



EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS  
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

## THIRD SECTION

### **CASE OF ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA**

*(Applications nos. 13505/20 and 138 others –  
see appended list)*

## JUDGMENT

Art 8 • Private life • Home • Correspondence • Mass searches of homes and offices of persons and entities associated with Aleksey Navalnyy and seizure of property during searches • Search authorisations issued on the basis of standard-form investigator's applications lacking individualised reasoning • Domestic court's failure to carry out effective judicial scrutiny required under domestic law, depriving the authorisation procedure of its protective function against arbitrariness • Interference not "in accordance with the law" • Impugned orders couched in general and broad terms conferring virtually unfettered discretion upon the investigative authorities

Art 1 P1 • Control of the use of property • Freezing of applicants' bank accounts • Relevant orders issued and extended in disregard of express statutory requirements of individualised justification and periodic review of their necessity • No reference to any supporting evidence or a factual basis • Formalistic judicial review • Interpretation and application of domestic law failed to ensure foreseeability and afford the requisite safeguards against arbitrariness • Interference not "in accordance with the law"

Art 1 P1 • Peaceful enjoyment of possessions • Seizure and retention of a sum of money from one individual applicant during searches • No judicial decision

authorising the seizure as required by domestic law • Interference arbitrary and inconsistent with legal certainty and rule of law principles • Interference not “in accordance with the law”

Art 11 (read in light of Art 10) • Freedom of association • Unjustified designation of one applicant organisation as “foreign agent” despite the absence of any evidence suggesting it was under foreign influence, control or direction or acting in the interests of a foreign entity • Rigid and formalistic application of “foreign agent” legislation • Disproportionate punitive fine capable of producing a chilling effect on civil society and public discourse

Art 11 (read in light of Art 10) • Freedom of association • Designation of applicant organisations as “extremist” and ensuing dissolution or prohibition of their activities • Application of vague and overly broad notions of “extremism” and “extremist activity” extending to ordinary political, associational and expressive activities • Lack of foreseeability • Judicial review did not provide adequate and effective safeguards • Chilling effect of expansive and punitive operation of the “extremism” framework on political expression and association • Interference not “prescribed by law”

Art 18 (+ Art 8, 11 and 1 P1) • Restriction for unauthorised purposes • Existence of ulterior purpose • Impugned measures were part of a concerted effort on an unprecedented scale to eliminate the organised democratic opposition centred around Aleksey Navalnyy

Prepared by the Registry. Does not bind the Court.

STRASBOURG

16 December 2025

*This judgment will become final in the circumstances set out in Article 44 § 2 of the Convention. It may be subject to editorial revision.*

**In the case of Anti-Corruption Foundation (FBK) and Others v. Russia,**

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting as a Chamber composed of:

Ioannis Ktistakis, *President*,

Peeter Roosma,

Lətif Hüseynov,

Diana Kovatcheva,

Úna Ní Raifeartaigh,

Mateja Đurović,

Canòlic Mingorance Cairat, *judges*,

and Olga Chernishova, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to:

the 139 applications against the Russian Federation lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by individual applicants and applicant organisations (“the applicants”), on the dates listed in the appendix;

the decision to give priority under Rule 41 of the Rules of Court to application no. 22357/21;

the decision to give notice to the Russian Government (“the Government”) of the complaints concerning the alleged violations of the applicants’ rights to respect for their home, to freedom of expression and association, to an effective remedy, to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions and to stand for election, as well as the alleged ulterior purpose behind the measures taken against the applicants, and to declare the remainder of the applications inadmissible;

the information submitted by the parties and the applicants’ observations on the admissibility and merits;

the decision of the President of the Section to treat as confidential all documents deposited with the Registry, excluding the application forms (Rule 33 § 2 of the Rules of Court);

the decision of the President of the Section to appoint one of the elected judges of the Court to sit as an *ad hoc* judge, applying by analogy Rule 29 § 2 of the Rules of Court (see *Kutayev v. Russia*, no. 17912/15, §§ 5-8, 24 January 2023);

Having deliberated in private on 18 November 2025,

Delivers the following judgment, which was adopted on that date:

## INTRODUCTION

1. The present case concerns various measures taken against Mr Aleksey Navalnyy, organisations affiliated with him, his own family members, his associates and, in some cases, their families. The applicants alleged violations of Article 8 of the Convention on account of mass searches of their offices

and homes and the seizure of property during the searches, and violations of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention on account of the subsequent freezing of their bank accounts. They also contended that the registration of the Anti-Corruption Foundation as a “foreign agent,” the designation of that foundation, the Foundation for the Defence of Civil Rights and the Navalnyy Headquarters as “extremist”, and the subsequent disbandment of those organisations, alongside the above-mentioned measures, had infringed their rights to freedom of expression and association under Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention, as well as their right to stand for election under Article 3 of Protocol No. 1. Lastly, they argued that those measures formed part of an abusive pattern of restrictions in breach of Article 18 of the Convention, asserting that the authorities had pursued the ulterior aim of suppressing their political activities and persecuting them for publishing anti-corruption material.

## THE FACTS

2. The applicants’ details and the names of their representatives appear in the appendix.

3. The Government were initially represented by Mr M. Galperin, former Representative of the Russian Federation to the European Court of Human Rights, and later by his successor in that office, Mr M. Vinogradov.

4. The facts of the case may be summarised as follows.

### I. BACKGROUND

5. Aleksey Navalnyy was a political activist, opposition leader, anti-corruption campaigner and popular blogger. He died on 16 February 2024 while serving a 19-year sentence in a high-security penal colony in the Russian Arctic.

6. In 2011 Mr Navalnyy founded the Anti-Corruption Foundation (“Фонд борьбы с коррупцией” – “FBK”), a non-profit organisation which investigated and published online reports on alleged corruption by high-ranking Russian officials (see *Navalnyy v. Russia* (no. 2), no. 43734/14, § 6, 9 April 2019). The FBK gained widespread attention through documentaries such as *He is Not Dimon to You* (2017) (see, for more details, *Navalnyy and Others v. Russia* [Committee], nos. 25809/17 and 14 others, § 1, 4 October 2022) and *Putin’s Palace: History of the World’s Largest Bribe* (2021), alleging large-scale corruption at the highest level of power. The organisation was funded primarily through private donations.

7. In 2017 Mr Navalnyy established a network of regional offices across Russia, known as the Navalnyy Headquarters (“Штабы Навального”), which did not have legal-entity status and functioned as the organisational backbone of his 2018 presidential campaign. Each regional office was headed

by a coordinator and included staff members and volunteers who organised local activities and maintained daily operations. After the campaign, the network continued to organise protests and, from late 2018, promoted a tactical-voting project known as “Smart Voting”, designed to consolidate the opposition vote against the ruling United Russia party.

8. In 2019 Ms Liliya Chanyшева, who was Mr Navalnyy’s associate from Ufa, the capital of the Republic of Bashkortostan, registered a non-profit organisation, the Foundation for the Protection of Civil Rights (*Фонд защиты прав граждан «Штаб»* – “Shtab”). This organisation channelled funds to Mr Navalnyy’s network of regional offices. It received financial support from a limited liability company, ООО Strana Prilivov, which handled merchandising and other revenue streams.

9. Also in May 2019 Ms Olga Guseva, a St Petersburg-based associate of Mr Navalnyy, founded the Foundation for the Defence of Civil Rights (*Фонд защиты прав граждан «ФЗПГ»* – “the FZPG”). The FZPG paid court fines and legal costs for volunteers arrested at protests. After the FBK announced its voluntary winding-up in July 2020 to avoid enforcement of an 88-million-rouble damages award, the FZPG became the legal shell through which the FBK continued to operate and pay salaries to its staff.

10. Taken together, the FBK, the Navalnyy Headquarters, Shtab, the FZPG and related commercial entities formed an integrated structure that underpinned Mr Navalnyy’s campaign against corruption and his advocacy of democratic reform in Russia. Most of these organisations were forcibly liquidated in 2021, after the Moscow City Court designated the FBK, the Navalnyy Headquarters network and the FZPG as “extremist” (see below).

11. Besides those organisations, the applicants in the present case include Mr Navalnyy’s close associates, among them FBK employees, coordinators of regional offices and volunteers, and in some cases their family members, who became the target of concurrent administrative and financial measures by the Russian authorities (see the appendix).

## II. INVESTIGATION INTO MONEY LAUNDERING

### A. Institution of criminal proceedings

12. On 15 July 2019 an investigator from the Moscow Department of the Ministry of the Interior filed a report indicating that funds exceeding 75 million Russian roubles (RUB; approximately 1,056,168 euros (EUR)), deposited via ATMs into the bank accounts of the FBK, Shtab, ООО Strana Prilivov, Mr Navalnyy and his associates, could have been obtained illicitly.

13. On 3 August 2019 the Moscow Investigative Committee launched criminal proceedings for large-scale money laundering under Article 174 § 4(b) of the Russian Criminal Code, on the basis of preliminary inquiry measures that had been carried out.

14. According to the investigation, from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2018, unidentified individuals – including persons affiliated with the activities of the FBK and its staff – had received over RUB 75 million from third parties, knowing that the funds had been obtained by criminal means. To legitimise their possession and use of these illicit funds, the accomplices had deposited the amount via cash-in and ATMs in Moscow into various bank accounts. The funds had then been transferred to the FBK’s accounts, thereby financing the organisation and completing the money-laundering scheme.

15. The investigation was launched against the backdrop of Russia’s mass protests in the summer of 2019, held in response to the exclusion of opposition candidates, including Mr Navalnyy’s associates, from the 2019 Moscow City Duma elections (see, for example, the Court’s judgments concerning the protests in *Ivanov and Others v. Russia* ([Committee], nos. 57884/19 and 21 others, 25 May 2023); *Bestuzhev and Others v. Russia* ([Committee], nos. 11350/20 and 26 others, 27 April 2023).

16. On 5 August 2019 the investigator in charge of the case instructed the police to collect personal data on “active FBK members”, including their home addresses, property holdings and bank accounts.

17. The money-laundering investigation remains ongoing, with the latest known extension of the time frame until 3 August 2024.

## **B. Freezing of bank accounts**

18. Following the investigator’s requests, between 6 August 2019 and 27 February 2020, the Basmanny and Presnenskiy District Courts of Moscow issued freezing orders on the bank accounts of the applicants and, in some cases, their relatives, alleging that those accounts had been used to launder criminal proceeds. Some orders were made collectively in respect of several account-holders, including the applicants’ relatives, without any individualised assessment. The dates of the freezing orders and the corresponding appeal decisions for each applicant are listed in the appendix.

19. According to the criminal case file, the amount allegedly laundered totalled RUB 75,535,054.75, a figure that exceeded the combined balances on the applicants’ bank accounts; accordingly, every rouble in those accounts was frozen. Newly opened accounts were also blocked, bringing the total amount actually frozen to about RUB 57 million (approximately EUR 850,000). As a result, the FBK was unable to pay staff salaries or continue its ordinary activities.

20. The freezing orders followed a consistent and typical structure across all court decisions. The courts routinely used a standardised template, citing charges under Article 174 § 4(b) of the Criminal Code to justify the measure. They stated summarily that the bank accounts in question had been used for laundering criminal proceeds. The reasoning then followed a repetitive structure: to secure the enforcement of a future judgment in respect of a civil

claim, fines or other financial penalties, it was deemed necessary to freeze the accounts in order to prevent any potential unlawful disposal of funds that might hinder or render impossible the execution of the judgment.

21. In each case, the courts mechanically endorsed the investigator's request, merely noting that it complied with the legal requirements as to form and content, without engaging with the specific facts or assessing the necessity and proportionality of the measure. The freezing orders were imposed for the duration of the preliminary investigation. Following the prolongation of the investigation, the investigators subsequently sought to have the freezing measures extended.

22. Between 31 July 2020 and 22 April 2021 the domestic courts gave a series of collective rulings extending the freezing measures in respect of nearly all the applicants. The extension orders, made following requests by the investigator, were couched in identical terms and did not refer to any new factual or evidentiary material justifying the measures. They maintained the freezing measures for the duration of the preliminary investigation, which remains ongoing.

23. Appeals by the applicants against both the initial freezing orders and their subsequent extensions were unsuccessful. The Moscow City Court upheld the measures in brief and formulaic terms, repeating the reasoning of the lower courts and concluding that the decisions had been justified and in accordance with Russian law.

### **C. Searches of homes and offices**

24. Between 8 August and 23 December 2019, searches were carried out at the applicants' offices, their homes, and, in some instances, the homes of their relatives across Russia. Items such as mobile phones, computers, documents and production equipment were seized. The great majority of the residential searches were performed on two dates: on 12 September and 15 October 2019. In total, about 191 searches were conducted in respect of individuals and entities affiliated with Mr Navalnyy. They targeted not only staff members of his organisations or their relatives but also his supporters and independent journalists who had no formal connection with him, such as the editor-in-chief of an online media outlet in Smolensk (see application no. 30769/20 in the appendix).

25. Details of the searches relating to each applicant are listed in the appendix, from which a typical pattern emerges. In the first scenario, the searches were authorised in advance by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow on the basis of applications submitted by the investigator with reference to the results of operational-search activities, which indicated that funds obtained through criminal activity had been distributed among various regional offices and that a particular applicant, being connected to Mr Navalnyy, might have been involved. No concrete facts implicating any

specific applicant in the alleged offence were, however, cited in the investigator's applications.

The decisions of the Basmannyy District Court in each case followed a standard template: they referred to the charges brought against the FBK and its staff (see paragraph 14 above) and stated that the applicant concerned might be involved in the alleged money-laundering scheme. The court concluded that the investigator had sufficient grounds to believe that items, documents or electronic devices relevant to the criminal case could be found at the applicant's premises and accordingly authorised the search and seizure of any such material.

26. In the second scenario, at least 36 searches were conducted without prior judicial authorisation, being treated as "urgent" searches under Article 165 § 5 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation, which dispenses with prior judicial authorisation where delay might jeopardise the investigation. The first such search took place on 8 August 2019 at the FBK's office. The search record referred solely to the investigator's decision of 7 August 2019 and cited the aim of locating criminally obtained funds and other items relevant to the criminal case. During that search, the investigator seized 170 items, including laptops, video cameras and storage devices, as well as documents relating to the functioning of the FBK. The FBK's representative subsequently challenged the searches and seizures in the courts. On 20 May 2020, the Basmannyy District Court upheld the investigator's actions, concluding in summary terms that the applicable procedures had been observed, the applicant's representatives had been present, and everything had been carried out in accordance with Russian law.

27. As regards the "urgent" searches carried out in the applicants' homes in various regions of Russia, the investigator referred to unspecified information suggesting that individuals affiliated with the FBK had been attempting to conceal documents relevant to the criminal case. However, no concrete data substantiating that claim were provided. The domestic court subsequently validated those searches, reasoning that they could not have been delayed as this might have resulted in the destruction or concealment of evidence pertinent to the investigation, and thus found that the searches had been lawful.

28. The applicants appealed against both the search orders and the court decisions retrospectively validating the "urgent" searches. The appeal courts dismissed all appeals, except in a few cases where the applicants had not been duly summoned to the first-instance hearing. Following reconsideration in those cases, the first-instance courts again found that the searches had been lawful. The appeal courts thereafter fully endorsed the lower courts' reasoning and confirmed that the searches and seizures had been justified and carried out in compliance with Russian law, without addressing the necessity



of resorting to the urgent-search procedure in the absence of any established risk of destruction or concealment of evidence or instruments of the offence.

### III. DESIGNATION OF THE FBK AS A FOREIGN AGENT

29. On 9 October 2019 the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation issued an order by which it included the FBK in the register of non-commercial organisations performing the functions of a foreign agent. The FBK lodged an administrative claim seeking to have that order declared unlawful, arguing that it had not received any foreign funding, as its bank accounts had been frozen in August and September 2019 pursuant to various freezing orders. It further submitted that its inclusion in the register of foreign agents violated its rights to freedom of expression, dissemination of information and freedom of association, contrary to Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention.

30. On 1 November 2019 the Zamoskvoretskiy District Court of Moscow dismissed the applicant organisation's claim. The court found that the FBK had received foreign funding from an individual in Spain in the amount of RUB 138,505.41 (approximately EUR 1,944), which had been transferred to its bank account on 6 and 17 September 2019. It further held that, despite the freezing of its accounts, the FBK had been under an obligation to return those funds. In fact it did so, using a different bank account, on 15 October 2019, after the Ministry of Justice had already issued the impugned order. That judgment was upheld on appeal by the Moscow City Court on 20 January 2020. On 10 June 2020 the Second Court of Cassation of General Jurisdiction rejected a cassation appeal by the FBK. Lastly, on 23 September 2020 the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation dismissed a final cassation appeal, finding no procedural defects in the decision to designate the FBK as a foreign agent. It held, in particular, that the FBK had received foreign funding and had failed to apply for inclusion in the register of foreign agents upon receipt of those funds.

31. The FBK also made a separate request to be removed from the register of foreign agents. That request was rejected on 21 January 2020, and its attempts to challenge the Ministry of Justice's refusal through the courts were unsuccessful. The final decision in those proceedings was taken by the Supreme Court on 26 April 2021.

32. Separately, on 28 July 2020 the Simonovskiy District Court of Moscow found that the FBK had committed an administrative offence under Article 19.34 § 1 of the Code of Administrative Offences ("the CAO") (violation of the established procedure for the activities of a non-commercial organisation acting as a foreign agent). The organisation was fined RUB 300,000 (approximately EUR 3,250). On 8 April 2021 the Moscow City Court upheld that judgment on appeal.

## IV. EXTREMISM PROCEEDINGS

33. On 16 April 2021 the Moscow prosecutor brought administrative proceedings against the FBK, the FZPG and the Navalnyy Headquarters, seeking to have them declared “extremist” and to have their activities banned under the Suppression of Extremism Act. The prosecutor stated, in particular, that the organisations in question were destabilising the social and political situation in the country through calls for violent actions, extremist activity, mass disorder and attempts to involve minors in illegal activities.

34. On 26 April 2021 the Moscow prosecutor ordered the Navalnyy network of regional offices to suspend its activities pending the court’s ruling. On 29 April 2021 the Navalnyy Headquarters, which did not have legal-entity status under Russian law, was disbanded as an organisation, ahead of the court’s decision declaring it “extremist”. On 30 April 2021 the Russian Financial Monitoring Service put the Navalnyy Headquarters on the list of organisations involved in “terrorism and extremism”.

