	25,0	25,5	25,1	NA	27,3	29,1	29,1	28,3	28,2	18,5%	-0,5%
Lithuania	26,2	25,8	26,4	27,3	27,3	27,1	26,8	26,5	25,6	26,1	23,9	-9,0%	-8,6%
Luxembourg	32,7	32,7	32,5	31,7	32,9	36,2	36,1	36,1	35,6	35,1	35,4	8,2%	0,9%
Malta	9,8	9,3	9,3	9,8	9,0	9,5	8,7	8,2	9,1	9,0	9,1	-7,5%	0,2%
Netherlands	14,1	14,0	13,9	13,6	14,8	14,6	14,5	14,9	15,1	15,0	15,0	6,3%	0,2%
Poland	-	26,2	-	26,0	26,1	25,5	25,3	25,2	25,8	28,0	28,0	NA	0,3%
Portugal	19,4	19,2	19,2	19,3	20,0	19,3	19,4	19,4	19,5	19,5	19,6	1,0%	0,5%
Romania	22,6	20,5	23,3	23,6	23,9	24,1	24,5	24,0	24,1	22,9	21,5	-5,1%	-6,4%
Slovak Republic	24,8	24,4	23,8	24,1	25,3	25,3	25,1	23,9	25,5	25,7	26,8	8,2%	4,2%
Slovenia	46,1	44,8	43,5	42,6	41,6	41,7	41,7	41,5	40,8	40,7	39,8	-13,8%	-2,3%
Spain	-	11,5	11,6	11,5	11,5	11,5	11,3	11,2	11,4	11,9	11,1	NA	-6,5%
Sweden	11,7	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,9	11,5	11,6	11,9	11,7	11,8	0,8%	1,3%
Average	21	20,5	20	21,2	21	21,2	21	21,8	22	22,2	22,2	0,1	0,0
Median	19	19,2	19	23,6	24	21,8	24	23,9	24	22,9	21,5	0,0	0,0
Minimum	3	3,5	3	3,5	3	3,3	3	3,3	3	3,3	3,7	-0,1	-0,1
Maximum	46	44,8	44	43,3	43	41,7	42	41,5	42	42,4	42,3	0,5	0,1
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%
% of NAP	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.

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 2013, 2022 and 2023 and their variations
Absolute number (Q46)

States	Total Professional judges by instance																			
	2013				2022				2023				Variations 2013-2023				Variations 2022-2023			
	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	1 565	1 341	160	63	2 677	2 184	362	131	2 614	2 177	303	134	67,1%	62,3%	89,5%	111,2%	-2,4%	-0,3%	-16,3%	2,3%
Belgium	1 604	1 271	305	28	1 684	1 345	311	28	1 805	1 467	308	30	12,5%	15,4%	1,0%	7,1%	7,2%	9,1%	-1,0%	7,1%
Bulgaria	2 191	1 614	396	181	2 188	1 230	778	180	2 234	1 282	780	172	2,0%	-20,6%	97,0%	-5,0%	2,1%	4,2%	0,3%	-4,4%
Croatia	1 912	1 366	506	40	1 631	1 153	444	34	1 629	1 144	454	31	-14,8%	-16,3%	-10,3%	-22,5%	-0,1%	-0,8%	2,3%	-8,8%
Cyprus	101	88	NAP	13	143	130	NAP	13	154	122	16	16	52,5%	38,6%	NAP	23,1%	7,7%	-6,2%	NAP	23,1%
Czech Republic	3 054	1 859	1 098	97	3 057	1 880	1 071	106	3 001	1 841	1 056	104	-1,7%	-1,0%	-3,8%	7,2%	-1,8%	-2,1%	-1,4%	-1,9%
Denmark	355	236	101	18	385	257	110	18	389	272	98	19	9,6%	15,3%	-3,0%	5,6%	1,0%	5,8%	-10,9%	5,6%
Estonia	226	165	43	18	237	175	43	19	246	183	44	19	8,8%	10,9%	2,3%	5,6%	3,8%	4,6%	2,3%	0,0%
Finland	986	758	185	43	1 148	895	208	45	1 180	923	213	44	19,7%	21,8%	15,1%	2,3%	2,8%	3,1%	2,4%	-2,2%
France	7 054	4 977	1 708	369	7 690	5 417	1 893	380	7 573	5 386	1 835	352	7,4%	8,2%	7,4%	-4,6%	-1,5%	-0,6%	-3,1%	-7,4%
Germany	19 323	14 840	4 024	459	20 863	16 215	4 186	462	21 054	16 329	4 263	462	9,0%	10,0%	6,0%	0,6%	0,9%	0,7%	1,8%	0,0%
Greece	3 877	2 643	984	250	3 981	2 640	925	416	4 012	2 650	943	419	3,5%	0,3%	-4,2%	67,6%	0,8%	0,4%	1,9%	0,7%
Hungary	2 807	1 687	1 036	84	2 660	1 345	1 218	97	2 657	1 287	1 277	93	-5,3%	-23,7%	23,3%	10,7%	-0,1%	-4,3%	4,8%	-4,1%
Ireland	148	138	NAP	10	171	146	16	9	196	168	18	10	32,4%	21,7%	NAP	0,0%	14,6%	15,1%	12,5%	11,1%
Italy	6 579	5 101	1 164	314	7 166	5 483	1 179	504	7 198	5 528	1 161	509	9,4%	8,4%	-0,3%	62,1%	0,4%	0,8%	-1,5%	1,0%
Latvia	481	298	133	50	533	370	128	35	527	364	128	35	9,6%	22,1%	-3,8%	-30,0%	-1,1%	-1,6%	0,0%	0,0%
Lithuania	772	691	48	33	746	668	48	30	689	610	50	29	-10,8%	-11,7%	4,2%	-12,1%	-7,6%	-8,7%	4,2%	-3,3%
Luxembourg	180	139	NA	41	232	173	54	5	238	176	56	6	32,2%	26,6%	NA	-85,4%	2,6%	1,7%	3,7%	20,0%
Malta	42	36	6	NAP	47	37	10	NAP	51	41	10	NAP	21,4%	13,9%	66,7%	NAP	8,5%	10,8%	0,0%	NAP
Netherlands	2 378	1 850	528	NA	2 671	1 931	705	35	2 695	1 944	717	34	13,3%	5,1%	35,8%	NA	0,9%	0,7%	1,7%	-2,9%
Poland	-	-	-	-	10 560	9 894	469	197	10 553	9 866	484	203	-	-	-	-	-0,1%	-0,3%	3,2%	3,0%
Portugal	2 025	1 525	425	75	2 043	1 505	454	84	2 087	1 542	456	89	3,1%	1,1%	7,3%	18,7%	2,2%	2,5%	0,4%	6,0%
Romania	4 511	3 571	825	115	4 367	1 996	2 271	100	4 091	1 739	2 245	107	-9,3%	-51,3%	172,1%	-7,0%	-6,3%	-12,9%	-1,1%	7,0%
Slovak Republic	1 342	888	370	84	1 397	917	400	80	1 455	952	424	79	8,4%	7,2%	14,6%	-6,0%	4,2%	3,8%	6,0%	-1,3%
Slovenia	951	738	116	33	862	705	127	30	845	692	124	29	-11,1%	-6,2%	6,9%	-12,1%	-2,0%	-1,8%	-2,4%	-3,3%
Spain	-	-	-	-	5 728	NA	NA	NA	5 416	3 829	1 530	57	-	-	-	-	-5,4%	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	1 132	764	334	34	1 229	817	380	32	1 248	820	396	32	10,2%	7,3%	18,6%	-5,9%	1,5%	0,4%	4,2%	0,0%
Average	2 624	1 943	659	107	3 189	2 289	712	123	3 179	2 346	718	120	11,2%	6,6%	24,7%	5,7%	1,2%	0,9%	0,6%	1,9%
Median	1 565	1 271	383	50	1 684	1 192	400	45	1 805	1 282	424	51	9,0%	8,2%	7,1%	0,6%	0,9%	0,5%	1,7%	0,0%
Minimum	42	36	6	10	47	37	10	5	51	41	10	6	-14,8%	-51,3%	-10,3%	-85,4%	-7,6%	-12,9%	-16,3%	-8,8%
Maximum	19 323	14 840	4 024	459	20 863	16 215	4 186	504	21 054	16 329	4 263	509	67,1%	62,3%	172,1%	111,2%	14,6%	15,1%	12,5%	23,1%
% of NA	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%	4%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	8%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	8%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Bulgaria: 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: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.3a Total number of professional judges by instance in 2013, 2022 and 2023
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q46)

States	Professional judges by instance per 100 000 inhabitants											
	2013				2022				2023			
	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court
Austria	18,4	15,8	1,9	0,7	29,4	24,0	4,0	1,4	28,5	23,8	3,3	1,5
Belgium	14,4	11,4	2,7	0,3	14,4	11,5	2,7	0,2	15,3	12,5	2,6	0,3
Bulgaria	30,2	22,3	5,5	2,5	33,9	19,1	12,1	2,8	34,7	19,9	12,1	2,7
Croatia	45,0	32,2	11,9	0,9	42,4	29,9	11,5	0,9	42,3	29,7	11,8	0,8
Cyprus	11,8	10,3	NAP	1,5	15,5	14,1	NAP	1,4	16,5	13,1	1,7	1,7
Czech Republic	29,1	17,7	10,4	0,9	28,2	17,3	9,9	1,0	27,5	16,9	9,7	1,0
Denmark	6,3	4,2	1,8	0,3	6,5	4,3	1,9	0,3	6,6	4,6	1,7	0,3
Estonia	17,2	12,5	3,3	1,4	17,8	13,2	3,2	1,4	18,0	13,4	3,2	1,4
Finland	18,1	13,9	3,4	0,8	20,6	16,1	3,7	0,8	21,0	16,4	3,8	0,8
France	10,7	7,6	2,6	0,6	11,3	8,0	2,8	0,6	11,1	7,9	2,7	0,5
Germany	23,9	18,4	5,0	0,6	24,7	19,2	5,0	0,5	24,9	19,3	5,0	0,5
Greece	35,0	23,9	8,9	2,3	37,3	24,7	8,7	3,9	38,5	25,4	9,1	4,0
Hungary	28,4	17,1	10,5	0,9	27,7	14,0	12,7	1,0	27,7	13,4	13,3	1,0
Ireland	3,2	3,0	NAP	0,2	3,3	2,8	0,3	0,2	3,7	3,1	0,3	0,2
Italy	11,0	8,5	2,0	0,5	12,2	9,3	2,0	0,9	12,2	9,4	2,0	0,9
Latvia	23,8	14,7	6,6	2,5	28,3	19,6	6,8	1,9	28,2	19,4	6,8	1,9
Lithuania	26,2	23,5	1,6	1,1	26,1	23,4	1,7	1,0	23,9	21,1	1,7	1,0
Luxembourg	32,7	25,3	NA	7,5	35,1	26,2	8,2	0,8	35,4	26,2	8,3	0,9
Malta	9,8	8,4	1,4	NAP	9,0	7,1	1,9	NAP	9,1	7,3	1,8	NAP
Netherlands	14,1	11,0	3,1	NA	15,0	10,8	4,0	0,2	15,0	10,8	4,0	0,2
Poland	-	-	-	-	28,0	26,2	1,2	0,5	28,0	26,2	1,3	0,5
Portugal	19,4	14,6	4,1	0,7	19,5	14,4	4,3	0,8	19,6	14,5	4,3	0,8
Romania	22,6	17,9	4,1	0,6	22,9	10,5	11,9	0,5	21,5	9,1	11,8	0,6
Slovak Republic	24,8	16,4	6,8	1,6	25,7	16,9	7,4	1,5	26,8	17,5	7,8	1,5
Slovenia	46,1	35,8	5,6	1,6	40,7	33,3	6,0	1,4	39,8	32,6	5,8	1,4
Spain	-	-	-	-	11,9	NA	NA	NA	11,1	7,9	3,1	0,1
Sweden	11,7	7,9	3,5	0,4	11,7	7,8	3,6	0,3	11,8	7,8	3,8	0,3
Average	21,4	15,8	4,8	1,3	22,2	16,3	5,5	1,0	22,2	15,9	5,3	1,0
Median	19,4	14,7	3,8	0,9	22,9	15,2	4,0	0,9	21,5	14,5	3,8	0,8
Minimum	3,2	3,0	1,4	0,2	3,3	2,8	0,3	0,2	3,7	3,1	0,3	0,1
Maximum	46,1	35,8	11,9	7,5	42,4	33,3	12,7	3,9	42,3	32,6	13,3	4,0
% of NA	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	8%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	4%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Bulgaria: 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: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.4 Total number of professional judges by case category in 2023 (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	2 614	2 177	303	134	1 220	934	238	48	395	312	65	18	999	931	NAP	68	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	1 805	1 467	308	30	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	99	99	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	2 234	1 282	780	172	NA	NA	460	64	NA	NA	269	23	392	308	NAP	84	14	9	5	NAP
Croatia	1 653	1 165	455	33	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	154	122	16	16	NA	58	10	NAP	NA	46	3	NAP	29	17	3	9	1	1	0	NAP
Czech Republic	3 001	1 841	1 056	104	2 101	1 414	643	44	739	427	290	22	161	0	123	38	0	0	0	0
Denmark	389	272	98	19	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	246	183	44	19	130	100	22	8	80	61	12	7	35	22	9	4	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	1 180	923	213	44	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	314	290	NAP	24	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	7 573	5 386	1 835	352	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 407	990	290	127	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	21 054	16 329	4 263	462	NA	5 648	1 494	NA	NA	4 327	575	NA	4 424	3 509	856	59	NA	2 845	1 338	NA
Greece	4 012	2 650	943	419	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 139	619	349	171	160	NAP	NAP	160
Hungary	2 657	1 287	1 277	93	1 416	749	633	34	963	538	408	17	190	NA	155	35	88	NA	81	7
Ireland	196	168	18	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	7 198	5 528	1 161	509	3 466	2 657	607	202	3 158	2 447	542	169	500	362	0	138	74	62	12	0
Latvia	526	364	128	34	NA	NA	62	13	NA	NA	45	9	72	39	21	12	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	689	610	50	29	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	66	45	21	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	238	176	56	6	NA	99	39	NA	NA	57	11	NA	26	20	6	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	51	41	10	NAP	22	16	6	NAP	27	23	4	NAP	2	2	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	2 695	1 944	717	34	NA	NA	NA	13	NA	NA	NA	11	NA	NA	NA	10	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	10 553	9 866	484	203	NA	NA	NA	30	NA	NA	NA	31	530	422	NA	108	NA	NA	NA	34
Portugal	2 087	1 542	456	89	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	353	270	55	28	1 734	1 272	401	61
Romania	4 091	1 739	2 245	107	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1 434	953	398	83	755	486	227	42	294	201	77	16	91	66	NAP	25	294	200	94	0
Slovenia	813	663	122	28	502	402	85	15	269	226	37	6	36	29	NAP	7	6	6	NAP	NAP
Spain	5 416	3 829	1 530	57	1 411	979	425	7	1 625	1 119	491	15	543	231	289	23	1 837	1 500	325	12
Sweden	1 248	820	396	32	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	349	218	117	14	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Average	3 178	2 345	717	120	1 225	1 129	354	43	839	815	202	29	534	404	164	52	421	655	251	34
Median	1 805	1 282	398	51	1 220	618	233	32	395	269	71	17	252	218	86	28	81	62	81	10
Minimum	51	41	10	6	22	16	6	7	27	23	3	6	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Maximum	21 054	16 329	4 263	509	3 466	5 648	1 494	202	3 158	4 327	575	169	4 424	3 509	856	171	1 837	2 845	1 338	160
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	56%	44%	37%	37%	56%	44%	37%	37%	7%	11%	19%	7%	22%	22%	19%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	4%	11%	11%	11%	19%	11%	11%	11%	19%	11%	11%	30%	22%	41%	44%	48%	56%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Bulgaria: 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.

Malta: The number of second instance judges for administrative cases is included in the number of second instance judges for civil and/or commercial cases.

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

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 2013, 2022 and 2023 (Q46)

States	Total professional judges: distribution of males and females							
	2013		2022		2023		Variation 2013-2023 in percentage points	
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	Male	Female
Austria	50,1%	49,9%	46,2%	53,8%	45,1%	54,9%	▼ -4,9	▲ 4,9
Belgium	50,2%	49,8%	39,7%	60,3%	37,6%	62,4%	▼ -12,7	▲ 12,7
Bulgaria	NA	NA	34,0%	66,0%	33,7%	66,3%	NA	NA
Croatia	30,9%	69,1%	28,0%	72,0%	27,7%	72,3%	▼ -3,2	▲ 3,2
Cyprus	53,5%	46,5%	46,2%	53,8%	46,8%	53,2%	▼ -6,7	▲ 6,7
Czech Republic	38,9%	61,1%	39,6%	60,4%	39,6%	60,4%	▲ 0,8	▼ -0,8
Denmark	49,6%	50,4%	47,0%	53,0%	47,6%	52,4%	▼ -2,0	▲ 2,0
Estonia	36,7%	63,3%	33,3%	66,7%	31,3%	68,7%	▼ -5,4	▲ 5,4
Finland	49,1%	50,9%	39,8%	60,2%	38,2%	61,8%	▼ -10,9	▲ 10,9
France	38,9%	61,1%	31,4%	68,6%	30,2%	69,8%	▼ -8,8	▲ 8,8
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	25,2%	74,8%	24,8%	75,2%	NA	NA
Hungary	31,8%	68,2%	30,8%	69,2%	31,0%	69,0%	▼ -0,8	▲ 0,8
Ireland	71,6%	28,4%	57,3%	42,7%	57,1%	42,9%	▼ -14,5	▲ 14,5
Italy	47,6%	52,4%	43,7%	56,3%	43,3%	56,7%	▼ -4,3	▲ 4,3
Latvia	23,5%	76,5%	19,3%	80,7%	19,9%	80,1%	▼ -3,6	▲ 3,6
Lithuania	40,4%	59,6%	34,7%	65,3%	32,9%	67,1%	▼ -7,5	▲ 7,5
Luxembourg	35,0%	65,0%	28,0%	72,0%	27,3%	72,7%	▼ -7,7	▲ 7,7
Malta	64,3%	35,7%	44,7%	55,3%	43,1%	56,9%	▼ -21,1	▲ 21,1
Netherlands	44,5%	55,5%	39,2%	60,8%	38,7%	61,3%	▼ -5,8	▲ 5,8
Poland	-	-	38,7%	61,3%	38,5%	61,5%	-	-
Portugal	41,9%	58,1%	35,7%	64,3%	34,4%	65,6%	▼ -7,5	▲ 7,5
Romania	26,9%	73,1%	28,0%	72,0%	28,6%	71,4%	▲ 1,8	▼ -1,8
Slovak Republic	37,5%	62,5%	36,4%	63,6%	36,9%	63,1%	▼ -0,6	▲ 0,6
Slovenia	22,3%	77,7%	18,6%	81,4%	18,1%	81,9%	▼ -4,2	▲ 4,2
Spain	-	-	43,8%	56,2%	42,7%	57,3%	-	-
Sweden	51,6%	48,4%	43,4%	56,6%	42,9%	57,1%	▼ -8,6	▲ 8,6
Average	42,6%	57,4%	36,6%	63,4%	36,1%	63,9%	-6,3	6,3
Median	41,2%	58,8%	37,5%	62,5%	37,2%	62,8%	-5,6	5,6
Minimum	22,3%	28,4%	18,6%	42,7%	18,1%	42,9%	-21,1	-1,8
Maximum	71,6%	77,7%	57,3%	81,4%	57,1%	81,9%	1,8	21,1
% of NA	12%	12%	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 January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.6 First instance professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2013, 2022 and 2023 (Q46)

States	First instance professional judges: distribution of males and females							
	2013		2022		2023		Variation 2013-2023 in percentage points	
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	Male	Female
Austria	48,2%	51,8%	44,9%	55,1%	44,0%	56,0%	▼ -4,3	▲ 4,3
Belgium	48,5%	51,5%	37,9%	62,1%	35,9%	64,1%	▼ -12,5	▲ 12,5
Bulgaria	NA	NA	35,1%	64,9%	34,8%	65,2%	NA	NA
Croatia	27,7%	72,3%	25,3%	74,7%	25,3%	74,7%	▼ -2,4	▲ 2,4
Cyprus	50,0%	50,0%	45,4%	54,6%	45,1%	54,9%	▼ -4,9	▲ 4,9
Czech Republic	34,0%	66,0%	33,1%	66,9%	32,8%	67,2%	▼ -1,2	▲ 1,2
Denmark	42,8%	57,2%	42,0%	58,0%	41,9%	58,1%	▼ -0,9	▲ 0,9
Estonia	30,3%	69,7%	27,4%	72,6%	26,2%	73,8%	▼ -4,1	▲ 4,1
Finland	47,8%	52,2%	37,4%	62,6%	35,8%	64,2%	▼ -12,0	▲ 12,0
France	35,6%	64,4%	29,0%	71,0%	27,9%	72,1%	▼ -7,7	▲ 7,7
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	24,0%	76,0%	23,0%	77,0%	NA	NA
Hungary	29,8%	70,2%	27,4%	72,6%	27,7%	72,3%	▼ -2,1	▲ 2,1
Ireland	71,7%	28,3%	58,2%	41,8%	57,7%	42,3%	▼ -14,0	▲ 14,0
Italy	44,8%	55,2%	41,5%	58,5%	41,1%	58,9%	▼ -3,6	▲ 3,6
Latvia	19,8%	80,2%	16,2%	83,8%	15,9%	84,1%	▼ -3,9	▲ 3,9
Lithuania	37,8%	62,2%	32,9%	67,1%	31,0%	69,0%	▼ -6,8	▲ 6,8
Luxembourg	33,1%	66,9%	24,9%	75,1%	27,3%	72,7%	▼ -5,8	▲ 5,8
Malta	58,3%	41,7%	35,1%	64,9%	39,0%	61,0%	▼ -19,3	▲ 19,3
Netherlands	40,9%	59,1%	37,1%	62,9%	36,3%	63,7%	▼ -4,7	▲ 4,7
Poland	-	-	37,5%	62,5%	37,3%	62,7%	-	-
Portugal	34,0%	66,0%	30,5%	69,5%	29,8%	70,2%	▼ -4,2	▲ 4,2
Romania	27,6%	72,4%	28,8%	71,2%	28,2%	71,8%	▲ 0,7	▼ -0,7
Slovak Republic	35,9%	64,1%	34,7%	65,3%	35,2%	64,8%	▼ -0,7	▲ 0,7
Slovenia	16,5%	79,8%	16,7%	83,3%	16,5%	83,5%	▼ -0,1	▲ 3,7
Spain	-	-	NA	NA	36,5%	63,5%	-	-
Sweden	54,2%	45,8%	44,6%	55,4%	44,6%	55,4%	▼ -9,6	▲ 9,6
Average	39,5%	60,3%	33,9%	66,1%	33,7%	66,3%	-5,6	5,8
Median	36,8%	63,2%	34,7%	65,3%	35,0%	65,0%	-4,2	4,2
Minimum	16,5%	28,3%	16,2%	41,8%	15,9%	42,3%	-19,3	-0,7
Maximum	71,7%	80,2%	58,2%	83,8%	57,7%	84,1%	0,7	19,3
% of NA	12%	12%	7%	7%	4%	4%	12%	12%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.7 Second instance judges: distribution of males and females in 2013, 2022 and 2023 (Q46)

