



Finland

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1990

National Judge: Pauliine Koskelo

[Judges' CVs](#) are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Raimo Pekkanen (1989-1998), Matti Pellonpää (1998-2006), Päivi Hirvelä (2007-2015)

The Court dealt with 263 applications concerning Finland in 2015, of which 256 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 7 judgments (concerning 7 applications), 5 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2014	2015	2016*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	185	177	86
Communicated to the Government	8	6	2
Applications decided:	284	263	76
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	260	240	75
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	6	5	0
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	6	11	1
- Decided by judgment	12	7	0
Interim measures:	50	33	25
- Granted	2	2	1
- Refused (including out of scope)	48	31	24

* January to July 2016

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the [ECHR internet site](#)

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2016	
Total pending applications*	65
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	24
Single Judge	16
Committee (3 Judges)	1
Chamber (7 Judges)	6
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	1

*including applications for which completed application forms have not yet been received

Finland and ...

Its contribution to the Court's budget

For 2016 the Court's budget amounts to approximately 71 million euros. That budget is financed by contributions from the 47 member States of the Council of Europe in accordance with scales based on population and GDP; the 2016 contribution of Finland to the Council of Europe's (EUR 326 million) budget is **EUR 3,430,698.**

The Registry

The task of the Registry is to provide legal and administrative support to the Court in the exercise of its judicial functions. It is composed of lawyers, administrative and technical staff and translators. There are currently **679** Registry staff members of whom **7** are Finnish.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Pentikäinen v. Finland

20.10.2015

The case concerned the apprehension of a media photographer during a demonstration and his subsequent detention and conviction for disobeying the police.

No violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Cases dealing with Article 6

Vilho Eskelinen and Others v. Finland

19.04.2007

Special allowance for working in a remote area refused to police officers.

The Court said that that Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) was applicable

Violation of Article 6 § 1 as regards the length of the proceedings

No violation of Article 6 § 1 as regards the lack of an oral hearing

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) taken alone or in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Jussila v. Finland

23.11.2006

The applicant complained that he was not given an oral hearing in proceedings in which a tax surcharge was imposed.

No violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Cases dealing with the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8)

Hämäläinen v. Finland

16.07.2014

The case concerned the complaint of a male-to-female transsexual that she could only obtain full official recognition of her new gender by having her marriage turned into a civil partnership.

No violation of Article 8

No need to examine the case under Article 12 (right to marry)

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with Articles 8 and 12

K. and T. v. Finland (no. 25702/94)

12.07.2001

Emergency care order and failure to take proper steps to reunite the family.

Violation of Article 8

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

Case concerning the right to life (Article 2)

Huohvanainen v. Finland

13.03.2007

Death of the applicant's brother, shot by the police authorities in a siege situation.

No violation of Article 2

Case on prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Senchishak v. Finland

18.11.2014

The case concerned the threatened removal from Finland of a 72-year-old Russian national.

No violation of Article 3 if Ms Senchishak, the applicant, were to be expelled to Russia

Cases concerning Article 6

Right to a fair trial

D. v. Finland (no. 30542/04)

07.07.2009

Use of a child's videotaped account as essential evidence in the criminal proceedings against a father convicted of aggravated sexual abuse of his daughter.

Violation of Article 6

Natunen v. Finland

31.03.2009

Failure to disclose recorded telephone conversations (destroyed by the police, in accordance with the law, at pre-trial stage) at the applicant's trial for drug trafficking.

Violation of Article 6

[Muttalainen v. Finland](#)

22.05.2007

Refusal by the Appeal Court to hold an oral hearing in criminal proceedings.

[Violation of Article 6](#)

Private and family life cases (Article 8)

[Röman c. Finlande](#)

29.01.2013

[Laakso v. Finland](#)

15.01.2013

[Grönmark v. Finland and Backlund v. Finland](#)

06.07.2010

Cases concerning the impossibility for the applicants to have their biological father's paternity legally established because of the automatic time limit imposed on children born before the entry into force of the Paternity Act.

[Violations of Article 8 in all three cases In Laakso v. Finland and Röman v. Finland, The European Court of Human Rights noted however that the Supreme Court had recently changed its previous line of case-law on this issue.](#)

[K.U. v. Finland \(no. 2872/02\)](#)

02.12.2008

Failure to protect a minor subject of an advertisement of a sexual nature on an Internet dating site.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

[Johansson v. Finland](#)

06.09.2007

Refusal to register a name chosen for the applicants' son.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

[Hokkanen v. Finland](#)

23.09.1994

Transfer of custody to a child's grandparents; father prevented to see her in defiance of court decisions.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

Cases concerning freedom of expression (Article 10)

[Salumäki v. Finland](#)

29.04.2014

Journalist convicted of defamation after writing an article concerning the investigation into an homicide, with a reference to a well-known Finnish businessman.

