Contribution ID: d2276e31-7a55-4386-abad-67af573e12ef

Date: 10/01/2022 14:51:23

## Anti-SLAPP Initiative

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

#### Introduction

With upholding democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights high on the Commission's agenda (<u>Politic al Guidelines</u>), protecting journalists and civil society from strategic lawsuits against public participation (SLAPP) is one of the key actions in the European democracy action plan[1]. The European Parliament, also concerned about this issue, is drafting an own-initiative report[2].

SLAPP – a relatively recent form of harassment – are increasingly used against journalists, rights defenders and others (such as media outlets or civil society organisations) who are involved in protecting the public interest. SLAPP are typically meritless lawsuits lodged by powerful individuals or entities (companies or state bodies) against weaker parties who express a critical stance on an issue of major public interest, in order to intimidate and ultimately silence such parties by draining their resources – filing high damages claims or lengthening proceedings, for example.

The Commission's <u>research[3]</u> shows that SLAPP are on the rise in the EU. The Council of Europe's Platform[4], which monitors SLAPP alerts, has also highlighted the growing pressure on journalists in Europe. Given the harm done in this way to the people who play a key role in upholding democracy in the EU by serving the public interest, the EU must act swiftly and decisively to curb SLAPP.

This is why the Commission is conducting this survey on what the EU can do about this. The survey's aim is twofold:

- to identify the problems in this area and get the public's views on what needs to be done to tackle them:
- to ask the public for their views on possible legislative and non-legislative anti-SLAPP measures.

Answer the questions that apply to you or that you are able to answer given your or your organisation's experience.

- [1] Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the European democracy action plan, COM (2020) 790 final, 3.12.2020.
- [2] 'Draft report on the strengthening of democracy and media freedom and pluralism in the EU: the undue use of actions under civil and criminal law to silence journalists, NGOs and civil society', 2021/2036(INI).
- $\hbox{[3]} \ \underline{\text{https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/ad-hoc-literature-review-analysis-key-elements-slapp\_en.pdf}$
- [4] https://www.coe.int/en/web/media-freedom/all-alerts

### About you

	,
*Lang	uage of my contribution
	Bulgarian
0	Croatian
0	Czech
0	Danish
0	Dutch
•	English
	Estonian
	Finnish
	French
0	German
0	Greek
0	Hungarian
	Irish
0	Italian
	Latvian
	Lithuanian
	Maltese
0	Polish
0	Portuguese
	Romanian
	Slovak

- \*I am giving my contribution as
  - Academic/research institution
  - Business association
  - Company/business organisation
  - Consumer organisation
  - EU citizen

Slovenian

Spanish

Swedish

Environmental organisation

Non-EU citizen	
Non-governmental organisation (NGO)	
Public authority	
Trade union	
Other	
If you are a legal practitioner, where do you work?	
Judicial authority	
Law firm	
Other	
Please specify	
The General Council of the Bar of England & Wales represents its 17,000+ barrister members, the of whom are in independent practice. It is also the approved regulator through the independent Bar Standards Board.	
*First name	
Evanna	
*Surname	
FRUITHOF	
*Email (this won't be published)	
evanna.fruithof@barcouncil.be	
*Organisation name	
255 character(s) maximum	
The General Council of the Bar of England & Wales (The Bar Council)	
*Organisation size	
Micro (1 to 9 employees)	
<ul><li>Small (10 to 49 employees)</li></ul>	
Medium (50 to 249 employees)	
Large (250 or more)	
(— · · · · · · · /	

## Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

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

39850528734-23			

4	$\sim$		•		
*	/ , OII	ntr.	$\sim$ t	origii	$\sim$
	( (( )( )	IIIIV		( )   ( )	
	-	,	$\mathbf{\circ}$	011911	

2 6	ease	e add your country of orig	in, o	or that of your organisation	n.			
		Afghanistan		Djibouti		Libya		Saint Martin
	0	Åland Islands	0	Dominica	0	Liechtenstein	0	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
		Albania		Dominican		Lithuania		Saint Vincent
				Republic				and the
								Grenadines
		Algeria		Ecuador		Luxembourg		Samoa
	0	American Samoa		Egypt		Macau		San Marino
	0	Andorra	0	El Salvador		Madagascar		São Tomé and
								Príncipe
		Angola		Equatorial Guinea	a	Malawi		Saudi Arabia
		Anguilla		Eritrea		Malaysia		Senegal
		Antarctica		Estonia		Maldives		Serbia
	0	Antigua and		Eswatini		Mali		Seychelles
		Barbuda						
		Argentina		Ethiopia		Malta		Sierra Leone
		Armenia		Falkland Islands		Marshall Islands		Singapore
	0	Aruba		Faroe Islands		Martinique		Sint Maarten
	0	Australia		Fiji		Mauritania		Slovakia
	0	Austria		Finland		Mauritius		Slovenia
		Azerbaijan		France		Mayotte		Solomon Islands
	0	Bahamas		French Guiana		Mexico		Somalia
	0	Bahrain	0	French Polynesia	0	Micronesia		South Africa
		Bangladesh		French Southern		Moldova		South Georgia
				and Antarctic				and the South
				Lands				Sandwich
								Islands
		Barbados		Gabon		Monaco		South Korea

