

2026 Rule of Law Report - targeted stakeholder consultation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The annual Rule of Law Report lies at the centre of the Annual Rule of Law Cycle, which acts as a preventive tool, deepening multilateral dialogue and joint awareness of rule of law issues. So far, six editions of the Rule of Law Report have been published since 2020.

As every year, the Commission would like to invite the stakeholders to provide contributions to the 2026 Rule of Law Report. On the basis of these contributions and on-going developments, further targeted questions may be shared at a later stage of preparation of the 2026 Rule of Law Report, in particular in the context of country visits, or bilateral contacts.

The Commission invites stakeholders to provide contributions which include:

**(1) developments and measures taken in relation to the recommendations in the 2025 report,
(2) developments related to topics covered in the 2025 country chapters, as well as any other new developments related to the rule of law.**

The input should consist of a short summary, if possible in English, covering the areas referred to below. Legislation or other documents may be referenced with a link. Contributions should focus on significant developments since the last Rule of Law Report both as regards the legal framework and its implementation in practice.

This questionnaire also integrates the separate questionnaire on the single market from last year. In addition to these specific questions, respondents to the questionnaire are invited to consider the Single Market dimension, including any relevant cross-border issues, in all their answers.

Where questions of particular relevance under the single market dimension, this is indicated before the relevant question.

[1] Unless the information was already submitted in the input for the previous Rule of Law Reports.

Type of information to be included:

Under each of the four pillars, the replies should include references to the following types of information:

A) Legislative developments

- Newly adopted legislation
- legislative drafts currently discussed in Parliament
- legislative plans envisaged by the Government

B) Policy developments

- Implementation and enforcement of legislation
- evaluations, impact assessment, surveys
- white papers/strategies/actions plans/consultation processes
- follow-up to reports/recommendations of Council of Europe bodies or other international organisations
- important administrative measures
- generalised practices

C) Developments related to the judiciary / independent authorities

- important case law by national courts
- important decision/opinions from independent bodies/authorities
- state of play on terms, nominations and expired mandates for high-level positions (e.g. Supreme Court, Constitutional Court, Council for the Judiciary, Prosecutor General, heads of independent authorities included in the scope of the request for input[2])

D) Any other relevant developments

- National authorities are free to add any further information, which they deem relevant; however, this should be short and to the point.

Where relevant, please also indicate whether the developments reported are linked to the implementation of reforms and investments under the national Recovery Resilience Plan. To simplify your answers to the questionnaire, if there are no developments, it is sufficient to indicate this and the information covered in the contributions for the previous Rule of Law Reports does not need not be repeated.

[2] Such as: media regulatory authorities and bodies, national human rights institutions, equality bodies, ombudsman institutions, supreme audit institutions and, where they exist, transparency authorities.

* I am giving my contribution as

- ☐ Academic/research institution
- ☐ Business association
- ☒ Civil society organisation/NGO
- ☐ International organisation
- ☐ Judicial association or network
- ☐ Media organisation or association
- ☐ Public authority or network of public authorities
- ☐ Other

* Organisation name

250 character(s) maximum

Háttér Society

Main Areas of Work

- ☐ Justice System
- ☐ Anti-corruption
- ☐ Media Pluralism and Freedom
- ☐ Checks and Balances
- ☒ Other

If "Other", please specify

Human rights of LGBTIQ people

Please insert an URL towards your organisation's main online presence or describe your organisation briefly:

500 character(s) maximum

www.en.hatter.hu/

Founded in 1995, Háttér is the oldest and largest LGBTQI organization in Hungary. Its aims are calling attention to the problems faced by LGBTQI people; providing support services; exploring the situation and needs of LGBTQI people; mainstreaming these concerns in laws and public services; protecting the human rights of LGBTQI people and tackling discrimination against them; and promoting their health and well-being.

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is in the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making

397132948685-34

*Country of origin

Please indicate the country of origin of your organisation

- ☐ Austria
- ☐ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia
- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czechia
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☐ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☒ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☐ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Slovak Republic
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐

Sweden

☐ Other - please specify

First name

Eszter

Surname

Polgari

Email Address of the organisation

hatter@hatter.hu

* Publication of your contribution and privacy settings

You can choose whether you wish for your contribution to be published and whether you wish your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- ☐ Anonymous - Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. Organisation name, URL, transparency register number, first name and surname given above will not be published. **To maintain anonymity, please refrain from mentioning the name of your organisation and any details from which your organisation can be identified in the rest of your contribution as we will not be able to guarantee anonymisation of these elements.**
- ☒ Public - Your personal details (name, organisation name, transparency register number, country of origin will be published with your contribution).
- ☐ No publication - Your contribution will not be published. Elements of your contribution may be referred to anonymously in documents produced by the Commission based on this consultation.

☒ I agree with the personal data protection provisions.

[Specific privacy statement targeted stakeholder consultation 2026 rule of law report.pdf](#)

Questions on horizontal developments

In this section, you are invited to provide information on general horizontal developments or trends, both positive and negative, covering all or several Member States. In particular, you could mention issues that are

common to several Member States, as well as best practices identified in one Member State that could be replicated. Moreover, you could refer to your activities in the area of the four pillars and sub-topics (an overview of all sub-topics can be found below), and, if you represent a Network of national organisations, to the support you might have provided to one of your national members.

Overview topics for contribution

[List of topics for contribution.docx](#)

Please provide any relevant information on horizontal developments here

5000 character(s) maximum

Questions for contribution

Under each pillar, you are invited to provide information on measures taken to implement the recommendations addressed to the Member State in the 2025 Rule of Law report, as well as developments with regard to the points raised in the respective country chapter of the 2025 Rule of Law Report and any other significant developments since January 2025 and up to the date of submission^[3]. Please always include a link to and reference relevant legislation/documents (in the national language and/or where available, in English). **Significant developments** can include challenges, positive developments and best practices, covering both legislative developments or implementation and practices.

