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

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 16627/21
Imrich SCHEFFER against Slovakia
and 47 other applications
(see list appended)

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 16 December 2025 as a Chamber composed of:

Ivana Jelić*, President*,
Erik Wennerström,
Raffaele Sabato,
Frédéric Krenc,
Davor Derenčinović,
Alain Chablais*, judges*,
Katarina Šmigová*,* ad hoc *judge*,

and Liv Tigerstedt, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the applications lodged on the various dates indicated in the appended table,

Having regard to the observations submitted by the respondent Government and the observations in reply submitted by the applicants,

Having regard to the decision of the President of the Chamber to appoint Ms Katarína Šmigová to sit as an *ad hoc* judge from a list submitted in advance by the respondent Government (Article 26 § 4 of the Convention and Rule 29 § 1 (a) of the Rules of Court), since the office of judge elected in respect of Slovakia is presently vacant,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

1. The applicants are Slovak nationals or companies incorporated in Slovakia ("the applicants"). Having been represented by the same lawyer practising in Bratislava, Mr B. Fridrich, a list of the applicants is set out in the appendix.

2. The Government of the Slovak Republic ("the Government") were represented by their Agent, Ms M. Bálintová.

The circumstances of the case

3. The facts of the case, as submitted by the parties, may be summarised as follows.

4. The applicants operate or operated the various businesses specified in the appendix. The case concerns the repercussions on their rights connected to their businesses of measures taken in Slovakia in response to the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus that causes COVID-19.

5. In particular, at a time when an extraordinary situation (*mimoriadna situácia*) had been declared under section 8 of the Civil Defence of the Population Act (Law no. 42/1992 Coll., as applicable at the relevant time – "the CDPA" – see paragraph 20 below), effective from 12 March 2020, the Public Health Service Authority (*Úrad verejného zdravotníctva* – "the PHSA") issued an order (*opatrenie* – OLP/8326/2020) taking effect on 15 October 2020 in which it ruled, *inter alia*, under section 5(4)(k) and section 48(4)(e) of the Public Health Protection, Support and Development Act (Law no. 355/2007 Coll., as applicable at the relevant time – "the PHPSD Act" – see paragraphs 12 and 14 below) to close all fitness centres and some other facilities in which individuals gathered. Catering services were subject to the sanitary measures specified in the order. The order was replaced by a subsequent order and decrees (*vyhláška*) issued by the PHSA, which included the following:

Legislation	Entry into force	Effect (among others)
Order no. 12/2020	30 October 2020	- closure of all fitness centres and restrictions on the operation of catering services
Decree no. 24/2020	16 November 2020	
Decree no. 27/2020	27 November 2020	
Decree no. 34/2020	11 December 2020	
Decree no. 45/2020	19 December 2020	- closure of retail shops and other operations, including fitness centres, and restrictions on the operation of catering services
Decree no. 70/2020	30 December 2020	
Decree no. 77/2020	1 January 2021	
Decree no. 3/2021	11 January 2021	

Decree no. 13/2021	27 January 2021	
Decree no. 45/2021	8 February 2021	
Decree no. 98/2021	8 March 2021	
Decree no. 131/2021	22 March 2021	
Decree no. 186/2021	19 April 2021	- closure of fitness centres and restrictions on the operation of catering services
Decree no. 194/2021	26 April 2021	- restrictions on the operation of fitness centres and catering services
Decree no. 253/2021	11 October 2021	- closure of some fitness centres and restrictions on the operation of others and on catering services
Decree no. 259/2021	22 November 2021	- closure of some retail shops and other operations, including fitness centres and catering services, and restrictions on the operation of others

6. It is undisputed that the above legislation had repercussions on the applicants' businesses in the form of having to close them or restrict their operations, as well as loss of clientele, as specified in the appendix.

7. The Government explained that financial support in respect of losses incurred as a result of the contested measures had been available to businesses such as those of the applicants from two schemes operated under the authority of the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family and the Ministry of the Economy.

8. The scheme operated by the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family had been based on section 54(1)(e) of the Employment Services Act (Law no. 5/2004 Coll., as amended), and had aimed to ensure that employment was maintained during extraordinary situations, states of emergency or exceptional circumstances and to remove their consequences. It had consisted of temporary financial assistance from the State to maintain employment and support self-employed individuals ("the First Aid scheme"). The various measures had been implemented in the period from March 2020 to February 2022 and had been comprised of: (i) contribution in respect of wages to employers who had been forced to close their businesses (at various levels depending on the phase of the scheme ranging from 80% of the average monthly wages of the given employee and 100% of the total costs of the employee's labour, up to an amount of 1,100 euros (EUR) per employee per month); (ii) contribution of up to EUR 870 per month to self-employed individuals; (iii) contribution to employers (a) if no work could be assigned

(at various times between 80% of the average monthly wages of the given employee – up to a maximum amount of EUR 880 per employee per month) and 100% of the total costs of that employee's labour (up to a maximum amount of EUR 1,000 per employee per month) or (b) in the event of lost revenue (lump sum of EUR 870 per employee for the costs of labour); and (iv) contribution to selected groups of self-employed individuals ranging at various times between EUR 105 and EUR 360. Once the eligibility conditions for those contributions had been met, the beneficiary had been legally entitled to obtain them.

9. The scheme operated under the authority of the Ministry of Economy had consisted of a subsidy under the Ministry of Economy Subsidies Act (Law no. 71/2013 Coll., as amended) in respect of rent available to businesses operated in rented premises. The subsidy would correspond to any discount on rent granted to the tenant by the landlord, up to 50% of the rent, and it would be paid directly to the landlord, with a notification of approval of the subsidy being sent both to the landlord and to the tenant (section 13c(6) and (14) of the Act). The subsidy however could not be claimed as a matter of legal entitlement (section 12(1)).

10. The Government specified that some of the applicants had in fact received financial support from the above sources as specified in the appendix. The figures provided by the applicants in that regard also appear in the appendix.

RELEVANT LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND PRACTICE

A. Public Health Protection, Support and Development Act

11. Section 4 specifies the role of the Ministry of Health in matters regulated by the PHPSD Act. Under letter (g), as in force at the relevant time, during an extraordinary situation this included the power to ban or order certain activities within the necessary scope and for the necessary duration. With effect from 15 October 2020, the PHPSD Act was amended (Law no. 286/2020 Coll. – "the 2020 Amendment") to introduce, *inter alia*, a new provision (letter (g)) to section 4 specifying that the Ministry's above-mentioned power was without prejudice to the PHSA's power to order measures under section 48 of the PHPSD Act, even during an extraordinary situation (see the subsequent paragraphs).

12. Section 5 defines the status and powers of the PHSA. Pursuant to subsection (4)(k), the PHSA has the power to order, *inter alia*, measures under section 48(4) in the event of a threat to public health, if such measures extend beyond the territorial reach of regional public health authorities.

13. Section 48(1) and (2) distinguishes between (i) (an ordinary) threat to public health and (ii) a level-two threat to public health. The existence of

a level-two threat is determined by the need for measures to be taken under the CDPA.

14. The powers of the PHSA in the event of a threat to public health are laid down in section 48(4) and comprise, *inter alia*, the power to order the closure of or restrictions on the operation of facilities in which individuals gather (letter (e) of subsection (4)).

15. Until 14 October 2020 the powers of the PHSA under section 48(4) could be exercised on the condition that section 48(5) (see paragraph 16 below) did not provide otherwise. The 2020 Amendment annulled that condition. The explanatory report (*dôvodová správa*) regarding the relevant part of the 2020 Amendment specified that the condition had become obsolete since the measures provided for under subsections (4) and (5) of section 48 were different and did not substantively overlap. The attendant interpretative uncertainties had needed to be resolved.

16. In the event of a level-two threat to public health, under section 48(5)(e) the PHSA has the power to make proposals to other authorities specified under the CDPA concerning measures to establish and lift a certain regime (*režimové opatrenia*) for the population of the endangered or affected territory.

17. The 2020 Amendment introduced a new provision to the effect that, if measures under the PHPSD Act concerned an indefinite number of people, the right to compensation in respect of actual damage and lost profits resulting from their implementation would be excluded (section 58(8)).

18. The 2020 Amendment also introduced a new section 59b, addressing the format of the measures taken by the PHSA under section 48(4). If such measures were necessary in relation to the entirety or a part of the territory of Slovakia or a group of people defined in a manner other than by individual identification, they constituted generally binding statutes (*všeobecne záväzný právny predpis* – subsection (1)) and were referred to as decrees (subsection (3)).