[No violation of Article 10](#)

[Ojala and Etukeno Oy v. Finland Ruusunen v. Finland](#)

14.01.2014

Both cases concerned the criminal convictions of Ms Ruusunen and Mr Ojala for writing and publishing an autobiographical work which contained details of the relationship between the former Prime Minister of Finland and his former girlfriend, Ms Ruusunen.

[No violation of Article 10](#)

[Ristamäki and Korvola v. Finland](#)

29.10.2013

Editor in a Finnish broadcasting company and his immediate superior condemned for defamation with regards to the reference made to a well-known Finnish businessman -standing trial for economic offences at the time- in a programme broadcasted on national television criticising the lack of co-operation between the authorities concerning the investigation of economic crime.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

[Saaristo v. Finland](#)

12.10.2010

Journalist's conviction for an article on private life of presidential candidate's communication manager.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

[Flinkkilä and Others v. Finland Tuomela and Others v. Finland Jokitaipale and Others v. Finland Iltalehti and Karhuvaara v. Finland Soila v. Finland](#)

06.04.2010

Concerned criminal sanctions for having disclosed the identity of a public figure's partner.

[Violations of Article 10 in all five cases](#)

Eerikäinen v. Finland

10.02.2009

Newspaper ordered to pay damages for the publication of an article about ongoing criminal proceedings, disclosing the identity of the accused.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

Juppala v. Finland

02.12.2008

Conviction of applicant for defamation of her son-in-law after she had taken her three-year-old grandson to a doctor and voiced a suspicion that he might have been hit by his father.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

Nikula v. Finland

21.03.2002

Lawyer convicted for having criticised a prosecutor for decisions taken in his capacity in criminal proceedings.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

Glantz v. Finland

Häkkä v. Finland

Nykänen v. Finland

Pirttimäki v. Finland

20.05.2014

All cases concerned the applicants' complaints of having been punished twice for the same offence after tax surcharges had been imposed on them and they had then also been convicted of tax fraud or aggravated tax fraud.

[Violation of Article 4 of Protocol No.7 \(right not to be tried or punished twice\) – in the cases of *Glantz* and *Nykänen*](#)

[No violation of Article 4 of Protocol No.7 – in the cases of *Häkkä* and *Pirttimäki*](#)

X v. Finland (no. 34806/04)

03.07.2012

The case concerned the confinement of a paediatrician to a mental health hospital and her being forcibly administered with drugs, in the context of criminal proceedings against her for aiding and abetting a mother to kidnap her daughter, suspected of being sexually abused by her father.

[Violation of Article 5 § 1 \(right to liberty and security\) and Article 8 \(right to protection of private life\)](#)

Jokela v. Finland

21.05.2002

Discrepancy between the assessment of the market value of expropriated land and land subject to inheritance tax.

[Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Helander v. Finland

Decision of 3.10.2013

The case concerned a complaint brought by a Finnish prisoner, Mr Helander, that the prison authority had refused to forward legal correspondence to him, which had been sent to the prison's official e-mail address by his lawyer.

[Application declared inadmissible](#)

A.A.S. v. Finland (no. 56693/09)

Decision of 3.07.2012

The applicant complained that his right to respect for private and family life had been violated as he had not been allowed to visit his daughter, even under supervision (he was found guilty of the attempted murder of the new husband of his child's mother and, while in prison, had threatened her life).

[Application declared inadmissible](#)

Noteworthy pending cases

Grand Chamber

Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland (no. 931/13)

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention, the applicant companies complain about the ban on them processing taxation data, alleging that it amounted to censorship as well as discrimination vis-à-vis other newspapers which were able to continue publishing such information. Also relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time), the companies complain about the excessive length – six years and

six months – of the related administrative proceedings.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 21 July 2015, the European Court of Human Rights held, by six votes to one, that there had been no violation of Article 10 of the European Convention.

[Referred](#) to the Grand Chamber on 14 December 2015

Grand Chamber [hearing](#) on 14 September 2016

Chamber

[SA-Capital Oy v. Finland](#) (no. 5556/10)

Communicated to the Finnish Government in January 2010

Proceedings concerning a company suspected of having been involved in a cartel. The applicant company relies on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention.

**ECHR Press Unit Contact:
+ 33 (0)3 90 21 42 08**