



## Input by civil society organisations to the Asylum Report 2026

Dear Colleagues,

The production of the *Asylum Report 2026* is currently underway. The annual [Asylum Report](#) presents an overview of developments in the field of international protection in Europe.

The report includes information and perspectives from various stakeholders, including experts from EU+ countries, civil society organisations, researchers and UNHCR. To this end, we invite you, our partners from civil society, academia and research institutions, to share your reporting on developments in asylum law, policies or practices in 2025 by topic as presented in the online survey (**'Part A' of the form**).

We also invite you to share with us any publications your organisation has produced throughout 2025 on issues related to asylum in EU+ countries (**'Part B' of the form**).

These may be:

- reports;
- articles;
- recommendations to national authorities or EU institutions;
- open letters and analytical outputs.

Your input can cover information for a specific EU+ country or the EU as a whole. You can complete all or only some of the sections.

Please note that the Asylum Report does not seek to describe national systems in detail but rather to present key developments of the past year, including improvements and challenges which remain.

All submissions are publicly accessible. For transparency, contributions will be published on the EUAA webpage and contributing organisations will be listed under the [Acknowledgements](#) of the report.

All contributions should be appropriately referenced. You may include links to supporting material, such as:

- analytical studies;
- articles;
- reports;
- websites;
- press releases;
- position papers.

Some sources of information may be in a language other than English. In this case, please cite the original language and, if possible, provide one to two sentences describing the key messages in English.





The content of the Asylum Report is subject to terms of reference and volume limitations. Contributions from civil society organisations feed into EUAA's work in multiple ways and inform reports and analyses beyond the Asylum Report.

***NB: Similarly to last year, this year's edition of the Asylum Report will be leaner and more analytical, with streamlined thematic sections. The focus will be on key trends in the field of asylum rather than on individual developments. For this reason, information shared by respondents to this call may be incorporated in the Asylum Report in a format different than in the past years. It will also feature prominently as info boxes in the [country overviews](#).***

Your input matters to us and will be much appreciated!

\*Please submit your contribution to the Asylum Report 2026 by **Friday, 9 January 2026**.\*





## Contact details

---

Name of organisation: Slovak Humanitarian Council

Name and title of contact person: Mgr. Peter Devínsky

Email: devinsky.peter@gmail.com

I accept the provisions of the EUAA [Legal and Privacy Statements](#)

## General Observations

---

Before sharing information by thematic area, please provide your general observations on asylum developments as indicated in the following three fields:

**1. What areas would you highlight where important developments took place in the country/countries you cover?**

There have been no significant legislative developments related to asylum in Slovakia. A new landmark law on international protection is still in the process of adoption, which will replace the previous Act No. 480/2002 Coll. on Asylum. There are several crucial changes stipulated; however, we do not find it important to include them here for this purpose, as the law has not yet been adopted. The most notable developments were, however, related to court decision-making (see point 15) and the practice of competent authorities (see *inter alia* point 12).

**2. What are the areas, where only few or no developments took place?**

The Slovak humanitarian council still records cases where the Migration Office does not respect court decisions (decisions of second instance).

**3. Would you have any observations to share specifically about the implementation of the Pact on Migration and Asylum in the national context of the country/ countries you cover?**

Refer to point 1.





## PART A: Contributions by topic

---

Please share **your reporting on developments in asylum law, policies or practices in 2025 by topic**. Kindly make sure that you provide information on:

- ✓ New developments and improvements in 2025 and new or remaining challenges;
- ✓ Changes in legislation, policies or practices, or institutional changes during 2025.

1. **Access to territory and access to the asylum procedure** (including first arrival to territory and registration, arrival at the border, application of the *non-refoulement* principle, the right to first response (shelter, food, medical treatment) and issues regarding border guards)
  
2. **Access to information and legal assistance** (including counselling and representation)

The Slovak humanitarian council provides legal advice and legal representation at all instances of the asylum procedure. Asylum seekers in Slovakia already have the access to legal representation during the administrative phase of the procedure and subsequently, also in court proceedings. Asylum seekers have information on the possibility of representation after the submission of the application in the refugee camp, where our organization's employees also work.

3. **Provision of interpretation services** (e.g. introduction of innovative methods for interpretation, increase/decrease in the number of languages available, change in qualifications required for interpreters)

The Slovak humanitarian council still perceives some problems in connection with interpretation in some specific languages. In Slovakia, there is a lack of interpreters for some languages (for example, Somali or Sinhala), so the double interpretation needs to be used (Slovak - English - the second language), which can distort what is said.