19. Under a newly introduced section 63l, orders issued by the PHSA up until the entry into force of the 2020 Amendment, which were still in force, were to be considered decrees within the meaning of section 59b from then on.

B. Civil Defence of the Population Act

20. If the endangered or affected territory extends beyond the territory of an administrative region, the power to declare and lift the state of an extraordinary situation for the endangered territory or for the territory in which an extraordinary incident within the meaning of section 3(2) of the Act occurred is bestowed upon the Cabinet (section 8).

21. Under section 3(2) of the CDPA, an extraordinary incident comprises, *inter alia*, situations of a level-two threat to public health under section 48(2) of the PHSA (see paragraph 13 above).

C. Constitutional Court's power to review legislation in the framework of the individual complaints procedure

22. It has been the Constitutional Court's long-established practice that neither Article 127 of the Constitution, which provides for the individual complaints procedure, nor any other of its provisions gave standing to individuals to challenge generally binding statutes as being incompatible with the Constitution or with international instruments, including the Convention (see, for example, the decision of 7 November 2007, case no. IV. ÚS 287/07).

23. Under an amendment, which was adopted on 9 December 2020 and which entered into force on 1 January 2025 (Constitutional Law no. 422/2020 Coll.), paragraph 5 has been added to Article 127 of the Constitution, providing that:

> "A complaint under paragraph 1 may be accompanied by an application for the Chamber of the Constitutional Court [in charge of examining that complaint] to initiate proceedings under Article 125 § 1 [of the Constitution] for a review of the compatibility of [the statute applicable in the matter at hand] with the Constitution, constitutional statute, international treaties under Article 7 § 5 [of the Constitution] ... If the Chamber [in question] finds the application well founded, it shall stay the proceedings [on the individual complaint] and file a motion for proceedings under Article 125 § 1 [of the Constitution]. The legal views of the Constitutional Court presented in a decision on that motion shall be binding on the [given] Chamber."

D. Constitutional Court's position on the status of the orders and decrees issued by the PHSA

24. Prior to the entry into force of the 2020 Amendment (15 October 2020 – see paragraph 11 above), on 24 September 2020 the Constitutional Court issued a ruling in case no I. US 435/2020, in which an individual had sought to challenge an order of the PHSA in view of the COVID-19 crisis concerning quarantine for individuals who had entered the territory of Slovakia. The court held that the order had constituted an administrative measure of a hybrid nature (*hybridný správny akt*) with both normative (abstract addressees) and individual (regulation of a specific situation) components. As the individual component had been more significant, the order was to be seen as a decision *sui generis*, which could be challenged individually before the administrative judiciary. As no such challenge had been brought, the complaint before the Constitutional Court was inadmissible owing to non-exhaustion of ordinary remedies. This position has subsequently become established.

25. After the entry into force of the 2020 Amendment, on 27 April 2021 the Constitutional Court ruled on another case arising from an individual

complaint seeking to challenge PHSA decrees issued under section 59b of the amended PHPSD Act imposing restrictions on the operation of businesses during the COVID-19 pandemic. The court held that even though the decrees had been labelled as generally binding statutes (see paragraph 18 above), in respect of which no judicial review was available (see paragraph 22 above), such decrees had in fact constituted administrative measures of a hybrid nature reviewable by the administrative judiciary (see paragraph 24 above). Under the subsidiarity principle, the Constitutional Court's jurisdiction was excluded.

26. On 1 December 2021, in a plenary formation, the Constitutional Court (PL. US 8/2021) examined an application by the Prosecutor General for the review of the lawfulness of certain aspects of sections 59b and 63l of the amended PHPSD Act. Noting that PHSA decrees issued under section 59b constituted generally binding statutes, rather than any individual legal administrative measures, it held that such decrees were reviewable by the Constitutional Court in proceedings under Article 125 § 1 of the Constitution for the review of the compatibility of secondary legislation with the Constitution, constitutional statute and certain international treaties.

COMPLAINTS

27. Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and, in substance, also on Article 13 of the Convention, the applicants alleged that the PHSA's orders and decrees had arbitrarily interfered with their property rights in that the PHSA had had no power to issue them and that they had been exempt from any judicial review.

THE LAW

A. Introductory remarks

28. The present applications concern essentially the same matters as those in the case of *Toromag, s.r.o. and Others v. Slovakia* (dec.) ([Committee], nos. 41217/20 and 4 others, 28 June 2022), albeit with reference to the regulatory framework in place at later stages of the COVID-19 pandemic (ibid., § 1). The applicants are represented by the same lawyer (see paragraph 1 above) as the one representing the applicants in *Toromag, s.r.o. and Others* (cited above), and the applicants in the present applications nos. 17559/21 (Toromag, s.r.o.), 18720/21 (Štúdio pohybu Bubema, s.r.o.), 18758/21 (Retsus s.r.o.), 17262/21 and 22491/22 (M. Bado), and 17260/21 and 22741/22 (P. Marcina) are identical to those in *Toromag, s.r.o. and Others* (cited above).

29. As regards the present case, the Court also notes that the applicant M. Karabin (applications nos. 16963/21 and 22488/22), P. Marcina

(applications nos. 17260/21 and 22741/22), M. Bado (applications nos. 17262/21 and 22491/22) and Slovakia Mango Franchisee s.r.o. (applications nos. 32892/21 and 26280/22) each introduced two applications with the Court, which again concerned different reference periods.

B. Joinder of the applications

30. Being represented by one and the same lawyer, the applicants in the present case each separately complained about essentially the same matters on the basis of the same arguments.

31. Having regard to the similar subject matter of the applications, the Court finds it appropriate to examine them jointly in a single decision.

C. Article 37 § 1 of the Convention:

32. The relevant part of Article 37 § 1 provides that:

> "The Court may at any stage of the proceedings decide to strike an application out of its list of cases where the circumstances lead to the conclusion that
>
> (a) the applicant does not intend to pursue his application; or
>
> ...
>
> (c) for any other reason established by the Court, it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application.
>
> However, the Court shall continue the examination of the application if respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and the Protocols thereto so requires."

33. From point 24 of the applicants' observations, it transpires that the applicant company in application no. 17559/21 (Toromag, s. r. o.) has legally ceased to exist. Publicly available records confirm that information, attributing it to the applicant company's dissolution. No interest has been established to continue the proceedings in its stead by any other person.

34. In a submission of 11 December 2024, the applicant company in application no. 32142/21 (CUBESHOP s. r. o.) informed the Court that it no longer wished to pursue the application.

35. In accordance with Article 37 § 1 *in fine*, the Court finds no special circumstances regarding respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and its Protocols which require the continued examination of these applications.

36. In view of the above, it is appropriate to strike the applications nos. 17559/21 and 32142/21 out of the Court's list of cases, pursuant to Article 37 § 1 (c) and (a) respectively.

D. Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention

37. The relevant part of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention provides that:

"The Court shall declare inadmissible any individual application submitted under Article 34 if it considers that:

(a) the application is ... an abuse of the right of individual application".

1. Parties' submissions

38. The Government pointed out that, in their respective application forms, the applicants in applications nos. 16633/21, 16674/21, 16938/21, 16951/21, 16963/21, 17260/21, 17262/21, 17265/21, 17275/21, 17293/21, 17572/21, 18319/21, 18720/21, 18758/21, 20404/21, 20421/21, 31836/21, 32142/21, 32154/21, 32765/21, 32873/21 and 22491/22 had failed to inform the Court that in the relevant period they had received financial compensation as specified in the appended table.

The applicant in application no. 17579/21 had indicated having received a contribution of EUR 10,000 in respect of rent, whereas the available records indicated that the actual figure had been EUR 23,166.66.

The applicant in application no. 38291/21 had specifically stated that it had been unaware of any subsidy in relation to rent and labour having been approved for 2021.

The applicant in application no. 22488/22 had indicated that he had not applied for any compensation as he had been ineligible for it. According to the available records, he had in fact received EUR 7,925.96 from the First Aid scheme.

39. Furthermore, while it was apparent that the existence and amount of any damage was the key feature of the case, the applicants in applications nos. 16627/21, 16633/21, 16674/21, 16938/21, 16947/21, 16951/21, 16959/21, 16963/21, 17260/21, 17262/21, 17265/21, 17275/21, 17278/21, 17290/21, 17293/21, 17559/21, 17572/21, 17579/21, 18319/21, 18720/21, 18758/21, 20902/21 and 22491/22 had failed to substantiate those elements other than by giving a figure for the amount of alleged damage without any explanation, while the applicants in applications nos. 20404/21, 20421/21, 31836/21, 32142/21, 32146/21, 32149/21, 32154/21, 32157/21, 32160/21, 32233/21, 32238/21, 32701/21, 32765/21, 32873/21, 32892/21, 33406/21, 38291/21, 44638/21, 47365/21, 47371/21, 22488/22, 22491/22, 22741/22, 26276/22 and 26280/22 had substantiated such amounts by referring to their business figures in the past, yet again with no supporting evidence.

40. The Government noted that the applicants in the present case were being represented before the Court by the same lawyer as the one representing the applicants in *Toromag, s.r.o. and Others* (cited above). That case had been rejected on account of abuse of the right of individual application, which partly had to do with the applicants' failure to disclose to the Court that, in circumstances similar to those of the present applications, they had received financial assistance from public funds. However, even after that decision, the applicants in the applications concerned had failed to inform the Court of their existing or possible claims for such assistance.

41. In sum, the Government submitted that the applications in question were to be rejected as an abuse of the right of individual application.

42. In reply, the applicants submitted that their applications had only contained basic information about the damage they had sustained, while their precise calculations had been reserved for their observations in reply to those of the Government. As indicated in paragraph 10 above, that precise information appears in the appendix.

43. The applicants further pointed out that the subsidy in respect of rent would be paid to their landlords and not directly to them. In addition, they submitted that (i) they had been unaware of the relevance of "the information about [any] financial assistance [received] under the First Aid scheme"; (ii) it had not been their intention to misinform the Court; and (iii) the basic information in their applications concerning their losses had already taken into account any financial assistance received under the First Aid scheme.

2. The Court's assessment

44. Having regard to the Court's finding concerning applications nos. 17559/21 and 32142/21 (see paragraph 36 above), the Government's objection under Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention in relation to these applications has lost practical consequence and as such calls for no determination.

45. As to the remaining applications concerned, the Court reiterates that an application may be rejected as an abuse of the right of individual application, if, among other reasons, it was knowingly based on false information or if significant information and documents were deliberately omitted either where they were known from the outset or where new significant developments occurred during the proceedings (see *Gross v. Switzerland* [GC], no. 67810/10, § 28, ECHR 2014, with further references).

46. The Court considers that in cases such as the present one financial aid granted to applicants from public funds is directly linked to the questions of their victim status, any possible significant disadvantage suffered by them, as well as to the proportionality of the impugned measures complained of under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (for illustrative purposes, see *Toromag, s.r.o. and Others*, cited above, § 9). Consequently, information about such aid concerned the very core of the case. Having regard *inter alia* to Rule 47 § 7 of the Rules of Court, such information should have been submitted to the Court in the applicants' application forms (lodged in 2020 and 2021).

47. In this context, the Court notes that the above-mentioned case of *Toromag, s.r.o. and Others* concerned similar matters and that the applicants in that case were represented by the same lawyer as the one representing the applicants in the present case. In that case, in the decision which was taken in 2022, the Court found specifically that the applicants' failure to inform the Court of such aid having been granted to them, along with other matters,

amounted to deliberate withholding of significant information and documents, constituting a ground for rejecting their applications as being abusive (§§ 11 and 12) (see also, *mutatis mutandis*, *Martins Alves v. Portugal* (dec.), no. 56297/11, §§ 11-13 and 16-17, 21 January 2014).

48. It was accordingly at the latest when the *Toromag, s.r.o. and Others* decision was given, that the applicants in the present case directly and *a fortiori* through the intermediary of their lawyer must have been aware of the particular relevance of the information about any financial aid from public funds for the assessment of their complaints under the Convention.

49. Nevertheless, the applicants in applications nos. 16633/21, 16674/21, 16938/21, 16951/21, 16963/21, 17260/21, 17262/21, 17265/21, 17275/21, 17293/21, 17572/21, 18319/21, 18720/21, 18758/21, 20404/21, 20421/21, 31836/21, 32154/21, 32765/21 and 32873/21 in the present case received the above-mentioned financial aid without informing the Court about it, and addressed the matter for the first time (2023) only in reply to the Government's inadmissibility objection to that effect. The situation was similar in application no. 38291/21, in which the applicant company stated that it had been unaware of any subsidy, whereas financial aid had in fact been paid to it, also with regard to the period under consideration.

50. In their observations, the applicants concerned argued that they were unaware of any financial aid having been paid in respect of rent since such aid would have been paid directly to their landlords. While they would have received a notification of the approval of the subsidy (see paragraph 9 above), there was no separate notification of its payment. In that regard, the Court notes that the applicants have not denied having been notified of the approval of the subsidies. Moreover, there is no suggestion that the approved subsidies were not paid or that, payable as they were to the landlord, these subsidies did not translate to any discount on rent to be granted by the landlords to the applicants.

As to the applicants' remaining arguments, the Court notes that they were represented before the Court by a lawyer well aware of its procedures. In the circumstances, their explanations for the failure to disclose the above-mentioned information to the Court (see paragraphs 42 and 43 above and, concerning applications nos. 20404/21 and 20421/21, also the applicants' submissions cited in the appendix) cannot be accepted.

51. Leaving aside the relevance of the applicants' arguments, they give rise to concerns regarding their lawyer's role as a legal representative in the proceedings before the Court (compare *Gross*, cited above, § 33), in particular noting that several other applications presented to the Court by him have already been rejected as having amounted to an abuse of the right of individual application (see *Toromag, s.r.o. and Others*, cited above, § 8).

52. In so far as the precise calculation by the Government and the applicants of the aid received by the latter displays variations, the Court observes that the methods used vary in that the applicants took into account

in their calculation only the *pro rata* portion of the amount received in respect of a given month in instances when the period under consideration started or ended in the course of that month. The figures provided by the Government referred to such months as a whole.

53. In sum, nothing has been presented to the Court or established otherwise that would lead to a different conclusion to the one that the applicants in the above applications deliberately withheld significant information, in view of which applications nos. 16633/21, 16674/21, 16938/21, 16951/21, 16963/21, 17260/21, 17262/21, 17265/21, 17275/21, 17293/21, 17572/21, 18319/21, 18720/21, 18758/21, 20404/21, 20421/21, 31836/21, 32154/21, 32765/21, 32873/21 and 38291/21 must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 and 4 of the Convention as amounting to an abuse of the right of individual application.

54. The situation with applications nos. 22488/22 and 22491/22 is different in that, in relation to the period under consideration in these applications, the applicants have not been shown to have received any aid. This is not altered by the fact that they may have received aid in respect of other periods.

55. In these two applications, as well as in a number of others (see paragraph 39 above), the Government objected, stating that the applicants had failed to substantiate their alleged damage. However, even if it is established that such a failure occurred, in so far as the objection has been substantiated, the Court finds that there is no abusive element attributable to the applicants.

56. The Government's objection under Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention in relation to applications nos. 22488/22 and 22491/22 accordingly cannot be sustained.

57. As regards application no. 17579/21, the Court notes the difference in the amount of aid received by the applicant in respect of rent, as indicated in the application form (EUR 10,000) and in the applicant's subsequent submissions (EUR 18,583.33). Irrespective of a further difference between those amounts and the one indicated by the Government (EUR 21,916.66), the Court finds it unnecessary to rule on their objection under Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention in relation to this application as it is in any event inadmissible on other grounds specified below.

58. The situation is similar with application no. 32892/21, in which the applicant company remained silent on having received any financial aid, whereas in fact it had received assistance from the First Aid scheme, but the Government' objection under Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention is based on other facts falling outside the scope of that provision (see paragraph 55 above).

E. Article 35 § 1 of the Convention

59. The relevant part of Article 35 § 1, as applicable at the relevant time, reads as follows:

> "1. The Court may only deal with the matter after all domestic remedies have been exhausted, ... and within a period of six months from the date on which the final decision was taken."

