



Forthcoming hearings in January 2021

The European Court of Human Rights will be holding the following two hearings in January 2021:

Khasanov and Rakhmanov v. Russia (application nos. 28492/15 and 49975/15), concerning the applicants' allegation that they risked ill-treatment if extradited to Kyrgyzstan because they belonged to the Uzbek ethnic minority, who have been persecuted by the authorities since inter-ethnic clashes in 2010.

Abdi Ibrahim v. Norway (no. 15379/16), concerning the decision by the Norwegian authorities to allow the adoption of a child by a foster family against his mother's wishes.

Due to the Covid-19 outbreak and until further notice, the hearings are not currently open to the public. However, all hearings are filmed in full and a video-recording will be available on the Court's website from 2.30 p.m. on the day of each hearing. After each hearing the Court will begin its deliberations, which will be held in private. Its rulings in the cases will be made at a later stage.

On 20 January 2021 at 10 a.m. by videoconference: Grand Chamber hearing in the case **Khasanov and Rakhmanov v. Russia**

The applicants, Turdyvay Urunbayevich Khasanov and Shavkatbek Salyzhanovich Rakhmanov, are Kyrgyz nationals. They were born in 1957 and 1986 and live in Verkhneye Mukhanovo, Oryol Region, and Elektrogorsk, Moscow Region, respectively.

Mr Khasanov arrived in Russia in 2010, while Mr Rakhmanov arrived in 2011. They were apprehended, respectively, in 2013 and 2014 because they were wanted in Kyrgyzstan on charges of aggravated misappropriation (Mr Khasanov) and several counts of aggravated robbery, destruction of property and murder (Mr Rakhmanov).

In the ensuing proceedings concerning the applicants' extradition and their requests for refugee status, they alleged that they were at risk of persecution and ill-treatment in Kyrgyzstan because they belonged to a vulnerable ethnic group. The courts, prosecution and migration authorities assessed these claims but dismissed them.

In particular, in final decisions of 2015 the courts found that the general human-rights situation in Kyrgyzstan did not as such preclude extradition. Furthermore, they found that both applicants had been charged with common crimes which were unrelated to ethnic or political issues. Moreover, Mr Khasanov had been accused of a financial crime which pre-dated the 2010 clashes, and Mr Rakhmanov had travelled from Russia to Kyrgyzstan between 2011 and 2014 without problem.

The courts also stressed that they were in any case satisfied with the assurances provided by the Kyrgyz authorities that the applicants would not be ill-treated and that Russian diplomatic staff would have access to their place of detention to monitor their situation.

The applicants' extradition was, however, stayed in June and October 2015, respectively, on the basis of an interim measure granted by the European Court of Human Rights under Rule 39 of its

Rules of Court, which indicated to the Russian Government that they should not be removed for the duration of the proceedings before it.

The applicants were released from detention in 2014 and 2015.

The applications were lodged with the European Court of Human Rights on 15 June 2015 and 11 October 2015, respectively.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that their removal to Kyrgyzstan would put them at real risk of ill-treatment, alleging in particular that the Kyrgyz authorities' assurances are unreliable.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 19 November 2019, the Court held, by five votes to two, that there would be no violation of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights if the applicants were extradited to Kyrgyzstan. The Chamber found in particular that the Russian courts had given the applicants' allegations careful consideration and that their reasons for dismissing them had been reasonable. The Chamber therefore had no grounds to doubt the Russian courts' position, and it concluded that neither the general situation in the country, nor the fact that the applicants belonged to the Uzbek ethnic minority put them at real risk of treatment contrary to Article 3 if they were extradited to Kyrgyzstan. Moreover, the Chamber had to assess the applicants' situation as it stood at present and stressed that, in light of recent international reports, they no longer constituted a vulnerable group at risk of ill-treatment solely in connection with their ethnic origin.

The Chamber further decided, by six votes to one, to continue to indicate to the Russian Government not to extradite or otherwise involuntarily remove the applicants to Kyrgyzstan until the Chamber judgment had become final or until further order.

On 15 April 2020 the Grand Chamber Panel accepted the applicants' request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber¹. On 15 October 2020 the Court granted the applicants' request to lift the anonymity previously applied in the case.

On 27 January 2021 at 10 a.m. by videoconference: Grand Chamber hearing in the case *Abdi Ibrahim v. Norway*

The applicant, Mariya Abdi Ibrahim, is a Somali national born in 1993.

Her child, a son born in 2009 in Kenya before she moved to Norway, where she was granted refugee status, was taken into emergency foster care in late 2010. He was subsequently placed with a Christian family, while the applicant had argued he should go to either her cousins or to a Somali or Muslim family.

In 2013 the authorities applied to allow the foster family to adopt the child, which would lead to the applicant having no contact, and for the applicant's parental rights to be removed for that purpose. She appealed: she did not ask for the child's return as he had spent a long time with foster parents to whom he had become attached, but she sought contact so, among other things, he could maintain his cultural and religious roots.

The High Court ruled by a majority in May 2015 to dismiss the applicant's appeal and allow the adoption. Among other things, it examined issues arising from his being adopted by a Christian

¹ Under Article 43 of the European Convention on Human Rights, within three months from the date of a Chamber judgment, any party to the case may, in exceptional cases, request that the case be referred to the 17-member Grand Chamber of the Court. In that event, a panel of five judges considers whether the case raises a serious question affecting the interpretation or application of the Convention or its protocols, or a serious issue of general importance, in which case the Grand Chamber will deliver a final judgment. If no such question or issue arises, the panel will reject the request, at which point the judgment becomes final. Otherwise Chamber judgments become final on the expiry of the three-month period or earlier if the parties declare that they do not intend to make a request to refer.

family, such as ethnicity, culture and religion. She was refused leave to appeal to the Supreme Court in September 2015.

The application was lodged with the European Court of Human Rights on 17 March 2016.

The applicant complains about the withdrawal of her parental rights and the authorisation for adoption, relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 17 December 2019, the Court, deciding to consider the applicant's complaints under Article 8 of the European Convention alone, held, unanimously, that there had been a violation of that Article. The Chamber referred in particular to the Court's judgment in the case of [Strand Lobben v. Norway](#), noting the "strict scrutiny" it had to apply when limitations had been placed on parental access after a child had been taken into care.

It found that the decision-making process on the applicant's son had failed to give due account to her views and interests, leading to violations of her human rights.

On 11 May 2020 the Grand Chamber Panel accepted the applicant's request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber².

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 [@ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

Press contacts

During the current public-health crisis, journalists can continue to contact the Press Unit via echrpess@echr.coe.int.

Tracey Turner-Tretz

Denis Lambert

Inci Ertekin

Neil Connolly

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.

² Under Article 43 of the European Convention on Human Rights, within three months from the date of a Chamber judgment, any party to the case may, in exceptional cases, request that the case be referred to the 17-member Grand Chamber of the Court. In that event, a panel of five judges considers whether the case raises a serious question affecting the interpretation or application of the Convention or its protocols, or a serious issue of general importance, in which case the Grand Chamber will deliver a final judgment. If no such question or issue arises, the panel will reject the request, at which point the judgment becomes final. Otherwise Chamber judgments become final on the expiry of the three-month period or earlier if the parties declare that they do not intend to make a request to refer.