

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

Analysis of statistics 2011

January 2012

Table of contents

Overview of the Court's statistics in 2011	4
A. Number of 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
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
Russia	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 2011

A. Number of new applications

In 2011 64,500 applications were allocated to a judicial formation, an overall increase of 5% compared with 2010 (61,300). 47,300 of these were identified as Single-Judge cases likely to be declared inadmissible (an increase of 11% in relation to 2010). 17,200 were identified as Chamber or Committee¹ cases (a decrease of 9%).

B. Applications disposed of judicially and pending applications

52,188 applications were disposed of judicially, an increase of 27% in relation to 2010 (41,182). However, the annual deficit, the difference between cases allocated and cases disposed of, was approximately 12,300 (i.e. a monthly deficit of more than 1,000).

As a result the number of applications pending before a judicial formation rose by 9% in 2011, from 139,650 to 151,600. However since the 31 August 2011, where the number of pending applications reached a total of 160,200, it has decreased by 5%.

C. Processing of applications

1. Pre-allocation

Before a case is allocated to a judicial formation applicants are required to complete the application form and submit the necessary supporting documents on pain of administrative disposal. As at 31 December 2011 the number of applications pending at this pre-judicial stage stood at 22,600, an increase of 3% in relation to the same date the previous year (21,950). The number of applications disposed of administratively in 2011 was 13,400, an increase of 14%.

2. Inadmissibility or strike out decisions

In 2011 50,677 applications were declared inadmissible or struck out of the list of cases by a Single Judge, a Committee or a Chamber, a 31% increase compared with 2010 (38,575). The Single-Judge formation decided 46,930 cases in 2011. The number of strike out decisions following a friendly settlement or a unilateral declaration increased by 25% in 2011 (1,518).

3. Communicated applications

Where an application is not on its face inadmissible, it is communicated to the respondent Government. In 2011 5,359 applications were communicated (a decrease of 20% in relation to 2010 when 6,674 applications were communicated). This figure reflects a decrease in the number of repetitive cases processed in accordance with the Court's policy of concentrating more resources on more complex cases.

4. Judgments

Judgments were delivered in respect of 1,511 applications (compared with 2,607 in 2010 – a decrease of 42%). A number of these applications were joined with the result that

¹ Committee competence provided for in Article 28 § 1 b) of the Convention.

the number of judgments actually delivered was 1,157, a decrease of 23%. 269 judgments were adopted by a three-judge formation under the new procedure introduced by Protocol 14. The decrease in the number of judgments can be explained mainly by the fact that fewer applications belonging to Category V (repetitive cases) have been processed this year.

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

The total number of decisions on interim measures (2,773) decreased by 27% compared with 2010 (3,775). The Court granted requests for interim measures in 342 cases (a decrease of 76% compared with 2010) and dismissed them in 1,807 cases (5% less than in 2010). The remainder fell outside the scope of Rule 39 of the Rules of Court but nonetheless required an urgent examination.

D. Priority policy²

In June 2009 the Court adopted a new priority policy establishing seven different categories. The essence of this policy is to concentrate more resources on the most important cases. It was recognised at the outset that a probable consequence of the policy would be a drop in output of applications decided on their merits as resources were diverted away from straightforward repetitive cases to these more complex and time-consuming cases. As noted above (see C. 4) this largely explains the lower number of applications disposed of in judgments overall in 2011.

The number of applications in the first three categories (“priority applications”) dealt with in 2011 increased globally by 5% compared to 2010. 12% more priority applications were communicated to the respondent Governments in comparison to 2010. The number of priority applications declared inadmissible or struck out of the list of cases by a Chamber or Committee increased by 7%. In particular the number of priority applications struck out following a friendly settlement or a unilateral declaration rose from 40 in 2010 to 146 in 2011.

The number of priority applications giving rise to a judgment decreased by 17% in 2011. However, the number of priority applications decided by a judgment represented 27% of the total number of applications dealt with by judgments in 2011 (compared to 19% in 2010).

The majority of the category I “urgent” applications (73%) have been pending for less than three years. The total number of “urgent” applications decreased by 47% compared to last year. This can be explained by the decrease in the number of cases where an interim measure has been granted and by the fact that many “urgent” cases have been disposed of.