1. Parties' submissions

60. The Government noted that the alleged violations resulted from an order and decrees issued by the PHSA. Under the 2020 Amendment, since 15 October 2020 those instruments had had the nature of generally binding statutes. As such, they could only be challenged before the Constitutional Court in a procedure for a constitutional review of legislation under Article 125 of the Constitution (see, in particular, paragraph 26 above). In other words, the applicants as individuals and legal entities of private law had no standing to complain of the alleged violations at the domestic level, as a result of which the time-limit for introducing their applications to the Court had started to run with the entry into force of the contested decision and decrees. Accordingly, any complaint with regard to measures applicable at any earlier periods was outside the time-limit under Article 35 § 1 of the Convention.

61. In reply, the applicants concurred that no effective remedies had been at their disposal and stated that their complaints specifically and only concerned periods falling within the time-limit under Article 35 § 1 of the Convention, and no earlier periods.

2. The Court's assessment

62. In view of the Court's findings under Article 37 of the Convention (see paragraph 36 above) and those in relation to the Government's objection under Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention (see paragraphs 53-58 above), its assessment of their objection under Article 35 § 1 of the Convention concerns only the remaining applications, that is applications nos. 16627/21, 16947/21, 16959/21, 16967/21, 17278/21, 17290/21, 17579/21, 20902/21, 32146/21, 32149/21, 32157/21, 32160/21, 32233/21, 32238/21, 32701/21, 32892/21, 33406/21, 44638/21, 47365/21, 47371/21, 22488/22, 22491/22, 22741/22, 26276/22 and 26280/22.

63. The parties did not dispute that the order and decrees concerned in the present case constituted generally binding statutes, which could not be challenged other than before the Constitutional Court, and that, as private parties, the applicants had no standing to challenge them before that court; this is not only provided in the PHSA, as amended by the 2020 Amendment (see paragraph 18 above), but also reflected in the Constitutional Court's

case-law (see paragraph 22 above). Any deviation from that position in a decision of the Constitutional Court of 27 April 2021 (see paragraph 25 above) was readjusted by its plenary formation on 1 December 2021 (see paragraph 26 above).

64. The Court notes that the contested measures in the present case, as defined in the appendix, were applicable prior to 1 February 2022 when Article 4 of Protocol No. 15 entered into force, shortening the six-month time-limit pursuant to Article 35 § 1 of the Convention to four months. In the present case, therefore, the six-month period applies, and the contested measures in the applications in issue fall within that period.

65. In other words, the applicants in fact do not contest the regulatory regime in place more than six months before the introduction of the respective applications. In such circumstances, the Government's objection in that regard calls for no decision.

F. Remaining applications

66. The applicants in applications nos. 16627/21, 16947/21, 16959/21, 16967/21, 17278/21, 17290/21, 17579/21, 20902/21, 32146/21, 32149/21, 32157/21, 32160/21, 32233/21, 32238/21, 32701/21, 32892/21, 33406/21, 44638/21, 47365/21, 47371/21, 22488/22, 22491/22, 22741/22, 26276/22 and 26280/22 alleged that they had incurred losses relating to their property as a result of the order and decrees issued by the PHSA under review and argued that the interference with their property rights (i) had been unlawful as the PHSA had not had the authority to issue those instruments; and (ii) had not been subject to any safeguards, in particular no judicial review. In that regard, they relied on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and, in substance, also on Article 13 of the Convention.

67. Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 reads as follows:

> "Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.
>
> The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties."

Article 13 of the Convention provides that:

> "Everyone whose rights and freedoms as set forth in [the] Convention are violated shall have an effective remedy before a national authority notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity."

1. Parties' submissions

(a) The Government

68. The Government acknowledged that the restrictions imposed on the applicants by way of the contested legislation had constituted an interference with their property rights, but argued that it had been lawful, had pursued a legitimate aim, and a fair balance had been struck between that aim and the applicants' rights.

69. In particular, the Government stated that the PHSA had issued the order and decrees in the exercise of its powers under section 5(4)(k) and section 48(4) of the PHPSD Act (see paragraphs 12 and 14 above). Any powers conferred upon other authorities under the CDPA to take measures on the basis of proposals by the PHSA in the event of a level-two threat to public health under section 48(5) of the PHPSD Act (see paragraph 16 above) had not negated those bestowed upon the PHSA under section 48(4) of the PHPSD Act and had existed in parallel to them. At the same time, no other legislation applicable in the event of a level-two threat to public health had suspended the PHSA's powers under section 48(4) of the PHPSD Act. Any arguments by the applicants to the contrary were no more than their subjective perceptions short of any basis in terms of official recognition.

70. The Government stated that the restrictions applicable to the applicants under the order and decrees in question had undoubtedly served the legitimate aim of protecting public health and that aim had to be seen in the light of the State's positive obligation to take the necessary measures to protect the lives of persons within their jurisdiction and to safeguard their physical integrity, including in the sphere of public health.

71. As regards the existence of a fair balance between the demands of the general interest of the community and the requirements of the protection of the individuals' fundamental rights, the Government relied on having a wide margin of appreciation with regard both to choosing the means of achieving the said aim and to ascertaining whether the consequences of their use were justified in the general interest for the purpose of achieving that aim. The issues at stake had been unprecedented matters of an epidemiological and thus a highly expert nature, which had been addressed by the competent authorities based on the information available at the given time.

72. Furthermore, the Government pointed out the compensation schemes that had been available to the applicants and the fact that they had actually made use of them. Those schemes had been based on the notion of distributive justice which did not presuppose full compensation. In that regard, the Government referred to the decision of the Constitutional Court of Austria of 14 July 2021 in case no. G 202/2020 which, they submitted, showed that the absence of compensation for businesses affected by legislation adopted to combat the spread of COVID-19 did not amount to an unconstitutional interference with the fundamental right to inviolability of property. The

Government stated that that position followed from the court's acknowledgment that, if closing businesses had been necessary to prevent the spread of the disease, property rights had not obliged the State to provide further compensation beyond the various existing assistance packages for businesses.

73. In addition, the Government argued that it was unjustified for the applicants to expect compensation for any alleged lost profits at the same level as actual profits prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic had been an objective fact and it would have had a negative impact on any profits at the time of the pandemic and possibly also after it.

74. In sum, in the Government's view, the applicants' complaint under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 was manifestly ill-founded and, as such, devoid of any arguable basis for the purposes of their additional complaint under Article 13 of the Convention. As a result, the complaint under Article 13 was also manifestly ill-founded.

(b) The applicants

75. The applicants contended that the order and decrees had been arbitrary in that they had been issued under the powers of the PHSA provided for in section 48(4) of the PHPSD Act applicable in times of an ordinary threat to public health, rather than a level-two threat. That legal provision had, however, been inapplicable at the given time in view of the fact that an extraordinary situation had already been declared (see paragraph 5 above). Under the applicable law, an extraordinary situation responded to an extraordinary incident and that comprised a level-two threat to public health (see paragraphs 20 and 21 above). As there had been a level-two threat to public health, the power to take response measures had shifted to the authorities specified under the CDPA, following a recommendation by the PHSA, as provided for under section 45(5) of the PHPSD Act (see paragraph 16 above). In sum, since the order and decrees had been issued by the PHSA directly, it had acted *ultra vires*. As the Government themselves admitted (see paragraph 60 above), since 15 October 2020 there had been no remedy against the PHSA's order and decrees, which had therefore lacked safeguards. In sum, the interference with their property rights had not been in accordance with the law for the purposes of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

76. In addition, in reply to the Government, the applicants acknowledged the existence of a legitimate aim for the interference with their property rights, in particular that of protecting public health, but argued that the means employed had not been proportionate to that aim. In that regard, they asserted that the Government had failed to demonstrate that achieving that aim would have been impossible with less stringent measures. Their losses consisted not only of lost income during the period when their business had been forced to close, but also in the attendant loss of clientele whose confidence had never been fully restored. There was no other way of quantifying the lost profits

than by referring to past income. The State assistance schemes referred to by the Government had been manifestly insufficient. The State had interfered with the standard business environment and that called for full compensation. The notion of distributive justice was not a legal term in Slovakia and its use in circumstances when the State was both the author of the interference and determining the level of compensation was inherently problematic. The context of their applications before the Court was different from that of the decision of the Austrian Constitutional Court relied on by the Government (see paragraph 72 above) in that, unlike in their cases, that decision had been taken against the background of an "extensive" package of measures to cushion the economic impact of the measures to combat COVID-19 in question. Moreover, in Austria such measures had been available as a matter of legal entitlement.