Information provided in reply to the first question under each pillar, related to the follow-up to the recommendations, does not need to be repeated in subsequent parts of the questionnaire, but can be cross-referenced in the subsequent questions, where relevant. All other questions are not limited to the recommendations, but as in previous years, cover the entire scope of the Report.

^[3] Unless already covered in the input for the previous Rule of Law Reports.

Member State/enlargement country covered in contribution [only one choice possible]

If you wish to submit information concerning several Member States/enlargement countries, please fill in the questionnaire separately for each country. There is no limit to the number of contributions submitted by a single participant.

- ☐ Albania
- ☐ Austria
- ☐ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia

- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czechia
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☐ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☒ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☐ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Montenegro
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ North Macedonia
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Serbia
- ☐ Slovakia
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐ Sweden

I. Justice System

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the justice system (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

A. Independence

Appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors and court presidents (incl. judicial review)

(The reference to 'judges' concerns judges at all level and types of courts as well as judges at constitutional courts)

5000 character(s) maximum

Irremovability of judges, including transfers, (incl. as part of judicial map reform), dismissal and retirement regime of judges, court presidents and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Promotion of judges and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Allocation of cases in courts

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence (including composition and nomination and dismissal of its members), and powers of the body tasked with safeguarding the independence of the judiciary (e. g. Council for the Judiciary)

5000 character(s) maximum

Accountability of judges and prosecutors, including disciplinary regime and bodies and ethical rules, judicial immunity and criminal/civil (where applicable) liability of judges (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence/autonomy of the prosecution service

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence of the Bar (chamber/association of lawyers) and of lawyers

5000 character(s) maximum

Significant developments capable of affecting the perception that the general public has of the independence of the judiciary

5000 character(s) maximum

The Kúria (supreme court with sole jurisdiction under the Assembly Act) in a rather unprecedented manner issued press releases in response to media reporting on decisions concerning LGBTQI-themed assemblies. On 31 May 2025, the Kúria quashed the police ban on an LGBTQI-themed march and ordered a new procedure, in which no ban was issued (the organizers did not hold the assembly as only a few hours remained to organize it in line with the original notification submitted to the police, thus they decided to reschedule it). Some media outlets reported on the judgment as the Kúria "approved the mini-Pride event in Budapest on Sunday afternoon" and some interpreted the judgment as a ruling in favour of the Budapest Pride. In the press release (<https://kuria-birosag.hu/hu/sajto/kuria-kozlemenye-11>), the Kúria refuted these statements. It clarified the situation: "The Kúria ordered the assembly authority to annul the prohibitive decision and to initiate new proceedings, and delivered its judgment at a time that allowed the assembly authority to make a new decision before the planned date of the Sunday assembly. According to press reports, the assembly authority did not issue such a decision, but instead acknowledged the notification, thereby paving the way for the assembly to be organized. There is no legal remedy against the acknowledgment of the notified assembly, and therefore the Supreme Court has no decision-making power in this regard." It further added: "The Curia firmly rejects statements that are untrue and therefore seriously undermine judicial authority, and is considering further legal action." (More information of the litigation related to the assembly in question may be found here: <https://hatter.hu/kiadvanyaink/the-application-of-the-pride-ban-beyond-the-pride-march>.)

On 5 September 2025, the police banned the Pécs Pride, the Kúria rejected the organizer's petition for judicial review on 18 September 2025. (The summary of the decisions is available here: <https://hatter.hu/kiadvanyaink/police-ban-related-to-pecs-pride>.) Parallel with the notification related to Pécs Pride, another assembly was notified to the police in Pécs with the aim of demonstrating against roadcar damages caused by the overpopulation of wild animals. The police banned the march arguing that the organizer is an ambassador of the Pécs Pride and it is likely that the event will provide a route to the banned Pécs Pride, or it will turn into that. On judicial review, the Kúria quashed the police ban and no repeat procedure was ordered. The march took place on 4 October 2025, and it did turn into the Pécs Pride. Two days after, on 6 October 2025, the Kúria issued a press release "on the protest in Pécs against wildlife damage". It recalled that "(i)n accordance with the general administrative rules applicable to assembly matters, the authority must presume the client's good faith. The presumption of good faith – as an extension of the presumption of innocence well known from criminal proceedings – means that the state and the authorities acting on its behalf cannot assume without factual basis that the client is deceiving them, preparing to engage in unlawful conduct, or deliberately lying." (see: <https://kuria-birosag.hu/hu/sajto/kuria-kozlemenye-vadkar-elleni-pecsi-tuntetesrol>) The decision of the Kúria (Kgyk.VII.39.090/2025/8) was based on the evidence available at the time it was made. Events following the decision do not change this. If the client has indeed violated the requirement of good faith that protects him but also binds him, and has acted in bad faith, deceiving the authority, this will be assessed in subsequent proceedings."

The Kúria – in addition to above statements – also reported on all the judgments rendered in May-July on the police bans of LGBTQI-themed assemblies organized by civil society organizations, no other topic was afforded such wide coverage by the press corps of the court.

B. Quality of justice

(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined in the introduction)

[single market relevance] Accessibility of courts (e.g. court/legal fees, legal aid, language)

5000 character(s) maximum

Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material), remuneration/bonuses/rewards for judges and prosecutors, including observed changes (significant and targeted increase or decrease over the past year)

(Material resources refer e.g. to court buildings and other facilities. Financial resources include salaries of staff in courts and prosecution offices.)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Training of justice professionals (including judges, prosecutors, lawyers, court staff, clerks/trainees)

5000 character(s) maximum

Digitalisation (e.g. use of digital technology, including electronic communication and AI tools, within the justice system and with court users, procedural rules, access to judgments online)

5000 character(s) maximum

Use of assessment tools and standards (e.g. ICT systems, including AI-based systems, for case management, court statistics and their transparency, monitoring, evaluation, surveys among court users or legal professionals)

5000 character(s) maximum

Geographical distribution and number of courts/jurisdictions (“judicial map”) and their specialisation, in particular specific courts or chambers within courts to deal with fraud and corruption cases.

