



## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing ten judgments on Tuesday 2 June 2020 and 93 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 4 June 2020.

*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](http://www.echr.coe.int))*

Tuesday 2 June 2020

### [Pranjić-M-Lukić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina \(application no. 4938/16\)](#)

The applicant, Goran Pranjić-M-Lukić, is a national of Bosnia and Herzegovina who was born in 1962 and lives in Karlsruhe (Germany).

The case concerns the applicant's complaint about being escorted by the police to involuntary psychiatric and psychological examinations during criminal proceedings against him.

In 2004 the applicant was indicted for damaging the façade of his neighbour's house and for spitting at a police officer and verbally abusing another after they had been called to the scene.

In 2011 the Municipal Court terminated the proceedings concerning the offence of damaging property as statute-barred and adjourned them in respect of the other offence of assaulting an official after a psychiatrist concluded that the applicant was incapable of standing trial because of mental health problems.

The criminal proceedings were resumed in December 2012, while non-contentious proceedings for the applicant's mandatory psychiatric treatment were still pending. The Municipal Court ordered that the applicant undergo psychiatric and psychological examinations, including his being forcibly escorted to those examinations on four occasions. In July 2013 the court decided to adjourn the proceedings and then in October 2016 to terminate them on the basis of medical reports which concluded that he had a permanent psychological illness.

Throughout the criminal proceedings, in a written objection to the Judicial Police Department and in an appeal to the Constitutional Court, the applicant unsuccessfully complained about his treatment by the judicial police when they escorted him for psychiatric examination, alleging that on one occasion he had been handcuffed in front of his ailing parents.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Pranjić-M-Lukić alleges that the court orders for him to be escorted to involuntary psychiatric and psychological examinations were unlawful because they had been issued when the decision terminating the non-contentious proceedings had not yet become final.

Further relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), he also complains about being handcuffed when he was being escorted by four judicial police officers to one of his involuntary psychiatric examinations.

### [Gospodăria țărănească Chiper Terenti Grigore v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 71130/13\)](#)

The applicant company, Gospodăria țărănească Chiper Terenti Grigore, is a company incorporated in the Republic of Moldova.

The case concerns the withdrawal of its licence to operate a limestone, gravel and sand quarry.

In March 2012 the Prosecutor General's office requested an expert report on the applicant company's activities, to find out in particular whether it had been extracting minerals outside the area allocated to it. The report, issued in June, found that this was not the case, but went on to conclude that the company had extracted 1,400 cubic metres of sand unlawfully.

The Prosecutor General's Office wrote to the Licensing Chamber to inform it of the report, adding that the unlawfully extracted sand had not been declared, and that the company had not filled in the official forms for taxation.

After issuing the applicant company with two warnings about breaches of the Mining Code, in September 2012 the Licensing Chamber revoked the company's licence and applied to the domestic courts to confirm the measure.

During the proceedings before the first-instance court, the applicant company argued that the warnings they had received were unclear, and that they had in fact declared to the competent authority the entire quantity of sand extracted and had submitted all the necessary official forms. On that basis, the district court dismissed the Licensing Chamber's request, pointing also to the fact that the only evidence it had produced was the June 2012 report, which had been carried out by experts who had not even visited the company's quarry and whose conclusions were confusing.

However, in 2013 the Chişinău Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court went against that ruling, ordering the revocation of the applicant company's licence on the grounds that it had failed to comply with the Licensing Chamber's warning letters.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, the applicant company complains that the withdrawal of its licence infringed its property rights and that the related proceedings were unfair.

### [Azerkane v. the Netherlands \(no. 3138/16\)](#)

The applicant, Khalid Azerkane, is a Moroccan national who was born in 1993 and lives in Rotterdam (the Netherlands). He has lived all his life in the Netherlands, where he also attended school. His parents and siblings either hold Dutch nationality or have a right of residence.

The case concerns his complaint about decisions revoking his residence permit in the Netherlands and imposing an entry ban on him.

In October 2013 the Deputy Minister of Security and Justice revoked the applicant's residence permit, imposed a ten-year entry ban, and informed him that he was required to leave the country immediately, finding him to be a threat to public order and security on account of a series of convictions.

The convictions included assault, theft and domestic violence while the applicant was still a minor and armed robbery after he had turned 18 for which he was still serving a three year sentence. In the decision, and another rejecting the applicant's objection, the Deputy Minister accepted that he enjoyed a degree of family life with his parents in the Netherlands, but considered that he also had ties to Morocco, where his parents had originally come from, that he had visited the country, had family living there and would not be incapable of managing by himself, despite claims that he had a minor intellectual disability.

The applicant challenged the Minister's decisions in the domestic courts, without success. The final ruling was handed down in July 2015.

He was subsequently convicted of further offences, notably involving the unlawful possession of firearms, in May 2016, then in March and July 2018.