77. In view of those arguments, the applicants stated that their complaint under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 was arguable for the purposes of their complaint under Article 13, which they reaffirmed.

2. The Court's assessment

78. The applications in question concern the measures taken in Slovakia in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, as set out by the legislative instruments in force as from 15 October 2020. The Government have acknowledged, and the Court agrees, that the implementation of those measures interfered with the applicants' property rights for the purposes of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, constituting a form of control of use of property under that provision (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *O'Sullivan McCarthy Mussel Development Ltd v. Ireland*, no. 44460/16, §§ 89, 90 and 104, 7 June 2018, and, for illustrative purposes, *Prodisotel S.A.U. and Others v. Spain* [Committee], no. 22946/24 and 39 others, § 16, 11 September 2025).

79. The Court reiterates that in order for an interference to be compatible with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 it must be lawful, be in the general interest and be proportionate, that is, it must strike a "fair balance" between the demands of the general interest of the community and the requirements of the protection of the individual's fundamental rights (see, for example, *J.A. Pye (Oxford) Ltd and J.A. Pye (Oxford) Land Ltd v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 44302/02, § 75, ECHR 2007-III). The Court will examine these three steps in turn.

80. The contested measures were adopted by the PHSA under its powers set out in section 5(4)(k) and section 48(4)(e) of the PHPSD Act (see paragraphs 5, 12 and 14 above). The applicants contested the power of the PHSA to take the given measures on the grounds that they had been taken during a level-two threat to public health, at a time when the power to take such measures had legally rested with the Ministry of Health and other designated authorities. The PHSA had merely had the authority to propose that those measures be taken.

81. In that regard, the Court notes that the order and decrees in question were issued by the PHSA with effect from 15 October 2020 and that, at that time, the 2020 Amendment to the PHPSD Act was already in force. That legislation amended the applicable regulatory framework by providing specifically that the power of the Ministry of Health to take measures under the PHPSD Act in the event of a level-two threat to public health (amounting to an extraordinary incident and thereby an extraordinary situation) was without prejudice to the power of the PHSA to order measures under section 48 of the PHPSD Act even during an extraordinary situation (see paragraph 11 above).

Any doubts about the impact of the existence of a level-two threat to public health on the power of the PHSA to order the measures under section 48(4) of PHPSD Act, including those taken in the present case under section 48(4)(e), have also been addressed by the 2020 Amendment (see paragraph 15 above). As specified in the explanatory report for that amendment, the PHSA's power to propose the declaration of an extraordinary situation and further measures in response to a level-two threat to public health under section 48(5) of the PHPSD Act differed from that under section 48(4) of the PHPSD Act. As such, the powers granted to the PHSA by those two provisions were not mutually exclusive, and the applicants have not provided any evidence to suggest otherwise.

82. In such circumstances, the Court is prepared to accept that the contested measures had a basis in national law.

83. The remaining component of the applicants' argument concerns procedural safeguards and focuses on the lack of judicial review in relation to the contested measures. In that regard, the applicants did not challenge any individual aspect of the measures or the effect of their implementation on them, but rather their mere existence and general parameters. The legislative nature of the impugned measures has been reaffirmed and recognised at the national level both by the legislature and the Constitutional Court (see paragraphs 18 and 26 above). On the facts as those obtaining in the present case, the lack of judicial review in relation to the contested measures needs to be seen in correlation with procedural safeguards more generally and the Court will revert to this question when examining whether the contested measures struck a "fair balance" between the demands of the general interest of the community and the requirements of the protection of the individual's fundamental rights. At this stage, it is prepared to accept that they were imposed in compliance with the conditions provided for by law.

84. It is uncontested between the parties and the Court acknowledges that the measures in question undoubtedly served the general interest of protecting public health (for illustrative purposes, see *Prodisotel S.A.U. and Others*, cited above, § 17). The remaining issue is whether the measures had been proportionate, or whether the State had imposed an excessive individual burden on the applicants.

85. The Court has already had occasion to note that the COVID-19 pandemic was liable to have very serious consequences not just for health (see *Fenech v. Malta*, no. 19090/20, § 96, 1 March 2022) but also for society, the economy, the functioning of the State and life in general (see, in the context of measures affecting freedom of movement, *Terheş v. Romania* (dec.), no. 49933/20, § 39, 13 April 2021). It reiterates that, in matters of public health policies, States enjoy a wide margin of appreciation with regard to the means to be employed and to the question of whether the consequences are justified in the general interest for the purpose of achieving the objective pursued (see *Pasquinelli and Others v. San Marino*, no. 24622/22, § 92, 29 August 2024, and *S.A. Bio d'Ardennes v. Belgium*, no. 44457/11, § 44, 12 November 2019). The Court will respect the legislature's judgment as to what is in the "public interest" unless that judgment is manifestly without reasonable foundation (see, albeit in a different context, *Béláné Nagy v. Hungary* [GC], no. 53080/13, § 113, 13 December 2016).

86. The Court notes that the measures in issue in the present case were contested with reference to the operation of fitness centres, catering services, retail shops and similar businesses. Nevertheless, they cannot be considered as having been addressed exclusively to a certain group of individuals or entities (compare and contrast, *R.Sz. v. Hungary*, no. 41838/11, § 60, 2 July 2013). As indeed is common knowledge, identical or similar measures were in place in general, not only in the respondent State, but almost in all European countries – and worldwide, for that matter (for illustrative purposes, see also *Prodisotel S.A.U. and Others*, cited above, § 20), which is a factor speaking in favour of the State.

87. The applicants in the present case have based their assertion of having been exposed to an excessive individual burden essentially on allegations of having sustained damage and not having received full compensation.

88. In that regard, the Court reiterates that the lack of compensation in respect of measures controlling the use of property under the third rule of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention is only one factor in the proportionality assessment and is not in itself sufficient to constitute a violation of that provision (see *Depalle v. France* [GC], no. 34044/02, § 91, ECHR 2010). Although there is accordingly no *a priori* requirement for there to be compensation to ensure compliance with the said provision, where the respondent State opted for providing a compensation scheme, the Court will take it into account in its overall assessment of the proportionality of the contested measure.

89. As regards the damage allegedly sustained by the applicants, they identified it as either actual damage or lost profits, or in some instances, lost turnover. They essentially based the amount on their operating expenses and business results from preceding periods. While the Court does not find it necessary to take a definitive stance on the methodology for the calculation

of any such damage, it considers it appropriate to make the following observations regarding its application to the facts of the present case.

90. The applicants attributed any loss of business exclusively to the contested measures. This is apparent in their contention that with those measures the State had interfered with the standard business environment (see paragraph 76 above). That argument, however, appears to completely ignore the fact that the measures in question were taken in the context of and in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, providing anything but the standard business environment. Accordingly, even assuming that any such loss of business was properly quantified, it cannot be attributed exclusively to the contested measures, of which the applicants take no account.

91. As regards any property loss that might be attributable to the State, and provided that any such loss is properly substantiated, its overall impact on a given applicant's property and business must, in the Court's view, be assessed over a longer period than the reference period alone, in contrast to the approach proposed by the applicants. In other words, as it is in normal course of business, losses from one period may be offset by gains from another.

92. To the extent that the applicants determined their losses in respect of both their operating expenses, that is expenses incurred in order to generate revenue, and the fact that no such revenue was generated, the Court finds it questionable whether such cumulation of claims is conceptually tenable.

93. The Court further notes that the applicants in applications nos. 16947/21 and 17290/21 have not supported their claims of alleged damage with any itemised particulars and that in so far as the applicants in applications nos. 16959/21, 16967/21 and 17290/21 considered "lost turnover" as the damage sustained, it has not been explained how that loss, even assuming that it has been properly calculated, would have impacted their property rights in the guise of lost profits or otherwise.

94. The applicants' argument that no measures with a less severe impact on their property rights were considered was general in nature and as such is to be assessed within the wide margin of appreciation accorded to the respondent State in the area concerned. On the facts, such a margin has been exercised by providing the First Aid scheme and financial aid in respect of rent.

95. As regards actual State support, the Court notes that the applicants in applications nos. 16959/21, 16967/21, 17290/21, 17579/21, 32146/21, 32149/21, 32157/21, 32160/21, 32233/21, 32238/21, 32701/21, 32892/21, 33406/21, 44638/21, 47365/21, 47371/21, 22741/22 and 26276/22 received compensation from one or both of the applicable schemes. As can be seen from the legislative and operational framework for this support (see paragraphs 8 and 9 above) and the concrete figures specified in the appendix, the level of such support has been substantial.