We also note there is a lack of official interpreters. The use of unofficial interpreters can affect the level of conducting an interview with an asylum seeker.

4. **Dublin procedures** (including the organisational framework, practical developments, suspension of transfers to selected countries, detention in the framework of Dublin procedures)

The Slovak humanitarian council see a problem in the fact that if the Migration Office decides that an asylum application is inadmissible due to the responsibility of another state, filing a lawsuit against that decision does not have a suspensive effect and, in our





experience, the courts do not grant suspensive effect to those lawsuits. In practice, a situation may be that a person has already been transferred to the responsible state, and the court will only decide on that case later, which can cause complications. Such asylum seekers are transferred from open camps to detention center, from where they are transferred to the responsible state.

Our organization does not have information about the suspension of transfers to selected countries.

5. **Special procedures** (including border procedures, procedures in transit zones, accelerated procedures, admissibility procedures, prioritised procedures or any special procedure for selected caseloads)
  
6. **Reception of applicants for international protection** (including information on reception capacities – increase/decrease/stable, material reception conditions – housing, food, clothing and financial support, contingency planning in reception, access to the labour market and vocational training, medical care, schooling and education, residence and freedom of movement)

After submitting their applications, asylum seekers are placed in a reception facility where initial administrative procedures and health examinations take place. Then they are moved to an open camp, which they can leave with permission from the Migration Office. In the camps, they are provided with accommodation, food, clothing, small amount of pocket money and the possibility of performing assistance work, attending Slovak classes (once a week), social, psychological and legal counseling provided by our NGO. Also there is a possibility for a school attendance in the Slovak elementary school. Asylum seekers are entitled to urgent health care.

Asylum seekers can work after 6 months from the start of the asylum procedure (submission of an asylum application) on the basis of a permission to enter the labor market (issued by the Migration Office). This period will probably not be shortened, but asylum seekers would be interested in it.

7. **Detention of applicants for international protection** (including detention capacity – increase/decrease/stable, practices regarding detention, grounds for detention, alternatives to detention, time limit for detention)

It is also possible to detain an asylum seeker by Slovak law. According to the experience of our organization in detentions centers are mainly asylum seekers who applied for international protection after their detention (for the purpose of expulsion) or if it is necessary due to a threat to state security or public order. Also, due to the execution of the transfer to the responsible state under the Dublin Regulation or sometimes in cases of repeated asylum applications. The maximum period of detention is 18 months. The





alternative to detention is reporting of residence or a financial guarantee. We also register cases of asylum seekers with alternatives to detention, but there are not many of them.

**8. Procedures at first instance** (including relevant changes in: the authority in charge, organisation of the process, interviews, evidence assessment, determination of international protection status, decision-making, timeframes, case management – including backlog management)

The Migration Office decides on applications for international protection. According to the law, they are required to make a decision within 6 months of the start of the asylum procedure and, in our experience, this deadline is respected.

The Slovak humanitarian council still records cases where we believe that the Migration Office doesn't respect court decisions, as a result of which it takes a very long time for the asylum seeker to obtain international protection. The court returns the case back to the Migration Office for a decision, it does not decide on the granting of international protection itself.

**9. Procedures at second instance** (including organisation of the process, hearings, written procedures, timeframes, case management – including backlog management)

The Slovak humanitarian council positively assess the establishment of administrative courts in Slovakia and the institutional separation of administrative justice from general courts. So, from 2023, administrative lawsuits in asylum cases are no longer decided by general courts, but by specialized administrative courts in Bratislava and Košice, which in our opinion has led to more professional and faster decision-making. According to the law, the court decides within 90 days to file an administrative lawsuit, and the courts respect this deadline. It is possible to file a cassation appeal against the judgment of the administrative court to the Supreme Administrative Court which needs to decide within 60 days of submitting the case from the administrative court.

None of the courts grants international protection directly, they only return the case back to the Migration Office for a decision (if the court agrees with the lawsuit/cassation appeal).

**10. Issues of statelessness in the context of asylum** (including identification and registration)





**11. Children and applicants with special needs** (special reception facilities, identification mechanisms/referrals, procedural standards, provision of information, age assessment, legal guardianship and foster care for unaccompanied and separated children)

In Slovakia, we have two open camps, one for adult male individuals and the other primarily for vulnerable groups of asylum seekers such as families, women, people with serious health problems, the elderly, etc.

Unaccompanied minors are placed in the center in Medzilaborce and Bratislava, not in one of these camps. Special legislation also applies to them in relation to the interview, when it can only be in the presence of a guardian, who must have the opportunity to inform the minor about the significance and possible consequences of the interview and prepare him for the interview before. The guardian has the opportunity to ask questions or make comments during the interview.

**12. Content of protection** (including access to social security, social assistance, health care, housing and other basic services; integration into the labor market; measures to enhance language skills; measures to improve attainment in schooling and/or the education system and/or vocational training)

After being granted international protection, there is an obligation to leave the camp, or the possibility of staying there for only a short time, which can be a shock. For people with international protection is mostly difficult to find a job or secure expensive accommodation. Since asylum seekers can only enter the labor market after 6 months from the start of the asylum procedure, if they are granted international protection within this period, they have never worked in Slovakia. There is also a problem with the level of Slovak - the classes in the camp are insufficient.

Newborn babies face significant health care risks when born to asylum applicants. Even when a baby is born to couples with international protection, the Migration Office carries out a full procedure that usually takes at least three months to issue a decision. During this period, as the baby stays outside the camp with their parents, obtaining necessary vaccinations remains at the parents' discretion. However, doctors are often unwilling to provide vaccination services - according to the applicable law (Act No. 580/2004 Coll. on Health Insurance<sup>1</sup>), asylum applicants are entitled only to urgent care, the definition of which is so vague<sup>2</sup> that doctors can easily—and often do—reject the provision of such services.

Once a person is granted subsidiary protection, the Act on Health Insurance states that they have an entitlement to health care reimbursement, which is to be provided through

---

<sup>1</sup> Act No. 580/2004 Coll. on Health Insurance (Zákon č. 580/2004 Z. z. o zdravotnom poistení), available in English at: <https://natlex ilo.org/dyn/natlex2/natlex2/files/download/72642/SVK-72642.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Act No. 576/2004 Coll. on Health Care, § 2 para. 3 (defining urgent care) [Zákon č. 576/2004 Z. z. o zdravotnej starostlivosti, § 2 ods. 3]





an entitlement certificate.<sup>3</sup> The health care provided this way is to be paid for by the health insurance agency with the highest number of insured persons.<sup>4</sup> However, doctors report that when they provide services to persons with the entitlement certificate, the reimbursements are not provided, which often leads to the refusal of health care.

There are also differences in the health insurance provided to refugees and persons granted subsidiary protection. While subsidiary protection beneficiaries are entitled to the aforementioned health insurance, refugees are entitled to proper, fully compensated public health insurance for only six months<sup>5</sup>, leaving both groups disadvantaged in different ways. Beneficiaries of subsidiary protection have an unlimited right to compensation for provided health care, which often leads to its refusal due to non-repayment of services to doctors. Meanwhile, refugees are obliged to either: (i) start working within six months to be insured based on employment and the regular payments stemming therefrom; (ii) register as unemployed and actively seek work, which is subject to monitoring by the Labour Office; or (iii) become self-payers (monthly EUR 107.25 for 2025; EUR 121.92 for 2026—note also the significant annual increase).

In accordance with Act No. 245/2008 Coll. on Upbringing and Education<sup>6</sup>, only children with permanent residence are explicitly subject to mandatory school attendance.<sup>7</sup> Children granted subsidiary protection, which confers only temporary residence status, are therefore not under mandatory school attendance obligation. As schools, especially in larger cities, have often reached capacity (already problematic due to the large influx of Ukrainian children), finding a school placement takes considerable time, and there is no mechanism compelling any school to accept such children (unlike the case with children holding permanent residence). This situation is further exacerbated by the fact that children often do not speak the state language, prompting schools to refuse admission even when capacity is available. This leads to situations where children are finally enrolled in schools far from their homes, or parents are forced to pay costly fees to register their children in private schools.

The most significant current issues relate to making appointments at the Foreign Police Department, which handles not only the issuance of residence permits (IDs) and foreigners' passports but also the submission of applications for the extension of subsidiary protection. For the majority of the past year, it was impossible for foreigners to make appointments, especially in the largest cities. From different reports<sup>8</sup> it

---

<sup>3</sup> Act No. 580/2004 Coll. on Health Insurance, § 9h para. 1 letter a) (entitlement certificate provision)

<sup>4</sup> Act No. 580/2004 Coll. on Health Insurance, § 9h para. 3 (reimbursement by health insurance agency with highest number of insured persons)

<sup>5</sup> Act No. 580/2004 Coll. on Health Insurance, § 11 para. 7 letter q) (six-month public health insurance for refugees)

<sup>6</sup> Act No. 245/2008 Coll. on Upbringing and Education (School Act) [Zákon č. 245/2008 Z. z. o výchove a vzdelávaní (školský zákon)]

<sup>7</sup> Act No. 245/2008 Coll. on Upbringing and Education (School Act), § 20 para. 5 (mandatory school attendance for children with permanent residence)

<sup>8</sup> "Trade in appointments at Foreign Police ends - reservation system undergoes major overhaul," TA3, 2025, <https://www.ta3.com/clanok/1007841/obchod-s-terminmi-na-cudzineckej-policii-konci->





appeared that some individuals were able to capture all available time slots once they appeared in the online reservation system and then sell them to people willing to pay (typically around EUR 150). The problem escalated to such an extent that the Foreign Police Department began granting exemptions for the most urgent cases, allowing individuals to visit the department without reservations based on their agreement. The police even created official email addresses where people can apply for these exemptions—e.g., [ocpvynimkyzapad@minv.sk](mailto:ocpvynimkyzapad@minv.sk) (“Foreign Police Department Exemptions West”)<sup>9</sup>. Many people received appointments this way, though many others did not.

The Ministry of Interior eventually introduced a new two-tier online reservation system in 2025, separating appointments for authorised foreigners (those with already-issued residence permits, using a code linked to the chip in the residence permit) and unauthorised foreigners (those without permits, who enter details manually) to reduce misuse and streamline visits. Applicants, however, still face challenges. For the second mentioned group, appointments are usually unavailable in larger cities, and the use of codes linked to residence permits is problematic, often making it difficult or even impossible for some applicants in the first group to book appointments. The Foreign Police Department does not provide substantial support for making appointments through this system or for resolving technical issues, thus making it very challenging for people not proficient with digital technologies to secure an appointment.

To apply for EU long-term residence after five years of continuous residence in Slovakia, beneficiaries of subsidiary protection must provide either: a valid passport from their country of origin; or a Slovak passport supplemented with another identification document (normally from their country of origin)<sup>10</sup>. Without such documentation, they have no other means to obtain permanent residence and therefore cannot apply for citizenship, as they must hold permanent residence at least at the time of application (in addition to having resided legally in Slovakia continuously for at least ten years)<sup>11</sup>. Many subsidiary protection beneficiaries lack such identification documents. When they do possess them, these documents are often not accepted by the police, deemed untrustworthy and falsified after analysis (for which no statutory deadline is provided in the law). This situation results in many subsidiary protection beneficiaries living in Slovakia for more than ten, twenty and perhaps even forever on the basis of temporary residence, as they are unable to obtain a passport from their country of origin or provide another identification document.

A new amendment entered into force in July 2025 regarding long-term residence. Applicants are now required to submit a certificate issued by an accredited language

---

[rezervacny-system-presiel-velkou-upravou](https://rezervacny-system-presiel-velkou-upravou) ; "Foreign Police in Slovakia," Kapitál, 2025, <https://kapital-noviny.sk/cudzinecka-policia-na-slovensku/>

<sup>9</sup> Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic, Foreign Police Department exemption information, available at: <https://www.minv.sk/?objednavaci-system-vynimky>

<sup>10</sup> Act No. 404/2011 Coll. on the Residence of Foreigners, § 125 para. 3 and § 52 para. 1 letter a) (documentation requirements for EU long-term residence) [Zákon č. 404/2011 Z. z. o pobyte cudzincov]

<sup>11</sup> Act No. 40/1993 Coll. on Citizenship of the Slovak Republic, § 7 para. 2 letter g) (permanent residence requirement for citizenship application) [Zákon č. 40/1993 Z. z. o štátnom občianstve SR]





school proving they have successfully passed an A2 language examination. There is no publicly available information about which schools are accredited to provide this service, and some accredited schools were unaware they had this authority (discovering it only when many foreigners began contacting them for this purpose). Others, however, were well aware of this competency and by July began charging around EUR 80-100 for the exam. By December, the price had increased to EUR 180 at the same schools<sup>12</sup>, with the least expensive option in Bratislava priced at EUR 123. The examination is therefore not provided by the state, and it is entirely at the discretion of private language schools to charge whatever they wish. The law does not regulate this at all, yet foreigners are obligated to provide this certificate. Additionally, applicants must pay EUR 250 for the submission of the application and EUR 10 for the delivery of their new ID if successful. The state by itself provides only limited or irregular opportunities to learn the state language.