35. On 9 June 2021 the Moscow City Court upheld the prosecutor’s administrative claim. It found that the FBK, the FZPG and the Navalnyy Headquarters had acted under the overall direction of Mr Navalnyy and his associates and shared common objectives. The court further established that the Navalnyy Headquarters operated as a public association without State registration or legal-entity status, was headed by Mr Leonid Volkov, and maintained offices in thirty-seven regions of Russia, functioning as an interregional structure.

The organisations were held to have (i) disseminated extremist content through their online platforms, including YouTube; (ii) organised and conducted unauthorised public events across various regions of Russia, among them the summer 2019 protests in Moscow; (iii) called on the audience to participate in unauthorised rallies in support of Mr Navalnyy on 23 January 2021, during which violence had been used against law-enforcement officers; and (iv) involved minors in their activities. On that basis the court characterised the organisations’ conduct as systematic extremist activity aimed at the violent overthrow of the constitutional order, entailing violations of human rights and freedoms, harm to public order and the incitement of social discord. The Moscow City Court accordingly ordered the dissolution of the FBK and the FZPG and prohibited the further operation of the Navalnyy Headquarters network. The hearing was held in camera owing to the use of classified material.

36. That judgment was upheld on appeal on 4 August 2021 by the First Appeal Court of General Jurisdiction, and on 25 March 2022 the Second Court of Cassation rejected further appeals, confirming the lower court rulings. On 17 August 2022 the Supreme Court upheld the judgments, finding them lawful and well-founded.

37. On 11 August 2021, charges were brought against Mr Leonid Volkov, coordinator of the Navalnyy Headquarters network, and Mr Ivan Zhdanov, director of the FBK, under Article 239 § 2 of the Criminal Code. According to the investigating authorities, they had committed the offence of directing a non-profit organisation acting as a foreign agent, the activities of which were associated with inciting citizens to commit further unlawful acts. On 4 February 2021 the same charge was laid against Mr Navalnyy.

38. On 9 November 2021 Ms Chanysheva was arrested in Ufa on suspicion of offences under the Criminal Code: public calls for extremist activity (Article 280 § 1), organisation of an extremist community (Article 282.1 § 3) and establishing a non-profit organisation violating citizens' rights (Article 239 § 3). After a first-instance trial, an appeal, a cassation review and a retrial, on 9 April 2024 the Supreme Court of the Republic of Bashkortostan found her guilty on all counts and sentenced her to nine years and six months' imprisonment. Ms Chanysheva was the first associate of Mr Navalnyy to be charged with "organisation of an extremist community" following the designation of the FBK as extremist, and her conviction was cited by the authorities as a precedent in other regional proceedings. On 1 August 2024 Ms Chanysheva was released as part of an international prisoner exchange.

39. According to the applicants, from 2022 to 2024 the Russian authorities continued to prosecute Mr Navalnyy's supporters with reference to the designation of his organisations as "extremist". The mere fact of having been involved in those organisations' activities could give rise to criminal charges under Article 282.1 of the Criminal Code, which penalises the organisation of or participation in an extremist community. Furthermore, by July 2024 the authorities had opened criminal proceedings against more than 50 individuals across the country for their alleged involvement with the FBK or Mr Navalnyy's regional network, on charges related to "extremist activity". In addition, at least 37 people were prosecuted for making donations to the FBK, in some cases involving amounts that were manifestly negligible. Separately, at least 57 individuals were convicted under Article 20.3 of the CAO for displaying prohibited symbols, including by posting photographs of Mr Navalnyy or reposting material relating to him or his organisations that had been designated as extremist.

## RELEVANT LEGAL FRAMEWORK

### I. RELEVANT DOMESTIC LAW AND PRACTICE

#### A. Legal instruments

##### 1. *Criminal Code*

40. The Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, as in force at the material time, provided as follows:

**Article 174. Legalisation (laundering) of monetary funds or other property acquired by others through criminal means**

“1. Carrying out financial operations or other transactions with monetary funds or other property knowingly acquired by other persons through criminal activity, for the purpose of giving a lawful appearance to the ownership, possession or disposal of those funds or that property, shall be punishable by:

a fine of up to 120,000 roubles, or a fine in an amount equivalent to the convicted person’s wages or other income for a period of up to one year.

...

4. The acts defined in paragraph 1 ... of this Article, when committed:

- (a) by an organised group; or
- (b) on an especially large scale,

shall be punishable by compulsory labour for a term of up to five years with or without restriction of liberty for up to two years and with or without disqualification from holding specified offices or engaging in specified activities for up to three years, or imprisonment for a term of up to seven years with an optional fine of up to 1,000,000 roubles (or the convicted person’s wages or other income for up to five years) or without such a fine, with or without restriction of liberty for up to two years, and with or without disqualification from holding specified offices or engaging in specified activities for up to five years.

Note. For the purposes of this Article and Article 174.1 of this Code, financial operations or other transactions involving monetary funds or other property shall be deemed to be committed on a large scale when their value exceeds 1,500,000 roubles, and to be committed on an especially large scale when their value exceeds 6,000,000 roubles.”

##### 2. *Code of Criminal Procedure*

41. The Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation, as in force at the material time, provided as follows:

**Article 82. Storage of physical evidence**

“1. Physical evidence shall be kept with the criminal case file until the judgment enters into legal force or until the expiry of the time-limit for appealing against the decision or ruling to discontinue the criminal proceedings, and shall be transmitted

together with the criminal case, except in the cases provided for by this Article. Where a dispute over ownership of the property constituting physical evidence is to be resolved in civil proceedings, the physical evidence shall be kept until the court's decision enters into legal force.

2. Physical evidence in the form of:

...

3.1) money, valuables and other property obtained as a result of the commission of a crime, as well as income derived from such property and discovered in the course of investigative actions, shall be subject to seizure in accordance with the procedure set out in Article 115 of this Code;

...

4.1) money, after the necessary investigative actions have been carried out, shall be photographed or recorded on video or film and:

(a) shall be returned to their lawful owner ...”

#### **Article 115. Seizure of property**

“1. To secure the enforcement of a sentence in respect of a civil claim, the recovery of a fine or other pecuniary penalties, or the possible confiscation of property referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 104.1 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, an investigator (with the consent of the head of the investigative body) or an inquiry officer (with the consent of the prosecutor) shall lodge an application with the court for the seizure of the property of a suspect, an accused person, or any other persons who, under the law, bear material liability for their actions.

The court shall examine the application in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 165 of this Code. When deciding whether to seize property, the court must set out the specific factual circumstances on which its decision is based and must specify any restrictions on the ownership, use or disposal of the seized property.

2. Seizure of property shall consist both in a prohibition, addressed to the owner or holder of the property, on disposing of it and, where necessary, on using it, and also in the removal of the property and its transfer into safekeeping.

3. Seizure may also be applied to property held by other persons who are neither suspects nor accused, nor persons bearing statutory material liability for their actions, where there are sufficient grounds to believe that such property was obtained through the suspect's or accused's criminal conduct, or was used, or intended for use, as an instrument, equipment or other means of committing an offence, or for financing terrorism, extremist activity (extremism), an organised group, an unlawful armed formation, or a criminal community (criminal organisation).

The court shall consider the application in the manner laid down in Article 165 of this Code. In deciding whether to seize the property, the court must set out the specific factual circumstances on which the decision is based, specify any restrictions on ownership, use or disposal of the seized property, and state the period for which the seizure is imposed, taking account of the time-limit for the pre-trial investigation in the criminal case and the time required to transmit the case to the court. The period of seizure fixed by the court may be extended in accordance with the procedure provided in Article 115.1 of this Code.

...

7. Where monetary funds or other valuables held in an account, a deposit, or otherwise in safekeeping with banks or other credit institutions are placed under seizure, all transactions on that account shall be suspended, in whole or in part, up to the amount of the funds and valuables seized.

...

9. A seizure imposed in respect of property, or any separate restrictions to which the seized property has been subjected, shall be cancelled by a ruling or decision of the person or body conducting the criminal proceedings whenever the application of that coercive procedural measure, or of the particular restrictions, is no longer necessary, and likewise where the period of seizure fixed by the court has expired or an extension has been refused.

A seizure imposed on non-cash funds held in the accounts of persons who are neither suspects nor accused, nor persons bearing statutory material liability for their actions – where the seizure was imposed to secure enforcement of the sentence in respect of a civil claim – shall also be lifted if, during the pre-trial investigation, ownership of the seized funds has been established and there is no information from an interested party, supported by appropriate documents, indicating a dispute as to their ownership, or if ownership of those funds has been determined by a court in civil proceedings brought by a person recognised as a victim and/or civil claimant in the criminal case.”

**Article 115.1. Procedure for extending the period during which the coercive procedural measure of seizure of property is applied**

“1. The period of seizure imposed on the property of the persons referred to in paragraph 3 of Article 115 of this Code may be extended if the grounds for applying that measure have not ceased to exist.

2. Where the period of seizure fixed by the court in respect of property belonging to persons who are neither suspects nor accused, nor persons bearing statutory material liability for their actions, is about to expire, or where the preliminary investigation is suspended on the grounds set out in paragraph 1 of Article 208 of this Code, the investigator (with the consent of the head of the investigative body) or the inquiry officer (with the consent of the prosecutor) shall, no later than seven days before the expiry of the period of seizure or before the suspension of the preliminary investigation, lodge an application with the court at the place where the investigation is being conducted, seeking an extension of that period, and shall issue a corresponding order. The order initiating the application shall specify the concrete factual circumstances showing the need to extend the period of seizure and to maintain the restrictions placed on the property, and state the length of time for which extension is sought. Materials substantiating the application shall be attached to the order.

3. The application shall be examined by a single judge of a district court or of a military court at the corresponding level within five days of its receipt.

...

5. Having considered the application, the judge shall give a ruling extending the period of seizure and maintaining or amending the restrictions on ownership, use or disposal of the property, or wholly or partly refusing to grant the application, including cancelling the seizure or varying the above-mentioned restrictions ...

6. In deciding whether to extend the period of seizure or to maintain the restrictions upon the property, the person or body conducting the criminal proceedings and the court must ensure the observance of a reasonable period for applying this coercive measure

to the property of persons who are neither suspects nor accused, nor persons bearing statutory material liability for their actions. When determining a reasonable period of seizure, account shall be taken of the circumstances specified in paragraph 3.2 of Article 6.1 of this Code ...

7. A judge's ruling made under paragraph 5 of this Article may be appealed against to a higher court by way of appeal or cassation in accordance with Chapters 45.1 and 47.1 of this Code."

**Article 165. Judicial procedure for obtaining authorisation to carry out an investigative action**

"1. In the cases set out in sub-paragraphs 4 to 9, 10.1, 11 and 12 of paragraph 2 of Article 29 of this Code, the investigator (acting with the consent of the head of the investigative body) or the inquiry officer (acting with the consent of the prosecutor) shall apply to the court for permission to carry out the investigative action, and shall issue a corresponding order.

...

4. Having examined the application, the judge shall issue a ruling either authorising the investigative action or refusing to authorise it, giving reasons for any refusal.

5. In exceptional circumstances, where an inspection of a dwelling, a search or seizure in a dwelling, a personal search, the seizure of an item pledged to or deposited with a pawn shop, or the seizure of property referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 104.1 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation cannot be delayed, those investigative actions may be carried out on the basis of an order issued by the investigator or inquiry officer without prior court authorisation.

In such a case the investigator or inquiry officer shall, no later than three days from the start of the investigative action, notify the judge and the prosecutor that it has been carried out, attaching copies of the order authorising the action and of the record of the action so that the legality of the decision may be reviewed. On receiving that notification, the judge shall, within the period specified in paragraph 2 of this Article, examine the legality of the investigative action and issue a ruling declaring it lawful or unlawful. If the judge finds the action unlawful, all evidence obtained during it shall be deemed inadmissible under Article 75 of this Code."

**Article 182. Grounds and procedure for conducting a search**

"1. The basis for conducting a search shall be the availability of sufficient information to believe that, in a given place or with a given person, there may be instruments, equipment or other means of committing an offence, as well as objects, documents or valuables that may be of significance to the criminal case.

2. A search shall be carried out on the basis of an order issued by the investigator.

3. A search of a dwelling shall be carried out on the basis of a court decision given in the manner laid down in Article 165 of this Code.

4. Before commencing a search the investigator shall present the order authorising it, and, where paragraph 3 of this Article applies, the court decision authorising it.

5. Before commencing a search the investigator shall invite the person concerned to voluntarily hand over any objects, documents and valuables subject to seizure that may be relevant to the criminal case. If they are surrendered voluntarily and there is no reason to fear their concealment, the investigator may dispense with the search.

6. In the course of a search any premises may be forced open if the owner refuses voluntarily to open them; unnecessary damage to property must not be caused.

7. The investigator shall take measures to ensure that any circumstances relating to private life revealed during the search, including personal and/or family secrets of the person whose premises are searched and of other persons, are not disclosed.

8. The investigator may prohibit persons present at the place of the search from leaving it or communicating with each other or with third parties until the search has been completed.

...

10. Seized objects, documents and valuables shall be shown to the attesting witnesses and other persons present at the search and, where necessary, packed and sealed on the spot; this shall be certified by the signatures of those persons.

11. The person whose premises are being searched, or adult members of his or her family, shall participate in the search. Defence counsel and the lawyer representing the person whose premises are searched are likewise entitled to be present.

12. A record of the search shall be drawn up in accordance with Articles 166 and 167 of this Code.

13. The record shall indicate where and under what circumstances the objects, documents or valuables were discovered, and whether they were surrendered voluntarily or seized compulsorily. All seized items must be itemised with precise details of their quantity, dimensions, weight, distinguishing features and, where possible, their value.

...”

### 3. “Foreign agent” legislation

42. For the original version of the “foreign agent” legislation applicable to NGOs and initial changes to it, see *Ecodefence and Others v. Russia* (nos. 9988/13 and 60 others, §§ 15-40, 14 June 2022). For subsequent developments relating to the “foreign agent” legislation, see *Kobaliya and Others v. Russia* (nos. 39446/16 and 106 others, §§ 18-37, 22 October 2024).

### 4. *Suppression of Extremism Act*

43. For a summary of the Suppression of Extremism Act (2002) and the evaluation by Council of Europe bodies, including the European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission) of the Council of Europe, see *Taganrog LRO and Others v. Russia* (nos. 32401/10 and 19 others, §§ 114-16 and 128-32, 7 June 2022).

## **B. Guidance by the Plenary Supreme Court**

44. On 1 June 2017 the Plenary Session of the Supreme Court adopted Resolution no. 19 “on the courts’ practice in examining applications for the conduct of investigative actions entailing restrictions on citizens’ constitutional rights (Article 165 of the Code of Criminal Procedure)”.



45. Paragraph 12 of the Resolution states that, beyond checking the procedural requirements for lodging an application, the judge must verify the factual grounds for the investigative action requested: for example, in relation to a search of a dwelling, by checking that the case file contains sufficient information suggesting that instruments or other means of committing an offence and relevant items, documents or valuables may be found there.

46. Paragraph 16 states that, in accordance with Article 165 § 5 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, judicial review covers both the lawfulness of the decision to conduct the action and compliance with procedural rules. The judge must be satisfied that (i) the action falls within Article 165 § 5, (ii) the urgency of the action has been substantiated, (iii) the decision-making procedure has been observed by the investigator or inquiry officer, and (iv) the action complied with criminal procedure requirements. Exceptional cases in which the investigative action cannot be postponed include: the need to prevent or stop an offence; a risk of absconding if the action is delayed; a real risk of destruction or concealment of items or instruments of the offence; or sufficient grounds to believe that a person on the premises is concealing items or documents significant to the case.

## II. RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL AND EUROPEAN MATERIAL

### A. Council of Europe

47. In its Resolution 2540 (2024) adopted on 17 April 2024, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe called on the Russian Federation to cease persecuting the family members, associates and supporters of Mr Navalnyy in Russia and abroad. It condemned the authorities' practice of designating political opponents, journalists and civil activists as "terrorists" or "extremists", and described the Russian Federation as having gradually transformed into a State that barred the existence of any political opposition.

### B. European Union

48. On 7 April 2022 the European Parliament adopted a resolution on the increasing repression in Russia, including the case of Aleksey Navalnyy (2022/2622(RSP)). It condemned the use of legislation on "foreign agents" and "extremist organisations" as tools to suppress independent civil society and political opposition, and considered the repression against Mr Navalnyy, his supporters, the media and civil society to be part of a broader campaign to silence dissenting voices in the country.

49. In a statement issued on 10 June 2021, the European Union denounced the ruling of the Moscow City Court designating Mr Navalnyy's

organisations as “extremist” and prohibiting their activities. It stated, in particular:

“Yesterday’s ruling by a Moscow Court to label Mr [Aleksey] Navalny[y]’s organisations as ‘extremist groups’ marks the most serious effort to date by the Russian Government to suppress the independent political opposition and anti-corruption investigations, and to eliminate Mr Navalny[y]’s political networks’ influence ahead of the State Duma elections in September and beyond. It is an unfounded decision that confirms a negative pattern of a systematic crackdown on human rights and freedoms which are enshrined in the Russian constitution. This ruling will have far-reaching consequences for the Russian civil society, opposition and critical voices. ...”

## THE LAW

### I. PRELIMINARY ISSUES

#### A. Joinder of the applications

50. Having regard to the similar subject matter of the applications, the Court finds it appropriate to examine them jointly in a single judgment.

#### B. The Court’s jurisdiction

51. The Court observes that the facts giving rise to the alleged violations of the Convention occurred prior to 16 September 2022, the date on which the Russian Federation ceased to be a party to the Convention. The Court therefore decides that it has jurisdiction to examine the present applications (see *Fedotova and Others v. Russia* [GC], nos. 40792/10 and 2 others, §§ 68-73, 17 January 2023, and *Pivkina and Others v. Russia* (dec.), no. 2134/23 and 6 others, § 46, 6 June 2023).

#### C. Consequences of the Government’s failure to participate in the proceedings

52. The Court further notes that the Government, by failing to submit any written observations in the present case, manifested an intention to abstain from participating in its examination. However, the cessation of a Contracting Party’s membership of the Council of Europe does not release it from its duty to cooperate with the Convention bodies. Consequently, the Government’s failure to engage in the proceedings cannot constitute an obstacle to the examination of these cases (Rule 44C of the Rules of Court; see also *Georgia v. Russia (II)* (just satisfaction) [GC], no. 38263/08, §§ 25-27, 28 April 2023; *Svetova and Others v. Russia*, no. 54714/17, §§ 29-31, 24 January 2023; and *Glukhin v. Russia*, no. 11519/20, §§ 42-43, 4 July 2023).

