

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Analysis of statistics 2017

January 2018

Table of Contents

Overview of the Court’s statistics in 2017	4
A. New applications	4
B. Applications disposed of judicially and pending applications	4
C. Processing of applications	4
1. Pre-allocation.....	4
2. Inadmissibility or strike out decisions	4
3. Communicated applications	4
4. Judgments.....	4
5. Requests for interim measures (Rule 39 of the Rules of Court).....	5
D. Priority policy	5
E. Conclusion.....	5
General information	6
Number of applications allocated to a judicial formation	7
Processing of applications	9
Country-specific information	14
Albania	14
Andorra	15
Armenia	16
Austria.....	17
Azerbaijan	18
Belgium	19
Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	20
Bulgaria	21
Croatia.....	22
Cyprus	23
Czech Republic.....	24
Denmark	25
Estonia	26
Finland	27
France	28
Georgia.....	29
Germany	30
Greece.....	31
Hungary.....	32
Iceland.....	33
Ireland.....	34
Italy	35
Latvia.....	36
Liechtenstein.....	37
Lithuania	38
Luxembourg.....	39

Malta.....	40
Republic of Moldova.....	41
Monaco.....	42
Montenegro.....	43
Netherlands.....	44
Norway.....	45
Poland.....	46
Portugal.....	47
Romania.....	48
Russian Federation.....	49
San Marino.....	50
Serbia.....	51
Slovakia.....	52
Slovenia.....	53
Spain.....	54
Sweden.....	55
Switzerland.....	56
“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”.....	57
Turkey.....	58
Ukraine.....	59
United Kingdom.....	60

Overview of the Court's statistics in 2017

As was the case last year the Court's statistics for 2017 disclose a higher number of incoming applications allocated to a judicial formation. This can be explained principally by an increase in the number of applications allocated coming from Turkey.

At the same time productivity increased spectacularly mainly due to large groups of applications that were adjudicated in particular concerning a few countries. As a result the Court was able to reduce the number of pending applications.

A. New applications

In 2017 63,350 applications were allocated to a judicial formation, an overall increase of 19% compared with 2016 (53,400). 49,400 of these were identified as Single-Judge cases likely to be declared inadmissible (an increase of 36% in relation to 2016). Single judge applications continue to be processed as soon as they are identified as qualifying for such a procedure. 13,950 applications were identified as probable Chamber or Committee cases (a decrease of 18%).

B. Applications disposed of judicially and pending applications

85,951 applications were disposed of judicially, an increase of 123% in relation to 2016 (38,506). The number of cases disposed of exceeded those allocated by more than 22,500. As a result, the stock of allocated applications pending before the Court decreased over the year, by 29% from 79,750 to 56,250.

C. Processing of applications

1. Pre-allocation

As at 31 December 2017 the number of applications pending at this pre-judicial stage stood at 12,600, a decrease of 9% in relation to the same date the previous year (13,800). The number of applications disposed of administratively in 2017 was 22,650, a decrease of 8%. 61% of these files were disposed of for failure to comply with the requirements of Rule 47 of the Rules of Court (contents of an individual application).

2. Inadmissibility or strike out decisions

In 2017 70,356 applications were declared inadmissible or struck out of the list of cases by a Single Judge, a Committee, a Chamber or a Grand Chamber, a 92% increase compared with 2016 (36,579).

The Single-Judge formation decided 66,156 applications in 2017, an increase of 113% compared with 2016 (30,996).

In 2017, 2,282 applications were struck out by a Chamber or a Committee, in a decision, following a friendly settlement or a unilateral declaration, a decrease of 40% (3,772 in 2016). Friendly settlements (1,528) decreased by 24% (2,006 in 2016) and unilateral declarations decreased by 57% (754 compared to 1,766 in 2016). The remainder of the applications were declared inadmissible by a Grand Chamber, Chamber or a Committee or struck out by these formations on other grounds.

3. Communicated applications

In 2017 7,225 applications were communicated (a decrease of 24% compared to 2016 when 9,533 applications were communicated).

