

Cases and rulings

Country Code	Year	Reference details title	Reference details URL	Hate Bias motivation	Court / Body	Key facts of the case	Results (sanctions, outcome) and key consequences or implications of the case	Main reasoning / argumentation	Key issues (concepts, interpretations) clarified by the case	Key quotation in original language and translated into English with reference details
Hungary	2013	Hungary / County Court of Miskolc / Decision no. 8.1725/2012/14	http://ukp.birosag.hu/portal-frontend/stream/birosagKod/0500/hatarozatAzonosito/B.1725_2012_14/	Religion	County Court of Miskolc (Miskolci Törvényszék)	The defendant informed the authorities anonymously over the phone that bombs had been placed somewhere in town by his 'Muslim brothers', and that these Muslims would detonate the bombs unless the authorities released certain people from prison. The authorities soon realised that it was an empty threat, and that the defendant used the cover of the alleged 'Muslim brothers' as a decoy.	The Court found the defendant guilty of threatening of public endangerment, while it did not find the charges on incitement to hatred against a member of a community legitimate. While the defendant certainly used the common misconception of connecting terrorism to Muslims, the Court found that the defendant's intention was not to commit a hate crime, but to make his story more credible to the authorities.	The prosecutor pressed charges on the grounds of threatening with public endangerment; however, civil society organisations (e.g. Working Group Against Hate-crimes) argued that the defendant's action could also qualify as 'incitement to hatred against a member of a community' since the defendant used the name of Muslims to pressure the authorities.	The key issue was whether using the name of 'Muslim brothers' in a threat of public endangerment could qualify as incitement to hatred against the Muslim community.	Excerpt from the reasoning of the decision: 'Tekintettel arra, hogy a vádlott fenyegetése nélkülözöte a konkrétságot, sőt, kifejezetten komolytalan volt, cselekménye kizárólag a közveszéllyel való fenyegetés minősülhet.' 'Given that the defendant's action was without any grounds, in fact, it was not even sincere, he only committed the misdemeanour of threatening of public endangerment'.

DISCLAIMER The information presented here is collected under contract by the FRA's research network FRANET. The information and views contained do not necessarily reflect the views or the official position of the FRA.

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/databases/anti-muslim-hatred/>

Copyright © 2026 European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights