

Comparative Media Law Practice

Comparative Media Law Practice

Media Regulatory Authorities in the Visegrad Countries

Edited by
András Koltay and Andrej Škol kay

Volume I
The Czech Republic and Slovakia

Czech Republic
Ondřej Moravec

Slovakia
Andrej Škol kay, Luboš Kukliš, Ondrej Jurišta

Published in Hungary
by the Institute for Media Studies
of the Media Council
of the National Media and Infocommunications Authority
5 Reviczky utca, Budapest, 1088

© Szabina Berkényi, Ewa Galewska, Ondrej Jurišta, András Koltay, Luboš Kukliš,
Ondřej Moravec, Andrej Školkay 2016

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of
criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of the publisher.

Media Studies Library 21
of the Institute for Media Studies
Series Editor – András Koltay and Levente Nyakas

ISBN 0-12-324678-9

Contents

Introduction	13
THE CZECH REPUBLIC – Ondřej Moravec	
I. General Introduction	19
II. Introduction to the Legal System	21
III. Key Principles of Electronic Media Regulation	23
A. Scope of Regulation	23
<i>i. Technical Regulation</i>	25
<i>ii. Content Regulation</i>	25
B. Media Types	27
C. System of Authorisations and Licensing	28
D. Characteristics of Media Legislation	28
E. Characteristics of the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting	29
IV. Procedure before the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting	31
A. Overview of Administrative Proceedings before the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting	31
B. Stages of Proceedings	31
C. Proceedings Imposing Fines	31
<i>i. The Relationship between the Council and the Council Office</i>	32
<i>ii. Relation Between the Council and Parties to the Proceedings</i>	34
<i>iii. Self-Regulation</i>	37
D. Other Proceedings Conducted by the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting	37
E. Breach of the Law Notice in the System of Administrative Sanctions	38
<i>i. Statutory Provisions</i>	38
<i>ii. General Characteristics of the Concept</i>	38
<i>iii. Judicial Reviewability of the Notice</i>	40
<i>iv. Applicability of Previous Notice—Summary of Case-Law Development</i>	41
<i>v. Legal Opinion of Extended Panel of the Supreme Administrative Court</i>	43
<i>vi. Reflection on the Extended Panel's Legal Opinion</i>	45
<i>vii. Breach of the Law Notice Viewed with the Broadcaster's Eyes</i>	46
V. The Judicial System with Special Reference to Electronic Media Regulation	47
A. The System of Administrative Courts	47
B. Types of Judicial Procedures	47
C. Remedies—Cassation Appeal	50

D. Consistency of the Case-Law of Administrative Courts	51
E. Intervention of the Constitutional Court in the Decision-Making of Administrative Courts	53
F. Application of the Case-Law of the European Court of Human Rights	55
VI. Protection of Human Dignity	56
A. Legal Provision—Section 32(1)f of the Act on Radio and Television Broadcasting	56
B. Statistics	56
C. Answers to Research Questions	56
D. General Trends	58
E. Case Studies.....	59
<i>i. Kuřim Case—Czech Television and TV Nova</i>	59
<i>ii. The Most Amazing Videos of the World</i>	61
<i>iii. Bullying in Velká nad Veličkou</i>	62
VII. Balanced Coverage.....	63
A. Legal Basis	63
B. Statistics.....	63
C. Detailed Information.....	64
D. Answers to Research Questions	64
E. Tendencies and Trends.....	66
F. Case Studies.....	67
<i>i. 168 hodin—Church Restitutions</i>	67
<i>a. Commentary—Agenda of the Judgment</i>	69
<i>b. Additional Context</i>	69
<i>ii. Televizní noviny—Conflicts with Russian-Speaking Minority</i>	69
<i>iii. Events—Godfathers</i>	71
<i>iv. Televizní noviny—Tram Drivers</i>	72
VIII. Hate Speech.....	73
A. Definition	73
B. Hate Speech in Constitutional Order and Constitutional Court Case-Law	74
C. Hate Speech in the Case-Law of the European Court of Human Rights	75
D. Hate Speech and Criminal Law	76
E. Hate Speech in Media Legislation.....	77
F. Agenda of the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting.....	77
G. Discussion	80
IX. Commercial Speech.....	81
A. Commercial Speech as Form of Freedom of Speech	81
B. Constitutional Protection of Commercial Communications in the Czech Republic.....	82
C. Regulation of Broadcasting Act	85
D. Act on On-Demand Audiovisual Media Services.....	87