4. Judgments

Judgments were delivered in respect of 15,595 applications (compared with 1,927 in 2016 – an increase of 709%). A large proportion of these applications were joined, but the number of

judgments actually delivered was 1,068, an increase of 8%. 523 judgments (in respect of 2,664 applications) were adopted by a three-judge Committee formation (+ 69% compared to 2016). Committee judgments accounted for 17% of the applications decided by a judgment (50% in 2016). This difference in percentage is explained by the fact that in 2017 the Grand Chamber struck out 12,148 applications in a single judgment.

5. Requests for interim measures (Rule 39 of the Rules of Court)

The total number of decisions on interim measures (1,669) decreased by 28% compared with 2016 (2,313). The Court granted requests for interim measures in 117 cases (a decrease of 10% compared to 130 in 2016) and dismissed them in 533 cases (52% less than the 1,103 in 2016). The remainder fell outside the scope of Rule 39 of the Rules of Court. 70% of the requests granted concern expulsion or immigration cases.

D. Priority policy ¹

The essence of this policy is to concentrate more resources on the most important cases, namely the cases falling within the top three categories (“priority applications”). At 31 December 2017 there were 17,860 applications in these categories (a decrease of 10% compared to the beginning of the year).

The number of priority applications dealt with at different stages of the procedure in 2017 decreased by 23% compared to 2016 (5,937 in 2016 and 4,594 in 2017). There are two main reasons for this:

- The first is that more than 6,000 Hungarian conditions of detention applications previously allocated to a priority category were sent to Single Judge after the Court found that Hungary had established a national remedy. These applications were declared inadmissible by a Single Judge and are therefore not counted in the priority productivity.
- The second reason is that the Romanian conditions of detention applications have been processed at a slower pace because of the pending pilot procedure.

36% fewer priority applications were communicated to the respondent Governments in comparison with 2016 (3,972 in 2016 and 2,555 in 2017). The number of priority applications declared inadmissible or struck out of the list of cases by a Chamber or Committee decreased by 15% (1,067 in 2016 and 905 in 2017). The number of priority applications struck out following a friendly settlement or a unilateral declaration decreased from 715 in 2016 to 479 in 2017. Despite the two reasons given above the number of priority applications giving rise to a judgment increased by 26% in 2017 (898 in 2016 and 1,134 in 2017).

E. Conclusion

2017 saw unusual fluctuation in the case-load as a result of a high volume of incoming cases in the first part of the year and a large number of cases disposed of over the last six months. The stock of pending cases which started the year at 79,750 rose to 93,200 in June and then was down to 56,250 by the end of the year. The difference between the figure in January and that at the end of the year is essentially the effect of cases being repatriated to the national system in one form or another (non-exhaustion of a new domestic remedy or strike out in the context of an on-going pilot procedure). The challenge of reducing the backlog of non-repetitive Chamber cases/priority cases remains. In this context the Court and its Registry have introduced new working methods and procedures intended to streamline processing and adjudication of this part of its case-load and will continue to review their approach to these cases in the coming year.

¹ An explanation of the Court’s priority policy can be found on the Court’s internet site http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Priority_policy_ENG.pdf

General information

Table 1 General statistical information

1. Applications allocated to a judicial formation [round figures (50)]	2017	2016	+/-
Applications allocated	63350	53400	19%

2. Interim procedural events	2017	2016	+/-
Applications communicated to respondent Government	7225	9533	-24%

3. Applications decided	2017	2016	+/-
By decision or judgment	85951	38506	123%
- by judgment delivered	15595	1927	709%
- by decision (inadmissible or struck out)	70356	36579	92%

4. Pending applications [round figures (50)]	31/12/2017	1/1/2017	+/-
Applications pending before a judicial formation	56250	79750	-29%
- Chamber and Grand Chamber	26250	28450	-8%
- Committee	25700	47500	-46%
- Single-Judge formation	4300	3800	13%

5. Pre-judicial applications [round figures (50)]	31/12/2017	1/1/2017	+/-
Applications at a pre-judicial stage	12600	13800	-9%
	2017	2016	+/-
Applications disposed of administratively	22650	20950	8%

Number of applications allocated to a judicial formation²

Chart 1 Applications allocated to a judicial formation per year





Chart 2 Applications pending before a judicial formation



² Figures represent the total number of applications, including joined applications. The document generally gives round figures. The upsurge in applications allocated in 2002 was due to a change in working methods, transferring much of the screening of inadmissible applications from the administrative, pre-judicial phase to the judicial stage.

