SLOVAKIA

Anton Dulak

The Protective Purpose of a Rule

Judgment of the Constitutional Court of the Slovak Republic of 9 May 2017, Case No. II ÚS 295/2017/11

Facts:

- Cooperate farm (investor) went bankrupt, while the members of the cooperate farm, who used the services of a bonds trader, lost their savings.
- Claim for a compensation for damage from the National Bank ... National Bank's erroneous bank supervision.

Judgment of the Court of first instance + the Appellate court:

"...the complaining party did not prove the National Bank's negligence"

The state's responsibility for damage inflicted as a result of erroneous institutional process requires the inflicted damage to be a result of the very erroneous institutional process. This is the case when the institutional process, or the result of the process, was conceived as a means to protect not only the general interests of society, but also the very infliction of damage upon the damaged party.

- the complaining party, as an investor, must have known that investing in the performance of a cooperate farm carries certain risks
- state authorities can only monitor proceedings in the limits defined and controlled by the law

- there is no subjective right or claim to 'correct' or 'accurate' lawful bank supervision, which would then create a claim for damage compensation when such supervision fails.
- basic bank supervision is a conceptual, and rather (economically) political activity – not a traditional administrative activity that Act No. 514/2003 Z. z. has in mind.

damage does not have to be compensated, as long as the purpose of the legal regulation surrounding it was not to protect from such damage.

References:

- German concept "Schutzzweck der Norm"
- Court ruling of 22 April 1058 (BHBZ 27, 137)
- European Court of Justice in the matter ESD C-222/02