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Specialisation (of judges/specific courts/chambers within courts) and training for the judiciary to deal with commercial cases, as well as alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and mediation as regards commercial cases.

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Efficiency of the justice system

(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined in the introduction)

[single market relevance] Developments related to efforts to improve the efficiency of the justice system (e.g. as regards length of proceedings, to address backlogs)

5000 character(s) maximum

Any other developments related to the justice system - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

II. Anti-Corruption Framework

Where previous specific reports, published in the framework of the review under the UN Convention against Corruption, of GRECO, and of the OECD address the issues below, please make a reference to the points you wish to bring to the Commission’s attention in these documents, indicating any relevant updates, changes or measures introduced that have occurred since these documents were published.

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the anti-corruption framework (if applicable):

5000 character(s) maximum

A. The institutional framework capacity to fight against corruption (prevention and investigation / prosecution)

List any **changes** as regards relevant authorities (e.g. national agencies, bodies) in charge of prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of corruption and the resources allocated to each of these authorities (the human, financial, legal, and technical/specialised resources as relevant), including the cooperation among domestic and with foreign authorities. Indicate any relevant measures taken to effectively and timely cooperate with OLAF and EPPO

5000 character(s) maximum

Safeguards for the functional independence of the authorities tasked with the prevention and detection of corruption

5000 character(s) maximum

Information on the implementation of measures foreseen in the strategic anti-corruption framework (if applicable). If available, please provide relevant objectives and indicators

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Prevention

Measures to enhance integrity in the public sector in particular as regards high-level officials (including as regards incompatibility rules, revolving doors, codes of conduct, ethics)

5000 character(s) maximum

Measures to enhance general transparency of public decision-making (including rules on lobbying, asset and interest disclosure rules, gifts policy, transparency of political party, financing)

5000 character(s) maximum

Measures to prevent conflicts of interest in the public sector. Please specify the features and scope of their application (e.g. categories of officials concerned, types of checks and corrective measures depending on the category of officials concerned)

5000 character(s) maximum

--> For the three previous points, **please also provide information and figures on their application/enforcement if available to you**, such as number of detected breaches/irregularities of the various rules in place and the follow-up given (investigations, sanctions, etc.)

Measures to ensure whistleblower protection and encourage reporting of corruption, including their application (i.e. number of reports received, and the follow-up given)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Specific measures to enhance transparency, integrity and accountability in sectors with high risks of corruption, with a view to monitor and prevent corruption and conflict of interests, and where applicable measures to prevent and address corruption committed by organised crime groups.

- *Such high-risk sectors could include: public procurement, including construction, transport/infrastructure, defence, cohesion, agriculture, environment, healthcare, investor residence schemes, large-scale investments of national interest and the spending of EU funds, urban planning.*
- *In particular, measures to mitigate high risks of corruption in the area of public procurement, such as enhancing transparency and oversight (for example through digital technologies) and promoting fair*

competition and accountability in public procurement (e.g. targeted actions to address the high share of single bids) and measures to guarantee the effective and independent functioning of the public procurement review bodies.

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Measures for the prevention of corruption in relation to the issuing of official permits (e.g. related to environment, energy, service provision and various types of construction)

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Repression

The legal framework on the criminalisation and sanctions for corruption and related offences, including foreign bribery

5000 character(s) maximum

Official data on the number of investigations, prosecutions, final judgments and the application of sanctions for corruption offences (differentiated by offence if possible). Please indicate whether the cases: involve legal persons; are related to the implementation of EU or national funds; involve high level corruption. Please indicate which data is publicly available and how policy-making is informed by the data

5000 character(s) maximum

Potential obstacles identified in law or in practice to the investigation and prosecution of high-level and complex corruption cases (e.g. political immunity regulation, procedural rules, statute of limitations, cross-border cooperation, pardoning)

5000 character(s) maximum

Information on effectiveness of criminal and non-criminal measures and of sanctions (e.g. recovery measures and administrative sanctions) on both public and private offenders

5000 character(s) maximum

Any other developments related to the anti-corruption framework - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

III. Media pluralism and media freedom

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding media pluralism and media freedom (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

A. Media authorities and bodies

(Cf. Article 30 of Directive 2018/1808)

Measures taken to ensure the independence, enforcement powers and adequacy of resources (financial, human and technical) of media regulatory authorities and bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

Conditions and procedures for the appointment and dismissal of the head / members of the collegiate body of media regulatory authorities and bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

Existence and functions of media councils or other self-regulatory bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Safeguards against government or political interference and transparency and concentration of media ownership

[single market relevance] Measures taken to ensure the fair and transparent allocation of state advertising

5000 character(s) maximum

Safeguards against state / political interference, in particular:

- safeguards to ensure editorial independence of media (private and public)
- specific safeguards for the independence of heads of management and members of the governing boards of public service media (e.g. related to appointment, dismissal), safeguards for their financial and operational independence (e.g. related to reporting obligations and the allocation of resources) and safeguards for plurality of information and opinions
- **[single market relevance]** information on specific legal provisions and procedures applying to media service providers, including as regards granting /renewal/termination of licenses, company operation, capital entry requirements, concentration and corporate governance

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Transparency of media ownership and public availability of media ownership information, including on direct, indirect and beneficial owners

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Framework for journalists' protection, transparency and access to documents

Rules and practices guaranteeing journalists' independence and safety, including as regards protection of journalistic sources and communications, referring also, if applicable, to follow-up given to alerts lodged with the Council of Europe's Platform to promote the protection of journalism and safety of journalists

5000 character(s) maximum

Law enforcement capacity, including during protests and demonstrations, to ensure journalists' safety and to investigate attacks on journalists

5000 character(s) maximum

Access to information and public documents by public at large and journalists (incl. transparency authorities where they exist, procedures, costs/fees, timeframes, administrative/judicial review of decisions, execution of decisions by public authorities, possible obstacles related to the classification of information)

5000 character(s) maximum

Lawsuits (incl. SLAPPs - strategic lawsuits against public participation) and convictions against journalists (incl. defamation cases) and measures taken to safeguard against manifestly unfounded and abusive lawsuits

5000 character(s) maximum

Any other developments related to media pluralism and freedom - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

As explained in Hättér Society's 2024-submission, the Hungarian media is largely state-captured, and therefore lacks pluralism and independence. State-controlled media is strategically and purposefully building anti-LGBTI narratives, using misinformation and disinformation, often echoing Russian anti-LGBTI / anti-gender campaigns. The messages correlate with the government's messaging or campaign narratives. One of their key tactics is trying to conflate being LGBTI with paedophilia, consistent with the governing party's messaging around the anti-LGBTQI Law.

Homo- and transphobic speech in the public discourse and also in the media (both electronic and print). Connected to the anti-LGBTQI legislation passed in 2025 (i.e. the Fifteenth Amendment to the Fundamental Law entrenching the binary understanding of sexes, or the ban on LGBTQI-themed assemblies discussed below; for more information see: <https://constitutionnet.org/news/voices/15th-amendment-hungarian-fundamental-law-advancing-illiberal-christian-democracy>), homo- and transphobic speech became an everyday phenomenon, championed by government officials or leading politicians of the ruling majority. Scapegoating sexual and gender minorities intensified particularly in April-June 2025 when the mayor of Budapest announced that the Budapest Pride March will be held as a municipality event, and parallel with that CSOs challenged the bans issued on LGBTQI-themed events (which were often conflated with Budapest Pride in the media). The

overview of these cases may be found here: https://en.hatter.hu/publications/the-application-of-the-pride-ban-beyond-the-pride-march?_gl=1*9yudn4*_gcl_au*OTE5NDQ0NTEwLjE3NjEyMTAwNDA*_ga*MTAwODIwMzc2MS4xNzM1OTA2OTA2*_ga_GZEK8GB25Y*czE3NjgyMDYzMzgkbzIxNCRnMSR0MTc2ODIwOTIzOSRqMTMkbDAkaDEzNDUwOTUwMDI..

The legal battles of CSOs were accompanied by growing political pressure from members of the government calling on the decision-makers to have the courage and give effect to the newly introduced provision of the Assembly Act (explained in detail below). According to a statement by the Hungarian Minister of Justice Bence Tuzson, he recommended that the event organisers, the police, and the Ministry of Interior designated a new location for the assembly, specifically proposing Kincsem Park (a horse racing park). The Minister added that the horse racing track is “spacious, secure, and suitable for a march, and it can be ensured that children will in no way come into contact with the event.” (see: <https://telex.hu/belfold/2025/06/03/tuzson-bence-igazsagugyi-miniszter-pride-felvonulas-kincsem-park>) János Lázár, Minister for Construction and Transport, to a question whether Pride was banned in Hungary, in a video responded: “We have banned it. We have passed all the necessary legislation in Hungary to ensure that there will be no Pride this year or in the coming years. Therefore, there will be no Pride on Andrassy Avenue, no Pride in Puskás [a sport arena], and I hope, for the sake of the horses, no Pride in Kincsem Park either. Now all that is needed is for the Hungarian authorities to finally dare to apply the new legislation. I ask for courage from everyone.” (see: <https://24.hu/belfold/2025/06/03/lazar-betiltottuk-nem-lesz-pride-az-andrassyn-es-a-lovak-erdekeben-remelem-a-kincsem-parkban-sem/>) Alexandra Szentkirályi, leader of the group of the ruling party in the Budapest city council, visited Vienna Pride and posted some photos that – in her assessment – illustrate why Pride marches are dangerous and harmful for children. (see: <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1AaN5Qyhw6/>) PM Viktor Orbán commented on her post: “Well, that's what we don't want at home!”. (see: <https://telex.hu/belfold/2025/06/14/orban-viktor-komment-szentkiralyi-alexandra-beecs-pride>)

Following the historic Budapest Pride march, the PM Orbán called on imposing fines on the participants: “The Hungarian people made a clear decision in the referendum on child protection. We decided on the laws accordingly. We informed everyone, and everyone is familiar with the legislation. The rest is up to the authorities; politics has no role to play here.” (see: <https://hu.euronews.com/my-europe/2025/07/01/orban-buntetes-budapest-pride-resztvevok-rendorseg-kamerak>)

IV. Other institutional issues related to checks and balances

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the system of checks and balances (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

A. The process for preparing, enacting and implementing laws

[single market relevance] Framework, policy and use of impact assessments and evidence based policy-making, stakeholders'*/public consultations (including rules and practices on the transparent participation of civil society to policy development and decision-making processes), and transparency and quality of the legislative process in the preparatory, the parliamentary and implementation phase (including guidance on how to implement legislation)

* This includes also the consultation of social partners

5000 character(s) maximum

As noted in Hátter's prior submissions, the legislative procedure in Hungary in the majority of the cases offers no room for civil society organizations to formally intervene, submit opinions, or in any way influence the decision-making procedure. Public consultation on bills is only mandatory if the bill is tabled by a minister (i.e. member of the government), this is easily circumvented by submitting legislative proposals by individual members of Parliament or parliamentary committees.

In 2025, all major anti-LGBTQI legislative proposals were tabled by Members of the Parliament, thus no civil society input was possible. On 17 March 2025 – following up on the promise of the Prime Minister made in February (<https://miniszerelnok.hu/en/prime-minister-viktor-orbans-state-of-the-nation-address-2025-02-22/>) – a bill amending Act no. LV of 2018 on the right of assembly (Assembly Act) was submitted by seven MPs from the ruling coalition. (for more details on the amendment see at: <https://hatter.hu/kiadvanyaink/legislating-fear-banning-pride-is-the-latest-assault-on-fundamental-rights-in-hungary>). The bill was processed in an accelerated procedure in the Parliament and the final vote took place within a day, and it was promulgated the next day, on 18 March 2025. Only one provision entered immediately into force, the remaining provisions' entry into force was linked to the Fifteenth Amendment to the Fundamental Law (Hungary's constitution).

The Fifteenth Amendment to the Fundamental Law was also submitted to the Parliament by individual MPs, namely by those belonging to the ruling coalition (Fidesz-KDNP), avoiding the rules on public consultation. (For more information on the Fifteenth Amendment see the Venice Commission's opinion: [https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdfid=CDL-AD\(2025\)043-e](https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdfid=CDL-AD(2025)043-e).)

The bill on the transparency of public life was also submitted by a Fidesz-MP to whom later further MPs joined (For the bill see: https://helsinki.hu/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2025/05/Bill-T11923_Transparency-of-Public-Life.pdf)

Occasionally draft laws are published for public consultation. The deadlines for submitting an opinion continue to be tight, and little or no information is made available about the impact of civil society input. On 9 January 2025, the Ministry of the Interior submitted for public debate a draft decree amending EMMI Decree 20/2012. (VIII. 31.) on extracurricular school activities (<https://cdn.kormany.hu/uploads/document/1/16/163/163c3289f85a4e698689ee3faddbf4a026bebe34.pdf>). The 'propaganda law' adopted in June 2021 amended Act CX of 2011 on national public education (NPA), and according to the newly inserted Section 9/A. (1) of NPA, no person or organization other than the institution's own teaching staff, professionals providing school health services at the institution, and state agencies with a cooperation agreement with the institution may hold classes on sexual culture, sex life, sexual orientation, sexual development, the harmful effects of drug use, the dangers of the internet, and other physical and mental health development, unless they have been registered by the competent authority. The draft regulation creating the registry only a partial regulation – Hátter Society not only proposed to list all the topics explicitly (i.e. include comprehensive sexual education), but elaborated on

ways to ensure quality, and recommended to broaden the circle of people qualified to hold such activities (<https://hatter.hu/sites/default/files/dokumentum/kiadvany/bm-iskfoglalkozasok-hatter-tarsasag-2025jan16-1.pdf>). Although a standardized summary of the opinions received has been published on the website, it did not include a summary of the opinion sent by Háltér or the reasons for its rejection. The omission was only rectified after a written request from Háltér.

On 1 July 2025, Háltér submitted a written opinion on the amendment of ministerial decrees affecting public health to the email address provided on the website. Although the decree was promulgated on 17 July 2025, under number 25/2025. (VII. 16.), the standardized summary was not published on the website.

On 19 December 2025, a call for submitting opinions on the draft Government Decree on the implementation of measures related to adoption (<https://kormany.hu/dokumentumtar/orokbefogadassal-kapcsolatos-intezkedesek-vegrehajtasarol-szolo-korm-rendelet>). The deadline – as it is still indicated on the website – was 26 December 2025, leaving two working days to prepare any submission. But not even this tight deadline was respected by the Government: the Decree was adopted and published on 23 December 2025, three days before the deadline for submitting critical opinions, thereby rendering the public debate on draft laws illusory and meaningless.

[single market relevance] Rules and use of fast-track procedures and emergency procedures (for example, the percentage of decisions adopted through emergency /urgent procedure compared to the total number of adopted decisions)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Safeguards to ensure legal certainty, the stability of the legal framework and non-discrimination.

5000 character(s) maximum

Rules and application of states of emergency (or analogous regimes), including judicial review and parliamentary oversight

5000 character(s) maximum

Regime for constitutional review of laws

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Independent authorities

Independence, resources, capacity and powers (including effective access to relevant data) of national human rights institutions ('NHRIs'), of ombudsman institutions if different from NHRIs, of equality bodies if different from NHRIs and of supreme audit institutions

(Cf. the website of the European Court of Auditors: <https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/SupremeAuditInstitutions.aspx#>)

5000 character(s) maximum

In the Fall of 2025, a new Commissioner for Fundamental Rights was elected. Civil society organizations sent an open letter to the President of Hungary in which they recommended to select the new Commissioner for Fundamental Rights through a transparent, merit-based selection process that meets international standards, and conduct broad and meaningful consultations with civil society and professional organizations on the selection of candidates for the position (see: <https://hatter.hu/hirek/az-alapveto-jogok-uj-biztosat-atlathato-folyamatban-valodi-konzultaciokovetoen-kell>). No such consultation took place, the procedure remained as non-transparent as before. Furthermore, shortly after the new ombuds took office, all position papers by the former deputy Commissioner for the Rights of Minorities were suspiciously removed. The work of the deputy commissioner – including analysis of systemic issues concerning LGBTQI rights like hate crimes and hate speech – was considered vital public documentation (see: <https://qubit.hu/2025/11/17/egyik-naprol-a-masikra-titokban-eltuntettek-12-ev-leleplezo-erteku-dokumentumait-az-ombudsmani-hivatal-honlapjarol>).