In so far as substantiated, the applicants in applications nos. 16627/21, 16947/21, 17278/21, 20902/21 and 22491/22 did not take advantage of the opportunity to claim such support, and no reasons for that have been submitted. The applicants in applications nos. 16947/21, 22488/22, 22491/22 and 26280/22 received no support in relation to the specific period under consideration, but did so for other periods.

96. In that regard, notwithstanding the principles cited at paragraph 88 above, the Court notes that in the respondent State the support from the First Aid scheme was provided as a matter of legal entitlement. Irrespective of the fact that, legally speaking, there appears to have been no such legal entitlement to any aid in respect of rent, there has not been any allegation or other indication that any claim for such aid by any of the applicants was in fact unsuccessful. Moving on to the aspect of procedural safeguards, the applicants have not submitted any argument to show that such claims and their processing in general were exempt from substantive or procedural rules, or that such claims did not attract judicial protection that is normally available in the administrative courts and ultimately the Constitutional Court.

97. In sum, having regard to the applicants' arguments and the above considerations in respect of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, the Court finds that they did not suffer an excessive individual burden.

98. As follows from the Court's finding at paragraph 96, there is nothing to show that the applicants' actual or potential claims for compensation from the applicable schemes were exempted from judicial review. In so far as the contested order and decrees issued by the PHSA were legislative in nature (see paragraph 83 above), the Court reiterates that Article 13 cannot be interpreted as requiring a remedy against the state of domestic law (see *Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 28957/95, § 113, ECHR 2002-VI).

99. Therefore, applications nos. 16627/21, 16947/21, 16959/21, 16967/21, 17278/21, 17290/21, 17579/21, 20902/21, 32146/21, 32149/21, 32157/21, 32160/21, 32233/21, 32238/21, 32701/21, 32892/21, 33406/21, 44638/21, 47365/21, 47371/21, 22488/22, 22491/22, 22741/22, 26276/22 and 26280/22 are manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) and must be dismissed, pursuant to Article 35 § 4 of the Convention.

For these reasons, the Court, by a majority,

Decides to join the applications;

Decides to strike the applications nos. 17559/21 and 32142/21 out of its list of cases;

Declares the applications nos. 16633/21, 16674/21, 16938/21, 16951/21, 16963/21, 17260/21, 17262/21, 17265/21, 17275/21, 17293/21, 17572/21, 18319/21, 18720/21, 18758/21, 20404/21, 20421/21, 31836/21, 32154/21, 32765/21, 32873/21 and 38291/21 inadmissible on account of abuse of the right of individual application under Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention;

Declares the remaining applications inadmissible.

Done in English and notified in writing on 22 January 2026.

Liv Tigerstedt Deputy Registrar	Ivana Jelić President

APPENDIX

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
1.	16627/21	25/03/2021	**Imrich SCHEFFER** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 130 days, restricted for a further 33 days. Damage sustained by 15/02/2021 at least 3,185 euros (EUR). In subsequent submissions, specified actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 1,699.65 and lost profit of EUR 1,200.23.				
Support received: The parties concurred that the applicant had not applied for and had not received any support for the period under consideration (having received support from the First Aid scheme for earlier periods).				
2.	16633/21	25/03/2021	**BAT TRNAVA, S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Total loss (actual damage and lost profit) sustained by 15/02/2021 of EUR 35,400. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions, pecuniary damage (operating expenses) specified as amounting to EUR 24,592.78, after having already deducted EUR 6,873.86 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 1,778.26 received in respect of rent.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 17,247.56 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 6,794.92 in respect of rent, of these amounts EUR 8,218.40 and EUR 2,265.76 respectively concerned the period under consideration.				
3.	16674/21	25/03/2021	**Peter MATUŠKA** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage of EUR 24,000 and lost profit of EUR 47,742.26 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions, the above was confirmed with a specification of EUR 1,857.28 (operating expenses) as actual damage, after having already deducted EUR 14,459.90 received from the First Aid scheme, and EUR 15,613.23 as lost profit.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 32,835.37 from the First Aid scheme, of which EUR 17,713.18 concerned the period under consideration.				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
4.	16938/21	25/03/2021	**KULTURISTICKÝ ODDIEL VETERINARY BODYBUILDING CLUB KOŠICE** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Total damage of EUR 28,985 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions, the above was confirmed, with a specification of EUR 28,985 as total pecuniary damage (without any itemised particulars), after having already deducted EUR 2,538.45 received from the First Aid scheme.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 5,027.51 from the First Aid scheme, of which EUR 2,790.26 concerned the period under consideration.				
5.	16947/21	25/03/2021	**K & S STAV PARTNERS S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 14,061.18 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions, the above was confirmed but the claim was not supported by any itemised particulars.				
Support received: The Government submitted that, in respect of an earlier period, the applicant company had received EUR 1,372.21 from the First Aid scheme.				
6.	16951/21	25/03/2021	**MEGAGYM INVEST, S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Operation closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 11,116 and lost profit of EUR 144,229 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, specifying that the former amount was after having already deducted EUR 9,060.81 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 24,312.23 received in respect of rent, and that the latter amount was in respect of "lost turnover".				
Support received:				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 24,233.09 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 47,114.41 in respect of rent, of these amounts EUR 10,012.99 and EUR 28,895.49 respectively concerned the period under consideration.				
7.	16959/21	25/03/2021	**EVA-ST, S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 32,240 and lost profit of EUR 64,000 sustained by 15/02/2021. The applicant acknowledged having received State support in respect of rent, without specifying the amount. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed with a specification that the claim in respect of actual damage was after having already deducted EUR 7,043.25 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 26,835.25 received in respect of rent, and that the claim in respect of lost profit concerned "lost turnover".				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 19,041.84 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 45,835.40 in respect of rent, of these amounts EUR 8,165.16 and EUR 32,168.73 respectively concerned the period under consideration.				
8.	16963/21	25/03/2021	**Matúš KARABIN** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Total damage of EUR 50,000 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed with a specification that the claimed amount was after having already deducted EUR 5,234.67 received from the First Aid scheme. No itemised particulars of the claim were provided.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 7,925.96 from the First Aid scheme, of which EUR 6,047.70 concerned the period from 10/2020 to 03/2021.				
9.	16967/21	25/03/2021	**Peter KOSTKA** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 130 days, and for further 33 days restricted to six customers at a time. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 36,301, after having already deducted EUR 12,912.64 received in State assistance, and lost profit of EUR 52,800 sustained by 15/02/2021. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, but the claim in respect of actual damage did not provide any itemised particulars, the amount of the State support				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
received was modified to EUR 12,682.40 and the claim for EUR 52,800 was identified as concerning "lost turnover".				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 27,022.65 from the First Aid scheme, of which EUR 14,603.39 concerned the period under consideration.				
10.	17260/21	25/03/2021	**Peter MARCINA** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 14,000 and lost profit of EUR 24,000 (anticipated turnover) sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, but the claim in respect of actual damage did not provide itemised particulars and it was specified that the amount was calculated after having already deducted EUR 7,705.08 received from the First Aid scheme. The second claim was specified as concerning "lost turnover".				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 21,645.72 from the First Aid scheme, of which EUR 7,383.60 concerned the period under consideration.				
11.	17262/21	25/03/2021	**Mikuláš BADO** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Total damage of EUR 132,000, sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, but the claim did not provide any itemised particulars, and it was added that the claimed amount was calculated after having already deducted EUR 3,613.05 received from the First Aid scheme.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 5,760 from the First Aid scheme, of which EUR 3,810 was in respect of the period under consideration.				
12.	17265/21	25/03/2021	**DOJO S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 12,200 and lost profit of EUR 30,000 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, but the former				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
amount was modified to EUR 24,609.49, with an indication that this was after having already deducted EUR 7,842.74 received from the First Aid scheme, and the latter amount was modified to EUR 22,000.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 11,551.73 from the First Aid scheme (of which EUR 7,842.74 concerned the period under consideration) and EUR 13,750 in respect of rent. At another point in its submissions (in addition to what is mentioned above), the applicant company acknowledged having received EUR 6,919.06 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 8,050 in respect of rent for the period under consideration.				
13.	17275/21	25/03/2021	**KINGS GYM V.O.S.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 7,232 and lost profit of EUR 15,840 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions, the claim in respect of actual damage was reduced to EUR 4,277.44, with an indication that this was calculated after having already deducted EUR 2,356 received in respect of rent, and the claim in respect of lost profit was reduced to EUR 2,159.74. The submission acknowledged that a further EUR 12,236 was received in respect of rent and that EUR 4,866.75 was received from the First Aid scheme, but there was no explanation for not having taken this into account for the calculation of the amounts claimed.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 9,704.34 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 17,426 in respect of rent, of these amounts EUR 5,480.95 and EUR 15,048 respectively concerned the period under consideration.				
14.	17278/21	25/03/2021	**BRADLOINVEST SK TRADE, S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 1,000 euros and lost profit of EUR 1,200 (an estimation) sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, but the claim in respect of lost profit was reduced to EUR 680.				
Support received: The parties concurred that the applicant company had not applied for and had not received any support.				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
15.	17290/21	25/03/2021	**IMPERIA FITNESS S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 13,000 euros and lost profit of EUR 15,000 sustained by 15/02/2021. The applicant company acknowledged that its expenses for rent had been compensated by State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, with an explanation that the claim in respect of actual damage (which did not however provide any itemised particulars) was calculated after having already deducted EUR 14,331.79 that had been received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 4,901.74 that had been received in respect of rent, and that the claim in respect of lost profit concerned "lost turnover".				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 31,540.13 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 9,212.43 in respect of rent, of these amounts EUR 16,272.51 and EUR 6,036.83 respectively concerned the period under consideration.				
16.	17293/21	25/03/2021	**P.R. AGENCY S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 13,205.60 and lost profit of EUR 52,982.48 (based on profits from the past, increased by 10%) sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, with the amount of actual damage specified as being EUR 13,976.57, after having already deducted EUR 4,350 received in respect of rent, with no mention of any lost profit.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 8,040 in respect of rent, of which EUR 5,580 concerned the period under consideration.				
17.	17559/21	25/03/2021	**TOROMAG, S.R.O.** Fitness centre Ceased to exist on 19/08/2022	15/10/2020
18.	17572/21	25/03/2021	**FIT&GYM, S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Lost "revenue" of EUR 9,611.70 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support.				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 51,642.37 from the First Aid scheme, of which EUR 21,723.82 concerned the period under consideration, and also EUR 786 in respect of rent.				
19.	17579/21	25/03/2021	**JANMAR IVANKA S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: By 24/03/2021, business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 17,684.60 lost "revenue" of EUR 51,713 sustained by 15/02/2021.				
Support received: In the application form, the applicant company stated that it had received State support of EUR 10,000 in respect of rent. The Government specified that, under the same heading, the applicant company had in fact received EUR 21,916.66 for the period under consideration (in addition to other amounts for other periods). In its observations in reply, the applicant company specified that, of that amount, only EUR 18,583.33 was in relation to the period under consideration and admitted that that amount had been higher than the amount indicated in the application form.				
20.	18319/21	31/03/2021	**FIT UP SLOVAKIA S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage of EUR 141,457 and lost "revenue" of EUR 120,000, sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, but the claim in respect of actual damage was specified as being EUR 269,390.99 (miscellaneous expenses), after having already deducted EUR 5,535.44 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 117,263.03 received in respect of rent. No mention of any lost revenue is made.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 12,972.43 from the First Aid scheme (of which EUR 5,857.46 concerned the period under consideration), and EUR 197,187.06 in respect of rent.				
21.	18720/21	25/03/2021	**ŠTÚDIO POHYBU BUBEMA, S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions:				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (unspecified expenses) of EUR 6,000 and lost profit of EUR 11,657.93 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 4,389.94 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 8,361.85 in respect of rent.				
22.	18758/21	25/03/2021	**RETSUS S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 163 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (unspecified expenses) of EUR 4,202 and lost profit of EUR 32,540 sustained by 15/02/2021. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions, the closure of the applicant company's business is specified as having lasted 130 days, the amount of the actual damage (operating expenses) was identified as being EUR 6,427.82, after having already deducted EUR 11,258.79 from the First Aid scheme, and the lost profit calculated as amounting to EUR 11,350.50.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 11,258.79 from the First Aid scheme for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods). At another place in its submissions (in addition to what is mentioned above), the applicant company acknowledged having received EUR 10,016.51 from the First Aid scheme for the period under consideration.				
23.	20404/21	12/04/2021	**TOGET, S.R.O.** Fitness centre	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 178 days, including 33 during which reopening was permitted but not financially viable owing to the restrictions in place. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 1,849.45 and lost profit of EUR 48,899.18. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, but the said amounts were amended to EUR 4,242.12 and EUR 55,018.49 respectively, the latter being specified as concerning "lost turnover".				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 22,025.86 in respect of rent. In the applicant company's subsequent submissions, without any explanation, it was noted that "[t]he amount of the rent subsidy of EUR 12,836.27 ... [had not been] included in the accounting".				
24.	20421/21	12/04/2021	**SKL AGENCY S.R.O.**	15/10/2020

