SUPREME COURT
REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

ACA EUROPE

Seminar organized by

the Supreme Court of Estonia and ACA-Europe

"Due process"

Tallinn, 18-19 October 2018

Answers to questionnaire: Croatia

Seminar co-funded by the «Justice » program of the European Union

Due Process

Questionnaire for the ACA Seminar in Tallinn, 26-27 April 2018

This questionnaire focuses on the limiting of a person's procedural rights based on the principle of procedural economy. First and foremost, it seeks to answer the questions whether Member States have regulated the simplification of procedure in resolving certain types of administrative disputes, and where is the line drawn between effective court procedure and the protection of a person's procedural rights.

The principle of effective judicial protection is a general principle of European Union law stemming from the constitutional traditions common to the Member States, which has been enshrined in Articles 6 and 13 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and which has also been reaffirmed by Article 47 of the Charter of fundamental rights of the European Union (joined cases C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P: Kadi, p 335; C-432/05: Unibet, p 37, and the case law referenced therein). The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) has stated that the principle of effective judicial protection laid down in Article 47 of the Charter comprises various elements; in particular, the rights of the defence, the principle of equality of arms, the right of access to a tribunal and the right to be advised, defended and represented (C-199/11: European Union v. Otis NV and others, p 48).

On the other hand, it is the CJEU's settled case law that fundamental rights, such as respect for the rights of the defence, do not constitute unfettered prerogatives and may be restricted, provided that the restrictions in fact correspond to objectives of general interest pursued by the measure in question and that they do not involve, with regard to the objectives pursued, a disproportionate and intolerable interference which infringes upon the very substance of the rights guaranteed (C-166/13: Mukarubega, p 53, and the case law referenced therein). In addition, the CJEU has stated that the principle of effective judicial protection does not only require that everyone should be able to exercise their right of access to court, but also that the administration of justice should be effective (F-3/11: Marcuccio, p 53). For instance, according to the CJEU, as long as the person can exercise their right to be heard, Article 47 of the Charter does not require an oral hearing in each case (see, for example, C-239/12 P: Abdulrahim, p 42; joined cases T-589/14 and T-772/14: Musso, p 59).

It follows from Article 52 subsection 3 of the Charter and the explanations relating to Article 47, that when defining the meaning and scope of the principle of effective judicial protection, it is also important to look at Article 6 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) on the topic.

According to Article 6 subsection 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the principle of a fair trial also includes the format of hearing a matter. According to the case law of the ECHR, a court case generally has to be reviewed in an oral hearing by at least one court instance; however, Member States can implement simplified proceedings for smaller and less complex disputes. This can serve the interests of the parties by facilitating access to justice, by reducing costs related to the proceedings and by accelerating the resolution of disputes.

According to ECHR case law, simplified proceedings can generally mean written proceedings, except in cases when the court deems an oral hearing to be necessary or if a party to the proceedings requests a hearing (in which case the request may be refused by the court) (see Pönka vs Estonia, No. 64160/11, p 30; on the obligation to hold a hearing see also: Göç v. Turkey [Grand Chamber], No. 36590/97, p 47, ECHR 2002-V, and the case law

referenced therein; Miller v. Sweden, No. 55853/00, p 29, February 8, 2005). ECHR has accepted exceptional circumstances for foregoing an oral hearing in cases where the proceedings concerned exclusively legal or highly technical questions, and which by their nature are not complex (see Koottummel v. Austria, No. 49616/06, p 19, December 10, 2009, and the case law referenced therein, Allan Jacobsson v. Sweden (no. 2), p 49; Valová, Slezák and Slezák v. Slovakia, p-s 65-68, Varela Assalino v. Portugal (dec.); Speil v. Austria (dec.), Schuler-Zgraggen v. Switzerland, p 58; Döry v. Sweden, No. 28394/95, p 41; and contrast Salomonsson v. Sweden, p-s 39-40; Jussila v. Finland [GC], No. 73053/01, p-s 41–42 and 47–48). A case can also be heard in simplified proceedings or written proceedings if the case raises no questions of fact or law which cannot be adequately resolved on the basis of the case file and the parties' written observations (see Döry v. Sweden, p 37) or if written proceedings are more effective than oral ones (Jussila v. Finland [GC], p-s 41–42 and 47–48).

Simplified proceedings in the context of this questionnaire mean special arrangements in administrative court procedure (a type of procedure) that allow for the court proceedings to be carried out in a simpler or faster manner than usual (shortened proceedings, accelerated proceedings, simple proceedings or any other special arrangements for resolving an administrative case in administrative court). Simplified proceedings, their prerequisites and nature are dealt with in part A of this questionnaire. It must be noted that in part A of the questionnaire, simplified proceedings do not include written proceedings without any other simplification, nor limitations of the right to appeal. The possibilities for resolving administrative cases in written proceedings will be dealt with in part B of the questionnaire, which also briefly touches upon the possibility of conducting a hearing via videoconferencing.

If simplified proceedings do not exist as a separate type of procedure in administrative courts in your country, when answering please do consider whether there are other, specific possibilities to make procedures more effective in certain ways (for example, exceptions in taking the minutes, procedural deadlines, format requirements, delivering the procedural documents, pre-trial proceedings, the formatting of a decision, the court panel, holding an oral hearing, etc.).

Part A

Efficiency of Court Proceedings (at the Expense of Procedural Guarantees)

1. Simplified proceedings

Does your administrative procedural law provide for the possibility of resolving administrative cases in simplified proceedings: on the level of the highest administrative court and/or in lower administrative courts? (YES/NO)

No, Croatian administrative dispute law does not provide for the possibility of resolving administrative cases in simplified proceedings.