E. Agenda of the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting.....	88
F. Statistics.....	88
G. Answers to Research Questions	88
H. Case Studies.....	90
<i>i. Judgment of the Supreme Administrative Court, 7 As 68/2011</i>	90
<i>a. Facts of the Case</i>	90
<i>b. Appeal Brought by the Broadcaster and Assessment of the Case by the Metropolitan Court in Prague</i>	91
<i>c. Case Assessment by the Supreme Administrative Court</i>	91
<i>d. Commentary and Comparison with Judgment 6 As 10/2011</i>	93
<i>ii. Judgment of the Supreme Administrative Court, 8 As 66/2013</i>	94
<i>a. Facts of the Case</i>	94
<i>b. Case Assessment by the Metropolitan Court</i>	94
<i>c. Cassation Appeal of the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting</i>	94
<i>d. Assessment by the Supreme Administrative Court</i>	95
<i>e. Commentary</i>	95
<i>iii. Judgment of the Supreme Administrative Court, 7 As 24/2010</i>	96
<i>a. Facts of the Case</i>	96
<i>b. Applied Legal Regulation</i>	96
<i>c. Judgment of the Metropolitan Court in Prague and Cassation Appeal of the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting</i>	97
<i>d. Assessment of the Case by the Supreme Administrative Court</i>	97
<i>e. Commentary</i>	99
<i>iv. Judgment of the Supreme Administrative Court, 6 As 16/2010</i>	100
<i>a. Facts of the Case</i>	100
<i>b. Broadcaster's Arguments</i>	100
<i>c. Assessment of the Case by the Metropolitan Court</i>	100
<i>d. Assessment of the Case by the Supreme Administrative Court</i>	101
<i>e. Commentary</i>	102
<i>v. Judgment of the Supreme Administrative Court, 8 As 28/2013</i>	103
<i>a. Facts of the Case and Assessment of the Case by the Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting</i>	103
<i>b. Broadcaster's Arguments and Assessment of the Case by the Metropolitan Court</i>	104
<i>c. Assessment of the Case by the Supreme Administrative Court</i>	105
<i>d. Commentary</i>	105
X. Protection of Minors.....	106
A. Legal Definition.....	106
B. The EU Law.....	107
C. Constitutional Basis.....	107
D. Statistics.....	110
E. Answers to Research Questions	111
F. Tendencies and Trends.....	113
G. Case Studies.....	115

<i>i. Broadcasting of the News and Journalistic Programme Sŕepiny on 15 March 2009 from 9:20 pm</i>	115
<i>ii. Broadcasting of an Episode of CSI Miami</i>	117
<i>iii. Broadcasting of the Film Kajínek on 14 October 2012 from 8:20 pm</i>	119
<i>iv. Broadcasting of an Episode of Californication on 9 March 2010 from 9:30 pm</i>	121
<i>v. Broadcasting of Leo Night Show</i>	121
XI. Right of Reply	124
A. Legal Nature of the Right of Reply	124
B. The Right of Reply in International Context	126
C. Constitutional Aspects of the Right of Reply	126
D. Legal Provisions	130
E. Statistics	131
F. Answers to Research Questions	132
G. Case Studies	133
<i>i. Supreme Court Judgment 30 Cdo 4403/2009 of 26 October 2011</i>	133
<i>ii. Supreme Court Judgment 30 Cdo 130/2010 of 30 November 2011</i>	134
<i>iii. Supreme Court Judgment 30 Cdo 520/2011 of 26 April 2012</i>	135
H. Tendencies and Trends	136
SLOVAKIA – Andrej Školkay, Ľuboš Kukliš, Ondrej Jurišta	
I. Introduction	141
II. The Legal-Judicial System	143
III. Electronic and Digital Media Regulations	150
A. Content Regulation	151
B. Protection of Human Dignity	151
C. Objectivity and Internal Pluralism	152
D. Protection of Minors	153
E. Advertising	154
F. System of Authorisation	154
G. Electronic / Digital Media Regulator	155
H. Administrative Procedures	156
I. Types of Sanctions	159
J. The System of the Judiciary in Relation to Electronic Media Regulation	161
IV. The Electronic / Digital Media System	162
V. Rules of Procedure (Media Authority and Courts)	166
A. Analytical Summary	175