**D. *Locus standi***

53. Although the Government have not raised any objection to the Court's jurisdiction *ratione personae*, the Court considers of its own motion that this matter warrants examination (see *Sejdić and Finci v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* [GC], nos. 27996/06 and 34836/06, § 27, ECHR 2009, and *Karpylenko v. Ukraine*, no. 15509/12, § 102, 11 February 2016).

*1. Whether the heir of the late Mr Aleksey Navalnyy can pursue the applications in his stead*

54. The Court notes that Ms Yuliya Borisovna Navalnaya expressed her wish to pursue the applications on behalf of her late husband, Mr Aleksey Navalnyy (see paragraph 5 above), and has submitted documents attesting to her status as his heir. It further observes that, in application no. 13505/20, Mr Navalnyy lodged an individual complaint under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention concerning the freezing of his bank accounts, together with related complaints under Articles 10, 11, 13 and 18 of the Convention. In application no. 22357/21, Mr Navalnyy also complained, under Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, that he had been rendered ineligible to stand for election following the designation of the FBK as an "extremist" organisation.

55. The Court reiterates that, where an applicant has died during the Convention proceedings, it has had regard to statements from the applicant's heirs or close relatives who have expressed a wish to pursue the application (see, among other authorities, *Gaggl v. Austria*, no. 63950/19, § 35, 8 November 2022). It has accepted that the next of kin or heir may continue the proceedings before the Court, provided that he or she can demonstrate a sufficient interest in the case (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, § 97, ECHR 2014, with further references).

56. In the light of the foregoing considerations, and having regard to the circumstances of the present case, the Court accepts that Ms Navalnaya has a legitimate interest in obtaining a finding as to whether there was a breach of her late husband's rights under the Convention. In accordance with her request, it will therefore proceed with the examination of the complaints as submitted originally by Mr Navalnyy. For convenience, the present judgment will refer to Mr Navalnyy as an applicant.

*2. Procedural succession in respect of the applicant organisations which have ceased to exist*

57. The Court notes that the five applicant organisations were dissolved or disbanded in the course of the proceedings before it (see the appendix). In their observations, the applicants have provided information on the founders

and former directors of these organisations who wish to pursue the applications in their stead.

58. The Court reiterates that the dissolution of an association affects not only the association itself but also its presidents, founders and members (see *Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow and Others v. Russia*, no. 302/02, § 101, 10 June 2010, with further references). It follows that former directors and members of a dissolved or liquidated applicant association may have a legitimate personal interest in pursuing its complaint stemming from the allegation that the dissolution or liquidation was the result of unlawful State interference (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Ecodefence and Others v. Russia*, nos. 9988/13 and 60 others, § 69, 14 June 2022). The Court considers that to decline to examine such complaints solely because the organisations have ceased to exist would risk depriving Article 34 of the Convention of its practical effect and enabling the impugned measures – mass searches and seizures, asset freezes or the designation of entities as “foreign agents” or “extremist” organisations – to escape judicial scrutiny (compare *Uniya OOO and Belcourt Trading Company v. Russia*, nos. 4437/03 and 13290/03, § 264, 19 June 2014).

59. Accordingly, the Court finds that the founders and former directors of the applicant organisations that have ceased to exist, who are listed with their titles in the appendix, have standing to pursue the applications lodged by those organisations.

#### **E. Victim status**

60. The Court reiterates that under Article 34 of the Convention it may receive applications from any person, non-governmental organisation or group of individuals claiming to be the victim of a violation by one of the High Contracting Parties of the rights set forth in the Convention or the Protocols thereto (see *National Federation of Sportspersons' Associations and Unions (FNASS) and Others v. France*, nos. 48151/11 and 77769/13, § 93, 18 January 2018). It has held, in the context of a religious institution, that the absence of formal legal personality status under domestic law does not prevent an entity from acting as an applicant, where its rights and capacity to take legal action in its own name have been recognised by the domestic authorities, including the courts (see *Chief Rabbinate of the Jewish Community of İzmir v. Türkiye*, no. 1574/12, §§ 43-46, 21 March 2023, and, *mutatis mutandis*, *Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church (Metropolitan Inokentiy) and Others v. Bulgaria* (just satisfaction), nos. 412/03 and 35677/04, §§ 34-35, 16 September 2010). Similar logic can be applied in the present case. The Court notes that the applicant movement known as the Navalnyy Headquarters, although not formally registered as a legal entity, existed as a structured and coordinated network with a recognised leadership and common political aims (see paragraph 7 above). The domestic

courts themselves acknowledged that the Navalnyy Headquarters was a public association operating without State registration or the acquisition of legal-entity status; it was headed by Mr Volkov, had offices in thirty-seven regions and functioned as an interregional association. They further referred to it in the extremism proceedings as a component part of the “extremist organisations” led by Mr Navalnyy and treated it as such in the measures prohibiting its activities (see paragraphs 34-35 above). Accordingly, the Court considers that the movement had a *de facto* existence and was directly affected by the impugned measures. It may therefore, for the purposes of Article 34, claim to be a victim of the alleged violations.

61. The Court further observes that, according to its well-established case-law, a decision by the authorities to dissolve or prohibit an association or movement affects not only the entity itself but also its presidents, founders and individual members (see *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 101, and the cases cited therein). It follows that the applicants in application no. 56994/22, who were members of the FBK, the Shtab organisation or the FZPG or served as coordinators within the Navalnyy Headquarters network, may claim to be victims of the alleged violations of Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention on account of the dissolution of those organisations or the prohibition of their activities following their designation as “extremist”.

## II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 8 OF THE CONVENTION ON ACCOUNT OF MASS SEARCHES

62. The majority of the applicants (see the appendix) complained that the searches of their homes and offices and the seizure of their property, documents and equipment had breached Article 8 of the Convention, and that there had been no effective judicial review of those measures, in breach of Article 13.

63. By virtue of the *jura novit curia* principle, the Court remains the master of the characterisation to be given to the facts of the case (see, among other authorities, *Radomilja and Others v. Croatia* [GC], nos. 37685/10 and 22768/12, § 126, 20 March 2018). Having regard to its established case-law (see *Italgomme Pneumatici S.r.l. v. Italy*, nos. 36617/18 and 12 others, § 70, 6 February 2025, and the cases cited therein), the Court considers it appropriate to examine the applicants’ complaints solely under Article 8 of the Convention, which provides:

### Article 8

“1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.

2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in

the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.”

### **A. Admissibility**

64. The Court notes that this complaint is neither manifestly ill-founded nor inadmissible on any other grounds listed in Article 35 of the Convention. It must therefore be declared admissible.

### **B. Merits**

#### *1. The applicants’ submissions*

65. The applicants submitted that the searches and the indiscriminate seizures of various items had neither pursued a legitimate aim nor been “in accordance with the law” or “necessary in a democratic society”. They pointed out that they had had no procedural status in the criminal proceedings in which the search of their homes and offices had been ordered and that none of them had been suspected or accused of any offence related to the alleged money-laundering scheme. They further stressed that they had never deposited money through ATMs into the FBK’s accounts. Some of the applicants had never worked for the FBK and had no formal connection to Mr Navalnyy or his organisations. In particular, it was unclear how the Shtab organisation, which had been established only in 2019, could have been implicated in an offence allegedly committed between 1 January 2016 and 31 December 2018. Furthermore, the search orders had been couched in vague terms, granting the investigating authorities unlimited discretion in conducting the searches and seizing the applicants’ property and documents.

#### *2. The Court’s assessment*

##### **(a) General principles**

66. The relevant general principles concerning searches and resulting interference with private life were summarised in *Tortladze v. Georgia* (no. 42371/08, §§ 55-58, 18 March 2021, with further references). In particular, for an interference with an applicant’s “home” or his or her “private life” to be in compliance with Article 8, it must be “in accordance with the law”, undertaken in pursuit of a “legitimate aim”, and “necessary in a democratic society”.

67. The wording “in accordance with the law” requires that the impugned measure both have a basis in domestic law and be compatible with the rule of law. The law must therefore meet quality requirements: it must be accessible to the person concerned and foreseeable as to its effects (see *Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], no. 47143/06, §§ 228-30, 4 December 2015). In the context of searches and seizures, domestic law must afford individuals adequate

protection against arbitrary interference with their rights under Article 8. The domestic law must therefore be sufficiently clear in its terms and should include adequate indication as to the circumstances and conditions in which public authorities are empowered to conduct searches and seizures (see *Särgava v. Estonia*, no. 698/19, § 87, 16 November 2021).

68. Furthermore, the Court must ensure that the relevant legislation and practice affords individuals adequate and effective safeguards against abuse; notwithstanding the margin of appreciation which the Court recognises the Contracting States have in this sphere, it must be particularly vigilant where the authorities are empowered under national law to order and carry out searches without a judicial warrant (see *Korniyets and Others v. Ukraine*, nos. 2599/16 and 2 others, § 59, 10 July 2025, and the cases cited therein).

**(b) Application of the above-mentioned principles in the present case**

69. The searches of the individual applicants' homes and the seizure of their property amounted to an interference with their right to respect for their private life and home within the meaning of Article 8 § 1 of the Convention (see *Avaz Zeynalov v. Azerbaijan*, nos. 37816/12 and 25260/14, § 78, 22 April 2021, with further references). Likewise, the searches and seizures conducted on the premises of the applicant organisations constituted an interference with their right to respect for their home and correspondence (see *UAB Kesko Senukai Lithuania v. Lithuania*, no. 19162/19, § 109, 4 April 2023, and *Association for European Integration and Human Rights and Ekimdzhiev v. Bulgaria*, no. 62540/00, § 60, 28 June 2007).

70. The Court observes that while the searches and seizures in the present case were formally carried out under Articles 165 and 182 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the applicants maintained that the interference had been unlawful owing to the absence of any factual grounds justifying it. The central question under Article 8 in the present case is therefore not the quality of the relevant domestic provisions, but whether their application and interpretation by the domestic authorities afforded the applicants adequate protection against arbitrariness (see *Guliyev v. Azerbaijan*, no. 54588/13, § 51, 6 July 2023).

71. The Court notes that, under Russian law, searches of dwellings may only be authorised by a court upon an investigator's reasoned request demonstrating that sufficient information exists to believe that relevant items, documents or means of committing an offence may be found on the premises (Article 165 §§ 1 and 4 and Article 182 §§ 1 and 3 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). The majority of searches in the present case were formally authorised by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow with the stated aim of uncovering criminal evidence. However, those authorisations were issued on the basis of standard-form investigator's applications reiterating the general allegations of money laundering against "persons affiliated with the FBK" and merely asserting that relevant items might be found at the

applicants' premises owing to their connection to Mr Navalnyy (see paragraph 25 above). The investigator's applications therefore lacked individualised reasoning capable of demonstrating the "sufficient information" required by Article 182 § 1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and by paragraph 12 of the Supreme Court's Resolution (see paragraphs 41 and 45 above).

72. While neither the Code of Criminal Procedure nor the Supreme Court's Resolution defines what constitutes "sufficient information", the Court considers that such information should correspond, in Convention terms, to a reasonable suspicion against the person concerned (see *Wieser and Bicos Beteiligungen GmbH v. Austria*, no. 74336/01, § 57, ECHR 2007-IV). None of the applicants was ever charged or even formally treated as a suspect in the money-laundering proceedings. The investigator's applications specified neither a date nor a transaction nor any concrete document linking the individual applicants or the applicant organisations to the allegedly laundered funds. In many instances, the persons concerned were not FBK employees or regional coordinators within the Navalnyy network, but volunteers, former staff members or journalists (see the appendix). Furthermore, it was incongruous to attribute involvement in an offence allegedly committed between 1 January 2016 and 31 December 2018 to the Shtab organisation, which was established only in May 2019.

Search warrants couched in such broad and generic language could thus have applied indiscriminately to virtually anyone who had, at any time, assisted or associated with the FBK or Mr Navalnyy. Such formulaic assertions, unaccompanied by any concrete facts or documents linking the individual to the alleged offence, failed to demonstrate a "reasonable suspicion" of the applicants' involvement in the matter under investigation (compare *Avaz Zeynalov*, cited above, § 88).

73. By approving the template-based investigator's applications without verifying whether they contained sufficient factual grounds as required by Article 182 § 1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and paragraph 12 of the Supreme Court's Resolution, the Basmannyy District Court failed to carry out the effective judicial scrutiny required under domestic law and in effect rubber-stamped the investigator's requests (see *Kruglov and Others v. Russia*, nos. 11264/04 and 15 others, § 127, 4 February 2020). Its review was purely formalistic and confined to endorsing the investigator's assertions, thereby depriving the authorisation procedure of its protective function against arbitrariness.

74. Furthermore, in at least 36 cases, searches were carried out under the urgent-search procedure provided for in Article 165 § 5 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. That provision, of an exceptional nature, allows investigators to dispense with prior judicial authorisation only when delay would jeopardise the investigation and requires them to notify a judge within three days for a prompt judicial review. In the present case, the investigators



justified the use of that procedure by referring in general terms to a risk of destruction or concealment of evidence after the initiation of the investigation (see paragraph 27 above). However, the majority of urgent searches were conducted on 15 October 2019, more than two months after the criminal proceedings had been opened, and over a month after the mass searches of 12 September 2019, when numerous investigative measures had already been carried out. No concrete information was provided to substantiate the alleged risk, such as examples of prior attempts to destroy or conceal documents. The domestic courts, for their part, confined their review to confirming the formal lawfulness of the investigator's actions, without assessing whether the urgency had been duly substantiated by factual circumstances or whether the searches fell within the narrowly defined exceptional situations listed in paragraph 16 of the Supreme Court's Resolution (see paragraph 46 above).

75. The foregoing considerations are sufficient to enable the Court to conclude that the interference in question was not "in accordance with the law" within the meaning of Article 8 § 2 of the Convention. Accordingly, it is not necessary to examine whether the interference pursued a legitimate aim or was necessary in a democratic society (see *Rustamkhanli v. Azerbaijan*, no. 24460/16, § 47, 4 July 2024).

76. Finally, the Court notes that the impugned orders authorised the search for "items, documents or electronic devices relevant to the criminal case" (see paragraph 25 above). They were thus couched in general and broad terms and allowed searches and seizures at the applicants' homes and at the premises of the applicant organisations without specifying the particular items or documents sought. The Court reiterates that, according to its case-law, search orders must, as far as practicable, be drafted in a manner calculated to keep their impact within reasonable bounds (see *Avaz Zeynalov*, cited above, § 88). This requirement was manifestly disregarded in the present case, as the search orders conferred upon the investigative authorities virtually unfettered discretion as to their scope and object.

77. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention in respect of the applicants listed in the appendix.

### III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL No. 1 TO THE CONVENTION ON ACCOUNT OF THE FREEZING OF BANK ACCOUNTS

78. The majority of the applicants (see the appendix) complained that the freezing of their bank accounts had infringed their property rights, in breach of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, and that the domestic remedies available to them were ineffective in breach of Article 13.

79. The Court, being the master of characterisation to be given in law to the facts of the case, will consider these complaints under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention (see *Radomilja and Others*, cited above,

and *Korotiyuk v. Ukraine*, no. 74663/17, §§ 28-29, 19 January 2023), which reads as follows:

“Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.

The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.”

### A. Admissibility

80. The Court reiterates that, although the Government did not raise a plea of inadmissibility based on the applicants’ alleged non-compliance with the six-month rule, the application of this rule cannot be set aside solely because a Government have not made a preliminary objection on that ground (see *Sabri Güneş v. Turkey* [GC], no. 27396/06, § 29, 29 June 2012, and *Walker v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), no. 34979/97, ECHR 2000-I). The Court therefore considers it appropriate to address this issue in the present case.

81. The Court reiterates that, as a general rule, the six-month time-limit runs from the date of the final decision in the process of exhaustion of domestic remedies (see *Varnava and Others v. Türkiye* [GC], nos. 16064/90 and 8 others, § 157, ECHR 2009). In cases governed by the Code of Criminal Procedure, the appeal judgment must be considered when applying both the requirement of exhaustion of domestic remedies and the six-month rule outlined in Article 35 § 1 of the Convention, as applicable before 24 February 2021 (see *Kashlan v. Russia* (dec.), no. 60189/15, §§ 29-30, 19 April 2016, and *Anikeyev and Yermakova v. Russia* (dec.), nos. 1311/21 and 10219/21, §§ 21-25, 13 April 2021).

82. The Court observes that in applications nos. 14573/20, 14591/20 and 14746/20 the complaints concerning the freezing of bank accounts were lodged more than six months after the appeal decisions upholding the court authorisation of the freezing measures. It further notes that these applicants did not provide any information about any subsequent extension of the freezing measures. It follows that the six-month time-limit laid down in Article 35 § 1 of the Convention has not been complied with.

83. As regards the exceptional extension of the time-limit adopted during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Court reiterates that this three-month grace period applies only where the six-month time-limit either began or expired between 16 March and 15 June 2020 (see *Saakashvili v. Georgia* (dec.), nos. 6232/20 and 22394/20, §§ 46-59, 1 March 2022). In the present cases, both the appeal decision and the introduction of the applications fall outside that window; the COVID-19 extension is therefore

inapplicable (see *Masse v. France* (dec.), no. 47506/20, §§ 20-32, 25 March 2025).

84. The Court notes that, as regards the remaining applications listed in the appendix, this complaint is neither manifestly ill-founded nor inadmissible on any other grounds listed in Article 35 of the Convention. It must therefore be declared admissible.

## **B. Merits**

### *1. The applicants' submissions*

85. The applicants submitted that the freezing of all funds held in their bank accounts, including those in newly opened accounts, constituted an unlawful and disproportionate interference with their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. They argued, in particular, that the underlying criminal case lacked any factual or legal basis demonstrating that the funds in question had been obtained unlawfully. No evidence had been produced to show that the sums allegedly transferred to the FBK's accounts by certain FBK staff members whose accounts had been frozen on 6 August 2019 represented proceeds of crime. As to the remaining applicants, they emphasised that they had never deposited money into FBK accounts through ATMs and had never worked for the organisation.

86. Furthermore, none of the applicants or applicant organisations had been charged or even formally suspected of any criminal offence. Nevertheless, the domestic courts, relying on identical template wording, had ordered the freezing of every rouble standing to their credit, in some instances through collective decisions covering several account holders simultaneously. The measures had remained in force for an extended period without any individualised assessment or substantiated justification.

