

ANTI-SLAPP MECHANISMS MONITORING STUDY



Austria
Justice and Environment 2021

Introduction

Justice and Environment (J&E) is participating in a European anti-SLAPP NGO coalition called CASE (www.the-case.eu) in order to investigate legal challenges faced by environmental activists and other watchdogs throughout Europe. Significant research has been published on this topic already (e.g. by the [Law Clinic of the University of Amsterdam](#)) but J&E would also like to contribute to the analysis of SLAPPs via its own means.

A SLAPP case consists of four components:

- * legal proceedings (generally civil lawsuits but also criminal complaints where these can be pursued privately)
- * filed by a private party (generally corporations or wealthy individuals, including government officials acting in a private capacity)
- * with the intent to silence another private party (generally activists, journalists, NGOs, or other public watchdogs)
- * in response to acts of public participation (including advocacy or criticism).

Our targets are the anti-SLAPP mechanisms enacted in Member State legislation or case law. We are not researching SLAPP cases. We are researching anti-SLAPP mechanisms in the law (or case law). We are looking for procedural rules or decisions, not limited to environmental ones.

Questions and Answers

1. Has law or case law defined SLAPP cases in any way? (e.g., by a court judgment calling a case frivolous or vexatious for having certain features, etc.)? If yes, in what way?

SLAPP is not defined in Austrian law.

2. Is there any law or case law that puts limits on cases with SLAPP characteristics (e.g., by defining lawful causes or capping the amount of compensation, etc.)? If yes, in what way?

In order to describe anti-SLAPP mechanisms in Austrian law or case law we need to shortly mention existing SLAPP mechanisms in civil law. Firstly SLAPP-mechanisms can be as well anti-SLAPP mechanisms because some of them aim to protect personal rights - and this works in both ways. Secondly in the peculiarity of existing SLAPP-mechanisms in combination with the basic guarantees of the civil law system in Austria we may find existing anti-SLAPP mechanisms.

SLAPP mechanisms can be found in Austrian civil law, by the use of **actions for injunction** (“Unterlassungsklagen”) e.g.

1. Actions on the insult of honour and damage to credit (§ 1330 ABGB - in the following: Civil Code) and other personality rights
2. Actions of trespass (“Besitzstörungsklagen” - § 339 Civil Code)

Insult of honour and damage to credit are also punishable under the **Austrian Criminal Code** (§§ 111 and 152 StGB). The penalties in these cases range from imprisonment of up to six months or a fine of up to 360 daily rates (§ 152) to imprisonment of up to one year or a fine of up to 720 daily rates (§ 111). The offence of damage to credit is only to be prosecuted at the request of the injured party (§ 152 para 2 StGB). As regards online harassment the criminal offenses:

- Continuous harassment by means of telecommunications or a computer system = cyberbullying (§ 107c StGB)
- The unauthorized image recording (§ 120a StGB) and
- The incitement to hatred (§ 283 para 1 StGB)

might be also of relevance.

For offences **committed in the media** (applicable only to media owners¹):

3. Actions on defamation, libel, slander, insult and ridicule (§ 6 Mediengesetz - in the following: Media Act)
4. Actions on the violation of the strictly personal sphere (§ 7 Media Act)

Furthermore, SLAPP mechanisms may be provided by the

5. Freedom of Information and Data protection Law

Ad 1 and 2: Actions on the **insult of honour and credit of damage** do cover a claim for compensation of actual losses and losses of profit, and the revocation and publication of untrue facts combined with a claim for injunction. Due to the character of personal rights as absolute rights, the courts have affirmed **injunctive relief for injuries of personality rights even if they are not expressly provided for by law**. The right to maintain confidentiality protects both against intrusion into the privacy of the person and against the dissemination of legally obtained

¹ § 1 Abs 1 cif 8 Media Act: “[...] **“media owner”**: who

a) engages in the operation of a media undertaking or a media service or

b) otherwise engages in or causes third parties to engage in the creation of contents of a medium and its production and dissemination, or

c) otherwise in case of an electronic medium engages in or causes third parties to engage in the creation of its contents and its production and dissemination, or

d) otherwise engages in the creation of the contents of a medium for the purpose of its subsequent broadcast, its availability for download or its dissemination;”

information about the confidentiality (OGH 19.12.2005 8 Ob 108/05y). Actions of trespass cover a claim for injunction and a claim for compensation.

The **rules of cost bearing in Austrian civil law** are meant to prevent the conduction of proceedings by misusing rights up to a certain extent. As soon as a lawsuit is pending in court, a **value in dispute** (so called "Streitwert") must be determined, because the competence, the court costs and the lawyer's fees are calculated based on this value. So, the higher the value in dispute, the higher are the costs which must be borne during the process, and which must be borne by the underlying party. When an **action for a declaratory judgment** ("Feststellungsklage") or an **action for injunction** is filed (as is the case in the SLAPP-mechanisms mentioned above), the plaintiff must estimate the value in dispute (§ 59 Jurisdiktionsnorm - in the following: JN). In case this estimation is not made by the plaintiff in his/her action the law determines the value in dispute for these cases "quite" low with EUR 5.000,- (§ 56 Abs 2 JN). In accordance with §§ 7f Rechtsanwaltsariefgesetz (in the following: Attorney Tariff Act) the defendant may object the estimation ("Streitwertbemängelung") latest at the first day of the oral hearing if he/she finds the value in dispute too high or low. If the parties don't agree on a value in dispute, the court itself is authorized to set it.

Actions on the **pure insult of honour** (§ 1330 Abs 1 Civil Code) are excluded from the estimation of a value in dispute: The object of protection in these cases is the absolute right of the personal dignity. Thus, the object of decision is of a non-pecuniary nature which cannot be evaluated (at all). (*Gitschthaler in Fasching/Konecny*³ § 59 JN (Stand 30.11.2013, rdb.at).

With the legislative package against "online harassment" - in force since 1st January 2021 - the Civil Code and the Civil Procedural Code were adapted:

In addition to the introduction of general provisions on the protection of personality rights, which place the previous case law on an explicit legal basis, facilitations are created in substantive law for persons affected by violations of personality rights. The new regulations clarify who can sue and who can be sued in cases of violations of personality rights. In addition, a further innovation is the introduction of a separate claim for employers who are adversely affected by their employees being subjected to violations of personality rights. Employers will be able to take direct action against "hate postings".

The draft also aims to establish a special procedure in the Civil Procedural Code ("mandate procedure"), which is to be available as an urgent procedure for very massive cases of violations of personality rights. This special procedure is to be used exclusively in legal disputes on actions in which claims for injunctive relief for violations of human dignity in an electronic communications network are asserted. For an injunction to be issued, it is sufficient that the alleged infringement can be conclusively derived from the information provided in the complaint

and any evidence attached thereto (such as a screenshot or link to the infringing act). Immediate enforceability of this cease-and-desist order shall also be possible in particularly serious cases. The provision of an electronic form is intended to simplify the enforcement of rights and achieve an acceleration effect for the proceedings. The new mandate procedure falls under the autonomous jurisdiction of the district courts. Moreover, a fixed amount in dispute of EUR 5,000 is set for the lawsuit, so there is no obligation to hire a lawyer. The court fee for the first instance is currently EUR 107.

Actions of trespass must be filed within 30 days (§ 430 ZPO - in the following: Civil Procedure Code) and they are directed towards the restoration of the possession. The burden of proof lies with the plaintiff, he/she may only claim compensation for proven damages (§ 339 Civil Code). Due to the limitation of the claim for compensation on proven damages these claims might not be applicable if it comes to e.g., civil society actors taking soil samples of a landfill, or making observations on operating sites.

Anyone who appoints a defence attorney in **criminal proceedings** usually must bear the costs incurred for his/her representation. If the accused is acquitted or the criminal proceedings are discontinued after the public prosecutor's office has withdrawn from the prosecution, the **federal government will contribute to the costs of the defence upon request**. The contribution includes the cash expenses paid by the accused and a lump sum contribution to the costs of the defence counsel.²

Ad 3 and 4: Offences under the **Media Law** are relevant for the organized public (NGOs, citizens initiatives etc.) because due to their communication activities the Media Act is usually applicable to these groups. The Austrian Media Law intends to grant reparation for the persons affected but not compensation for future losses. The Media Act itself sets limits for the amounts of compensation. On 1st January 2021 the legislative package against “online harassment” entered into force. It brings more effective protection against hate postings on the internet. With this package of measures, it has been made clear that the internet is not a lawless space, but that our rule of law also applies here. Even before the legislative package entered into force, hate postings could fulfil various criminal offences and trigger claims under civil law and media law. However, the legislative package expanded the claims and made it much easier for those affected to enforce the law.

