Last updated: January 2024

Norway

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1952

National Judge: Arnfinn Bårdsen (1 January 2019 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Terje Wold (1959-1972), Rolv Ryssdal (1973-1998), Hanne Sophie Greve (1998-2004), Sverre Erik Jebens (2004-2011), Erik Møse (2011-2018)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 105 applications concerning Norway in 2023, of which 96 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 3 judgments (concerning 9 applications), which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2021	2022	2023
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	117	131	87
Communicated to the Government	6	3	1
Applications decided:	102	125	105
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	86	117	75
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	6	3	21
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	0	0	0
- Decided by judgment	10	5	9

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:	54
Single Judge	22
Committee (3 Judges)	27
Chamber (7 Judges)	5
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

Norway 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

Grand Chamber

Abdi Ibrahim v. Norway

10.12.2021

The case concerned the decision by the Norwegian authorities to allow the adoption of a child by a foster family against his mother's wishes. The mother, a Somali national who had moved to Norway, did not ask for her son's return as he had spent a long time with his foster parents, but wished for him to maintain his cultural and religious roots.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Strand Lobben and Others v. Norway

10.09.2019

The case concerned the domestic authorities' decision to remove a mother's parental authority and let foster parents adopt her son.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) in respect of both applicants, a mother and her son

A and B v. Norway (nos. 24130/11 and 29758/11)

15.11.2016

The case concerned two taxpayers who submitted that they had been prosecuted and punished twice – in administrative and criminal proceedings – for the same offence.

No violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice)

Folgero and Others v. Norway

29.06.2007

Applicants, members of the Norwegian Humanist Association (Human-Etisk Forbund), complained about the domestic authorities' refusal to grant their children full exemption from lessons at primary school on Christianity, religion and philosophy.

Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

Freedom of expression (Article 10)

Nilsen and Johnsen v. Norway

25.11.1999

Concerned representatives of the Norwegian Police Association's complaint about being held liable to pay compensation for defamation of a University Professor in the course of a heated public debate on police brutality.

Violation of Article 10

Bladet Tromso and Stensaas v. Norway

20.05.1999

Complaint by newspaper and its former editor about being held liable to pay compensation for defamation of seal hunters.

Violation of Article 10

Chamber

Cases regarding Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Inadmissible application

Hansen v. Norway

21.06.2018

The case concerned complaints by the applicant, whose previous name was Anders Behring Breivik, about his conditions of detention.

Application declared inadmissible for being manifestly ill-founded.

Cases concerning Article 6

Right to a fair trial/hearing

Violations of Article 6

Hansen v. Norway

02.10.2014

The case concerned the failure to give reasons for the refusal to admit for examination a civil appeal subjected to a filtering procedure before a Norwegian High Court (*lagmannsrett*).

Ekeberg and others v. Norway
31.07.2007
Concerned the lack of objective impartiality of a High Court, sitting with a jury, in a case brought against members of a motorcycle club – a hang-out for the Hells Angels – for detonating explosives and killing the driver of a passing car.

Botten v. Norway
19.02.1996
Unfairness of criminal proceedings brought against a lieutenant-colonel in Norwegian Air Force for neglect or carelessness in the performance of his official duties (a rescue operation at sea) as the Supreme Court overturned his initial acquittal without hearing him in person.

No violation of Article 6

N.A. v. Norway
18.12.2014
The case concerned the applicant's complaint that she had been ordered to pay compensation to her children for having caused injuries to them, although she had been acquitted of the related criminal charges.

Procedo Capital Corporation v. Norway
24.09.2009
Concerned complaint by Procedo, a company registered in Panama, about the lack of impartiality of the Norwegian High Court as a whole, after the disqualification of one of its lay members, in proceedings with regard to a dispute with Sundal Collier, a Norwegian securities broker.

