

This translated ruling is provided for information purposes only. Only the Swedish-language versions are the official rulings.

In case no. 4076-25, the **Swedish Social Insurance Agency** (Appellant) v. **AA** (Respondent), the Supreme Administrative Court delivered the following judgment on 21 April 2026.

RULING OF THE SUPREME ADMINISTRATIVE COURT

The Supreme Administrative Court rejects the appeal.

BACKGROUND

1. Persons who are employed in Sweden are insured against occupational injuries by virtue of the occupational injury insurance which is part of the public social security insurance. Occupational injury means an injury resulting from an accident or other harmful effect at work. Anyone who, as a consequence of an occupational injury suffers a reduction in working capacity is entitled to compensation in the form of an annuity.
2. AA applied for an annuity due to an injury she suffered as a consequence of an accident on 19 December 2021. On the relevant day, she had participated in a planning day for a foundation of which she was an employee and chairman. During the planning day, the participants of the meeting had gathered on a premises which were temporarily occupied by the foundation and, at lunchtime, they set out to a restaurant in another part of the city at which they were going to eat lunch which they were to pay for out-of-pocket. On the way to the restaurant, AA slipped and sustained an injury.
3. The Swedish Social Insurance Agency determined that AA's journey to the restaurant could not be regarded as being closely connected to her work since she did not regularly visit the restaurant during lunchtime and, furthermore, the restaurant was far from the actual meeting place. In addition, the Swedish Social Insurance Agency determined that the lunch was not, and could not be compared to, an obligatory part of a conference. Accordingly, the Swedish Social Insurance Agency rejected her application for an annuity.

Case no.
4076-25

4. AA appealed to the Administrative Court in Gothenburg which rejected the appeal. According to the administrative court, it was not shown that the lunch was an obligatory part of the planning day. The administrative court further stated that the restaurant was far from the meeting place and that the matter involved an individual visit to the restaurant and that the lunch was to be paid for out-of-pocket. In light of the same, the administrative court was of the opinion that it had not been shown to be probable that the accident occurred during a lunch which was closely connected to the work and that it was accordingly not a matter involving an occupational injury.
5. The Administrative Court of Appeal in Gothenburg granted AA's appeal to it and decided that the accident could be regarded to be an occupational injury and that the Swedish Social Insurance Agency was to examine whether other conditions had been met for the right to an annuity. The administrative court of appeal took into account, among other things, the fact that purpose of the relevant journey was connected to AA's work, that the change of location occurred during paid work hours together with other board members of the foundation, and that the lunch was part of the relevant planning day. Against this background, the administrative court of appeal was of the opinion that the journey to the lunch restaurant could be deemed to have been caused by, and be closely connected to, AA's work.

CLAIMS, ETC.

6. *The Swedish Social Insurance Agency* claims that the Supreme Administrative Court shall overturn the judgment of the administrative court of appeal and affirm the judgment of the administrative court.
7. AA is of the opinion that the appeal is to be rejected.

Case no.
4076-25

REASONS FOR THE RULING

The question in the Supreme Administrative Court

8. The question in the case is whether an injury as a consequence of an accident occurring in conjunction with a journey to a lunch restaurant during paid work hours constitutes an occupational injury and is therefore covered by occupational injury insurance.

Legislation, etc.

9. Pursuant to Chapter 39, section 3 of the Social Insurance Code, an occupational injury is an injury arising as a consequence of an accident or other harmful effect at work. Section 4 provides that an injury means, among other things, a personal injury.

The Court's assessment

10. A basic principle of the occupational injury insurance, both the current and its predecessor, is that it shall provide protection against specific risks arising in working life. In order to constitute a work accident, there must thus be a connection between the insured's work and the accident (Government Bill 1954:60, p. 108 f. and Government Bill 2001/02:81, p. 102, as well as HFD 2020 reported case no. 4, section 10 and cases referred to therein).
11. As regards accidents which have occurred when the insured performed work at the workplace, it has been assumed that the finding of connection would be generous. Injuries arising as a consequence of accidents which have occurred outside the workplace can also be deemed to constitute occupational injuries given the fact that, as expressed in the bill, "at the time of the accident, the employee was engaged in the affairs of the employer" or, in any case, performed something in the interest of the employer (Government Bill 1954:60, p. 109; see, also, HFD 2018 reported case no. 73).
12. As regards work carried out under more flexible circumstances, it may sometimes be difficult to determine where the boundary is between working

Case no.
4076-25

life and private life. However, the starting point should always be that the occupational injury subsists if the employee, at the time of the injury, performs something in the interest of the employer.

13. AA's accident occurred in connection with a journey undertaken during a planning day of a foundation with which she was employed. The journey was undertaken during paid work hours and for the purpose that she would participate in a lunch jointly with other meeting participants. According to the Supreme Administrative Court, it may thereby be assumed to be in the interests of the employer that she carried out the journey and, accordingly, there was such a connection between the accident and work that it involves an occupational injury in accordance with Chapter 39, section 3 of the Social Insurance Code.
14. Accordingly, the appeal is rejected.

Justices Henrik Jermsten, Margit Knutsson, Leif Gäverth, Mikael Westberg and Karin Attorps have participated in the ruling.

Judge Referee: Elin Nilsson.