

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
Croatia	2024	Croatia/Supreme Court/Revvd-518/2024-2	https://odluke.sudovi.hr/Document/View?id=5dff24db-170b-4cda-89db-fecaea2b68d9	Religion	Vrhovni sud Republike Hrvatske (Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia)	The Supreme Court reviewed the defendant's proposal for a revision of the judgment from the Varaždin County Court (Gž-779/2023-4), which partially confirmed and partially modified the Zagreb Municipal Civil Court's ruling (Pn-1201/2022-43). The dispute concerned a claim for non-material damages due to defamation from a published article. The defendant sought a revision based on procedural violations and misapplication of the law, arguing that the lower court failed to recognise freedom of expression and that the damages were not proven to stem from online publication.	The revision request was denied. The ruling solidifies the protection of personal dignity over abusive public commentary, reinforcing standards from the ECHR for balancing expression and dignity.	The Supreme Court rejected the revision request, stating that none of the proposed legal questions justified a review under the Civil Procedure Act. It found no breach of procedural rights, as the lower courts properly balanced freedom of expression against protection of dignity using criteria from the ECHR Axel Springer case. The court concluded that the disputed expressions were offensive value judgments, not protected satire, and that the defendant failed to show that the ruling contradicted established case law.	The court clarified that offensive value judgments may not be protected under freedom of expression if they serve no public interest and are purely ad hominem attacks, referencing the Axel Springer v. Germany ECtHR case.	"Revizijski sud je utvrdio da je predlagatelj u prijedlogu za dopuštenje revizije naznačio četiri pravna pitanja (...). Međutim (...) prvo naznačeno pitanje nije važno za osiguranje jedinstvene primjene prava i ravnopravnosti svih u njegovoj primjeni." "The revision court determined that the proposer indicated four legal questions in the request for permission to file a revision (...) However, (...) the first stated question is not important for ensuring the uniform application of the law and the equality of all in its application."

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