Statistics/reports concerning the follow-up to recommendations by National Human Rights Institutions, ombudsman institutions, equality bodies and supreme audit institutions in the past year

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Safeguards to ensure the effective independence of supervisory and regulatory authorities with a direct impact on economic operators such as national economic oversight, enforcement and competition authorities

C. Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions

[single market relevance] Transparency of administrative decisions and sanctions (incl. their publication and rules on collection of related data) and respect of the good administration principle (including the obligation of the administration to give reasons for decisions)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Judicial review of administrative decisions: short description of the general regime (in particular competent court, scope, suspensive effect, interim measures, and any applicable specific rules or derogations from the general regime of judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Safeguards (other than judicial review) regarding decisions or inaction of administrative authorities, including remedies (e.g. administrative review)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Rules and practices related to the application by all courts, including constitutional jurisdictions, of the preliminary ruling procedure (Art. 267 TFEU)

5000 character(s) maximum

Despite the entering into force of the 15th Amendment to the Fundamental Law and the amendment to the Assembly Act, four civil society organisations – Amnesty International Hungary, Háttér Society, the Hungarian Helsinki Committee and the Hungarian Civil Liberties Union – notified various LGBTQI-themed assemblies to the police. Except for one, all these assemblies were banned by the police with reference to the amended Assembly Act. The summary of these procedures is available at: <https://hatter.hu/sites/default/files/dokumentum/kiadvany/lgbtqi-themed-assemblies-in-hu-bans.pdf>

On judicial review, the organizers requested the Kúria (Hungary's supreme court with sole jurisdiction in such cases) to initiate a preliminary ruling procedure before the CJEU with reference to the ongoing infringement procedure against Hungary on account of the anti-LGBTQI law (propaganda law) [C-769/22]. These requests were in all cases rejected by the Kúria. In judgment no. judgment no. Kgyk.VII.39.073/2025/6. (10 July 2025), the Kúria categorically rejected to request a preliminary ruling from the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU): in previous judgments it “has already pointed out that the general principles of EU law and fundamental rights only apply in situations falling within the scope of EU law, such as where the authorities or courts of a Member State are implementing EU law. However, not in cases where the underlying facts have no connection with EU law (a purely internal situation). According to Article 6(1) TEU and Article 51(2) of the Charter, the provisions of the Charter do not in any way extend the powers of the European Union as defined in the Treaties. Where a legal situation does not fall within the scope of EU law, the CJEU has no jurisdiction to rule on it, and the provisions of the Charter which may be invoked cannot in themselves constitute a basis for such jurisdiction (...). Even if the [Police's] decision fell within the scope of EU law, the Kúria could not have requested the CJEU to give a preliminary ruling. In view of the extremely short time limit for appealing against the decision of the assembly authority, the Kúria could not initiate proceedings before either the Constitutional Court or the CJEU, as in that case it would have to suspend its own proceedings and would thus violate the three-day (substantive) time limit laid down in Section 15(4) of the Assembly Act.” With this holding, the Kúria effectively excluded requesting a preliminary ruling from the CJEU in assembly related cases.

[single market relevance] Implementation of final judgments by the public administration and State institutions and follow-up given to supranational judgments, including decisions from the European Court of Human Rights, as well as available remedies in case of non-implementation

5000 character(s) maximum

Judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

The Hungarian Government has not taken any general measure to implement the judgments concerning the lack of legal gender recognition (LGR) rendered by the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), in particular *Rana v. Hungary* (<https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-203563>), *R.K. v. Hungary* (<https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-225330>) and *E.G. and Others v. Hungary* (<https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-238029>).

Judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union

On 13 March 2025, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) rendered its decision in the *Deldits* case (C-247/23). The petitioner in the case was in a substantially similar position as the applicant in *Rana*: he was recognized as a refugee in Hungary on account of the well-established fear of persecution based on his gender identity, yet his birth gender was recorded in the asylum registry and his request for change was rejected. The CJEU held that the right to rectification as guaranteed by Article 16 of the GDPR applies to the gender marker as well. (§ 38) The individual measure was taken and the petitioner's gender marker was corrected in the asylum registry, however, no general measures have been implemented.

As noted in *Háttér Society's* 2024-submission, Hungarian law fails to comply with the CJEU judgments in *Coman* and *Mirin*.

Domestic judgments – Constitutional Court

The applicant in the case of *Rana v. Hungary* also submitted a constitutional complaint parallel to the ECtHR. The Constitutional Court rejected the constitutional complaint, but ex officio proceeded to examine if the case presents any unconstitutional omission. In Decision no. 6/2018. (VI. 27.), it found that the Parliament failed to fulfil its legislative obligations and called on them to rectify the situation by 31 December 2018, it has not happened to date.

As noted in *Háttér Society's* 2024-submission, the Hungarian authorities have consistently rejected the recognition of foreign same-sex marriages in Hungary, even if one of the partners is a Hungarian citizen. Two clients of *Háttér Society* filed a constitutional complaint with the Constitutional Court after unsuccessfully attempting to have their marriages concluded abroad recognized as registered partnerships by Hungarian authorities. In Decision no. 6/2025. (VI. 30.). The Court opined that leaving the petitioners (married same-sex couples) without any recognition violates their fundamental rights. The Parliament had until 31 October 2025 to adopt legislation, but no legislative proposal has been tabled to date.

Domestic judgments – ordinary courts

As noted in *Háttér Society's* submission in the previous years, in adoption cases guardianship offices persistently refuse to follow the judgments of ordinary court when conducting the fresh procedures as ordered by courts. The process of individual adoption is formulated in compliance with ECtHR standards (*E.B. v. France*), however, it is applied in a discriminatory way against applicants belonging to sexual or gender minorities.