Part of the legislative amendments was to raise the amounts for indemnification under the Media Act -the maximum claims for the above-mentioned offences where doubled: from 20.000

² the lump sum is capped depending on the competent court from 1.000 up to 10.000 euros: https://www.oesterreich.gv.at/themen/dokumente_und_recht/strafrecht/9/3/Seite.2460503.html (17.11.2021)

to 40.000 and from 50.000 to 100.000 euros (§ 8 Media Act). The minimum amount is fixed with 100 euros.

Furthermore, with the legislative package against “online harassment” the **identity protection** which in the past was only applicable to victims of criminal offences, suspects and convicted persons as well as to persons providing information before a committee of enquiry of the Parliament was extended to **relatives of victims and to witnesses of criminal offences** (§ 7a/1a Media Act). The scope of protection is narrower than that of suspects, convicted persons and victims of criminal offences: the protection only exists against the **publication of name or image**, but not against the publication of other information enabling identification.

The deadline of six months to assert claims was extended to one year for victims who are particularly affected by a crime and for close relatives of the victim of a homicide and witnesses of such a crime (§ 8a/2 Media Act).

The regulations on the statute of limitations (of criminal liability) of a media content offence for retrievable periodic electronic media (§ 1/1/5a/b Media Act) were adapted, i.e., in particular websites: by stipulating that the statute of limitations only begins to run when the communication or presentation is deleted (§ 32 Media Act).

It is now clarified that the statute of limitations (of criminal liability) of a media content offence does not prevent confiscation and publication of the judgement (§ 33/2, § 34/3 Media Act).

Ad 5: Anti-SLAPP mechanisms are also provided for by **Austria’s Environmental Information Law** (B-UIG and the Regional UIGs). The Supreme Administrative Court (VwGH) ruled that the formal decision enabling an environmental NGO to exercise party rights in EIA procedures (“Anerkennungsbescheid”) is not an environmental information. These formal decisions only provide - with constitutive effect - the status of a formal party for the environmental NGO (VwGH 30.3.2017, Ro 2017/07/0004).³ The formal decision recognizing NGOs as party in EIA proceedings contains in its Annexes the statutes of the association, information on members of the organisation etc. In the mentioned case an operator’s attorney wanted to collect information about two environmental NGOs - procedural parties in permitting proceedings of an installation he is representing - in order to use this information to harass the NGOs in the following. The Supreme Administrative Court made a precedent with this decision - the formal decisions recognizing NGOs as parties to environmental proceedings must not be disclosed under the freedom of information law (here the federal environmental information act).

³https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/Dokumente/Vwgh/JWT_2017070004_20170330J00/JWT_2017070004_20170330J00.pdf

Furthermore, the **European General Data Protection Regulation** (GDPR) combined with the **Austrian Data Protection Act** (DSG) serve to protect natural persons when processing personal data. § 1 para 1 and 2 DSG defines the obligation to keep personal data confidential. In case of infringement of the guaranteed rights on data protection the affected person may file a complaint to the data protection authority (“Datenschutzbehörde”).⁴

3. If there are anti-SLAPP mechanisms in law or case law, are they effective, i.e., do they slow or stop the filing of lawsuits with the intention of silencing private parties?

As regards the anti-SLAPP mechanism in our **Environmental Information law** the mechanism is effective. Claims for information must be interpreted on the basis of the objective of the Environmental Information Directive. In accordance with the case law of the Supreme Administrative Court the concept of "environmental information" should be based on a broad understanding and the objective of the Environmental Information Directive, according to which the disclosure of information should be the norm. Nevertheless, the Federal and Regional Environmental Information Acts are not intended to grant a general and unlimited right of access to all information available from the authorities that "shows even the slightest reference to environmental goods" (VwGH 30.3.2017, Ro 2017/07/0004).

The **data protection authority** has competences to enforce the implementation of the GDPR and the DSG (§ 30ff DSG). Since the GDPR has entered into force authorities are even more cautious when it comes to the release of information - in case of doubt they hold the information back. Insofar the anti-SLAPP mechanism data protection law can be evaluated as effective.