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
			Fitness centre	
Alleged repercussions: Business closed for 145 days, and for a further 33 limited to six customers. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 4,959.40 and lost profit of EUR 60,820.81. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the above was confirmed, but the said amounts were amended to EUR 21,472.04 and EUR 55,018.49, the latter specified as being for "lost turnover".				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 1,397.22 from the First Aid scheme (for March, April and May 2020) and EUR 14,613.33 in respect of rent. In the applicant company's subsequent submissions, without any explanation, it was noted that "[t]he amount of the rent subsidy of EUR 8,426.67 ... [had not been] included in the accounting".				
25.	20902/21	13/04/2021	**GALEK, S.R.O.** Restaurant	15/10/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 178 days, actual damage of EUR 73,000 and in respect of lost "revenue" estimated at about EUR 100,000. In subsequent submissions, this was confirmed. No supporting documents have been provided, other than data used for the calculation of the amount in a claim for assistance from the First Aid scheme.				
Support received: No claim for and receipt of any support has been demonstrated.				
26.	31836/21	16/06/2021	**INMODESK S.R.O.** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 75,416.94 and lost profit of EUR 10,372.59. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the closure of the applicant company's business was specified as having lasted 163 days, with the amounts of the actual damage being EUR 23,702.98 (unsold goods) and of the operating expenses being EUR 23,120.95, after having already deducted EUR 5,503.58 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 9,062 received in respect of rent. There was no mention of any lost profit.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 6,729.04 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 16,258.06 in respect of rent.				
27.	32142/21	17/06/2021	**CUBESHOP S.R.O.** Retail store	19/12/2020

