



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

FIRST SECTION

CASE OF ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA

(Applications nos. 19195/23 and 21299/24)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

27 August 2026

This judgment is final but it may be subject to editorial revision.

In the case of Angyal and Others v. Slovakia,

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting as a Committee composed of:

Raffaele Sabato, *President*,

Artūrs Kučs,

Anna Adamska-Gallant, *judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 2 July 2026,

Delivers the following judgment, which was adopted on that date:

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in applications against Slovakia lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) on the various dates indicated in the appended table.

2. The applicants were represented by Ms O. Szabó, a lawyer practising in Patince.

3. The Slovak Government (“the Government”) were given notice of the applications.

THE FACTS

4. The list of applicants and the relevant details of the applications are set out in the appended table.

5. The present applications pertain to the same administrative proceedings as those described in the Court’s judgments *Balogh and Others v. Slovakia*, no. 35142/15, 31 August 2018, and *Balogh and Others v. Slovakia* [Committee], nos. 7918/19 and 43062/20, 16 December 2021.

6. The proceedings before the Nitra Regional Court (domestic file no. 19Sp/19/2010) ended on 5 March 2020, when the decision concerning the costs incurred by the applicants became final. The case file was transmitted to the Komárno Land Office on 23 July 2020.

7. On 24 February 2023 the applicants (application no. 19195/23) lodged a constitutional complaint and complained about the excessive length of the administrative proceedings before the Komárno Land Office, Komárno District Office, Nitra Regional Court (19Sp/19/2010) and the Supreme Court (10/Sžr/22/2013). On 2 March 2023 the Constitutional Court rejected the complaint as inadmissible in relation to the proceedings before the administrative organs, for lack of jurisdiction in relation to the proceedings before the Regional Court, and as belated in relation to the proceedings before the Supreme Court, without giving any specific justification for its decision other than a general comment about the possibility to lodge an administrative action for acceleration of the administrative proceedings. Additionally,

the Constitutional Court noted that the proceedings had been factually complex on account of the high number of plaintiffs and multiple inheritance proceedings (I. ÚS 144/2023).

8. On 31 January 2024 the applicants (application no. 21299/24) lodged essentially the same constitutional complaint as the applicants in application no. 19195/23. On 25 April 2024 the Constitutional Court rejected the complaint as inadmissible in relation to the proceedings before the administrative organs referring in general to the possibility to lodge an administrative action for acceleration of the administrative proceedings and as belated in relation to the Regional and Supreme Courts, as those proceedings had already ended (II. ÚS 224/2024).

9. On 2 May and 8 November 2023, 11, 17, 18 and 19 April and on 15 May 2024, the Komárno Land Office dismissed the restitution claims of the following applicants: Imrich Németh, Beáta Szalayová, Endre Szabó, Iveta Marosiová, Martina Kollár, Tomáš Marosi, Monika Gögh and Eva Marosiová, Attila Gögh (application no. 19195/23), Georgina Tóth, Mária Jányová, Katarína Tóthová, Štefan Németh, Tibor Domján, Richard Szabó, František Fülöp (born in 1964) and František Fülöp (born in 1940), Marian Madarász, Alexander Balogh, Anna Szépeová and Magdaléna Fülöpová, Teréz Varga, Magdaléna Holá, Vojtech Nagy, Edita Nagyová, Erika Károlyiová, Anikó Jezsó, Jozef Libárdi and Agneša Dobreová.

10. According to the information in the case-file, the applicants lodged either an administrative appeal with the Nitra District Office, Department of Appeals or an administrative action with the Bratislava Administrative Court. It further appears that the administrative file was transmitted to the Bratislava Administrative Court on 26 September 2024, and the proceedings have been pending before that court ever since. The proceedings before the Nitra District Office, Department of Appeals were stayed until the final resolution of the proceedings before the Bratislava Administrative Court.

THE LAW

I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

11. Having regard to the similar subject matter of the applications, the Court finds it appropriate to examine them jointly in a single judgment.

II. THE *LOCUS STANDI* OF THE APPLICANTS' HEIRS

12. As concerns the applicants marked by an asterisk (see appended table), the Court notes that they died while the present applications were pending before the Court. The applicants' heirs, whose details are set out in the appended table, asked to pursue the applications on their relatives' behalf.

As the requests are in line with its case-law, the Court sees no reason to refuse them (see, among other authorities, *Horváthová v. Slovakia*, no. 74456/01, §§ 25-27, 17 May 2005). However, reference will still be made to the original applicants throughout the present text.

III. STRIKING OUT OF APPLICATIONS

13. The legal representative of Ms K. Takácsová (born in 1953) and Ms M. Domjánová (born in 1954) informed the Court, by letters of 1 March 2024 and of 14 April 2025 respectively, that they did not intend to pursue their applications. In view of that information, the Court considers it appropriate to strike the applications, in so far as they were lodged by these applicants, out of its list of cases.

IV. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION

14. The applicants complained principally that the length of the administrative proceedings, described in the appended table, had been incompatible with the “reasonable time” requirement. They relied on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention

15. The Court rejects the Government’s objection that the applicants had failed to exhaust domestic remedies, because they had not lodged an action for the acceleration of administrative proceedings pursuant to the relevant legislation, as amended on 1 July 2023, according to which the administrative court may now award also financial compensation. While taking note of the legislative changes, the Court observes that the present situation is different from cases where a new remedy was created in respect of the length of the proceedings and the applicants were obliged to exhaust that remedy, even though it became available only after the introduction of their application (contrast *Andrášik and Others v. Slovakia* (dec.), nos. 57984/00 *et al.*, 22 October 2002).

16. In the present case, the applicants had at their disposal a preventive, as well as a compensatory remedy, namely the constitutional complaint which they had also used. The Court notes that if the domestic law provides for several parallel remedies in different fields of law, an applicant who has sought to obtain redress for an alleged breach of the Convention through one of these remedies is not necessarily required to use others which have essentially the same objective (see *Jasinskis v. Latvia*, no. 45744/08, §§ 50 and 53-54, 21 December 2010). There is no doubt that both remedies pursue the same aim, namely the acceleration of the proceedings and payment of the compensation. Thus, the applicants cannot be required to additionally lodge an action for acceleration of the administrative proceedings, particularly in view of the fact that, by the date on which the new law entered into force, the impugned administrative proceedings had already lasted for

more than eighteen years and six months before two levels of jurisdiction and appear to be still pending (see *Balogh and Others* [Committee], cited above, § 21).

17. The Court also rejects the Government's non-exhaustion objection concerning the applicants Georgina Tóth, Mária Jányová, Katarína Tóthová, and Štefan Németh. As it appears from the case file, the applicants had lodged the administrative action on 20 October 2023, while the administrative file was transmitted to the Bratislava Administrative Court on 26 September 2024 (see paragraph 10 above). They thus had lodged their constitutional complaint before the administrative file was transmitted to the administrative court (contrast *Obluk v. Slovakia*, no. 69484/01, § 53, 20 June 2006).

18. The Government further submitted that the case was procedurally very complex (the restitution claim had been lodged by 179 plaintiffs, whose number increased to 352 in the course of the proceedings), the applicants, as well as their lawyer, had remained passive during the proceedings and five hearings had been adjourned due to their representative's absences or upon their requests. Moreover, the dispute had little significance for the applicants, since they were asserting a claim to which they were not entitled.

19. The Court reiterates that the reasonableness of the length of proceedings must be assessed in the light of the circumstances of the case and with reference to the following criteria: the complexity of the case, the conduct of the applicants and the relevant authorities and what was at stake for the applicants in the dispute (see *Frydlender v. France* [GC], no. 30979/96, § 43, ECHR 2000-VII).

20. In the leading case of *Balogh and Others*, cited above, the Court already found a violation in respect of issues similar to those in the present case.

21. Having examined all the material submitted to it, the Court has not found any fact or argument (including the complexity of the case, the alleged contribution of the applicants' representatives and the alleged minor importance of the dispute) capable of justifying the overall length of the proceedings, described in the appended table, at the national level. Having regard to its case-law on the subject, the Court considers that in the instant case the length of those proceedings was excessive and failed to meet the "reasonable time" requirement.

22. These complaints are therefore admissible and disclose a breach of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

V. OTHER ALLEGED VIOLATIONS UNDER WELL-ESTABLISHED CASE-LAW

23. The applicants complained under Article 13 of the Convention that they had not had an effective remedy at their disposal in respect of the excessive length of the administrative proceedings.

24. Without questioning the general effectiveness of the constitutional complaint which remains a remedy to be pursued by other applicants who wish to invoke their rights under the Convention before the Court (*mutatis mutandis*, *K.V. Mediterranean Tours Limited v. Türkiye*, no. 41120/17, § 72, 10 June 2025), the Court notes that in the present case the Constitutional Court segmented the proceedings and declined jurisdiction to examine the length of the proceedings before the administrative organs, directing the applicants to lodge an action for acceleration of administrative proceedings. Such practice was found at odds with the Court's approach to examine the overall length of the proceedings, reiterated in two judgments concerning the same domestic proceedings but different applicants (*Balogh and Others*, [cited above](#), 48-67, and *Balogh and Others* [Committee], [cited above](#)).