### *2. The Court's assessment*

#### **(a) Interference with possessions**

87. The Court considers that the impugned measures constituted an interference with the applicants' right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. The freezing of their bank accounts deprived them of the ability to use or dispose of their funds, and thus amounted to a control of the use of property within the meaning of the second paragraph of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention (see *Shorazova v. Malta*, no. 51853/19, § 104, 3 March 2022).

88. However, that provision must be interpreted in the light of the overarching principle set out in the first sentence of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1. Accordingly, the Court must ascertain whether the interference with the applicants' possessions was lawful and pursued a legitimate aim in the public interest, and whether a fair balance was maintained between the

requirements of the general interest and the protection of the applicants' rights (ibid; see also *Microintellect OOD v. Bulgaria*, no. 34129/03, § 37, 4 March 2014).

**(b) Justification for the interference**

89. The Court reiterates that any control of the use of property by a public authority must have a basis in domestic law of sufficient quality, being accessible to the persons concerned, formulated with reasonable precision and foreseeability, and applied in a manner consistent with the principles of the Convention (see *Iatridis v. Greece* [GC], no. 31107/96, § 58, ECHR 1999-II, and *Beyeler v. Italy* [GC], no. 33202/96, §§ 109-10, ECHR 2000-I).

90. It is common ground that the freezing orders were issued under Articles 115 and 115.1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which empower a court to seize assets in order to secure a potential civil claim or fine in criminal proceedings. The Court will therefore proceed on the assumption that the interference had a formal basis in domestic law. It must nevertheless ascertain whether the interpretation and application of those provisions in the present case afforded adequate safeguards against arbitrariness and produced consequences compatible with the Convention principles.

91. The Court observes that under the provisions in question, a freezing order may only be imposed where there are “specific factual circumstances” indicating that the property in question represents the proceeds of crime, and the judicial decision authorising the measure must itself set out the factual circumstances justifying it. Any subsequent extension must likewise specify concrete reasons demonstrating the continuing need for the measure. These domestic requirements are designed to prevent arbitrariness and to ensure the foreseeability of the interference with property rights, as well as the observance of a reasonable balance between competing interests (see paragraph 41 above).

92. In the present case, the domestic courts relied on standardised templates that reproduced, almost verbatim, the investigator's submissions and the wording of the relevant statutory provisions. Each freezing order merely stated that the accounts “were used to launder funds in the amount of RUB 75,535,054.75” and that the freezing measures were necessary to secure a potential civil claim or financial penalty (see paragraph 20 above). None of the decisions contained individualised reasoning or referred to any specific transaction, date or documentary evidence linking a particular applicant or applicant organisation to the alleged money-laundering scheme, or explaining how the funds standing to the credit of a given applicant were connected to the offence under investigation (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Lachikhina v. Russia*, no. 38783/07, § 63, 10 October 2017). Nor did the courts indicate the evidentiary material on which the suspicion was based or otherwise explain the factual basis for the measure (contrast *BENet Praha, spol. s r.o. v. the Czech Republic*, no. 33908/04, § 104, 24 February 2011, where the

seizure orders were supported by thousands of pages of documentary evidence, witness statements and detailed tracing of multiple company transactions).

93. An equally formulaic approach was observed in the extension orders. Between 31 July 2020 and 22 April 2021, the domestic courts issued several collective rulings extending almost all freezing measures then in force, again without adducing any new factual material or demonstrating the continuing necessity of the restrictions. The extension order of 31 July 2020, which covered the majority of the applicants, effectively prolonged the blocking of their bank accounts for at least a year, and left open the prospect of further extensions for as long as the preliminary investigation continued; that investigation is still ongoing, with the last known extension having applied until 3 August 2024 (see paragraph 17 above). A blanket and repetitive practice of that nature was incompatible with the safeguards laid down in Article 115.1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which requires the courts to establish whether the grounds for maintaining a freezing measure still exist and to set a reasonable period for its application in respect of persons who are neither suspects nor accused, such as the applicants in the present case.

94. Moreover, the judicial review of the freezing orders and their extensions was purely formalistic. The Moscow City Court confined its reasoning to brief statements that the orders were “lawful and justified”, without addressing the applicants’ arguments concerning the lack of individualised assessment, the absence of supporting evidence, or the requirement in domestic law that extension orders set out concrete reasons for their continuation. Such a perfunctory review fell short of the level of scrutiny required to prevent the arbitrary application of coercive measures affecting property rights (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Capital Bank AD v. Bulgaria*, no. 49429/99, § 134, ECHR 2005-XII).

95. In view of the above, the Court concludes that the interpretation and application of Articles 115 and 115.1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in respect of the applicants failed to afford the requisite safeguards against arbitrariness. The freezing orders were issued and extended in a manner that disregarded the express statutory requirements of individualised justification and periodic review of their necessity, thereby depriving the applicants of the minimum level of legal protection required to ensure the foreseeability of the measures and to uphold the principles inherent in the rule of law.

96. Accordingly, the Court finds that the interference with the applicants’ right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions was not “in accordance with the law” within the meaning of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention. Having reached that conclusion, the Court considers that it is not necessary to examine whether the interference pursued a legitimate aim or whether a fair balance was struck between the demands of the general interest and the protection of the applicants’ property rights (see *Iatridis*, cited above, § 62).

97. There has therefore been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention in respect of the applicants listed in the appendix.

#### IV. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL No. 1 TO THE CONVENTION ON ACCOUNT OF THE SEIZURE OF PROPERTY

98. Some of the applicants complained about seizure and retention of their personal belongings and documents during the searches (see the appendix). They relied on Articles 1 of Protocol No. 1 and Article 13 of the Convention.

99. The Court will examine these complaints under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention (see *Radomilja and Others*, cited above).

##### **A. Admissibility**

100. The Court notes that this complaint is neither manifestly ill-founded nor inadmissible on any other grounds listed in Article 35 of the Convention. It must therefore be declared admissible.

##### **B. Merits**

###### *1. Submissions by the applicants*

101. The applicants submitted that their personal items, including mobile phones, laptops, computers, hard drives and other electronic devices, had been unlawfully seized during the searches and subsequently retained by the investigating authorities as physical evidence. They emphasised that they were neither suspects nor accused persons in the criminal proceedings, and that the unjustified and prolonged retention of their property breached their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions.

102. In particular, Mr Kolesnikov (application no. 53059/20) complained that during the search of Ms Chekhovich's home on 8 August 2019 the investigator had unlawfully seized an amount of RUB 2,320,000 (approximately EUR 31,550) together with several personal items, including a MacBook Pro, an iPad and an iPhone. He maintained that the seized amount represented the proceeds of the sale of his flat in June 2019, which he had owned since 2015. This amount had never been formally placed under seizure in accordance with Article 115 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, nor had it been returned to him under Article 82 of that Code.

###### *2. The Court's assessment*

###### **(a) Application no. 53059/20 (Mr Kolesnikov)**

103. The Court refers to the general principles set out above in paragraphs 87-88 and considers that the seizure of Mr Kolesnikov's personal

property constituted an interference with his right to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.

104. The Court observes that during the search of Ms Chekhovich's home on 8 August 2019 the investigator seized from Mr Kolesnikov a sum of RUB 2,320,000, as well as several personal items. The applicant produced documentary evidence showing that the seized money represented the proceeds of the sale of his flat in June 2019, which he had lawfully owned since 2015. It is not disputed that he was neither a suspect nor an accused in the criminal case concerning the alleged money-laundering scheme in connection with which the search was carried out.

105. Under Article 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, monetary funds recognised as physical evidence may either be subject to seizure in accordance with Article 115 or returned to their lawful owner after the necessary investigative actions have been completed (see paragraph 41 above). The Court notes that the authorities did not produce any judicial decision formally ordering the seizure of the applicant's money under Article 115. Such authorisation would have allowed the domestic courts to assess the specific factual grounds indicating that the sum in question constituted the proceeds of crime, which represents an essential safeguard against arbitrary application of measures affecting property rights. The reference to the funds being recognised as physical evidence did not, in itself, provide a sufficient legal basis for their continued retention.

106. In these circumstances, the seizure and continued retention of the applicant's money had no legal basis in the domestic law. The authorities' failure either to return the property to its lawful owner or to obtain a formal seizure order rendered their actions arbitrary and inconsistent with the principles of legal certainty and the rule of law (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Forminster Enterprises Limited v. the Czech Republic*, no. 38238/04, § 69, 9 October 2008, and *Smirnov v. Russia*, no. 71362/01, § 57, 7 June 2007). Having reached this conclusion, the Court does not find it necessary to examine whether the seizure and retention of the applicant's electronic devices were lawful and proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued.

107. The Court accordingly finds that the interference with the applicant's right to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions was not "in accordance with the law" within the meaning of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention. There has therefore been a violation of that provision in respect of Mr Kolesnikov.

**(b) The remaining applications**

108. The Court notes that it has already found a violation of the applicants' right to respect for their private life and home on account of the mass searches and seizures (see paragraphs 76-77 above). It therefore considers that it is not necessary to give a separate ruling on the admissibility and merits of their complaints concerning the seizure of property during those

searches (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu*, cited above, § 156, and *Reznik v. Ukraine*, no. 31175/14, §§ 98-100, 23 January 2025).

V. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLES 10 AND 11 OF THE CONVENTION ON ACCOUNT OF THE FBK'S DESIGNATION AS A "FOREIGN AGENT"

109. The FBK in application no. 13505/20 complained that the restrictions imposed on it by the "foreign agent" legislation infringed its right to freedom of expression and association under Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention, the relevant parts of which read as follows:

**Article 10**

"1. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority ...

2. The exercise of these freedoms, since it carries with it duties and responsibilities, may be subject to such formalities, conditions, restrictions or penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society, in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others ..."

**Article 11**

"1. Everyone has the right to freedom of ... association with others ...

2. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of these rights other than such as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others ...."

110. The Court has previously recognised that the freedom of association guaranteed by Article 11 of the Convention must be interpreted in the light of Article 10, given the inherent link between an association's ability to freely express its ideas and the principle of pluralism in a democratic society (see *Ecodefence and Others*, cited above, § 72, and the cases cited therein). This connection is particularly relevant where State interference is prompted, at least in part, by the association's views or statements. The Court will therefore examine the applicants' complaint under Article 11 interpreted in the light of Article 10 of the Convention.

**A. Admissibility**

111. The Court notes that this complaint is neither manifestly ill-founded nor inadmissible on any other grounds listed in Article 35 of the Convention. It must therefore be declared admissible.



## B. Merits

### 1. *Submissions by the applicants*

112. The applicants referred to the Court’s findings in *Ecodefence and Others* (cited above) that the absence of lawfulness of the foreign-agent regime, and the lack of a pressing social need for the creation of “foreign agent” status – which had resulted in additional auditing requirements, restricted funding and disproportionate penalties – had breached Article 11 of the Convention read in the light of Article 10.

### 2. *The Court’s assessment*

113. In the leading case of *Kobaliya and Others v. Russia* (nos. 39446/16 and 105 others, §§ 70-98, 22 October 2024), the Court found that designation as a “foreign agent” was both stigmatising and misleading, as it suggested an agency relationship with foreign actors despite the lack of evidence of foreign control or direction. The “foreign agent” legislation imposed onerous labelling requirements, restrictions on certain activities, and severe sanctions for non-compliance, including significant fines and the possibility of dissolution of organisations. Those measures were found to be not “necessary in a democratic society”.

114. The Court sees no reason to reach a different conclusion in the present case, which likewise concerns a rigid and formalistic application of the “foreign agent” legislation. It notes that the FBK was involved in anti-corruption investigations and public awareness campaigns, activities that lie at the heart of political expression and debate on matters of public interest, and thus attract heightened protection under Article 10. The FBK was designated as a “foreign agent” solely on the basis of having received the equivalent of EUR 1,944 from a foreign source, despite the absence of any evidence suggesting that it was under foreign influence, control or direction, or that it was acting in the interests of a foreign entity. The FBK was subsequently fined approximately EUR 3,250 for carrying out political activities without registering as a foreign agent. In the Court’s view, such punitive sanctions, imposed in response to legitimate civic activity, were not only disproportionate, but were also capable of producing a chilling effect on civil society and public discourse more broadly (see *Kobaliya and Others*, cited above, § 97).

115. It follows that the interference with the FBK’s rights under Article 11 of the Convention read in the light of Article 10 was not justified under the second paragraph of Article 11. There has accordingly been a violation of that provision in respect of the FBK in application no. 135050/20.

VI. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLES 10 AND 11 OF THE CONVENTION AND ARTICLE 3 OF PROTOCOL No. 1 ON ACCOUNT OF THE APPLICANT ORGANISATIONS' DESIGNATION AS "EXTREMIST" AND THEIR DISSOLUTION

116. The Court will next examine the applicants' complaints concerning the designation of the FBK, the FZPG and the Navalnyy Headquarters network as "extremist" organisations, and the ensuing dissolution or prohibition of their activities, which led to the inability of some of the applicants to stand for election (applications nos. 22357/21 and 56994/22). The applicants complained that such actions by the Russian authorities had been in breach of Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention, as well as Article 3 of Protocol No. 1, which reads as follows:

"The High Contracting Parties undertake to hold free elections at reasonable intervals by secret ballot, under conditions which will ensure the free expression of the opinion of the people in the choice of the legislature."

**A. Admissibility**

117. The Court notes that this complaint is neither manifestly ill-founded nor inadmissible on any other grounds listed in Article 35 of the Convention. It must therefore be declared admissible.

**B. Merits**

*1. The applicants' submissions*

118. The applicants submitted that the Suppression of Extremism Act did not meet the Convention requirement of legality. In their view, the core notions of "extremism", "extremist activity" and "extremist organisation" were formulated so broadly and imprecisely that they conferred an unfettered discretion on the prosecuting and judicial authorities, thereby enabling arbitrary enforcement. They argued that the court's order for the immediate dissolution of the FBK, the FZPG and the Navalnyy network of regional offices was manifestly disproportionate to any legitimate aim.

119. The individual applicants in applications nos. 22357/21 and 56994/22 further maintained that, following the impugned decisions, they had been included in the list of persons involved in an extremist organisation, and had consequently been barred from standing for election for a period of between three and five years. They contended that such a ban was based on vague expressions in the legislation and was open to arbitrary and abusive application by the authorities.

120. Lastly, the applicants submitted that the proceedings leading to the designation of the organisations as "extremist" had formed part of an orchestrated State strategy to silence Mr Navalnyy, dismantle his

organisations and intimidate their supporters, and had therefore been politically motivated.

## 2. *The Court's assessment*

### (a) **Designation of the applicant organisations as “extremist” and their dissolution**

#### (i) *General principles*

121. For the general principles regarding the forced dissolution of an association, see *Yefimov and Youth Human Rights Group v. Russia* (nos. 12385/15 and 51619/15, § 54, 7 December 2021).

122. Furthermore, Article 11 of the Convention must be read in the light of Article 10, since the protection of opinions and the freedom to express them constitute one of the objectives of the freedoms of assembly and association, a link particularly relevant where the authorities' intervention against an association or assembly is prompted, at least in part, by the views or statements of its members (see *Yefimov and Youth Human Rights Group*, cited above, § 55, and *Stankov and the United Macedonian Organisation Ilinden v. Bulgaria*, nos. 29221/95 and 29225/95, § 85, ECHR 2001-IX).

#### (ii) *Existence of interference*

123. The Court observes that the impugned measures, namely the dissolution of the FBK and the FZPG and the prohibition of the Navalnyy regional network, prevented the applicants from continuing any collective activity in pursuit of their aims. They therefore constituted an interference with the applicants' right to freedom of association under Article 11 of the Convention (see *Yefimov and Youth Human Rights Group*, cited above, § 54, and *United Communist Party of Turkey and Others v. Turkey*, 30 January 1998, § 33, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-I).

124. Such interference will constitute a breach of Article 11 unless it was “prescribed by law”, pursued one or more legitimate aims under the second paragraph of that Article and was “necessary in a democratic society” for the achievement of those aims.

#### (iii) *Justification for the interference*

125. It was undisputed that the impugned measures had a legal basis in sections 2, 8 and 9 of the Suppression of Extremism Act, provisions that were in principle accessible to the applicants. The Court must nevertheless ascertain whether the domestic law afforded the applicants a sufficient degree of foreseeability and protection against arbitrary interference by public authorities with the rights safeguarded by the Convention (see *Mukhin v. Russia*, no. 3642/10, §§ 165-66, 14 December 2021). It reiterates that, in matters affecting fundamental rights, the law must define with sufficient

clarity the scope of any discretion conferred on the authorities and the manner of its exercise, in order to guard against arbitrariness (see *Ivashchenko v. Russia*, no. 61064/10, § 73, 13 February 2018).

126. In *Taganrog LRO and Others v. Russia* (nos. 32401/10 and 19 others, §§ 158-59, 7 June 2022) the Court found that the statutory definition of “extremism” in Russian law was overly broad and lacked the necessary precision. Such vagueness allowed the authorities to prosecute individuals and organisations for entirely peaceful forms of expression or association and left them with excessive discretion, contrary to the rule of law and the principle of foreseeability. The Court, referring also to the assessments of the Venice Commission and other international bodies, stressed that legal provisions directed against violent or hateful conduct had to be narrowly defined and strictly construed to prevent arbitrary or selective enforcement.

127. The present case illustrates once again the broad and indeterminate manner in which the domestic authorities have interpreted and applied the notion of “extremism”, extending it to conduct falling within the legitimate sphere of political expression and association. The Moscow City Court described the applicant organisations’ actions as “systematic extremist activity aimed at the violent overthrow of the constitutional order, entailing violations of human rights and freedoms, harm to public order and the incitement of social discord”, referring to several aspects of their activity, such as the dissemination of extremist material online, the organisation of unauthorised public events and the alleged involvement of minors (see paragraph 35 above). However, no specific statements were identified as inciting violence, hatred or hostility; no evidence was produced to suggest that the calls to attend public events were anything other than general invitations to participate in peaceful rallies; and there were no indications that the applicants deliberately addressed persons under the age of majority, solicited their participation, or otherwise involved them in organisational activities.

128. In these circumstances, the application of the vague and overly broad notions of “extremism” and “extremist activity” was not limited to conduct involving violence, hatred or coercion, but was extended to the applicants’ ordinary political, associational and expressive activities. The applicants could therefore not have reasonably foreseen that peaceful activities protected in principle by Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention would expose them to the particularly severe sanctions of dissolution or prohibition of their activities. Moreover, as in *Taganrog LRO and Others* (cited above, § 159), the judicial review of the impugned measures did not provide adequate and effective safeguards against an excessively broad interpretation of the concept of “extremism”, resulting in the automatic and overly rigid application of the legislative framework.

