



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing nine judgments on Tuesday 2 October 2018 and 124 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 4 October 2018.

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 2 October 2018

[Kožemiakina v. Lithuania \(application no. 231/15\)](#)

The applicant, Irina Kožemiakina, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1969 and lives in Klaipėda (Lithuania).

The case concerns a civil compensation award that was awarded against her and her son, a minor, after the son was involved in an assault on a man.

The applicant's son, A.K., argued that he had acted in self-defence in the assault, which took place in February 2012. The first-instance court in November 2012 ultimately found a friend of A.K.'s guilty of attacking the man, stating that the applicant's son had participated in the attack. As a minor below the age of sixteen, the son could not be prosecuted and no finding of guilt was made against him. The man who had been assaulted made a civil compensation claim against the applicant and her son in May 2013, which led to an award against them. They argued that the criminal court's judgment on the assault had never assessed her son's guilt and thus the courts in civil proceedings could not rely on the criminal courts' findings, but their arguments and appeals against the compensation claim were dismissed in 2014.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains that the damages proceedings were unfair because they relied on criminal proceedings in which her son had only had the status of a witness and she had not had any procedural status.

[Bivolaru v. Romania \(no. 2\) \(no. 66580/12\)](#)

The applicant, Gregorian Bivolaru (alias Magnus Auroldsson), is a Romanian national who was born in 1952. He is the leader of a movement known as the "Movement for spiritual integration in the absolute" ("MISA").

The case concerns criminal proceedings in which Mr Bivolaru was sentenced to six years' imprisonment on charges of sexual relations with a minor.

In March 2004 the Bucharest Public Prosecutor's Office ordered criminal proceedings against Mr Bivolaru on charges of sexual relations with a minor and sexual perversion. The applicant was remanded in police custody from 30 March to 1 April 2004. After his release, on an unknown date, he travelled to Sweden, where, in 2006, he was granted political refugee status and given a new identity. In the meantime, the Bucharest Public Prosecutor's Office committed him for trial *in absentia*. He was acquitted at first instance and on appeal, but on 14 June 2013 he was convicted by the High Court on charges of sexual relations with a minor. The High Court based its decision on the evidence on file, particularly recordings of telephone conversations. In February 2016 Mr Bivolaru was arrested by the French authorities in Paris. In July 2016 he was surrendered to the Romanian

authorities, who remanded him in custody. He was released on licence in September 2017. His application for a reopening of the criminal proceedings was dismissed.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, Mr Bivolaru complains that he was convicted *in absentia* without having been heard in person by the High Court. He also complains about the length of proceedings and the refusal of the Romanian authorities to reopen the criminal proceedings.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), he complains about the tapping of his telephone. In that regard, he also relies on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), alleging that he had no access to an effective remedy.

[A.B.V. v. Russia \(no. 56987/15\)](#)

The applicant, Mr A.B.V., is a Russian national who was born in 1977 and lives in Balashikha (Moscow Region, Russia).

The case concerns the applicant's legal efforts to enforce a court order allowing him contact with his daughter.

A woman with whom the applicant had been living gave birth to a daughter in July 2010. The applicant had regular contact with the child until January 2011, when the mother began to avoid communication with him and prevented him from visiting the child.

Between June 2011 and July 2014 the applicant was involved in legal proceedings which ultimately led to the courts establishing his paternity of the child and issuing a contact order.

However, even with the involvement of the bailiff's service, the applicant was unable to enforce the court decision for several years as the mother refused to comply. The applicant met his child for the first time since 2011 in February 2017. The mother prevented a further two meetings from taking place while at the third the child stated that she did not want to communicate with him.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains about his continuing lack of access to his daughter and of the failure of the authorities to offer him effective assistance to enforce his access rights.

[Fedchenko v. Russia \(no. 3\) \(no. 7972/09\)](#)

[Fedchenko v. Russia \(no. 4\) \(no. 17221/13\)](#)

[Fedchenko v. Russia \(no. 5\) \(no. 17229/13\)](#)

The applicant in all three cases is Oleg Fedchenko, a Russian national who was born in 1968 and who lives in Suponevo (Bryansk Region, Russia).

Mr Fedchenko is the editor of a weekly newspaper which he founded himself called *Bryanskiye Budni* (Брянские будни).