73% of the category II applications (pilot or leading cases) have at least been communicated to the Government and 57% of all the applications in this category have been pending for less than three years. The total number of category II applications has increased by 5% compared to 2010.

57% of the category III applications (complaints about Articles 2, 3 4 or 5 § 1 of the Convention) are still waiting for a first examination by the Court and 68% of all the applications in this category have been pending for less than three years. The total number of category III applications has increased by 38% compared to 2010.

² An explanation of the Court's priority policy can be found on the Court's internet site www.echr.coe.int. Category IV applications are potentially well-founded cases based on other Articles; category V are “repetitive applications”; category VI are applications identified as giving rise to a problem of admissibility and category VII are manifestly inadmissible applications.

General information

Table 1 General statistical information

1. Applications allocated to a judicial formation [round figures (50)]	2011	2010	+/-
Applications allocated	64500	61300	5%

2. Interim procedural events	2011	2010	+/-
Applications communicated to respondent Government	5359	6674	-20%

3. Applications decided	2011	2010	+/-
By decision or judgment	52188	41182	27%
- by judgment delivered	1511	2607	-42%
- by decision (inadmissible or struck out)	50677	38575	31%

4. Pending applications [round figures (50)]	31/12/2011	1/1/2011	+/-
Applications pending before a judicial formation	151600	139650	9%
- Chamber (7 judges)	45850	47150	-3%
- Committee (3 judges)	13700	4100	234%
- Single-Judge formation	92050	88400	4%

5. Pre-judicial applications [round figures (50)]	31/12/2011	1/1/2011	+/-
Applications at a pre-judicial stage	22600	21950	3%
	2011	2010	+/-
Applications disposed of administratively (applications not pursued)	13400	11800	14%

Number of applications allocated to a judicial formation³

Chart 1 Applications allocated to a judicial formation per year





Chart 2 Applications pending before a judicial formation



³ 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 (more than 3,500 applications pending before a judicial formation)





Chart 4 The Court's total caseload by stage of proceedings and judicial formation⁴



⁴ The "Pending Government action" category was created to monitor applications following a judgment applying the pilot procedure.

Processing of applications

Chart 5 Major procedural steps in processing of applications




Chart 6 Number of judgments since 1999




Chart 7 Applications in categories I, II and III processed in 2010 and 2011





Chart 8 Time elapsed since date of allocation to a judicial formation – pending category I “Urgent” applications by stage of proceedings⁵



⁵ Most of the « urgent » cases awaiting first examination are cases awaiting the adoption of a decision or a judgment in a “leading” case.

Chart 9 Time elapsed since date of allocation to a judicial formation – pending category II “Leading or Pilot” applications by stage of proceedings




Chart 10 Time elapsed since date of allocation to a judicial formation – pending category III “Articles 2, 3, 4 or 5 § 1” applications by stage of proceedings