Chart 3 High case-count States






Chart 4 The Court’s total caseload by stage of proceedings and judicial formation³



³ The “Pending Government action” category was created to monitor applications following a judgment applying the pilot procedure.

Chart 5 The Court’s total caseload by priority category



Processing of applications

Chart 6 Major procedural steps in processing of applications




Chart 7 Number of judgments since 2002




Chart 8 Applications in categories I, II and III processed from 2014 to 2017




Table 2 Applications allocated per Contracting State and population

State	Applications allocated to a judicial formation				Population (1000)				Allocated/population (10000)			
	2014	2015	2016	2017	1.1.2014	1.1.2015	1.1.2016	1.1.2017	2014	2015	2016	2017
Albania	82	147	146	95	2896	2892	2886	2886	0,28	0,51	0,51	0,33
Andorra	5	6	4	2	76	76	72	73	0,66	0,79	0,56	0,27
Armenia	156	122	753	356	3017	3017	2999	2986	0,52	0,40	2,51	1,19
Austria	315	261	236	228	8507	8576	8690	8773	0,37	0,30	0,27	0,26
Azerbaijan	402	268	331	679	9477	9593	9706	9810	0,42	0,28	0,34	0,69
Belgium	159	202	184	153	11204	11209	11311	11366	0,14	0,18	0,16	0,13
Bosnia and Herzegovina	667	908	1030	866	3831	3825	3516	3510	1,74	2,37	2,93	2,47
Bulgaria	928	1031	882	582	7246	7202	7154	7102	1,28	1,43	1,23	0,82
Croatia	1096	812	764	723	4247	4225	4191	4154	2,58	1,92	1,82	1,74
Cyprus	55	32	33	31	858	847	848	855	0,64	0,38	0,39	0,36
Czech Republic	370	340	338	385	10512	10538	10554	10579	0,35	0,32	0,32	0,36
Denmark	66	44	47	58	5617	5660	5707	5749	0,12	0,08	0,08	0,10
Estonia	187	190	206	156	1316	1313	1316	1316	1,42	1,45	1,57	1,19
Finland	185	177	196	181	5451	5472	5487	5503	0,34	0,32	0,36	0,33
France	1142	1087	916	887	65835	66415	66760	67024	0,17	0,16	0,14	0,13
Georgia	102	80	74	89	4490	4490	3720	3718	0,23	0,18	0,20	0,24
Germany	1026	789	676	586	80767	81198	82176	82800	0,13	0,10	0,08	0,07
Greece	585	457	337	422	10927	10858	10784	10757	0,54	0,42	0,31	0,39
Hungary	2403	4234	5568	1952	9877	9856	9830	9798	2,43	4,30	5,66	1,99
Iceland	28	10	24	27	326	329	333	338	0,86	0,30	0,72	0,80
Ireland	33	18	26	54	4605	4629	4725	4775	0,07	0,04	0,06	0,11
Italy	5490	1885	1409	1374	60783	60796	60666	60589	0,90	0,31	0,23	0,23
Latvia	298	244	255	275	2001	1986	1969	1950	1,49	1,23	1,30	1,41
Liechtenstein	12	13	10	9	37	37	38	38	3,24	3,51	2,63	2,37
Lithuania	387	376	405	401	2943	2921	2889	2848	1,31	1,29	1,40	1,41
Luxemburg	23	22	38	38	550	563	576	591	0,42	0,39	0,66	0,64
Malta	39	24	25	22	425	429	434	440	0,92	0,56	0,58	0,50
Republic of Moldova	1101	1011	834	758	3559	3555	3553	3553	3,09	2,84	2,35	2,13
Monaco	4	9	6	7	36	38	38	38	1,11	2,37	1,58	1,84
Montenegro	158	129	165	138	622	622	622	622	2,54	2,07	2,65	2,22
Netherlands	674	495	494	532	16829	16901	16979	17082	0,40	0,29	0,29	0,31
Norway	141	73	90	123	5108	5166	5214	5258	0,28	0,14	0,17	0,23
Poland	2747	2178	2422	2066	38018	38006	37967	37973	0,72	0,57	0,64	0,54
Portugal	252	233	152	197	10427	10375	10341	10310	0,24	0,22	0,15	0,19
Romania	4425	4604	8192	6509	19947	19871	19760	19638	2,22	2,32	4,15	3,31
Russia	8913	6003	5587	7957	143667	143667	143667	143667	0,62	0,42	0,39	0,55
San Marino	5	4	13	11	34	33	33	33	1,47	1,21	3,94	3,33
Serbia	2786	1235	1330	1431	7147	7114	7076	7040	3,90	1,74	1,88	2,03
Slovak Republic	324	353	309	425	5416	5421	5426	5435	0,60	0,65	0,57	0,78
Slovenia	352	213	239	374	2061	2063	2064	2066	1,71	1,03	1,16	1,81
Spain	642	552	627	669	46512	46450	46440	46529	0,14	0,12	0,14	0,14
Sweden	272	212	138	150	9645	9747	9851	9995	0,28	0,22	0,14	0,15
Switzerland	304	318	258	266	8140	8238	8327	8418	0,37	0,39	0,31	0,32
"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	382	362	339	345	2066	2069	2071	2074	1,85	1,75	1,64	1,66
Turkey	1584	2212	8303	25978	76668	77696	78741	79815	0,21	0,28	1,05	3,25
Ukraine	14181	6007	8644	4387	45246	45246	45246	45246	3,13	1,33	1,91	0,97
United Kingdom	720	575	372	415	64351	64875	65383	65809	0,11	0,09	0,06	0,06
Total	56208	40557	53427	63369	823320	826105	828136	830929	0,68	0,49	0,65	0,76

