Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing five judgments on Tuesday 2 May 2023 and 20 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 4 May 2023.

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

Tuesday 2 May 2023

Mestan v. Bulgaria (application no. 24108/15)

The applicant, Lyutvi Ahmed Mestan, is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1960 and lives in Sofia.

The case concerns an administrative fine (approximately 250 euros) imposed on the applicant, the leader of a political party and a candidate in the 2013 Bulgarian parliamentary elections, on the grounds that he had used Turkish during his election campaign. The Bulgarian authorities took the view that he had breached Article 133 of the Bulgarian Electoral Code.

In the proceedings before the Court, Mr Mestan relies on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

Just Satisfaction

Sakskoburggotski and Chrobok v. Bulgaria (nos. 38948/10 and 8954/17)

The applicants, Simeon Borisov Sakskoburggotski and Maria-Luisa Borisova Chrobok, are Bulgarian nationals who were born in 1937 and 1933 and live in Sofia and the United States of America respectively. They are siblings. In 1943 Mr Sakskoburggotski was crowned Simeon II, King of Bulgaria. Ms Chrobok was a royal princess. Mr Sakskoburggotski was prime minister of Bulgaria from 2001 until 2005.

The judgment will concern the just satisfaction to be awarded following the Court's judgment of 7 September 2021 in their favour. In it the Court found that the actions by the Bulgarian authorities restricting use of land claimed by the applicants had placed a disproportionate individual burden on the applicants. The Court had found violations of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention.

Just Satisfaction

Stoyanov and Tabakov v. Bulgaria (no. 2) (no. 64387/14)

The applicants in the main case, decided by the Court's judgment of 7 December 2021, were Valeri Stoyanov Stoyanov and Valentin Stoyanov Tabakov, Bulgarian nationals who were born in 1962 and 1960 respectively and live in Pazardzhik (Bulgaria).

The judgment in this case will concern the question of just satisfaction – specifically in respect of pecuniary damage sustained by My Stoyanov – on which the Court has not yet ruled. The judgment of 7 December 2021 concerned the non-enforcement, after the period considered in the Court's judgment of 2013 concerning the same issue and the same applicants, of two final domestic judgments in the applicants' favour by virtue of which the Pazardzhik Municipal Council was obliged to initiate a privatisation procedure for the sale of a property to the applicants at preferential



conditions. The applicants, through no fault of their own, and despite a myriad of additional legal actions in which they actively engaged, continued to endure the consequences of a situation in which the final judgments in their favour were not enforced for a number of further years after the Court's 2013 judgment.

The Court had found violations of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial/access to a court) of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention.

Strassenmeyer v. Germany (no. 57818/18)

The applicant, Marco Straßenmeyer, is a German national who was born in 1971 and is currently detained in Tonna Prison (Thuringia, Germany).

The case concerns Mr Straßenmeyer's trial and conviction for the murder of a German national in the Czech Republic in 1994. He was arrested in 2014 following a tip-off which led to other coaccused being questioned and incriminating the applicant. During the trial, his co-accused refused to testify.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), Mr Straßenmeyer complains that the criminal proceedings against him were unfair, that he was unable to examine the co-accused, and that none of the accused were informed of their right to court-appointed counsel before police questioning.

S.P. and Others v. Russia (no. 36463/11 and 10 other applications)

The applicants are 11 Russian nationals. They have all been convicted of crimes and have either served their custodial sentences or are currently serving their sentences in penal facilities in Russia.

The case concerns the treatment of the applicants while serving time in penal institutions in various parts of Russia. They were informally categorised as "outcasts" by other prisoners.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition on inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant complains of the suffering allegedly caused by their informal status as "outcasts" in the prisoner hierarchy, and of not having had an effective remedy for that complaint.

Thursday 4 May 2023

Alif Ahmadov and Others v. Azerbaijan (no. 22619/14)

The applicants, Alif Ahmadov, Nazbika Ahmadova, Ruslan Ahmadov, and Ibrahim Ahmadov, are Azerbaijani nationals who were born in 1956, 1958, 1978 and 1982 respectively and live in Baku, apart from Ms Ahmadova, who died in 2016.

The case concerns the planned eviction of the applicants from the house they have lived in for many years, and its demolition. The land was claimed by Azneft, a subsidiary of the State oil company. The domestic courts ruled in favour of Azneft and ordered the demolition at the applicants' expense.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain of their eviction from their home and demolition of their house.

A.C. and M.C. v. France (no. 4289/21)

The applicants, A.C. and M.C., a mother and her son, are Guinean nationals who were born in 1997 and 2020 respectively.

The case concerns the placement in administrative detention of the first applicant and her minor son, aged seven and a half months at the relevant time, for a period of nine days with a view to their

transfer to Spain under Regulation (EU) No 604/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 (the "Dublin III Regulation").

The applicants maintain that their placement in administrative detention was contrary to Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention. The minor applicant, M.C., contends that his placement in administrative detention was also in breach of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security). Relying on Article 5 § 4 (right to a speedy review of the lawfulness of detention), M.C. also alleges that he did not have an effective remedy by which to challenge the order for his administrative detention.

Dieudonné and Others v. France (no. 59832/19 and 6 other applications)

The applicants, Beatrice Dieudonné, Grégory Bazin, Luc Terrolle, Béatrice Dias, Marguerite Courlet, Yves Gimenez and Fabienne Tardy, are French nationals who were born in 1985, 1978, 1972, 1955, 1957, 1948 and 1981 respectively and live in Villeurbanne and Douvres (Mr Gimenez).

The case concerns the inability of the applicants, co-owners of an expropriated property, to appeal against the judgment determining the level of compensation for the expropriation.

Relying on Articles 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), and on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain that they did not have access to the courts for the determination of the compensation to which they were entitled following the expropriation of the property of which they were co-owners.

Stassart v. France (no. 79356/17)

The applicant, G. Stassart, is a Belgian national who was born in 1952 and lives in Braine L'Alleud (Belgium).

The case concerns the criminal proceedings for tax fraud brought against Mr Stassart for having allegedly, in his capacity as *de facto* manager of a British company, C., evaded payment of corporation tax owed by the company.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicant complains that the calling into question by the criminal court of the approach previously taken by the administrative court, concerning an issue of decisive importance for the outcome of the proceedings, breached the principle of legal certainty.

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 <u>HUDOC</u>.

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

Name	Main application number
Karas v. the Czech Republic	20647/21
Marcoski and Others v. the Czech Republic	72064/17
A.M. and Others v. France	7534/20
Bacar v. France	3925/20
N.T. and Others v. France	7027/20
Ruffin and Association Fakir v. France	29854/22
H.N. v. Hungary	26250/15

Thursday 4 May 2023

Name	Main application number
M.M. v. Hungary	26819/15
R.N. v. Hungary	71/18
M.T. v. Ireland	54387/20
Ansari (Abu Salem) v. Portugal	4262/17
Baharov v. Ukraine	28982/19
Bogdanov v. Ukraine	27380/20
Lyakh v. Ukraine	53099/19
Trofymenko v. Ukraine	18444/18
Vysotskyy and Baranska v. Ukraine	51098/13

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 <u>www.echr.coe.int</u>. To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: <u>www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en</u> or follow us on Twitter <u>@ECHR_CEDH</u>.

Press contacts

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

We would encourage journalists to send their enquiries via email.

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) Neil Connolly (tel.: + 33 3 90 21 48 05) Jane Swift (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 29 04)

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.