25. This complaint is therefore admissible and constitutes a violation of Article 13 of the Convention.

VI. REMAINING COMPLAINTS

26. As regards the complaint of some of the applicants raised under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention concerning the excessive length of the proceedings before the Regional Court from 22 July 2010 to 23 July 2020, the Court finds, in the light of all the material in its possession and in so far as the matters complained of are within its competence, that they do not disclose any appearance of a violation of the rights and freedoms set out in the Convention or the Protocols thereto and that the admissibility criteria set out in Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention have not been met.

VII. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

27. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Balogh and Others*, [cited above](#)), the Court considers it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Decides* that the applicants' heirs (see appended table) have *locus standi* in the proceedings;
3. *Decides* to strike out of its list of cases application no. 19195/23 in so far as it was lodged by Ms K. Takácsová (born 1953) and application no. 21299/24 in so far as it was lodged by Ms M. Domjánová (born 1954) in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention;

4. *Declares* the complaint under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention raised by 35 applicants from application no. 19195/23 and by 16 applicants from application no. 21299/24 (see appended table) in so far as it concerns the excessive length of the proceedings while the case was pending before the Nitra Regional Court inadmissible and *declares* the remaining part of the applications admissible;
5. *Holds* that these applications disclose a breach of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention concerning the excessive length of the administrative proceedings, as described in the appended table;
6. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 13 of the Convention as regards the lack of an effective domestic remedy to complain about the excessive length of the administrative proceedings (see appended table);
7. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, within three months, the amounts indicated in the appended table;
 - (b) that from the expiry of the above-mentioned three months until settlement simple interest shall be payable on the above amounts at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 27 August 2026, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Viktoriya Maradudina
Acting Deputy Registrar

Raffaele Sabato
President

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

APPENDIX

List of applications raising complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention
(excessive length of administrative proceedings)

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Domestic court File number Domestic award (in euros)	Other complaints under well- established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant/ household (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses (in euros) ²
1.	19195/23 26/04/2023	Magdaléna SZABÓOVÁ 1959	Szabó Olga Patince	04/02/2019	pending	More than 7 years and 2 months and 5 days 2 levels of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court no. I. ÚS 144/ 2023 0	Art. 13 - lack of any effective remedy in domestic law to complain about the excessive length of administrative proceeding	1,950	250
	19195/23 26/04/2023 (7 applicants)	Sabina ŽIBRITOVÁ 1973 <u>Household</u> Juliana PÁLOVICSOVÁ 1950 Denisa CSIZMADIA 1975 Ladislav FEKETE 1976 <u>Household</u> Tomáš VARGA 1978		23/12/2004	pending	More than 21 years and 3 months and 20 days 2 levels of jurisdiction			8,500	

¹ Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants.

² Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants.

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Domestic court File number Domestic award (in euros)	Other complaints under well- established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant/ household (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses (in euros) ²
		Zsolt NAGY 1977 Mária NAGYOVÁ 1956								
	19195/23 26/04/2023 (35 applicants)	Arpád ANGYAL 1971 Ladislav BALOGH 1960 Attila GÓGH 1962 Imrich GÓGH 1950 Imrich NÉMETH 1960 Livia ÓSZIOVÁ 1958 Katarína SZABÓOVÁ 1959 <u>Household</u> Júlia SIMIGHOVÁ 1956 Ján BORKA 1959 <u>Household</u> Beáta SZALAYOVÁ 1968 Endre SZABÓ 1966		Proceedings no. 1 23/12/2004 Proceedings no. 2 23/07/2020	Proceedings no. 1 22/07/2010 Proceedings no. 2 pending	More than 11 years and 3 months and 16 days 1 level of jurisdiction			5,200	

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Domestic court File number Domestic award (in euros)	Other complaints under well- established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant/ household (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses (in euros) ²
		<u>Household</u> Iveta MAROSIOVÁ 1969 Tomáš MAROSI 1988 Martina KOLLÁR 1986 Monika GÖGH 1972 Eva MAROSIOVÁ 1948 <u>Household</u> Andrea NAGYOVÁ 1976 Štefan KUCSERA 1963 Magdaléna NAGYOVÁ 1960 <u>Household</u> Diana RÁKÓCZI 1975 Viola RÁKÓCZIOVÁ 1950 Roland RÁKÓCZI 1972 <u>Household</u> Štefan FÜLÖP 1961								