- If NO, then are there any other possibilities for simplifying administrative court procedures (are there exceptions in, for example, taking the minutes, procedural deadlines, format requirements, delivering the procedural documents, pre-trial proceedings, the formatting of a decision, the court panel, holding an oral hearing, etc.)? Have there been discussions about the creation of simplified proceedings as a separate type of procedure? What are the main positions on the issue?

Other possibilities for simplifying administrative court procedures are:
- If time limits are not laid down in Act on Administrative Disputes, the court sets time limits on the basis of the circumstances of the case. The deadlines can be short.
- Decisions concerning procedural issues must not be reasoned in each occasion. The procedural decision must be reasoned if it serves to reject a proposal of the party or to resolve opposing proposals of the parties, and may be reasoned where the court deems that is necessary.
- An administrative dispute before first instance administrative courts is decided by the sole judge.
- Some specific laws are providing deadlines for solving administrative dispute (e.g. access to information, dissolution of representative body of local (regional) self-government, asylum law, public procurement law).

There have been no discussions about the creation of simplified proceedings as a separate type of procedure.

- If YES, please answer questions 2–4.

2. Prerequisites of simplified proceedings

2.1 To hear a case in simplified proceedings, is the prerequisite:

a. that the dispute is in a specific area of law? Please specify which areas (for example, minor traffic violations, administrative fees, aliens' cases, extradition *etc.*);
b. a minor infringement? Please specify criteria for which infringements are considered minor (for example, is the breach of law in question of a low priority or is the amount of the claim small; is it characterised by a monetary limit and if so, what is it?). If possible, please submit the legal definition of a minor infringement or a small claim, as well as examples or definitions from case law;
c. that the solution to the case is clear and obvious;
d. something else (please specify)?

2.2 Have the possibilities of hearing a case in simplified proceedings been exhaustively defined in law or is it case law instead that has a decisive role in whether it is used (for example, a discretionary decision)?

2.3 Can the court use simplified proceedings regardless of whether the parties to the proceedings agree to it?

2.4 Can a person appeal the implementation of simplified proceedings separately from the final court decision?

2.5 Can simplified proceedings be carried over into general procedure and *vice versa*?

3. Nature of simplified proceedings

3.1 Which rules of administrative court procedure are mandatory in simplified proceedings (for example, hearing the parties, general principles of administrative court procedure, *etc.*)?

3.2 Which general rules of administrative court procedure do not need to be followed in simplified proceedings (are there exceptions, for example, in taking the minutes, procedural deadlines, format requirements, delivering the procedural documents, pre-trial proceedings, the formatting of a decision, the court panel, holding an oral hearing, public announcement *etc*.)?

3.3 Are there differences in using simplified proceedings across the court instances?

3.4 What are the limitations on the right to appeal in case of simplified proceedings? Can an administrative case that is resolved in simplified proceedings be appealed up to the highest instance? If there are differences compared to general procedure, please describe how a case for which simplified proceedings are used moves through the court system (for example, the appeal might be submitted directly to the highest court, etc.).

3.5 In simplified proceedings, can a court issue a judgment without the statement of reasons? (YES/NO)

- If NO, then why is such a possibility not provided?

- If YES, then:

    a. what kind of information does that judgment have to contain?
    b. do the parties to the proceedings have the right to demand for the judgment to be supplemented with the statement of reasons?

4. Simplified proceedings in court practice

4.1 What is the share of cases resolved in simplified proceedings out of all resolved cases? (%)

4.2 Has the case law in your country pointed to any problems related to simplified proceedings, and if it has, what kinds of problems were they? Please give up to 3 examples.

Part B

Right to Public Hearing

1. Are there any types of administrative cases or any court instances in which only oral proceedings are allowed (i.e. written proceedings are prohibited)?

In each administrative dispute an oral hearing is a rule.

Principle of the party's right to be heard means that before rendering a judgment, the court shall provide all parties with an opportunity to declare themselves regarding the claims and allegations of other parties and all facts and legal issues which are the subject-matter of the administrative dispute.

The court may adjudicate concerning a claim to which the counter party was not provided with an opportunity to respond only in cases laid down by the Act on Administrative disputes (see next question).

2. Under which circumstances may cases be resolved in written proceedings? Can the justification be, for example:

a. exclusively legal questions;
b. highly technical questions;
c. the case raises no questions of fact or law that cannot be adequately resolved on the basis of the case file and the parties' written observations;
d. other bases, for example at the request of one of the parties to the proceedings?

According to the Act on Administrative disputes the first instance administrative court may resolve a dispute by a decision without holding a hearing:

1. if the respondent acknowledged the statement of claim in full;

2. in a case where the adjudication is based on a final judgement rendered in a model dispute;

3. if the court establishes that a particular decision, action or administrative contract is defective in a way which prevents an assessment of its lawfulness;

4. if the complainant disputes only the application of law, the facts of the case are indisputable, and the parties in the complaint or in the response to a claim are expressly not asking for the holding of a hearing.

In the last instance of administrative dispute, the High Administrative Court decides about the appeals at council sessions, without holding a discussion. If the High Administrative Court holds that it is necessary, it may hold a hearing.

3. Can oral proceedings also be carried out via videoconferencing (i.e. in a manner where either a party to the proceedings or their representative or counsel can be in a different place during the hearing and carry out procedural acts in real time, through an audiovisual transmission)? (YES/NO)

- If NO, then has the creation of such a possibility been discussed? What were the main positions on the issue?

No. The creation of such a possibility has not been discussed.

- If YES, then:

a. what are the legal limitations (for example, in which kinds of cases is it not permitted)?
b. have the risks of videoconferencing and the protection of a person's rights been discussed? What were the main positions on the issue?

4. Can oral proceedings also be carried out outside the court-room (in prison, hospital *etc*)? In which circumstances is this possible?

Such a possibility is not proscribed by law.

Thank you!