States	Second instance professional judges: distribution of males and females							
	2013		2022		2023		Variation 2013-2023 in percentage points	
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	Male	Female
Austria	58,6%	41,4%	50,0%	50,0%	47,9%	52,1%	▼ -10,7	▲ 10,7
Belgium	55,1%	44,9%	44,4%	55,6%	42,2%	57,8%	▼ -12,9	▲ 12,9
Bulgaria	NA	NA	33,8%	66,2%	33,5%	66,5%	NA	NA
Croatia	37,4%	62,6%	31,8%	68,2%	30,6%	69,4%	▼ -6,7	▲ 6,7
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	56,3%	43,8%	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	44,0%	56,0%	47,6%	52,4%	47,8%	52,2%	▲ 3,8	▼ -3,8
Denmark	61,4%	38,6%	53,6%	46,4%	57,1%	42,9%	▼ -4,2	▲ 4,2
Estonia	39,5%	60,5%	41,9%	58,1%	38,6%	61,4%	▼ -0,9	▲ 0,9
Finland	51,4%	48,6%	45,2%	54,8%	42,7%	57,3%	▼ -8,6	▲ 8,6
France	44,5%	55,5%	34,5%	65,6%	33,7%	66,3%	▼ -10,8	▲ 10,8
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	25,4%	74,6%	26,6%	73,4%	NA	NA
Hungary	33,8%	66,2%	33,7%	66,3%	33,7%	66,3%	▼ -0,1	▲ 0,1
Ireland	NAP	NAP	43,8%	56,3%	50,0%	50,0%	NAP	NAP
Italy	52,1%	47,9%	43,7%	56,3%	42,5%	57,5%	▼ -9,6	▲ 9,6
Latvia	23,3%	76,7%	25,0%	75,0%	27,3%	72,7%	▲ 4,0	▼ -4,0
Lithuania	56,3%	43,8%	54,2%	45,8%	50,0%	50,0%	▼ -6,3	▲ 6,3
Luxembourg	NA	NA	35,2%	64,8%	28,6%	71,4%	NA	NA
Malta	100,0%	0,0%	80,0%	20,0%	60,0%	40,0%	▼ -40,0	▲ 40,0
Netherlands	57,0%	43,0%	43,8%	52,3%	44,6%	55,4%	▼ -12,4	▲ 12,4
Poland	-	-	49,3%	50,7%	50,4%	49,6%	-	-
Portugal	61,9%	38,1%	47,4%	52,6%	44,1%	55,9%	▼ -17,8	▲ 17,8
Romania	25,5%	74,5%	27,4%	72,6%	29,0%	71,0%	▲ 3,5	▼ -3,5
Slovak Republic	39,2%	60,8%	38,8%	61,3%	39,2%	60,8%	▼ 0,0	▲ 0,0
Slovenia	13,8%	62,9%	19,7%	80,3%	19,4%	80,6%	▲ 5,6	▲ 17,7
Spain	-	-	NA	NA	56,9%	43,1%	-	-
Sweden	44,6%	55,4%	39,2%	60,8%	37,9%	62,1%	▼ -6,7	▲ 6,7
Average	47,3%	51,5%	41,2%	58,6%	41,2%	58,8%	-6,9	8,1
Median	44,6%	55,4%	42,8%	57,2%	42,3%	57,7%	-6,7	6,7
Minimum	13,8%	0,0%	19,7%	20,0%	19,4%	40,0%	-40,0	-4,0
Maximum	100,0%	76,7%	80,0%	80,3%	60,0%	80,6%	5,6	40,0
% of NA	16%	16%	7%	7%	4%	4%	16%	16%
% of NAP	8%	8%	4%	4%	0%	0%	8%	8%

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 2013, 2022 and 2023 (Q46)

States	Supreme Court professional judges: distribution of males and females									
	2013		2022		2023		Variation 2013-2023 in percentage points			
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	Male		Female	
Austria	67,4%	32,6%	58,0%	42,0%	58,2%	41,8%	▼	-9,2	▲	9,2
Belgium	78,6%	21,4%	71,4%	28,6%	70,0%	30,0%	▼	-8,6	▲	8,6
Bulgaria	NA	NA	26,7%	73,3%	26,2%	73,8%		NA		NA
Croatia	57,5%	42,5%	67,6%	32,4%	71,0%	29,0%	▲	13,5	▼	-13,5
Cyprus	76,9%	23,1%	53,8%	46,2%	50,0%	50,0%	▼	-26,9	▲	26,9
Czech Republic	74,2%	25,8%	75,5%	24,5%	76,9%	23,1%	▲	2,7	▼	-2,7
Denmark	72,2%	27,8%	77,8%	22,2%	78,9%	21,1%	▲	6,7	▼	-6,7
Estonia	88,9%	11,1%	68,4%	31,6%	63,2%	36,8%	▼	-25,7	▲	25,7
Finland	62,8%	37,2%	62,2%	37,8%	68,2%	31,8%	▲	5,4	▼	-5,4
France	58,0%	42,0%	50,5%	49,5%	46,9%	53,1%	▼	-11,1	▲	11,1
Germany	75,8%	24,2%	63,9%	36,1%	63,9%	36,1%	▼	-12,0	▲	12,0
Greece	NA	NA	32,2%	67,8%	32,2%	67,8%		NA		NA
Hungary	50,0%	50,0%	40,2%	59,8%	40,9%	59,1%	▼	-9,1	▲	9,1
Ireland	70,0%	30,0%	66,7%	33,3%	60,0%	40,0%	▼	-10,0	▲	10,0
Italy	76,1%	23,9%	67,3%	32,7%	68,2%	31,8%	▼	-7,9	▲	7,9
Latvia	46,0%	54,0%	31,4%	68,6%	34,3%	65,7%	▼	-11,7	▲	11,7
Lithuania	72,7%	27,3%	43,3%	56,7%	44,8%	55,2%	▼	-27,9	▲	27,9
Luxembourg	41,5%	58,5%	60,0%	40,0%	16,7%	83,3%	▼	-24,8	▲	24,8
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP		NAP		NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	60,0%	40,0%	55,9%	44,1%		NA		NA
Poland	-	-	71,6%	28,4%	70,9%	29,1%		-		-
Portugal	90,7%	9,3%	66,7%	33,3%	65,2%	34,8%	▼	-25,5	▲	25,5
Romania	15,7%	84,3%	23,0%	77,0%	29,0%	71,0%	▲	13,3	▼	-13,3
Slovak Republic	46,4%	53,6%	43,8%	56,3%	45,6%	54,4%	▼	-0,9	▲	0,9
Slovenia	60,6%	39,4%	56,7%	43,3%	51,7%	48,3%	▼	-8,9	▲	8,9
Spain	-	-	NA	NA	78,9%	21,1%		-		-
Sweden	61,8%	38,2%	65,6%	34,4%	62,5%	37,5%	▲	0,7	▼	-0,7
Average	64,0%	36,0%	56,2%	43,8%	55,0%	45,0%		-8,5		8,5
Median	67,4%	32,6%	60,0%	40,0%	59,1%	40,9%		-9,1		9,1
Minimum	15,7%	9,3%	23,0%	22,2%	16,7%	21,1%		-27,9		-13,5
Maximum	90,7%	84,3%	77,8%	77,0%	78,9%	83,3%		13,5		27,9
% of NA	12%	12%	4%	4%	0%	0%		12%		12%
% 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: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.2.1 Total number of non-judge staff (absolute number and per 100 000 inhabitants) and their distribution by category in 2023 (Q1, Q52)

States	Total number of non-judge staff in 2023		Distribution of non-judge staff by category in 2023				
	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	5 498	60,0	697	767	3 484	105	445
Belgium	5 718	48,6	NAP	4 982	157	579	0
Bulgaria	6 606	102,5	NAP	4 936	994	636	40
Croatia	5 989	155,4	578	4 166	571	674	NAP
Cyprus	582	62,3	NAP	172	176	185	49
Czech Republic	9 827	90,2	2 509	4 473	2 163	636	46
Denmark	1 840	31,0	355	5	1 385	85	10
Estonia	803	58,8	55	591	71	54	32
Finland	2 199	39,2	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	25 947	37,9	NAP	19 730	4 116	908	1 193
Germany	53 717	63,4	8 559	27 347	6 934	4 189	6 888
Greece	4 776	45,9	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	8 383	87,5	963	833	NA	NA	6 587
Ireland	1 294	24,2	24	1 010	122	59	79
Italy	26 573	45,0	NAP	17 636	4 945	2 112	1 880
Latvia	1 657	88,5	NAP	1 041	471	128	17
Lithuania	2 553	88,5	NAP	1 423	813	240	77
Luxembourg	253	37,6	NAP	233	4	4	12
Malta	498	88,4	NAP	324	47	11	116
Netherlands	7 972	44,4	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	44 117	117,2	2 750	25 108	8 692	2 124	5 443
Portugal	5 698	53,6	NAP	4 967	81	426	224
Romania	11 469	60,2	NAP	6 747	1 777	1 733	1 212
Slovak Republic	4 975	91,7	1 256	2 194	1 525	NA	NA
Slovenia	3 428	161,4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Spain	50 069	103,0	4 525	NAP	NAP	NAP	45 544
Sweden	4 724	44,8	NAP	3 152	679	179	714
Average	11 006	71,5	2 025	5 993	1 867	753	3 362
Median	5 498	60,2	963	2 673	813	333	116
Minimum	253	24,2	24	5	4	4	0
Maximum	53 717	161,4	8 559	27 347	8 692	4 189	45 544
% of NA	0%	0%	4%	15%	19%	22%	11%
% of NAP	0%	0%	56%	4%	4%	4%	11%

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Poland: Starting from 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.2 Evolution of the total number of non-judge staff (absolute number) from 2013 to 2023 (Q52)

States	Total number of non-judge staff										
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	4 698	4 705	4 735	5 544	5 544	4 966	5 117	5 270	4 997	5 410	5 498
Belgium	5 307	5 290	5 204	5 054	4 940	4 974	5 614	5 064	5 097	5 712	5 718
Bulgaria	5 958	6 014	6 143	6 174	6 212	6 262	6 323	6 329	6 475	6 587	6 606
Croatia	6 222	6 061	5 929	5 827	5 900	5 828	5 929	5 886	6 027	6 002	5 989
Cyprus	427	448	424	437	441	427	475	449	496	513	582
Czech Republic	9 107	9 309	9 409	9 714	9 887	9 857	9 989	9 921	9 914	9 868	9 827
Denmark	1 751	1 754	1 529	1 642	1 634	1 656	1 775	1 816	1 799	1 779	1 840
Estonia	990	1 017	965	877	846	819	802	825	799	806	803
Finland	2 196	2 161	2 145	2 170	2 137	2 131	2 128	2 162	2 208	2 194	2 199
France	21 946	22 360	22 326	22 712	22 714	22 844	23 396	24 062	22 115	25 388	25 947
Germany	53 302	53 302	53 292	53 181	53 178	54 072	54 434	54 107	54 117	52 999	53 717
Greece	5 376	5 474	5 572	4 236	4 145	4 179	4 284	4 198	4 774	4 770	4 776
Hungary	8 000	8 022	7 979	8 003	8 379	8 528	8 538	8 576	8 638	8 483	8 383
Ireland	927	927	942	975	1 023	1 049	1 080	1 089	1 145	1 253	1 294
Italy	22 991	21 903	21 360	21 182	20 664	22 401	21 808	21 193	22 222	25 947	26 573
Latvia	1 594	1 578	1 519	1 582	1 536	NA	1 678	1 666	1 615	1 648	1 657
Lithuania	2 602	2 608	2 729	2 740	2 722	2 664	2 684	2 709	2 646	2 608	2 553
Luxembourg	198	196	197	200	200	220	225	223	239	248	253
Malta	451	389	393	383	394	413	412	396	449	464	498
Netherlands	7 287	7 422	7 265	7 317	7 523	7 492	7 699	7 435	7 653	7 736	7 972
Poland	-	41 534	-	43 176	46 807	40 662	41 927	41 973	42 854	44 832	44 117
Portugal	6 005	5 698	5 799	5 652	5 789	5 818	5 829	5 779	5 732	5 412	5 698
Romania	9 639	10 147	10 251	10 297	10 638	10 662	10 700	10 512	11 144	11 071	11 469
Slovak Republic	4 497	4 468	4 390	4 482	4 616	4 710	4 731	4 912	4 361	4 642	4 975
Slovenia	3 239	3 355	3 300	3 330	3 328	3 391	3 427	3 427	3 455	3 416	3 428
Spain	-	48 563	49 746	49 186	46 871	47 645	47 816	48 620	49 137	49 802	50 069
Sweden	4 716	4 797	4 800	4 859	5 088	5 208	4 921	4 996	4 989	4 873	4 724
Average	7 577	10 352	9 167	10 405	10 487	10 726	10 509	10 504	10 559	10 906	11 006
Median	4 716	5 290	5 002	5 054	5 088	5 091	5 117	5 064	4 997	5 410	5 498
Minimum	198	196	197	200	200	220	225	223	239	248	253
Maximum	53 302	53 302	53 292	53 181	53 178	54 072	54 434	54 107	54 117	52 999	53 717
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018.

Poland: Starting from 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.2a Evolution of the total number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants from 2013 to 2023 and their variations (Q1, Q52)

States	Total number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants											Variations of the number of non-judge staff	
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2013-2023	2022-2023
Austria	55,4	54,8	54,4	63,4	63,0	56,3	57,5	59,0	55,7	59,4	60,0	8,4%	1,0%
Belgium	47,6	47,2	46,2	44,6	43,4	43,5	49,1	44,0	44,1	48,8	48,6	2,1%	-0,5%
Bulgaria	82,2	83,5	85,9	86,9	88,1	89,5	91,0	91,5	94,7	102,2	102,5	24,6%	0,3%
Croatia	146,5	143,4	141,5	140,3	143,7	143,0	146,1	145,8	155,7	155,9	155,4	6,1%	-0,3%
Cyprus	49,8	52,2	50,0	51,5	51,6	48,7	53,5	50,1	54,8	55,7	62,3	25,3%	11,9%
Czech Republic	86,6	88,4	89,2	91,8	93,4	92,6	93,6	92,7	94,3	90,9	90,2	4,0%	-0,9%
Denmark	31,1	31,0	26,8	28,6	28,3	28,5	30,5	31,1	30,6	30,0	31,0	-0,4%	3,4%
Estonia	75,2	77,4	73,3	66,7	64,3	62,1	60,5	62,1	60,1	60,7	58,8	-21,9%	-3,1%
Finland	40,3	39,5	39,1	39,4	38,8	38,6	38,5	39,1	39,8	39,4	39,2	-2,8%	-0,7%
France	33,3	33,7	33,5	33,9	33,8	34,1	34,9	35,7	32,7	37,3	37,9	13,8%	1,7%
Germany	66,0	66,0	65,2	64,7	64,3	65,1	65,5	65,1	65,0	62,8	63,4	-3,9%	1,0%
Greece	48,6	50,5	51,3	39,3	38,5	38,9	39,9	39,2	44,7	44,7	45,9	-5,6%	2,7%
Hungary	81,0	81,4	81,2	81,7	84,8	88,9	87,4	86,7	89,2	88,4	87,5	8,0%	-1,0%
Ireland	20,1	20,0	20,2	20,9	21,3	21,6	21,9	21,9	22,3	24,3	24,2	20,2%	-0,5%
Italy	38,5	36,0	35,2	35,0	34,2	37,1	36,2	35,8	37,7	44,1	45,0	16,9%	2,2%
Latvia	78,8	78,8	77,1	80,3	78,8	NA	88,0	88,0	86,1	87,5	88,5	12,4%	1,1%
Lithuania	88,4	89,3	94,5	96,2	96,9	95,3	96,1	96,9	94,3	91,3	88,5	0,1%	-3,1%
Luxembourg	36,0	34,8	35,0	33,9	33,2	35,8	35,9	35,1	37,0	37,5	37,6	4,6%	0,3%
Malta	105,0	88,5	87,3	83,2	82,8	86,8	83,5	77,0	87,0	89,2	88,4	-15,8%	-0,9%
Netherlands	43,3	43,9	42,8	42,8	43,8	43,4	44,2	42,5	43,7	43,4	44,4	2,6%	2,3%
Poland	-	107,9	-	112,3	121,8	105,9	109,2	109,8	112,5	118,7	117,2	-	-1,3%
Portugal	57,6	54,9	56,1	54,8	56,3	56,6	56,6	56,1	55,4	51,7	53,6	-7,0%	3,6%
Romania	48,3	45,5	51,9	52,4	54,5	54,9	55,1	54,8	58,5	58,1	60,2	24,5%	3,5%
Slovak Republic	83,0	82,4	80,9	82,5	84,8	86,4	86,7	90,0	80,2	85,5	91,7	10,5%	7,3%
Slovenia	157,2	162,8	159,9	161,2	161,0	163,0	163,5	162,5	164,0	161,4	161,4	2,7%	0,0%
Spain	-	104,6	107,1	105,7	100,4	101,4	100,8	102,7	103,6	103,6	103,0	-	-0,6%
Sweden	48,9	49,2	48,7	48,6	50,3	50,9	47,6	48,1	47,7	46,3	44,8	-8,4%	-3,3%
Average	66,0	68,4	66,7	68,2	68,7	68,0	69,4	69,0	70,0	71,1	71,5	0,0	0,0
Median	55,4	54,9	55,2	63,4	63,0	56,5	57,5	59,0	58,5	59,4	60,2	0,0	0,0
Minimum	20,1	20,0	20,2	20,9	21,3	21,6	21,9	21,9	22,3	24,3	24,2	-0,2	0,0
Maximum	157,2	162,8	159,9	161,2	161,0	163,0	163,5	162,5	164,0	161,4	161,4	0,3	0,1
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018.

Poland: Starting from 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.3 Number of non-judge staff by instance in 2023 (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	4 823	510	165	87,7%	9,3%	3,0%
Belgium	4 453	529	83	87,9%	10,4%	1,6%
Bulgaria	4 272	1 890	444	64,7%	28,6%	6,7%
Croatia	4 971	931	87	83,0%	15,5%	1,5%
Cyprus	489	27	66	84,0%	4,6%	11,3%
Czech Republic	6 429	2 936	462	65,4%	29,9%	4,7%
Denmark	1 643	174	23	89,3%	9,5%	1,3%
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Finland	1 815	238	146	82,5%	10,8%	6,6%
France	20 106	3 588	752	82,2%	14,7%	3,1%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	3 340	653	783	69,9%	13,7%	16,4%
Hungary	3 975	4 142	266	47,4%	49,4%	3,2%
Ireland	1 272	14	8	98,3%	1,1%	0,6%
Italy	21 274	4 239	1 060	80,1%	16,0%	4,0%
Latvia	1 237	309	111	74,7%	18,6%	6,7%
Lithuania	1 798	663	92	70,4%	26,0%	3,6%
Luxembourg	221	30	2	87,4%	11,9%	0,8%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	6 689	1 073	210	83,9%	13,5%	2,6%
Poland	NA	NA	757	NA	NA	1,7%
Portugal	5 287	262	149	92,8%	4,6%	2,6%
Romania	4 671	6 267	531	40,7%	54,6%	4,6%
Slovak Republic	3 839	922	209	77,2%	18,5%	4,2%
Slovenia	3 005	285	138	87,7%	8,3%	4,0%
Spain	45 140	4 447	482	90,2%	8,9%	1,0%
Sweden	3 720	867	137	78,7%	18,4%	2,9%
Average	6 716	1 522	298	78,5%	17,2%	4,1%
Median	3 975	663	157	82,5%	13,7%	3,1%
Minimum	221	14	2	40,7%	1,1%	0,6%
Maximum	45 140	6 267	1 060	98,3%	54,6%	16,4%
% of NA	15%	15%	11%	15%	15%	11%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

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 2023 (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	29,0%	71,0%	28,6%	71,4%	32,7%	67,3%	31,5%	68,5%
Belgium	25,7%	74,3%	24,7%	75,3%	32,7%	67,3%	33,7%	66,3%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	13,8%	86,2%	13,2%	86,8%	16,1%	83,8%	24,1%	75,9%
Cyprus	34,4%	65,6%	37,0%	63,0%	3,7%	96,3%	27,3%	72,7%
Czech Republic	12,9%	87,1%	9,3%	90,7%	17,1%	82,9%	35,5%	64,5%
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	14,6%	85,4%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Finland	23,0%	77,0%	22,5%	77,5%	23,9%	76,1%	27,4%	72,6%
France	19,0%	81,0%	17,5%	82,5%	24,2%	75,8%	36,0%	64,0%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	26,4%	73,6%	25,2%	74,8%	25,4%	74,6%	32,3%	67,7%
Hungary	15,9%	84,1%	10,3%	89,7%	20,5%	79,5%	27,4%	72,6%
Ireland	38,5%	61,5%	38,0%	62,0%	71,4%	28,6%	62,5%	37,5%
Italy	33,3%	66,7%	33,0%	67,0%	34,5%	65,5%	34,3%	65,7%
Latvia	7,1%	92,9%	5,5%	94,5%	10,4%	89,6%	16,2%	83,8%
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	36,0%	64,0%	36,2%	63,8%	33,3%	66,7%	50,0%	50,0%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	16,1%	83,9%	NA	NA	NA	NA	31,7%	68,3%
Portugal	33,5%	66,5%	33,4%	66,6%	36,3%	63,7%	30,2%	69,8%
Romania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	15,2%	84,8%	12,7%	87,3%	22,6%	77,4%	28,7%	71,3%
Slovenia	12,5%	87,5%	11,0%	89,0%	20,0%	80,0%	29,7%	70,3%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	26,3%	73,7%	26,4%	73,6%	26,1%	73,9%	24,8%	75,2%
Average	22,8%	77,2%	22,6%	77,4%	26,5%	73,5%	32,4%	67,6%
Median	23,0%	77,0%	24,7%	75,3%	24,2%	75,8%	30,9%	69,1%
Minimum	7,1%	61,5%	5,5%	62,0%	3,7%	28,6%	16,2%	37,5%
Maximum	38,5%	92,9%	38,0%	94,5%	71,4%	96,3%	62,5%	83,8%
% of NA	30%	30%	37%	37%	37%	37%	33%	33%
% of NAP	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.