129. The Court further notes that the consequences of the designation as “extremist” extended far beyond the dissolution of the FBK and the FZPG

and the prohibition of the Navalnyy Headquarters network. Following the decision of the Moscow City Court, any public display of their symbols, including photographs of Mr Navalnyy or reposts of material referring to the organisations, became potentially punishable as an administrative offence under Article 20.3 of the CAO. A number of former staff members, regional coordinators and supporters of Mr Navalnyy were subsequently prosecuted or convicted for “participating in” or “financing” an extremist organisation, in some instances because they had made minor donations (see paragraphs 37-39 above). Furthermore, their alleged involvement in organisations designated as “extremist” meant that some of them were barred from standing for election for a period of between three and five years. These developments demonstrate the expansive and punitive operation of the “extremism” framework and the chilling effect it produced on political expression and association. Such consequences reveal a system in which peaceful and legitimate conduct is stigmatised and criminalised, a situation fundamentally incompatible with the principles of pluralism and tolerance that form the hallmark of a “democratic society” and bearing no resemblance to the standards of a State governed by the rule of law (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Novaya Gazeta and Others v. Russia*, nos. 11884/22 and 161 others, § 114, 11 February 2025).

130. The Court therefore concludes that the interference was not “prescribed by law” within the meaning of Article 11 § 2 of the Convention. This finding makes it unnecessary for the Court to examine whether the interference also pursued a legitimate aim and was “necessary in a democratic society” (see *Yefimov and Youth Human Rights Group*, cited above, § 74).

131. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 11 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 10, in respect of the applicants in applications nos. 22357/21 and 56994/22.

**(b) Ban on standing for election**

132. As to the complaint by the individual applicants in applications nos. 22357/21 and 56994/22 of a breach of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, the Court notes that the ban on their eligibility to stand for election resulted automatically from their inclusion on the list of persons involved in an extremist organisation, which in turn stemmed directly from the designation of the FBK, the FZPG and the Navalnyy Headquarters network as “extremist”. The restriction was thus an incidental consequence of the measures that the Court has already found to be in breach of Article 11 of the Convention. It is therefore unnecessary to examine this complaint separately (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *United Communist Party of Turkey and Others*, cited above, § 64, and *Linkov v. the Czech Republic*, no. 10504/03, § 56, 7 December 2006).

VII. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 18 OF THE CONVENTION  
TAKEN IN CONJUNCTION WITH ARTICLES 8, 10, 11 AND  
ARTICLES 1 AND 3 OF PROTOCOL No. 1 TO THE CONVENTION

133. The majority of the applicants (see the appendix) alleged that the criminal proceedings and coercive measures pursued against them had been aimed at obstructing their work, intimidating them and their supporters, and preventing Mr Navalnyy from functioning as an effective opposition leader, thereby restricting their rights for purposes other than those prescribed by the Convention. They relied on Article 18 in conjunction with Articles 8, 10, 11 of the Convention and Articles 1 and 3 of Protocol No. 1.

134. Having regard to the circumstances of the case, the Court considers that the present complaint falls to be examined under Article 18 of the Convention in conjunction with Articles 8 and 11 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention. Article 18 provides:

“The restrictions permitted under [the] Convention to the said rights and freedoms shall not be applied for any purpose other than those for which they have been prescribed.”

**A. Admissibility**

135. The Court notes that the right to respect for one’s home and private life, the right to freedom of association and the right to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions are qualified rights which may be subject to restrictions permitted under the Convention (see *Kogan and Others v. Russia*, no. 54003/20, § 78, 7 March 2023, in the context of the right to respect for private and family life; *Navalnyy v. Russia* [GC], nos. 29580/12 and 4 others, §§ 163-76, 15 November 2018, as regards the right to freedom of peaceful assembly under Article 11 of the Convention; and *OAO Neftyanaya Kompaniya Yukos v. Russia*, no. 14902/04, §§ 663-66, 20 September 2011, concerning the right to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions).

136. It further notes that this complaint is neither manifestly ill-founded nor inadmissible on any other grounds listed in Article 35 of the Convention. It must therefore be declared admissible.

**B. Merits**

*1. The applicants’ submissions*

137. The applicants submitted that the mass searches, seizures of property and freezing of bank accounts had been unjustified and had gone beyond the scope of any genuine criminal investigation. The measures in question had formed part of a systematic campaign of intimidation and harassment aimed at obstructing the work of the applicant organisations and preventing them from exercising their rights under Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention. The

investigation had served not to uncover any crime but to suppress the political activities of Mr Navalnyy and his supporters, resulting in the continued and effectively permanent freezing of their funds. The listing of the FBK as a “foreign agent” and its subsequent designation, together with other affiliated organisations, as “extremist” had pursued an ulterior and predominant purpose within the meaning of Article 18 of the Convention, namely to curtail political opposition, paralyse the structures associated with Mr Navalnyy, and intimidate his colleagues and supporters.

138. The applicants further argued that those measures reflected a broader pattern of repression of civil society and political dissent in Russia, evidencing an abusive system of restrictions contrary to the purpose and spirit of the Convention.

## 2. The Court’s assessment

139. The Court will examine the applicants’ complaints in the light of the general principles set out by the Grand Chamber in *Merabishvili v. Georgia* ([GC], no. 72508/13, §§ 287-317, 28 November 2017) and *Navalnyy* ([GC], cited above, §§ 164-65).

140. The Court has already found that the mass searches, the freezing of bank accounts, the FBK’s listing as a “foreign agent” and its subsequent designation as an “extremist” organisation together with the FZPG and Navalnyy Headquarters did not meet the lawfulness requirement under the Convention. Accordingly, the present case does not raise an issue of plurality of purposes as encountered in *Merabishvili*, where a restriction may pursue both an ulterior purpose and a purpose prescribed by the Convention (see *Democracy and Human Rights Resource Centre and Mustafayev v. Azerbaijan*, nos. 74288/14 and 64568/16, § 104, 14 October 2021).

141. The mere fact that a restriction of a Convention right or freedom does not meet all the requirements of the clause that permits it does not necessarily raise an issue under Article 18. Separate examination of a complaint under that provision is warranted only if the claim that a restriction has been applied for a purpose not prescribed by the Convention appears to be a fundamental aspect of the case (see *Merabishvili*, cited above, § 291). It therefore remains to be determined whether there is sufficient evidence that the authorities’ actions were actually driven by an ulterior purpose not prescribed by the Convention.

142. The Court notes at the outset that the applicants’ complaints arise against the background of a well-established pattern of reprisals against Mr Navalnyy and those associated with him, which it has previously examined in several judgments (see *Navalnyy* [GC], cited above; *Navalnyy and Gunko v. Russia*, no. 75186/12, 10 November 2020; *Navalnyy v. Russia* (no. 2), no. 43734/14, 9 April 2019; *Navalnyy and Ofitserov v. Russia*, nos. 46632/13 and 28671/14, 23 February 2016; *Navalnyye v. Russia*, no. 101/15, 17 October 2017; and *Navalnyy and Yashin v. Russia*,

no. 76204/11, 4 December 2014). In some of those cases, the Court identified elements of political motivation in the authorities' actions and expressed concern about arbitrary and unforeseeable applications of criminal law. It has notably found that certain restrictions imposed on Mr Navalnyy pursued an ulterior purpose within the meaning of Article 18 of the Convention, namely to suppress political pluralism and to bring the opposition's political activity under control (see *Navalnyy* [GC], cited above, §§ 173-75). This established pattern provides relevant background for assessing the authorities' intentions in the applications at hand (*ibid.*, §§ 171-72).

143. Turning to the present case, the Court observes the exceptional scale and coordination of the measures complained of, notably mass searches of homes and offices, the seizure of property and the freezing of numerous personal and organisational bank accounts. Most residential searches occurred on two dates, 12 September and 15 October 2019, in various regions across the country, indicating a centrally coordinated operation against the background of the summer 2019 protests (see paragraphs 15 and 24 above). The issuing of freezing orders unfolded in two distinct waves: an initial surge in September to October 2019, coinciding with the searches, and a second in February 2020 (see paragraph 18 above). The measures in question were exceptionally broad in both personal and financial scope, extending to a wide circle of persons and entities linked to Mr Navalnyy, including his close family members, and covering accounts in nearly every major Russian bank (see the appendix). The scale, timing and targeting of these actions also suggest that they were not prompted by any genuine investigative need but formed part of a concerted campaign extending far beyond the remit of an ordinary criminal investigation (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Mammadli v. Azerbaijan*, no. 47145/14, § 102, 19 April 2018, and *Kavala v. Türkiye* (infringement proceedings) [GC], no. 28749/18, § 144, 11 July 2022).

144. The Court also attaches importance to the cumulative context of the other measures examined in the present case, namely the FBK's listing as a "foreign agent", its subsequent designation, together with the FZPG and the Navalnyy Headquarters, as an "extremist" organisation, and the ensuing deregistration of the entities and disqualification of their members from standing for election. Those measures were of particular gravity given their broad impact not only on the applicants themselves, but also on the wider community of political activists and supporters associated with Mr Navalnyy (see *Navalnyy* [GC], cited above, §§ 172-75, and *mutatis mutandis*, *Natig Jafarov v. Azerbaijan*, no. 64581/16, § 69, 7 November 2019). The designation of the FBK, the FZPG and the Navalnyy Headquarters as "extremist" had particularly far-reaching consequences: it led to the liquidation of the registered organisations, the criminalisation of any further activity under their auspices, and the exposure of former members and supporters to prosecution and imprisonment. Taken together, those measures dismantled the organisational framework of Mr Navalnyy's movement,



excluded its members from political life, and sent a clear warning to anyone who might seek to engage in opposition activity. Their combined effect was to paralyse the applicants' legitimate activities in the fields of political expression and civic participation, thereby striking at the heart of pluralistic democracy (see *Navalnyy* [GC], cited above, § 174, as well as *Selahattin Demirtaş v. Turkey* (no. 2) [GC], no. 14305/17, § 436, 22 December 2020, and *Aliyev v. Azerbaijan*, nos. 68762/14 and 71200/14, § 213, 20 September 2018).

145. This conclusion is reinforced by the broader context in which the events unfolded (see *Navalnyy* [GC], cited above, §§ 171-72, and compare *Kutayev v. Russia*, no. 17912/15, § 138, 24 January 2023). In recent years, the political system in Russia has undergone a profound transformation, marked by the progressive dismantling of independent institutions, the suppression of dissenting voices and the erosion of fundamental democratic safeguards, further aggravated by the full-scale military aggression against Ukraine in February 2022. The Court has taken note in its recent judgments of this general trend, observing that the authorities have increasingly restricted the functioning of democratic institutions and political opposition, have gradually eliminated the remaining structures of civil society, and have imposed far-reaching limitations on freedom of expression (see, among other authorities, *Ukraine and the Netherlands v. Russia* [GC], nos. 8019/16 and 3 others, 9 July 2025; *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)* [GC], nos. 20958/14 and 38334/18, 25 June 2024; *Google LLC and Others v. Russia*, no. 37027/22, 8 July 2025; *Selishcheva and Others v. Russia*, nos. 39056/22 and 9 others, 27 May 2025; *Novaya Gazeta and Others*, cited above; *Kobaliya and Others*, cited above; *Andrey Rylkov Foundation and Others v. Russia*, nos. 37949/18 and 83 others, 18 June 2024; *Kogan and Others*, cited above; *Svetova and Others*, cited above; and *Kutayev*, cited above).

146. International bodies have likewise condemned the Russian authorities' treatment of Mr Navalnyy and his organisations as part of a wider effort to suppress political opposition. In its Resolution 2540 (2024) the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe described the Russian Federation as having gradually transformed into a State which barred the existence of any political opposition (see paragraph 47 above). Similarly, the European Parliament, in its resolution of 7 April 2022 on the increasing repression in Russia, condemned the use of legislation on "foreign agents" and "extremist organisations" as tools of political control, viewing the repression against Mr Navalnyy, his supporters, the media and civil society as part of a wider campaign to silence dissenting voices in the country (see paragraph 48 above). The European Union in its statement of 10 June 2021 denounced the Moscow City Court's ruling designating Mr Navalnyy's organisations as "extremist", describing it as an unfounded decision indicative of a systematic crackdown on human rights and aimed at eliminating independent political opposition (see paragraph 49 above).

147. The Court observes that the official reasons advanced by the authorities, namely the fight against money laundering and extremism, were not supported by any evidence of genuine criminal conduct and instead served as a pretext for dismantling independent political and civic structures. Having regard to the cumulative pattern of measures – the coordinated mass searches and freezing of bank accounts, the FBK’s listing as a “foreign agent”, the dissolution and criminalisation of the applicant organisations through their designation as “extremist”, and the broader context of the progressive suppression of political pluralism in Russia – the Court considers that the authorities’ actions were not applied for any purpose prescribed by the Convention. They formed part of a concerted effort on an unprecedented scale to strike at the heart of and eliminate the organised democratic opposition centred around Mr Navalnyy and therefore pursued an ulterior purpose within the meaning of Article 18 of the Convention.

148. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 18 taken in conjunction with Articles 8 and 11 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

#### VIII. OTHER ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE CONVENTION

149. The majority of the applicants further complained that the mass searches of their homes and offices, the seizure of their personal belongings and the freezing of their bank accounts also infringed their rights under Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention. Lastly, some applicants alleged that no effective domestic remedies were available in respect of their complaints under those provisions (see the appendix).

150. Having regard to the facts of the case, the applicants’ submissions and its findings above, the Court considers that it has already dealt with the main legal questions raised in the present applications, and no separate ruling is required on the admissibility or merits of the remaining complaints (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu*, cited above, § 156).

#### IX. APPLICATION OF ARTICLES 41 AND 46 OF THE CONVENTION

151. Article 41 of the Convention provides:

“If the Court finds that there has been a violation of the Convention or the Protocols thereto, and if the internal law of the High Contracting Party concerned allows only partial reparation to be made, the Court shall, if necessary, afford just satisfaction to the injured party.”

152. Article 46 of the Convention, in so far as relevant, provides as follows:

“1. The High Contracting Parties undertake to abide by the final judgment of the Court in any case to which they are parties.

2. The final judgment of the Court shall be transmitted to the Committee of Ministers, which shall supervise its execution.

...”

**A. Applications nos. 13505/20, 53059/20, 22357/21 and 56994/22**

153. Relying on the Court’s case-law, the applicants in applications nos. 13505/20, 53059/20, 22357/21 and 56994/22 each claimed 10,000 euros (EUR) in respect of non-pecuniary damage, except for Mr Navalnyy, who claimed EUR 100,000. As regards pecuniary damage, the claims were as follows: (i) the FBK claimed approximately EUR 820,867 in respect of funds frozen in its bank accounts and subsequently converted into State revenue following its dissolution; (ii) Mr Gimadi, Mr Pomazuyev, Mr Zamyatin, Ms Chanysheva, Ms Guseva, Mr Shaveddinov and Mr Boyko each claimed EUR 1,000 in respect of personal property seized during the searches of their homes; (iii) Mr Zamyatin claimed EUR 1,000 in respect of seized property and EUR 3,914.31 for amounts frozen in his bank account; and (iv) Mr Kolesnikov claimed EUR 1,000 in respect of seized property and EUR 31,550 for money seized during the search, which he submitted had derived from the sale of his apartment.

154. The Court reiterates that a clear causal link must be established between the damage claimed and the violation found (see *Valant v. Slovenia*, no. 23912/12, § 68, 24 January 2017). It notes that the applicants sustained pecuniary losses as a result of unlawful interferences with their rights under Articles 8 of the Convention, on account of the seizure of their property, and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, concerning the freezing of the bank accounts of the FBK and Mr Zamyatin and the subsequent confiscation of the FBK’s funds.

155. The Court notes that, under Rule 60 of the Rules of Court, any claim for just satisfaction must be itemised and submitted together with the relevant supporting documents or vouchers, failing which the Court may reject the claim in whole or in part. It notes that, with the exception of Mr Zamyatin and Mr Kolesnikov, the applicants did not provide an itemised list or any supporting documents substantiating the value of the property allegedly seized. This part of their just satisfaction claim should therefore be rejected (see *Akshin Garayev v. Azerbaijan*, no. 30352/11, § 72, 2 February 2023).

156. The Court further observes that, while the FBK sought compensation for all funds that had been frozen (see paragraph 19 above), it did not substantiate the precise sum originally blocked in its bank accounts. As regards Mr Zamyatin and Mr Kolesnikov, who submitted documents confirming the sums in question, the Court notes that they were not permanently deprived of their assets but were merely prevented from using them for a certain period. It would therefore be speculative to calculate the exact pecuniary loss sustained by them. However, the Court considers that

the violations found resulted in a permanent loss of funds and serious disruption to the FBK's activities and caused Mr Zamyatin and Mr Kolesnikov distress and frustration arising from their inability to dispose of their seized property (see *East West Alliance Limited v. Ukraine*, no. 19336/04, §§ 254-65, 23 January 2014). The Court therefore finds it reasonable to award the applicants concerned an aggregate sum, as indicated in the appendix, to cover all heads of damage combined, plus any tax that may be chargeable (see *Comingersoll S.A. v. Portugal* [GC], no. 35382/97, § 29, ECHR 2000-IV, and *Democracy and Human Rights Resource Centre and Mustafayev*, cited above, § 121).

157. As to the remaining applicants, the Court awards the amounts indicated in the appendix in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable on those amounts.

158. In the cases where the applicant organisations have ceased to exist, the awards are to be paid into the bank accounts of their successors in the proceedings before the Court, as indicated in the appendix (see *Ecodefence and Others*, cited above, § 198).

## **B. Application no. 22694/20**

159. Mr S.S. Sergeyenko claimed EUR 200 in respect of pecuniary damage resulting from the seizure of two hard disks belonging to him during the search, and EUR 20,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage. The remaining three applicants in application no. 22694/20 each claimed EUR 10,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage. Lastly, the applicants claimed EUR 4,000 jointly for the work of their representative before the Court and 1,332 Russian roubles (approximately EUR 16) as reimbursement of postal expenses incurred.