In 2025, several court judgments found that the discriminatory practice of the guardianship authorities was in violation of Hungarian law, six of *Háttér Society's* cases are or have been in judicial phase. The overview of the procedures is available here (<https://hatter.hu/tevekenysegek/jogsegelyszolgalat/jelentosebb-ugyeink/orokbefogadasi-ugyek-2021>, in Hungarian). In one case (in November 2025) the Budapest-Capital Regional Court, after the fourth rejection by the guardianship office (in stark contravention of three judgments), decided

to exercise its exceptional power and ruled on the suitability of the plaintiff itself (and found him suitable for adoption). Thus after four years of back-and-forth between the guardianship authority and the court, the plaintiff was eventually declared suitable for adoption. (Judgment no. 16.K.702.593/2025/7) In another case, the court – as a warning to the guardianship authority – noted: “(t)he court draws the defendant's attention to the fact that the provisions of its final judgment are binding on everyone – including public authorities – and that the enforcement of judgments is a fundamental condition for the enforcement of legal certainty.” (Judgment no. 16.K.701.319/2025/9., § 21)

In October 2025, the Budapest-Environs Regional Court followed a similar approach: instead of ordering a new procedure before the Pest County Government Office, it awarded the plaintiff the family allowance she claimed. The plaintiff raises three children together with her registered partner (she is the biological mother of one of them). She requested family allowance after all of them (which would be possible in case of married couples), but the authorities refused it arguing that the reference rule mandating the application of rules on marriage to registered partnership does not apply in this case. (Judgment no. 105.K.700.967/2025/7. § 28)

Oversight, including by courts, of the use of intrusive surveillance software by national authorities

5000 character(s) maximum

D. The enabling framework for civil society

Measures regarding the framework for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. legal framework and its application in practice incl. registration, transparency and dissolution rules)

5000 character(s) maximum

Háttér Society's submissions in previous years already elaborated on the Sovereignty Protection Office (SPO), set up as of 1 February 2024, with its "investigations" and "reports" has repeatedly framed EU activities, EU funding and engagement with the EU's rule of law toolbox as threats to the sovereignty of Hungary; and in February 2025 a special commissioner was appointed who is "responsible for uncovering political corruption funds paid by the United States Agency for International Development to Hungarian entities". [Government Resolution 1033/2025. (II. 27.)]

The SPO regularly issues reports and newsletters, and these are part of the wider efforts to stigmatise and threaten organizations critical of Hungary's democratic erosion. Study demonstrated that the Act on the protection of national sovereignty had an immediate chilling effect, and SPO's operation further exacerbated the harassment of civil society organizations (<https://helsinki.hu/en/from-chilling-effect-to-immediate-harm-consequences-of-the-sovereignty-protection-act/>). Although no SPO investigation has been launched against Háttér Society, it has been repeatedly portrayed as a lobby organization harmful for Hungarian interests and national sovereignty. On 29 January 2025, SPO published a report on the CERV programme of the European Union, with the subtitle: "This is how Brussels opened the floodgates to finance the Soros network". The report discusses the "European hubs" of civil society groups, and declares that among the members of the LGBTQI hub "such pressure organizations" may be found as Háttér Society (<https://szuverenitasvedelmihivatal.hu/dokumentumok/Az-Europai-Bizottsag-CERV-programja-Igy-nyitotta-meg-Brusszel-a-penzcsapot-a-Soros-halozat-finanszirozasa.pdf>). On 13 May 2025, the SPO report titled "Political work by pressure organisations is funded by EU grants" was released. On the topics funded by the EU the report notes: these "are suitable for

dividing people, disrupting social peace, and creating a basis for the EU public to put Hungary or other non-compliant states in the spotlight. Green politics and sexual minorities, for example, are global front lines that are clearly visible in the projects.” The report discusses at length two projects in which Háltér Society participated, insinuating that the projects had aims that could be categorized as exerting political pressure.

(<https://szuverenitasvedelmihivatal.hu/dokumentumok/Political-work-by-pressure-organisations-is-funded-by-EU-grants.pdf>) The 2 October issue of SPO’s newsletter [Sovereignty Observer] summarizes a Guardian article about the use of LGBTQI narratives in electoral campaigns prepared by Outright. The author adds: “It is important to emphasize that Outright International also finances Háltér Society, the flagship LGBTQ organization of the Soros empire in Hungary.”

On 20 October 2025, SPO released its report on “The Erasmus+ programme and externally funded lobby networks”. The summary of the report already sets the tone: Erasmus+ “is used to regularly support foreign-funded organizations that represent political goals. Erasmus+ is thus not only an educational program, but also an instrument of power that serves to undermine national sovereignty and impose EU ideological priorities on member states.” In addition its Dragtivism Erasmus+ youth exchange program, Háltér Society’s Q-Learning project implemented with an Austrian LGBTQI organization is explicitly singled out. The Erasmus+ program and SPO’s reservations about it is also mentioned in the report titled “There is no social support for the Brussels empire-building” published on 15 December 2025, which recalls that Háltér Society – as “a network actor financed from abroad” – performs activities that “are mainly aimed at young people”.

(<https://szuverenitasvedelmihivatal.hu/dokumentumok/az-erasmus-program-es-a-kulfoldrol-finanszirozott-nyomasgyarkorlo-halozatok.pdf>)

On 13 May 2025, the bill on the Transparency of Public Life (the Bill) was submitted by an individual MP to whom members of the governing coalition joined a week later (thus circumventing the requirement on public consultation). The unofficial translation of the bill is available [here](#). Under the Bill, the government can designate in a decree any legal entity registered inside or outside of Hungary, upon the proposal of the SPO, as “an organisation that uses foreign support to influence public life” and thereby threatens the sovereignty of Hungary. The detailed analysis of the Bill is maybe found in the joint civil society briefing paper [here](https://helsinki.hu/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2025/05/Operation-Starve-and-Strangle-2025.pdf): <https://helsinki.hu/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2025/05/Operation-Starve-and-Strangle-2025.pdf>. The final vote of the Bill was scheduled in early June 2025, but first it was postponed to the Fall. The Bill was not further discussed in the Parliament, however, it has not yet been formally withdrawn, thus can be revived any time.