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2103, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Poland: Starting from 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.5 Number of professional judges and number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q46, Q52)

States	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		2023	
	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	18,4	55,4	18,9	54,8	18,6	54,4	27,4	63,4	28,2	63,0	27,3	56,3	29,5	57,5	29,0	59,0	26,6	55,7	29,4	59,4	28,5	60,0
Belgium	14,4	47,6	14,3	47,2	14,3	46,2	14,1	44,6	13,8	43,4	13,3	43,5	13,3	49,1	13,2	44,0	14,4	44,1	14,4	48,8	15,3	48,6
Bulgaria	30,2	82,2	30,8	83,5	31,1	85,9	31,8	86,9	31,7	88,1	31,8	89,5	31,9	91,0	31,6	91,5	32,1	94,7	33,9	102,2	34,7	102,5
Croatia	45,0	146,5	44,4	143,4	44,5	141,5	43,3	140,3	43,2	143,7	40,7	143,0	41,4	146,1	40,7	145,8	42,4	155,7	42,4	155,9	42,3	155,4
Cyprus	11,8	49,8	11,3	52,2	13,3	50,0	13,1	51,5	13,9	51,6	13,5	48,7	13,0	53,5	14,1	50,1	14,3	54,8	15,5	55,7	16,5	62,3
Czech Republic	29,1	86,6	28,8	88,4	28,6	89,2	28,4	91,8	28,4	93,4	28,4	92,6	28,2	93,6	28,1	92,7	28,4	94,3	28,2	90,9	27,5	90,2
Denmark	6,3	31,1	6,7	31,0	6,6	26,8	6,5	28,6	6,5	28,3	6,5	28,5	6,4	30,5	6,6	31,1	6,6	30,6	6,5	30,0	6,6	31,0
Estonia	17,2	75,2	17,6	77,4	17,8	73,3	17,6	66,7	17,3	64,3	17,7	62,1	17,3	60,5	17,6	62,1	17,7	60,1	17,8	60,7	18,0	58,8
Finland	18,1	40,3	18,1	39,5	18,1	39,1	19,4	39,4	19,0	38,8	19,6	38,6	19,7	38,5	19,5	39,1	20,9	39,8	20,6	39,4	21,0	39,2
France	10,7	33,3	10,5	33,7	10,5	33,5	10,4	33,9	10,5	33,8	10,9	34,1	11,1	34,9	11,2	35,7	11,2	32,7	11,3	37,3	11,1	37,9
Germany	23,9	66,0	23,9	66,0	23,6	65,2	24,2	64,7	24,3	64,3	24,5	65,1	24,7	65,5	25,0	65,1	25,2	65,0	24,7	62,8	24,9	63,4
Greece	35,0	48,6	20,6	50,5	20,3	51,3	25,8	39,3	26,6	38,5	26,8	38,9	26,9	39,9	36,0	39,2	37,6	44,7	37,3	44,7	38,5	45,9
Hungary	28,4	81,0	28,5	81,4	28,6	81,2	28,7	81,7	28,6	84,8	30,2	88,9	29,5	87,4	28,2	86,7	28,0	89,2	27,7	88,4	27,7	87,5
Ireland	3,2	20,1	3,5	20,0	3,4	20,2	3,5	20,9	3,3	21,3	3,3	21,6	3,4	21,9	3,3	21,9	3,3	22,3	3,3	24,3	3,7	24,2
Italy	11,0	38,5	11,4	36,0	10,9	35,2	10,6	35,0	10,8	34,2	11,6	37,1	11,8	36,2	11,9	35,8	12,1	37,7	12,2	44,1	12,2	45,0
Latvia	23,8	78,8	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
Lithuania	26,2	88,4	25,8	89,3	26,4	94,5	27,3	96,2	27,3	96,9	27,1	95,3	26,8	96,1	26,5	96,9	25,6	94,3	26,1	91,3	23,9	88,5
Luxembourg	32,7	36,0	32,7	34,8	32,5	35,0	31,7	33,9	32,9	33,2	36,2	35,8	36,1	35,9	36,1	35,1	35,6	37,0	35,1	37,5	35,4	37,6
Malta	9,8	105,0	9,3	88,5	9,3	87,3	9,8	83,2	9,0	82,8	9,5	86,8	8,7	83,5	8,2	77,0	9,1	87,0	9,0	89,2	9,1	88,4
Netherlands	14,1	43,3	14,0	43,9	13,9	42,8	13,6	42,8	14,8	43,8	14,6	43,4	14,5	44,2	14,9	42,5	15,1	43,7	15,0	43,4	15,0	44,4
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
Portugal	19,4	57,6	19,2	54,9	19,2	56,1	19,3	54,8	20,0	56,3	19,3	56,6	19,4	56,6	19,4	56,1	19,5	55,4	19,5	51,7	19,6	53,6
Romania	22,6	48,3	20,5	45,5	23,3	51,9	23,6	52,4	23,9	54,5	24,1	54,9	24,5	55,1	24,0	54,8	24,1	58,5	22,9	58,1	21,5	60,2
Slovak Republic	24,8	83,0	24,4	82,4	23,8	80,9	24,1	82,5	25,3	84,8	25,3	86,4	25,1	86,7	23,9	90,0	25,5	80,2	25,7	85,5	26,8	91,7
Slovenia	46,1	157,2	44,8	162,8	43,5	159,9	42,6	161,2	41,6	161,0	41,7	163,0	41,7	163,5	41,5	162,5	40,8	164,0	40,7	161,4	39,8	161,4
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
Sweden	11,7	48,9	11,8	49,2	11,8	48,7	11,8	48,6	11,8	50,3	11,9	50,9	11,5	47,6	11,6	48,1	11,9	47,7	11,7	46,3	11,8	44,8
Average	21,4	66,0	20,5	68,4	20,4	68,4	21,2	68,2	21,3	68,7	21,2	68,0	21,5	69,4	21,8	69,0	22,0	70,0	22,2	71,1	22,2	71,5
Median	19,4	55,4	19,2	54,9	18,9	54,9	23,6	63,4	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
Minimum	3,2	20,1	3,5	20,0	3,4	20,0	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
Maximum	46,1	157,2	44,8	162,8	44,5	162,8	43,3	161,2	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
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	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.

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018.

Poland: In 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.6 Ratio between non-judge staff and judges from 2013 to 2023 (Q46, Q52)

States	Ratio between non-judge staff and judges										
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2022	2023
Austria	3,0	3,0	2,9	2,9	2,3	2,2	2,1	1,9	2,0	2,0	2,1
Belgium	3,4	3,3	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,3	3,7	3,3	3,4	3,2
Bulgaria	2,7	2,7	2,7	2,8	2,7	2,8	2,8	2,9	2,9	3,0	3,0
Croatia	3,2	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,3	3,5	3,5	3,6	3,7	3,7
Cyprus	4,1	4,2	4,6	3,8	3,9	3,7	3,6	4,1	3,6	3,6	3,8
Czech Republic	3,0	3,0	3,1	3,1	3,2	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,2	3,3
Denmark	4,9	4,9	4,7	4,1	4,4	4,3	4,4	4,7	4,7	4,6	4,7
Estonia	4,2	4,4	4,4	4,1	3,8	3,7	3,5	3,5	3,5	3,4	3,3
Finland	2,3	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	1,9	1,9
France	3,1	3,1	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,1	3,2	3,2	3,3	3,4
Germany	2,7	2,8	2,8	2,8	2,7	2,6	2,7	2,6	2,6	2,5	2,6
Greece	2,1	1,4	2,5	2,5	1,5	1,4	1,5	1,5	1,1	1,2	1,2
Hungary	2,9	2,9	2,9	2,8	2,8	3,0	2,9	3,0	3,1	3,2	3,2
Ireland	6,6	6,3	5,8	5,9	6,0	6,4	6,6	6,5	6,7	7,3	6,6
Italy	3,7	3,5	3,2	3,2	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,1	3,0	3,6	3,7
Latvia	3,7	3,3	3,2	3,1	3,1	3,1	NA	3,2	3,0	3,1	3,1
Lithuania	3,4	3,4	3,5	3,6	3,5	3,5	3,5	3,6	3,7	3,5	3,7
Luxembourg	NA	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,1	1,1
Malta	9,0	10,7	9,5	9,4	8,5	9,2	9,2	9,6	9,4	9,9	9,8
Netherlands	2,6	3,1	3,1	3,1	3,1	3,0	3,0	3,1	2,9	2,9	3,0
Poland	4,0	-	4,1	-	4,3	4,7	4,2	4,3	4,3	4,2	4,2
Portugal	3,0	3,0	2,9	2,9	2,8	2,8	2,9	2,9	2,9	2,6	2,7
Romania	2,2	2,1	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,3	2,3	2,3	2,3	2,5	2,8
Slovak Republic	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,5	3,8	3,3	3,4
Slovenia	3,4	3,4	3,6	3,7	3,8	3,9	3,9	3,9	3,9	4,0	4,1
Spain	8,7	-	9,1	9,3	9,2	8,7	8,8	9,0	9,1	8,7	9,2
Sweden	4,6	4,2	4,2	4,1	4,1	4,2	4,3	4,2	4,2	4,0	3,8
Average	3,8	3,5	3,7	3,7	3,7	3,6	3,6	3,7	3,7	3,7	3,7
Median	3,4	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,3
Minimum	2,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,1	1,1
Maximum	9,0	10,7	9,5	9,4	9,5	9,2	9,2	9,6	9,4	9,9	9,8
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	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.

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018.

Poland: In 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Public prosecutors and non-prosecutor staff

Table 7.3.1 Evolution of the total number of public prosecutors from 2020 to 2023 and persons with similar duties in 2023 Absolute number (Q55, Q57, Q57-1)

States	Total number of public prosecutors				Persons with similar duties to those of public prosecutors in 2023	
	2020	2021	2022	2023	Existence	Absolute number
Austria	398	395	394	404		155
Belgium	876	919	883	961		NAP
Bulgaria	1 520	1 527	1 542	1 549		NAP
Croatia	622	615	624	627		NAP
Cyprus	50	146	47	65		NA
Czech Republic	1 224	1 233	1 244	1 246		NAP
Denmark	NA	764	800	819		NAP
Estonia	169	177	169	180		NAP
Finland	390	424	441	457		NA
France	2 151	2 143	2 156	2 394		430
Germany	6 197	6 320	6 503	6 776		1 071
Greece	NA	611	607	623		NA
Hungary	1 876	1 873	1 874	1 864		NAP
Ireland	128	123	137	156		30
Italy	2 269	2 231	2 255	2 168		1 604
Latvia	461	449	457	415		NAP
Lithuania	644	622	602	597		NAP
Luxembourg	62	63	65	70		NAP
Malta	38	37	46	61		131
Netherlands	945	976	1 026	1 071		241
Poland	5 843	5 898	5 914	5 863		499
Portugal	1 416	1 480	1 512	1 516		NAP
Romania	2 446	2 370	2 213	2 064		NAP
Slovak Republic	922	976	1 014	1 017		NA
Slovenia	206	201	207	202		NAP
Spain	2 544	2 631	2 679	2 750		NA
Sweden	1 044	1 133	1 173	1 119		NAP
Number of Yes					13	
Average	1 378	1 346	1 355	1 372		520
Median	922	919	883	961		336
Minimum	38	37	46	61		30
Maximum	6 197	6 320	6 503	6 776		1 604
% of NA	7%	0%	0%	0%		19%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%		52%

Legend

Yes

No/NAP

Table 7.3.1a Evolution of the total number of public prosecutors from 2020 to 2023 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	2020-2023	2022-2023
Austria	4,5	4,4	4,3	4,4	-1,0%	1,9%
Belgium	7,6	7,9	7,5	8,2	7,4%	8,2%
Bulgaria	22,0	22,3	23,9	24,0	9,4%	0,5%
Croatia	15,4	15,9	16,2	16,3	5,6%	0,4%
Cyprus	5,6	16,1	5,1	7,0	24,8%	36,4%
Czech Republic	11,4	11,7	11,5	11,4	-0,1%	-0,3%
Denmark	NA	13,0	13,5	13,8	-	2,3%
Estonia	12,7	13,3	12,7	13,2	3,7%	3,6%
Finland	7,0	7,6	7,9	8,1	15,5%	2,7%
France	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,5	9,7%	10,5%
Germany	7,5	7,6	7,7	8,0	7,4%	3,8%
Greece	NA	5,7	5,7	6,0	-	5,2%
Hungary	19,0	19,3	19,5	19,4	2,5%	-0,4%
Ireland	2,6	2,4	2,7	2,9	13,5%	9,7%
Italy	3,8	3,8	3,8	3,7	-4,0%	-4,1%
Latvia	24,4	23,9	24,3	22,2	-9,0%	-8,7%
Lithuania	23,0	22,2	21,1	20,7	-10,2%	-1,8%
Luxembourg	9,8	9,8	9,8	10,4	6,6%	5,9%
Malta	7,4	7,2	8,8	10,8	46,6%	22,4%
Netherlands	5,4	5,6	5,8	6,0	10,4%	3,6%
Poland	15,3	15,5	15,7	15,6	2,0%	-0,5%
Portugal	13,8	14,3	14,4	14,2	3,6%	-1,4%
Romania	12,7	12,4	11,6	10,8	-15,1%	-6,8%
Slovak Republic	16,9	18,0	18,7	18,7	11,0%	0,4%
Slovenia	9,8	9,5	9,8	9,5	-2,6%	-2,7%
Spain	5,4	5,5	5,6	5,7	5,3%	1,5%
Sweden	10,1	10,8	11,1	10,6	5,4%	-4,9%
Average	11	11	11,2	11,3	6%	3%
Median	10	11	9,8	10,6	5%	1%
Minimum	3	2	2,7	2,9	-15%	-9%
Maximum	24	24	24,3	24,0	47%	36%
% of NA	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 7.3.2 Total number of public prosecutors by instance from 2020 to 2023 and their variations
Absolute number (Q55)

States	Total public prosecutors by instance																Variations 2020-2023				Variations 2022-2023			
	2020				2021				2022				2023											
	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	1,5%	1,1%	9,1%	0,0%	2,5%	2,0%	9,1%	5,9%
Belgium	876	705	159	12	919	735	169	15	883	736	132	15	961	810	138	13	9,7%	14,9%	-13,2%	8,3%	8,8%	10,1%	4,5%	-13,3%
Bulgaria	1 520	884	514	122	1 527	904	507	116	1 542	883	528	131	1 549	900	515	134	1,9%	1,8%	0,2%	9,8%	0,5%	1,9%	-2,5%	2,3%
Croatia	622	439	158	25	615	434	159	22	624	439	162	23	627	437	164	26	0,8%	-0,5%	3,8%	4,0%	0,5%	-0,5%	1,2%	13,0%
Cyprus	50	NAP	NAP	NAP	146	NAP	NAP	NAP	47	NAP	NAP	NAP	65	NAP	NAP	NAP	30,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	38,3%	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	1,8%	1,2%	2,9%	3,5%	0,2%	-0,5%	1,7%	0,0%
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	764	594	170	6	800	662	131	7	819	663	148	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,4%	0,2%	13,0%	14,3%
Estonia	169	NAP	NAP	NAP	177	NAP	NAP	NAP	169	NAP	NAP	NAP	180	NAP	NAP	NAP	6,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP	6,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	390	NAP	NAP	NAP	424	NAP	NAP	NAP	441	NAP	NAP	NAP	457	NAP	NAP	NAP	17,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP	3,6%	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	11,3%	17,9%	-9,2%	1,8%	11,0%	17,2%	-8,3%	0,0%
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	9,3%	8,3%	20,1%	14,0%	4,2%	3,7%	11,1%	0,0%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	611	388	196	27	607	382	198	27	623	392	204	27	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,6%	2,6%	3,0%	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	-0,6%	41,7%	-94,3%	8,1%	-0,5%	-1,6%	14,3%	12,1%
Ireland	128	NAP	NAP	NAP	123	NAP	NAP	NAP	137	NAP	NAP	NAP	156	NAP	NAP	NAP	21,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP	13,9%	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	-4,5%	-3,1%	-15,7%	1,4%	-3,9%	-4,0%	-2,2%	-4,1%
Latvia	461	302	93	66	449	295	90	64	457	306	89	62	415	287	79	49	-10,0%	-5,0%	-15,1%	-25,8%	-9,2%	-6,2%	-11,2%	-21,0%
Lithuania	644	576	NAP	68	622	556	NAP	66	602	533	NAP	69	597	528	NAP	69	-7,3%	-8,3%	NAP	1,5%	-0,8%	-0,9%	NAP	0,0%
Luxembourg	62	47	NAP	15	63	48	NAP	15	65	48	NAP	17	70	50	NAP	20	12,9%	6,4%	NAP	33,3%	7,7%	4,2%	NAP	17,6%
Malta	38	NAP	NAP	NAP	37	NAP	NAP	NAP	46	NAP	NAP	NAP	61	NAP	NAP	NAP	60,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP	32,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	945	850	95	NAP	976	873	103	NAP	1 026	918	108	NAP	1 071	968	103	NAP	13,3%	13,9%	8,4%	NAP	4,4%	5,4%	-4,6%	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	0,3%	-0,7%	0,2%	14,8%	-0,9%	-1,5%	-1,8%	17,4%
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	7,1%	6,1%	20,0%	25,0%	0,3%	-0,2%	9,8%	-4,8%
Romania	2 446	1 144	788	514	2 370	1 153	707	510	2 213	1 089	668	456	2 064	912	675	477	-15,6%	-20,3%	-14,3%	-7,2%	-6,7%	-16,3%	1,0%	4,6%
Slovak Republic	922	607	200	115	976	651	206	119	1 014	684	213	117	1 017	679	212	126	10,3%	11,9%	6,0%	9,6%	0,3%	-0,7%	-0,5%	7,7%
Slovenia	206	151	43	12	201	144	45	12	207	148	44	15	202	141	46	15	-1,9%	-6,6%	7,0%	25,0%	-2,4%	-4,7%	4,5%	0,0%
Spain	2 544	NAP	NAP	33	2 631	NAP	NAP	32	2 679	NAP	NAP	40	2 750	NAP	NAP	36	8,1%	NAP	NAP	9,1%	2,7%	NAP	NAP	-10,0%
Sweden	1 044	NA	NA	12	1 133	NA	NA	12	1 173	NA	NA	12	1 119	NA	NA	12	7,2%	NA	NA	0,0%	-4,6%	NA	NA	0,0%
Average	1 378	1 238	369	82	1 346	1 202	316	75	1 355	1 217	313	75	1 372	1 230	314	77	7,7%	4,5%	-5,3%	7,2%	4,2%	0,5%	2,3%	2,0%
Median	922	836	231	57	919	785	183	56	883	786	180	58	961	821	184	49	7,1%	1,5%	1,6%	8,1%	2,4%	-0,3%	1,5%	0,0%
Minimum	38	47	22	12	37	48	26	6	46	48	22	7	61	50	24	8	-15,6%	-20,3%	-94,3%	-25,8%	-9,2%	-16,3%	-11,2%	-21,0%
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	60,5%	41,7%	20,1%	33,3%	38,3%	17,2%	14,3%	17,6%
% of NA	7%	11%	11%	7%	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%

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 2023
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q55)

States	Public prosecutors by instance per 100 000 inhabitants															
	2020				2021				2022				2023			
	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
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
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
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
Cyprus	5,6	NAP	NAP	NAP	16,1	NAP	NAP	NAP	5,1	NAP	NAP	NAP	7,0	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
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
Estonia	12,7	NAP	NAP	NAP	13,3	NAP	NAP	NAP	12,7	NAP	NAP	NAP	13,2	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	7,0	NAP	NAP	NAP	7,6	NAP	NAP	NAP	7,9	NAP	NAP	NAP	8,1	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
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
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
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
Ireland	2,6	NAP	NAP	NAP	2,4	NAP	NAP	NAP	2,7	NAP	NAP	NAP	2,9	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
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
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
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
Malta	7,4	NAP	NAP	NAP	7,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	8,8	NAP	NAP	NAP	10,8	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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
Average	11,0	9,0	2,7	1,0	11,4	9,1	2,4	0,9	11,2	9,2	2,4	0,9	11,3	9,2	2,4	0,9
Median	9,8	7,5	2,6	0,5	10,8	7,7	2,0	0,3	9,8	7,5	2,0	0,3	10,6	7,5	2,1	0,3
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
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
% of NA	7%	11%	11%	7%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%
% of NAP	0%	22%	30%	22%	0%	22%	30%	22%	0%	22%	30%	22%	0%	22%	30%	22%

Table 7.3.3 Total public prosecutors: distribution of males and females in 2020 - 2023 (Q55)

States	Total public prosecutors: distribution of males and females									
	2020		2021		2022		2023		Variation 2020-2023 in percentage points	
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	Male	Female
Austria	47,7%	52,3%	47,8%	52,2%	47,5%	52,5%	45,3%	54,7%	▼ -2,4	▲ 2,4
Belgium	40,8%	59,2%	40,4%	59,6%	40,1%	59,9%	41,7%	58,3%	▲ 1,0	▼ -1,0
Bulgaria	48,7%	51,3%	48,3%	51,7%	48,3%	51,7%	48,2%	51,8%	▼ -0,5	▲ 0,5
Croatia	31,7%	68,3%	30,7%	69,3%	30,6%	69,4%	30,8%	69,2%	▼ -0,9	▲ 0,9
Cyprus	NA	NA	20,5%	79,5%	NA	NA	24,6%	75,4%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	45,8%	54,2%	46,1%	53,9%	46,9%	53,1%	47,6%	52,4%	▲ 1,8	▼ -1,8
Denmark	NA	NA	33,1%	67,0%	33,0%	67,0%	32,7%	67,3%	NA	NA
Estonia	29,6%	70,4%	28,2%	71,8%	29,6%	70,4%	30,0%	70,0%	▲ 0,4	▼ -0,4
Finland	39,7%	60,3%	37,3%	62,7%	35,8%	64,2%	33,9%	66,1%	▼ -5,8	▲ 5,8
France	40,5%	59,5%	41,2%	58,8%	40,2%	59,8%	45,5%	54,5%	▲ 5,0	▼ -5,0
Germany	49,4%	50,6%	49,6%	50,4%	48,4%	51,6%	46,9%	53,1%	▼ -2,5	▲ 2,5
Greece	NA	NA	38,1%	61,9%	35,4%	64,6%	35,8%	64,2%	NA	NA
Hungary	39,6%	60,4%	39,6%	60,4%	38,8%	61,2%	38,7%	61,3%	▼ -0,8	▲ 0,8
Ireland	39,1%	60,9%	37,4%	62,6%	35,8%	64,2%	35,3%	64,7%	▼ -3,8	▲ 3,8
Italy	52,9%	47,1%	52,5%	47,5%	51,8%	48,2%	51,4%	48,6%	▼ -1,5	▲ 1,5
Latvia	39,3%	60,7%	41,0%	59,0%	40,9%	59,1%	38,8%	61,2%	▼ -0,5	▲ 0,5
Lithuania	48,9%	51,1%	49,5%	50,5%	49,0%	51,0%	48,2%	51,8%	▼ -0,7	▲ 0,7
Luxembourg	50,0%	50,0%	52,4%	47,6%	47,7%	52,3%	44,3%	55,7%	▼ -5,7	▲ 5,7
Malta	52,6%	47,4%	56,8%	43,2%	47,8%	52,2%	50,8%	49,2%	▼ -1,8	▲ 1,8
Netherlands	38,8%	61,2%	39,8%	60,2%	39,5%	60,5%	38,4%	61,6%	▼ -0,5	▲ 0,5
Poland	47,7%	52,3%	47,6%	52,4%	47,7%	52,3%	47,6%	52,4%	▼ -0,1	▲ 0,1
Portugal	35,1%	64,9%	34,3%	65,7%	33,0%	67,0%	30,0%	70,0%	▼ -5,1	▲ 5,1
Romania	48,0%	52,0%	48,4%	51,6%	48,5%	51,5%	49,8%	50,2%	▲ 1,8	▼ -1,8
Slovak Republic	49,8%	50,2%	47,1%	52,9%	49,1%	50,9%	49,9%	50,1%	▲ 0,1	▼ -0,1
Slovenia	31,6%	68,4%	30,8%	69,2%	31,9%	68,1%	29,7%	70,3%	▼ -1,9	▲ 1,9
Spain	34,7%	65,3%	34,2%	65,8%	33,3%	66,7%	33,1%	66,9%	▼ -1,7	▲ 1,7
Sweden	37,9%	62,1%	30,0%	70,0%	34,6%	65,4%	31,5%	68,5%	▼ -6,5	▲ 6,5
Average	42,5%	57,5%	40,8%	59,2%	41,0%	59,0%	40,0%	60,0%	-1,4	1,4
Median	40,6%	59,4%	40,4%	59,6%	40,2%	59,8%	38,8%	61,2%	-0,9	0,9
Minimum	29,6%	47,1%	20,5%	43,2%	29,6%	48,2%	24,6%	48,6%	-6,5	-5,0
Maximum	52,9%	70,4%	56,8%	79,5%	51,8%	70,4%	51,4%	75,4%	5,0	6,5
% of NA	11%	11%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0,1	0,1
% of NAP	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 2023 (Q55)

States	Public prosecutors at the first instance level: distribution of males and females									
	2020		2021		2022		2023		Variation 2020-2023 in percentage points	
	% 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%	▼ -2,7	▲ 2,7
Belgium	36,7%	63,3%	35,9%	64,1%	36,4%	63,6%	38,6%	61,4%	▲ 1,9	▼ -1,9
Bulgaria	44,0%	56,0%	43,5%	56,5%	45,3%	54,7%	45,9%	54,1%	▲ 1,9	▼ -1,9
Croatia	28,7%	71,3%	28,6%	71,4%	28,5%	71,5%	28,4%	71,6%	▼ -0,3	▲ 0,3
Cyprus	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%	▲ 1,9	▼ -1,9
Denmark	NA	NA	31,0%	69,0%	32,6%	67,4%	32,7%	67,3%	NA	NA
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	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%	▲ 7,5	▼ -7,5
Germany	48,0%	52,0%	48,3%	51,7%	46,9%	53,1%	45,3%	54,7%	▼ -2,7	▲ 2,7
Greece	NA	NA	34,5%	65,5%	33,8%	66,2%	33,4%	66,6%	NA	NA
Hungary	35,9%	64,1%	38,4%	61,6%	37,8%	62,2%	37,8%	62,2%	▲ 2,0	▼ -2,0
Ireland	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%	▼ -1,3	▲ 1,3
Latvia	34,8%	65,2%	36,6%	63,4%	36,3%	63,7%	35,2%	64,8%	▲ 0,4	▼ -0,4
Lithuania	47,6%	52,4%	48,0%	52,0%	47,3%	52,7%	46,4%	53,6%	▼ -1,2	▲ 1,2
Luxembourg	51,1%	48,9%	56,3%	43,8%	54,2%	45,8%	50,0%	50,0%	▼ -1,1	▲ 1,1
Malta	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%	▼ 0,0	▲ 0,0
Poland	42,8%	57,2%	42,8%	57,2%	42,7%	57,3%	42,8%	57,2%	▲ 0,0	▼ 0,0
Portugal	33,2%	66,8%	32,1%	67,9%	30,6%	69,4%	27,7%	72,3%	▼ -5,5	▲ 5,5
Romania	47,6%	52,4%	48,0%	52,0%	48,9%	51,1%	48,9%	51,1%	▲ 1,3	▼ -1,3
Slovak Republic	46,5%	53,5%	46,5%	53,5%	45,9%	54,1%	47,3%	52,7%	▲ 0,8	▼ -0,8
Slovenia	28,5%	71,5%	27,8%	72,2%	28,4%	72,3%	27,0%	73,0%	▼ -1,5	▲ 1,5
Spain	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Sweden	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%	0,1	-0,1
Median	42,0%	58,0%	40,2%	59,8%	40,5%	59,5%	43,0%	57,0%	0,0	0,0
Minimum	28,5%	48,8%	27,8%	43,8%	28,4%	45,8%	27,0%	50,0%	-5,5	-7,5
Maximum	51,2%	71,5%	56,3%	72,2%	54,2%	72,3%	50,0%	73,0%	7,5	5,5
% of NA	11%	11%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0,1	0,1
% of NAP	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 2023 (Q55)

States	Public prosecutors at the second instance level: distribution of males and females									
	2020		2021		2022		2023		Variation 2020-2023 in percentage points	
	% 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%	▼ -5,3	▲ 5,3
Belgium	55,3%	44,7%	56,2%	43,8%	56,1%	43,9%	55,8%	44,2%	▲ 0,5	▼ -0,5
Bulgaria	57,8%	42,2%	57,6%	42,4%	54,9%	45,1%	54,2%	45,8%	▼ -3,6	▲ 3,6
Croatia	39,9%	60,1%	37,1%	62,9%	37,7%	62,3%	37,2%	62,8%	▼ -2,7	▲ 2,7
Cyprus	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%	▲ 1,0	▼ -1,0
Denmark	NA	NA	40,6%	59,4%	35,1%	64,9%	33,1%	66,9%	NA	NA
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	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%	▼ -2,3	▲ 2,3
Germany	62,6%	37,4%	61,3%	38,7%	59,6%	40,4%	58,9%	41,1%	▼ -3,7	▲ 3,7
Greece	NA	NA	42,3%	57,7%	36,4%	63,6%	38,2%	61,8%	NA	NA
Hungary	44,6%	55,4%	55,2%	44,8%	53,6%	46,4%	46,9%	53,1%	▲ 2,3	▼ -2,3
Ireland	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%	▼ -2,3	▲ 2,3
Latvia	44,1%	55,9%	47,8%	52,2%	47,2%	52,8%	43,0%	57,0%	▼ -1,0	▲ 1,0
Lithuania	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	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%	▼ -3,9	▲ 3,9
Poland	54,7%	45,3%	54,2%	45,8%	54,8%	45,2%	53,7%	46,3%	▼ -1,0	▲ 1,0
Portugal	69,3%	30,7%	70,7%	29,3%	64,6%	35,4%	56,7%	43,3%	▼ -12,7	▲ 12,7
Romania	46,2%	53,8%	46,1%	53,9%	45,2%	54,8%	48,9%	51,1%	▲ 2,7	▼ -2,7
Slovak Republic	54,0%	46,0%	51,9%	48,1%	54,9%	45,1%	54,7%	45,3%	▲ 0,7	▼ -0,7
Slovenia	34,9%	65,1%	35,6%	64,4%	43,2%	59,1%	37,0%	65,2%	▲ 2,1	▲ 0,1
Spain	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Sweden	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%	-1,8	2,0
Median	53,5%	46,5%	52,6%	47,4%	53,7%	46,3%	51,3%	48,7%	-1,7	1,7
Minimum	34,9%	30,7%	35,6%	29,3%	35,1%	35,4%	33,1%	39,1%	-12,7	-2,7
Maximum	69,3%	65,1%	70,7%	64,4%	64,6%	64,9%	60,9%	66,9%	2,7	12,7
% of NA	11%	11%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0,1	0,1
% of NAP	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 2023 (Q55)

States	Public prosecutors at the Supreme court level: distribution of males and females											
	2020		2021		2022		2023		Variation 2020-2023 in percentage points			
	% 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%	▲	5,6	▼	-5,6
Belgium	83,3%	16,7%	80,0%	20,0%	80,0%	20,0%	84,6%	15,4%	▲	1,3	▼	-1,3
Bulgaria	44,3%	55,7%	45,7%	54,3%	42,0%	58,0%	40,3%	59,7%	▼	-4,0	▲	4,0
Croatia	32,0%	68,0%	27,3%	72,7%	21,7%	78,3%	30,8%	69,2%	▼	-1,2	▲	1,2
Cyprus	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%	▲	2,8	▼	-2,8
Denmark	NA	NA	33,3%	66,7%	28,6%	71,4%	25,0%	75,0%		NA		NA
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP		NAP		NAP
Finland	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%	▲	2,5	▼	-2,5
Germany	60,8%	39,2%	60,8%	39,2%	65,0%	35,0%	65,0%	35,0%	▲	4,2	▼	-4,2
Greece	NA	NA	59,3%	40,7%	51,9%	48,1%	51,9%	48,1%		NA		NA
Hungary	54,1%	45,9%	52,7%	47,3%	50,5%	49,5%	49,2%	50,8%	▼	-4,9	▲	4,9
Ireland	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%	▼	-0,9	▲	0,9
Latvia	53,0%	47,0%	51,6%	48,4%	54,8%	45,2%	53,1%	46,9%	▲	0,0	▼	0,0
Lithuania	60,3%	39,7%	62,1%	37,9%	62,3%	37,7%	62,3%	37,7%	▲	2,0	▼	-2,0
Luxembourg	46,7%	53,3%	40,0%	60,0%	29,4%	70,6%	30,0%	70,0%	▼	-16,7	▲	16,7
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP		NAP		NAP
Netherlands	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%	▼	-4,0	▲	4,0
Portugal	31,3%	68,8%	50,0%	50,0%	71,4%	28,6%	75,0%	25,0%	▲	43,8	▼	-43,8
Romania	51,6%	48,4%	52,5%	47,5%	52,4%	47,6%	52,6%	55,8%	▲	1,1	▲	7,3
Slovak Republic	60,0%	40,0%	58,0%	42,0%	57,3%	42,7%	55,6%	44,4%	▼	-4,4	▲	4,4
Slovenia	58,3%	41,7%	50,0%	50,0%	40,0%	60,0%	33,3%	66,7%	▼	-25,0	▲	25,0
Spain	78,8%	21,2%	65,6%	34,4%	65,0%	35,0%	58,3%	41,7%	▼	-20,5	▲	20,5
Sweden	33,3%	66,7%	33,3%	66,7%	33,3%	66,7%	33,3%	66,7%	▭	0,0	▭	0,0
Average	55,7%	44,3%	54,5%	45,5%	53,4%	46,6%	53,1%	47,3%		-1,0		1,4
Median	55,6%	44,4%	52,7%	47,3%	55,2%	44,8%	55,2%	44,8%		0,0		0,9
Minimum	31,3%	16,7%	27,3%	20,0%	21,7%	20,0%	25,0%	15,4%		-25,0		-43,8
Maximum	83,3%	68,8%	80,0%	72,7%	80,0%	78,3%	84,6%	75,0%		43,8		25,0
% of NA	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		0,1		0,1
% of NAP	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 2023 (Q1, Q60)

States	Total number of staff (non-public prosecutors)		% Male	% Female
	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants		
Austria	367	4,0	21,5%	78,5%
Belgium	2 855	24,3	29,2%	70,8%
Bulgaria	3 081	47,8	NA	NA
Croatia	1 170	30,4	13,5%	86,5%
Cyprus	89	9,5	19,1%	80,9%
Czech Republic	1 448	13,3	16,6%	83,4%
Denmark	595	10,0	15,1%	84,9%
Estonia	87	6,4	33,3%	66,7%
Finland	185	3,3	7,0%	93,0%
France	536	0,8	22,9%	77,1%
Germany	12 583	14,9	24,4%	75,6%
Greece	1 503	14,4	26,7%	73,3%
Hungary	2 344	24,5	19,8%	80,2%
Ireland	119	2,2	34,5%	65,5%
Italy	8 645	14,7	35,3%	64,7%
Latvia	390	20,8	30,3%	69,7%
Lithuania	472	16,4	19,7%	80,3%
Luxembourg	204	30,4	52,5%	47,5%
Malta	26	4,6	50,0%	50,0%
Netherlands	4 982	27,8	30,5%	69,5%
Poland	9 194	24,4	20,2%	79,8%
Portugal	1 663	15,6	34,0%	66,0%
Romania	1 810	9,5	11,3%	88,7%
Slovak Republic	840	15,5	19,6%	80,4%
Slovenia	308	14,5	20,8%	79,2%
Spain	2 356	4,8	NA	NA
Sweden	610	5,8	17,5%	82,5%
Average	2 165	15,2	25,0%	75,0%
Median	840	14,5	21,5%	78,5%
Minimum	26	0,8	7,0%	47,5%
Maximum	12 583	47,8	52,5%	93,0%
% 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 2023 (Q60)

States	Total number of non-prosecutor staff			
	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	364	369	342	367
Belgium	2 424	2 711	3 240	2 855
Bulgaria	3 021	2 887	2 956	3 081
Croatia	1 058	1 137	1 139	1 170
Cyprus	73	NA	89	89
Czech Republic	1 474	1 454	1 449	1 448
Denmark	1 670	747	605	595
Estonia	89	102	87	87
Finland	139	169	176	185
France	NA	359	375	536
Germany	12 204	12 197	12 372	12 583
Greece	1 631	1 508	1 565	1 503
Hungary	2 425	2 411	2 353	2 344
Ireland	90	103	99	119
Italy	7 858	8 958	8 181	8 645
Latvia	397	357	NA	390
Lithuania	585	476	477	472
Luxembourg	150	172	188	204
Malta	21	21	19	26
Netherlands	3 998	4 412	4 594	4 982
Poland	9 073	9 063	9 226	9 194
Portugal	1 657	1 674	1 678	1 663
Romania	2 408	2 413	2 089	1 810
Slovak Republic	977	900	840	840
Slovenia	321	302	304	308
Spain	2 280	2 312	2 336	2 356
Sweden	522	580	607	610
Average	2 189	2 223	2 207	2 165
Median	1 266	1 019	990	840
Minimum	21	21	19	26
Maximum	12 204	12 197	12 372	12 583
% of NA	4%	4%	4%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 7.4.3 Total number of non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants from 2020 to 2023 and their variations (Q1, Q60)

States	Total number of non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants				Variations	
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020-2023	2022-2023
Austria	4,1	4,1	3,8	4,0	-1,7%	6,7%
Belgium	21,0	23,4	27,7	24,3	15,4%	-12,4%
Bulgaria	43,7	42,2	45,8	47,8	9,4%	4,3%
Croatia	26,2	29,4	29,6	30,4	15,8%	2,7%
Cyprus	8,1	NA	9,7	9,5	17,0%	-1,4%
Czech Republic	13,8	13,8	13,4	13,3	-3,6%	-0,5%
Denmark	28,6	12,7	10,2	10,0	-64,9%	-1,7%
Estonia	6,7	7,7	6,5	6,4	-4,9%	-2,7%
Finland	2,5	3,0	3,2	3,3	31,2%	4,2%
France	NA	0,5	0,6	0,8	NA	42,2%
Germany	14,7	14,7	14,7	14,9	1,3%	1,3%
Greece	15,2	14,1	14,7	14,4	-5,2%	-1,5%
Hungary	24,5	24,9	24,5	24,5	-0,3%	-0,2%
Ireland	1,8	2,0	1,9	2,2	23,2%	15,8%
Italy	13,3	15,2	13,9	14,7	10,5%	5,4%
Latvia	21,0	19,0	NA	20,8	-0,6%	NA
Lithuania	20,9	17,0	16,7	16,4	-21,8%	-2,0%
Luxembourg	23,6	26,7	28,4	30,4	28,4%	6,7%
Malta	4,1	4,1	3,7	4,6	13,1%	26,3%
Netherlands	22,9	25,2	25,8	27,8	21,4%	7,7%
Poland	23,7	23,8	24,4	24,4	3,0%	0,0%
Portugal	16,1	16,2	16,0	15,6	-2,9%	-2,5%
Romania	12,6	12,7	11,0	9,5	-24,4%	-13,4%
Slovak Republic	17,9	16,6	15,5	15,5	-13,5%	0,1%
Slovenia	15,2	14,3	14,4	14,5	-4,7%	1,0%
Spain	4,8	4,9	4,9	4,8	0,6%	-0,3%
Sweden	5,0	5,5	5,8	5,8	14,9%	0,2%
Average	15,8	15,1	14,9	15,2	2,2%	3,3%
Median	15,2	14,5	14,1	14,5	1,0%	0,1%
Minimum	1,8	0,5	0,6	0,8	-64,9%	-13,4%
Maximum	43,7	42,2	45,8	47,8	31,2%	42,2%
% of NA	4%	4%	4%	0%	4%	4%
% of NAP	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 2023 (Q1, Q55, Q60)

States	2020		2021		2022		2023	
	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
Belgium	7,6	21,0	7,9	23,4	7,5	27,7	8,2	24,3
Bulgaria	22,0	43,7	22,3	42,2	23,9	45,8	24,0	47,8
Croatia	15,4	26,2	15,9	29,4	16,2	29,6	16,3	30,4
Cyprus	5,6	8,1	16,1	NA	5,1	9,7	7,0	9,5
Czech Republic	11,4	13,8	11,7	13,8	11,5	13,4	11,4	13,3
Denmark	NA	28,6	13,0	12,7	13,5	10,2	13,8	10,0
Estonia	12,7	6,7	13,3	7,7	12,7	6,5	13,2	6,4
Finland	7,0	2,5	7,6	3,0	7,9	3,2	8,1	3,3
France	3,2	NA	3,2	0,5	3,2	0,6	3,5	0,8
Germany	7,5	14,7	7,6	14,7	7,7	14,7	8,0	14,9
Greece	NA	15,2	5,7	14,1	5,7	14,7	6,0	14,4
Hungary	19,0	24,5	19,3	24,9	19,5	24,5	19,4	24,5
Ireland	2,6	1,8	2,4	2,0	2,7	1,9	2,9	2,2
Italy	3,8	13,3	3,8	15,2	3,8	13,9	3,7	14,7
Latvia	24,4	21,0	23,9	19,0	24,3	NA	22,2	20,8
Lithuania	23,0	20,9	22,2	17,0	21,1	16,7	20,7	16,4
Luxembourg	9,8	23,6	9,8	26,7	9,8	28,4	10,4	30,4
Malta	7,4	4,1	7,2	4,1	8,8	3,7	10,8	4,6
Netherlands	5,4	22,9	5,6	25,2	5,8	25,8	6,0	27,8
Poland	15,3	23,7	15,5	23,8	15,7	24,4	15,6	24,4
Portugal	13,8	16,1	14,3	16,2	14,4	16,0	14,2	15,6
Romania	12,7	12,6	12,4	12,7	11,6	11,0	10,8	9,5
Slovak Republic	16,9	17,9	18,0	16,6	18,7	15,5	18,7	15,5
Slovenia	9,8	15,2	9,5	14,3	9,8	14,4	9,5	14,5
Spain	5,4	4,8	5,5	4,9	5,6	4,9	5,7	4,8
Sweden	10,1	5,0	10,8	5,5	11,1	5,8	10,6	5,8
Average	11,0	15,8	11,4	15,1	11,2	14,9	11,3	15,2
Median	9,8	15,2	10,8	14,5	9,8	14,1	10,6	14,5
Minimum	2,6	1,8	2,4	0,5	2,7	0,6	2,9	0,8
Maximum	24,4	43,7	23,9	42,2	24,3	45,8	24,0	47,8
% of NA	7%	4%	0%	4%	0%	4%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 7.4.5 Ratio between non-prosecutors staff and public prosecutors from 2020 to 2023 (Q55, Q60)

States	Ratio between non-prosecutor staff and public prosecutors			
	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
Belgium	2,8	2,9	3,7	3,0
Bulgaria	2,0	1,9	1,9	2,0
Croatia	1,7	1,8	1,8	1,9
Cyprus	1,5	NA	1,9	1,4
Czech Republic	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2
Denmark	NA	1,0	0,8	0,7
Estonia	0,5	0,6	0,5	0,5
Finland	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4
France	NA	0,2	0,2	0,2
Germany	2,0	1,9	1,9	1,9
Greece	NA	2,5	2,6	2,4
Hungary	1,3	1,3	1,3	1,3
Ireland	0,7	0,8	0,7	0,8
Italy	3,5	4,0	3,6	4,0
Latvia	0,9	0,8	NA	0,9
Lithuania	0,9	0,8	0,8	0,8
Luxembourg	2,4	2,7	2,9	2,9
Malta	0,6	0,6	0,4	0,4
Netherlands	4,2	4,5	4,5	4,7
Poland	1,6	1,5	1,6	1,6
Portugal	1,2	1,1	1,1	1,1
Romania	1,0	1,0	0,9	0,9
Slovak Republic	1,1	0,9	0,8	0,8
Slovenia	1,6	1,5	1,5	1,5
Spain	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
Sweden	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5
Average	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,5
Median	1,2	1,1	1,1	1,1
Minimum	0,4	0,2	0,2	0,2
Maximum	4,2	4,5	4,5	4,7
% of NA	11%	4%	4%	0%
% of NAP	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 2023 (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	149	75	74	50,3%	49,7%	143	71	72	49,7%	50,3%	4	3	1	75,0%	25,0%	2	1	1	50,0%	50,0%
Belgium	51	28	23	54,9%	45,1%	40	22	18	55,0%	45,0%	10	6	4	60,0%	40,0%	1	0	1	0,0%	100,0%
Bulgaria	180	77	103	42,8%	57,2%	144	61	83	42,4%	57,6%	34	15	19	44,1%	55,9%	2	1	1	50,0%	50,0%
Croatia	61	29	32	47,5%	52,5%	43	16	27	37,2%	62,8%	17	12	5	70,6%	29,4%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Cyprus	34	18	16	52,9%	47,1%	31	16	15	51,6%	48,4%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%	2	1	1	50,0%	50,0%
Czech Republic	95	49	46	51,6%	48,4%	83	41	42	49,4%	50,6%	10	6	4	60,0%	40,0%	2	2	0	100,0%	0,0%
Denmark	31	19	12	61,3%	38,7%	28	16	12	57,1%	42,9%	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	25	11	69,4%	30,6%	29	18	11	62,1%	37,9%	5	5	0	100,0%	0,0%	2	2	0	100,0%	0,0%
France	247	135	112	54,7%	45,3%	203	109	94	53,7%	46,3%	42	24	18	57,1%	42,9%	2	2	0	100,0%	0,0%
Germany	595	395	200	66,4%	33,6%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	2	4	33,3%	66,7%
Greece	124	41	83	33,1%	66,9%	93	33	60	35,5%	64,5%	28	7	21	25,0%	75,0%	3	1	2	33,3%	66,7%
Hungary	140	68	72	48,6%	51,4%	114	52	62	45,6%	54,4%	25	15	10	60,0%	40,0%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Ireland	5	4	1	80,0%	20,0%	3	2	1	66,7%	33,3%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Italy	193	129	64	66,8%	33,2%	174	116	58	66,7%	33,3%	17	12	5	70,6%	29,4%	2	1	1	50,0%	50,0%
Latvia	15	8	7	53,3%	46,7%	8	3	5	37,5%	62,5%	6	4	2	66,7%	33,3%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Lithuania	17	8	9	47,1%	52,9%	14	7	7	50,0%	50,0%	2	1	1	50,0%	50,0%	1	0	1	0,0%	100,0%
Luxembourg	9	5	4	55,6%	44,4%	6	2	4	33,3%	66,7%	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	NAP	100,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	17	8	9	47,1%	52,9%	10	5	5	50,0%	50,0%	6	3	3	50,0%	50,0%	1	0	1	0,0%	100,0%
Poland	395	199	196	50,4%	49,6%	382	189	193	49,5%	50,5%	11	9	2	81,8%	18,2%	2	1	1	50,0%	50,0%
Portugal	29	17	12	58,6%	41,4%	23	13	10	56,5%	43,5%	5	3	2	60,0%	40,0%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Romania	236	90	146	38,1%	61,9%	170	58	112	34,1%	65,9%	65	32	33	49,2%	50,8%	1	1	1	100,0%	100,0%
Slovak Republic	50	30	20	60,0%	40,0%	39	23	16	59,0%	41,0%	9	5	4	55,6%	44,4%	2	2	0	100,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	66	19	47	28,8%	71,2%	60	14	46	23,3%	76,7%	5	4	1	80,0%	20,0%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Spain	98	74	24	75,5%	24,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	93	69	24	74,2%	25,8%	5	5	0	100,0%	0,0%
Sweden	65	38	27	58,5%	41,5%	54	33	21	61,1%	38,9%	9	4	5	44,4%	55,6%	2	1	1	50,0%	50,0%
Average	109	59	50	53,2%	46,8%	76	37	39	47,4%	52,6%	16	10	7	68,6%	32,6%	2	1	1	71,8%	32,1%
Median	61	29	24	52,9%	47,1%	40	18	18	49,7%	50,3%	8	5	3	63,3%	40,0%	2	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Minimum	5	2	1	28,8%	20,0%	3	1	1	23,3%	33,3%	1	1	0	25,0%	0,0%	1	0	0	0,0%	0,0%
Maximum	595	395	200	80,0%	71,2%	382	189	193	66,7%	76,7%	93	69	33	100,0%	75,0%	6	5	4	100,0%	100,0%
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%	0%	4%	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 2023 (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	13	9	59,1%	40,9%	17	9	8	52,9%	47,1%	4	4	0	100,0%	0,0%	1	0	1	0,0%	100,0%
Belgium	30	24	6	80,0%	20,0%	24	20	4	83,3%	16,7%	5	4	1	80,0%	20,0%	1	0	1	0,0%	100,0%
Bulgaria	69	41	28	59,4%	40,6%	34	16	18	47,1%	52,9%	34	24	10	70,6%	29,4%	1	1	NAP	100,0%	NAP
Croatia	34	14	20	41,2%	58,8%	19	9	10	47,4%	52,6%	14	5	9	35,7%	64,3%	1	0	1	0,0%	100,0%
Cyprus	2	0	2	0,0%	100,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	97	64	33	66,0%	34,0%	86	56	30	65,1%	34,9%	10	7	3	70,0%	30,0%	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	6	4	2	66,7%	33,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	200	132	68	66,0%	34,0%	163	105	58	64,4%	35,6%	36	26	10	72,2%	27,8%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Germany	140	NA	NA	NA	NA	115	NA	NA	NA	NA	24	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	83	36	47	43,4%	56,6%	63	24	39	38,1%	61,9%	19	12	7	63,2%	36,8%	1	0	1	0,0%	100,0%
Hungary	165	98	67	59,4%	40,6%	145	84	61	57,9%	42,1%	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	147	113	34	76,9%	23,1%	128	96	32	75,0%	25,0%	18	16	2	88,9%	11,1%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Latvia	28	15	13	53,6%	46,4%	14	6	8	42,9%	57,1%	5	3	2	60,0%	40,0%	9	6	3	66,7%	33,3%
Lithuania	70	45	25	64,3%	35,7%	59	36	23	61,0%	39,0%	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	412	224	188	54,4%	45,6%	354	184	170	52,0%	48,0%	46	30	16	65,2%	34,8%	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	278	152	126	54,7%	45,3%	75	37	38	49,3%	50,7%	133	71	62	53,4%	46,6%	70	44	26	62,9%	37,1%
Slovak Republic	63	39	24	61,9%	38,1%	54	32	22	59,3%	40,7%	8	6	2	75,0%	25,0%	1	1	0	100,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	14	4	10	28,6%	71,4%	13	4	9	30,8%	69,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	0	1	0,0%	100,0%
Spain	83	44	39	53,0%	47,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Sweden	32	16	16	50,0%	50,0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	0	1	0,0%	100,0%
Average	77	43	31	50,4%	49,6%	72	40	30	57,1%	42,9%	22	14	8	67,0%	33,0%	5	4	2	58,5%	43,8%
Median	34	20	17	55,5%	44,5%	46	22	18	57,9%	42,1%	10	6	2	70,3%	29,7%	1	1	1	81,8%	25,8%
Minimum	1	0	1	0,0%	20,0%	2	2	0	30,8%	0,0%	1	0	0	0,0%	0,0%	1	0	0	0,0%	0,0%
Maximum	412	224	188	80,0%	100,0%	354	184	170	100,0%	69,2%	133	71	62	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%	30%	26%	30%

