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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 089 (2015)
26.03.2015

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 5 judgments on Tuesday 31 March 2015 and 46 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 2 April 2015.

*Press releases and texts of the judgments and decisions will be available at **10 a.m.** (local time) on the Court's Internet site (www.echr.coe.int)*

Tuesday 31 March 2015

Davtyan v. Armenia (application no. 29736/06)

The applicant, Artashes Davtyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1962 and lives in Yerevan.

The case principally concerns Mr Davtyan's complaint about inadequate medical care in detention over a prolonged period of time.

Mr Davtyan was arrested in March 2003 and charged with large-scale embezzlement through preparing and using false accounting documents when he was the executive director of a bank from 1997 to 1999. He was found guilty in November 2005 and sentenced to six years' imprisonment. This judgment was later upheld on appeal, and Mr Davtyan's appeal on points of law was ultimately dismissed by the Court of Cassation in June 2006. He was released on parole in June 2006.

Less than a month after Mr Davtyan was placed in detention, doctors recommended that he have a biopsy of a tumour on his vocal chords as well as further examinations and treatment. Similar recommendations were made in January and April 2005. None of these recommendations were apparently followed up and, in March 2006 following a drastic deterioration in his health (which included him coughing blood, having asphyxia attacks and losing consciousness), Mr Davtyan was transferred to an outside hospital for urgent surgery. He thus had two operations in March and April 2006 which improved his condition.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Davtyan alleges that his continued detention, despite his poor health and without the requisite medical care, had caused him severe physical and mental pain and had put his life in danger. He complains in particular that he only received symptomatic instead of specialised treatment for about three years, alleging that such a long delay in carrying out the biopsy test and surgery were not justified. Also relying on Article 7 (no punishment without law), Mr Davtyan alleges that the legal provisions (notably Article 325 of the new Criminal Code of 2003) used to convict him were not applicable in his case and did not therefore meet the requirement of foreseeability.

Helsinki Committee of Armenia v. Armenia (no. 59109/08)

The applicant organisation, the Helsinki Committee of Armenia, is a non-governmental human rights organisation based in Yerevan. The case concerns a ban on the organisation holding a march in mourning of the death of a man, who was a witness in a murder investigation, in police custody. The incident, involving the witness jumping out of a police station window on 12 May 2007, had provoked an outcry among Armenian human rights groups and civil society.

On 6 May 2008 the applicant NGO notified the Mayor of Yerevan of its intention to hold a commemoration march. The Mayor banned the march for national security and public order reasons following post-election clashes which had caused casualties and had resulted in the President of

Armenia declaring a state of emergency in March 2008 for 20 days. The applicant NGO, which had not received the letter informing them of the Mayor's decision, tried to hold the march on 12 May 2008 as planned but was prevented from doing so by the police. The NGO received the letter informing them of the ban on 13 May 2008.

Relying on Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association) of the Convention, the applicant NGO complain about the ban on them holding their mourning march. Further relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the NGO also complains that any appeal against the decision banning their march, received after the date of the planned event, was not only ineffective but meaningless.

Nalbandyan v. Armenia (nos. 9935/06 and 23339/06)

The applicants, Bagrat and Narine Nalbandyan, husband and wife, and their daughter, Arevik Nalbandyan, are Armenian nationals who were born in 1961, 1964, and 1988 respectively. Bagrat and Narine Nalbandyan were apparently serving prison sentences in Kosh and Abovyan penitentiary institutions (Armenia) at the time of the submission of their application. Arevik Nalbandyan lives in the town of Vardenis (Armenia).

The case concerns the family's allegations of their ill-treatment in police custody on suspicion of murdering one of Arevik Nalbandyan's classmates in Vardenis and of the unfairness of the ensuing criminal proceedings against them.

Mr Nalbandyan alleges that he was first taken into custody on 8 June 2004 and, held without his arrest being formally recorded, was subjected to continual beatings by the police in order to make him confess to the schoolgirl's murder. His wife alleges that she was also subsequently questioned by the police in July 2004 and, on refusing to testify against her husband, was beaten on the soles of her fee with a baton. On the same occasion the police threatened to rape her daughter, who had been brought to the police station and locked up in a nearby, dark room infested with rats, if she did not confess. As a result, Ms Nalbandyan confessed to the murder and her husband confessed to having assisted her. Their daughter alleges that she was taken to the police station on numerous occasions, frequently at late hours, and threatened with rape if she did not admit that her mother had committed the murder. Bagrat and Narine Nalbandyan were formally arrested on 9 July 2004 and charged with murder on 12 July 2004. On 14 July 2004 Ms Nalbandyan was transferred from the police station to a detention facility where she was medically examined and found to have bruised and swollen feet. Arevik was taken to hospital by her uncle on 16 July 2004 and found to have concussion and bruising to her head, back and left arm.

