ECHR 161 (2012) 12.04.2012

Judgments concerning France, Slovenia and Sweden

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing the following three judgments, of which only *Kralj v. Slovenia* (no. 21313/06) is a Committee judgment and is final. The others are Chamber judgments¹ and are not final.

Length-of-proceedings cases, with the Court's main finding indicated, can be found at the end of the press release. The judgments in French are indicated with an asterisk (*).

Lesquen du Plessis-Casso v. France (no. 54216/09)*

The applicant, Henry de Lesquen du Plessis-Casso, is a French national who was born in 1949 and lives in Versailles. He is a town councillor and runs a local political movement which is the main opposition force in the town. He alleged that his criminal conviction for defamation of a political opponent during a session of the municipal council amounted, in particular, to a violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression).

Violation of Article 10

Just satisfaction: no claim made by the applicant

Eriksson v. Sweden (no. 60437/08)

The applicant, Mats Eriksson, is a Swedish national who was born in 1942 and lives in Trosa (Sweden). He suffered a heart attack and a cerebral stroke at work in 2000 and was granted early retirement pension as from December 2001. However, in April 2003, he was refused life annuity by the Social Insurance Office, a decision upheld upon appeal by the administrative courts. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), he complains about the appellate courts' refusal, despite his request, to hold an oral hearing in the proceedings concerning his claim for life annuity.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

Length-of-proceedings cases

In the following cases, the applicants complained in particular under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time) about the excessive length of (non-criminal) proceedings

Kralj v. Slovenia (no. 21313/06)

The applicant, Alojz Kralj, is a Slovenian national. In 1993 he brought civil proceedings against his neighbour seeking the removal of her car as it blocked the passage to his outbuildings. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and Article 13 (right to an

Once a judgment becomes final, it is transmitted to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe for supervision of its execution. Further information about the execution process can be found here: www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/execution



¹ Under Articles 43 and 44 of the Convention, Chamber judgments are not final. During the three-month period following a judgment's delivery, any party may request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber of the Court. If such a request is made, a panel of five judges considers whether the case deserves further examination. In that event, the Grand Chamber will hear the case and deliver a final judgment. If the referral request is refused, the Chamber judgment will become final on that day. Under Article 28 of the Convention, judgments delivered by a Committee are final.

effective remedy), he complained about the excessive length of those proceedings and about the absence of effective remedies in that respect.

Violation of Article 6 § 1 Violation of Article 13

This press release is a document produced by the Registry. It does not bind the Court. Decisions, judgments and further information about the Court can be found on www.echr.coe.int. To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe to the Court's RSS feeds.

Press contacts

echrpress@echr.coe.int | tel: +33 3 90 21 42 08

Tracey Turner-Tretz (tel: + 33 3 88 41 35 30)

Kristina Pencheva-Malinowski (tel: + 33 3 88 41 35 70)

Céline Menu-Lange (tel: + 33 3 90 21 58 77) Nina Salomon (tel: + 33 3 90 21 49 79) Denis Lambert (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 09)

The European Court of Human Rights was set up in Strasbourg by the Council of Europe Member States in 1959 to deal with alleged violations of the 1950 European Convention on Human Rights.