	Belarus		Georgia		Mongolia		South Sudan
	Belgium		Germany	0	Montenegro		Spain
	Belize	0	Ghana	0	Montserrat	0	Sri Lanka
	Benin	0	Gibraltar	0	Morocco	0	Sudan
	Bermuda		Greece	0	Mozambique		Suriname
	Bhutan	0	Greenland	0	Myanmar/Burma	0	Svalbard and
							Jan Mayen
	Bolivia		Grenada	0	Namibia		Sweden
0	Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	©	Guadeloupe	0	Nauru	©	Switzerland
0	Bosnia and	0	Guam	0	Nepal	0	Syria
	Herzegovina		Guam		Ποραί		- Cyria
0	Botswana	0	Guatemala	0	Netherlands	0	Taiwan
0	Bouvet Island	0	Guernsey	0	New Caledonia	0	Tajikistan
0	Brazil	0	Guinea	0	New Zealand		Tanzania
0	British Indian		Guinea-Bissau	0	Nicaragua	0	Thailand
	Ocean Territory				· ·		
	British Virgin	0	Guyana	0	Niger	0	The Gambia
	Islands						
0	Brunei		Haiti	0	Nigeria		Timor-Leste
0	Bulgaria		Heard Island and	0	Niue		Togo
			McDonald Islands	3			
	Burkina Faso	0	Honduras	0	Norfolk Island	0	Tokelau
0	Burundi		Hong Kong	0	Northern	0	Tonga
					Mariana Islands		
0	Cambodia		Hungary	0	North Korea		Trinidad and
				_			Tobago
0	Cameroon	0	Iceland	0	North Macedonia	0	Tunisia
0	Canada	0	India		Norway	0	Turkey
	Cape Verde	0	Indonesia	0	Oman	0	Turkmenistan
0	Cayman Islands	0	Iran	0	Pakistan		Turks and
_				_			Caicos Islands
0	Central African Republic	0	Iraq	0	Palau	0	Tuvalu

	Chad	Ireland	Palestine	0	Uganda
	Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	0	Ukraine
	China	Israel	Papua New	0	United Arab
			Guinea		Emirates
	Christmas Island	Italy	Paraguay	0	United Kingdom
	Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	0	United States
	Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	0	United States
	Islands				Minor Outlying
					Islands
	Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	0	Uruguay
	Comoros	Jordan	Poland		US Virgin Islands
	Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	0	Uzbekistan
	Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico	0	Vanuatu
	Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	0	Vatican City
	Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	0	Venezuela
	Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	0	Vietnam
	Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	0	Wallis and
					Futuna
	Curaçao	Laos	Rwanda	0	Western Sahara
	Cyprus	Latvia	Saint Barthélemy	0	Yemen
	Czechia	Lebanon	Saint Helena		Zambia
			Ascension and		
			Tristan da Cunha		
0	Democratic	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and	0	Zimbabwe
	Republic of the		Nevis		
	Congo				
	Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia		

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published. Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

## \*Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

### Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

#### Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

1.	Are you familiar with the term	'strategic lawsuits against publ	ic
pa	rticipation' (SLAPP)?		

- Yes
- ON O
- I don't know/No reply

### 2. Are you aware of SLAPP in your own country?

- Yes
- O No
- I don't know/No reply

### Please specify

5	500 character(s) maximum	

# 3. What do you think is the current situation in terms of SLAPP in your own country?

- The number of cases has been growing considerably
- The number of cases has been slightly growing

0

The number of cases has remained the same
The number of cases has been slightly decreasing
The number of cases has been decreasing considerably
I don't know/No reply
4. Are you aware of SLAPP in (a) country (countries) other than your own?
Specify which country/countries and provide examples.
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Czechia Czechia
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland
Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Malta
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Please provide examples
500 character(s) maximum

5. If you know of one or more SLAPP in the EU, is there a cross-border aspect (the case does not relate to one country only, but to several)? If yes, specify the country/countries involved.
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Czechia
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Ireland
Latvia
Lithuania
Malta
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
6. Who is the target (defendant) in the SLAPP you know of?
Journalist
Rights defender (individual)
Media outlet
Civil society organisation