SOURCES 2014 and 2017: Internet sites of the Eurostat service ("Population and social conditions").

The Council of Europe member States had a combined population of about 831 million inhabitants on 1 January 2017. The average number of applications allocated per 10,000 inhabitants was 0.76 in 2017.

Table 3 The Court's total caseload by stage of proceedings and judicial formation

State	Single Judge or Committee (cat. VI - VII)	Chamber or Committee - awaiting first examination (cat. I - V)	Communicated	Pending Government action	Admissible	TOTAL
Albania	4	308	213	0	1	526
Andorra	0	0	1	0	0	1
Armenia	36	1636	140	0	7	1819
Austria	20	11	29	0	4	64
Azerbaijan	4	1588	431	0	4	2027
Belgium	14	263	42	0	2	321
Bosnia and Herzegovina	77	467	93	6	34	677
Bulgaria	70	429	108	0	16	623
Croatia	34	211	250	0	7	502
Cyprus	9	24	16	0	3	52
Czech Republic	20	25	52	0	1	98
Denmark	3	8	8	0	1	20
Estonia	30	14	22	0	2	68
Finland	9	2	3	0	0	14
France	58	135	160	0	6	359
Georgia	8	1753	161	0	2	1924
Germany	64	36	56	0	11	167
Greece	19	458	208	0	10	695
Hungary	194	2305	1026	0	10	3535
Iceland	3	30	9	0	2	44
Ireland	1	15	2	0	1	19
Italy	139	2203	2290	13	20	4665
Latvia	64	60	34	0	4	162
Liechtenstein	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lithuania	34	54	106	0	8	202
Luxembourg	1	3	3	0	1	8
Malta	0	27	27	0	5	59
Republic of Moldova	143	833	365	1	6	1348
Monaco	0	2	0	0	0	2
Montenegro	22	12	43	0	3	80
Netherlands	77	99	36	0	0	212
Norway	18	25	9	0	2	54
Poland	141	654	603	0	5	1403
Portugal	13	85	46	0	8	152
Romania	266	983	3172	5481	18	9920
Russia	697	3055	3763	61	171	7747
San Marino	0	8	6	0	0	14
Serbia	159	601	176	0	4	940
Slovakia	83	66	42	0	11	202
Slovenia	56	38	26	1	6	127
Spain	62	24	76	0	6	168
Sweden	16	7	2	0	2	27
Switzerland	49	45	42	0	5	141
"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	16	184	109	0	4	313
Turkey	1214	4310	1920	0	74	7518
Ukraine	301	5576	1193	0	42	7112
United Kingdom	43	52	33	0	2	130
ALL STATES	4292	28724	17152	5563	531	56262