In February 2005 Bagrat and Narine Nalbandyan were found guilty of murder and sentenced to nine and 14 years' imprisonment, respectively. Their conviction was upheld by the Court of Appeal in July 2005. Narine Nalbandyan lodged an appeal on points of law which was dismissed by the Court of Cassation in August 2005. Their lawyer also lodged an appeal on points of law on behalf of Bagrat Nalbandyan, which was dismissed on the ground that the lawyer was no longer authorised to represent him as the couple had allegedly dispensed with her services during a court hearing held on 1 July 2005. The criminal proceedings against Arevik Nalbandyan were dropped due to lack of evidence in August 2004.

During the criminal proceedings against them Bagrat and Narine Nalbandyan consistently denied their guilt and stated that they had only confessed to the murder under duress. They also complained about the atmosphere of constant intimidation in the courtroom, including threats, verbal and physical abuse directed at both the applicants and their lawyers by the relatives and friends of the murder victim. The Court of Cassation ultimately dismissed their allegations of ill-treatment, finding that they were unsubstantiated as there were no records of any ill-treatment, and did not examine their complaint of courtroom disorder during the proceedings. The applicants also made repeated requests with the prosecuting authorities to have their complaints of ill-treatment investigated and the accused prosecuted and punished. In August 2004 the investigating authorities

issued a decision refusing to bring criminal proceedings as they considered credible the police officers' testimonies denying any ill-treatment and found the applicants' allegations unreliable.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), the applicants allege that they were ill-treated in police custody in June and July 2004 and that the authorities' ensuing investigation into their allegations was ineffective. Further relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial / right to legal assistance of own choosing / right of access to court), the applicants also allege in particular that the atmosphere of constant disorder in the courtroom during the hearings on their case prevented their lawyers from performing their functions correctly. Lastly, relying on Article 6 § 1 (right of access to court), Mr Nalbandyan complains about the Court of Cassation's refusal to examine on the merits his lawyer's appeal on points of law for purely formal reasons.

S.C. Uzinexport S.A. v. Romania (no. 43807/06)

The applicant, S.C. Uzinexport S.A., is a Romanian company with its registered office in Bucharest.

The case concerns the rejection of a request that it made to obtain default interest for late payment in respect of a sum owed to it by the State.

The applicant company's capital was held by the State until 1997, when it was privatised and its capital transferred to private investors. The company then complained of a loss resulting from the fact that in 1990 the Ministry of Finance had assigned part of its receivables for a sum that was lower than that initially agreed.

The company brought two sets of proceedings for damages against the Ministry of Finance, which was ordered, in judgments of 31 May 1999 and 1 February 2000, to pay a total of 20 million US dollars in damages to the applicant. In February 2005 the applicant company sought interest from the Ministry of Finance as a result of the delayed enforcement of those judgments.

As regards the enforcement of the 31 May 1999 judgment, the High Court of Cassation and Justice found that the applicant company was entitled to default interest. However in a final judgment of 23 May 2006, it dismissed the request concerning the enforcement of the judgment of 1 February 2000. It took the view that the interest was ancillary to the debt established by that judgment, finding that the right to claim interest was subject to the same time limit as the capital, namely three years from the date on which the judgment in respect of the debt had become final.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), the applicant company complains of a breach of the principle of legal certainty on account of the dismissal of its claim by the final judgment of 23 May 2006 of the High Court of Cassation and Justice. It also complains about that dismissal under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

Öner and Türk v. Turkey (no. 51962/12)

The applicants, Senanik Öner and Ferhan Türk, are Turkish nationals who were born in 1952 and 1951 respectively and live in Diyarbakır (Turkey). The case concerns criminal proceedings brought against the applicants following speeches they made in public during the Newroz celebrations about the problems of Kurdish people.

After making these speeches, the applicants were convicted of disseminating terrorist propaganda on behalf of an illegal organisation, the PKK (Kurdish Workers' Party), in April 2008 and sentenced to one year and eight months' imprisonment. This judgment was upheld by the Court of Cassation in December 2011. The execution of the applicants' sentences was, however, suspended in October 2012 following an amendment to the law and revision of the first-instance judgment against the applicants.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicants complain about their conviction for making a speech, which had called for a peaceful resolution of the problems of the Kurdish people and in no way advocated violence or any illegal activities.