VI. Protection of Human Dignity	176
A. Human Dignity and Broadcasting	177
B. What is Human Dignity?	177
C. Three Levels of Human Dignity	180
D. Slovak Media Regulation—Protecting the Human Dignity as a Concept or the Human Dignity of Individuals?	181
E. Protection of the Human Dignity of Groups	182
F. Protection of Human Dignity—Public Regulation vs Civil Law Disputes	183
G. Consent of the Aggrieved Person	185
H. Identification of the Aggrieved Person	189
I. Analysis of References in Case Law of the Supreme Court	190
J. Conclusion	195
VII. Balanced Coverage	196
A. The European Court of Human Rights and Balanced Coverage	199
B. Discussion on Objectivity and Impartiality	201
C. The Case of International News Reporting	205
D. Slovak Cases	207
<i>i. Case No 1: 6 Sžo 527/2009 (final verdict 26 October 2010)</i>	207
<i>ii. Case No 2: 2Sžo73/2010 (final verdict of the Constitutional Court I. ÚS 29/2012-40)</i>	208
<i>iii. Case No 3: 3 Sž 200/2010 (final verdict of 8 October 2010)</i>	211
<i>iv. 2 in 1: Plurality of Opinions and Human Dignity: Case Cervanová</i>	212
E. The Case Study: Commentaries v Information in News Reporting—Where does the Border Lie?	217
<i>i. Argumentation by the Media Regulator</i>	218
<i>ii. Public / Experts' Reactions to this Case</i>	220
<i>iii. Argumentation by the Office of the Rada pre vysielanie a retransmisiiu</i>	221
<i>iv. Argumentation by the RTVS</i>	222
<i>v. Method of Analysis</i>	222
<i>vi. Fellows' Judgment and/or Experts' Judgment</i>	225
<i>a. Grave Problems</i>	226
<i>b. Some Doubts</i>	227
<i>c. No Problem</i>	229
<i>d. No Answer / No Opinion</i>	229
F. Conclusion	229
VIII. Commercial Communications	237
A. Media Commercial Communication	237
B. Subliminal Commercial Communication	239
C. Surreptitious Commercial Communication	240
<i>i. Surreptitious Advertising in the News Program—Case Study</i>	242
D. Definitions of Advertising and Teleshopping	243
<i>i. Prize Games as Teleshopping—Case Study</i>	244
E. Content Requirements for the Advertising and Teleshopping	247