All three cases concern court findings of defamation against Mr Fedchenko.

In Fedchenko v. Russia (no. 3) the domestic court found that the applicant had defamed a member of the Bryansk Region Duma in an article published in February 2008, which referred, among other things, to the politician allegedly using his official car for private purposes. The court in November 2008, upheld on appeal in December of the same year, awarded 40,000 Russian roubles to the claimant and ordered Mr Fedchenko to publish a retraction within 10 days of the judgment coming into force.

Fedchenko v. Russia (no. 4) concerns a November 2012 damages award of 5,000 roubles against the applicant after he published an article which referred to a deputy governor of the Bryansk region in connection with land fraud.

Fedchenko v. Russia (no. 5) concerns an award of 5,000 roubles made against the applicant in September 2012 after he was found to have defamed another regional governor in an article about alleged favouritism by the authorities to the owner of a local shopping centre which had been found to be in breach of fire safety rules. He was also ordered to publish retractions in both cases.

Mr Fedchenko relies on Article 10 (freedom of expression) in all three cases to complain about the court awards against him.

[Tsakoyevy v. Russia \(no. 16397/07\)](#)

The applicants, Dzhamal Tsakoyev and Zukhra Tsakoyeva, are Russian nationals who were born in 1940 and 1950 respectively. They live in the North Caucasus (Russia).

The case concerns the alleged abduction of their son, Rasul Tsakoyev, on 27 September 2004 during a police special operation. He was found two days later next to a local petrol station. He had been severely beaten and died soon after in hospital from his injuries.

The applicant couple complained to the authorities while their son was still alive and an investigator went to the hospital to question him. He explained that he had been forced into a car and taken to police premises which he recognised from previous times he had been questioned about his involvement in an illegal armed group. He alleged that he had then been beaten with rubber truncheons, burnt with cigarettes and tortured with electric shocks and needles under his nails for the next three days.

The prosecuting authorities opened a criminal case on 7 October 2004. Rasul Tsakoyev's family and colleagues were questioned and confirmed his allegations, while the police officers gave statements either saying that they could not recall the incident or that they had been asked by family and friends to search the police station for Mr Tsakoyev but had not found him.

The investigation has since been repeatedly suspended and resumed, the supervising prosecutors and domestic courts pointing out shortcomings in the investigation. The criminal proceedings are, however, still pending.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 5 (right to liberty and security) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant couple allege that the police abducted and tortured their son, as a result of which he had died, and that the authorities failed to effectively investigate the matter.

[Mutu and Pechstein v. Switzerland \(nos. 40575/10 and 67474/10\)](#)

The applicants are a Romanian national (Mr Adrian Mutu), who was born in 1979, and a German national (Ms Claudia Pechstein), who was born in 1972. The case concerns the lawfulness of proceedings brought by professional athletes before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS).

In August 2003 Mr Mutu, a professional footballer, was transferred from the Italian club AC Parma to Chelsea for a total of 26 million euros. In October 2004 the English Football Association conducted anti-doping checks which showed cocaine traces in the sample provided by Mr Mutu. Chelsea consequently terminated their contract with him.

In April 2005 the Football Association Premier League Appeals Committee (FAPLAC), to which the footballer and the club had appealed, ruled that there had been a breach "without reasonable cause" of the contract on the footballer's part. He appealed to the CAS, which upheld that decision. In May 2006 the club filed an action for damages with the Disputes Division of the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA). It ordered Mr Mutu to pay the club over 17 million euros. In July 2009 the CAS dismissed Mr Mutu's appeal. In September 2009 he lodged an appeal with the Swiss Federal Court ("the Federal Court") seeking the setting aside of the CAS decision. He argued that the Court of Arbitration had been neither independent nor impartial. Mr Mutu relied on an

anonymous email stating that one of the arbitrators of that court, Mr D.-R. M., had been a partner in a law firm representing the interests of the owner of Chelsea Football Club, and on the fact that another arbitrator, L. F., had previously sat on the bench which had confirmed the lack of a “reasonable cause” for the breach of contract. In June 2010 the Federal Court ruled that the bench of the Court of Arbitration could be considered to have been “independent and impartial”, and therefore dismissed the applicant’s appeal.