Salaries of judges and public prosecutors

Table 7.6.1 Annual salaries of judges and public prosecutors in 2023 (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	40 430 €	63 420 €	NA	175 514 €	NA	67 270 €	NA	175 514 €	NA
Belgium	51 369 €	85 615 €	48 544 €	156 548 €	88 762 €	85 615 €	48 544 €	159 414 €	90 387 €
Bulgaria	12 518 €	34 867 €	31 381 €	61 202 €	55 082 €	34 867 €	31 381 €	61 202 €	55 082 €
Croatia	19 008 €	32 787 €	22 176 €	60 804 €	38 667 €	32 787 €	22 176 €	60 804 €	38 667 €
Cyprus	28 200 €	83 494 €	58 803 €	148 408 €	113 228 €	36 847 €	NA	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	20 959 €	76 149 €	NA	108 920 €	NA	66 107 €	NA	91 669 €	NA
Denmark	44 793 €	141 942 €	NA	265 248 €	NA	50 011 €	NA	128 625 €	NA
Estonia	21 984 €	64 872 €	50 028 €	84 840 €	65 424 €	59 388 €	45 792 €	67 872 €	52 344 €
Finland	51 663 €	80 761 €	NA	152 787 €	NA	59 000 €	NA	95 000 €	NA
France	42 534 €	54 495 €	46 320 €	123 504 €	102 508 €	54 495 €	46 320 €	123 504 €	102 508 €
Germany	59 094 €	55 971 €	43 631 €	140 608 €	90 217 €	55 971 €	43 631 €	127 203 €	82 751 €
Greece	19 654 €	31 710 €	22 987 €	96 037 €	56 373 €	31 710 €	22 995 €	87 247 €	51 923 €
Hungary	19 304 €	25 759 €	17 129 €	58 623 €	38 984 €	25 759 €	17 129 €	54 652 €	36 344 €
Ireland	47 725 €	144 856 €	NA	266 974 €	NA	37 200 €	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	33 453 €	59 179 €	37 293 €	199 670 €	114 750 €	59 180 €	37 293 €	199 670 €	114 750 €
Latvia	18 444 €	43 680 €	30 565 €	68 244 €	47 415 €	41 628 €	29 157 €	51 456 €	35 899 €
Lithuania	24 165 €	56 115 €	33 950 €	71 776 €	43 424 €	32 265 €	19 520 €	53 679 €	32 476 €
Luxembourg	75 346 €	101 592 €	NA	179 657 €	NA	101 592 €	NA	179 657 €	NA
Malta	21 843 €	108 905 €	83 710 €	118 595 €	77 415 €	58 722 €	44 083 €	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	70 800 €	95 913 €	55 046 €	165 564 €	NA	91 244 €	54 053 €	NA	NA
Poland	19 747 €	37 742 €	29 057 €	105 819 €	70 342 €	42 399 €	34 420 €	98 232 €	78 529 €
Portugal	21 465 €	49 953 €	NA	109 504 €	NA	49 953 €	NA	109 504 €	NA
Romania	17 083 €	27 824 €	16 861 €	113 501 €	65 748 €	29 890 €	17 486 €	93 759 €	54 850 €
Slovak Republic	17 160 €	54 054 €	38 355 €	71 198 €	50 520 €	46 553 €	31 935 €	70 750 €	52 320 €
Slovenia	26 651 €	35 465 €	22 620 €	69 190 €	40 440 €	35 465 €	22 620 €	69 190 €	40 440 €
Spain	26 555 €	58 128 €	42 433 €	141 220 €	90 381 €	58 128 €	42 433 €	141 220 €	90 381 €
Sweden	43 527 €	81 256 €	52 004 €	138 036 €	75 920 €	49 780 €	NA	78 700 €	NA
Average	33 166 €	66 167 €	39 145 €	127 852 €	69 768 €	51 623 €	33 943 €	103 414 €	63 103 €
Median	26 555 €	58 128 €	37 824 €	118 595 €	65 748 €	49 953 €	33 178 €	93 759 €	53 597 €
Minimum	12 518 €	25 759 €	16 861 €	58 623 €	38 667 €	25 759 €	17 129 €	51 456 €	32 476 €
Maximum	75 346 €	144 856 €	83 710 €	266 974 €	114 750 €	101 592 €	54 053 €	199 670 €	114 750 €
% of NA	0%	0%	26%	0%	30%	0%	33%	4%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	11%

Table 7.6.2 Evolution of the gross annual salaries of judges from 2018 to 2023 (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	Variations		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Variations	
							2018 - 2023	2022 - 2023							2018 - 2023	2022 - 2023
Austria	53 865 €	55 392 €	56 638 €	57 460 €	59 188 €	63 420 €	17,7%	7,2%	131 228 €	134 559 €	137 586 €	139 581 €	163 801 €	175 514 €	33,7%	7,2%
Belgium	70 238 €	67 532 €	67 532 €	73 069 €	83 937 €	85 615 €	21,9%	2,0%	128 424 €	122 877 €	122 877 €	133 608 €	153 479 €	156 548 €	21,9%	2,0%
Bulgaria	19 941 €	22 957 €	24 990 €	27 867 €	30 085 €	34 867 €	74,9%	15,9%	36 097 €	39 583 €	44 214 €	48 222 €	53 144 €	61 202 €	69,5%	15,2%
Croatia	22 883 €	27 962 €	27 878 €	29 020 €	27 754 €	32 787 €	43,3%	18,1%	53 347 €	53 636 €	53 447 €	57 318 €	57 558 €	60 804 €	14,0%	5,6%
Cyprus	77 738 €	77 738 €	77 916 €	77 916 €	77 916 €	83 494 €	7,4%	7,2%	137 139 €	138 179 €	138 494 €	138 494 €	138 494 €	148 408 €	8,2%	7,2%
Czech Republic	34 578 €	38 064 €	40 584 €	42 485 €	44 182 €	76 149 €	120,2%	72,4%	78 296 €	85 157 €	89 904 €	96 492 €	100 367 €	108 920 €	39,1%	8,5%
Denmark	128 780 €	132 316 €	122 545 €	118 377 €	140 244 €	141 942 €	10,2%	1,2%	225 785 €	240 196 €	236 387 €	221 226 €	261 648 €	265 248 €	17,5%	1,4%
Estonia	44 388 €	48 112 €	51 962 €	56 952 €	56 952 €	64 872 €	46,1%	13,9%	58 044 €	62 916 €	67 942 €	74 484 €	74 786 €	84 840 €	46,2%	13,4%
Finland	63 000 €	64 500 €	66 900 €	68 900 €	70 628 €	80 761 €	28,2%	14,3%	132 000 €	134 500 €	136 300 €	141 720 €	141 720 €	152 787 €	15,7%	7,8%
France	45 728 €	46 149 €	46 149 €	46 149 €	46 812 €	54 495 €	19,2%	16,4%	122 802 €	123 213 €	123 213 €	123 213 €	122 192 €	123 504 €	0,6%	1,1%
Germany	49 605 €	51 199 €	52 928 €	53 568 €	54 224 €	55 971 €	12,8%	3,2%	130 370 €	134 040 €	136 245 €	137 712 €	139 986 €	140 608 €	7,9%	0,4%
Greece	31 710 €	31 710 €	31 710 €	31 710 €	31 710 €	31 710 €	0,0%	0,0%	87 247 €	87 247 €	87 247 €	87 247 €	96 037 €	96 037 €	10,1%	0,0%
Hungary	22 043 €	21 812 €	21 856 €	23 942 €	30 157 €	25 759 €	16,9%	-14,6%	42 104 €	41 879 €	57 542 €	63 886 €	69 818 €	58 623 €	39,2%	-16,0%
Ireland	122 373 €	123 754 €	129 704 €	130 197 €	139 917 €	144 856 €	18,4%	3,5%	196 444 €	197 916 €	208 854 €	208 145 €	257 872 €	266 974 €	35,9%	3,5%
Italy	56 263 €	56 263 €	56 263 €	57 500 €	57 500 €	59 179 €	5,2%	2,9%	186 637 €	186 637 €	187 296 €	194 005 €	194 005 €	199 670 €	7,0%	2,9%
Latvia	23 592 €	32 340 €	34 104 €	35 808 €	36 948 €	43 680 €	85,1%	18,2%	50 508 €	50 520 €	56 093 €	57 302 €	57 712 €	68 244 €	35,1%	18,2%
Lithuania	23 933 €	35 649 €	36 267 €	36 473 €	36 242 €	56 115 €	134,5%	54,8%	36 939 €	49 425 €	49 698 €	49 960 €	54 213 €	71 776 €	94,3%	32,4%
Luxembourg	84 888 €	92 016 €	92 016 €	92 591 €	96 084 €	101 592 €	19,7%	5,7%	NA	NA	110 177 €	110 865 €	169 916 €	179 657 €	NA	5,7%
Malta	86 932 €	90 863 €	95 215 €	96 176 €	97 161 €	108 905 €	25,3%	12,1%	94 658 €	98 713 €	103 246 €	104 336 €	105 451 €	118 595 €	25,3%	12,5%
Netherlands	76 500 €	82 113 €	83 765 €	85 440 €	89 236 €	95 913 €	25,4%	7,5%	138 500 €	NA	NA	155 799 €	160 741 €	165 564 €	19,5%	3,0%
Poland	24 146 €	26 117 €	25 796 €	25 796 €	26 931 €	37 742 €	56,3%	40,1%	67 267 €	72 866 €	71 941 €	71 941 €	79 666 €	105 819 €	57,3%	32,8%
Portugal	35 699 €	35 805 €	48 055 €	48 378 €	48 728 €	49 953 €	39,9%	2,5%	85 820 €	93 095 €	105 345 €	106 183 €	106 533 €	109 504 €	27,6%	2,8%
Romania	45 127 €	44 041 €	43 223 €	42 550 €	42 541 €	27 824 €	-38,3%	-34,6%	91 378 €	89 180 €	87 522 €	86 160 €	86 142 €	113 501 €	24,2%	31,8%
Slovak Republic	36 061 €	38 291 €	41 278 €	42 828 €	45 775 €	54 054 €	49,9%	18,1%	52 088 €	55 310 €	59 623 €	61 862 €	66 264 €	71 198 €	36,7%	7,4%
Slovenia	32 633 €	32 633 €	32 628 €	32 628 €	34 101 €	35 465 €	8,7%	4,0%	63 664 €	63 664 €	63 660 €	63 660 €	66 528 €	69 190 €	8,7%	4,0%
Spain	48 997 €	50 927 €	51 946 €	52 534 €	57 855 €	58 128 €	18,6%	0,5%	124 968 €	128 092 €	130 654 €	131 830 €	140 534 €	141 220 €	13,0%	0,5%
Sweden	72 848 €	73 800 €	79 951 €	79 387 €	76 973 €	81 256 €	11,5%	5,6%	126 152 €	127 840 €	138 395 €	136 945 €	134 036 €	138 036 €	9,4%	3,0%
Average	53 129 €	55 558 €	57 030 €	57 989 €	60 733 €	66 167 €	32,55%	11,04%	102 996 €	104 450 €	107 842 €	111 192 €	120 468 €	127 852 €	27,6%	7,9%
Median	45 728 €	48 112 €	51 946 €	52 534 €	54 224 €	58 128 €	19,68%	7,15%	93 018 €	93 095 €	104 296 €	106 183 €	106 533 €	118 595 €	23,1%	5,6%
Minimum	19 941 €	21 812 €	21 856 €	23 942 €	26 931 €	25 759 €	-38,34%	-34,59%	36 097 €	39 583 €	44 214 €	48 222 €	53 144 €	58 623 €	0,6%	-16,0%
Maximum	128 780 €	132 316 €	129 704 €	130 197 €	140 244 €	144 856 €	134,47%	72,35%	225 785 €	240 196 €	236 387 €	221 226 €	261 648 €	266 974 €	94,3%	32,8%
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	7%	4%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%
% of NAP	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 2023 (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	Variations		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Variations	
							2018 - 2023	2022 - 2023							2018 - 2023	2022 - 2023
Austria	57 158 €	58 762 €	60 084 €	60 955 €	62 782 €	67 270 €	17,7%	7,1%	131 228 €	134 558 €	137 586 €	139 581 €	163 801 €	175 514 €	33,7%	7,2%
Belgium	70 238 €	67 532 €	67 532 €	73 069 €	83 937 €	85 615 €	21,9%	2,0%	130 775 €	125 183 €	125 183 €	136 054 €	156 288 €	159 414 €	21,9%	2,0%
Bulgaria	19 941 €	22 957 €	24 990 €	27 867 €	30 085 €	34 867 €	74,9%	15,9%	36 097 €	39 583 €	44 214 €	48 222 €	53 144 €	61 202 €	69,5%	15,2%
Croatia	22 883 €	27 962 €	27 878 €	29 020 €	27 754 €	32 787 €	43,3%	18,1%	53 347 €	53 636 €	53 447 €	57 318 €	57 558 €	60 804 €	14,0%	5,6%
Cyprus	34 060 €	32 959 €	35 010 €	35 010 €	35 010 €	36 847 €	8,2%	5,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	31 121 €	34 238 €	36 528 €	38 564 €	39 763 €	66 107 €	112,4%	66,3%	67 176 €	74 171 €	79 008 €	79 813 €	83 522 €	91 669 €	36,5%	9,8%
Denmark	53 600 €	54 045 €	48 322 €	49 058 €	49 137 €	50 011 €	-6,7%	1,8%	91 087 €	95 657 €	NA	89 407 €	126 411 €	128 625 €	41,2%	1,8%
Estonia	24 384 €	40 968 €	47 556 €	52 140 €	52 350 €	59 388 €	143,6%	13,4%	58 041 €	47 786 €	53 353 €	59 592 €	59 828 €	67 872 €	16,9%	13,4%
Finland	48 800 €	50 400 €	50 880 €	50 880 €	59 000 €	59 000 €	20,9%	0,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	95 000 €	95 000 €	NAP	0,0%
France	46 317 €	46 738 €	48 738 €	46 738 €	48 838 €	54 495 €	17,7%	11,6%	122 802 €	123 213 €	123 213 €	123 213 €	122 192 €	123 504 €	0,6%	1,1%
Germany	49 605 €	51 199 €	52 928 €	53 568 €	54 224 €	55 971 €	12,8%	3,2%	117 941 €	121 261 €	123 256 €	124 583 €	126 640 €	127 203 €	7,9%	0,4%
Greece	31 710 €	31 710 €	31 710 €	31 710 €	31 710 €	31 710 €	0,0%	0,0%	87 247 €	87 247 €	87 247 €	87 247 €	87 247 €	87 247 €	0,0%	0,0%
Hungary	20 263 €	21 843 €	21 856 €	24 156 €	24 609 €	25 759 €	27,1%	4,7%	39 828 €	41 543 €	45 961 €	50 796 €	52 213 €	54 652 €	37,2%	4,7%
Ireland	32 153 €	32 153 €	33 370 €	33 370 €	36 450 €	37 200 €	15,7%	2,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	56 263 €	56 263 €	56 263 €	57 500 €	57 500 €	59 180 €	5,2%	2,9%	186 637 €	186 637 €	187 296 €	194 005 €	194 005 €	199 670 €	7,0%	2,9%
Latvia	27 975 €	31 668 €	33 396 €	35 064 €	36 192 €	41 628 €	48,8%	15,0%	34 827 €	43 195 €	41 411 €	43 479 €	44 880 €	51 456 €	47,7%	14,7%
Lithuania	26 495 €	28 856 €	29 357 €	29 523 €	31 092 €	32 265 €	21,8%	3,8%	35 422 €	45 664 €	47 038 €	48 996 €	52 236 €	53 679 €	51,5%	2,8%
Luxembourg	84 888 €	92 016 €	92 016 €	92 591 €	96 084 €	101 592 €	19,7%	5,7%	NA	NA	110 177 €	110 865 €	169 916 €	179 657 €	NA	5,7%
Malta	33 895 €	39 612 €	43 505 €	44 496 €	56 958 €	58 722 €	73,2%	3,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	76 500 €	NA	84 058 €	85 195 €	87 637 €	91 244 €	19,3%	4,1%	138 500 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	24 146 €	26 117 €	25 796 €	25 796 €	26 931 €	42 399 €	75,6%	57,4%	67 267 €	72 866 €	71 941 €	71 941 €	73 651 €	98 232 €	46,0%	33,4%
Portugal	35 699 €	35 805 €	48 055 €	48 378 €	48 728 €	49 953 €	39,9%	2,5%	85 820 €	93 095 €	105 345 €	106 183 €	106 533 €	109 504 €	27,6%	2,8%
Romania	45 127 €	44 041 €	43 223 €	42 550 €	42 541 €	29 890 €	-33,8%	-29,7%	67 977 €	68 320 €	67 051 €	66 007 €	65 993 €	93 759 €	37,9%	42,1%
Slovak Republic	34 058 €	36 164 €	38 984 €	40 448 €	42 249 €	46 553 €	36,7%	10,2%	52 088 €	55 310 €	59 623 €	60 162 €	62 130 €	70 750 €	35,8%	13,9%
Slovenia	32 633 €	32 633 €	32 628 €	32 628 €	34 101 €	35 465 €	8,7%	4,0%	63 664 €	63 664 €	63 660 €	63 660 €	66 528 €	69 190 €	8,7%	4,0%
Spain	48 997 €	50 927 €	51 946 €	52 534 €	57 855 €	58 128 €	18,6%	0,5%	124 968 €	128 092 €	130 654 €	131 830 €	140 534 €	141 220 €	13,0%	0,5%
Sweden	56 000 €	56 800 €	56 000 €	56 000 €	56 520 €	49 780 €	-11,1%	-11,9%	88 000 €	89 600 €	88 000 €	89 800 €	97 680 €	78 700 €	-10,6%	-19,4%
Average	41 663 €	42 476 €	45 282 €	46 252 €	48 520 €	51 623 €	30,8%	8,1%	85 488 €	85 251 €	87 841 €	90 125 €	98 171 €	103 414 €	25,9%	7,1%
Median	34 060 €	37 888 €	43 505 €	44 496 €	48 728 €	49 953 €	19,7%	4,0%	76 899 €	74 171 €	79 008 €	83 530 €	87 247 €	93 759 €	27,6%	4,0%
Minimum	19 941 €	21 843 €	21 856 €	24 156 €	24 609 €	25 759 €	-33,8%	-29,7%	34 827 €	39 583 €	41 411 €	43 479 €	44 880 €	51 456 €	-10,6%	-19,4%
Maximum	84 888 €	92 016 €	92 016 €	92 591 €	96 084 €	101 592 €	143,6%	66,3%	186 637 €	186 637 €	187 296 €	194 005 €	194 005 €	199 670 €	69,5%	42,1%
% of NA	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	7%	7%	4%	7%	4%	7%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15%	15%	15%	15%	7%	11%	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 2023 (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	4,3	1,7	4,3
Belgium	1,7	3,0	1,7	3,1
Bulgaria	2,8	4,9	2,8	4,9
Croatia	1,7	3,2	1,7	3,2
Cyprus	3,0	5,3	1,3	NAP
Czech Republic	3,6	5,2	3,2	4,4
Denmark	3,2	5,9	1,1	2,9
Estonia	3,0	3,9	2,7	3,1
Finland	1,6	3,0	1,1	1,8
France	1,3	2,9	1,3	2,9
Germany	0,9	2,4	0,9	2,2
Greece	1,6	4,9	1,6	4,4
Hungary	1,3	3,0	1,3	2,8
Ireland	3,0	5,6	0,8	NAP
Italy	1,8	6,0	1,8	6,0
Latvia	2,4	3,7	2,3	2,8
Lithuania	2,3	3,0	1,3	2,2
Luxembourg	1,3	2,4	1,3	2,4
Malta	5,0	5,4	2,7	NAP
Netherlands	1,4	2,3	1,3	NA
Poland	1,9	5,4	2,1	5,0
Portugal	2,3	5,1	2,3	5,1
Romania	1,6	6,6	1,7	5,5
Slovak Republic	3,2	4,1	2,7	4,1
Slovenia	1,3	2,6	1,3	2,6
Spain	2,2	5,3	2,2	5,3
Sweden	1,9	3,2	1,1	1,8
Average	2,2	4,2	1,8	3,6
Median	1,9	4,1	1,7	3,1
Minimum	0,9	2,3	0,8	1,8
Maximum	5,0	6,6	3,2	6,0
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	4%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	11%

Table 7.6.5: Existence of additional benefits for judges and public prosecutors in 2023 (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	7	6	13
No	27	18	21	12	27	20	21	14

Lawyers

Table 7.7.1 Evolution of the number of lawyers from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q146)

States	Number of lawyers										
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	5 801	5 940	6 138	6 132	6 325	6 483	6 667	6 707	6 875	6 984	7 073
Belgium	17 795	18 134	18 402	18 532	18 604	18 658	18 905	18 875	19 161	19 310	19 300
Bulgaria	12 010	12 696	13 013	13 500	13 720	13 640	13 880	13 964	13 605	13 487	13 533
Croatia	4 408	4 487	4 560	4 690	4 719	4 756	4 752	4 835	5 002	4 979	5 301
Cyprus	2 896	3 114	3 208	3 605	3 793	4 012	4 209	4 273	4 377	4 651	4 718
Czech Republic	10 255	11 842	12 300	11 310	11 587	11 180	12 188	12 267	12 390	14 335	12 766
Denmark	6 053	6 134	6 235	6 236	6 450	6 563	6 843	6 870	7 063	7 290	7 290
Estonia	878	934	970	993	1 024	1 041	1 076	1 096	1 074	1 085	1 136
Finland	2 009	2 115	3 550	3 791	3 846	3 965	4 022	4 087	4 173	4 098	4 138
France	60 223	62 073	62 073	65 480	66 958	66 958	68 835	70 073	70 794	72 521	72 521
Germany	162 695	163 513	163 772	164 393	164 656	165 104	165 901	165 680	165 587	165 186	165 776
Greece	42 177	42 052	42 226	42 091	41 903	42 949	42 500	44 595	43 240	47 141	46 009
Hungary	13 000	13 000	13 000	11 191	11 191	12 715	12 719	11 436	11 617	20 221	20 686
Ireland	11 215	11 588	11 907	12 237	12 588	13 142	14 816	14 054	13 434	14 177	14 054
Italy	226 202	223 842	237 132	229 292	231 565	234 386	236 494	235 964	229 783	234 632	227 410
Latvia	1 336	1 363	1 363	1 231	1 370	1 218	1 357	1 370	1 351	1 351	1 337
Lithuania	1 988	1 988	2 117	2 213	2 207	2 213	2 248	2 254	2 277	2 297	2 297
Luxembourg	2 203	2 180	2 323	2 381	2 597	2 993	2 914	3 080	3 247	3 255	3 431
Malta	1 112	1 485	1 569	1 327	1 473	1 535	1 648	1 762	1 316	1 523	1 772
Netherlands	17 298	17 713	17 343	17 498	17 672	17 784	17 829	17 964	18 108	18 218	18 513
Poland	-	52 760	-	48 315	51 227	53 081	55 178	57 365	59 635	61 554	63 447
Portugal	28 765	29 337	27 277	30 475	31 326	32 368	33 204	33 115	33 937	35 432	36 634
Romania	23 332	23 244	23 635	23 205	23 020	22 873	23 554	23 424	23 308	23 123	23 160
Slovak Republic	5 541	5 827	5 993	6 142	6 037	6 112	6 186	6 266	6 469	6 430	6 605
Slovenia	1 529	1 628	1 669	1 711	1 737	1 768	1 813	1 834	1 856	1 872	1 907
Spain	-	135 016	149 818	142 061	144 212	143 205	143 398	143 717	144 642	148 388	145 025
Sweden	5 422	5 575	5 800	5 767	5 911	6 000	6 000	6 257	6 436	6 571	5 966
Average	26 646	31 836	32 207	32 437	32 878	33 211	33 672	33 822	33 732	34 819	34 511
Median	6 053	11 588	9 071	11 191	11 191	11 180	12 188	11 436	11 617	13 487	12 766
Minimum	878	934	970	993	1 024	1 041	1 076	1 096	1 074	1 085	1 136
Maximum	226 202	223 842	237 132	229 292	231 565	234 386	236 494	235 964	229 783	234 632	227 410
Nb of values	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

***Before 2017, Cyprus also included "legal advisors", who cannot represent clients in court.**

Finland: Since 2015, the number of lawyers provided includes both the number of lawyers working in the private sector and the number of lawyers working in the public sector. Before 2015 the number given only included the members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional titles advokat (advocate).

Table 7.7.1a Evolution of the number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants from 2013 to 2023 and their variations (Q1, Q146)

States	Number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants											Variation of the total number of lawyers	
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2013-2023	2022-2023
Austria	68,4	69,2	70,5	70,2	71,9	73,5	74,9	75,1	76,6	76,7	77,2	13,0%	0,7%
Belgium	159,6	161,8	163,3	163,7	163,5	163,2	165,4	163,8	165,6	165,1	164,1	2,8%	-0,6%
Bulgaria	165,8	176,3	181,9	190,1	194,6	194,9	199,7	201,9	198,9	209,2	210,0	26,7%	0,4%
Croatia	103,8	106,2	108,8	112,9	114,9	116,7	117,1	119,8	129,2	129,3	137,6	32,5%	6,4%
Cyprus	337,5	362,9	378,2	425,0	443,7	458,0	474,0	476,9	483,8	505,2	505,4	49,7%	0,0%
Czech Republic	97,6	112,5	116,5	106,9	109,4	105,0	114,2	114,6	117,8	132,1	117,1	20,0%	-11,4%
Denmark	107,6	108,4	109,2	108,5	111,6	113,0	117,5	117,6	120,3	123,0	122,9	14,2%	-0,1%
Estonia	66,7	71,1	73,7	75,5	77,8	78,9	81,2	82,4	80,7	81,7	83,2	24,6%	1,8%
Finland	36,9	38,7	64,7	68,9	69,8	71,8	72,8	73,9	75,2	73,7	73,7	100,0%	0,1%
France	91,5	93,6	93,2	97,7	99,7	99,9	102,6	104,0	104,7	106,6	106,1	15,9%	-0,5%
Germany	201,4	202,4	200,3	200,1	199,2	198,9	199,5	199,2	198,9	195,8	195,8	-2,8%	0,0%
Greece	381,3	387,7	388,9	390,3	389,1	399,9	396,3	416,1	404,9	441,5	441,8	15,9%	0,1%
Hungary	131,6	131,9	132,2	114,2	113,3	132,6	130,2	115,6	119,9	210,6	215,8	64,0%	2,5%
Ireland	243,7	250,5	255,3	261,8	262,7	270,6	301,0	282,4	262,2	275,3	263,0	7,9%	-4,5%
Italy	379,0	368,2	390,9	378,4	382,9	388,3	392,6	398,2	389,6	398,7	385,5	1,7%	-3,3%
Latvia	66,0	68,1	69,2	62,5	70,3	63,4	71,1	72,4	72,0	71,7	71,4	8,2%	-0,4%
Lithuania	67,5	68,1	73,3	77,7	78,6	79,2	80,5	80,6	81,1	80,4	79,6	17,8%	-1,0%
Luxembourg	400,5	387,2	412,6	403,1	431,4	487,5	465,4	485,2	503,1	492,6	510,5	27,5%	3,6%
Malta	259,0	337,7	348,3	288,3	309,6	322,7	333,9	342,4	255,0	292,8	314,5	21,4%	7,4%
Netherlands	102,8	104,8	102,1	102,4	102,9	102,9	102,4	102,8	103,4	102,3	103,2	0,4%	0,9%
Poland	-	137,1	-	125,7	133,3	138,2	143,7	150,0	156,6	163,0	168,6	-	3,4%
Portugal	275,9	282,8	263,8	295,6	304,4	315,0	322,5	321,6	327,8	338,5	344,3	24,8%	1,7%
Romania	117,0	104,3	119,6	118,2	117,9	117,9	121,3	122,1	122,4	121,4	121,5	3,8%	0,1%
Slovak Republic	102,3	107,5	110,4	113,0	110,9	112,1	113,3	114,8	119,0	118,4	121,8	19,0%	2,8%
Slovenia	74,2	79,0	80,9	82,8	84,0	85,0	86,5	87,0	88,1	88,4	89,8	21,0%	1,5%
Spain	-	290,7	322,6	305,3	308,8	304,6	302,3	303,6	304,9	308,8	298,3	-	-3,4%
Sweden	56,2	57,2	58,9	57,7	58,4	58,6	58,1	60,3	61,6	62,5	56,5	0,6%	-9,5%
Average	163,7	172,8	180,4	177,6	182,0	187,1	190,4	192,0	189,8	198,7	199,2	21,2%	0,0%
Median	107,6	112,5	118,1	114,2	114,9	117,9	121,3	119,8	122,4	132,1	137,6	17,8%	0,1%
Minimum	36,9	38,7	58,9	57,7	58,4	58,6	58,1	60,3	61,6	62,5	56,5	-2,8%	-11,4%
Maximum	400,5	387,7	412,6	425,0	443,7	487,5	474,0	485,2	503,1	505,2	510,5	100,0%	7,4%
Nb of values	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	25	27
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

***Before 2017, Cyprus also included "legal advisors", who cannot represent clients in court.**

Finland: Since 2015, the number of lawyers provided includes both the number of lawyers working in the private sector and the number of lawyers working in the public sector. Before 2015 the number given only included the members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional titles advokat (advocate).

Table 7.7.2 Evolution of the number of professional judges and lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q46, Q146)

States	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		2023	
	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	18,4	68,4	18,9	69,2	18,6	70,5	27,4	70,2	28,2	71,9	27,3	73,5	29,5	74,9	29,0	75,1	26,6	76,6	29,4	76,7	28,5	77,2
Belgium	14,4	159,6	14,3	161,8	14,3	163,3	14,1	163,7	13,8	163,5	13,3	163,2	13,3	165,4	13,2	163,8	14,4	165,6	14,4	165,1	15,3	164,1
Bulgaria	30,2	165,8	30,8	176,3	31,1	181,9	31,8	190,1	31,7	194,6	31,8	194,9	31,9	199,7	31,6	201,9	32,1	198,9	33,9	209,2	34,7	210,0
Croatia	45,0	103,8	44,4	106,2	44,5	108,8	43,3	112,9	43,2	114,9	40,7	116,7	41,4	117,1	40,7	119,8	42,4	129,2	42,4	129,3	42,3	137,6
Cyprus	11,8	337,5	11,3	362,9	13,3	378,2	13,1	425,0	13,9	443,7	13,5	458,0	13,0	474,0	14,1	476,9	14,3	483,8	15,5	505,2	16,5	505,4
Czech Republic	29,1	97,6	28,8	112,5	28,6	116,5	28,4	106,9	28,4	109,4	28,4	105,0	28,2	114,2	28,1	114,6	28,4	117,8	28,2	132,1	27,5	117,1
Denmark	6,3	107,6	6,7	108,4	6,6	109,2	6,5	108,5	6,5	111,6	6,5	113,0	6,4	117,5	6,6	117,6	6,6	120,3	6,5	123,0	6,6	122,9
Estonia	17,2	66,7	17,6	71,1	17,8	73,7	17,6	75,5	17,3	77,8	17,7	78,9	17,3	81,2	17,6	82,4	17,7	80,7	17,8	81,7	18,0	83,2
Finland	18,1	36,9	18,1	38,7	18,1	64,7	19,4	68,9	19,0	69,8	19,6	71,8	19,7	72,8	19,5	73,9	20,9	75,2	20,6	73,7	21,0	73,7
France	10,7	91,5	10,5	93,6	10,5	93,2	10,4	97,7	10,5	99,7	10,9	99,9	11,1	102,6	11,2	104,0	11,2	104,7	11,3	106,6	11,1	106,1
Germany	23,9	201,4	23,9	202,4	23,6	200,3	24,2	200,1	24,3	199,2	24,5	198,9	24,7	199,5	25,0	199,2	25,2	198,9	24,7	195,8	24,9	195,8
Greece	35,0	381,3	20,6	387,7	20,3	388,9	25,8	390,3	26,6	389,1	26,8	399,9	26,9	396,3	36,0	416,1	37,6	404,9	37,3	441,5	38,5	441,8
Hungary	28,4	131,6	28,5	131,9	28,6	132,2	28,7	114,2	28,6	113,3	30,2	132,6	29,5	130,2	28,2	115,6	28,0	119,9	27,7	210,6	27,7	215,8
Ireland	3,2	243,7	3,5	250,5	3,4	255,3	3,5	261,8	3,3	262,7	3,3	270,6	3,4	301,0	3,3	282,4	3,3	262,2	3,3	275,3	3,7	263,0
Italy	11,0	379,0	11,4	368,2	10,9	390,9	10,6	378,4	10,8	382,9	11,6	388,3	11,8	392,6	11,9	398,2	12,1	389,6	12,2	398,7	12,2	385,5
Latvia	23,8	66,0	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
Lithuania	26,2	67,5	25,8	68,1	26,4	73,3	27,3	77,7	27,3	78,6	27,1	79,2	26,8	80,5	26,5	80,6	25,6	81,1	26,1	80,4	23,9	79,6
Luxembourg	32,7	400,5	32,7	387,2	32,5	412,6	31,7	403,1	32,9	431,4	36,2	487,5	36,1	465,4	36,1	485,2	35,6	503,1	35,1	492,6	35,4	510,5
Malta	9,8	259,0	9,3	337,7	9,3	348,3	9,8	288,3	9,0	309,6	9,5	322,7	8,7	333,9	8,2	342,4	9,1	255,0	9,0	292,8	9,1	314,5
Netherlands	14,1	102,8	14,0	104,8	13,9	102,1	13,6	102,4	14,8	102,9	14,6	102,9	14,5	102,4	14,9	102,8	15,1	103,4	15,0	102,3	15,0	103,2
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
Portugal	19,4	275,9	19,2	282,8	19,2	263,8	19,3	295,6	20,0	304,4	19,3	315,0	19,4	322,5	19,4	321,6	19,5	327,8	19,5	338,5	19,6	344,3
Romania	22,6	117,0	20,5	104,3	23,3	119,6	23,6	118,2	23,9	117,9	24,1	117,9	24,5	121,3	24,0	122,1	24,1	122,4	22,9	121,4	21,5	121,5
Slovak Republic	24,8	102,3	24,4	107,5	23,8	110,4	24,1	113,0	25,3	110,9	25,3	112,1	25,1	113,3	23,9	114,8	25,5	119,0	25,7	118,4	26,8	121,8
Slovenia	46,1	74,2	44,8	79,0	43,5	80,9	42,6	82,8	41,6	84,0	41,7	85,0	41,7	86,5	41,5	87,0	40,8	88,1	40,7	88,4	39,8	89,8
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
Sweden	11,7	56,2	11,8	57,2	11,8	58,9	11,8	57,7	11,8	58,4	11,9	58,6	11,5	58,1	11,6	60,3	11,9	61,6	11,7	62,5	11,8	56,5
Average	21,4	163,7	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
Median	19,4	107,6	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
Minimum	3,2	36,9	3,5	38,7	3,4	58,9	3,5	57,7	3,3	58,4	3,3	58,6	3,4	58,1	3,3	60,3	3,3	61,6	3,3	62,5	3,7	56,5
Maximum	46,1	400,5	44,8	387,7	44,5	412,6	43,3	425,0	43,2	443,7	41,7	487,5	41,7	474,0	41,5	485,2	42,4	503,1	42,4	505,2	42,3	510,5
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	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%

Cyprus: Before 2017, the "legal advisors", who cannot represent clients in court were also included.

Finland: Since 2015, the number of lawyers provided includes both the number of lawyers working in the private sector and the number of lawyers working in the public sector. Before , the number included only the members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional title “advokat” (advocate).

Italy: Administrative justice has been taken into account since 2018.

EC Templates - Professional judges and lawyers

Table 7.8 (EC) Total number of professional judges sitting in courts per 100 000 inhabitants from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q46)

States	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	20	18,4	18,9	18,6	27,4	28,2	27,3	29,5	29,0	26,6	29,4	28,5
Belgium	1	14,4	14,3	14,3	14,1	13,8	13,3	13,3	13,2	14,4	14,4	15,3
Bulgaria	2	30,2	30,8	31,1	31,8	31,7	31,8	31,9	31,6	32,1	33,9	34,7
Croatia	11	45,0	44,4	44,5	43,3	43,2	40,7	41,4	40,7	42,4	42,4	42,3
Cyprus	13	11,8	11,3	13,3	13,1	13,9	13,5	13,0	14,1	14,3	15,5	16,5
Czech Republic	3	29,1	28,8	28,6	28,4	28,4	28,4	28,2	28,1	28,4	28,2	27,5
Denmark	4	6,3	6,7	6,6	6,5	6,5	6,5	6,4	6,6	6,6	6,5	6,6
Estonia	6	17,2	17,6	17,8	17,6	17,3	17,7	17,3	17,6	17,7	17,8	18,0
Finland	26	18,1	18,1	18,1	19,4	19,0	19,6	19,7	19,5	20,9	20,6	21,0
France	10	10,7	10,5	10,5	10,4	10,5	10,9	11,1	11,2	11,2	11,3	11,1
Germany	5	23,9	23,9	23,6	24,2	24,3	24,5	24,7	25,0	25,2	24,7	24,9
Greece	8	35,0	20,6	20,3	25,8	26,6	26,8	26,9	36,0	37,6	37,3	38,5
Hungary	17	28,4	28,5	28,6	28,7	28,6	30,2	29,5	28,2	28,0	27,7	27,7
Ireland	7	3,2	3,5	3,4	3,5	3,3	3,3	3,4	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,7
Italy	12	11,0	11,4	10,9	10,6	10,8	11,6	11,8	11,9	12,1	12,2	12,2
Latvia	14	23,8	24,4	25,0	25,5	25,1	NA	27,3	29,1	29,1	28,3	28,2
Lithuania	15	26,2	25,8	26,4	27,3	27,3	27,1	26,8	26,5	25,6	26,1	23,9
Luxembourg	16	32,7	32,7	32,5	31,7	32,9	36,2	36,1	36,1	35,6	35,1	35,4
Malta	18	9,8	9,3	9,3	9,8	9,0	9,5	8,7	8,2	9,1	9,0	9,1
Netherlands	19	14,1	14,0	13,9	13,6	14,8	14,6	14,5	14,9	15,1	15,0	15,0
Poland	21	-	26,2	-	26,0	26,1	25,5	25,3	25,2	25,8	28,0	28,0
Portugal	22	19,4	19,2	19,2	19,3	20,0	19,3	19,4	19,4	19,5	19,5	19,6
Romania	23	22,6	20,5	23,3	23,6	23,9	24,1	24,5	24,0	24,1	22,9	21,5
Slovak Republic	25	24,8	24,4	23,8	24,1	25,3	25,3	25,1	23,9	25,5	25,7	26,8
Slovenia	24	46,1	44,8	43,5	42,6	41,6	41,7	41,7	41,5	40,8	40,7	39,8
Spain	9	-	11,5	11,6	11,5	11,5	11,5	11,3	11,2	11,4	11,9	11,1
Sweden	27	11,7	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,9	11,5	11,6	11,9	11,7	11,8

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 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q146)

States	EC Code	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	*20*	68,4	69,2	70,5	70,2	71,9	73,5	74,9	75,1	76,6	76,7	77,2
Belgium	*1*	159,6	161,8	163,3	163,7	163,5	163,2	165,4	163,8	165,6	165,1	164,1
Bulgaria	*2*	165,8	176,3	181,9	190,1	194,6	194,9	199,7	201,9	198,9	209,2	210,0
Croatia	*11*	103,8	106,2	108,8	112,9	114,9	116,7	117,1	119,8	129,2	129,3	137,6
Cyprus	*13*	337,5	362,9	378,2	425,0	443,7	458,0	474,0	476,9	483,8	505,2	505,4
Czech Republic	*3*	97,6	112,5	116,5	106,9	109,4	105,0	114,2	114,6	117,8	132,1	117,1
Denmark	*4*	107,6	108,4	109,2	108,5	111,6	113,0	117,5	117,6	120,3	123,0	122,9
Estonia	*6*	66,7	71,1	73,7	75,5	77,8	78,9	81,2	82,4	80,7	81,7	83,2
Finland	*26*	36,9	38,7	64,7	68,9	69,8	71,8	72,8	73,9	75,2	73,7	73,7
France	*10*	91,5	93,6	93,2	97,7	99,7	99,9	102,6	104,0	104,7	106,6	106,1
Germany	*5*	201,4	202,4	200,3	200,1	199,2	198,9	199,5	199,2	198,9	195,8	195,8
Greece	*8*	381,3	387,7	388,9	390,3	389,1	399,9	396,3	416,1	404,9	441,5	441,8
Hungary	*17*	131,6	131,9	132,2	114,2	113,3	132,6	130,2	115,6	119,9	210,6	215,8
Ireland	*7*	243,7	250,5	255,3	261,8	262,7	270,6	301,0	282,4	262,2	275,3	263,0
Italy	*12*	379,0	368,2	390,9	378,4	382,9	388,3	392,6	398,2	389,6	398,7	385,5
Latvia	*14*	66,0	68,1	69,2	62,5	70,3	63,4	71,1	72,4	72,0	71,7	71,4
Lithuania	*15*	67,5	68,1	73,3	77,7	78,6	79,2	80,5	80,6	81,1	80,4	79,6
Luxembourg	*16*	400,5	387,2	412,6	403,1	431,4	487,5	465,4	485,2	503,1	492,6	510,5
Malta	*18*	259,0	337,7	348,3	288,3	309,6	322,7	333,9	342,4	255,0	292,8	314,5
Netherlands	*19*	102,8	104,8	102,1	102,4	102,9	102,9	102,4	102,8	103,4	102,3	103,2
Poland	*21*	-	137,1	-	125,7	133,3	138,2	143,7	150,0	156,6	163,0	168,6
Portugal	*22*	275,9	282,8	263,8	295,6	304,4	315,0	322,5	321,6	327,8	338,5	344,3
Romania	*23*	117,0	104,3	119,6	118,2	117,9	117,9	121,3	122,1	122,4	121,4	121,5
Slovak Republic	*25*	102,3	107,5	110,4	113,0	110,9	112,1	113,3	114,8	119,0	118,4	121,8
Slovenia	*24*	74,2	79,0	80,9	82,8	84,0	85,0	86,5	87,0	88,1	88,4	89,8
Spain	*9*	-	290,7	322,6	305,3	308,8	304,6	302,3	303,6	304,9	308,8	298,3
Sweden	*27*	56,2	57,2	58,9	57,7	58,4	58,6	58,1	60,3	61,6	62,5	56,5

***Before 2017, Cyprus also included "legal advisors", who cannot represent clients in court.**

Finland: Since 2015, the number of lawyers provided includes both the number of lawyers working in the private sector and the number of lawyers working in the public sector. Before 2015 the number given only included the members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional titles advokat (advocate).

Indicator 7: Professionals of justice

comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

Question 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 (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 (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 (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.
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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.
Q166 (2013): Registered mediator can be any natural or legal person, who complies with the legal requirements (concerning university degree, mediation training etc.). According to the relevant legislation (Act LV of 2002 on Mediation) mediators established in other EEA Member States (i.e. living in the European Economic Area) can act in a current case in Hungary. The foreign mediator should inform the Ministry of Justice, which shall specify the rights for one year.

Q192 (General Comment): .

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 (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 (2021): from 2021 January 1 all mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania have the right to conduct judicial mediation in both civil and administrative cases.
Q166 (2020): In 2020 the list contained 438 mediators not judges (of which 100 males and 338 females), and 114 mediators judges (of which 27 males and 87 females).
The Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania, implementing the project co-financed by the European Union Structural Funds No. 10.1.4-V-922-01-005 "Development of the Conciliation Mediation System", taking into account the expansion of the Institute of Mediation and the consequent increased need for mediators, initiated the organization of training for mediators, during which a total of 420 persons (320 people were trained in the training of 40 academic hours, 100 people took part in the training of 24 academic hours).
This training took place in May – October, 2019. All participants signed a contract for the provision of training services, one of the conditions of which was the obligation to register to take the qualification exam for mediators and to come to take it. Due to the fact that the Training Participants' Agreement did not provide for the obligation to pass the mediators' qualification examination but to come to take it, the Ministry of Justice did not collect information on the proportion of trainees who passed the mediators' qualification examination, but the persons who took part in this training were very active in applying for the qualification examination for mediators. There were also cases when those who did not pass the mediator qualification exam for the first time registered to take the exam again six months later.
October – November in 2020 specialized training for mediators on the topic “Mediation in family disputes in the presence of signs of domestic violence” was organized on the order of the Ministry of Justice. A total of 60 mediators participated in the training. These training were intended to improve the qualification of mediators in disputes where are possible signs of domestic violence, therefore only mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania and having signed agreements with the State Guaranteed Legal Aid Service on the provision of compulsory mediation services could participate in.
It is noteworthy that the organized training, which were free of charge for their participants, increased the number of mediators in both 2019 and 2020. In this context, it would not be appropriate to compare the increase between 2019 and 2020 .

Q166 (2019): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.
Till 1st January, 2019 National Couts Administration have been maintained the list of court mediators which included judges and other persons (not judges). Due to a change in legal regulation (from 1st January, 2019), National Courts Administration maintains only the list of Judges who have been granted the status of mediators (Article 5 (2) of the Law on Mediation of the Republic of Lithuania) and transmits this data to the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service. The latter maintains the common list of mediators and decides on the status of mediator for persons who are not judges. The mentioned list is published on the website of the The State Garanteed Legal Aid Service (Article 5 (6) of the Law on Mediation). On 31 December, 2019 the list contained 286 mediators not judges (of which 71 males and 215 females), and 106 mediators judges (of which 25 males and 81 females).
It is to notice that court-related mediation in practice is more often executed by mediators judges however the mediators who are not judges are also allowed to mediate at this stage when they are appointed by the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service.

Q166 (2018): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.

Q166 (2017): The number of the mediators could increase due to the more effective spread of the information about the judicial mediation.
Q166 (2016): Judicial mediation is becoming more popular, efforts made by the judiciary and the National Courts Administration, as well as the legislator, resulted in an increased number of mediators.
Q166 (2015): National Courts Administration, data of the Activities report of 2015 of the Commission of the Judicial Mediation (http://www.teismai.lt/data/public/uploads/2016/03/teismines-mediacijos-komisijos-2015-m.-veiklos-apibendrinimas.pdf)

The main reforms that have been implemented over the last two years in judicial mediation:
From the 1st January 2015 the judicial mediation is available in all the courts of general jurisdiction. Before it was only available in courts, who participated in the pilot project. It is only available in civil cases. The judicial mediation is free of charge and parties may choose the judicial mediator from the List of Judicial Mediators (the List of Judicial Mediators is available at website https://e.teismas.lt/lt/public/teismin%C4%97-mediacija/). Judges, assisstants of judges, lawyers, psichologists and other persons of different background are on the List of Judicial Mediators.

The peculiarity is that judges can also have the status of judicial mediator. The parties may choose the judge, who deals with the case (if she/he has the status of judicial mediator) to act as judicial mediator. If a peaceful agreement is reached in such a case he/she has also the power to validate it.
Parties may also choose the judge of the Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court of Lithuania to deal with their dispute, which is heard by the court of lower instance, i.e. the dispute, which arose in the court of first instance, can be dealt with by the judge of the higher court.
In order to secure the impartiality of a judge, the judge, who was dealing with the dispute as judicial mediator has an obligation to opt out from the case at later stage.

In order to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Judicial Council has also decided, that judges in every case should decide on suitability of the case for judicial mediation. It was also decided to set at least 4 hours of trainings on judicial mediation in the training programmes of judges.