160. The Court rejects the claim for pecuniary damage as the applicant failed to provide supporting documents substantiate the value of the hard disks (see paragraph 155 above). Having regard to its findings under Article 8 and Article 18 in conjunction with Article 8 of the Convention and ruling on an equitable basis, as required by Article 41 of the Convention, the Court awards the applicants in application no. 22694/20 the amounts indicated in the appendix in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable on those amounts.

161. Furthermore, according to the Court's case-law, an applicant is entitled to the reimbursement of costs and expenses only in so far as it has been shown that these have been actually and necessarily incurred and are reasonable as to quantum. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and the above criteria, the Court considers it reasonable to award the applicants in application no. 22694/20 jointly EUR 2,000 for their legal representation in the proceedings before it, and EUR 16 in respect of postal expenses, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them.

### C. The remaining applications

162. The applicants represented by Mr Sholokhov and Ms Khrunova (see the appendix) requested that the Court order the lifting of the freezing orders imposed on their bank accounts and the payment of interest on the frozen amounts, calculated at the marginal lending facility rate of the Central Bank of the Russian Federation applicable on the date of the lifting of the freezing orders. As regards non-pecuniary damage, they left the determination of the amounts to the Court's discretion. Relying on Article 46 of the Convention, they further invited the Court to indicate that the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, in cooperation with the applicants' representatives, should develop effective measures to ensure payment of the Court's awards by the respondent Government.

163. The Court reiterates that, pursuant to Rule 60 § 1 of the Rules of Court, an applicant who wishes to obtain an award of just satisfaction under Article 41 of the Convention must submit a specific claim to that effect. In the present case, the applicants did not indicate the amounts originally frozen in their bank accounts, nor did they submit any documents showing those amounts, which would have served as a basis for calculating the interest claimed. In the absence of such substantiation, the Court is unable to make any award in respect of pecuniary damage (see *Narodni List D.D. v. Croatia*, no. 2782/12, § 77, 8 November 2018).

164. Having regard to its findings under Article 8, Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, and Article 18 taken in conjunction with those provisions, and ruling on an equitable basis, as required by Article 41 of the Convention, the Court awards the applicants the amounts indicated in the appendix in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable on those amounts.

165. Lastly, as regards the applicants' request for the indication of individual and general measures under Article 46 of the Convention, the Court reiterates that the State remains free to choose the means by which it will discharge its legal obligation under Article 46, provided that such means are compatible with the conclusions and the spirit of the Court's judgment. Furthermore, the cessation of a Contracting Party's membership of the Council of Europe does not release the State from its duty to cooperate with the Convention institutions. Article 46 of the Convention requires the existence of an effective mechanism for the implementation of the Court's judgments, including in cases brought against a State which has ceased to be a Party to the Convention. The Committee of Ministers continues to supervise the execution of the Court's judgments against the Russian Federation, and that State remains, pursuant to Article 46 § 1 of the Convention, under an obligation to implement them despite the cessation of its membership of the Council of Europe (see *Georgia v. Russia (II)* [GC] (just satisfaction), no. 38263/08, § 46, 28 April 2023, and *Andrey Rylkov Foundation and*

*Others*, cited above, § 120; see also paragraph 2 of decision CM/Del/Dec(2025)1521/H46-29, adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 6 March 2025 on the execution of the Court’s judgment in *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)*, cited above).

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Holds* that it has jurisdiction to deal with the applicants’ complaints and that the Government’s failure to participate in the proceedings presents no obstacles to the examination of the case;
3. *Holds* that that Ms Navalnaya has standing to pursue the applications in stead of her late husband, Mr Aleksey Navalnyy;
4. *Declares* the applications admissible, except for the complaints under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention in applications nos. 14573/20, 14591/20 and 14746/20 which were lodged out of time;
5. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention in the applications listed in the appendix;
6. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention on account of the freezing of bank accounts in the applications listed in the appendix;
7. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention on account of the seizure of Mr Kolesnikov’s property in application no. 53059/20;
8. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 11 of the Convention on account of the FBK’s listing as a “foreign agent” in application no. 13505/20;
9. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 11 of the Convention on account of the designation of the applicant organisations as “extremist” and their dissolution in applications nos. 22357/21 and 56994/22;
10. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 18 of the Convention in conjunction with Articles 8 and 11 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention in the applications listed in the appendix;
11. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the reminder of the complaints;

12. *Holds*

- (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, or their procedural successors where relevant, within three months from the date on which the judgment becomes final in accordance with Article 44 § 2 of the Convention, the amounts indicated in the appendix, to be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable at the date of settlement, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them;
- (b) that from the expiry of the above-mentioned three months until settlement simple interest shall be payable on the above amounts at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points;

13. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claims for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 16 December 2025, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Olga Chernishova  
Deputy Registrar

Ioannis Ktistakis  
President

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

APPENDIX

List of cases:

No.	Application no. Date lodged	Applicant details	Representative's name and location	Facts	Complaints	Just satisfaction award (PD – pecuniary damage, NPD – non-pecuniary damage, CE – costs and expenses)
1.	13505/20 03/03/2020	<b>ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK)</b>  Non-profit organisation Founded in 2011 Liquidated in 2021 Moscow	Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>(1) “Urgent” search of the office on 08/08/2019, 170 items of property seized, no prior judicial authorisation, on 20/05/2020 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search and seizure lawful upon the applicant’s complaint, appeal dismissed on 21/09/2020 by the Moscow City Court;</p> <p>(2) “Urgent” search of the office on 15/10/2019 and seizure of various items, no prior judicial authorisation, on 20/02/2020 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search and seizure lawful upon the applicant’s complaint, appeal dismissed on 12/07/2021 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>(1) Freezing order of 06/08/2019 Presnenskiy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank); appeal decision of 11/09/2019 Moscow City Court;</p> <p>(2) freezing orders of 19/08/2019, 28/08/2019, 20/09/2019, 24/12/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal decisions of 23/09/2019, 25/11/2019, 16/03/2020 Moscow City Court;</p> <p>(3) collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p> <p><u>Listing as “foreign agent”</u></p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – the measures taken against the applicant, including mass searches and freezing of bank accounts as well as official listing of the applicant as a “foreign agent”, prevented it from exercising its regular activities;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the searches of the office and freezing of bank accounts as well as the FBK’s listing as a “foreign agent”;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – when taking the measures against the FBK, namely the searches of the office, freezing of bank accounts, its listing as a “foreign agent”, the authorities pursued an ulterior purpose of suppressing its activities;</p>	EUR 20,000 (aggregate amount for PD and NPD), to be paid to the heir of Mr Aleksey Navalnyy – Ms Yuliya Navalnaya



ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

				See §§ 29-32 of the judgment.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions on account of seizure and retention of belongings during the search and freezing of bank accounts.	
		<p><b>FOUNDATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS (“SHTAB”)</b></p> <p>Non-profit organisation Founded in 2019 Liquidated in 2022 Ufa, Republic of Bashkortostan</p>	<p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p> <p>Yevgeniy Zamyatin Moscow</p>	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the office on 15/10/2019 and seizure of various items, no prior judicial authorisation, on 20/02/2020 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search and seizure lawful upon the applicant’s complaint, appeal pending.</p> <p align="center"><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 19/08/2019 and 27/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal decisions of 23/09/2019 and 05/12/2019 Moscow City Court; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the search and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – (1) seizure and retention of belongings seized during the searches; (2) freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.</p>	<p>EUR 10,000 (NPD), to be paid to Ms Liliya Chanysheva</p>
		<p><b>OOO “STRANA PRILIVOV”</b></p> <p>Limited liability company Established in 2017 Liquidated in 2023 Moscow</p>	<p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p> <p>Yevgeniy Zamyatin Moscow</p>	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the offices on 12/09/2019 and seizure of various items, no prior judicial authorisation, on 06/02/2020 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search and seizure lawful upon the applicant’s complaint, appeal dismissed on 18/11/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p align="center"><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 11/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Raiffeisen bank), appeal decision of 14/10/2019 Moscow City Court; collective extension</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the search and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search and freezing of bank accounts;</p>	<p>EUR 10,000 (NPD), to be paid to Mr Zamyatin</p>

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

				order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – (1) seizure and retention of belongings seized during the searches; (2) freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	
		<p><b>Aleksey Anatolyevich NAVALNY</b></p> <p>Born in 1976 Died in 2024</p> <p><b>HEIR:</b> <b>Yuliya Navalnaya</b></p> <p>Founder of the FBK and Navalny Headquarters Moscow</p>	Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom	<p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 27/02/2020 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank, VTB Bank, Raiffeisen Bank), appeals Moscow City Court 22/06/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.</p>	EUR 20,000 (NPD)
		<p><b>Sergey Andreyevich BOYKO</b></p> <p>Born in 1983</p> <p>Coordinator of the Novosibirsk regional office Novosibirsk region</p>	<p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p> <p>Yevgeniy Zamyatin Moscow</p>	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 04/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
		<p><b>Liliya Ayratovna CHANYSHEVA</b></p> <p>Born in 1982</p> <p>Founder and director of “Shtab”; coordinator of the Ufa regional office Republic of Bashkortostan</p>	<p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p> <p>Yevgeniy Zamyatin Moscow</p>	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
		<p><b>Vyacheslav Ilyich GIMADI</b></p> <p>Born in 1985</p> <p>Lawyer; head of legal department of the FBK Moscow</p>	<p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p> <p>Yevgeniy Zamyatin Moscow</p>	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 08/08/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 09/08/2019 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, decision quashed on 18/03/2020 by the Moscow City Court on formal grounds; on 22/04/2020 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 17/06/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 06/08/2019 Presnenskiy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank) and 19/08/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal decisions of 09/09/2019 and 23/09/2019 Moscow City Court; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – (1) seizure and retention of belongings seized during the search; (2) freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		<p><b>Olga Andreyevna GUSEVA</b></p> <p>Born in 1995</p> <p>FBK manager; founder of the Foundation for the Defence of Civil Rights ("FZPG") St Petersburg</p>	<p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p> <p>Yevgeniy Zamyatin Moscow</p>	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p align="center"><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – (1) seizure and retention of belongings seized during the search; (2) freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
		<p><b>Aleksandr Yevgenyevich POMAZUYEV</b></p> <p>Born in 1982</p> <p>Lawyer for FBK Moscow</p>	<p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p> <p>Yevgeniy Zamyatin Moscow</p>	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>"Urgent" search of the applicant's flat on 08/08/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 09/08/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 01/06/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p align="center"><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 06/08/2019 Presnenskiy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank) and 19/08/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal decisions of 30/09/2019 and 23/09/2019 Moscow City Court; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – (1) seizure and retention of belongings</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

				seized during the search; (2) freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	
	<p><b>Leonid Mikhaylovich VOLKOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1980</p> <p>Head of Aleksey Navalnyy's 2018 presidential campaign; coordinator of Navalnyy Headquarters network Moscow</p>	<p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p> <p>Yevgeniy Zamyatin Moscow</p>	<p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 06/08/2019 Presnenskiy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank, Avangard Bank) and 19/08/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal decisions of 11/09/2019, 23/09/2019 and 25/09/2019 Moscow City Court; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes –freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
	<p><b>Yevgeniy Mikhaylovich ZAMYATIN</b></p> <p>Born in 1989</p> <p>Junior lawyer at FBK; director of OOO "Strana Prilivov" Moscow</p>	<p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p>	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>"Urgent" search of the applicant's flat on 08/08/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 09/08/2019 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, decision quashed on 18/05/2020 by the Moscow City Court on formal grounds; on 03/07/2020 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 28/10/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 06/08/2019 Presnenskiy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank, Bank "Otkrytiye", Bank "Russkiy standart", Sberbank) and 19/08/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal decisions of 09/09/2019 and 23/09/2019 Moscow City Court; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – (1) seizure and retention of belongings</p>	EUR 14,000 (aggregate amount for PD and NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					seized during the search; (2) freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	
2.	14045/20 28/02/2020	<b>Aleksey Aleksandrovich LAVRINENKOV</b>  Born in 1982  Coordinator of the Smolensk regional office Smolensk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flats on 12/09/2019 and 13/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 02/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 05/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000
3.	14079/20 28/02/2020	<b>Semen Aleksandrovich KOCHKIN</b>  Born in 1993  Coordinator of the Cheboksary regional office Republic of Chuvashia	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flats on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 28/10/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

4.	14120/20 28/02/2020	<b>Olga Aleksandrovna KARTAVTSEVA</b>  Born in 1980  Coordinator of the Omsk regional office Omsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 23/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 14/11/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 - lack of any effective remedy in domestic law - in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (PD)
5.	14404/20 28/02/2020	<b>Daniil Olegovich KEN</b>  Born in 1988  Volunteer of the St Petersburg office St Petersburg	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 14/11/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
6.	14405/20 27/02/2020	<b>Viktor Vyacheslavovich LUTCHENKO</b>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov	<u>Search</u>	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		<p>Born in 1989</p> <p>Volunteer of the Khabarovsk regional office Khabarovsk region</p>	Kazan	<p>(1) Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 27/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court;</p> <p>(2) Seizure and retention of seized electronic devices and mobile phone.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyny District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 25/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat, seizure of belongings and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat, seizure of belongings and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – (1) seizure and retention of seized electronic devices and mobile phone, (2) freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.</p>	
7.	14409/20 28/02/2020	<p><b>Aleksandr Olegovich TIKHONOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1990</p> <p>Employee at the Kazan regional office Republic of Tatarstan</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant's flats on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 18/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
8.	14506/20 06/03/2020	<p><b>Tatyana Vladimirovna GLINBERG</b></p> <p>Born in 1992</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 25/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)



ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Coordinator of the Stavropol regional office Republic of Crimea*			Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
9.	14512/20 06/03/2020	<b>Valentin Alekseyevich BOLDYSHEV</b>  Born in 1956  Coordinator of the Pskov regional office Pskov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
10.	14517/20 06/03/2020	<b>Anastasiya Aleksandrovna VASILYEVA</b>  Born in 1984  Employee at the Omsk regional office Omsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 14/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Gazprombank, Alfa-bank), appeals Moscow City Court 25/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions –	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	
11.	14521/20 06/03/2020	<b>Ivan Alekseyevich VOSTRIKOV</b>  Born in 1984  Coordinator of the Tyumen regional office Tyumen region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyny District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal Moscow City Court 14/11/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
12.	14523/20 06/03/2020	<b>Nikolay Aleksandrovich KUZMIN</b>  Born in 1980  Volunteer at the Pskov regional office Pskov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 13/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
13.	14563/20 28/02/2020	<b>Vitaliy Viktorovich VOTANOVSKIY</b>  Born in 1972	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Volunteer at the Krasnodar regional office Krasnodar region			Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
14.	14565/20 28/02/2020	<b>Vladimir Viktorovich MURZIN</b>  Born in 1969  Volunteer at the Tambov regional office Tambov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
15.	14567/20 28/02/2020	<b>Dmitriy Yuryevich DOBRYNIN</b>  Born in 1989  Volunteer at the Tyumen regional office Tyumen region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 13/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
16.	14569/20 28/02/2020	<b>Svetlana Gennadyevna VALIULLINA</b>  Born in 1973	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Volunteer at the Khabarovsk regional office Khabarovsk region		Moscow, appeal dismissed on 18/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
17.	14570/20 28/02/2020	<b>Leonid Vladimirovich SANKIN</b>  Born in 1963  Volunteer at the Rostov-on-Don regional office Rostov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyny District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 14/11/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
18.	14571/20 28/02/2020	<b>Marina Vladislavovna TSEVASHEVA</b>  Born in 1995  Volunteer at the Volgograd regional office Volgograd region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
19.	14573/20 28/02/2020 and 25/09/2020	<b>Zakhar Borisovich SARAPULOV</b>  Born in 1992  Volunteer at the Irkutsk regional office Irkutsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 25/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 26/12/2019.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
20.	14578/20 28/02/2020	<b>Pavel Vladimirovich CHERNOV</b>  Born in 1970  Volunteer at the Pskov regional office Pskov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 04/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
21.	14580/20 28/02/2020	<b>Andrey Sergeyevich PROKUDIN</b>  Born in 1990  Coordinator of the Tver regional office Tver region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank), appeals Moscow City Court 24/12/2019 (Sberbank) and 25/12/2019 (Alfa-bank); collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020).	Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					<p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.</p>	
22.	14584/20 28/02/2020	<p><b>Vadim Leonidovich KOBZEV</b></p> <p>Born in 1997</p> <p>Volunteer at the Rostov-on-Don regional office Rostov region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
23.	14585/20 28/02/2020	<p><b>Pavel Valeryevich CHERNUKHIN</b></p> <p>Born in 1978</p> <p>Volunteer at the Irkutsk regional office Irkutsk region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 16/09/2019 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
24.	14587/20 28/02/2020	<p><b>Ildar Shamlevich ZAKIROV</b></p> <p>Born in 1986</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Coordinator of the Izhevsk regional office Republic of Udmurtia		Moscow, appeal dismissed on 28/10/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
25.	14591/20 28/02/2020 and 16/09/2020	<b>Aleksandr Borisovich DANILOV</b>  Born in 1996  Employee at the Belgorod regional office Belgorod region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 03/09/2019 Basmanyny District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
26.	14592/20 28/02/2020	<b>Aleksey Aleksandrovich GRIGORYEV</b>  Born in 1988  Volunteer at the Murmansk regional office Murmansk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
27.	14594/20	<b>Andrey Sergeyevich</b>	Igor Nikolayevich	<u>Search</u>	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

	28/02/2020	<b>YEGOROV</b>  Born in 1984  Volunteer at the Pskov regional office Pskov region	Sholokhov Kazan	Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Alpha Bank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	
28.	14595/20 28/02/2020	<b>Andrey Alekseyevich KOZLOV</b>  Born in 1987  Employee at the Orenburg regional office Orenburg region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 13/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 02/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Tinkoff bank, Alfa-bank), no appeal; a number of collective extension orders, last one of 02/02/2021 (Alfa-bank) - appeal pending, appeals Moscow City Court 19/04/2021 and of 27/04/2021 (Tinkoff bank).	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
29.	14636/20 06/03/2020	<b>Yegor Sergeyevich ALASHEYEV</b>	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova	<u>Search</u> (1) Search of the applicant's flats on 10/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)



ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Born in 1983 Coordinator of the Samara regional office Samara region	Kazan	Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court; (2) “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, decision quashed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court on formal grounds; on 31/01/2020 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 10/06/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flats;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flats;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flats.	
30.	14637/20 06/03/2020	<b>Aleksandr Vladimirovich SMIRNOV</b>  Born in 1990 Employee at the Yaroslavl regional office Yaroslavl region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> (1) Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 13/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court; (2) “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 29/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flats;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flats;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flats.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
31.	14639/20 06/03/2020	<b>Ilya Sergeyevich DANILOV</b>  Born in 1989 Coordinator of the Lipetsk regional office Lipetsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
32.	14642/20	<b>Violetta Andreyevna</b>	Igor Nikolayevich	<u>Search</u>	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