Thursday 2 April 2015

Sarközi and Mahran v. Austria (no. 27945/10)

The applicants, Jana Sarközi, a Slovak national, and Mohamed Mahran, an Austrian national, are a mother and son who were born in 1966 and 2002 and live in Mosonmagyaróvár (Hungary) and Vienna (Austria) respectively. The case concerns their complaint about an exclusion order against Ms Sarközi and her expulsion to Slovakia.

Having arrived in Austria in 1990, Ms Sarközi was granted a permanent residence permit in 1997. Between 1993 and 2008 she was convicted seven times for a number of offences, including causing bodily harm and several counts of fraud. Following her latest conviction and imposition of a three-year prison sentence, the Vienna Federal Police Authority issued an unlimited exclusion order against her. Her initial appeals against the order were unsuccessful, but the duration of the exclusion order was later reduced to eight years, pursuant to a change in the relevant legislation. In December 2012 Ms Sarközi was expelled to Slovakia. Mr Mahran remained with his father, an Austrian citizen from whom Ms Sarközi is divorced, in Vienna. Both parents continue to share custody.

The applicants complain that the exclusion order gave rise to a violation of, in particular, Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life). Ms Sarközi maintains in particular that a close bond exists between mother and son.

Pavlović and Others v. Croatia (no. 13274/11)

The applicants, Davorka Pavlović, Dubravka Družinec, and Višnja Lacko, are Croatian nationals who were born in 1959, 1950, and 1952 respectively, and live in Brestovec Orehovički and Krapina (Croatia) respectively.

The applicants are the heirs of the owner of a flat. In 2001, following his death, they took over as plaintiffs in a civil action he had brought seeking the eviction of a tenant from the flat and reimbursement of the costs of the proceedings. In June 2007 a municipal court allowed the action in part, ordering the eviction of the tenant, but dismissing the remainder of the claim. The judgment was upheld on appeal and the applicants' constitutional complaint, maintaining that the appeal court had incorrectly assessed their request for reimbursement of the costs, was declared inadmissible in September 2010.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain that they were erroneously and arbitrarily deprived of the reimbursement of costs in the civil proceedings.

Ribić v. Croatia (no. 27148/12)

The applicant, Zdenko Ribić, is a Croatian national who was born in 1954 and lives in Zagreb. The case concerns the prolonged proceedings for contact rights with his son.

Mr Ribić and his wife separated in December 1993, two months after their son was born. In 1996 his wife filed for divorce, at the same time seeking custody of their son and maintenance payments. After hearings had been postponed repeatedly, the divorce was eventually granted in a decision by a court of October 2001 which took effect in 2002. The court at the same time awarded custody of the child to the mother, granted Mr Ribić contact rights and ordered him to pay maintenance. On appeal by both parties, the judgment was quashed as far as the contact rights and maintenance were concerned, and the case was remitted. A new judgment granting Mr Ribić contact rights and issuing

a detailed contact schedule was upheld on appeal and became final in June 2005. In parallel, while the proceedings were pending, Mr Ribić was provisionally granted access to his son by the local social welfare centre. However, his former wife refused to cooperate both with the provisional contact schedule and with the final judgment of June 2005. In enforcement proceedings a fine was imposed on her for non-compliance, which she paid. She nevertheless continued not to comply with the contact arrangements. In parallel criminal proceedings, she was also convicted of obstruction of child-protection measures and given a suspended prison sentence. The enforcement proceedings were eventually discontinued after Mr Ribić's son turned 18 in October 2011.

Mr Ribić complains that by failing to secure his contact with his son on a regular basis, the Croatian authorities had breached his rights under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life). He points out in particular that between the time his son was two months old and the time he turned 18 he saw him only three times.

Solomun v. Croatia (no. 679/11)

The applicant, Ivica Solomun, is a Croatian national who was born in 1974 and lives in Sisak (Croatia). The case concerns his complaint about the quashing of a judgment against the State awarding him a bonus in his salary.