National Courts Administration has implemented the EU project on e-services in administration of justice in 2015. During the project, management of the process of judicial mediation was created in the Information System of Lithuanian Courts LITEKO. Parties have a possibility to make a statement in the claim or other document on judicial mediation, the judicial mediator can access the case via electronic means, can arrange the judicial mediation session via electronic means, the parties can discuss on a peaceful agreement, can sign and deliver it to the court via electronic means, i.e. E-Service Portal of Lithuanian Courts (https://e.teismas.lt/en/public/home/).

Q166 (2014): One of the reasons explaining the increase of the number of judicial mediators in 2014 is that from 1st January, 2015 new regulations on judicial mediation came into force, which set stricter requirements for candidates to judicial mediators (requirement for longer trainings (32 hours instead of 16 hours), requirement to attend the meetings of the Judicial Mediation Commission). Therefore persons, who wished to act as judicial mediators hurried to deliver their documents before the 1st. January, 2015, so that their request would be considered under rules, which were valid before 1st. January, 2015.

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 (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 (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 freedom 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 pe

rformance 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 (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.

Q166 (2013): The increase of the number of mediators in 2012 and 2013 comparing to 2010 is a result of the legislative reforms, stimulating the ADR.
Q192 (2018): Notaries public are not differentiated by gender within the records of the Ministry of Justice.

Slovak Republic

Q166 (2021): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 84 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2020): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2019): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2018): In previous cycles the number of registered mediators provided by the Ministry of Justice included all persons listed in the register of mediators, including those who has been stroke out of a list or suspended. For this evaluation cycle we can provide the number of active registered mediators.
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 (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 (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 7: Professionals of justice

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q166 (2013): Registered mediator can be any natural or legal person, who complies with the legal requirements (concerning university degree, mediation training etc.). According to the relevant legislation (Act LV of 2002 on Mediation) mediators established in other EEA Member States (i.e. living in the European Economic Area) can act in a current case in Hungary. The foreign mediator should inform the Ministry of Justice, which shall specify the rights for one year.

Ireland

Q166 (2014): 2014: Reforms are also under consideration. Legislation is being prepared to promote mediation as a viable, effective and efficient alternative to court proceedings thereby reducing legal costs, speeding up the resolution of disputes and relieving the stress involved in court proceedings. It is anticipated that a Mediation Bill will be published in 2015 with a view to enactment of the legislation quickly thereafter.

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 (2021): from 2021 January 1 all mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania have the right to conduct judicial mediation in both civil and administrative cases.

Q166 (2020): In 2020 the list contained 438 mediators not judges (of which 100 males and 338 females), and 114 mediators judges (of which 27 males and 87 females).
The Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania, implementing the project co-financed by the European Union Structural Funds No. 10.1.4-V-922-01-005 "Development of the Conciliation Mediation System", taking into account the expansion of the Institute of Mediation and the consequent increased need for mediators, initiated the organization of training for mediators, during which a total of 420 persons (320 people were trained in the training of 40 academic hours, 100 people took part in the training of 24 academic hours).
This training took place in May – October, 2019. All participants signed a contract for the provision of training services, one of the conditions of which was the obligation to register to take the qualification exam for mediators and to come to take it. Due to the fact that the Training Participants' Agreement did not provide for the obligation to pass the mediators' qualification examination but to come to take it, the Ministry of Justice did not collect information on the proportion of trainees who passed the mediators' qualification examination, but the persons who took part in this training were very active in applying for the qualification examination for mediators. There were also cases when those who did not pass the mediator qualification exam for the first time registered to take the exam again six months later.
October – November in 2020 specialized training for mediators on the topic “Mediation in family disputes in the presence of signs of domestic violence” was organized on the order of the Ministry of Justice. A total of 60 mediators participated in the training. These training were intended to improve the qualification of mediators in disputes where are possible signs of domestic violence, therefore only mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania and having signed agreements with the State Guaranteed Legal Aid Service on the provision of compulsory mediation services could participate in.
It is noteworthy that the organized training, which were free of charge for their participants, increased the number of mediators in both 2019 and 2020. In this context, it would not be appropriate to compare the increase between 2019 and 2020 .

Q166 (2019): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.
Till 1st January, 2019 National Couts Administration have been maintained the list of court mediators which included judges and other persons (not judges). Due to a change in legal regulation (from 1st January, 2019), National Courts Administration maintains only the list of Judges who have been granted the status of mediators (Article 5 (2) of the Law on Mediation of the Republic of Lithuania) and transmits this data to the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service. The latter maintains the common list of mediators and decides on the status of mediator for persons who are not judges. The mentioned list is published on the website of the The State Garanteed Legal Aid Service (Article 5 (6) of the Law on Mediation). On 31 December, 2019 the list contained 286 mediators not judges (of which 71 males and 215 females), and 106 mediators judges (of which 25 males and 81 females).
It is to notice that court-related mediation in practice is more often executed by mediators judges however the mediators who are not judges are also allowed to mediate at this stage when they are appointed by the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service.

Q166 (2018): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.

Q166 (2017): The number of the mediators could increase due to the more effective spread of the information about the judicial mediation.

Q166 (2016): Judicial mediation is becoming more popular, efforts made by the judiciary and the National Courts Administration, as well as the legislator, resulted in an increased number of mediators.

Q166 (2015): National Courts Administration, data of the Activities report of 2015 of the Commission of the Judicial Mediation (http://www.teismai.lt/data/public/uploads/2016/03/teismines-mediacijos-komisijos-2015-m.-veiklos-apibendrinimas.pdf)

The main reforms that have been implemented over the last two years in judicial mediation:
From the 1st January 2015 the judicial mediation is available in all the courts of general jurisdiction. Before it was only available in courts, who participated in the pilot project. It is only available in civil cases. The judicial mediation is free of charge and parties may choose the judicial mediator from the List of Judicial Mediators (the List of Judicial Mediators is available at website https://e.teismas.lt/lt/public/teismin%C4%97-mediacija/). Judges, assisstants of judges, lawyers, psichologists and other persons of different background are on the List of Judicial Mediators.

The peculiarity is that judges can also have the status of judicial mediator. The parties may choose the judge, who deals with the case (if she/he has the status of judicial mediator) to act as judicial mediator. If a peaceful agreement is reached in such a case he/she has also the power to validate it.
Parties may also choose the judge of the Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court of Lithuania to deal with their dispute, which is heard by the court of lower instance, i.e. the dispute, which arose in the court of first instance, can be dealt with by the judge of the higher court.
In order to secure the impartiality of a judge, the judge, who was dealing with the dispute as judicial mediator has an obligation to opt out from the case at later stage.

In order to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Judicial Council has also decided, that judges in every case should decide on suitability of the case for judicial mediation. It was also decided to set at least 4 hours of trainings on judicial mediation in the training programmes of judges.

National Courts Administration has implemented the EU project on e-services in administration of justice in 2015. During the project, management of the process of judicial mediation was created in the Information System of Lithuanian Courts LITEKO. Parties have a possibility to make a statement in the claim or other document on judicial mediation, the judicial mediator can access the case via electronic means, can arrange the judicial mediation session via electronic means, the parties can discuss on a peaceful agreement, can sign and deliver it to the court via electronic means, i.e. E-Service Portal of Lithuanian Courts (https://e.teismas.lt/en/public/home/).

Q166 (2014): One of the reasons explaining the increase of the number of judicial mediators in 2014 is that from 1st January, 2015 new regulations on judicial mediation came into force, which set stricter requirements for candidates to judicial mediators (requirement for longer trainings (32 hours instead of 16 hours), requirement to attend the meetings of the Judicial Mediation Commission). Therefore persons, who wished to act as judicial mediators hurried to deliver their documents before the 1st. January, 2015, so that their request would be considered under rules, which were valid before 1st. January, 2015.

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 (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.

Q166 (2013): The increase of the number of mediators in 2012 and 2013 comparing to 2010 is a result of the legislative reforms, stimulating the ADR.

Slovak Republic

Q166 (2021): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 84 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2020): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2019): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2018): In previous cycles the number of registered mediators provided by the Ministry of Justice included all persons listed in the register of mediators, including those who has been stroke out of a list or suspended. For this evaluation cycle we can provide the number of active registered mediators.

Slovenia

Q166 (2021): The procedures for listing (and un-listing) individual mediators are led by individual courts.

Spain

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.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (2020): The Ministry of Justice.

Luxembourg

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 (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 freedom 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 pe

rformance 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 (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".

Indicator 8: Mediators and notaries

Table 8.1 Evolution of the absolute number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation from 2013 to 2023 (Q166)

States	Number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation										
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	2 400	2 456	2 313	2 562	2 234	2 273	1 692	1 741	1 645	1 674	1 748
Belgium	1 157	1 352	1 457	1 454	1 744	2 122	2 399	2 577	2 463	2 736	2 736
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	406	453	474	549	588	612	632	673	706	824	927
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	442	421	589	620	660	657	589	669	686	712	726
Denmark	124	151	147	143	135	143	142	143	143	138	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	2 435	2 450	2 571	2 940	2 940	1 436	NA	2 542	2 542	2 854	2 980
Germany	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Greece	NA	NA	NA	1 665	1 809	1 665	2 553	NA	2 985	3 363	3 496
Hungary	20	120	160	174	174	153	203	141	150	136	135
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	19 266	21 555	23 612	23 932	24 010	23 875	23 804	24 944	23 561	23 745
Latvia	NAP	24	38	43	46	52	48	50	50	48	51
Lithuania	47	109	129	269	366	469	392	552	663	688	743
Luxembourg	130	135	110	173	144	198	227	238	245	270	292
Malta	69	61	61	66	69	67	67	66	71	66	56
Netherlands	927	1 187	1 409	1 466	1 511	1 002	935	865	803	768	760
Poland	-	NA	-	NA	NA	NA	4 120	4 100	4 102	4 200	6 648
Portugal	250	196	221	514	617	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	10 847	6 833	11 701	5 080	4 739	4 585	11 234	11 259	3 075	4 357	4 298
Slovak Republic	846	1 068	1 248	1 450	1 664	913	798	877	909	945	1 052
Slovenia	341	311	292	281	272	276	267	258	245	236	204
Spain	-	1 151	3 289	NA	5 302	6 939	7 710	8 896	9 921	10 723	9 225
Sweden	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Average	1 363	2 097	2 654	2 392	2 576	2 643	3 216	3 303	2 966	3 068	3 156
Median	406	437	532	585	660	785	715	769	803	824	927
Minimum	20	24	38	43	46	52	48	50	50	48	51
Maximum	10 847	19 266	21 555	23 612	23 932	24 010	23 875	23 804	24 944	23 561	23 745
% of NA	19%	19%	15%	19%	15%	19%	19%	19%	15%	15%	15%
% of NAP	19%	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 2013 to 2023 (Q166)

States	Number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation per 100 000 inhabitants										
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Austria	28,3	28,6	26,6	29,3	25,4	25,8	19,0	19,5	18,3	18,4	19,1
Belgium	10,4	12,1	12,9	12,8	15,3	18,6	21,0	22,4	21,3	23,4	23,3
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	9,6	10,7	11,3	13,2	14,3	15,0	15,6	16,7	18,2	21,4	24,1
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	4,2	4,0	5,6	5,9	6,2	6,2	5,5	6,3	6,5	6,6	6,7
Denmark	2,2	2,7	2,6	2,5	2,3	2,5	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,3	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	3,7	3,9	4,4	4,4	2,1	NA	3,8	3,8	4,2	4,4
Germany	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Greece	NA	NA	NA	15,4	16,8	15,5	23,8	NA	28,0	31,5	33,6
Hungary	0,2	1,2	1,6	1,8	1,8	1,6	2,1	1,4	1,5	1,4	1,4
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	31,7	35,5	39,0	39,6	39,8	39,6	40,2	42,3	40,0	40,3
Latvia	NAP	1,2	1,9	2,2	2,4	2,7	2,5	2,6	2,7	2,5	2,7
Lithuania	1,6	3,7	4,5	9,4	13,0	16,8	14,0	19,7	23,6	24,1	25,7
Luxembourg	23,6	24,0	19,5	29,3	23,9	32,3	36,3	37,5	38,0	40,9	43,4
Malta	16,1	13,9	13,5	14,3	14,5	14,1	13,6	12,8	13,8	12,7	9,9
Netherlands	5,5	7,0	8,3	8,6	8,8	5,8	5,4	4,9	4,6	4,3	4,2
Poland	-	NA	-	NA	NA	NA	10,7	10,7	10,8	11,1	17,7
Portugal	2,4	1,9	2,1	5,0	6,0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	54,4	30,7	59,2	25,9	24,3	23,6	57,9	58,7	16,2	22,9	22,5
Slovak Republic	15,6	19,7	23,0	26,7	30,6	16,8	14,6	16,1	16,7	17,4	19,4
Slovenia	16,5	15,1	14,1	13,6	13,2	13,3	12,7	12,2	11,6	11,1	9,6
Spain	-	2,5	7,1	NA	11,4	14,8	16,3	18,8	20,9	22,3	19,0
Sweden	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Average	13,0	11,9	14,1	14,4	14,4	14,8	17,4	17,0	15,8	16,8	17,3
Median	9,6	8,9	9,8	13,0	13,2	14,9	14,3	14,4	16,2	17,4	19,0
Minimum	0,2	1,2	1,6	1,8	1,8	1,6	2,1	1,4	1,5	1,4	1,4
Maximum	54,4	31,7	59,2	39,0	39,6	39,8	57,9	58,7	42,3	40,9	43,4
% of NA	19%	19%	15%	19%	15%	19%	19%	19%	15%	15%	15%
% of NAP	19%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%

Table 8.3 Number of notaries in 2023 (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	536	5,9	NAP	536	NAP	NAP
Belgium	1754	14,9	NAP	1754	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	702	10,9	NAP	702	NAP	NAP
Croatia	336	8,7	NAP	336	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	437	4,0	NAP	437	NAP	NAP
Denmark	41	0,7	NAP	NAP	41	NAP
Estonia	87	6,4	NAP	87	NAP	NAP
Finland	140	2,5	NAP	NAP	140	NAP
France	17528	25,6	NAP	17528	NAP	NAP
Germany	6534	7,7	NAP	6534	NAP	NAP
Greece	3470	33,3	NAP	3470	NAP	NAP
Hungary	313	3,3	NAP	313	NAP	NAP
Ireland	388	7,3	NAP	388	NAP	NAP
Italy	5033	8,5	NAP	5033	NAP	NAP
Latvia	105	5,6	NAP	105	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	226	7,8	NAP	226	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	36	5,4	NAP	36	NAP	NAP
Malta	392	69,6	NAP	392	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	3430	19,1	NAP	3430	NAP	NAP
Poland	4083	10,8	NAP	NAP	NAP	4083
Portugal	522	4,9	NAP	522	NAP	NAP
Romania	2780	14,6	NAP	2780	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	312	5,8	NAP	312	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	87	4,1	NAP	87	NAP	NAP
Spain	2819	5,8	NAP	2819	NAP	NAP
Sweden	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA
Average	2084	11,7	NA	2174,0	NA	NA
Median	437	7,3	NA	479,5	NA	NA
Minimum	36	0,7	NA	36,0	NA	NA
Maximum	17528	69,6	NA	17528,0	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 2023 (Q192)

States	Notaries				
	Total	Men	Women	% of Men	% of Women
Austria	536	452	84	84%	16%
Belgium	1754	1015	739	58%	42%
Bulgaria	702	225	477	32%	68%
Croatia	336	129	207	38%	62%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	437	156	281	36%	64%
Denmark	41	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	87	19	68	22%	78%
Finland	140	34	106	24%	76%
France	17528	7397	10131	42%	58%
Germany	6534	4987	1547	76%	24%
Greece	3470	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	313	129	181	41%	59%
Ireland	388	286	102	74%	26%
Italy	5033	3092	1941	61%	39%
Latvia	105	19	86	18%	82%
Lithuania	226	46	180	20%	80%
Luxembourg	36	20	16	56%	44%
Malta	392	140	252	36%	64%
Netherlands	3430	1502	1928	44%	56%
Poland	4083	1440	2643	35%	65%
Portugal	522	107	415	20%	80%
Romania	2780	859	1921	31%	69%
Slovak Republic	312	91	221	29%	71%
Slovenia	87	31	56	36%	64%
Spain	2819	1803	1016	64%	36%
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	2084	1043	1069	43%	57%
Median	437	156	252	36%	64%
Minimum	36	19	16	18%	16%
Maximum	17528	7397	10131	84%	82%
% of NA	4%	11%	11%	11%	11%
% 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 (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 (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 (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.
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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q166 (2013): Registered mediator can be any natural or legal person, who complies with the legal requirements (concerning university degree, mediation training etc.). According to the relevant legislation (Act LV of 2002 on Mediation) mediators established in other EEA Member States (i.e. living in the European Economic Area) can act in a current case in Hungary. The foreign mediator should inform the Ministry of Justice, which shall specify the rights for one year.

Q192 (General Comment): .

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 (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 (2021): from 2021 January 1 all mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania have the right to conduct judicial mediation in both civil and administrative cases.

Q166 (2020): In 2020 the list contained 438 mediators not judges (of which 100 males and 338 females), and 114 mediators judges (of which 27 males and 87 females).
The Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania, implementing the project co-financed by the European Union Structural Funds No. 10.1.4-V-922-01-005 "Development of the Conciliation Mediation System", taking into account the expansion of the Institute of Mediation and the consequent increased need for mediators, initiated the organization of training for mediators, during which a total of 420 persons (320 people were trained in the training of 40 academic hours, 100 people took part in the training of 24 academic hours).
This training took place in May – October, 2019. All participants signed a contract for the provision of training services, one of the conditions of which was the obligation to register to take the qualification exam for mediators and to come to take it. Due to the fact that the Training Participants' Agreement did not provide for the obligation to pass the mediators' qualification examination but to come to take it, the Ministry of Justice did not collect information on the proportion of trainees who passed the mediators' qualification examination, but the persons who took part in this training were very active in applying for the qualification examination for mediators. There were also cases when those who did not pass the mediator qualification exam for the first time registered to take the exam again six months later.
October – November in 2020 specialized training for mediators on the topic “Mediation in family disputes in the presence of signs of domestic violence” was organized on the order of the Ministry of Justice. A total of 60 mediators participated in the training. These training were intended to improve the qualification of mediators in disputes where are possible signs of domestic violence, therefore only mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania and having signed agreements with the State Guaranteed Legal Aid Service on the provision of compulsory mediation services could participate in.
It is noteworthy that the organized training, which were free of charge for their participants, increased the number of mediators in both 2019 and 2020. In this context, it would not be appropriate to compare the increase between 2019 and 2020 .

Q166 (2019): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.
Till 1st January, 2019 National Couts Administration have been maintained the list of court mediators which included judges and other persons (not judges). Due to a change in legal regulation (from 1st January, 2019), National Courts Administration maintains only the list of Judges who have been granted the status of mediators (Article 5 (2) of the Law on Mediation of the Republic of Lithuania) and transmits this data to the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service. The latter maintains the common list of mediators and decides on the status of mediator for persons who are not judges. The mentioned list is published on the website of the The State Garanteed Legal Aid Service (Article 5 (6) of the Law on Mediation). On 31 December, 2019 the list contained 286 mediators not judges (of which 71 males and 215 females), and 106 mediators judges (of which 25 males and 81 females).
It is to notice that court-related mediation in practice is more often executed by mediators judges however the mediators who are not judges are also allowed to mediate at this stage when they are appointed by the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service.

Q166 (2018): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.

Q166 (2017): The number of the mediators could increase due to the more effective spread of the information about the judicial mediation.
Q166 (2016): Judicial mediation is becoming more popular, efforts made by the judiciary and the National Courts Administration, as well as the legislator, resulted in an increased number of mediators.

Q166 (2015): National Courts Administration, data of the Activities report of 2015 of the Commission of the Judicial Mediation (http://www.teismai.lt/data/public/uploads/2016/03/teismines-mediacijos-komisijos-2015-m.-veiklos-apibendrinimas.pdf)

The main reforms that have been implemented over the last two years in judicial mediation:
From the 1st January 2015 the judicial mediation is available in all the courts of general jurisdiction. Before it was only available in courts, who participated in the pilot project. It is only available in civil cases. The judicial mediation is free of charge and parties may choose the judicial mediator from the List of Judicial Mediators (the List of Judicial Mediators is available at website https://e.teismas.lt/lt/public/teismin%C4%97-mediacija/). Judges, assisstants of judges, lawyers, psichologists and other persons of different background are on the List of Judicial Mediators.

The peculiarity is that judges can also have the status of judicial mediator. The parties may choose the judge, who deals with the case (if she/he has the status of judicial mediator) to act as judicial mediator. If a peaceful agreement is reached in such a case he/she has also the power to validate it.
Parties may also choose the judge of the Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court of Lithuania to deal with their dispute, which is heard by the court of lower instance, i.e. the dispute, which arose in the court of first instance, can be dealt with by the judge of the higher court.
In order to secure the impartiality of a judge, the judge, who was dealing with the dispute as judicial mediator has an obligation to opt out from the case at later stage.

In order to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Judicial Council has also decided, that judges in every case should decide on suitability of the case for judicial mediation. It was also decided to set at least 4 hours of trainings on judicial mediation in the training programmes of judges.

National Courts Administration has implemented the EU project on e-services in administration of justice in 2015. During the project, management of the process of judicial mediation was created in the Information System of Lithuanian Courts LITEKO. Parties have a possibility to make a statement in the claim or other document on judicial mediation, the judicial mediator can access the case via electronic means, can arrange the judicial mediation session via electronic means, the parties can discuss on a peaceful agreement, can sign and deliver it to the court via electronic means, i.e. E-Service Portal of Lithuanian Courts (https://e.teismas.lt/en/public/home/).

Q166 (2014): One of the reasons explaining the increase of the number of judicial mediators in 2014 is that from 1st January, 2015 new regulations on judicial mediation came into force, which set stricter requirements for candidates to judicial mediators (requirement for longer trainings (32 hours instead of 16 hours), requirement to attend the meetings of the Judicial Mediation Commission). Therefore persons, who wished to act as judicial mediators hurried to deliver their documents before the 1st. January, 2015, so that their request would be considered under rules, which were valid before 1st. January, 2015.

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 (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 (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 freedom 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 pe

rformance 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 (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.

Q166 (2013): The increase of the number of mediators in 2012 and 2013 comparing to 2010 is a result of the legislative reforms, stimulating the ADR.
Q192 (2018): Notaries public are not differentiated by gender within the records of the Ministry of Justice.

Slovak Republic

Q166 (2021): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 84 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2020): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2019): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2018): In previous cycles the number of registered mediators provided by the Ministry of Justice included all persons listed in the register of mediators, including those who has been stroke out of a list or suspended. For this evaluation cycle we can provide the number of active registered mediators.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

Q166 (2013): Registered mediator can be any natural or legal person, who complies with the legal requirements (concerning university degree, mediation training etc.). According to the relevant legislation (Act LV of 2002 on Mediation) mediators established in other EEA Member States (i.e. living in the European Economic Area) can act in a current case in Hungary. The foreign mediator should inform the Ministry of Justice, which shall specify the rights for one year.

Ireland

Q166 (2014): 2014: Reforms are also under consideration. Legislation is being prepared to promote mediation as a viable, effective and efficient alternative to court proceedings thereby reducing legal costs, speeding up the resolution of disputes and relieving the stress involved in court proceedings. It is anticipated that a Mediation Bill will be published in 2015 with a view to enactment of the legislation quickly thereafter.

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 (2021): from 2021 January 1 all mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania have the right to conduct judicial mediation in both civil and administrative cases.