Rules and practices having an impact on the effective operation and safety of civil society organisations and human rights defenders. This includes measures to protect them from attacks – verbal, physical or on-line –, intimidation, legal threats incl. SLAPPs, negative narratives or smear campaigns, measures capable of affecting the public perception of civil society organisations, etc. It also includes measures to monitor threats or attacks and dedicated support services, as well as available remedies

5000 character(s) maximum

Following up on the promise of the Prime Minister made in February – a bill amending Act no. LV of 2018 on the right of assembly (Assembly Act) was submitted by seven MPs from the ruling coalition. The amendment adopted within a day added a further ground for banning an assembly to the Assembly Act, namely Section 13 /A, which now prohibits holding an assembly that “violates the prohibition set forth in Section 6/A of Act XXXI of 1997 on the protection of children and guardianship administration (hereinafter: Child Protection Act) or that displays a substantial element of the content prohibited under Section 6/A of the Child Protection Act.” Section 6 /A of the Child Protection Act – as amended by the anti-LGBTQI Propaganda Law – restricts access of minors

to “content that is pornographic or that depicts sexuality as having a purpose in itself or that depicts or propagates divergence from self-identity corresponding to the sex at birth, sex change or homosexuality.” [The infringement procedure launched against the propaganda law is pending before the CJEU (C-769/22)] The new ground for banning an assembly entered into force on 15 April 2025 together with the Fifteenth Amendment of the Fundamental Law, which modified Article XVI (1) and created a constitutional underpinning of the restrictions on freedom of assembly by declaring that the right of the child “right to the protection and care necessary for his or her proper physical, mental and moral development” shall take precedence over any other concurring right except for the right to life.

As a result of the 2025-amendment of the Assembly Act, organizers of assemblies banned under Section 13/A, including the Budapest Pride March, or any other LGBTQI-themed gathering, may face up to one year imprisonment, while participants risk fines of up to EUR 500. According to the new provisions a fine for this particular petty offense cannot be converted to community service or to custodial sentence (like other petty offense fines), thereby removing the possibility of civil disobedience of those individuals unable or unwilling to pay the fine. The amendment also widened the scope where the police may disperse a notified assembly, and changed the rules on notification: it reduced the earliest possible time for notifying assemblies to the police from three to one month prior to the planned date, which civil society has also interpreted as a targeted act towards the Budapest Pride March.

The new amendments dangerously broaden the use of facial recognition techniques (FRT) in Hungary, allowing authorities to use it to identify unknown perpetrators of all petty offenses, which violates privacy and aims to suppress dissent. (For an analysis see the joint submission of CSOs to the UN Special rapporteur here: <https://en.hatter.hu/sites/default/files/dokumentum/kiadvany/submission-hs-hclu-hhc-un-sr-on-freefom-of-preaceful-assemby-impact-of-digital-and-ai-assisted.pdf>.)

Four civil society organizations, including Háttér Society, notified the police of four smaller LGBTQI-themed assemblies on IDAHOT in May 2025. No police ban was issued and one small march was held on 17 May. However, when the same group notified the police of a larger anti-homophobia and anti-transphobia march later that month, it was banned under Section 13/A of the Assembly Act. The ban, which showed arbitrary application of the law, was challenged by the CSOs before the Kúria (supreme court), which quashed the police ban due to a lack of proof it would violate the CPA. The police subsequently banned the rescheduled event several times arguing that the proposed march will be the Budapest Pride March or substantially similar to that. (An overview of the bans applied to LGBTQI-themed assemblies outside the Pride March is available here: <https://en.hatter.hu/publications/the-application-of-the-pride-ban-beyond-the-pride-march>) Minister János Lázár,, publicly stated that “We have passed all the necessary legislation in Hungary to ensure that there will be no Pride this year or in the coming years,” and asked authorities to “finally dare to apply the new legislation”. (<https://telex.hu/belfold/2025/06/06/lazar-janos-lazarinfo-berettyoujfalufidesz-valasztas-kampany-forum>)

On 28 June 2025, a historic Budapest Pride march, organized by the municipality of Budapest, saw hundreds of thousands in protest restrictions. The march was a municipal nevertheless, the police considered it as an assembly, and despite no notification of it having been submitted, they banned it. Consequently, the Mayor of Budapest, Gergely Karácsony, was questioned on 1 August and is now facing ongoing criminal charges.

The police banned the Pécs Pride March, the only one outside the capital, on 5 September 2025, the march was held on 4 October 2025. Organized by a private individual, the event was vulnerable due to a lack of public body involvement. Criminal proceedings against organizer Géza Buzás-Hábel were also launched .

Organisation of financial support for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. framework to ensure access to funding, and for financial viability, taxation/incentive/donation systems, measures to ensure a fair distribution of funding)

5000 character(s) maximum

E. Initiatives to foster a rule of law culture

If there have been developments related to initiatives to foster a rule of law culture, please specify, which (e.g. debates in national parliaments on the rule of law, public information campaigns on rule of law issues, contributions from civil society, education initiatives, etc.)

5000 character(s) maximum

As discussed in Háttér Society's 2024 submission, the Legal Equality Thematic Working Group replacing the previously operating LGBT Working Group under the auspices of the Human Rights Roundtable does not serve as a consultative forum for LGBTQI civil society organizations. The Working Group's bylaws do not mention sexual and gender minorities. In 2025 the Working Group did not have the prescribed number of meetings, and Háttér's recommended topics for discussion were never put on the agenda even when the Working Group met.

Any other developments related to the system of checks and balances - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

Cross-pillar elements: cross-border rule of law issues related to the Single Market

If there are any significant challenges concerning the Single Market you have been facing in a cross-border context relating to any of the four pillars of the report, including for example issues with market access and the conditions for economic activities, that you would like to highlight, please do so here.

Given the cross-cutting nature of this question, it is included as a separate section in the questionnaire. Information collected under this question will however be integrated under the relevant existing pillar(s) of the Report.

5000 character(s) maximum

Supporting document upload

If you would like to submit any supporting document(s) to your contribution, please upload your file(s) here

Contact

rule-of-law-network@ec.europa.eu