Presumption of innocence

Violations of Article 6

Orr v. Norway
15.05.2008

Hammern v. Norway
11.02.2003

O v. Norway
11.02.2003

Y v. Norway
11.02.2003
In the cases of O and Hammern, the applicants were acquitted of sexually abusing minors. Following their acquittal, they claimed compensation for the inconvenience suffered as a result of the criminal proceedings. In the case of Y, the applicant, acquitted of rape and murder charges, was found liable to pay compensation to the victim's parents under the civil law on tort. In the case of Orr, a former British Airways Pilot, acquitted of having raped one of his cabin crew, was ordered to pay compensation to the alleged victim. The applicants all complained that the decisions taken by the Norwegian courts concerning the compensation claims in question were based on reasoning which contained assumptions of criminal guilt despite their acquittal.

Cases concerning private and family life (Article 8)

Violations of Article 8

Vilnes and Others v. Norway
05.12.2013
The case concerned former complaints by divers that they are disabled as a result of diving in the North Sea for oil companies during the pioneer period of oil exploration (from 1965 to 1990).
This case is of interest because it complements the Court's case-law on access to information under Articles 2 and 8, notably in so far as it establishes an obligation on the authorities to ensure that employees receive essential information enabling them to assess occupational risks to their health and safety.

Nunez v. Norway
28.06.2011
Concerned a complaint of a national of the Dominican Republic that an order to expel her from Norway would separate her from her small children.

A v. Norway (no. 28070/06)
09.04.2009
Concerned the applicant's complaint about the national courts' rejection of his defamation suit against the newspaper *Fædrelandsvennen* for its coverage of him as a suspect in the so-called Banehia case (rape and murder of two young girls)

No violations of Article 8

Lillo-Stenberg and Sæther v. Norway

14.01.2014

Complaint by well-known Norwegian rock musician and actress that the weekly magazine *Se og Hør* published photographs of their wedding on an islet in the Oslofjord.

Bernh Larsen Holding AS and Others v. Norway

14.03.2013

The case concerned the complaint by three Norwegian companies about a decision of the tax authorities ordering tax auditors to be provided with a copy of all data on a computer server used jointly by the three companies.

Antwi and others v. Norway

14.02.2012

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants complained about the immigration authorities' decision in 2006 to expel Mr Antwi and prohibit his re-entry into Norway for five years following their discovering that his passport was forged.

Parental rights (Article 8)

European Court rules on 21 applications against Norway concerning children taken into public care

14.09.2023

12 applications declared inadmissible concerning decisions by the authorities in respect of children who were in public care at the time.
9 other similar applications where the Court held that there had been violations of Article 8.

K.O. and V.M. v. Norway (no. 64808/16)

19.11.2019

The case concerned official decisions to take a couple's daughter into care a few weeks after her birth in 2015 and their limited contact rights. The family were ultimately reunited in 2018.

No violation of Article 8 as concerned the placement of the applicant couple's daughter in care

Violation of Article 8 as concerned their contact with their daughter, which had been restricted to four, then six times per year

Violation of Article 8

A.L. and Others v. Norway
E.M. and Others v. Norway

20.01.2022

A.L. and Others concerned a care order issued by the Norwegian authorities in respect of the applicant child and the limitations imposed on the parents' contact with that child, following questions arounds the child's safety in their care. E.M. and Others concerned the refusal by the Norwegian authorities to lift a care order in respect of the two applicant children, an order removing the first applicant's parental responsibilities, and the refusal to grant her contact rights. The authorities had had concerns around physical and sexual abuse.

Violation of Article 8 in respect of A.L. and Others

No violation of Article 8 in respect of E.M. and Others

M. L. v. Norway

22.12.2020

The case concerned the domestic authorities' decisions to remove a mother's parental authority and authorise her daughter's adoption by her foster parents.

A.S. v. Norway (no. 60371/15)

17.12.2019

The case concerned decisions by the Norwegian authorities and courts to take the applicant' child into care at a young age and then to refuse to terminate long-term foster care for the child.

Sanchez Cardenas v. Norway

04.10.2007

Concerned Norwegian courts' rejection of a father's claim for right of access to his sons on account of allegations of sexual abuse and one of the son's strong anxiety about access.

Johansen v. Norway

07.08.1996

Violation of Article 8 as concerned deprivation of applicant's parental rights and access

No violation of Article 8 as concerned the taking into public care of the applicant's daughter and refusal to terminate the care.