Ms Pechstein is a professional speed skater. In February 2009 all the athletes registered for the world speed skating championships had anti-doping tests. After analysis of the applicant’s blood profile, the ISU’s disciplinary board imposed a two-year suspension on her. In July 2009 she and the DESG German speed skating association appealed to the CAS against that decision.

The hearing took place in private session, despite Ms Pechstein’s request for a public procedure. In November 2009 the TAS upheld the two-year suspension. In December 2009 Ms Pechstein applied to the Federal Court to set aside the decision given by the TAS. She argued that the latter was not an “independent and impartial” tribunal on account of the mode of appointment of the arbitrators, the “hard line” against doping taken by its President and its refusal to allow her hearing to be held in public. In February 2010 the Federal Court dismissed the applicant’s application.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicants submit that the CAS cannot be regarded as an independent and impartial tribunal. The second applicant complains that she did not have a public hearing before the ISU disciplinary board, the CAS or the Federal Court, despite her explicit requests to that end. Relying on Article 4 § 1 (prohibition of slavery and forced labour) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the first applicant complains about the sum which he was ordered to pay to Chelsea Football Club.

[Krivolapov v. Ukraine \(no. 5406/07\)](#)

The applicant, Igor Krivolapov, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1961 and lives in Kramatorsk (Ukraine).

The case concerns Mr Krivolapov’s detention and trial during criminal proceedings against him.

In January 2004 the authorities began criminal proceedings against Mr Krivolapov, alleging that as deputy head of the police in Kramatorsk he had falsified the case against a man accused of murdering a local journalist in 2001 in order to avoid responsibility for his failure to solve the crime.

Mr Krivolapov was remanded in custody in February 2004, with his period in detention being extended several times. He was finally released in February 2009 after a court acquitted him of some of the charges and found him guilty of others, but held that he had already served his sentence while in detention. He was ordered back into pre-trial detention in January 2012 on different charges but was released by a court in January 2013 after the remaining charges became time-barred.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Krivolapov complains about the conditions of his detention and his medical care in the Lugansk SIZO detention centre in 2012.

He also complains under Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security / lawful arrest on reasonable suspicion) that his detention from 10 August 2005 to 19 February 2009 was unlawful and arbitrary. Relying on Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 (right to liberty and security / entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial) he complains that his detention from 25 January 2012 until 24 January 2013 was excessively long and was not based on relevant and sufficient reasons. He relies on Article 5 § 5 (right to compensation) to complain that he had no enforceable right to compensation for such violations of his rights.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time) and Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence), he complains about the length of the proceedings against him and the fact that public

officials were involved in the media campaign surrounding his case, asserting his guilt prior to his conviction.

Thursday 4 October 2018

[Pojatina v. Croatia \(no. 18568/12\)](#)

The applicant, Ivana Pojatina, is a Croatian national who was born in 1976 and lives in Zagreb.

The case concerns her complaint about Croatian legislation on home births.

In February 2012 Ms Pojatina gave birth to her fourth child at home, assisted by a midwife from abroad. During her pregnancy she had written to the Croatian Chamber of Midwives to enquire whether she could have professional help with a home birth. However, the Chamber had told her that under Croatian law, health professionals, including midwives, were unable to assist with such births. The Chamber cited in particular a statement by the Ministry of Health showing that there was no system for assisting home births in Croatia.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Ms Pojatina complains that Croatian law dissuades health professionals from assisting home births. She alleges in particular that, although the law allows home births, women such as herself cannot make this choice in practice because they are not able to get professional help. She also alleges that, because she chose to give birth at home, she was denied postnatal care and that it was difficult to register her child and obtain a birth certificate.

[Leotsakos v. Greece \(no. 30958/13\)](#)

The applicant, Petros Leotsakos, is a Greek national who was born in 1951 and lives in Athens. He has been practising as a lawyer in Greece since 1976.

The case concerns a search of Mr Leotsakos's professional premises and the seizure of several items and documents in the context of a criminal investigation on suspicion of his involvement in the perpetration of criminal offences.

In July 2010 the prosecutor's office at the Athens Court of Appeal ordered a search of Mr Leotsakos's professional premises in the context of an investigation into a criminal organisation whose members were suspected of involvement in such offences as money laundering and the bribery of judges. The search lasted twelve days and was conducted by a police officer accompanied by a deputy prosecutor. A neighbour, a non-legal expert, acted as a witness during the search. The authorities confiscated a computer and hundreds of documents, including client files relating to judicial proceedings and tax documents. Twelve confiscation reports were drawn up, to a total of 372 pages.

