# Stunning in ritual slaughter in Slovenia

## Amendment of Animal Protection Act 2013

 Ban on slaughter of animals without stunning even for the purpose of ritual slaughter

- Published 3 May 2013
- In force 18 May 2013

### Animal Protection Act, Article 25

...

"Notwithstanding provisions of art. 4 of Regulation 1099/09, stunning of animals must be performed in ritual slaughter, except in the case of slaughter of poultry, rabbits and hares, which takes place outside of a slaughterhouse for private domestic consumption."

• • •

### Legal base

- Regulation 1099/09, art. 26(2)(c)
  - Stricter national rules concerning ritual slaughter

- Regulation 1099/09, art 10(1)
  - Private domestic consumption

#### Constitutional review

- One of the muslim associations triggered the constitutional review of the amended art. 25 of Animal protection Act (12.6.2014)
  - Limitation of freedom of practicing religion

#### Justification

Veterinary administration was in charge to prepare the justification for the amendment

- Strictly avoiding arguments against religious teachings
- Detailed Scientific justification and presentation of the science of slaughter

## Deliberation of the Constitutional Court

- Acknowledging that freedom of practicing religion is the constitutional right
- Constitutional rights may be limited only based on another constitutional right/provision
- Protection of animals against cruelty is also mentioned in Slovenian constitution – constitutes a public morality

## Deliberation of the Constitutional Court

Limitation of freedom to manifest religion:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, for the protection of public order, health or **morals**, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. "

European convention on human rights, Art. 9

#### Decision

- Unanimous decision that the ban is NOT unconstitutional.
- 4 separate CONCURRING opinions of judges.

Agreeing on the final decision but some differences in the opinion on reasons for it.

Thank you for your attention