Between 2014 and 2018 the Dutch authorities unsuccessfully attempted to obtain a travel document for the applicant from the Moroccan consulate in Rotterdam, but, according to the most recent information available, no such document has been issued.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Mr Azerkane complains about the decisions to revoke his residence permit and to impose an entry ban on him, submitting that he is reliant on his parents, who live in the Netherlands, and that his ties with Morocco are almost non-existent.

### [S.A. v. the Netherlands \(no. 49773/15\)](#)

The applicant, Mr S.A., states that he is a Sudanese national who was born in 1993. He is currently residing in Utrecht.

The case concerns the applicant's complaint about his possible removal to Sudan.

The applicant entered the Netherlands in May 2010, with the authorities rejecting two successive applications for asylum in 2011 and 2014. During interviews he alleged that if returned to Sudan he would be at risk of being perceived as an opponent to the regime as he belonged to the Tunjur, a non-Arab ethnic group associated with Darfuri rebel groups. The authorities did not believe that he was exclusively a Sudanese national as he had entered the country on a genuine Chadian passport.

When the applicant was informed on 9 October 2015 that his removal was scheduled the next day, he lodged an objection with the Deputy Minister for Security and Justice. As this step does not have automatic suspensive effect, he requested a provisional measure from the Regional Court. That request was rejected, with the judge considering that it was not necessary to assess whether the applicant would run a risk of inhuman or degrading treatment in Sudan, as his identity and nationality had not been demonstrated.

His removal was stayed the same day and until further notice on the basis of an interim measure granted by the European Court of Human Rights under Rule 39 of its Rules of Court pending an examination by it of the applicant's case.

The applicant filed a third asylum application. He was interviewed again and submitted comments on the Deputy Minister's intention to refuse his asylum claim. The Deputy Minister's assessment of the case was subsequently examined by the Regional Court of The Hague in appeal proceedings, which included an oral hearing, and by the Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State which gave a final decision on the case in September 2018. The third asylum claim was rejected, the courts essentially confirming their earlier findings that the applicant's statements lacked credibility, in particular those regarding his country of origin.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant complains that if removed to Sudan he would be at risk of forced recruitment, persecution because he belongs to a non-Arab ethnic group from Darfur, and more generally, on account of the humanitarian situation in Sudan as a result of the conflict in Darfur.

### [A and B v. Romania \(nos. 48442/16 and 48831/16\)](#)

The applicants, Ms A and Mr B, are Romanian nationals who were born in 1981 and 1978 respectively and live as a couple in R.

The case concerns their complaint about the effectiveness and operation of the protection provided for them as witnesses in a corruption case.

In August 2015 the anti-corruption prosecutor's office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice ("the HCCJ") declared the applicants "threatened witnesses": they had worked for C, who, along with another senior official, D, was being investigated for alleged acts of corruption. The applicants were believed to have witnessed suspect transactions between C and D.

Immediate protection was provided by the Directorate General of Police (“the DGP”) in B., via the Special Actions Service and their local police station. The Special Actions Service team started immediately and from February 2016 a second team was assigned to protect the applicants. The National Office for Witness Protection (“the NOWP”) met the applicants and explained the conditions and requirements of the programme, which they agreed in December 2015 to join.

They subsequently had discussions over the protection protocols to be used by the DGP, which described the police officers’ duties and the applicants’ obligations, which the applicants refused to sign. In June 2016 the prosecutor’s office asked the HCCJ to lift the protection measures and exclude them from witness protection as they were no longer in any danger, but the HCCJ dismissed that request in August 2016.

The applicants were ultimately formally included in the witness protection programme run by the NOWP in January 2017, with protection provided by the police. They signed the protection protocols the same month, in which they also asked the NOWP to change their identities, move them abroad and to give them financial assistance. In March 2017 the HCCJ dismissed the applicants’ requests.

According to the applicants, the police measures for their protection were ineffective. For example, the police officers admitted that they had not had any instructions for their mission, which they had said was the first of its kind. B also had disputes with the police officers as he was not happy with the way they organised the protection. He was fined several times over these disputes.

During the protection period the applicants also faced threats, for instance, two bullets were left on their doorstep and their car tyres were slashed. The applicants lodged complaints about the protection, which were mostly dismissed. The applicants left Romania in 2017.

Relying on various Articles of the Convention, the applicants complain about the organisation of the witness protection programme, arguing that it was inefficient. The Court will deal with their complaint under Article 2 (right to life).

### [Potoroc v. Romania \(no. 37772/17\)](#)

The applicant, Ioan Potoroc, is a Romanian national who was born in 1953 and lives in Bucharest. He suffers from various medical disorders, including in particular brain damage following several strokes, and has to use a wheelchair.

The case concerns the applicant’s conditions of detention despite being seriously ill.

Mr Potoroc was convicted in a final judgment in 2009 for his involvement in international drug trafficking and sentenced to 15 years’ imprisonment. He was placed off and on in prison hospitals during his detention until his release in 2017 after a European Court judgment found that the criminal proceedings against him had been unfair (*Potoroc v. Romania*, no. 59452/09, of February 2017) and he applied for a review of the decision sentencing him to imprisonment.