F. Formal Requirements for the Advertising and Teleshopping.....	248
G. Insertion of Advertising and Teleshopping into the Television Broadcasting.....	248
H. Insertion of Advertising into the Radio Broadcasting.....	249
I. Advertising Time.....	249
J. Sponsoring.....	250
<i>i. Sponsoring Announcements v Advertising—Case Study.....</i>	<i>250</i>
K. Legal Basis.....	251
L. The Interpretation.....	254
M. The Initial Case.....	254
N. Product Placement.....	258
IX. Hate Speech.....	266
A. Local Cultural Context.....	271
B. International and European Legislation and Norms.....	273
C. The Media and Hate Speech.....	276
X. Right of Reply.....	277
A. Analytical Summary.....	283
XI. Protection of Minors.....	284
A. Case Study.....	290
<i>i. Case Study 1 (3 Sž 6/2011 SC, Decision RP 56/2010, 21 December 2010, fine 7,000 euro, justified).....</i>	<i>292</i>
<i>ii. Case Study 2 (8 Sž 8/2010, 20 October 2010, RP 07/2010.....</i>	<i>295</i>
<i>iii. Case Study 3 (28 September 2010, 5 Sž 8/2010, verdict was confirmed).....</i>	<i>296</i>
<i>iv. Case Study 4 (5 Sž 14/2011, RP 21/2011 of 24 May 2011.....</i>	<i>296</i>
<i>v. Case Study 5 (6 Sž 5/2013, 19 March 2014.....</i>	<i>297</i>
<i>vi. Case Study 6.....</i>	<i>298</i>
<i>a. First Case.....</i>	<i>298</i>
<i>b. Second Case.....</i>	<i>3299</i>
<i>vii. Case Study 7 (8 Sž 15/2010, RP 21/2010.....</i>	<i>300</i>
B. Analytical Summary.....	303
About the authors.....	307

Introduction

This is the first comparative analytical report on how administrative judiciary-administrative law courts or senates, higher regional courts, and partly constitutional courts deal with regulatory challenges related to various, content-based types of administrative-legal sanctions issued by the electronic / digital media regulators in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. The selection of these four countries and their electronic / digital media regulatory systems stems from their recent and sometimes rather distant common history combined with geographical factor (V-4 or Visegrad Group). It is scientifically naturally very interesting to find similarities, but especially differences, in legal argumentation and legal-regulatory development among such a group of countries. In fact, even local administrative law judges themselves are very much interested in examples from these neighbouring countries. The whole research project was enabled by funding from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

As these studies document, these are actually rather challenging regulatory issues which usually take years to come to conclusions or final verdicts. Yet there is no such country-specific or comparative study. Sure, one can find many studies on electronic media law and regulation, however, those studies mostly use civic or criminal law regulatory-judicial examples, but rarely concentrate on more systematic or in-depth approach, and even less often focus on administrative law content related aspects. Moreover, it is hard to find full texts of controversial broadcast items—yet sometimes either media regulator or court(s), or sometimes even civic organisations, or all three public legal and normative assessors can in fact be wrong in their assessment of professionalism of work of journalists / media. Therefore, in some cases, we included full transcript of the most arguable or the most interesting news and current affairs in broadcasting. For similar reasons, we have included extensive, although simplified transcripts of courts' verdicts.

The authors focused on the regulatory areas of human dignity, balanced coverage, commercial communication, hate speech, right of reply, and protection of minors. These are arguably the key media regulatory issues. Already here we could find substantial differences among four countries. For example, whilst the Hungarian case law covers each of the before mentioned regulatory areas in Slovakia, we did not find any case that would deal directly with hate speech related to electronic / digital media and administrative law. In the Czech Republic, no hate speech case connected with media was found either (in administrative law nor in criminal law). Cases related with right to reply in the Czech Republic and Slovakia are decided by civil courts in civil proceedings. Thus, the manner of judicial review is quite different in this area. In Poland, the right of reply was replaced by the right to disclaimer that is out of competences of the National Broadcasting Council. Also there were no cases concerning the balanced coverage.

Our *ad hoc* research group has been interested in finding the key normative and legal values motivating judges (or rather administrative courts or administrative law senates) in their regulatory rulings (usually in connection with appeals of broadcasters against decision of the media regulators or lower regional courts) on broadcast (and maybe soon online media) regulatory issues. However, appeals or media regulators' rulings of technical nature, eg, not granting licence or ones related to transfer of ownership, were out of our research scope.

Of course, by definition, fundamental rights are actually competing rights. Thus, can we identify freedom of speech or other basic human rights (eg, personality rights or human dignity) as a key driving force behind rulings either media regulators or administrative courts? If preference was given to fundamental human values other than freedom of speech, which were these? What does 'balanced coverage' actually mean for media regulators on the one hand, and for the courts on the other? What kind of moral and legal justification was used for a given legal-normative preference? Have there actually been value-based conflicts between courts and the regulator?