The effectiveness of the **rules of cost bearing in general civil law** as anti-SLAPP mechanism must be questioned at this point. Firstly, although the defendant has the possibility to object the estimation of the value in dispute, a certain cost risk stays. Furthermore, the defendant may have to pre-finance their efforts in the process (attorney, expert opinions etc.). It cannot be predicted if they will be granted a right for procedural assistance during the process. But secondly, and even more important, may be a non-monetary hurdle: Civil society actors may be already intimidated by the sole threat to open a court procedure. So, depending on the financial wealth, legal representation and the procedural experiences of civil society actors the rules of cost bearing in general civil law, may be more or less an effective anti-SLAPP mechanism.⁵ Additionally, even if you do win your case, only a fixed amount of legal fees must be paid by the losing party, potentially leaving you with the cost of prep time for lawyers and expert witnesses. Moreover, most cases in this area tend to end in an amicable settlement, which usually means that each side covers its own costs, so as not to rack up more costs for

⁴ Austrian Data Protection Authority: <https://www.data-protection-authority.gv.at/> (12.9.2020)

⁵ On the effectiveness of SLAPPS see Blog from Martin Balluch: <https://martinballuch.com/category/repression/slapps/>

the court. So even in strong cases against financially strong opponents, NGOs and activists may end up paying a substantial amount out of their own pocket.

Lastly, regarding **criminal law**, the state still has little obligations to cover the costs of a victorious defendant. The contribution to the defence costs is normally lower than the costs of a defence attorney. An acquittal can therefore also entail financial charges and can even lead to financial ruin. In a case against animal rights activists, this led (close/up until) to their personal financial ruin, even though the state's case was dismissed.⁶

4. Is there law or case law to protect whistle-blowers? If yes, does that contain any reference to SLAPP cases and if yes, in what way?

In Austria **whistleblowing systems** are not very common. They have been put in place at certain authorities in the last decade, such as at the **Office of the Attorney General for Economic Affairs and Corruption** ("Wirtschafts- und Korruptionsstaatsanwaltschaft"), the **Financial Market Authority** ("Finanzmarktaufsicht") and the **Federal Competition Authority** ("Bundeswettbewerbsbehörde").⁷ Also, there are some newspapers and NGOs providing anonymous options for whistleblowing. Since 2021 the City of Vienna has a whistleblowing system in place. The Viennese Platform enables anonymous information about possible violations of legal provisions or internal guidelines as well as suspected cases of corruption. The whistle-blower platform is aimed at all municipal employees and persons who are, for example, customers or contractual partners of the City of Vienna.⁸ § 209a, 209b regulate a state's evidence rule that grants criminals a more favourable prosecution treatment if they voluntarily make a full confession and disclose their knowledge of new evidence.

Reports of legal violations can be **submitted anonymously** via the Internet, and the authorities can also keep in contact with the whistle-blower.

The technical design of these whistle-blower systems in combination with the obligation of the executive organs for "official secrecy" ("Amtsverschwiegenheit") and special procedures for the protection of personal data shall **guarantee the preservation of the anonymity** of the whistle-blower.

⁶ In the criminal proceedings against an animal protection association the accused was acquitted of all charges but had to bear 600.000 euros defence costs: <https://www.tt.com/artikel/15391457/tierschuetzer-prozess-eine-chronologie> (15.9.2020)

⁷ Cp. Wiener Zeitung vom 21.9.2019: „Whistleblower quo vadis“: <https://www.wienerzeitung.at/themen/recht/recht/2039337-Whistleblower-quo-vadis.html> (8.9.2020)

Cp. Korruptionsstaatsanwaltschaft - Hinweisgebersystem: <https://www.justiz.gv.at/wksta/wirtschafts--und-korruptionsstaatsanwaltschaft/hinweisgebersystem~2c9484853d643b33013d8860aa5a2e59.de.html> (8.9.2020); Bundeswettbewerbsbehörde - Hinweisgebersystem: https://www.bwb.gv.at/kartelle_marktmachtmissbrauch/whistleblower_werden/ (8.9.2020); Finanzmarktaufsicht - Hinweisgebersystem: <https://www.fma.gv.at/whistleblowing/> (8.9.2020).

⁸ <https://www.bkms-system.net/bkwebanon/report/clientInfo?cin=YexZ5r&c=-1&language=ger> (18.11.2021).

These currently existing whistleblowing systems do not contain any reference to SLAPP cases. Beyond that Austria must implement the minimum standards specified by the **EU Whistle-blower Directive** (EU 2019/1937) by December 17th, 2021. Public bodies and certain private companies (with 50 or more employees) are obliged to have a whistleblowing system by then. However, there is no legislative proposal so far.⁹

5. If, as mentioned above, there is law or case law to protect whistle-blowers, does this law in practice actually stop or slow SLAPP lawsuits?