No violation of Article 8

Høiness v. Norway

19.03.2019

The case concerned the domestic courts' refusal to impose civil liability on an Internet forum host after vulgar comments about Ms Høiness had been posted on the forum.

M.L. v. Norway (no. 43701/14)

07.09.2017

The case concerned the applicant's complaint about the placement of her son in a foster home under the care of people who were not her relatives.

Aune v. Norway

28.10.2010

Concerned Ms Aune's complaint about the Norwegian courts depriving her of parental responsibilities and authorising her son's adoption by his foster parents. Adoption was in child's best interests and number of visits remained the same even after his adoption.

Cases concerning freedom of expression (Article 10)

Violation of Article 10

Becker v. Norway

05.10.2017

The case concerned a journalist for a daily newspaper who was ordered to give evidence in a criminal case brought against one of her sources for market manipulation.

TV Vest AS and Rogaland Pensjonistparti v. Norway

11.12.2008

Concerned fine imposed on TV Vest for showing adverts for the Pensioners Party prior to the local and regional elections of 2003 in breach of statutory prohibition in Norway of broadcasting political advertisements.

No violation of Article 10

Egeland and Hanseid v. Norway

16.04.2009

Concerned the newspapers' (*Dagbladet* and *Aftenposten*) complaint, in particular, that they were convicted and sentenced to a fine for unlawful publication of photographs of a woman leaving a court building where she had just been convicted and sentenced to 21 years' imprisonment for a triple murder (the so-called Orderud case)

Cases concerning freedom of assembly and association (Article 11)

Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO) and Norwegian Transport Workers' Union (NTF) v. Norway

10.06.2021

The case concerned a domestic court judgment ruling a proposed boycott organised by NTF of a shipping firm by union dockworkers unlawful. The boycott had been in opposition to a shipping firm, Holship Norge AS, employing dockworkers outside of a collective framework agreement which had pertained in the port of Drammen.

No violation of Article 11

Case concerning property rights (Article 1 of Protocol no. 1)

The Karibu Foundation v. Norway

10.11.2022

The case concerned the authorities' limiting of ground rents, in accordance with legislation that had been introduced to deal with previous violations of the Convention, on property in Oslo owned by The Karibu Foundation.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Lindheim and Others v. Norway

12.06.2012

Concerned the impossibility for landowners of permanent homes or holiday homes to increase rent to people leasing their land as a result of a change in the legislation. They were therefore obliged to extend leases on the same conditions as before without limitation in time.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Behrami and Behrami v. France and Saramati v. France, Germany and Norway

Declared inadmissible on 02.05.2007

Concerned applicants' complaints about the United Nations peace keeping mission in Kosovo following the 1998-1999 conflict

between Serbian and Kosovar Albanian forces. Mr Saramati complained in particular about his extra-judicial detention from July 2001 to January 2002 by order of the international security presence in Kosovo (KFOR).
In particular, Articles 1 (obligation to respect human rights), 5 (right to liberty and security), 6 (right to a fair trial) and 13 (effective remedy).
Saramati application concerning Germany struck out (withdrawn) and the remainder of his application declared inadmissible
(Behrami and Behrami v. France application also declared inadmissible).

Thiermann and Others v. Norway

Declared inadmissible on 08.03.2007
Concerned "Lebensborn" (widely referred to as war children), a Nazi scheme, introduced by Heinrich Himmler in 1935, to create children who were deemed racially and genetically pure.
Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Storbråten v. Norway

Declared inadmissible on 01.02.2007
Applicant complained that he was punished twice for the same offence by first being declared bankrupt and imposed with disqualification orders preventing him from setting up or running a company for two years and then being convicted in separate proceedings with regard to his conduct in the bankruptcy.
Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice): declared inadmissible
Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 also declared inadmissible in the case of Haarvig v. Norway in a decision of 11.12.2007 concerning a newly graduated medical doctor who was first convicted of certain offences and then had his licence to practice suspended for a certain period.

ECHR Press Unit Contact:
+33 (0)3 90 21 42 08