



# Monaco

## Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 2005

**National Judge: Stéphanie Mourou-Vikström (17 September 2015 - )**

Previous Judge: Isabelle Berro (2006-2015)

[List of judges of the Court since 1959](#)

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

The Court dealt with 6 applications concerning Monaco in 2023, of which 5 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered one judgment, which did not find any violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2021	2022	2023
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	8	8	9
Communicated to the respondent Government	5	1	0
Applications decided:	9	4	6
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	7	3	4
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	2	1	1
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	0	0	0
- Decided by judgment	0	0	1

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the [ECHR internet site](#).  
Statistics on interim measures can be found [here](#).

Applications pending before the Court on 01/01/2024	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	16
Single Judge	0
Committee (3 Judges)	6
Chamber (7 Judges)	10
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

## The Principality of Monaco and ...

### The Registry

The task of the Registry is to provide legal and administrative support to the Court in the exercise of its judicial functions. It is composed of lawyers, administrative and technical staff and translators. There are currently **618** Registry staff members.

## Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

---

### Chamber

#### Cases relating to custody

##### [Navone and Others v. Monaco](#)

24.10.2013

These cases concern the rights of a person held in police custody, including the unequivocal confirmation of waiver of the right to the assistance of a lawyer, notification of the right to remain silent, or the effective assistance of a lawyer when expressly requested.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 – Mr Navone and Mr Lafleur not having been informed of their right to remain silent during their custody](#)

[Violation of Article 6 § 3 \(c\) read together with Article 6 § 1– the three applicants having been deprived of their right to be assisted by a lawyer while in police custody](#)

## Other noteworthy case, judgment delivered

---

##### [Prencipe v. Monaco](#)

16.07.2009

Josette Prencipe, a French national, was charged with misappropriating funds when she worked as a bank employee in Monaco. She spent four years in detention pending trial.

[Violation of Article 5 § 3 \(right of a detained person to be tried within a reasonable time\)](#)

The Court considered the reasons given by the domestic courts to justify the applicant's detention too abstract and insufficiently substantiated.

##### [Scavetta v. Monaco](#)

30.05.2017

The case concerned a failure to communicate to the Review Court a report by the reporting judge and the written conclusions of the representative of the prosecutor's office.

[Violation of Article 6 §](#)

##### [Bershedha and Rybolovlev v. Monaco](#)

06.06.2024

The case concerned the conduct of a judicial investigation directed by a French judge seconded to the Monegasque courts.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

## Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

---

##### [Ordre des avocats défenseurs et avocats près la cour d'appel de Monaco v. Monaco](#)

21.05.2013

Case concerning Monaco's law of 3 August 2009 placing obligations on lawyers in connection with money laundering activities and imposing criminal sanctions in the event of failure to comply.

[Application declared inadmissible as incompatible \*ratione personae\* with the provisions of the Convention.](#)

##### [Fogwell v. Monaco](#)

15.06.2010

According to the Court's case-law, the reasonableness of the length of the proceedings must be assessed in the light of the particular circumstances of the case and notably with regard to the complexity of the case and the conduct of the applicant and the national authorities. In this instance the complexity of the case had justified the Review Court's failure to give judgment within the requisite 45-day time-limit.

[Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.](#)