Q166 (2020): In 2020 the list contained 438 mediators not judges (of which 100 males and 338 females), and 114 mediators judges (of which 27 males and 87 females).
The Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania, implementing the project co-financed by the European Union Structural Funds No. 10.1.4-V-922-01-005 "Development of the Conciliation Mediation System", taking into account the expansion of the Institute of Mediation and the consequent increased need for mediators, initiated the organization of training for mediators, during which a total of 420 persons (320 people were trained in the training of 40 academic hours, 100 people took part in the training of 24 academic hours).
This training took place in May – October, 2019. All participants signed a contract for the provision of training services, one of the conditions of which was the obligation to register to take the qualification exam for mediators and to come to take it. Due to the fact that the Training Participants' Agreement did not provide for the obligation to pass the mediators' qualification examination but to come to take it, the Ministry of Justice did not collect information on the proportion of trainees who passed the mediators' qualification examination, but the persons who took part in this training were very active in applying for the qualification examination for mediators. There were also cases when those who did not pass the mediator qualification exam for the first time registered to take the exam again six months later.
October – November in 2020 specialized training for mediators on the topic “Mediation in family disputes in the presence of signs of domestic violence” was organized on the order of the Ministry of Justice. A total of 60 mediators participated in the training. These training were intended to improve the qualification of mediators in disputes where are possible signs of domestic violence, therefore only mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania and having signed agreements with the State Guaranteed Legal Aid Service on the provision of compulsory mediation services could participate in.
It is noteworthy that the organized training, which were free of charge for their participants, increased the number of mediators in both 2019 and 2020. In this context, it would not be appropriate to compare the increase between 2019 and 2020 .

Q166 (2019): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.
Till 1st January, 2019 National Couts Administration have been maintained the list of court mediators which included judges and other persons (not judges). Due to a change in legal regulation (from 1st January, 2019), National Courts Administration maintains only the list of Judges who have been granted the status of mediators (Article 5 (2) of the Law on Mediation of the Republic of Lithuania) and transmits this data to the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service. The latter maintains the common list of mediators and decides on the status of mediator for persons who are not judges. The mentioned list is published on the website of the The State Garanteed Legal Aid Service (Article 5 (6) of the Law on Mediation). On 31 December, 2019 the list contained 286 mediators not judges (of which 71 males and 215 females), and 106 mediators judges (of which 25 males and 81 females).
It is to notice that court-related mediation in practice is more often executed by mediators judges however the mediators who are not judges are also allowed to mediate at this stage when they are appointed by the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service.

Q166 (2018): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.

Q166 (2017): The number of the mediators could increase due to the more effective spread of the information about the judicial mediation.

Q166 (2016): Judicial mediation is becoming more popular, efforts made by the judiciary and the National Courts Administration, as well as the legislator, resulted in an increased number of mediators.

Q166 (2015): National Courts Administration, data of the Activities report of 2015 of the Commission of the Judicial Mediation (http://www.teismai.lt/data/public/uploads/2016/03/teismines-mediacijos-komisijos-2015-m.-veiklos-apibendrinimas.pdf)

The main reforms that have been implemented over the last two years in judicial mediation:
From the 1st January 2015 the judicial mediation is available in all the courts of general jurisdiction. Before it was only available in courts, who participated in the pilot project. It is only available in civil cases. The judicial mediation is free of charge and parties may choose the judicial mediator from the List of Judicial Mediators (the List of Judicial Mediators is available at website https://e.teismas.lt/lt/public/teismin%C4%97-mediacija/). Judges, assisstants of judges, lawyers, psichologists and other persons of different background are on the List of Judicial Mediators.

The peculiarity is that judges can also have the status of judicial mediator. The parties may choose the judge, who deals with the case (if she/he has the status of judicial mediator) to act as judicial mediator. If a peaceful agreement is reached in such a case he/she has also the power to validate it.
Parties may also choose the judge of the Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court of Lithuania to deal with their dispute, which is heard by the court of lower instance, i.e. the dispute, which arose in the court of first instance, can be dealt with by the judge of the higher court.
In order to secure the impartiality of a judge, the judge, who was dealing with the dispute as judicial mediator has an obligation to opt out from the case at later stage.

In order to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Judicial Council has also decided, that judges in every case should decide on suitability of the case for judicial mediation. It was also decided to set at least 4 hours of trainings on judicial mediation in the training programmes of judges.

National Courts Administration has implemented the EU project on e-services in administration of justice in 2015. During the project, management of the process of judicial mediation was created in the Information System of Lithuanian Courts LITEKO. Parties have a possibility to make a statement in the claim or other document on judicial mediation, the judicial mediator can access the case via electronic means, can arrange the judicial mediation session via electronic means, the parties can discuss on a peaceful agreement, can sign and deliver it to the court via electronic means, i.e. E-Service Portal of Lithuanian Courts (https://e.teismas.lt/en/public/home/).

Q166 (2014): One of the reasons explaining the increase of the number of judicial mediators in 2014 is that from 1st January, 2015 new regulations on judicial mediation came into force, which set stricter requirements for candidates to judicial mediators (requirement for longer trainings (32 hours instead of 16 hours), requirement to attend the meetings of the Judicial Mediation Commission). Therefore persons, who wished to act as judicial mediators hurried to deliver their documents before the 1st. January, 2015, so that their request would be considered under rules, which were valid before 1st. January, 2015.

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 (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.

Q166 (2013): The increase of the number of mediators in 2012 and 2013 comparing to 2010 is a result of the legislative reforms, stimulating the ADR.

Slovak Republic

Q166 (2021): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 84 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2020): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2019): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2018): In previous cycles the number of registered mediators provided by the Ministry of Justice included all persons listed in the register of mediators, including those who has been stroke out of a list or suspended. For this evaluation cycle we can provide the number of active registered mediators.

Slovenia

Q166 (2021): The procedures for listing (and un-listing) individual mediators are led by individual courts.

Spain

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.

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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (2020): The Ministry of Justice.

Luxembourg

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 (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 freedom 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 pe

rformance 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 (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 2023 (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 2023 (Q66 and Q67)

Performance and Evaluation for each individual judge

Table 1.2 Existence of quantitative performance targets for each judge and authority responsible in 2023 (Q83 and Q83-1)

Table 1.3 Consequences for a judge if quantitative performance targets are not met in 2023 (Q83 and Q83-1-1)

Performance and Evaluation - public prosecutors

Table 1.4 Existence of quantitative performance targets for each public prosecutors, authority responsible as well as individual evaluation in 2023 (Q83-2, Q83-3, Q120 and Q120-1)

Table 1.5 Consequences for a prosecutor if quantitative performance targets are not met in 2023 (Q83-2 and Q83-3-1)

Monitoring

Table 1.6 Modalities for monitoring court activities (performance and quality) in 2023 (Q70)

Table 1.7 Modalities for monitoring public prosecution services' activities (performance and quality) in 2023 (Q70-1)

Table 1.8 Monitoring of the number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs) in 2023 (Q71)

Table 1.9 Monitoring of the waiting time during judicial proceedings within courts and the public prosecution services in 2023 (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 2023 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of all courts as geographic locations) (Q42, Q43 and Q44)

Table 2.1b Number of courts per 100 000 inhabitants in 2023 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of all courts as geographic locations) (Q1, Q42, Q43 and Q44)

Table 2.2a Number of first instance courts from 2013 to 2023 (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 2013 to 2023 (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 2013 to 2023 (Q44)

Table 2.3b Number of all courts as geographic location per 100 000 inhabitants from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q44)

Table 2.4a Number and distribution of first instance specialised courts as legal entities in 2023 (Q43)

Table 2.4b Number and distribution of higher instance specialised courts as legal entities in 2023 (Q43)

Table 2.5 (EC) Absolute number of all courts (geographic locations) from 2013 to 2023 and their variations between 2013 and 2023 and between 2022 and 2023 (Q44)

Indicator 2: The judicial organisation

Indicator 2: The judicial organisation

Indicator 3: The 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. 2023

Table 3.1.1.1b: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2023

Table 3.1.1.2a: First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2023

Table 3.1.1.2b: First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2023

Table 3.1.1.3a: First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2023

Table 3.1.1.3b: First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2023

Table 3.1.1.4a: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2023
Table 3.1.1.4b: First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2023

Table 3.1.1.5: First instance civil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2023

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. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.2.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigiousl cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.2.3: Evolution of the first instance administrativel cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.3.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.3.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigiousl cases - incoming 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.3.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - incoming 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.4.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.4.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigiousl cases - resolved 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.4.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - resolved 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.5.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.5.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigiousl cases - pending on 31st Dec.2013 - 2023
Table 3.1.5.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2013 - 2023

Table 3.1.6.1: Evolution of the first instance total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023

Table 3.1.6.2: Evolution of the first instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023
Table 3.1.6.3: Evolution of the first instance administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023

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 2023 (Q91)
Table 3.2.1.2: Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in in 2023 (Q91)
Table 3.2.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance total of other than criminal cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.2.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance total of other than criminal cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.2.3.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.2.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.2.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of first instance administrative cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.2.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of first instance administrative cases 2013 - 2023

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 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.3.2: First instance courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.3.3: First instance courts, variation of pending 31 Dec. other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.3.4: First instance courts, variation of Clearance Rate of other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.3.5: First instance courts, variation of Disposition time of other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

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

Table 3.4.1.1a: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2023
Table 3.4.1.1b: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2023
Table 3.4.1.2a: Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2023
Table 3.4.1.2b: Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming cases in 2023
Table 3.4.1.3a: Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved cases in 2023
Table 3.4.1.3b: Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved cases per 100 inhabitants in 2023
Table 3.4.1.4a: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023
Table 3.4.1.4b: Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023

Table 3.4.1.5: Second instance civil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - pending more than 2 years in 2023

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. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.2.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.2.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.3.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.3.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigiousl cases - incoming 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.3.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - incoming 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.4.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.4.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - resolved 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.4.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - resolved 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.5.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.5.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.5.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2013 - 2023
Table 3.4.6.1: Evolution of the second instance total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023
Table 3.4.6.2: Evolution of the second instance civil and commercial litigious cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023
Table 3.4.6.3: Evolution of the second instance administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023
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 2023
Table 3.5.1.2: Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases in 2023
Table 3.5.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of second instance total of other than criminal cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.5.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of second instance total of other than criminal cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.5.3.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of second instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.5.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of second instance civil and commercial litigious cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.5.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of second instance administrative cases 2013 - 2023
Table 3.5.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of second instance administrative cases 2013 - 2023
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 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.6.2: Second instance courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.6.3: Second instance courts, variation of pending other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.6.4: Second instance courts, variation of Clearance rate of other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.6.5: Second instance courts, variation of Disposition time for other than criminal cases between 2013 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
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 2023
Table 3.7.1.1b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. in 2023
Table 3.7.1.2a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - incoming in 2023
Table 3.7.1.2b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - incoming cases in 2023
Table 3.7.1.3a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - resolved cases in 2023
Table 3.7.1.3b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - resolved cases per 100 inhabitants in 2023
Table 3.7.1.4a: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023
Table 3.7.1.4b: Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2023
Table 3.7.1.5: Supreme court civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - pending more than 2 years in 2023
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 - 2023
Table 3.7.2.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2023

Table 3.7.2.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014 - 2023
Table 3.7.3.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - incoming 2014 - 2023
Table 3.7.3.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - incoming 2014 - 2023
Table 3.7.3.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - incoming 2014 - 2023
Table 3.7.4.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - resolved 2014 - 2023
Table 3.7.4.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - resolved 2014 - 2023
Table 3.7.4.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - resolved 2014 - 2023
Table 3.7.5.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2023
Table 3.7.5.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2023
Table 3.7.5.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2014 - 2023

Table 3.7.6.1: Evolution of the Supreme court total of other than criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023

Table 3.7.6.2: Evolution of the Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023
Table 3.7.6.3: Evolution of the Supreme court administrative cases - pending more than 2 years 2016 - 2023

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 2023
Table 3.8.1.2: Disposition time for Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2023
Table 3.8.2.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of Supreme court total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2023
Table 3.8.2.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of Supreme court total of other than criminal cases 2014 - 2023
Table 3.8.3.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases 2015 - 2023
Table 3.8.3.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of Supreme court civil and commercial litigious cases 2015 - 2023
Table 3.8.4.1: Evolution of the Clearance rate of Supreme court administrative cases 2015 - 2023
Table 3.8.4.2: Evolution of the Disposition time of Supreme court administrative cases 2015 - 2023

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 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.9.2: Supreme court, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

Table 3.9.3: Supreme court, variation of pending 31st Dec. other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

Table 3.9.4: Supreme court, variation of Clearance rate of other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

Table 3.9.5: Supreme court, variation of Disposition Time for other than criminal cases between 2016 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

European Comission templates for first instance data on other than criminal instance cases

Table 3.10.1 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance of other than criminal cases**, from 2013 to 2023 (Q91)

Table 3.10.2 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases, from 2013 to 2023 (Q91)
Table 3.10.3 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance administrative law cases, from 2013 to 2023 (Q91)
Table 3.10.4 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) of first instance total of other than criminal cases**, from 2013 to 2023 (Q91)
Table 3.10.5 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases from 2013 to 2023 (Q91)
Table 3.10.6 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) for first instance administrative cases, from 2013 to 2023 (Q91)
Table 3.10.7 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)
Table 3.10.8 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)
Table 3.10.9 (EC): Number of first instance administrative cases pending on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)
Table 3.10.10 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)
Table 3.10.11 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)

Table 3.10.12 (EC): Number of first instance administrative incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q91)

First instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.11.1a: First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2023
Table 3.11.1b: First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2023
Table 3.11.2a: First instance criminal cases - incoming in 2023
Table 3.11.2b: First instance criminal cases - incoming in 2023
Table 3.11.3a: First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2023
Table 3.11.3b: First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2023
Table 3.11.4a: First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2023
Table 3.11.4b: First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2023
Table 3.11.5: First instance criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2023

Evolution of the 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 - 2023
Table 3.12.2: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023

Table 3.12.3: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.4: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.5: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.6: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.7: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.8: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.9: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.10: Evolution of the first instance total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.11: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023

Table 3.12.12: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.13: Evolution of the first instance total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.14: Evolution of the first instance severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023
Table 3.12.15: Evolution of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Clearance rate and Disposition time for first instance criminal cases

Table 3.13.1: Clearance rate (%) of first instance criminal cases in 2023 (Q94)
Table 3.13.2: Disposition time (in days) of first instance criminal cases in 2023 (Q94)
Table 3.13.3: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.13.4: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.13.5: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.13.6: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.13.7: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.13.8: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the first instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2023

Variations for first instance criminal cases

Table 3.14.1: First instance courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.14.2: First instance courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

Table 3.14.3: First instance courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

Table 3.14.4: First instance courts, variation of the Clearance Rate of criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

Table 3.14.5: First instance courts, variation of the Disposition Time criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

Second instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.15.1a: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2023
Table 3.15.1b: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2023
Table 3.15.2a: Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2023
Table 3.15.2b: Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2023
Table 3.15.3a: Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2023
Table 3.15.3b: Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2023
Table 3.15.4a: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2023
Table 3.15.4b: Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2023
Table 3.15.5: Second instance criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2023

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 - 2023
Table 3.16.2: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.3: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.4: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.5: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.6: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.7: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.8: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.9: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.10: Evolution of the second instance total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.11: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.12: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.13: Evolution of the second instance total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.14: Evolution of the second instance severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023
Table 3.16.15: Evolution of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023

Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance criminal cases

Table 3.17.1: Clearance rate (%) of second instance criminal cases in 2023 (Q98)
Table 3.17.2: Disposition time (in days) of second instance criminal cases in 2023 (Q98)
Table 3.17.3: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the second instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.17.4: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the second instance total criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.17.5: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the second instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.17.6: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the second instance severe criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.17.7: Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.17.8: Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the second instance misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2023

Variations for second instance criminal cases

Table 3.18.1: Second instance courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.18.2: Second instance courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.18.3: Second instance courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.18.4: Second instance courts, variation of the Clearance Rate of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.18.5: Second instance courts, variation of the Disposition Time of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023

Supreme courts, criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.19.1a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2023
Table 3.19.1b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2023
Table 3.19.2a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - incoming in 2023

Table 3.19.2b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - incoming in 2023
Table 3.19.3a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - resolved in 2023
Table 3.19.3b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - resolved in 2023
Table 3.19.4a: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2023
Table 3.19.4b: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2023
Table 3.19.5: Supreme courts, criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2023
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 - 2023
Table 3.20.2: Supreme courts, Evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.3: Supreme courts, Evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.4: Supreme courts, Evolution of the total of criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.5: Supreme courts, Evolution of the severe criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.6: Supreme courts, Evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - incoming 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.7: Evolution of the total of criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.8: Supreme courts, Evolution of the severe criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.9: Supreme courts, Evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - resolved 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.10: Supreme courts, Evolution of the total of criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.11: Supreme courts, Evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.12: Supreme courts, Evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending on 31st Dec. 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.13: Supreme courts, Evolution of the total criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.14: Supreme courts, Evolution of the severe criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023
Table 3.20.15:Supreme courts, Evolution of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - pending more than 2 years 2020 - 2023
Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court criminal cases
Table 3.21.1: Supreme courts, Clearance rate (%) of criminal cases in 2023 (Q100)
Table 3.21.2: Supreme courts, Disposition time (in days) of criminal cases in 2023 (Q100)
Table 3.21.3: Supreme courts, Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the total criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.21.4: Supreme courts, Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the total criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.21.5: Supreme courts, Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the severe criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.21.6: Supreme courts, Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the severe criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.21.7: Supreme courts, Evolution of the Clearance rate (%) of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Table 3.21.8: Supreme courts, Evolution of the Disposition Time (in days) of the misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases 2020 - 2023
Supreme courts, Variations for criminal cases
Table 3.22.1: Supreme courts, variation of the incoming criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.22.2: Supreme courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.22.3: Supreme courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.22.4: Supreme courts, variation of the Clearance Rate of resolved criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
Table 3.22.5: Supreme courts, variation of the Disposition Time of pending on 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 - 2023 and 2022 - 2023
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: Case flow in 2023
Absolute values (Q107 and Q109)
Table 4.1.1b: Public prosecution: Case flow in 2023
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107 and Q109)
Table 4.1.2: Public prosecution: Distribution of different categories of processed cases within all processed cases in 2023 (Q107)

Ratios of public prosecution cases

Table 4.1.3: Public prosecution: Ratio of processed cases and pending cases with incoming cases in 2023 (Q107)
Table 4.1.4: Public prosecution: Evolution of the total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor between 2020 and 2023 (Q55, Q057, Q107 and Q109)
Table 4.1.5: Public prosecution: Evolution of the ratio of processed cases as well as pending cases with incoming cases from 2020 to 2023 (Q107)

Evolution of the number of cases in public prosecution services

Table 4.1.6: Public prosecution: Evolution of the incoming/received, processed, discontinued cases as well as cases brought to court from 2020 to 2023
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107)
Table 4.1.7: Public prosecution: Evolution of the pending cases at the beginning and at the end of the reference year from 2020 to 2023
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107)

Number of cases concluded with the guilty plea procedure

Table 4.2.1 Number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure in 2023 (Q107-1)
Table 4.2.2 Evolution of the number of cases concluded through the guilty plea procedure from 2020 to 2023 (Q107-1)

Budget of the public prosecution services

Table 4.3.1 (a) Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q13)
Table 4.3.1 (b) Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution per inhabitant from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q13)
Table 4.3.2 (a) Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution from 2014 to 2023 (Q13)
Table 4.3.2 (b) Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution per inhabitant from 2014 to 2023 (Q1, Q13)

Indicator 4: Systems for measuring and evaluating the performance of courts
Indicator 4: Systems for measuring and evaluating the performance of courts
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 2023 (Q37)

Table 5.2 System for compensating users: amounts of granted compensations by specific circumstances in 2023 (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 2023 (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 2023 (Q62-23)
Table 6.2 Functionalities of the writing assistance tools in 2023 (Q62-24)
Table 6.3 Deployment and usage rate of the recording of court hearings in 2023 (Q62-25)
Table 6.4 Functionalities of the tool to record court hearings in 2023 (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 2023
Absolute number (Q1, Q46, Q48, Q48-1,Q49 and Q49-1)
Table 7.1.2 Evolution of the total number of professional judges from 2013 to 2023
Absolute number (Q46)
Table 7.1.2a Evolution of the total number of professional judges from 2013 to 2023 and their variations
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q46)
Table 7.1.3 Total number of professional judges by instance in 2013, 2022 and 2023 and their variations
Absolute number (Q46)
Table 7.1.3a Total number of professional judges by instance in 2013, 2022 and 2023
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q46)
Table 7.1.4 Total number of professional judges by case category in 2023 (Q46-2)
Table 7.1.5 Total professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2013, 2022 and 2023 (Q46)

Table 7.1.6 First instance professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2013, 2022 and 2023 (Q46)
Table 7.1.7 Second instance judges: distribution of males and females in 2013, 2022 and 2023 (Q46)
Table 7.1.8 Supreme court professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2013, 2022 and 2023 (Q46)
Table 7.2.1 Total number of non-judge staff (absolute number and per 100 000 inhabitants) and their distribution by category in 2023 (Q1, Q52)
Table 7.2.2 Evolution of the total number of non-judge staff (absolute number) from 2013 to 2023 (Q52)
Table 7.2.2a Evolution of the total number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants from 2013 to 2023 and their variations (Q1, Q52)
Table 7.2.3 Number of non-judge staff by instance in 2023 (Q52-1)
Table 7.2.4 Non-judge staff: distribution of males and females by instance in 2023 (Q52-1)
Table 7.2.5 Number of professional judges and number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants, from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q46, Q52)
Table 7.2.6 Ratio between non-judge staff and judges from 2013 to 2023 (Q46, Q52)

Public prosecutors and non-prosecutor staff

Table 7.3.1 Evolution of the total number of public prosecutors from 2020 to 2023 and persons with similar duties in 2023
Absolute number (Q55, Q57, Q57-1)
Table 7.3.1a Evolution of the total number of public prosecutors from 2020 to 2023 and their variation
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q55)
Table 7.3.2 Total number of public prosecutors by instance from 2020 to 2023 and their variations
Absolute number (Q55)
Table 7.3.2a Total number of public prosecutors by instance from 2020 to 2023
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q55)
Table 7.3.3 Total public prosecutors: distribution of males and females in 2020 - 2023 (Q55)
Table 7.3.4 Public prosecutors at the first instance level: distribution of males and females from 2020 to 2023 (Q55)
Table 7.3.5 Public prosecutors at the second instance level: distribution of males and females from 2020 to 2023 (Q55)
Table 7.3.6 Public prosecutors at the Supreme court level: distribution of males and females from 2020 to 2023 (Q55)
Table 7.4.1 Total number of non-prosecutor staff and their distribution in males and females in 2023 (Q1, Q60)
Table 7.4.2 Total number of non-prosecutor staff (absolute number) from 2020 to 2023 (Q60)
Table 7.4.3 Total number of non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants from 2020 to 2023 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 2023 (Q1, Q55, Q60)
Table 7.4.5 Ratio between non-prosecutors staff and public prosecutors from 2020 to 2023 (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 2023 (Q47)
Table 7.5.2 Total number of Heads of prosecution services by instance and their distribution in males and females in 2023 (Q56)

Salaries of judges and public prosecutors

Table 7.6.1 Annual salaries of judges and public prosecutors in 2023 (Q4 and Q132)
Table 7.6.2 Evolution of the gross annual salaries of judges from 2018 to 2023 (Q132)
Table 7.6.3 Evolution of the gross annual salaries of public prosecutors from 2018 to 2023 (Q132)
Table 7.6.4 Ratio of annual salaries of judges and public prosecutors with annual gross salary in the country in 2023 (Q4 and Q132)
Table 7.6.5: Existence of additional benefits for judges and public prosecutors in 2023 (Q133)

Lawyers

Table 7.7.1 Evolution of the number of lawyers from 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q146)
Table 7.7.1a Evolution of the number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants from 2013 to 2023 and their variations (Q1, Q146)
Table 7.7.2 Evolution of the number of professional judges and lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants from 2012 to 2021 (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 2013 to 2023 (Q1, Q46)

Table 7.9 (EC) Number of lawyers* per 100 000 inhabitants from 2013 to 2023 (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 2013 to 2023 (Q166)
Table 8.2 Evolution of the number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation per 100 000 inhabitants from 2013 to 2023 (Q166)
Table 8.3 Number of notaries in 2023 (Q1 and Q192)
Table 8.4 Number of notaries and their distribution in males and female in 2023 (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, 2024

© European Union, 2024

