



*Association of European Administrative Judges / Vereinigung der Europäischen Verwaltungsrichter /
Fédération européenne des juges administratifs / Associazione dei Magistrati Amministrativi Europei*

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE ACTION WEEK FOR THE RULE OF LAW IN AUSTRIA

The Association of European Administrative Judges (AEAJ) expresses its full support for the "Action Week for the Rule of Law" organised from 12 to 16 October 2026 by the Austrian associations of judges and prosecutors, especially the Austrian apex association of administrative judges and AEAJ member DVVR (*Dachverband der Verwaltungsrichter:innen*).

Everyone seeking justice has the right to a fair trial within a reasonable time under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights. This requires courts to be adequately funded and staffed. European standards are clear: the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe has recommended that a sufficient number of judges and qualified support staff should be allocated to the courts¹, and the European Network of Councils for the Judiciary (ENCJ) has called for court budgets to be adapted to their workload². Persistent understaffing places an excessive workload on individual judges and consequently affects the quality and timeliness of judicial decisions³.

AEAJ further reaffirms its commitment to its Lisbon Statement on Judicial Remuneration and to the principles providing for an adequate, stable, and appropriate remuneration of judges as an essential safeguard of judicial independence and the Rule of law.

AEAJ therefore calls on the Austrian government and Parliament to provide the courts with the budget, judges and staff they need.

Adopted by the AEAJ Board on October 1st, 2026

Mr Sylvain Mérenne
President of the AEAJ

Ms Camille Vinet
General Secretary of the AEAJ

¹ Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on judges: independence, efficiency and responsibilities, par. 33 and 35.

² ENCJ, *Report on Independence, Accountability and Quality of the Judiciary*, 2023–2024

³ CCJE, Opinion No. 28 (2025), par. 14 and 21