Table 2 Applications allocated per Contracting State and population

State	Applications allocated to a judicial formation				Population (1000)				Allocated/population (10000)			
	2008	2009	2010	2011	1.1.2008	1.1.2009	1.1.2010	1.1.2011	2008	2009	2010	2011
Albania	75	99	96	85	3170	3169	3185	3185	0,24	0,31	0,30	0,27
Andorra	1	6	8	8	83	87	85	85	0,12	0,69	0,94	0,94
Armenia	106	125	197	173	3230	3238	3249	3249	0,33	0,39	0,61	0,53
Austria	373	410	439	386	8332	8357	8375	8404	0,45	0,49	0,52	0,46
Azerbaijan	334	361	337	532	8630	8934	8997	8997	0,39	0,40	0,37	0,59
Belgium	166	256	304	256	10670	10741	10840	10918	0,16	0,24	0,28	0,23
Bosnia and Herzegovina	971	621	658	509	3843	3760	3844	3844	2,53	1,65	1,71	1,32
Bulgaria	890	1194	1348	1206	7640	7602	7564	7505	1,16	1,57	1,78	1,61
Croatia	608	755	992	1192	4435	4432	4426	4426	1,37	1,70	2,24	2,69
Cyprus	66	59	118	69	795	802	803	804	0,83	0,74	1,47	0,86
Czech Republic	721	726	606	523	10381	10475	10507	10533	0,69	0,69	0,58	0,50
Denmark	73	63	96	111	5476	5519	5529	5561	0,13	0,11	0,17	0,20
Estonia	169	204	265	346	1341	1340	1340	1340	1,26	1,52	1,98	2,58
Finland	276	489	377	433	5301	5325	5351	5375	0,52	0,92	0,70	0,81
France	2724	1589	1619	1600	63753	64105	64716	65075	0,43	0,25	0,25	0,25
Georgia	1771	2122	375	395	4382,1	4219	4386	4386	4,04	5,03	0,85	0,90
Germany	1572	1515	1683	1754	82222	82062	81802	81752	0,19	0,18	0,21	0,21
Greece	416	518	585	668	11215	11263	11305	11330	0,37	0,46	0,52	0,59
Hungary	425	449	436	656	10045	10030	10014	9986	0,42	0,45	0,44	0,66
Iceland	7	10	15	10	314	321	318	318	0,22	0,31	0,47	0,31
Ireland	48	62	62	54	4420	4450	4468	4480	0,11	0,14	0,14	0,12
Italy	1824	3624	3852	4733	59618	60090	60340	60626	0,31	0,60	0,64	0,78
Latvia	248	326	271	291	2271	2261	2248	2230	1,09	1,44	1,21	1,30
Liechtenstein	8	14	15	9	35	36	36	36	2,26	3,92	4,17	2,50
Lithuania	255	261	242	305	3366	3350	3329	3245	0,76	0,78	0,73	0,94
Luxemburg	35	29	44	24	484	492	502	512	0,72	0,59	0,88	0,47
Malta	12	14	23	21	411	413	414	418	0,29	0,34	0,56	0,50
Republic of Moldova	1147	1322	945	1025	3573	3576	3564	3564	3,21	3,70	2,65	2,88
Monaco	5	9	13	8	32	33	33	33	1,56	2,73	3,94	2,42
Montenegro	156	269	305	318	628	626	633	633	-	4,30	4,82	5,02
Netherlands	385	500	727	798	16404	16481	16575	16655	0,23	0,30	0,44	0,48
Norway	79	79	86	154	4737	4801	4858	4920	0,17	0,16	0,18	0,31
Poland	4369	4986	5777	5035	38116	38130	38167	38200	1,15	1,31	1,51	1,32
Portugal	151	152	186	163	10618	10632	10637	10637	0,14	0,14	0,17	0,15
Romania	5242	5260	5992	5207	21529	21497	21462	21414	2,43	2,45	2,79	2,43
Russia	10146	13666	14309	12465	142009	141904	141915	141915	0,71	0,96	1,01	0,88
San Marino	4	2	4	0	31	32	31	31	1,30	0,63	1,29	0,00
Serbia	1067	1576	1566	3730	7374	7335	7307	7307	1,66	2,15	2,14	5,10
Slovak Republic	488	569	568	553	5401	5411	5425	5435	0,90	1,05	1,05	1,02
Slovenia	1353	598	837	426	2026	2053	2047	2050	6,68	2,91	4,09	2,08
Spain	393	641	689	808	45283	45853	45989	46153	0,09	0,14	0,15	0,18
Sweden	317	367	901	1899	9183	9259	9341	9416	0,35	0,40	0,96	2,02
Switzerland	261	471	368	357	7591	7668	7786	7866	0,34	0,61	0,47	0,45
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	395	489	422	376	2045	2049	2053	2057	1,93	2,39	2,06	1,83
Turkey	3706	4474	5821	8702	70586	71517	72561	73723	0,53	0,63	0,80	1,18
Ukraine	4770	4693	3962	4621	46373	45964	45783	45783	1,03	1,02	0,87	1,01
United Kingdom	1253	1133	2766	1553	61186	61612	62027	62436	0,20	0,18	0,45	0,25
Total	49861	57157	61307	64547	810587	813306	816167	818848	0,62	0,70	0,75	0,79

SOURCES 2010 et 2011: Internet sites of the Eurostat service ("Population and social conditions") or from the United Nations Statistics Division.

The Council of Europe member States had a combined population of about 819 million inhabitants on 1 January 2011. The average number of applications allocated per 10,000 inhabitants was 0.79 in 2011.