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
			Applicant no longer wishes to pursue the application	
28.	32146/21	17/06/2021	**Vladimír BEŇO** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 755,421.52, which was however to be reduced by EUR 92,244.84 received from the First Aid scheme, and EUR 17,057.75 received in respect of rent. In subsequent submissions the closure of the applicant's business was specified as having lasted 163 days, and the total amount of pecuniary damage was defined as being EUR 159,276.24 (operating and other expenses), after having already deducted EUR 99,274.97 received from the First Aid scheme, which fully compensated the applicant's labour costs. There was no mention of any lost profit.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 115,946.23 from the First Aid scheme for the relevant period (in addition to further amounts for other periods). The applicant acknowledged having received the amount mentioned above (EUR 99,274.97) under that head.				
29.	32149/21	16/06/2021	**SMARTY SK S.R.O.** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (unspecified expenses) of EUR 371,739 and lost profit of EUR 301,455. These amounts would have to be reduced by any financial assistance that the applicant company had applied for and would receive, estimated at approximately EUR 80,000 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 120,000 in respect of rent.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 79,764.32 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 60,609.69 in respect of rent for the period under consideration (in addition to other amounts for other periods).				
30.	32154/21	16/06/2021	**DANIAN S.R.O.** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 155,687.18 and lost profit of EUR 96,355.44. No mention of any State support. In subsequent submissions the closure of the applicant company's business was specified as having lasted 163 days, and the amount of the actual damage was specified as being EUR 51,882.83 (unsold goods) and EUR 37,434.93 (operating expenses), after having already deducted EUR 7,191.22 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 13,539.59 received in respect of rent. There was no mention of any lost profit.				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 8,595.24 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 13,539.59 in respect of rent for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods).				
31.	32157/21	16/06/2021	**Marián RÚČKA** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 536,285.22 and lost profit of EUR 754,916. These amounts were to be reduced by EUR 104,674.69 received from the First Aid scheme and any further amounts claimed but not received by that time in respect of rent. In subsequent submissions the closure of the applicant's business was specified as having lasted 163 days, and the amount of actual damage was identified as being EUR 619,352, after having already deducted EUR 91,327.98 received from the First Aid scheme, and EUR 69,823.46 received in respect of rent, while the amount of the lost profit was identified as being EUR 421,735.4.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 104,674.69 from the First Aid scheme for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods).				
32.	32160/21	16/06/2021	**MISS PINK S.R.O.** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 35,351.33 and lost profit of EUR 13,900.67. These amounts would have to be reduced by EUR 5,645.86 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 3,933.59 received in respect of rent.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 6,514.09 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 3,933.59 in respect of rent for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods).				
33.	32233/21	16/06/2021	**SUPER SPORT S.R.O.** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 169,432.85 and lost profit of EUR 85,727.15, after having already deducted EUR 19,625.84 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 4,917.2 received in respect of rent.				
Support received:				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 34,679.03 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 8,263.68 in respect of rent for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods).				
34.	32238/21	16/06/2021	**DIAMANTIER, S.R.O.** Goldsmith and jeweller	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 145,065.71, after having already deducted EUR 142,284.96 received from the First Aid scheme.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 142,284.96 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 31,324.91 in respect of rent for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods).				
35.	32701/21	17/06/2021	**Stanislav FARKAŠ** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 197,460.44 and lost profit of EUR 702,226.80. These amounts need to be reduced by EUR 46,207.12 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 10,049.02 received in respect of rent.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 75,195.94 from the First Aid scheme for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods).				
36.	32765/21	17/06/2021	**SKL S.R.O.** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 474,732.56 and lost profit of EUR 812,243.03. No mention of any State support.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant has received EUR 62,521.23 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 54,765.74 in respect of rent for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods).				
37.	32873/21	17/06/2021	**PLAYER, S.R.O.** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 547,189.30 and lost profit of EUR 749,817.90. No mention of any State support.				
Support received:				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
According to the Government, the applicant has received EUR 133,243.75 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 99,419.55 in respect of rent for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods). In its observations in reply, the applicant company specified that, of those amounts, only the following portions related to the period under consideration: EUR 66,857.11 under the First Aid scheme and EUR 21,149.63 in respect of rent.				
38.	32892/21	17/06/2021	**SLOVAKIA MANGO FRANCHISEE S.R.O.** Retail store	19/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 115,165.19 and lost profit of EUR 130,834.81 sustained by 18/04/2021. No mention of any State support.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant company received EUR 9,406.63 from the First Aid scheme, which the applicant company acknowledged.				
39.	33406/21	26/06/2021	**Michal ČERVÁK** Retail store	30/12/2020
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 235,122, after having already deducted EUR 3,922 received from the First Aid scheme and EUR 31,600 received in respect of rent, and lost profit of EUR 123,888.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 28,567 from the First Aid scheme, of which the applicant in his observations only determined EUR 24,516.45 as relating to the period under consideration.				
40.	38291/21	26/07/2021	**ENERGYFIT S.R.O.** Fitness centre	27/01/2021
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 128 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 20,802.81 and profit lost as of 25/04/2021 in the amount of EUR 29,800 (based on average monthly profit in 2019 and expected increase of prices and clientele).				
Support received: In the application form, the applicant company specifically stated that it was unaware of any subsidy in relation to rent and labour having been approved for January-April 2021. The Government specified that the applicant had received EUR 6,572.66 from the First Aid scheme, which included payments for 2021, for example, between March and June 2021, and also EUR 13,606.35 in respect of rent.				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
In its observations in reply, the applicant specified that, of those amounts, only the following portions related to the period under considerations: EUR 1,364.98 under the First Aid scheme, and EUR 4,104.74 in respect of rent.				
41.	44638/21	03/09/2021	**OZETA, S.R.O.** Retail store	08/03/2021
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 475,069.94 and lost profit of EUR 449,911. Costs of labour and rent were excluded from the calculation as the applicant company had received State assistance in respect of them.				
Support received: In subsequent observations, the applicant company indicated amounts of EUR 95,486.31 under the First Aid scheme and EUR 41,382.20 for rent with reference to a period between March and April 2021. The Government specified that the applicant company had received EUR 264,239.23 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 123,608.19 in respect of rent for the period under consideration (in addition to further amounts for other periods).				
42.	47365/21	17/09/2021	**ORION TIP SK, A.S.** Betting agency	22/03/2021
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, between March and April 2021 actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 354,651.15 and lost profit of EUR 651,899.56. Of these amounts, the following were to be deducted as having been received by the applicant company for March and April 2021: EUR 54,249.25 from the First Aid scheme and EUR 16,200.53 in respect of rent for the period under consideration.				
Support received: The Government specified that the applicant company had received EUR 259,692.04 from the first aid scheme and EUR 62,449.22 in respect of rent for the period since the starting date of the impugned regime (in addition to further amounts for other periods). The applicant company explained that of these amounts, EUR 54,249.25 and EUR 16,190.54 related to the contested period.				
43.	47371/21	17/09/2021	**SLOVAK GAMES, S.R.O.** Betting agency	22/03/2021
Alleged repercussions: Closed for 121 days, between March and April 2021 actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 385,121.12 and lost profit of EUR 280,000. These amounts already took into account support received in respect of rent.				
Support received: The Government specified that the applicant company had received EUR 245,546.55 from the first aid scheme and EUR 92,472.52 in respect of rent for the period under				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
consideration. The applicant company explained that of these amounts, EUR 43,172.77 and EUR 21,194.60 related to March and April 2021.				
44.	22488/22	29/04/2022	**Matúš KARABIN** Fitness centre	11/10/2021
Alleged repercussions: In the period under consideration (from 01/11/2021), business closed for 39 days and restricted for a further 85 days. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 10,120 and lost profit of EUR 29,000.				
Support received: In the application form, the applicant stated that he had been unable to claim any support as he had not been eligible for it. The Government submitted that, in respect of an earlier period, he had received EUR 7,925.96 from the First Aid scheme.				
45.	22491/22	29/04/2022	**Mikuláš BADO** Fitness centre	11/10/2021
Alleged repercussions: In the period under consideration (from 01/11/2021 to 23/11/2021), business closed for 9 days, and opened with restrictions for 14 days; total damage of EUR 12,580 (no details provided). No mention of any State support.				
Support received: The Government submitted that, in respect of an earlier period, the applicant had received EUR 5,760 from the First Aid scheme.				
46.	22741/22	29/04/2022	**Peter MARCINA** Fitness centre	11/10/2021
Alleged repercussions: In the period under consideration (from 01/11/2021 to 25/02/2022), operation closed for 32 days and restricted for 92 days. Actual damage (operating costs) of EUR 23,936.95, after having already deducted EUR 170.37 in State support, and lost profit of EUR 36,000.				
Support received: According to the Government, the applicant received EUR 21,645.72 from the First Aid scheme, of which EUR 170.37 concerned the period under consideration.				
47.	26276/22	17/05/2022	**DENIM RETAIL S.R.O.** Retail store	22/11/2021
Alleged repercussions: In the period under consideration (from 22/11/2021 to 18/01/2022), operation closed for 15 days and restricted for 43 days. Actual damage (operating costs) of EUR 462,438.13 and lost profit of EUR 146,791.87. In the application form, the applicant company stated that it was unable to specify the State support received at the given time, and that it would provide that information later.				

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant's name Area of business	Starting date of the impugned regime
Support received: The Government submitted that, in respect of the period under consideration, the applicant company had received EUR 9,044.09 in respect of rent, and additional amounts in respect of other periods.				
48.	26280/22	17/05/2022	**SLOVAKIA MANGO FRANCHISEE S.R.O.** Retail store	22/11/2021
Alleged repercussions: In the period under consideration (from 22/11/2021 to 18/01/2022), business closed for 15 days and restricted for 43 days. Actual damage (operating expenses) of EUR 57,715.42 and lost profit of EUR 48,991.58. In the application form, the applicant company stated that it was unable to specify the State support received at the given time, and that it would provide that information later.				
Support received: The Government submitted that, in respect of an earlier period, the applicant company had received EUR 9,406.63 from the First Aid scheme.				