Another interesting question is that of the consistency of the rulings. Do courts refer in their rulings to their previous ones, especially when there are two or three different specialised senates? Were various senates / courts consistent in their rulings? This may seem to be a useless research question, but in fact, it will be shown that various senates of the court, even the same senate of the court, have been inconsistent in their rulings.

Which international legal sources have been used to support these rulings and verdicts, eg, European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), or also possibly Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)? Which international legal sources were not used to support these rulings and verdicts, and why? Have there been any common trait in rulings / verdicts? Could these traits be seen as long-term, or rather short-term ones? If there are no similarities, why not? Is there any known, important difference in key principles of media regulation in comparison with other EU Member States, especially within V-4?

Which principles mentioned above bring the biggest regulatory challenges? Is the regulation of the electronic / digital media too complicated, demanding or strict to broadcasters, or is it OK, comparatively speaking? Do broadcasters complain, either officially or off the record, with respect to principles of media regulation? Can their complaints be seen as legitimate in some areas? What else could help in improving the current state of affairs? How could we characterise the cooperation between the staff (office) and the Board of the media regulator? Do the regulatory boards of the media authorities accept all regulatory suggestions of the staffs (offices)? If not, in which area can one notice the biggest or most important divergences? Which arguments of the office count usually? What is the role of the professional, ideological, and education backgrounds of the members of the media regulator—does it have any impact on how they see imposing a regulation? Is there any foreign impact or inspiration, either from the European Platform of Regulatory Agencies (EPRA) or from other bodies? Do we see any areas of administrative law procedures which could be improved? How? How can we characterise or assess direct or indirect intervention of the Parliament and the Ministry of Finance or other external bodies in the work of the media regulator? Do broadcasters complain, either officially or off the record, with respect to the professional competences or work of board members? Have the appeals of the broadcasters against sanctions usually been well-argued? Is there any external professional or civic informal, at least *ad hoc*, supervision or criticism of the work of the media regulator? If yes, how could we evaluate it, eg, commentaries in the media, reports by NGOs)?

How professionally competent is judiciary seen in general, and in this area of administrative law in particular? Have argumentation used in the administrative courts rulings been persuasive enough? Which cases are seen as the most difficult ones to decide for the judiciary? Is there any long-term, value-based difference / tendency between various levels of courts? Indeed, it seems that the Constitutional Courts in Slovakia and Hungary show long-term,

more liberal values, following the ECtHR rulings. In Poland, the Constitutional Court focuses above all on the provisions of Polish law, and only in identical cases refers to the judgments of the ECtHR. In the majority of judgments, the Constitutional Court merely states that the freedom of speech does not have an absolute nature, and its limits are imposed by other freedoms. In the majority of the judgments, the Constitutional Court of Poland shares the view of the National Broadcasting Council.

In the Czech Republic, it is the Supreme Administrative Court that seems to be the dominant player, because its decisions are very rarely revoked by the Constitutional Court in media cases. The Czech Supreme Administrative Court seems to be more liberal in balanced coverage cases, while more protective in cases dealing with protection of minors.

Further research questions we were interested: Is there any platform at which the courts and the regulator could discuss issues of common interest? What is the annual percentage of accepted / rejected rulings focused at content broadcast, issued by the media regulator in the years 2010–2014? Can we see any areas of judiciary work which could be improved? If yes, how? What else could help improve the current state of affairs?

Of course, some questions above were too ambitious to be answered in this research, nevertheless, they show how interesting and important this type of research can be. We focused our analysis primarily on the period between 2010 (or back to 2007, if there were not enough cases) and 2014. It is a problem that many regulatory and court cases actually last a few years until the final verdict is issued, therefore, it was impossible to follow strict differentiation with respect to the time span. Finally, this report is certainly imperfect; yet there is a hope that it will serve as a starting point for a more refined research in the future in this increasingly important regulatory area. This follow-up research is needed, indeed.

The Editors

Bratislava–Budapest
July 2016