In September 2000 Mr Solomun, a police officer, brought civil proceedings against the State seeking payment of a bonus in his salary for working in Dvor, a municipality that received special State support under legislation in force at the time. In October 2003 the first-instance court accepted Mr Solomun's claim and ordered the State to pay the bonus. This judgment, upheld in February 2004, was enforced in April 2004 and Mr Solomun was paid the amount due. However, in April 2005 the State Attorney's Office lodged a request for the protection of legality with the Supreme Court against the part of the judgment awarding Mr Solomun a bonus for the period between 11 August and 5 May 2001. The case was thus remitted to the courts which, finding that travel expenses awarded to Mr Solomun – as well as the address he gave in his civil action – suggested that he actually lived in Sisak, an area which did not receive State support, reversed the first-instance judgment for the period in question. Mr Solomun was also ordered to repay the compensation he had been awarded, together with interest. He lodged a constitutional complaint which was dismissed as ill-founded in April 2010.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Mr Solomun alleges that the use of the legality review procedure to quash the final civil court judgment in his favour breached the principle of legal certainty and unjustifiably deprived him of an acquired possession.

Vinci Construction and 'GTM Génie Civil et Services' v. France (nos. 63629/10 and 60567/10)

The applicants are the companies Vinci Construction France and GTM Génie Civil et Services (GTM GCS), both based in Nanterre.

The case concerns inspections and seizures carried out by the Department of Competition, Consumer Protection and Fraud (the "DGCCRF") on the premises of the two companies.

By an application of 3 October 2007 the DGCCRF asked the liberties and detention judge of the Paris *tribunal de grande instance* for authorisation to carry out inspections and seizures on the premises of the applicant companies in the context of an investigation into illegal concerted practices. The judge granted the request in a decision of 5 October 2007. The inspections took place on 23 October 2007. Many documents and computer files were seized, together with all the e-mails of certain employees.

In support of their appeals to the judge against those inspections, the applicant companies alleged that the seizures had been widespread and indiscriminate, concerning several thousand electronic

documents of which many were not connected to the investigation or were confidential, being protected by legal professional privilege. They also complained that no detailed inventory of the seized items had been drawn up.

The DGCCRF argued that the inspections and seizures had been carried out in accordance with the law and in the context of the judge's authorisation. It stated that the companies had been given a copy of the documents seized and a detailed inventory.

In two decisions of 2 and 9 September 2008 all the claims of the applicant companies were dismissed on the ground that the inspections and seizures had complied with the applicable provisions of the Commercial Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure, and that there had been no breach of Convention rights. The judge found among other things that the respect for the secrecy of correspondence covered by legal professional privilege did not preclude the seizure of documents classified as such. The applicants' appeal on points of law was dismissed by two judgments of 8 April 2010.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair hearing), 8 (right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, the applicant companies allege that there has been a violation of their right to an effective remedy, first because they were not able to lodge a full appeal against the decision authorising the inspections and seizures, and secondly because they could only complain about those operations before the judge who had authorised them, and the requisite conditions of impartiality were not therefore satisfied, in their view. They further complain about a disproportionate interference with their defence rights and with the right to respect for their home, private life and correspondence, particularly as regards the confidentiality arising from legal professional privilege and taking into account the widespread and indiscriminate nature of the seizures and the lack of a detailed inventory.

Aarabi v. Greece (no. 39766/09)

The applicant, Mahran Aarabi, is a Lebanese national who was born in 1991 and lives in Chania (Crete).

Mr Aarabi arrived illegally in Greece by sea on 11 July 2009 without the requisite documents. The case concerns the conditions of his detention in various centres in Greece before he obtained registration as an asylum-seeker.

After being arrested by the police, the authorities proposed his removal and he was then placed in a detention centre. On 18 July 2009 the chief of police ordered his removal for illegally entering and remaining in Greece and extended his detention. On 27 July 2009 he was transferred to the Tychero detention centre near the Turkish border. On 30 July 2009 the immigration police authority ordered that he be transferred to Thessaloniki so that the public prosecutor could take the necessary measures to find him accommodation in a centre for juveniles. On 31 July 2009 he was transferred to the shelter of the NGO "House of Arsis", which informed the police authority that Mr Aarabi wished to travel to Crete, where his two brothers, also asylum seekers, were already living. On 17 June 2010 Mr Aarabi obtained his asylum seeker's card.

Relying in particular on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment), the applicant complained about the total lack of measures of supervision and support during his detention and after his release by the Greek authorities.

Dimech v. Malta (no. 34373/13)

The applicant, Martin Dimech, is a Maltese national who was born in 1960 and lives in Zejtun (Malta). The case concerns his complaint about not having access to a lawyer at the pre-trial stage of proceedings brought against him for drug trafficking.