A new problem has arisen due to a recent amendment to Act No. 480/2002 Coll. on Asylum, according to which refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection are not entitled to initial financial integration support if they previously held permanent residence, temporary residence, or tolerated residence (currently provided to Ukrainian people under the name temporary protection) in the Slovak Republic.<sup>13</sup> Many successful applicants did have some form of residence previously in Slovakia. Some Ukrainian people preferred to apply later for international protection instead of the already provided temporary protection and are then required to leave the camp without any finances at all, leaving them extremely vulnerable. Some applicants studied in Slovakia in the past or participated in volunteering programmes, but after their stay in the camp, they are not provided with any financial support and must therefore rely solely on NGOs with available finances. This amendment was adopted in 2024, but only in the previous year did its effects become striking.

There is a significant difference between the possibilities for applying for Slovak citizenship. Persons with subsidiary protection must stay continuously in Slovakia for at least ten years and, if they have already been granted permanent residence, may apply for citizenship. If their application is successful, they are subject to an administrative fee of EUR 1,000.<sup>14</sup> Refugees with granted asylum, on the other hand, may apply for citizenship four years after their asylum was granted.<sup>15</sup> Should their application be successful, they are exempt from payment of any administrative fee.<sup>16</sup> This leads to

---

<sup>12</sup> Examples of language examination fees: iCAN School, <https://skuska.icanschool.sk/> ; ECU, <https://www.eku.sk/produkt/jazykova-skuska-a2-zo-slovenskeho-jazyka-pre-cudzincov/> (accessed December 2025)

<sup>13</sup> Act No. 480/2002 Coll. on Asylum, § 28 para. 7 (exclusion from initial financial integration support for persons with previous residence) [Zákon č. 480/2002 Z. z. o azyle]

<sup>14</sup> Act No. 145/1995 Coll. on Administrative Fees (EUR 1,000 fee for citizenship application by beneficiaries of subsidiary protection) [Zákon č. 145/1995 Z. z. o správnych poplatkoch]

<sup>15</sup> Act No. 40/1993 Coll. on Citizenship of the Slovak Republic, § 7 para. 2 letter e) (four-year residence requirement for refugees to apply for citizenship) [Zákon č. 40/1993 Z. z. o štátnom občianstve SR]

<sup>16</sup> Act No. 145/1995 Coll. on Administrative Fees (exemption from administrative fee for refugees applying for citizenship) [Zákon č. 145/1995 Z. z. o správnych poplatkoch]





frustration among beneficiaries of subsidiary protection, as their integration with regard to their status is much more problematic compared to refugees.

### **13. Return of former applicants for international protection**

Former asylum seekers have the option of assisted voluntary return. We highly value the option of assisted voluntary return through IOM (International Organisation for Migration), when former asylum seekers also have the option to stay in the camp until their voluntary return is completed. In addition to IOM, FRONTEX also carries out voluntary returns from Slovakia, but only from the detention centers.

If a former asylum seeker is not interested in voluntary return, it is possible that he or she will be detained and his or her return to the home country will be forced. There are some countries where the Slovak Republic does not deport.

### **14. Resettlement and humanitarian admission programmes** (including EU Joint Resettlement Programme, national resettlement programme (UNHCR), National Humanitarian Admission Programme, private sponsorship programmes/schemes and ad hoc special programmes)

### **15. National jurisprudence on international protection in 2025** (please include a link to the relevant case law and/or submit cases to the [EUAA Case Law Database](#))

Among many, we select judgment of the Administrative Court in Košice no. 15Saz/1/2025 of 14 July 2025, concerning an asylum seeker of Russian citizenship and Ukrainian nationality. The Migration Office provided him with subsidiary protection but did not grant asylum. The court ruled that the Migration Office did not justify the connection between the applicant's military service in the circumstances of a specific, currently ongoing war conflict between specific countries, involvement in which the applicant is in real danger, while in relation to both countries the applicant declares and demonstrates his interests. As regards the very nature of the specific war conflict in which the applicant, in the event of his return to the territory of the country of origin involved in this conflict, is in real danger of being involved, the administrative authority should deal with the type of military action with which the applicant does not want to be associated, in particular whether the type of military action in question can be considered, according to the criteria of the international community, as being in conflict with the basic rules of human conduct, and in this context it must assess whether punishment for avoiding military service could, in light of all the requirements of the definition, be considered as persecution. The Migration Office must also decide, according to the available information on the applicant's country of origin, if the relevant state authorities of the applicant's country of origin (Russia) insist on the performance of





military service by Russian citizens of Ukrainian nationality under identical conditions as by Russian citizens of Russian or other nationality.<sup>17</sup>

