



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

FIFTH SECTION

**CASE OF VOGLREITER v. AUSTRIA**

*(Application no. 21155/18)*

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

19 September 2019

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



**In the case of Voglreiter v. Austria,**

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

Yonko Grozev, *President*,

Ganna Yudkivska,

André Potocki, *judges*,

and Liv Tigerstedt, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 29 August 2019,

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

**PROCEDURE**

1. The case originated in an application against Austria lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) on 25 April 2018.

2. The applicant was represented by Ms S. Walder, a lawyer practising in Henndorf a. W.

3. Notice of the application was given to the Austrian Government (“the Government”).

**THE FACTS**

4. The applicant’s details and information relevant to the application are set out in the appended table.

5. The applicant complained of the excessive length of criminal proceedings.

**THE LAW****I. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION**

6. The applicant complained that the length of the criminal proceedings in question had been incompatible with the “reasonable time” requirement. He relied on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, which reads as follows:

**Article 6 § 1**

“In the determination of ... any criminal charge against him, everyone is entitled to a ... hearing within a reasonable time by [a] ... tribunal...”

7. 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 applicant and the relevant authorities and what was at stake for the applicant 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).

8. In the leading cases of *Vitzthum v. Austria*, no. 8140/04, §§ 21-23, 26 July 2007, and *Donner v. Austria*, no. 32407/04, §§ 34-38, 22 February 2007, the Court already found a violation in respect of issues similar to those in the present case.

9. Having examined all the material submitted to it, the Court has not found any fact or argument capable of persuading it to reach a different conclusion as to the admissibility and merits of these complaints. 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.

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

## II. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

11. Article 41 of the Convention provides:

“If the Court finds that there has been a violation of the Convention or the Protocols thereto, and if the internal law of the High Contracting Party concerned allows only partial reparation to be made, the Court shall, if necessary, afford just satisfaction to the injured party.”

12. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Kücher v. Austria*, no. 2834/09, §§ 16 and 43, 5 February 2015), the Court finds it reasonable to award the sum indicated in the appended table.

13. The Court considers it appropriate that the default interest rate should be based on the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank, to which should be added three percentage points.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Declares* the application admissible;
2. *Holds* that this application discloses a breach of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention concerning the excessive length of criminal proceedings;
3. *Holds*
  - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicant, within three months, the amount 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 amount 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 19 September 2019, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Liv Tigerstedt  
Acting Deputy Registrar

Yonko Grozev  
President

## APPENDIX

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

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth	Representative's name and location	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Type of procedure	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in euros) <sup>1</sup>
21155/18 25/04/2018	<b>Markus Manfred Voglreiter</b> 01/11/1966	Walder Sandra Henndorf a. W.	05/04/2007	14/06/2018	11 year(s) and 2 month(s) and 10 day(s) 1 level(s) of jurisdiction	Criminal proceedings	16,000

---

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