In May 2012 proceedings were commenced against several individuals, including Mr Leotsakos. The following month Mr Leotsakos applied to the Indictments Division of the Athens Court of Appeal seeking a finding that the search and seizure had been unlawful and that all the confiscated items and documents should be returned to him. He relied, *inter alia*, on the principle of protection of professional secrecy. His application was declared ill-founded, and the public prosecutor at the Court of Cassation refused to file a plea of nullity against that decision for the preservation of the law.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Mr Leotsakos complains of the conditions under which the search of his law firm in Kallithea was conducted.

[Aumatell i Arnau v. Spain \(no. 70219/17\)](#)

The applicant, Ms Montserrat Aumatell i Arnau, is a Spanish national who was born in 1975 and lives in Valls. The case concerns the applicant's involvement in organising a referendum, scheduled for 1 October 2017, on the independence of Catalonia.

On 6 September 2017 the Parliament of Catalonia enacted the Law “on the self-determination referendum” providing, in particular, for the appointment of the members of the Central Electoral Bureau of Catalonia responsible for organising the referendum. The Principal State Prosecutor, representing the Spanish Government, declared the law unconstitutional and requested its provisional suspension. By order of 7 September 2017, the Constitutional Court declared the law inapplicable and the organisation of the referendum unlawful. On 8 September 2016, ignoring the order issued by the Constitutional Court, the Central Electoral Bureau appointed the members of electoral boards. Ms Aumatell i Arnau was appointed as a member of the Tarragona electoral board. By order of 13 September 2017, the Constitutional Court reminded the members of the electoral boards that the Law “on the self-determination referendum” had been suspended.

On 20 September 2017, noting the failure to implement its orders, the Constitutional Court imposed a day-fine of a minimum 6,000 euros (EUR) on all members of the electoral boards. On 22 September 2017 Ms Aumatell i Arnau was informed of that decision via the Official Gazette. She resigned from her post on the same day. By decision of 14 November 2017, the Constitutional Court lifted the day-fines imposed on the members of the electoral boards in view of all the resignations.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), the applicant submits that notice of the day-fine was not served on her personally and that she could not be deemed a party to the proceedings. Relying on Article 7 (no punishment without law), she argues that her membership of the Tarragona electoral board did not amount to an offence. Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), she complains of the lack of a remedy against the Constitutional Court’s decision. Lastly, under Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), she alleges that she has been subjected to political persecution on the grounds of her involvement in the referendum.

[Chong and Others v. the United Kingdom \(no. 29753/16\)](#)

The case concerns the killing of 24 men in December 1948 by British soldiers in the village of Batang Kali in Selangor, which is now a state of Malaysia but at the time was part of the British Empire. The killings occurred shortly after the end of the Second World War during a communist insurgency which became known as the “Malayan Emergency”.

The applicants, Nyok Keyu Chong, Ah Yin Lim, Kok Lim, Ah Choi Loh Kon Fook Loh, and Kum Thai Wooi, are relatives of the men who were killed. They are Malaysian nationals who were born in 1961, 1937, 1939, 1941, and 1942 respectively. They live in Selangor, Johor Bahru, Kuala Lumpur, and Pahang (all in Malaysia).

The official account of the killings was that a patrol of the Scots Guards, sent to the village to ambush insurgents, had detained men they believed to be “bandits” and opened fire on them when they had tried to escape. The surviving villagers alleged on the other hand that the villagers, who were unarmed, had been rounded up, and the men had been separated from the women and children and murdered in cold blood.

The British authorities took some investigatory steps in 1948 and 1970 and the Royal Malaysian Police in 1993, but no full public inquiry has ever been carried out.

The 1970 investigation was prompted by a number of guardsmen making sworn statements to the media that the villagers had not tried to escape and that they had been ordered to massacre them. The guardsmen confirmed their statements when interviewed by the prosecuting authorities. The Attorney General decided however that the investigation should go no further because it was unlikely that sufficient evidence would be obtained to support a prosecution.

Similarly, the Royal Malaysian Police file was closed in 1997, apparently because there was insufficient evidence.

