



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing six judgments on Tuesday 2 March 2021 and ten judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 4 March 2021.

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 March 2021

[Delić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina \(application no. 59181/18\)](#)

The applicant, Sanel Delić, is a citizen of Bosnia and Herzegovina who was born in 1975 and lives in Banovići (Bosnia and Herzegovina).

The case concerns the length of his civil proceedings regarding an alleged forgery that he had been a victim of. The proceedings lasted from 2012 to 2020.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains that the civil proceedings were not conducted within a “reasonable time”, and of a lack of an effective remedy in that regard.

[R.R. and Others v. Hungary \(no. 36037/17\)](#)

The applicants, R.R., S.H., M.H., R.H. and A.R., are an Iranian and four Afghan nationals respectively. They are a family of five. In 2017 they arrived in Hungary and applied for asylum there.

The case concerns their confinement in the Röszke transit zone on the border with Serbia in April-August 2017.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 13 (right to an effective remedy), 5 (right to liberty and security), and 34 (right of individual petition) of the European Convention, the applicants complain, in particular, of the fact of and the conditions of their detention in the transit zone, of the lack of a legal remedy to complain of the conditions of detention, the lack of judicial review of their detention, and of the authorities' failure to comply with an interim measure concerning them.

[Kolesnikova v. Russia \(no. 45202/14\)](#)

The applicant, Olga Kondratyevna Kolesnikova, is a Russian national who was born in 1958 and lives in Archangel (Russia).

The case concerns an alleged breach of the applicant's right to be presumed innocent on account of the reasoning of a decision given by the investigating authorities, and the alleged lack of impartiality of the court in which the applicant contested that decision.

In a decision of 5 May 2012 the investigating authorities decided not to open a criminal investigation against the applicant on the grounds that prosecution of the offence was time-barred. On 27 December 2012 the Naryan-Mar Town Court dismissed an appeal by the applicant against the decision. On 18 April 2013 the court of the Nenetskiy Autonomous District of the Archangel Region upheld that decision on appeal.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant complains that the District Court lacked independence and impartiality.

[Pavel Shishkov v. Russia \(no. 78754/13\)](#)

The applicant, Pavel Grigoryevich Shishkov, is a Russian national who was born in 1989 and lives in Moscow.

The case concerns the authorities' refusal to return the applicant's daughter to his care. Her mother had been deprived of parental authority and she had been placed in a foster family without the applicant's knowledge or consent.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains of the refusal to return his daughter to his care.

[Voronkov v. Russia \(no. 2\) \(no. 10698/18\)](#)

The applicant, Valeriy Yakovlevich Voronkov, is a Russian national who was born in 1939 and lives in Samara (Russia). The case concerns two courts which in turn declined jurisdiction to hear the applicant's case.

In March 2016 Mr Voronkov brought proceedings against his employer claiming payment of outstanding salary and seeking confirmation of the existence of the employment relationship. On 4 April 2016 the Promyshlenny District Court of Samara found that it did not have territorial jurisdiction, taking the view that the proceedings should be brought in the Oktyabrskiy District Court of Samara, which had jurisdiction for the area in which the defendant company was based. On 3 October 2016 the judge of that court likewise declined territorial jurisdiction, observing that the company was not based in the Oktyabrskiy district and indicating an address in the Promyshlenny district.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), the applicant alleges a breach of his right of access to a court on account of the fact that each of the two courts in turn declined territorial jurisdiction to hear his case.

Thursday 4 March 2021

[Sigurjón Þorvaldur Árnason v. Iceland \(nos. 42655/16 and 27495/18\)](#)

[Ívar Guðjónsson v. Iceland \(no. 46015/16\)](#)

[Sigurbór Charles Guðmundsson v. Iceland \(no. 60672/16\)](#)

[Margrét Guðjónsdóttir v. Iceland \(no. 60704/16\)](#)

[Karl Emil Wernersson v. Iceland \(no. 61464/16\)](#)

The applicants in these five separate cases, Sigurjón Þorvaldur Árnason, Ívar Guðjónsson, Sigurbór Charles Guðmundsson, Margrét Guðjónsdóttir and Karl Emil Wernersson, are Icelandic nationals who were born in 1966, 1968, 1958, 1958 and 1962 respectively. They live in Reykjavík (Mr Árnason, Mr Guðmundsson and Ms Guðjónsdóttir) and Garðabær (Iceland) (the other two applicants).

The cases concern the applicants' criminal convictions in cases related to the 2008 financial crisis and its aftermath in Iceland.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), the applicants complain of the manner in which the Supreme Court of Iceland overturned or partially overturned their acquittals, or, in Mr Árnason's and Mr Guðjónsson's cases, various aspects of the criminal proceedings against them.

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.

Tuesday 2 March 2021

Name	Main application number
OOO Gastronom v. Russia	47386/17

Thursday 4 March 2021

Name	Main application number
Bereza v. Ukraine	67800/12
Borisov v. Ukraine	2371/11
Komtekhn-Plus, PF NVP v. Ukraine	15361/10
Plotnik v. Ukraine	11614/20
Ruban v. Ukraine	39973/09

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.