



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

FIRST SECTION

CASE OF TALÁN AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA

(Applications nos. 5798/23 and 7 others – see appended list)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

8 October 2026

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

In the case of Talán and Others v. Slovakia,

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

Frédéric Krenc, *President*,

Davor Derenčinović,

Alain Chablais, *judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 17 September 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 Slovak Government (“the Government”) were given notice of the applications.

THE FACTS

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

4. The applicants complained of the excessive length of criminal investigation pending against them.

5. On 12 March 2019 the applicants were charged with serious economic crimes.

6. On 16 March 2022 and 11 January 2023, the Constitutional Court dismissed the applicants’ constitutional complaints as manifestly ill-founded, in particular, in view of the complexity of the criminal investigation (II. ÚS 594/2021 and II. ÚS 472/2022, respectively).

7. According to the information in the case file, the criminal investigation is still ongoing.

THE LAW

I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

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

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

9. The applicants complained that the length of the criminal investigation in question had been incompatible with the “reasonable time” requirement. They relied on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

10. In respect of the period following the Constitutional Court’s decisions, the Government argued that the applicants had failed to exhaust domestic remedies, since they had not lodged a fresh constitutional complaint (the Government referred to *Jesenská and Jesenský v. Slovakia* (dec.), no. 1876/07, 14 December 2010). Alternatively, they argued that the complaint was manifestly ill-founded, relying mostly on the Constitutional Court’s decisions.

11. As concerns the Government’s plea of non-exhaustion, the Court notes that it examined and dismissed the same argument, for example, in *Lacková and Lacko v. Slovakia* [Committee], no. 32769/22, § 13, 23 October 2025. The Court finds nothing in the present case to justify a different conclusion from the one reached in the latter judgment and consequently rejects the Government’s non-exhaustion objection.

12. 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, among many other authorities, *Pélissier and Sassi v. France* [GC], no. 25444/94, § 67, ECHR 1999-II, and *Frydlender v. France* [GC], no. 30979/96, § 43, ECHR 2000-VII).

13. In the leading case of *Pavlík v. Slovakia* (no. 74827/01, 30 April 2007) the Court already found a violation in respect of issues similar to those in the present case.

14. Having examined all the material submitted to it, the Court has not found any fact or argument, including the complexity of the criminal investigation, capable of justifying the overall length of the proceedings at the national level. Having regard to its case-law on the subject, the Court considers that in the instant case the length of the proceedings was excessive and failed to meet the “reasonable time” requirement.

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

III. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

16. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Pavlík*, cited above), the Court finds it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Declares* the applications admissible;
3. *Holds* that these applications disclose a breach of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention concerning the excessive length of the impugned criminal investigation;
4. *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 8 October 2026, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Viktoriya Maradudina
Acting Deputy Registrar

Frédéric Krenc
President

TALÁN AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

APPENDIX

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

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Domestic court File number Domestic award (in euros)	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros) ¹
1.	5798/23 23/01/2023	Peter TALÁN 1982	12/03/2019	pending	More than 7 years and 3 months and 11 days 1 level of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court: II. ÚS 594/2021 and II. ÚS 472/2022 0	3,600
2.	10668/23 02/03/2023	Pavel FIALA 1956	12/03/2019	pending	More than 7 years and 3 months and 12 days 1 level of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court: II. ÚS 594/2021 and II. ÚS 472/2022 0	3,600
3.	10686/23 02/03/2023	Oľga MUCHOVÁ 1956	12/03/2019	pending	More than 7 years and 3 months and 12 days 1 level of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court: II. ÚS 594/2021 and II. ÚS 472/2022 0	3,600
4.	10689/23 02/03/2023	Juraj MUCHA 1953	12/03/2019	pending	More than 7 years and 3 months and 12 days 1 level of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court: II. ÚS 594/2021 and II. ÚS 472/2022 0	3,600
5.	10802/23 02/03/2023	Igor HRADOVSKÝ 1949	12/03/2019	pending	More than 7 years and 3 months and 12 days 1 level of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court: II. ÚS 594/2021 and II. ÚS 472/2022 0	3,600

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

TALÁN AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Domestic court File number Domestic award (in euros)	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros) ¹
6.	13538/23 17/03/2023	Peter TALÁN 1953	12/03/2019	pending	More than 7 years and 3 months and 12 days 1 level of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court: II. ÚS 594/2021 and II. ÚS 472/2022 0	3,600
7.	13609/23 17/03/2023	Adriana TALÁNOVÁ 1955	12/03/2019	pending	More than 7 years and 3 months and 12 days 1 level of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court: II. ÚS 594/2021 and II. ÚS 472/2022 0	3,600
8.	18559/23 19/04/2023	Robert VERNER 1958	12/03/2019	pending	More than 7 years and 3 months and 12 days 1 level of jurisdiction	Constitutional Court: II. ÚS 472/2022 0	3,600