Following the refusal of two Ministers to hold an inquiry, the applicants brought judicial review proceedings in 2011. The domestic courts, ultimately the Supreme Court in 2015, rejected the

applicants' complaints as inadmissible, either because they were outside the scope of the European Convention (*ratione materiae*) or were out of time (*ratione temporis*).

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), the applicants' complain that there has been a failure to conduct an independent investigation into the deaths at Batang Kali in 1948.

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.

Petrosyan v. Armenia (no. 2126/12)

Kobaš v. Croatia (no. 27228/14)

Krstanović v. Croatia (no. 32132/12)

Nijemčević v. Croatia (no. 51519/12)

Vojnović v. Croatia (no. 5151/15)

Kuklík and Others v. the Czech Republic (nos. 15493/12, 34297/13, 25705/14, 39843/16, and 45417/16)

Dudashvili v. Georgia (no. 13533/10)

Katcheishvili v. Georgia (no. 55793/09)

Kharebava v. Georgia (no. 64831/12)

Tsivtsivadze v. Georgia (no. 43098/10)

Marouggas v. Greece (no. 44689/16)

Tufail Bhatti v. Greece (no. 22358/14)

Benkő and Others v. Hungary (nos. 41897/16, 48520/16, 66437/16, 44677/17, 45033/17, and 46966/17)

Briseno-Varga and Others v. Hungary (nos. 1258/13, 48514/13, 50999/13, 59371/13, 65705/13, 66713/13, and 74714/13)

Frankel Leó u. 84 Társasház and Others v. Hungary (nos. 78155/14, 1294/15, 4070/15, 5025/15, 43954/15, and 49217/15)

Gubó and Others v. Hungary (nos. 58097/14, 66580/14, 77535/14, 77536/14, 77675/14, and 77696/14)

Hegyí and Others v. Hungary (nos. 929/14, 1435/14, 9277/14, 9292/14, 17177/14, 18855/14, and 30694/14)

Kádár and Others v. Hungary (nos. 53034/13, 65044/13, 1424/14, 10717/14, 19306/14, 34506/14, 37575/14, 72306/14, 73346/14, and 73920/14)

Kalmár 88 Faiskolai Kft and Others v. Hungary (nos. 4247/15, 9439/15, 9844/15, 14936/15, 3976/16, 3983/16, 5177/16, 76340/17, and 76345/17)

Nagy and Others v. Hungary (nos. 64345/14, 77697/14, 4706/16, 14700/16, 30711/16, and 38665/16)

Pikó and Others v. Hungary (nos. 41728/15, 42036/15, 7535/16, 69185/16, 71537/16, 17153/17, 36514/17, 42654/17, 67408/17, and 67410/17)

Alonzi and Others v. Italy (no. 24322/16)

Annunziata and Others v. Italy (no. 32969/14)

Aprile v. Italy (no. 8579/15)

Colpani v. Italy (no. 26430/03)

Coppi and Others v. Italy (nos. 24542/13, 57788/13, 77826/13, 11567/14, and 17105/15)

Curcio and Others v. Italy (nos. 19041/09, 5890/11, 5987/11, 22406/11, 46323/11, 7483/13, 23791/13, 31753/13, and 31754/13)

Del Pezzo v. Italy (no. 45893/13)

Esposito and Others v. Italy (nos. 29190/13, 51467/13, 65013/13, 68893/13, 11965/14, and 17781/14)

