



Forthcoming judgments

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 13 judgments on Tuesday 15 May 2012.

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

Tuesday 15 May 2012

[I.G. v. Republic of Moldova \(application no. 53519/07\)](#)

The applicant, I.G., is a Moldovan national who was born in 1989 and lives in Bilicenii Vechi (Republic of Moldova). Alleging that in 2004, at the age of fourteen, she was raped by an acquaintance, she complains that the authorities did not investigate her allegations effectively and that the requirement of corroborative evidence of resistance was discriminatory against her. She relies on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

[Plotnicova v. Republic of Moldova \(no. 38623/05\)](#)

The applicant, Lidia Plotnicova, is a Moldovan national who was born in 1950 and lives in Chişinău. Convicted of fraud and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment in July 2005, she complains about the conditions of her pre-trial detention, in particular that she was not provided with sufficient medical assistance and that the food was inedible. She relies on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention. Further relying in particular on Article 6 § 3 (right to a fair trial), she complains that the trial court failed to hear certain witnesses and to order the translation of key documents.

[Sochichiu v. Republic of Moldova \(no. 28698/09\)](#)

The applicant, Sergiu Sochichiu, is a Moldovan national who was born in 1973 and lives in Chişinău. Arrested on suspicion of fraud in January 2007 and subsequently placed under house arrest for 150 days without having been convicted, he complains that he was ill-treated by the police during his arrest and that the authorities failed to effectively investigate his allegations. He maintains in particular that he received a blow to his head and that the use of force was unwarranted, as he had not been wanted by the police and had been unarmed. He relies in particular on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment).

[Labsi v. Slovakia \(no. 33809/08\)](#)

The applicant, Mustapha Labsi, is an Algerian national who was born in 1969. He is currently detained in Algeria. Having been convicted, in absentia, of membership of a terrorist organisation in 2005 by an Algerian court and sentenced to life imprisonment, he unsuccessfully applied for asylum in Slovakia. After the Supreme Court of Slovakia had upheld the decision dismissing his third asylum request, Mr Labsi was expelled to Algeria in April 2010. He complains that his expulsion exposed him to the threat of being ill-treated by Algerian authorities, in violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment). He further alleges that he did not have an effective remedy in

respect of that complaint, in violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy). Finally, he complains of a violation of Article 34 (right of individual petition) in that the Slovak Government had disregarded the interim measure, issued by the European Court of Human Rights in July 2008 under Rule 39 of its Rules of Court, to the effect that Mr Labsi should not be extradited to Algeria pending the proceedings before the Court.

[Fernandez Martinez v. Spain \(no. 56030/07\)](#)

The applicant, Mr José Antonio Fernández Martínez, is a Spanish national. He was ordained a priest in 1961. In 1984 he applied to the Vatican for dispensation from celibacy, which was granted on 15 September 1997. He was married in a civil ceremony in 1985, and he and his wife have five children. He has been a teacher of Catholic religion and morals in a public high school since October 1991, his contract being renewed every year by the Bishop of the Diocese of Murcia. In 1996 *La Verdad* newspaper in Murcia published an article about the movement in favour of optional celibacy for priests, of which Mr Fernández Martínez was a member, showing a picture of him, with his family, attending one of their meetings. On 29 September 1997 the Bishopric of Cartagena informed the Ministry of Education of its intention not to renew the applicant's contract for the school year 1997/98. Relying on Article 8 of the Convention, Mr Fernández Martínez alleges that the non-renewal of his contract because of his personal and family situation amounted to a violation of his right to respect for his private and family life. He also relies on Articles 9 (freedom of religion), 10 (freedom of expression) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

[H.N. v. Sweden \(no. 30720/09\)](#)

The applicant, Mr H.N, is a Burundian national who was born in 1984. Having arrived in Sweden in 2006, he sought asylum, without success. Relying on Article 2 (right to life) and Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), he alleges that, if deported to Burundi, he risked being killed or ill-treated.

[Nacic and Others v. Sweden \(no. 16567/10\)](#)

The applicants, Sladjan and Jelena Nacic, a married couple, and their sons Alexander and Milan Nacic, were born in 1969, 1971, 1991 and 1994 respectively. They are of Roma descent and lived in the village of Kosovo Polje. They are currently in Sweden. Following the outbreak of war in 1999, the father refused to participate in the fighting and hid from the armed forces, as a result of which his family was subjected to threats and beatings by the Serbian military. Having hidden in a friends' house for years, completely isolated from the world, they travelled to Sweden in 2006 and sought asylum and residence permits. Their requests were refused, save for that of the elder son who was granted a permanent residence permit due to mental health problems. Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants complain that, if three of them were deported to Kosovo or Serbia, the chances of their mental health improving were minimal, and also that their family life would suffer as a result of separation from their son and brother.

[S.F. and Others v. Sweden \(no. 52077/10\)](#)

The applicants, S.F., N.S. and A.F., are Iranian nationals who were born in 1977, 1979 and 2009 respectively and are currently in Sweden. Having fled Iran for fear of persecution because of the first applicant's involvement with a Kurdish political party, the first two applicants arrived in Sweden in 2007 and unsuccessfully sought asylum, and residence and work permits. Their child was born in 2009 in Sweden. Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), they allege that, if deported to Iran, they would be tortured or otherwise ill-treated.

Grigoryev v. Ukraine (no. 51671/07)

The applicant, Andrey Grigoryev, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1967 and is currently serving a prison sentence in Yenakiyev Penitentiary no. 52 (Ukraine) for murder, banditry, illegal arms handling, car-jacking, destruction of property, theft and robbery. Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial), he complains that he was tortured by the police after his arrest in March 2002, and that his subsequent conviction was based on self-incriminating statements and evidence obtained under duress and in the absence of a lawyer.

Kaverzin v. Ukraine (no. 23893/03)

The applicant, Aleksandr Kaverzin, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1973. He is currently serving a life prison sentence in Vinnytsya (Ukraine) for aggravated murder, bodily injuries, illegal possession of firearms, banditry and robbery. Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), he complains that he was tortured by the police following his arrest in January 2001 in order to extract a confession in respect of the crimes of which he had been suspected. He further alleges that his related complaints were not duly examined, and that he was not provided with adequate medical treatment, as a result of which he became completely blind. Finally, he complains about the conditions of his detention and about being handcuffed at all times when leaving his cell, despite his blindness.

Repetitive case

The following case raises issues which have already been submitted to the Court.

Firma Veritas, Tov v. Ukraine (no. 2217/07)

Length-of-proceedings cases

In the following cases, the applicants complain in particular about the excessive length of (non-criminal) proceedings.

Madzarevic v. Slovenia (no. 38975/05)

Rijavec v. Slovenia (no. 36349/05)

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 to the [Court's RSS feeds](#).

Press contacts

echrpres@echr.coe.int | tel: +33 3 90 21 42 08

Tracey Turner-Tretz (tel: + 33 3 88 41 35 30)

Kristina Pencheva-Malinowski (tel: + 33 3 88 41 35 70)

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.