In May 2009 Mr Dimech was arrested on suspicion of drug trafficking and, after being cautioned about his right to remain silent, was questioned in the absence of a lawyer. At the time in Malta there was no law allowing legal assistance during the police investigation of a case, as the law providing such a right only came into force in 2010. During his questioning Mr Dimech admitted to hiding 800 grams of heroin in his fridge as a guarantee against a sum of money he was owed, but denied that the drugs were his or that he ever used or sold drugs. During the criminal proceedings Mr Dimech requested that his complaint of lack of legal assistance during the investigation and questioning be referred to the constitutional jurisdictions. The ensuing constitutional redress proceedings resulted in a judgment of April 2013 which found that there had been no violation of Mr Dimech's right to a fair trial as there had been nothing illicit or abusive in the taking of his statement, Mr Dimech himself having admitted that he had not been pressured into making his statement. The criminal proceedings are, to date, still pending, Mr Dimech having requested that the trial by jury be suspended on the basis of a new set of constitutional proceedings he had lodged as well as the proceeding pending before the European Court of Human Rights.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and right to legal assistance of own choosing) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), Mr Dimech complains about not having access to a lawyer while in police custody, alleging that the conflicting Constitutional Court judgments on the matter ran counter to the principle of legal certainty and meant that he was treated differently to others in a similar situation without any objective or reasonable justification.

Ireziyevy v. Russia (no. 21135/09)

The applicants, Salambek, Imaddi and Sidyk Ireziyev, three brothers, are Russian nationals who were born in 1959, 1965, and 1967 respectively. Salambek Ireziyev lives in Grozny and Imaddi and Sidyk Ireziyev live in the village of Avtury, in the Chechen Republic (Russia). The case concerns the disappearance of their brother, Aslan Ireziyev, born in 1975.

In the early hours of the morning of 7 May 2002 a group of masked men in camouflage uniforms with machine guns and rubber truncheons arrived at the applicants' family home in Avtury and, having checked passports, took away their brother, Aslan, and their nephew, Khaseyn Suleymanov. Khaseyn was released on 13 May 2002, claiming that he and Aslan had first been taken to the Avtury collective farm and had then been driven to another detention point where they had been placed in a cellar and questioned and beaten by a special task police unit from St. Petersburg. The applicants have had no news of their brother since. The ensuing investigation into their brother's disappearance has been pending for a number of years with a significant period of inactivity since the suspension of the investigation in October 2003, and has so far failed to identify the abductors or establish what exactly happened to their missing brother. The Government submit that the investigation into Aslan Ireziyev's disappearance was still ongoing and that there was no evidence to prove that he had been abducted by Russian servicemen or that he was dead.

The applicants allege that their brother disappeared after being placed in unacknowledged detention by Russian servicemen and that he was presumed to be dead, alleging that this has caused them mental suffering. They also complain that the authorities failed to carry out an effective investigation into the disappearance of their brother. They rely on Article 2 (right to life), Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 5 (right to liberty and security) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).

Kirpichenko v. Ukraine (no. 38833/03)

The applicant, Sergey Kirpichenko, now deceased, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1963 and lived in Donetsk (Ukraine). His mother has continued the application.

The case concerns Mr Kirpichenko's allegations of ill-treatment by the police and by a prosecuting investigator in the murder case against him.

On 29 January 2003 Mr Kirpichenko was arrested at his home and taken to his local police station for questioning about the murder of an adolescent girl. Mr Kirpichenko subsequently complained to the prosecuting authorities that he had been tortured by the police both before and after having been taken to the police station for questioning between 29 and 30 January 2003, claiming in particular that he had been severely beaten, had had his fingers twisted and stepped on and had had plastic bags filled with smoke put over his head in order to force him into making a confession. He claimed that he had been ill-treated again on 6 May 2003 when, studying his case file at the prosecutor's office, an investigator had insulted and hit him in the face making his nose bleed, and on 16 May 2003 when, brought for questioning by the police again, a police officer had insulted him, punched him in the face and kicked him in the back. Mr Kirpichenko was committed to stand trial in the autumn of 2003 and was convicted of murder and theft and sentenced to life imprisonment in November 2004. His conviction and sentence was upheld by the Supreme Court in November 2005, that court also finding that Mr Kirpichenko's complaints of ill-treatment had been thoroughly examined by the law-enforcement authorities and the first-instance court and correctly dismissed as unsubstantiated.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Kirpichenko alleges three instances of ill-treatment while in custody and complains that the official investigation into his allegations of ill-treatment was ineffective. He claims in particular that the investigation was neither independent nor impartial, was marked by various delays and was based exclusively on statements made by the officers accused of ill-treating him.