Garofalo and Others v. Italy (nos. 42585/07, 42596/07, 21121/08, 43595/10, 11324/14, and 44599/14)
Rota v. Italy (no. 43484/14)
Therapic Center S.r.l. and Others v. Italy (nos. 39186/11, 39187/11, 39189/11, 39190/11, 39192/11, 39193/11, 39194/11, 39196/11, 39197/11, and 39198/11)
Tuscano and Others v. Italy (nos. 74586/11, 74632/11, 74711/11, 4713/12, and 8124/12)
Kuchta v. Poland (no. 36895/11)
Kulik and Others v. Poland (no. 65395/16)
Masiak v. Poland (no. 40768/17)
Szulc v. Poland (no. 58042/17)
Turowski v. Poland (no. 38601/12)
Agafiței and Others v. Romania (nos. 21226/16, 21696/16, 52066/16, 55403/16, and 58222/16)
Apolozan v. Romania (no. 32367/15)
Baias and Others v. Romania (nos. 36299/15, 36736/15, 41123/15, 60242/15, 1342/16, 4837/16, 8669/16, 9601/16, 11616/16, 15181/16, 15800/16, 16509/16, 19349/16, 24500/16, 27926/16, 33830/16, 38486/16, 44436/16, 44449/16, 44472/16, and 44518/16)
Bara and Others v. Romania (nos. 35732/15, 37341/15, 37539/15, 40060/15, 42754/15, 42788/15, 43101/15, 46328/15, 49731/15, 50562/15, 56211/15, 11073/16, 17443/16, 24147/16, 28378/16, 28975/16, 41492/16, and 43919/16)
Bărbuia and Others v. Romania (nos. 15281/15, 22657/15, 37494/15, 41499/15, and 44159/15)
Boldijan and Others v. Romania (nos. 72271/14, 37629/15, and 7807/16)
Budaca v. Romania (no. 31688/15)
Cârstea and Others v. Romania (nos. 69442/14, 35234/15, 47266/15, 55872/15, and 14931/16)
Ciofu v. Romania (no. 53096/13)
Constantinescu v. Romania (no. 68773/14)
Coțu and Others v. Romania (nos. 21427/16, 22926/16, 26126/16, 30701/16, and 31687/16)
Cozianu and Others v. Romania (nos. 72263/13, 61189/15, 24131/15, 34640/15, 40213/15, 6539/16, 10837/16, 13064/16, 15647/16, 20453/16, 20967/16, 21700/16, 22202/16, 31360/16, and 48538/16)
Dobre v. Romania (no. 55361/15)
Dumitrescu v. Romania (no. 29057/17)
Hristea and Others v. Romania (nos. 43937/15, 48700/15, 51972/15, 163/16, 786/16, 3563/16, 8110/16, 10174/16, 17628/16, 31346/16, 31361/16, and 48156/16)
Iftinchi and Others v. Romania (nos. 12005/15, 15458/15, 16708/15, 57687/15, 24484/16, 45792/16, 46017/16, 47061/16, and 47695/16)
Iordache and Others v. Romania (nos. 5735/15, 19791/15, 19793/15, 20720/15, 21070/15, 22393/15, 23221/15, 23980/15, 28225/15, 31246/15, 31263/15, 31292/15, 38876/15, 42268/15, 43016/15, 44908/15, 54082/15, and 55981/15)
Itineanț v. Romania (no. 12915/09)
Lăpădat v. Romania (no. 42934/15)
Lința and Others v. Romania (nos. 46756/15, 46829/15, 47103/15, 47154/15, 47328/15, 51916/15, 43/16, 5412/16, 12867/16, 14656/16, 16008/16, and 19929/16)
Loghin and Others v. Romania (nos. 19313/15, 19957/15, 20035/15, 20892/15, 22160/15, 23241/15, 23486/15, 24202/15, 25146/15, 25450/15, 25461/15, 26404/15, 26682/15, 26691/15, 26703/15, 29489/15, 32807/15, 7185/16, and 22306/16)
Manoliță and Others v. Romania (nos. 17419/15, 55080/15, 56341/15, 56999/15, 57699/15, 59809/15, 61735/15, 509/16, 7022/16, 12631/16, 20370/16, and 44048/16)
Mărgel v. Romania (no. 13736/16)
Moldovanu v. Romania (no. 54644/15)
Moldoveanu v. Romania (no. 28598/16)
Neacșu v. Romania (no. 35089/15)

