



## Judgments and decisions of 7 March 2024

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing one Chamber judgment<sup>1</sup> and ten decisions<sup>2</sup>:

the Chamber judgment is summarised below;

the ten decisions can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

*The judgment below is available only in English.*

### [Vagdalt v. Hungary](#) (application no. 9525/19)

The applicant, István Vagdalt, is a Hungarian national who was born in 1961 and lives in Répcelak (Hungary).

The case concerns the applicant's inability to be recognised as the father of his daughter. The mother's husband was registered as the child's father, but a DNA test revealed that the applicant was the biological father of the child. The national authorities found that proceedings with a view to settling the child's family status were in the child's best interest, but none were concluded due to mistakes made by the domestic authorities. Subsequently, any paternity challenge became time-barred, depriving the applicant of any possibility to establish a legal relationship with his daughter.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains that he was not able to have his paternity recognised because the national authorities had been inefficient in conducting the proceedings.

### Violation of Article 8

#### Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 10,000 euros (EUR)

costs and expenses: EUR 10,000

This press release is a document produced by the Registry. It does not bind the Court. Decisions, judgments and further information about the Court can be found on [www.echr.coe.int](http://www.echr.coe.int). To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: [www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en](http://www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en) or follow us on Twitter [@ECHR\\_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

#### Press contacts

[echrpresse@echr.coe.int](mailto:echrpresse@echr.coe.int) | tel.: +33 3 90 21 42 08

**We would encourage journalists to send their enquiries via email.**

Tracey Turner-Tretz (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 35 30)

Denis Lambert (tel.: + 33 3 90 21 41 09)

<sup>1</sup> Under Articles 43 and 44 of the Convention, Chamber judgments are not final. During the three-month period following a judgment's delivery, any party may request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber of the Court. If such a request is made, a panel of five judges considers whether the case deserves further examination. In that event, the Grand Chamber will hear the case and deliver a final judgment. If the referral request is refused, the Chamber judgment will become final on that day. Under Article 28 of the Convention, judgments delivered by a Committee are final.

Once a judgment becomes final, it is transmitted to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe for supervision of its execution. Further information about the execution process can be found here: [www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/execution](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/execution).

<sup>2</sup> Inadmissibility and strike-out decisions are final.

Inci Ertekin (tel.: + 33 3 90 21 55 30)  
Neil Connolly (tel.: + 33 3 90 21 48 05)  
Jane Swift (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 29 04)

**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.