	06/03/2020	<p><b>GRUDINA</b></p> <p>Born in 1990</p> <p>Coordinator of the Murmansk regional office Murmansk region</p>	Sholokhov Kazan	Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmany District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	<p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	
33.	14643/20 06/03/2020	<p><b>Valeriya Ibragimovna DZBOYEVA</b></p> <p>Born in 1998</p> <p>Employee at the Rostov-on-Don regional office Rostov region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant's flats on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmany District Court of Moscow, appeals dismissed on 14/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flats;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flats;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flats.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
34.	14644/20 28/02/2020	<p><b>Aleksandr Olegovich SHURSHEV</b></p> <p>Born in 1982</p> <p>Coordinator of the St Petersburg office St Petersburg</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmany District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 28/10/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmany District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 14/11/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p>	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	
35.	14645/20 28/02/2020	<b>Danila Aleksandrovich BUZANOV</b>  Born in 1995  Coordinator of the Balakovo regional office Saratov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.</p>	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
36.	14646/20 28/02/2020	<b>Yevgeniy Olegovich GOLIGOROV</b>  Born in 1993  Employee at the Nizhniy Novgorod regional office Nizhniy Novgorod region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 27/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 03/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Gazprombank, Tinkoff bank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p>	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	
37.	14647/20 28/02/2020	<b>Sergey Vladimirovich GORKUNOV</b>  Born in 1989  Volunteer at the Irkutsk regional office Irkutsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 04/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
38.	14648/20 28/02/2020	<b>Mikhail Olegovich ALEKSEYEV</b>  Born in 1990  Employee at the Khabarovsk regional office Khabarovsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 18/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 29/04/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
39.	14649/20	<b>Georgiy Andreyevich</b>	Igor Nikolayevich	<u>Search</u>	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

	28/02/2020	<p><b>BORODIN</b></p> <p>Born in 1998</p> <p>Volunteer at the Voronezh regional office Voronezh region</p>	Sholokhov Kazan	<p>Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 30/10/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), no appeal lodged as the applicant was unaware of the freezing order; collective extension order of 22/04/2021, appeal pending.</p>	<p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank account.</p>	
40.	14675/20 06/03/2020	<p><b>Sergey Vasilyevich OSKOLKOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1992</p> <p>Employee at the Tyumen regional office Tyumen region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
41.	14679/20 06/03/2020	<p><b>Artur Borisovich STASH</b></p> <p>Born in 1964</p> <p>Employee at the Kemerovo regional office Kemerovo region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
42.	14680/20 06/03/2020	<b>Aleksandr Aleksandrovich SURINOV</b>  Born in 2000  Employee at the Murmansk regional office Murmansk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 14/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
43.	14682/20 06/03/2020	<b>Vladislav Vladimirovich KULCHITSKIY</b>  Born in 1997  Employee at the Rostov-on-Don regional office Rostov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flats on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 and 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeals dismissed on 30/10/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flats;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flats;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flats.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
44.	14685/20 06/03/2020	<b>Andrey Vladimirovich BOROVIKOV</b>  Born in 1988  Coordinator of the Arkhangelsk regional office Arkhangelsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 16/09/2019 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					<p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	
45.	14741/20 06/03/2020	<p><b>Mariya Viktorovna MAKOVOZOVA</b></p> <p>Born in 1996</p> <p>Former coordinator of the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk regional offices</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

46.	14742/20 06/03/2020	<b>Kseniya Vladislavovna FADEYEVA</b>  Born in 1992  Coordinator of the Tomsk regional office Tomsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 16/09/2019 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 30/10/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 04/09/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank), appeals Moscow City Court 13/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
47.	14743/20 06/03/2020	<b>Yevgeniy Andreyevich RUDKOVSKIY</b>  Born in 1993  Employee at the Omsk regional office Omsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 17/10/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Alfa-Bank, Tinkoff Bank, F Rocketbank, QIWI Bank, Sberbank), appeals Moscow City Court 26/12/2019 and 27/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeals Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
48.	14744/20	<b>Kseniya Aleksandrovna</b>	Igor Nikolayevich	<u>Search</u>	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)



ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

	06/03/2020	<b>SEREDKINA</b>  Born in 1986  Coordinator of the Rostov-on-Don regional office Rostov region	Sholokhov Kazan	Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmany District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 14/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmany District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	
49.	14745/20 06/03/2020	<b>Andrey Leonidovich FATEYEV</b>  Born in 1988  Employee at the Tomsk regional office Tomsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmany District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
50.	14746/20 06/03/2020 and 25/09/2020	<b>Viktor Sergeyevich RASPOPOV</b>  Born in 1996  Employee at the Yekaterinburg regional office Sverdlovsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmany District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u>	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

				Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal Moscow City Court 25/12/2019.	Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts.	
51.	14762/20 11/03/2020	<b>Sergey Anatolyevich UKHOV</b>  Born in 1985  Coordinator of the Perm regional office Perm region		<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 12/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
52.	14763/20 11/03/2020	<b>Igor Yevgenyevich SLIVIN</b>  Born in 1990  Employee at the Tambov regional office Tambov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
53.	14764/20 11/03/2020	<b>Diana Borisovna RUDAKOVA</b>  Born in 1991	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 12/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Coordinator of the Tambov regional office Tambov region		<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	
54.	14765/20 11/03/2020	<b>Daniil Andreyevich GOLOVACHEV</b>  Born in 2000  Employee at the Stavropol regional office Republic of Crimea*  <i>* Crimea is internationally recognised as sovereign territory of Ukraine</i>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
55.	14766/20 11/03/2020	<b>Rezeda Basyrovna ABASHEVA</b>  Born in 1972  Coordinator of the Izhevsk regional office Republic of Udmurtia	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank), appeals Moscow City Court 27/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					<p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.</p>	
56.	14767/20 11/03/2020	<p><b>Yuriy Sergeyevich KUZMINYKH</b></p> <p>Born in 1978</p> <p>Coordinator of the Yekaterinburg regional office Sverdlovsk region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant’s flats on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeals dismissed on 14/11/2019 and 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flats;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flats;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flats.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
57.	14768/20 11/03/2020	<p><b>Vladislav Yuryevich ZLOBIN</b></p> <p>Born in 1992</p> <p>Employee at the Lipetsk regional office Lipetsk region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 25/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions -</p>	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	
58.	14769/20 11/03/2020	<b>Nikolay Yuryevich DYACHKOV</b>  Born in 1991  Coordinator of the Ivanovo regional office Ivanovo region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 08/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
59.	14770/20 11/03/2020	<b>Dmitriy Mikhaylovich ZVEREV</b>  Born in 1975  Volunteer at the Tyumen regional office Tyumen region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; last collective extension order of 22/04/2021, appeal Moscow City Court 12/05/2021.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
60.	14771/20 11/03/2020	<b>Anton Alekseyevich ZHUKOVETS</b>  Born in 1996	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 25/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Coordinator of the Irkutsk regional office Irkutsk region			Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
61.	14772/20 11/03/2020	<b>Aleksey Yuryevich VORSIN</b>  Born in 1987  Coordinator of the Khabarovsk regional office Khabarovsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alpha-Bank, VTB Bank), appeals Moscow City Court 27/05/2020, 01/06/2020 and 08/06/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
62.	14773/20 11/03/2020	<b>Yuriy Sergeyevich BOBROV</b>  Born in 1982  Employee at the Perm regional office Perm region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 16/09/2019 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
63.	14774/20 11/03/2020	<b>Stanislav Yuryevich KALINICHENKO</b>  Born in 1982  Coordinator of the Kemerovo regional office Kemerovo region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> (1) Search of the applicant’s parents’ flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 14/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court; (2) “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 16/09/2019 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
64.	14775/20 11/03/2020	<b>Andrey Yevgenyevich SERGEYEV</b>  Born in 1981  Employee at the Saratov regional office Saratov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
65.	14776/20 11/03/2020	<b>Dmitriy Denisovich DIDENKO</b>  Born in 2003  Volunteer at the Kemerovo regional office Kemerovo region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
66.	14777/20 11/03/2020	<b>Olga Nikolayevna FOTIYEVA</b>  Born in 1980  Former employee at the Barnaul regional office Altai region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 26/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
67.	14778/20 11/03/2020	<b>Olga Vladimirovna KUZNETSOVA</b>  Born in 1998  Volunteer at the Saratov regional office Saratov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (FK Otkrytiye, Sberbank), appeals Moscow City Court 18/05/2020 and 01/06/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions –	EUR 12,000 (NPD)



ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	
68.	14779/20 11/03/2020	<b>Pavel Konstantinovich SHCHERBINA</b>  Born in 1993  Volunteer at the Rostov-on-Don regional office Rostov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 16/09/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
69.	14780/20 11/03/2020	<b>Oleg Vasilyevich VASILYEV</b>  Born in 1981  Volunteer at the Izhevsk regional office Republic of Udmurtia	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 25/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court;  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank and Alpha-Bank), appeals Moscow City Court 27/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
70.	14781/20 11/03/2020	<b>Ivan Vladimirovich MELNIK</b>  Born in 1996	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Volunteer at the Kaliningrad regional office Kaliningrad region			Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
71.	14782/20 11/03/2020	<b>Yelena Nikolayevna LEKIASHVILI</b>  Born in 1979  Coordinator of the Yaroslavl regional office Yaroslavl region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
72.	14866/20 28/02/2020	<b>Yevgeniy Konstantinovich TRUBCHENKO</b>  Born in 1987  Employee at the Samara regional office Samara region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 10/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 25/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
73.	14943/20 27/02/2020	<b>Igor Vasilyevich PETROV</b>  Born in 1997	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Coordinator of the Kaliningrad regional office Kaliningrad region		Moscow, appeal dismissed on 18/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
74.	15158/20 11/03/2020	<b>Ivan Ivanovich LUZIN</b>  Born in 2000  Volunteer at the Kaliningrad regional office Kaliningrad region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flats on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeals dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flats;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flats;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flats.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
75.	15164/20 11/03/2020	<b>Daniil Sergeyvich CHEBYKIN</b>  Born in 1991  Employee at the Omsk regional office Omsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> (1) Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 27/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court; (2) "Urgent" search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 16/09/2019 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 25/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank, QIWI Bank),	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flats and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flats and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flats and freezing of bank accounts;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

				appeals Moscow City Court 26/12/2019 (QIWI Bank) and 27/05/2020 (Sberbank, Alfa-bank); collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	
76.	15167/20 11/03/2020	<b>Nikolay Ivanovich SEVERIN</b>  Born in 2000  Employee at the Saratov regional office Saratov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
77.	15169/20 11/03/2020	<b>Aleksey Yuryevich SUSHCHENKO</b>  Born in 1990  Employee at the Kemerovo regional office Kemerovo region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 25/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
78.	15171/20 11/03/2020	<b>Artem Anatolyevich KOSARETSKIY</b>  Born in 1978  Former employee at the Barnaul regional office	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Altai region			Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
79.	15331/20 11/03/2020	<b>Oleg Igorevich YEMELYANOV</b>  Born in 1996  Employee at the Kazan regional office Republic of Tatarstan	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
80.	15334/20 11/03/2020	<b>Azat Sadgatovich GABDULVALEYEV</b>  Born in 1964  Volunteer at the Kazan regional office Republic of Tatarstan	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> (1) Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court; (2) "Urgent" search of the applicant's flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 8/10/2019 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 29/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flats;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flats;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flats.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
81.	15337/20 11/03/2020	<b>Polina Aleksandrovna GOLOBOKOVA</b>  Born in 1996	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Employee at the Novosibirsk regional office Novosibirsk region			Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
82.	15338/20 11/03/2020	<b>Pavel Yuryevich SMIRNOV</b>  Born in 1991  Coordinator of the Voronezh regional office Voronezh region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 12/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal Moscow City Court 25/12/2019; collective extension order of 15/06/2020, appeal pending.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
83.	15340/20 11/03/2020	<b>Daniil Andreyevich MARKELOV</b>  Born in 1992  Former coordinator of the Krasnoyarsk regional office; employee at the Novosibirsk regional office Novosibirsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 02/09/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank, QIWI Bank), appeals Moscow City Court 14/11/2019 and 25/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					<p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.</p>	
84.	15342/20 11/03/2020	<p><b>Mikhail Yevgenyevich PARKHOTIN</b></p> <p>Born in 1973</p> <p>Employee at the Krasnoyarsk regional office Krasnoyarsk region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 04/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
85.	16416/20 20/03/2020	<p><b>Anna Gennadiyevna NEFEDOVA</b></p> <p>Born in 1976</p> <p>Employee at the Tambov regional office Tambov region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
86.	16418/20 20/03/2020	<p><b>Aleksey Mikhaylovich SHVARTS</b></p> <p>Born in 1996</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Coordinator of the Kurgan regional office Kurgan region		Moscow, appeal dismissed on 12/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
87.	16420/20 20/03/2020	<b>Dmitriy Vladimirovich SILIVONCHIK</b>  Born in 1989  Coordinator of the regional office in Nizhniy Novgorod Nizhniy Novgorod region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 12/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
88.	16423/20 20/03/2020	<b>Artem Vladimirovich SAYGALOV</b>  Born in 1996  Volunteer at the Bryansk regional office Bryansk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 12/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)



ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

89.	16426/20 20/03/2020	<b>Anton Viktorovich STRUNIN</b>  Born in 1982  Coordinator of the Penza regional office Penza region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 12/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
90.	16437/20 20/03/2020	<b>Aleksandr Andreyevich MARKIN</b>  Born in 1999  Coordinator of the Bryansk regional office Bryansk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
91.	16440/20 20/03/2020	<b>Olga Igorevna ZHULIMOVA</b>  Born in 1992  Former employee at the Penza regional office Penza region	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Search</u> (1) Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 12/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court; (2) "Urgent" search of the applicant's flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, decision quashed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court on formal grounds; on 31/01/2020 the Basmannyy District Court	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flats;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flats;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

				of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 08/06/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flats.	
92.	16443/20 20/03/2020	<b>Mark Vladimirovich KLYAMAR</b>  Born in 1995  Volunteer at the Kaliningrad regional office Kaliningrad region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 09/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
93.	16448/20 20/03/2020	<b>Yevgeniy Sergeyevich KOCHIGIN</b>  Born in 1998  Employee at the Volgograd regional office Volgograd region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (QIWI bank), appeal Moscow City Court 25/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 - interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions - freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
94.	16451/20 20/03/2020	<b>Sofya Sergeyevna LOPATINA</b>  Born in 1997	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Employee at the Kurgan regional office Kurgan region		<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 03/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal Moscow City Court 26/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	
95.	16458/20 20/03/2020	<b>Nikita Anatolyevich ILYIN</b>  Born in 1998  Volunteer at the Kurgan regional office Kurgan region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
96.	16461/20 20/03/2020	<b>Anastasiya Ilyinichna VASILYEVA</b>  Born in 1996  Employee at the Cheboksary regional office Republic of Chuvashia	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
97.	16465/20 20/03/2020	<b>Roman Vyacheslavovich BUGAKOV</b>  Born in 1994  Coordinator of the Ryazan regional office Ryazan region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 05/12/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
98.	16469/20 20/03/2020	<b>Yevgeniy Vladimirovich NEVECHERYA</b>  Born in 1978  Coordinator of the Orenburg regional office Orenburg region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 02/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 12/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 - interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions - freezing of the applicant's bank account.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
99.	16474/20 20/03/2020	<b>Denis Vladimirovich MOLYAKOV</b>  Born in 1989	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 20/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – on account of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Volunteer at the Penza regional office Penza region			Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
100.	22694/20 06/05/2020	<p><b>Sergey Sergeyevich SERGEYENKO</b>  Born in 1987  Volunteer at the Vladivostok regional office Primorye region</p> <p><b>Nikolay Sergeyevich SERGEYENKO</b>  Born in 1988  Family member</p> <p><b>Sergey Nikolayevich SERGEYENKO</b>  Born in 1960  Family member</p> <p><b>Vera Vladimirovna SERGEYENKO</b>  Born in 1961  Family member</p>	<p>Dmitriy Vladimirovich Zubarev Vladivostok</p> <p>Mr Zubarev was granted leave to represent the applicants in this application in accordance with Rule 36 of the Rules of Court.</p>	<p><u>Search</u> (1) Search of the applicants’ flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanny District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 06/11/2019 by the Moscow City Court; (2) Seizure of electronic devices and documents (in respect of Mr Sergeyenko S.S.).</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and seizure of electronic devices and documents (in respect of Mr Sergeyenko S.S.);  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – seizure of electronic devices and documents (in respect of Mr Sergeyenko S.S.).</p>	<p>EUR 10,000 (NPD) – to Mr S.S. Sergeyenko  EUR 7,500 (NPD) – to Mr N.S. Sergeyenko  EUR 7,500 (NPD) – to Mr S.N. Sergeyenko  EUR 7,500 (NPD) – to Ms V.V. Sergeyenko  EUR 2,016 (CE) – to all four applicants jointly</p>

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

101.	23869/20 30/04/2020	<b>Vadim Valeryevich OSTANIN</b>  Born in 1976  Former coordinator of the Barnaul regional office Altai region	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 29/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
102.	23872/20 30/04/2020	<b>Viktoriya Sergeyevna RAYKH</b>  Born in 1996  Employee at the Yekaterinburg regional office Sverdlovsk region	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 29/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 17/10/2019 Basmanny District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank and Sberbank)), appeal Moscow City Court 15/06/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 - interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions - freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
103.	23875/20 30/04/2020	<b>Andrey Vitalyevich MAKAROV</b>  Born in 1996  Volunteer at the Penza regional office Penza region	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 27/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					<p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	
104.	24315/20 30/04/2020	<p><b>Yekaterina Vladimirovna FOMENKO</b></p> <p>Born in 1969</p> <p>Former employee at the Barnaul regional office Altai region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 13/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 17/10/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal Moscow City Court 27/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.</p>	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
105.	24321/20 30/04/2020	<p><b>Tatyana Sergeyevna SUKHORUKOVA</b></p> <p>Born in 1997</p> <p>Former employee at the Saransk regional office Republic of Mordovia</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