Nema v. Romania (no. 59176/15)
Palada v. Romania (no. 21580/16)
Pîntaru v. Romania (no. 45745/15)
Sabou v. Romania (no. 7854/16)
Şerban v. Romania (no. 26426/16)
Simion v. Romania (no. 41500/15)
Ştefan v. Romania (no. 33254/15)
Ştefan v. Romania (no. 33255/15)
Văcăruş v. Romania (no. 66536/13)
Viezure and Others v. Romania (no. 62665/14 and 26 other applications)
Vincze Kecskes v. Romania (no. 16238/16)
Voicu v. Romania (no. 38427/16)
Alabina v. Russia (no. 21810/10)
Basmanov and Others v. Russia (no. 52595/09)
Cheplakov and Lunev v. Russia (nos. 41478/13 and 82669/17)
Deriglazova and Chernykh v. Russia (nos. 17800/06 and 13946/07)
Dzhanayeva and Others v. Russia (no. 42624/09)
Grigoryants v. Russia (no. 62856/10)
Ilyin and Kuligin v. Russia (nos. 5563/08 and 9312/09)
Kazarin and Others v. Russia (nos. 17250/17, 22819/17, 27392/17, 27561/17, 40647/17, 40847/17, 49931/17, 65688/17, 69073/17, and 70395/17)
Khanov v. Russia (no. 35317/17)
Khurtak and Kozyrev v. Russia (nos. 40667/17 and 65633/17)
Kochergin and Others v. Russia (nos. 62899/10, 62865/11, and 34346/17)
Kotumanova v. Russia (no. 57964/08)
Kozhukhov and Others v. Russia (nos. 11584/17, 23212/17, and 41921/17)
Kulminskiy and Others v. Russia (nos. 50992/16, 57403/16, 60790/16, 71850/16, 15940/17, 27716/17, 29273/17, 32657/17, 38123/17, 72059/17, and 72822/17)
Lir and Others v. Russia (nos. 49356/13, 68271/17, 74977/17, and 82169/17)
Lukmanov v. Russia (no. 13901/15)
Mikhaylov and Others v. Russia (nos. 28258/17, 51604/17, 52639/17, 68986/17, 70235/17, 71238/17, 71308/17, 71311/17, 73079/17, and 73661/17)
Okishev and Others v. Russia (nos. 25640/17, 25744/17, 34001/17, 65612/17, 69179/17, 69396/17, 73349/17, and 84133/17)
Pashkevich and Others v. Russia (nos. 785/12, 41478/15, 10223/17, 17269/17, 34666/17, 56225/17, 62934/17, 65296/17, 68830/17, 70127/17, 70194/17, and 70846/17)
Pokusin and Others v. Russia (nos. 21440/13, 8052/14, 34442/15, 18293/17, 33984/17, 42204/17, 44658/17, 52066/17, 81600/17, and 83401/17)
Polivayev and Others v. Russia (nos. 55886/07, 53003/08, 57969/11, and 19239/12)
Prostotin and Others v. Russia (nos. 43709/12, 31610/13, 41161/13, 20200/14, 63788/16, 43241/17, 53781/17, 56098/17, and 78245/17)
Protasov v. Russia (no. 68429/13)
Raspopov and Others v. Russia (nos. 47380/17, 59093/17, 61093/17, 74159/17, 79518/17, 81571/17, and 83380/17)
Savelyuk v. Russia (no. 47807/06)
Starikov v. Russia (no. 49580/17)
Stepanov and Others v. Russia (nos. 5849/11, 74867/14, and 78497/14)
Vnuchkov v. Russia (no. 48749/16)
Bistrović-Nastić v. Serbia (no. 47040/07)
Zoppi v. Switzerland (nos. 15625/09 and 56889/10)
Andonov v. ‘the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia’ (no. 75968/12)

Maliki v. ‘the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia’ (no. 54609/11)
Zekirov v. ‘the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia’ (no. 16460/17)
Abeş and Others v. Turkey (nos. 18468/15, 34557/17, and 34560/17)
Osma and Others v. Turkey (no. 73706/14 and 107 other applications)
Tokay v. Turkey (no. 1412/07)
Biletskyy v. Ukraine (no. 21004/11)
Bubskiy v. Ukraine (no. 64220/13)
Gorkovlyuk and Kaganovskiy v. Ukraine (no. 49785/06)
Kompaniyets and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 70622/12, 75098/17, 76577/17, and 2276/18)
Kruchko and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 52227/10, 28013/14, 80877/17, and 1143/18)
Shumskyy v. Ukraine (no. 37477/10)
F.O. v. United Kingdom (no. 56699/11)
Sumislawska and Zajic v. the United Kingdom (no. 14642/18)

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](https://twitter.com/ECHRpress).

Press contacts

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

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

Denis Lambert (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 09)

Inci Ertekin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 55 30)

Patrick Lannin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 44 18)

Somi Nikol (tel: + 33 3 90 21 64 25)

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.