

702
28.09.2010

Press release issued by the Registrar¹

HEARING IN OCTOBER 2010

The European Court of Human Rights will be holding **the following hearing in October 2010:**

(A limited number of seats are available for the press; they are allocated on a first come, first served basis.)

Wednesday 13 October at 9.15 a.m.

Grand Chamber hearing in the cases of *Axel Springer AG v. Germany* (application no. 39954/08) and *von Hannover v. Germany* (no. 40660/08 and 60641/08)

Both cases concern the impugned publication in the media of articles and, in the second case, photos depicting the private life of well-known people.

Axel Springer AG

The applicant company, Axel Springer AG, is registered in Germany. It is the publisher of *Bild-Zeitung*, a national daily newspaper with a large circulation.

In September 2004, *Bild-Zeitung* published a front-page article with a large-type headline about X., a well-known television actor, being arrested at the Munich beer festival (*Oktoberfest*) for possession of cocaine. The article was illustrated by three pictures of X., taken at the *Oktoberfest*, and complemented by a more detailed article on another page. It mentioned that X., who had played the role of a police superintendent in a popular TV series since 1998, had previously been given a suspended prison sentence for possession of drugs. The newspaper published a second article in July 2005, which reported on X. being convicted and fined for illegal possession of drugs after he had made a full confession.

Immediately after the first article appeared, X. instituted injunction proceedings against the applicant company with the Hamburg Regional Court, which granted his request and prohibited the publication of the article and the photos. The applicant company did not challenge the judgment concerning the photos, and the prohibition to publish the article was eventually upheld by the court of appeal in June 2005.

In November 2005, Hamburg Regional Court prohibited any further publication of almost the entire article, on pain of penalty for non-compliance, and ordered the applicant company to pay a fine. The court held in particular that the right to protection of X.'s personality rights prevailed over the public's interest in being informed, even if the truth of the facts related by the daily had not been disputed. The case had not concerned a serious offence and there was no particular public interest in knowing about X.'s offence. The judgment was eventually upheld by the Federal Court of Justice in December 2006.

¹ These summaries by the Registry do not bind the Court.

In another set of proceedings concerning the second article, about X.'s conviction, the Hamburg Regional Court granted his application on essentially the same grounds as those set out in its judgment on the first article. The judgment was eventually upheld by the Federal Court of Justice in June 2007. In March 2008, the Federal Constitutional Court declined to consider constitutional appeals lodged by the applicant company against the decisions.

Under Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant company complains of the injunction preventing it from publishing the articles.

The application was lodged with the European Court of Human Rights on 18 August 2008. On 30 March 2010, the Chamber to which the case had been allocated, after having joined to it the applications *von Hannover v. Germany* (nos. 40660/08 and 60641/08), relinquished jurisdiction in favour of the Grand Chamber.

von Hannover

The applicants are Princess Caroline von Hannover, daughter of the late Prince Rainier III of Monaco, and her husband Prince Ernst August von Hannover.

Since the early 1990s Princess Caroline had been trying to prevent the publication of photos of her private life in the press. Two series of photos, published in 1993 and 1997 respectively in German magazines had been the subject of three sets of proceedings before the German courts and in particular leading judgments of the Federal Court of Justice of 1995 and of the Federal Constitutional Court of 1999 dismissing her claims. Those proceedings were the subject of the European Court of Human Rights' judgment in [*Caroline von Hannover v. Germany* \(no. 59320/00\)](#) of 24.06.2004, in which the Court held that the court decisions had infringed Princess Caroline's right to respect for her private life under Article 8.

Relying on that judgment, Princess Caroline and Prince Ernst August subsequently brought several sets of proceedings before the civil courts seeking an injunction against the publication of further photos, showing them during their holiday and taken without their consent, which had appeared in the German magazines *Frau im Spiegel* and *Frau Aktuell* between 2002 and 2004.

While the courts granted Princess Caroline's claim as regards the publication of two of the impugned photos, they eventually dismissed both applicants' claims as regards another photo which had appeared in February 2002 in both magazines in a similar context. It showed the couple taking a walk during their skiing holiday in St. Moritz and was accompanied by an article reporting, among other issues, on the poor health of Prince Rainier of Monaco. The courts found that the reigning prince's poor health was a subject of general interest and that the press had been entitled to report on the manner in which his children reconciled their obligations of family solidarity with the legitimate needs of their private life, among which was the desire to go on holiday. In a judgment of 26 February 2008, the Federal Constitutional Court also dismissed the allegation that the German courts had disregarded or taken insufficient account of the Court's case-law.

Under Article 8, the applicants complain of the German courts' refusal to prohibit any further publication of the impugned photos. They allege in particular that the courts have not taken sufficient account of the Court's judgment in *Caroline von Hannover v. Germany* of 2004.

The applications were lodged with the European Court of Human Rights on 22 August and 15 December 2008 respectively. On 24 November 2009 the Court decided to join them. On 30 March 2010, the Chamber to which the case had been allocated, after having joined the

applications to the application *Axel Springer AG v. Germany* (no. 39954/08), relinquished jurisdiction in favour of the Grand Chamber.

After the hearing the Court will begin its deliberations, which will be held in private. Its ruling in the case will be made at a later stage.

Decisions, judgments and further information about the Court can be found on [its Internet site](#).

Press contacts

echrpress@echr.coe.int / +33 3 90 21 42 08

Nina Salomon (telephone: + 33 (0)3 90 21 49 79)

Emma Hellyer (telephone: + 33 (0)3 90 21 42 15)

Tracey Turner-Tretz (telephone : + 33 (0)3 88 41 35 30)

Kristina Pencheva-Malinowski (telephone : + 33 (0)3 88 41 35 70)

Céline Menu-Lange (telephone : + 33 (0)3 90 21 58 77)

Frédéric Dolt (telephone : + 33 (0)3 90 21 53 39)

The European Court of Human Rights was set up in Strasbourg by the Council of Europe Member States in 1959 to deal with alleged violations of the 1950 European Convention on Human Rights.