Table 4 Unilateral declarations and friendly settlements from 2015 to 2017

State	Unilateral declaration			Friendly settlement		
	2015	2016	2017	2015	2016	2017
Albania		1	2	14	10	2
Andorra						
Armenia						
Austria				2	7	2
Azerbaijan	6			19	9	4
Belgium		1		1		2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	3		5	4	5
Bulgaria	5	4	1	4	11	5
Croatia	9	2	2	36	11	5
Cyprus		1				
Czech Republic				5	2	
Denmark						
Estonia				1	2	1
Finland	1					
France	3	2		1	2	6
Georgia	14	1	7	12	4	1
Germany	2	2	1		4	1
Greece	24	15	20	129	146	115
Hungary			2	61	98	83
Iceland						
Ireland			1			
Italy	1853	811	17	9	279	36
Latvia	2		4	4	1	2
Liechtenstein		1				
Lithuania			4	1	2	4
Luxembourg						
Malta		1	1	2		1
Republic of Moldova	4	3		2	5	1
Monaco			1			
Montenegro		8	2	1	23	7
Netherlands	1	1		2	8	2
Norway						
Poland	33	12	171	113	27	346
Portugal	7	5		31	36	6
Romania	116	110	46	168	353	221
Russia	194	215	202	43	354	305
San Marino						
Serbia	9	3	1	291	5	32
Slovakia	4	5	4	20	18	18
Slovenia	1		1	1		1
Spain				1		1
Sweden				2		
Switzerland						
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'	5	10	2	19	26	5
Turkey	18	65	52	139	103	65
Ukraine	658	482	210	520	456	237
United Kingdom		2		1		6
Grand Total	2970	1766	754	1660	2006	1528


Country-specific information

Albania

Chart 9 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 10 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Andorra

Chart 11 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 12 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Armenia

Chart 13 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 14 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Austria

Chart 15 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 16 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Azerbaijan

Chart 17 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 18 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Belgium

Chart 19 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 20 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Bosnia and Herzegovina

Chart 21 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 22 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Bulgaria

Chart 23 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 24 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Croatia

Chart 25 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 26 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Cyprus

Chart 27 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 28 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Czech Republic

Chart 29 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 30 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Denmark

Chart 31 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 32 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Estonia

Chart 33 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 34 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Finland

Chart 35 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 36 Major procedural steps in processing applications




France

Chart 37 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 38 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Georgia

Chart 39 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 40 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Germany

Chart 41 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 42 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Greece

Chart 43 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 44 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Hungary

Chart 45 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 46 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Iceland

Chart 47 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 48 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Ireland

Chart 49 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 50 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Italy

Chart 51 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 52 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Latvia

Chart 53 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 54 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Liechtenstein

Chart 55 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 56 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Lithuania

Chart 57 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 58 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Luxembourg

Chart 59 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 60 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Malta

Chart 61 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 62 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Republic of Moldova

Chart 63 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 64 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Monaco

Chart 65 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 66 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Montenegro

Chart 67 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 68 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Netherlands

Chart 69 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 70 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Norway

Chart 71 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 72 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Poland

Chart 73 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 74 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Portugal

Chart 75 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 76 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Romania

Chart 77 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 78 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Russian Federation

Chart 79 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 80 Major procedural steps in processing applications




San Marino

Chart 81 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 82 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Serbia

Chart 83 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 84 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Slovakia

Chart 85 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 86 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Slovenia

Chart 87 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 88 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Spain

Chart 89 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 90 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Sweden

Chart 91 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 92 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Switzerland

Chart 93 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 94 Major procedural steps in processing applications




“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”

Chart 95 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 96 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Turkey

Chart 97 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 98 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Ukraine

Chart 99 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body




Graph 100 Major procedural steps in processing applications



United Kingdom

Chart 101 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body



Graph 102 Major procedural steps in processing applications