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	143	116	71	0	5	335
Andorra	10	2	4	0	0	16
Armenia	176	711	58	0	4	949
Austria	393	96	100	0	12	601
Azerbaijan	668	920	97	0	7	1692
Belgium	308	220	33	0	6	567
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1098	172	109	0	29	1408
Bulgaria	2946	797	281	0	30	4054
Croatia	1373	264	85	0	30	1752
Cyprus	51	52	62	0	1	166
Czech Republic	971	162	60	0	14	1207
Denmark	109	4	12	0	0	125
Estonia	566	31	18	0	3	618
Finland	285	168	37	0	1	491
France	2254	276	197	0	25	2752
Georgia	589	2281	170	0	5	3045
Germany	2737	182	66	0	18	3003
Greece	529	547	170	0	25	1271
Hungary	1566	321	77	0	7	1971
Iceland	7	6	2	0	0	15
Ireland	13	15	5	0	1	34
Italy	3114	9498	1095	0	34	13741
Latvia	316	128	97	0	11	552
Liechtenstein	10	2	1	0	0	13
Lithuania	404	128	50	0	4	586
Luxembourg	3	0	4	0	2	9
Malta	15	6	6	0	9	36
Republic of Moldova	3168	700	322	45	26	4261
Monaco	2	5	1	0	0	8
Montenegro	688	132	43	0	6	869
Netherlands	939	244	69	0	2	1254
Norway	104	9	11	0	2	126
Poland	4339	1650	366	0	21	6376
Portugal	152	49	55	0	5	261
Romania	5056	3428	1314	2447	41	12286
Russia	35273	2968	1843	56	85	40225
San Marino	0	0	3	0	1	4
Serbia	2635	3615	496	0	6	6752
Slovakia	777	174	90	0	11	1052
Slovenia	2611	422	289	0	10	3332
Spain	688	142	55	0	6	891
Sweden	844	63	61	0	5	973
Switzerland	825	162	59	0	5	1051
"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	612	358	49	0	1	1020
Turkey	5330	8483	2031	0	96	15940
Ukraine	6183	1376	390	2289	33	10271
United Kingdom	1321	2204	112	0	26	3663
ALL STATES	92201	43289	10626	4837	671	151624


Country-specific information

Albania

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




Graph 12 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Andorra

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




Graph 14 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Armenia

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




Graph 16 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Austria

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




Graph 18 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Azerbaijan

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




Graph 20 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Belgium

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




Graph 22 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Bosnia and Herzegovina

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




Graph 24 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Bulgaria

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




Graph 26 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Croatia

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




Graph 28 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Cyprus

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




Graph 30 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Czech Republic

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




Graph 32 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Denmark

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




Graph 34 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Estonia

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




Graph 36 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Finland

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




Graph 38 Major procedural steps in processing applications




France

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




Graph 40 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Georgia

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




Graph 42 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Germany

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




Graph 44 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Greece

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




Graph 46 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Hungary

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




Graph 48 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Iceland

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




Graph 50 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Ireland

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




Graph 52 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Italy

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




Graph 54 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Latvia

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




Graph 56 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Liechtenstein

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




Graph 58 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Lithuania

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




Graph 60 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Luxembourg

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




Graph 62 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Malta

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




Graph 64 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Republic of Moldova

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




Graph 66 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Monaco

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




Graph 68 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Montenegro

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




Graph 70 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Netherlands

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




Graph 72 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Norway

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




Graph 74 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Poland

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




Graph 76 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Portugal

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




Graph 78 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Romania

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




Graph 80 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Russia

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




Graph 82 Major procedural steps in processing applications




San Marino

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




Graph 84 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Serbia

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




Graph 86 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Slovakia

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




Graph 88 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Slovenia

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




Graph 90 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Spain

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




Graph 92 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Sweden

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




Graph 94 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Switzerland

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




Graph 96 Major procedural steps in processing applications




“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”

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




Graph 98 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Turkey

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




Graph 100 Major procedural steps in processing applications




Ukraine

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




Graph 102 Major procedural steps in processing applications



United Kingdom

Chart 103 The Court’s caseload by stage of proceedings and decision body



Graph 104 Major procedural steps in processing applications