Body or institution defending human rights
Other individual or organisation – please specify
✓ I don't know/No reply
6.1. Are you aware of the field of activity on which these targets are active?
Yes
No
7. Who is the alleged perpetrator (applicant or claimant) in the SLAPP you
know of?
Public administration or state body
Company
Organisation (e.g. business association, political organisation)
Politician
Private person acting in his/her personal capacity
Other – please specify
I don't know/No reply
8. Are you aware of cases in which no lawsuit(s) was/were filed but a
journalist, rights defender or an organisation/body/institution was threatened
with litigation or other action in order to intimidate them?
Yes, legal threats without actual litigation, other parallel procedures
Yes, other form of intimidation – please specify
No
<ul><li>No</li><li>9. What do you think are the consequences of SLAPP for the targets</li></ul>
9. What do you think are the consequences of SLAPP for the targets
9. What do you think are the consequences of SLAPP for the targets (defendants)?
9. What do you think are the consequences of SLAPP for the targets (defendants)?  No consequences
<ul> <li>9. What do you think are the consequences of SLAPP for the targets (defendants)?</li> <li>No consequences</li> <li>Targets are intimidated but can continue to do their work</li> <li>Targets are silenced and avoid engaging in debate on matters of public</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9. What do you think are the consequences of SLAPP for the targets (defendants)?</li> <li>No consequences</li> <li>Targets are intimidated but can continue to do their work</li> <li>Targets are silenced and avoid engaging in debate on matters of public interest that could trigger SLAPP</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9. What do you think are the consequences of SLAPP for the targets (defendants)?</li> <li>No consequences</li> <li>Targets are intimidated but can continue to do their work</li> <li>Targets are silenced and avoid engaging in debate on matters of public interest that could trigger SLAPP</li> <li>Targets stop engaging in debate on matters of public interest altogether</li> </ul>

The Bar Council acknowledges the research conducted by the EU, the Council of Europe, other international bodies and relevant NGOs into the consequences of SLAPP for targets, and based upon that research recognises that targets are often silenced and avoid engaging in debate on matters of public interest that could trigger SLAPP, and that some targets stop engaging on matters of public interest altogether.

# 10. Do you think that the lack of EU-wide safeguards against SLAPP poses a problem to public participation?

- Yes, it is a serious problem
- Yes, it is a somewhat serious problem
- Yes, but not a serious problem
- No, it is not a problem
- I don't know/No reply

#### Please comment if needed

500 character(s) maximum

Based upon the research referred to in answer to Q 9, it is recognised that EU-wide safeguards against SLAPPs, provided they strike the necessary delicate balance, may mitigate their effect, and that the lack of such safeguards is therefore a somewhat serious problem. As developed further in the Bar Council's accompanying preliminary position paper, any such balanced EU-wide safeguards would best be developed in collaboration with third states where SLAPPs have been identified, such as the UK.

# 11. What measures do you think would effectively curb the use of SLAPP in the EU?

- Legislation (e.g. procedural safeguards against SLAPP)
- Non-legislative measures (e.g. recommendations or guidelines or sharing best practices)
- A combination of legislation and non-legislative measures
- Financial support for bodies that specialise in supporting targets
- Other please specify
- I don't know/No reply
- None of the above

## 12. What type of legislative measures do you think would make a real difference in this area?

- Civil procedural safeguards against SLAPP, such as early dismissal of a lawsuit and accelerated proceedings
- Legal aid to targets of SLAPP

Third-party interventions and allowing representative organisations to act on behalf of targets of SLAPP
Private international law rules (e.g. on jurisdiction and applicable law)
Other – please specify
I don't know/No reply
None of the above
None of the above
13. What assistance do you think targets (defendants) in SLAPP need?
Information on SLAPP
Information about legal professionals or other bodies/people that could help
Legal assistance (e.g. pro-bono lawyers)
Monitoring of SLAPP
None of the above
Other forms of assistance – please specify
I don't know/No reply
14. Are you aware if, in your country, there are associations or other legal
bodies offering assistance (e.g. information or legal assistance) to targets of
SLAPP?
Yes, there are. Please explain and provide examples
No
I don't know/No reply
14.1. Should there be such an association/body in every EU country?
Yes
No
I don't know/No reply
15. Which of the following non-legislative measures do you think would help
curb the use of SLAPP?
Raising awareness of SLAPP
Training legal professionals
Sharing good practices among EU countries
Sharing good practices among legal professionals
Monitoring SLAPP in the EU
None of the above – please explain

16. To whom should awareness-raising activities be addres	sed?
Citizens	
Journalists and human rights defenders	
Legal professionals	

None of the above

Others – please specify

Other – please explain

### 17. What should training activities on SLAPP focus on?

Specify the main themes that the training should cover and who the target audience should be

500 character(s) maximum

Training activities on SLAPP should focus on: (i) avoidance, by training publishers in how to safely report on matters of public interest (so far as possible); (ii) mitigation, by setting out any assistance available and how to access it in the event that a publisher is targeted; and (iii) defence, by explaining to publishers the relevant domestic law and procedure.

#### Other

# 18. Please comment or give any additional information you would like to give on SLAPP.

The Commission would like to know your views on specific aspects of this initiative and/or references to relevant research.

5000 character(s) maximum

The Bar Council has developed a short, preliminary position paper setting out some key issues and concerns. That paper is being submitted directly to the consultation email address, and will also be made available on the Bar Council's consultation webpage, at: https://www.barcouncil.org.uk/policy-representation/consultations.html

We would be delighted to follow up in writing or otherwise on any of the matters raised.

If you have any questions, send an email to JUST-A1-CIVIL-JUSTICE@ec.europa.eu, putting Public consultation on SLAPP in the subject line.

#### Contact

JUST-A1-CIVIL-JUSTICE@ec.europa.eu