



## Case referred to the Grand Chamber

At its last meeting (Monday 31 May 2021), the Grand Chamber panel of five judges decided to refer one case and to reject requests to refer 17 other cases<sup>1</sup>.

The following case has been referred to the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights:

**L.B. v. Hungary** (no. 36345/16), concerning the publication of the applicant's personal data on the website of the National Tax and Customs Authority for failure to fulfil his tax obligations.

### Referral accepted

#### [L.B. v. Hungary \(no. 36345/16\)](#)

The applicant is a Hungarian national who was born in 1966 and lives in Budapest.

The case concerns the tax authorities' publishing of his personal data on the Internet for failure to pay his taxes.

On 27 January 2016 the National Tax and Customs Authority published the applicant's personal details on a list of tax defaulters on its website, as provided for under the relevant domestic law in respect of those individuals whose tax arrears and debts exceeded 10 million Hungarian forints. The information published included the applicant's name, home address, tax identification number and the amount of unpaid tax which he owed.

He subsequently also appeared on a list of "major tax evaders" on the tax authorities' website, while an online media outlet produced an interactive map of tax defaulters indicating his home address with a red dot.

The application was lodged with the European Court of Human Rights on 7 June 2016.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life and the home) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant alleges that the publication of his name and other details on the Tax Authority's website for his failure to comply with his tax obligations had not been necessary in a democratic society and had infringed his right to private life. He submits that the main reason behind the Hungarian legislative policy of making the data available was public shaming.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 25 November 2020, the Court, by five votes to two, held that there had been no violation of Article 8 of the European Convention.

On 31 May 2021 the Grand Chamber Panel accepted the applicant's request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber.

<sup>1</sup> Under Article 43 of the European Convention on Human Rights, within three months from the date of a Chamber judgment, any party to the case may, in exceptional cases, request that the case be referred to the 17-member Grand Chamber of the Court. In that event, a panel of five judges considers whether the case raises a serious question affecting the interpretation or application of the Convention or its protocols, or a serious issue of general importance, in which case the Grand Chamber will deliver a final judgment. If no such question or issue arises, the panel will reject the request, at which point the judgment becomes final. Otherwise Chamber judgments become final on the expiry of the three-month period or earlier if the parties declare that they do not intend to make a request to refer.

## Requests for referral rejected

Judgments in the following 17 cases are now final<sup>2</sup>

**Xhoxhaj v. Albania** (no. 15227/19), [judgment](#) of 9 February 2021

**Grozđanić and Gršković-Grozđanić v. Croatia** (no. 43326/13), [judgment](#) of 28 January 2021

**Khan v. Denmark** (no. 26957/19), [judgment](#) of 12 January 2021

**Société Editrice de Mediapart and Others v. France** (no. 281/15 and 34445/15), [judgment](#) of 14 January 2021

**Alfa Glass Anonymi Emboriki Etairia Yalopinakon v. Greece** (no. 74515/13), [judgment](#) of 28 January 2021

**Vorotņikova v. Latvia** (no. 68188/13), [judgment](#) of 4 February 2021

**Gawlik v. Liechtenstein** (no. 23922/19), [judgment](#) of 16 February 2021

**Stichting Landgoed Steenbergen and Others v. the Netherlands** (no. 19732/17), [judgment](#) of 16 February 2021

**Buliga v. Romania** (no. 22003/12), [judgment](#) of 16 February 2021

**Negulescu v. Romania** (no. 11230/12), [judgment](#) of 16 February 2021

**Timofeyev and Postupkin v. Russia** (no. 45431/14 and 22769/15), [judgment](#) of 19 January 2021

**Shlykov and Others v. Russia** (no. 78638/11 and 3 others), [judgment](#) of 19 January 2021

**Dickinson v. Turkey** (no. 25200/11), [judgment](#) of 2 February 2021

**Ramazan Demir v. Turkey** (no. 68550/17), [judgment](#) of 9 February 2021

**Tokel v. Turkey** (no. 23662/08), [judgment](#) of 9 February 2021

**Sađdıç v. Turkey** (no. 9142/16), [judgment](#) of 9 February 2021

**Mont Blanc Trading Ltd and Antares Titanium Trading Ltd v. Ukraine** (no. 11161/08), [judgment](#) of 14 January 2021

---

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

### Press contacts

During the current public-health crisis, journalists can continue to contact the Press Unit via [echrpess@echr.coe.int](mailto:echrpess@echr.coe.int).

Tracey Turner-Tretz  
Denis Lambert  
Inci Ertekin  
Neil Connolly  
Jane Swift

<sup>2</sup> Under Article 44 § 2 (c) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the judgment of a Chamber becomes final when the panel of the Grand Chamber rejects the request to refer under Article 43.

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