Orlovskiy v. Ukraine (no. 12222/09)

The applicant, Sergey Orlovskiy, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1968 and is apparently currently detained in Odessa (Ukraine).The case concerns his pre-trial detention on charges related to his involvement in organised crime.

Mr Orlovskiy was arrested on 28 July 2006 and, transferred between various police units for questioning until 1 August 2006, was subsequently remanded in custody and formally charged with possessing illegal explosives and the murder of the member of an organised criminal gang. He was also charged at a later date with other offences committed in a criminal gang and his detention was repeatedly extended – despite Mr Orlovskiy's objections – until his conviction in October 2011 of murder, kidnapping and banditry and sentencing to 14 years' imprisonment.

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), Mr Orlovskiy complains about the unlawfulness of his detention between 28 July and 1 August 2006, which he alleges went unrecorded, as well as of his detention between 19 February and 18 March 2009, which he alleges was based solely on the fact that the case file had been submitted to the trial court for examination. Further relying on Article 5 §§ 3 and 4 (entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial/ right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court), he complains about the excessive length, more than five years and two months, of his pre-trial detention and the lack of an effective procedure for the review of the lawfulness of his detention. Lastly, he complains under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and correspondence) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) that he was not allowed to see or correspond with his family during his detention and that he had no effective domestic remedy in that respect.

The Court will give its rulings in writing on the following cases, some of which concern issues which have already been submitted to the Court, including excessive length of proceedings.

These rulings can be consulted from the day of their delivery on the Court's online database HUDOC.

They will not appear in the press release issued on that day.

Zeneli v. Albania (no. 21718/05)

Aleksic v. Bosnia and Herzegovina (no. 38233/05)
Radovanovic v. Croatia (no. 50252/12)
De Chaisemartin v. France (no. 59426/12)
Kopadze v. Georgia (no. 58228/09)
Sidiani-Aprasidze v. Georgia (no. 32220/07)
Markgraf v. Germany (no. 42719/14)
Karavoulias and Skyrodema Axiou AVEE v. Greece (nos. 21433/10 and 36203/10)
Kodelas v. Greece (no. 64806/09)
Palaiogiannis v. Greece (no. 66438/09)
Smyth v. Greece (no. 51935/13)
Thalassinou and Politis v. Greece (nos. 75685/13 and 76231/13)
Vakirtzi and Others v. Greece (nos. 31174/13, 34939/13, and 65788/13)
Alekseeva v. Latvia (no. 73285/12)
Cveckovskis v. Latvia (no. 43134/09)
Tucs v. Latvia (no. 7712/12)
Cichowski v. Poland (no. 71845/10)
Darmowski v. Poland (no. 68098/10)
Gasinski (no. 19) v. Poland (no. 31535/12)
Kobiz v. Poland (no. 13571/10)
Kosinski v. Poland (no. 23534/12)
Przewoznik v. Poland (no. 60731/12)
Smigielskl v. Poland (no. 76707/13)
T.T. v. Poland (no. 3090/13)
Wardaszko v. Poland (no. 10248/14)
Vieira Soares and Others v. Portugal (no. 34710/13)
Malaescu v. Romania (no. 43943/07)
Chernukhin v. Russia (no. 29993/06)
Dushkin v. Russia (no. 65757/12)
M.L. and Others v. Russia (nos. 9417/13, 10490/13, 11327/13, 11672/13, 23879/13, 29191/13, and 42289/13)
Sanayev v. Russia (no. 30066/08)
Vlasov v. Russia (no. 32015/08)
Zlobin v. Russia (no. 18069/08)
Bozkurt v. Turkey (no. 38674/07)
Canan v. Turkey (no. 19139/12)
Inci and Tutar v. Turkey (no. 60666/10)

This press release is a document produced by the Registry. It does not bind the Court. Decisions, judgments and further information about the Court can be found on www.echr.coe.int. To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en or follow us on Twitter @ECHRpress.

Press contacts
echrpress@echr.coe.int | tel: +33 3 90 21 42 08

Tracey Turner-Tretz (tel: + 33 3 88 41 35 30)
Céline Menu-Lange (tel: + 33 3 90 21 58 77)
Nina Salomon (tel: + 33 3 90 21 49 79)
Denis Lambert (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 09)

The European Court of Human Rights was set up in Strasbourg by the Council of Europe Member States in 1959 to deal with alleged violations of the 1950 European Convention on Human Rights.