In the area of national security versus individual rights and freedoms, the Constitutional Court judgment PL. ÚS 15/2020-63 of 15 March 2023—finding that the obligatory acceptance of statements issued by the Slovak information services, which typically include consent or disagreement with the granting or extension of international protection, is unconstitutional—is now producing its first tangible effects in asylum-related decision-making. As a result of this judgment, the practice previously applied by the relevant authorities (the Migration Office in relation to asylum and subsidiary protection, the Ministry of the Interior in relation to the granting of citizenship, and the Border and Foreign Police Office in relation to temporary and permanent residence) has had to be modified, requiring more thorough substantiation of alleged threats to national security posed by applicants.

Two recent decisions illustrate this shift: decision no. 19Saz/3/2024-74 of 13 December 2024<sup>18</sup> and decision no. 20SaZ/3/2025-80 of 1 August 2025<sup>19</sup>. In the first case, subsidiary protection was not extended to an Afghan national due to an alleged reasonable suspicion that he had maintained contacts with a criminal milieu not only within the territory of the Slovak Republic but also in other European countries, allegedly resulting in the loss of his clean criminal record abroad and thereby giving rise to a reasonable suspicion that he posed a threat to the security of the Slovak Republic. The second case likewise concerned the refusal to extend subsidiary protection to an Afghan national, this time based on an alleged security risk consisting of suspicion that he was radicalising a group of persons or individuals. Both individuals had been living in Slovakia for many years and had children for whom they could care based on the protection concerned.

In both cases, the Migration Office appeared to accept the opinions of the Slovak intelligence services without further substantiation, relying on their statements of suspicion. The court, however, held that it is the duty of the administrative authority to obtain from the originators of the classified information forming the basis of the decision a necessary abstract of the relevant information constituting the essence of the grounds for the decision—in these cases, the substance of the allegations concerning the existence of a reasonable suspicion that the applicant, as a third-country national, poses a threat to state security during his stay in the territory of the Slovak Republic. The court further emphasised the need to duly justify the reasons why it was not possible to

---

<sup>17</sup> Administrative Court in Košice, judgment no. 15Saz/1/2025, 14 July 2025 (concerning Russian citizen of Ukrainian nationality and assessment of persecution for avoiding military service), available at: <https://otvorenesudy.sk/decrees/5619826?h=1+2025+15saz&l=sk>

<sup>18</sup> Administrative Court in Bratislava, decision no. 19Saz/3/2024-74, 13 December 2024 (refusal to extend subsidiary protection to Afghan national based on alleged security concerns), available at: <https://otvorenesudy.sk/decrees/5506741?h=19saz+3+2024&l=sk>

<sup>19</sup> Administrative Court, decision no. 20SaZ/3/2025-80, 1 August 2025 (refusal to extend subsidiary protection to Afghan national based on alleged radicalization concerns), available at: <https://otvorenesudy.sk/decrees/5633252?h=20saz+3+2025&l=sk>





disclose the evidence to the applicant at all, particularly where that evidence constituted the sole ground for refusing the application for an extension of subsidiary protection.

The court inferred that, following the aforementioned Constitutional Court judgment, a mere reference to a classified opinion of the Slovak Information Service is no longer sufficient to establish the criterion of a threat to the security of the Slovak Republic. Instead, the Migration Office is required to assess such an opinion in the same manner as any other evidence forming the basis of the decision, in conjunction with other materials or evidence—for example, the applicant’s statements, which in both cases contested the information, even though it had been communicated only in general terms. The Migration Office should therefore focus primarily on assessing whether such an opinion and the information contained therein may be considered credible, relevant, consistent, and thus, taken as a whole, suitable for use in deciding the application.

## 16. Other important developments in 2025

### Part B: Publications

---

1. If available online, please provide links to relevant publications produced by your organisation in 2025:
2. If not available online, please share your publications with us at: [Asylum.Report@euaa.europa.eu](mailto:Asylum.Report@euaa.europa.eu)
3. For publications that due to copyright issues cannot be easily shared, please provide references using the table below.

	Title of publication	Name of author	Publisher	Date
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