106.	24462/20 27/05/2020	<b>Andrey Yuryevich VOLOBUYEV</b>  Born in 1992  Employee at the Smolensk regional office Smolensk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/03/2020 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 02/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 05/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
107.	24467/20 27/05/2020	<b>Maksim Yevgenyevich KLIMOV</b>  Born in 1992  Employee at the Belgorod regional office Belgorod region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 02/09/2019 by the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 11/03/2020 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 03/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Tinkoff bank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)



ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

108.	24480/20 27/05/2020	<b>Danil Vasilyevich NOVIKOV</b>  Born in 1990  Employee at the Voronezh regional office Voronezh region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant's flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 04/09/2019 by the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 26/02/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
109.	30682/20 30/06/2020	<b>Aleksandra Dmitriyevna STAROSTINA</b>  Born in 1997  Volunteer at the Kemerovo regional office Kemerovo region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant's flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 29/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
110.	30769/20 30/06/2020	<b>Aleksey Viktorovich VOLKOV</b>  Born in 1982  Editor-in-chief of an online media outlet in Smolensk Smolensk region	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant's flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 29/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
111.	30776/20 30/06/2020	<b>Polina Nikolayevna GREYSMAN</b>  Born in 1991  Former employee at the Yekaterinburg regional office Sverdlovsk region	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 03/02/2020 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Raiffeisen bank and Sberbank), appeals Moscow City Court 26/12/2019 (Raiffeisen bank) and 27/05/2020 (Sberbank); collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 - interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions - freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
112.	30792/20 30/06/2020	<b>Viktor Viktorovich PRYADILSHCHIKOV</b>  Born in 1987  Volunteer at the Ufa regional office Republic of Bashkortostan	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
113.	30796/20 30/06/2020	<b>Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich ROMANOV</b>  Born in 1995	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		<p>Volunteer at the Stavropol regional office Republic of Crimea*</p> <p><i>* Crimea is internationally recognised as sovereign territory of Ukraine</i></p>		<p>search lawful, appeal dismissed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	
114.	30798/20 30/06/2020	<p><b>Aleksandr Ivanovich LYUTOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1987</p> <p>Former volunteer at the Saransk regional office Republic of Mordovia</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
115.	30803/20 30/06/2020	<p><b>Anastasiya Valeryevna ZHUKOVA</b></p> <p>Born in 1996</p> <p>Volunteer at the Saratov regional office Saratov region</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 27/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
116.	30933/20 30/06/2020	<p><b>Ildar Anvyarovich NEVAYEV</b></p> <p>Born in 1988</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Former coordinator of the Saransk regional office Republic of Mordovia		search lawful, appeal dismissed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
117.	39854/20 20/08/2020	<b>Kirill Sergeyevich LEVCHENKO</b>  Born in 1982  Employee at the Novosibirsk regional office Novosibirsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 16/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, decision quashed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court on formal grounds; on 31/01/2020 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 10/06/2020 by the Moscow City Court.	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
118.	41429/20 27/08/2020	<b>Nikita Sergeyevich PETUKHOV</b>  Born in 1988  Volunteer at the Tver regional office Tver region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> “Urgent” search of the applicant’s flats on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, decision quashed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court on formal grounds; on 31/01/2020 the Basmanyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeals dismissed on 08/06/2020 and 10/06/2020 by the Moscow City Court.  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 17/10/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

				Court 27/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	
119.	43359/20 10/09/2020	<b>Andrey Aleksandrovich PASTUKHOV</b>  Born in 1987  Activist, supporter of A. Navalnyy from Khabarovsk Khabarovsk region	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Tinkoff Bank), appeal Moscow City Court 12/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
120.	43622/20 17/09/2020	<b>Fedor Alekseyevich TELIN</b>  Born in 1986  Employee at the Ufa regional office Republic of Bashkortostan	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
121.	45167/20 16/09/2020	<b>Dmitriy Andreyevich KORZHENEVSKIY</b>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u>	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions –	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Born in 1984  Employee at the Ivanovo regional office Ivanovo region	Kazan	Freezing order of 04/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	freezing of the applicant's bank accounts;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.	
122.	46004/20 24/09/2020	<b>Aleksandr Vyacheslavovich ZYKOV</b>  Born in 1998  Employee at the Saratov regional office Saratov region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 05/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (QIWI bank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
123.	47200/20 10/09/2020	<b>Yevgeniy Vyacheslavovich KARPOV</b>  Born in 1988  Employee at the Belgorod regional office Belgorod region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 03/09/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 24/12/2019; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					<p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.</p>	
124.	48300/20 08/10/2020	<p><b>Albert Renatovich GASKAROV</b></p> <p>Born in 1984</p> <p>Volunteer at the Ufa regional office Republic of Bashkortostan</p>	<p>Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan</p>	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, decision quashed on 13/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court on formal grounds; on 31/01/2020 the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 20/05/2020 by the Moscow City Court;</p> <p align="center"><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmanyny District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Tinkoff bank, UniCreditBank), appeals Moscow City Court 25/12/2019 (UniCreditBank) and 27/05/2020 (Sberbank, Tinkoff bank); collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.</p>	EUR 12,000 (NPD)
125.	48309/20 08/10/2020	<p><b>Sergey Eduardovich KOMANDIROV</b></p> <p>Born in 1995</p> <p>Volunteer at the Smolensk regional office Smolensk region</p>	<p>Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan</p>	<p align="center"><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant’s flat on 15/10/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 18/10/2019 the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, decision quashed on 09/01/2020 by the Moscow City Court on formal grounds; on 31/01/2020 the Basmanyny District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 15/06/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat.	
126.	50158/20 27/10/2020	<b>Anastasiya Aleksandrovna KORSAKOVA</b>  Born in 1981  Employee at the Krasnoyarsk regional office Krasnoyarsk region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 02/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank), appeals Moscow City Court 29/04/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
127.	52327/20 28/10/2020	<b>Anastasiya Lvovna SINELNIKOVA</b>  Born in 1994  Employee at the Izhevsk regional office Republic of Udmurtia	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank, Sberbank), appeals Moscow City Court 27/05/2020 (Alfa-bank, Sberbank); collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020).	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
128.	53059/20 12/11/2020	<b>Ivan Yuryevich ZHDANOV</b>	Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 27/02/2020 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank, QIWI Bank, VTB Bank,	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions –	EUR 10,000 (NPD)



ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		<p>Born in 1988</p> <p>FBK director Moscow</p>	Vilnius	<p>Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 22/06/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020).</p>	<p>freezing of the applicant's bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.</p>	
		<p><b>Anna Sergeyevna BIRYUKOVA</b></p> <p>Born in 1991</p> <p>Head of the Sociological Department of the FBK Moscow</p>	<p>Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev Vilnius</p>	<p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 05/02/2020 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank), appeal Moscow City Court 23/09/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
		<p><b>Anna Mikhaylovna CHEKHOVICH</b></p> <p>Born in 1992</p> <p>FBK employee</p>	<p>Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev Vilnius</p>	<p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 05/02/2020 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank, Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 23/09/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant's bank accounts;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Moscow			<p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.</p>	
		<p><b>Vitaliy Viktorovich KOLESNIKOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1997</p> <p>Video editor at the FBK Moscow</p>	<p>Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev Vilnius</p>	<p><u>Seizure of personal belongings during the search</u></p> <p>Seizure and retention of personal belongings seized during the search of Ms Chekhovich's home and FBK's office on 08/08/2019 (an amount of EUR 31,550 was seized, which originated from the sale of the apartment); on 12/08/2020 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow dismissed the applicant's complaint about retention of his belongings; appeal dismissed on 05/10/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p>	<p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – seizure and retention of money and personal belongings seized during the search;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – interference on account of seizure of property during the searches;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the seizure of property;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – seizure of property.</p>	<p>EUR 30,000 (aggregate amount for PD and NPD)</p>
		<p><b>Ruslan Tabrizovich SHAVEDDINOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1996</p> <p>“Shtab” employee; project manager at FBK Moscow</p>	<p>Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev Vilnius</p>	<p><u>Search</u></p> <p>“Urgent” search of the applicant's flat on 23/12/2019, no prior judicial authorisation, on 24/12/2019 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow declared the search lawful, appeal dismissed on 13/05/2020 by the Moscow City Court.</p> <p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p>	<p>Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;</p>	<p>EUR 10,000 (NPD)</p>

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

				Freezing order of 05/02/2020 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank, Sberbank, VTB Bank), appeal Moscow City Court 23/09/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	
		<b>Yuliya Borisovna NAVALNAYA</b>  Born in 1976  Spouse of late Mr A. Navalnyy Moscow	Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev Vilnius	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts (freezing order of 27/02/2020 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Raiffeisenbank), appeal Moscow City Court 22/06/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020).	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 5,000 (NPD)
		<b>Darya Alekseyevna NAVALNAYA</b>  Born in 2001  Daughter of late Mr A. Navalnyy and Ms Yuliya Navalnaya Moscow	Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev Vilnius	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 27/02/2020 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (VTB Bank, Raiffeisenbank), appeal Moscow City Court 22/06/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 5,000 (NPD)
		<b>Kseniya Igorevna ZHDANOVA</b>  Born in 1993  Spouse of Mr I. Zhdanov Moscow region	Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev Vilnius	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 27/02/2020 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 22/06/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 5,000 (NPD)
129.	1186/21 26/11/2020	<b>Alina Faritinovna KHANNANOVA</b>  Born in 1964  Volunteer at the Ufa regional office	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmanyy District Court of Moscow (RGS Bank, Sberbank), appeals Moscow City Court 23/04/2020 (RGS Bank) and 27/05/2020 (Sberbank); collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		Republic of Bashkortostan			<p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.</p>	
130.	1216/21 26/11/2020	<p><b>Kirill Valeryevich ISHUTIN</b></p> <p>Born in 1984</p> <p>Volunteer at the Vladimir regional office Vladimir region</p>	<p>Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan</p>	<p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 17/10/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 27/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
131.	2264/21 26/11/2020	<p><b>Denis Yuryevich KOROLEV</b></p> <p>Born in 1996</p> <p>Volunteer at the Ufa regional office Republic of Bashkortostan</p>	<p>Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan</p>	<p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank, RGS Bank), appeals Moscow City Court 23/04/2020 (RGS Bank) and 27/05/2020 (Sberbank, Alfa-bank); collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					<p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.</p>	
132.	2313/21 26/11/2020	<p><b>Yuriy Aleksandrovich PRUDNIKOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1993</p> <p>Employee at the Cheboksary regional office Republic of Chuvashia</p>	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Alfa-bank, AB “Rossiya”, “Bank Russkiy Standart”, Sberbank), appeals Moscow City Court 23/04/2020 (“Bank Russkiy Standart”) and 27/05/2020 (Alfa-bank, Sberbank); collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
133.	3380/21 26/11/2020	<p><b>Yaroslav Igorevich VARENIK</b></p> <p>Born in 1998</p> <p>Journalist for an online media outlet in Arkhangelsk Arkhangelsk region</p>	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing order of 17/10/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 27/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.</p>	<p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

					Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.	
134.	3389/21 26/11/2020	<b>Viktor Viktorovich BARMIN</b>  Born in 1977  Former coordinator of the Yekaterinburg regional office Sverdlovsk region	Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 17/10/2019 Basmany District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 27/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
135.	11276/21 05/02/2021	<b>Svetlana Nikolayevna LUBINA</b>  Born in 1978  Volunteer of Nizhny Novgorod regional office Nizhny Novgorod region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Search</u> Search of the applicant’s flat on 12/09/2019, authorised on 03/09/2019 by the Basmany District Court of Moscow, that decision was quashed on appeal on 06/07/2020; the new decision declaring the search lawful was taken on 25/08/2020 by the Basmany District Court of Moscow, appeal dismissed on 18/11/2020 by the Moscow City Court;  <u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing order of 03/09/2019 Basmany District Court of Moscow (Sberbank), appeal Moscow City Court 14/11/2019; collective extension order of 22/04/2021, appeal pending).	Art. 8 (1) – unlawful search;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – search of the flat and freezing of bank accounts;  Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts.	EUR 12,000 (NPD)

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

136.	22357/21 29/04/2021	<p><b>Aleksey Anatolyevich NAVALNYY</b></p> <p>Born in 1976 Died in 2024</p> <p><b>HEIR:</b> <b>Yuliya Navalnaya</b></p> <p>Founder of the FBK and Navalnyy Headquarters Moscow</p> <p><b>ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK)</b></p> <p>Non-profit organisation Founded in 2011 Liquidated in 2021 Moscow</p> <p><b>FOUNDATION FOR THE DEFENCE OF CIVIL RIGHTS (FZPG)</b></p> <p>Non-profit organisation Founded in 2019 Liquidated in 2021 Moscow</p> <p><b>NAVALNYY HEADQUARTERS</b></p> <p>Civic movement Established in 2017 Disbanded in 2021</p>	<p>Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev Vilnius</p> <p>Philip Leach St Albans, United Kingdom</p> <p>Jessica Gavron London</p>	See §§ 33-36 of the judgment	<p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – designation of the FBK, the FZPG and the Navalnyy Headquarters as “extremist” organisations and their subsequent deregistration (final decision was taken by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation on 17/08/2022);</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – designation of the above-mentioned organisations as “extremist” by the authorities pursued an ulterior purpose of suppressing their activities;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 3 – ineligibility to stand for elections – Mr Navalnyy cannot stand for elections as the former founder of the organisations designated as “extremist” by the authorities.</p>	<p>For the awards to Mr Navalnyy and the FBK, see application no. 13505/20 above</p> <p>EUR 10,000 (NPD) to the FZPG, to be paid to Ms Olga Guseva</p> <p>EUR 10,000 (PD) to the Navalnyy Headquarters, to be paid to Mr Leonid Volkov</p>
------	------------------------	--	--	------------------------------	---	--

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

137.	35918/21 25/06/2021	<p><b>Yevgeniy Gennadyevich PASHUTKIN</b></p> <p>Born in 1989</p> <p>Coordinator of the Saransk regional office Republic of Mordovia</p>	<p>Irina Vladimirovna Khrunova Kazan</p>	<p><u>Freezing of bank accounts</u></p> <p>Freezing orders of 04/09/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Tinkoff bank, Alfa-bank, VTB Bank, Raiffeisen bank), no appeals lodged as the applicant was unaware of the freezing orders; a number of collective extension orders of 19/04/2021 (Alfa-bank), 23/04/2021 (VTB Bank), 26/04/2021 (Sberbank), 27/04/2021 (Raiffeisen bank), appeals pending.</p>	<p>Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.</p>	EUR 10,000 (NPD)
138.	56994/22 09/12/2022	<p><b>Leonid Mikhaylovich VOLKOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1980</p> <p>Head of Aleksey Navalnyy’s 2018 presidential campaign; coordinator of Navalnyy Headquarters network Moscow</p> <p><b>Georgiy Valentinovich ALBUROV</b></p> <p>Born in 1989</p> <p>Deputy head of the investigations department at FBK Moscow</p> <p><b>Vyacheslav Ilyich GIMADI</b></p>	<p>Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Pomazuyev Vilnius</p>	<p>See §§ 33-39 of the judgment</p>	<p>Art. 11 (1) and Art. 10 (1) – freedom of association and freedom of expression – designation of the Anti-Corruption Foundation and the Foundation for the Protection of Civil Rights as “extremist” organisations and their subsequent deregistration;</p> <p>Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – designation of the above-mentioned organisations as “extremist” by the authorities pursued an ulterior purpose of suppressing their activities;</p> <p>Prot. 1 Art. 3 – ineligibility to stand for elections – as a consequence of the applicants’ involvement in the organisations designated “extremist” by the authorities.</p>	<p>For the awards to Mr Volkov, Mr Gimadi, Ms Guseva, Mr Pomazuyev see application no. 13505/20 above</p> <p>For the awards to Mr Shaveddinov and Mr Zhdanov, see application no. 53059/20 above</p> <p>For the award to Mr Yemelyanov, see case no. 15331/20 above</p> <p>***</p> <p>EUR 10,000 (NPD) to Mr Alburov</p>



ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		<p>Born in 1985</p> <p>Lawyer; head of legal department of the FBK Moscow</p> <p><b>Olga Andreyevna GUSEVA</b></p> <p>Born in 1995</p> <p>FBK manager; founder of the Foundation for the Defence of Civil Rights ("FZPG") St Petersburg</p> <p><b>Vladlen Kornelevich LOS</b></p> <p>Born in 1990</p> <p>Lawyer for FBK Moscow</p> <p><b>Dmitriy Aleksandrovich NIZOVTSEV</b></p> <p>Born in 1987</p> <p>Activist; supporter of FBK and Navalnyy Headquarters Moscow</p>				<p>EUR 10,000 (NPD) to Mr Los</p> <p>EUR 10,000 (NPD) to Mr Nizovtsev</p> <p>EUR 10,000 (NPD) to Ms Yarmysh</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		<p><b>Aleksandr Yevgenyevich POMAZUYEV</b></p> <p>Born in 1982</p> <p>Lawyer for FBK Moscow</p> <p><b>Ruslan Tabrizovich SHAVEDDINOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1996</p> <p>“Shtab” employee; project manager at FBK Moscow</p> <p><b>Kira Aleksandrovna YARMYSH</b></p> <p>Born in 1989</p> <p>Press secretary for FBK Moscow</p> <p><b>Oleg Igorevich YEMELYANOV</b></p> <p>Born in 1996</p> <p>Coordinator of the Kazan regional office Republic of Tatarstan</p> <p><b>Ivan Yuryevich</b></p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

ANTI-CORRUPTION FOUNDATION (FBK) AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

		<b>ZHDANOV</b>  Born in 1988  FBK director Moscow				
139.	41195/23 26/11/2020	<b>Natalya Valeryevna MALAKHOVA</b>  Born in 1991  Employee at the Tver regional office Tver region	Igor Nikolayevich Sholokhov Kazan	<u>Freezing of bank accounts</u> Freezing orders of 17/10/2019 Basmannyy District Court of Moscow (Sberbank, Alfa-bank), appeal Moscow City Court 27/05/2020; collective extension order of 31/07/2020, appeal Moscow City Court 03/12/2020.	Prot. 1 Art. 1 – interference with peaceful enjoyment of possessions – freezing of the applicant’s bank accounts;  Art. 11 (1) – freedom of association – interference on account of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 13 – lack of any effective remedy in domestic law – in respect of the freezing of bank accounts;  Art. 18 – application of restrictions only for prescribed purposes – freezing of bank accounts.	EUR 10,000 (NPD)