Whistle-blower protection rules in Austria do not aim at slowing down or stopping lawsuits but are mainly in force to protect personal identities. SLAPP lawsuits are not affected by whistle-blower rules in another way than other, non-SLAPP lawsuits.

6. Are there any additional laws in your jurisdiction which might protect parties against SLAPP suits, even if they were not designed for that specific purpose?

Since Austria does not have SLAPP-specific laws, please see the answers to questions 2-4 for other laws that have the potential to protect against SLAPP lawsuits.

7. Which laws in your jurisdiction, civil or criminal, are commonly weaponized as SLAPPs to silence parties? Do you have any notable examples where these laws have been abused?

As stated in the answer to question two, the most commonly weaponized law in civil law is the action for injunction (“Unterlassungsklage”), which commonly include actions on the insult of honour and damage to credit (§ 1330 Civil Code and other personality rights as well as actions of trespass (“Besitzstörungsklagen” - § 339 Civil Code).

Insult of honour and damage to credit are also punishable under the Austrian Criminal Code (§§ 111 and 152 StGB). The offence of damage to credit is only to be prosecuted at the request of the injured party (§ 152 para 2 StGB).

In media law, actions on defamation, libel, slander, insult and ridicule (§ 6 Media Act) as well as actions on the violation of the strictly personal sphere (§ 7 Media Act) are suited for SLAPP lawsuits.

Recent cases of presumable SLAPP lawsuits that made the news include for example

⁹ Cp. Der Standard Online vom 28.10.2021: Regierung ist bei Umsetzung der Whistleblower-Richtlinie unter Zugzwang: <https://www.derstandard.at/story/2000130751213/regierung-ist-bei-umsetzung-der-whistleblower-richtlinie-unter-zugzwang> (18.11.2021).

Austrian Author and filmmaker Alexander Schiebel who was reported for defamation (in Austria: § 111 StGB) by 1370 farmers in South Tyrol because he had criticized the use of pesticides in local apple plantations.¹⁰

René Benkos real estate holding company sued an online magazine on the grounds of § 6 Media Act for publishing potentially incriminating screenshots. The action included the claim to publicly revoke the magazine's reporting in various newspapers, which would cost it millions.¹¹

Research platform "Dossier" that was sued by Austrian mineral oil company OMV for compensations worth 130.000 euros. The platform had published accusations that OMV had systematically surveilled Greenpeace and Fridays For Future activists.¹²

The Styrian Farmers' Union sued an individual for insult and credit damage after the person had put up billboards with "God save us from poison-spraying farmers!", "No germs and antibiotics on our families' plates!" and "Stop endangering humans, animals and the environment with poison-supported agriculture! The first instance had ruled in favour of the Farmers' Union. The Styrian Court for Civil Matters dismissed the action on the grounds of freedom of opinion, saying that statements on the billboards were correct in the core of the facts and did not show an exaggerated "excess of value" (LGZ Graz 4.10.2021, 6 R 108/21b)

8. Has international legislation played a role in SLAPP lawsuits in your jurisdiction? (e.g., European Union GDPR) If yes, to what end?

Yes. Please see the answer to question 3 for the impacts of the GDPR and the Environmental Information Law on SLAPP lawsuits in Austria. Generally, EU legislation and its (albeit very slow) implementation in Austrian law have brought about more participation rights for environmental organizations. This is a double-edged sword, since the option to take legal action also makes environmental organizations a target of legal action themselves. Apparently plans for EU SLAPP legislation are being made, with a draft report due to be voted on by the European Parliament plenary in November.

9. In SLAPP cases, do litigants tend to invoke due process rights? If yes, how do judges weigh the right to due process when balanced against concern about frivolous suits?

Due process rights in Austria include "classic" rights such as the right to one's lawful and impartial judge, the right to a public hearing, a reasonable duration of proceedings etc. The

¹⁰ APA-OTS vom 27. 5. 2021, "Sarah Wiener: SLAPP-Klage in Südtirol will Pestizidkritiker zum Schweigen bringen" https://www.ots.at/presseaussendung/OTS_20210527_OTS0065/sarah-wiener-slapp-klage-in-suedtirol-will-pestizidkritiker-zum-schweigen-bringen (23. 10. 2021).