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Domestic court File number Domestic award (in euros)	Other complaints under well- established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant/ household (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses (in euros) ²
		Mária ANGYALOVÁ 1960 <u>Household</u> Gizela LECZKÉSIÓVÁ 1949 Zuzana ÁRGYUSIOVÁ 1951 Jozef ELEK 1963 Eva GÓGHOVÁ 1959 Katarína ELEKOVÁ 1961 <u>Household</u> Zsuzsanna SZÁNTÓ 1980 Katarína SZABÓOVÁ 1979 <u>Household</u> Viktor MADARÁSZ 1982 Vojtech MADARÁSZ 1956 <u>Household</u> Irena ŠUDÁKOVÁ 1950 Eszter ŐSZI 1986								

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Domestic court File number Domestic award (in euros)	Other complaints under well- established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant/ household (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses (in euros) ²
2.	21299/24 15/07/2023	Tibor DOMJÁN 1957		23/12/2004	pending	More than 21 years and 3 months and 20 days 2 levels of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court no. II. ÚS 224/2024 0		800	250
	21299/24 15/07/2023 (7 applicants)	Magdaléna FÜLÖPOVÁ 1951 Georgina TÓTH 1972 Teréz VARGA* Born in 1956 The applicant died in 2025 The following relatives have the quality of heirs: <i>Andrea Fazekas Varga</i> 1977 <i>Levente Varga</i> 1981 <i>Tibor Varga</i> 1952 Richard SZABÓ 1971		23/12/2004	pending	More than 21 years and 3 months and 20 days 2 levels of jurisdiction			8,500	
	21299/24 15/07/2023 (16 applicants)	Alexander BALOGH* Born in 1963 The applicant died in 2025		Proceedings no. 1 23/12/2004	Proceedings no. 1 22/07/2010	More than 11 years and 3 months and 16 days			5,200	

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Domestic court File number Domestic award (in euros)	Other complaints under well- established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant/ household (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses (in euros) ²
		The following relative has the quality of heir: <i>Alexander Balogh</i> 1994 Magdaléna HOLÁ 1944 Mária JANYOVÁ 1935 Marian MADARÁSZ 1984 Štefan NÉMETH 1964 Anna SZÉPEOVÁ 1951 Katarína TÓTHOVÁ 1952 <u>Household</u> František FÜLÖP 1964 František FÜLÖP 1940 <u>Household</u> Vojtech NAGY 1966 Edita NAGYOVÁ 1942 Erika KÁROLYIOVÁ 1964 Anikó JEZSÓ 1968		Proceedings no. 2 23/07/2020	Proceedings no. 2 pending	1 level of jurisdiction				

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Domestic court File number Domestic award (in euros)	Other complaints under well- established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant/ household (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses (in euros) ²
		Household Jozef LIBÁRDI 1952 Agneša DOBROVÁ 1964								

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

Applicants from application no. 19195/23 who constitute household with the applicants from application no. 21299/24:

Households
19195/23 Ladislav BALOGH 1960 21299/24 Alexander BALOGH 1994
19195/23 Katarína SZABÓOVÁ 1959 21299/24 Anna SZÉPEOVÁ 1951
19195/23 Sabina ŽIBRITOVÁ 1973 21299/24 Richard SZABÓ 1971
19195/23 Imrich NÉMETH 1960 21299/24 Štefan NÉMETH 1964
19195/23 Iveta MAROSIOVÁ 1969

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

Households
Tomáš MAROSI 1988 Martina KOLLÁR 1986 Monika GÓGH 1972 Eva MAROSIOVÁ 1948 21299/24 Katarína TÓTHOVÁ 1952
19195/23 Viktor MADARÁSZ 1982 Vojtech MADARÁSZ 1956 21299/24 Marian MADARÁSZ 1984
19195/23 Štefan FÜLÖP 1961 Mária ANGYALOVÁ 1960 21299/24 František FÜLÖP 1940 František FÜLÖP 1964

ANGYAL AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

Applicants whose applications were struck out of the Court's list of cases:

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location
1.	19195/23 26/04/2023	Katarína TAKÁCSOVÁ 1953	Szabó Olga Patince
2.	21299/24 15/07/2023	Monika DOMJÁNOVÁ 1954	Szabó Olga Patince