¹¹ ZackZack vom 17. 8. 2021, „Millionenklage gegen ZackZack: Die Benko-Rechnung“ <https://zackzack.at/2021/08/18/millionenklage-gegen-zackzack-die-benko-rechnung/> (23. 10. 2021).

¹² Orf.at vom 22. 4. 2021, „Vorwürfe gegen OMV in Neuseeland“ <https://orf.at/stories/3210167/> (23. 10. 2021).

“problem” with these rights is that they are not necessarily affected in a SLAPP lawsuit. A lawsuit can have a legally abusive aim, but if the process laws are followed depends almost entirely on the competent court. All in all, there is no due process right to be found in Austrian legislature that would prevent a party to take a case to court, even if its aim is the abuse of the law. In the end, most SLAPP lawsuits do not end up being successful and are dismissed on the grounds of lack of legitimate legal interest etc. However, there are currently no due process laws in place that prevent parties from making claims to intimidate or financially overburden their opponent.

10. Is there a need to reform legislation on a national level to prevent frivolous or SLAPP cases? If yes, what might that look like?

Currently, SLAPP cases are not a common topic in the media or of discussion in Austria. However, the financial and psychological threat for organizations or persons faced with SLAPP lawsuits remains considerable. In Austria there are currently no plans to reform legislation with regards to SLAPP lawsuits, even though it has been called for occasionally in the context of a recent lawsuit.¹³ A reform could include a possibility for SLAPP targets to call for an early dismissal of a civil lawsuits in case of an apparent abuse of law. This could also result in a reverse burden of proof, where the plaintiff must prove that their claim is in fact not abusive. During a motion for dismissal, the defendant could also be enabled to file an incidental claim for damages or cost compensation. Finally, SLAPP targets should be provided with assistance, support and protection both within and outside the judicial process, such as financial support as well as psychological support to prevent further emotional harm and intimidation.

11. Are there rules codified into professional or bar association codes of conduct which could prevent or punish lawyers from filing SLAPPs? If yes, are these rules typically enforced?

According to the Austrian Disciplinary Code for Lawyers, disciplinary sanctions may be imposed if the conduct of the profession is breached. Case law states that for example knowingly making false claims or allegations in court constitute a breach of conduct¹⁴ as well as unjustified means of pressure¹⁵ or the unjustified threat of filing criminal charges¹⁶. The disciplinary code is typically enforced. However, there is a lack of a specific legal definition of a breach of conduct. Furthermore, the proceedings take place before the disciplinary board of the bar association and do not include rights to participation for external parties. That means

¹³ Der Standard vom 15. 8. 2021, "Zackzack": SPÖ will Schritte gegen "Einschüchterungsklagen" <https://www.derstandard.at/story/2000128931823/zackzack-spo-will-schritte-gegen-einschuechterungsklagen> (26. 10. 2021).

¹⁴ OGH 12. 12. 2017, 20 Ds 15/17m.

¹⁵ OGH 9. 11. 2015, 22 Os 5/15y.

¹⁶ OGH 20. 9. 2016, 20 Os 6/16g.

disciplinary measures against lawyers do not constitute effective legal protection for parties who are typically affected by SLAPP lawsuits.

12. What are the broad takeaways from SLAPP lawsuits in your jurisdiction? Are there unwritten norms or patterns which the cases tend to follow?

See our explanations on the different SLAPP-mechanisms above. SLAPP Suits in Austria are based on different legal foundations (see above) thus it is very difficult to derive norms or patterns which cases in general tend to follow.

13. Based on your experience, what types of advocacy action can best prevent the initial filing of SLAPPs? What types of advocacy actions can be best for getting such suits dismissed once they are filed?

Before SLAPPs are filed: Primary - searching agreement with the plaintiff, Mediation. Secondary: Media work, shifting topic on a political/parliamentary level.

When proceeding is already ongoing: searching agreement with the plaintiff, mediation.

Contact information

Association Justice and Environment, z.s.
 European Network of Environmental Law Organizations
 33 Udolní, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic
 Birgit Schmidhuber, Csaba Kiss
 Co-leaders / Aarhus Convention Topic Team
 e-mail: info@justiceandenvironment.org
 web: www.justiceandenvironment.org



The Work Plan of J&E has received funding from the European Union through its LIFE+ funding scheme. The sole responsibility for the present document lies with the author and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.