There had in the meantime been several sets of proceedings concerning the interruption of the execution of his sentence on health grounds. Following a first set of proceedings, a court ordered his release in 2012 on account of his “dreadful” state of health.

However, he was returned to prison in 2015 when the authorities applied for a reassessment of his health in a second set of proceedings and it was found that adequate medical care was available in prison. In 2016, in a third set of proceedings, a court dismissed the applicant’s further request for release, while in a fourth set of proceedings, his request to be transferred to a hospital was granted. The courts relied in the decisions on several medical reports finding that the prison healthcare system was able to cater for the applicant’s needs, but that he needed constant help, which should be provided by a personal assistant.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Potoroc alleges that his continued detention amounted to exceptional hardship owing to his advanced age, significant health

problems, and the inadequacies of the medical treatment he received in prison. He complains in particular that he was never provided with a personal assistant and that help from fellow inmates was inadequate.

### [N.T. v. Russia \(no. 14727/11\)](#)

The applicant, Mr N.T., is a Russian national who is currently serving a life sentence in special-regime correctional colony no. 6 (“IK-6”) in the village of Elban in the Khabarovsk Region.

The case concerns the applicant’s complaint about routine handcuffing and various aspects of his strict imprisonment regime, which had been applied to him for several years on the sole grounds of his life sentence.

Mr N.T. started serving his sentence in special-regime correctional colony no. 56, located in the Lozvinskiy settlement in the Sverdlovsk Region (“IK-56”), in December 2010. He was automatically placed under the strict imprisonment regime, which applies to all life prisoners in Russia for at least the first ten years of their sentence.

He was detained there for over seven years before being transferred to IK-6, where the strict imprisonment regime continued for several more months until the statutory period expired. During this time he was held in solitary confinement or a double cell with another prisoner.

From the first day of his detention in IK-56 until the end of 2015, he was handcuffed each time he left his cell, and even when he had to empty his heavy 30-litre lavatory bucket into a cesspool outside the building, there being no sewerage system in the facility.

When transferred to IK-6 in March 2018 he was put on the list of dangerous prisoners (“prisoners inclined to escape, attack, take hostages, commit suicide or self-injure”), and prison guards started to handcuff him again on a regular basis.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr N.T. complains about the strict imprisonment regime applied to him as a life prisoner, including routine handcuffing.

### [Tolmachev v. Russia \(no. 42182/11\)](#)

The applicant, Aleksandr Tolmachev, is a Russian national who was born in 1955 and lived in Rostov-on-Don at the relevant time.

The case concerns two sets of defamation proceedings brought against the applicant, a journalist, following the publication of articles he had written in a local newspaper criticising two district judges in Rostov-on-Don.

The first set of proceedings focused on an article published in May 2010 reporting on allegations that a judge had cut off her neighbours’ access to the communal space in a block of flats by installing a partition.

The second set of proceedings dealt with three articles published in 2008 and 2010 about a judge’s resignation following allegations that she had been caught taking bribes. The proceedings were brought by the judge’s son because the judge had in the meantime died.

The courts subsequently found that the applicant’s articles had tarnished the judges’ reputation, ruling that he had not proved the truthfulness of certain of his statements. The rulings stressed the heightened vulnerability of the claimants as judges and a judge’s son.

The courts held the applicant liable to pay the claimants a total of 215,000 Russian roubles (RUB – approximately EUR 5,250) in compensation for non-pecuniary damage in the first set of proceedings and a total of RUB 1,000,000 (approximately EUR 25,000) in the second set of proceedings.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), Mr Tolmachev complains about the defamation rulings against him, emphasising that his articles should have been considered in the wider context

of his efforts to expose judicial corruption. He also alleges that the awards to the claimants were disproportionately high.

Thursday 4 June 2020

### [Avendi OOD v. Bulgaria \(no. 48786/09\)](#)

The applicant company, Avendi OOD, is a Bulgarian limited liability company based in Sofia which trades in alcoholic beverages.

The case concerns the applicant company's complaint that the authorities failed to comply with a final domestic court decision ordering the return of its merchandise, which had been seized as evidence in criminal proceedings.

In January 2005 the Varna regional police carried out a search-and-seizure operation at a warehouse where merchandise belonging to the applicant company was stored. The police seized 26,748 bottles of Baileys cream liqueur belonging to the applicant company as evidence in ongoing criminal proceedings against a certain M.M. and S.S. who were suspected of storing merchandise subject to excise duty without the mandatory stamps. M.M. and S.S. were subsequently acquitted and the Varna District Court ordered the return of the seized bottles to the applicant company. The court's decision became final in December 2005.

However, the investigative and tax authorities continued to retain the bottles pending parallel proceedings against the applicant company for storing merchandise without the mandatory excise duty stamps and against an importing company and its representative for selling the beverages to the applicant company without the mandatory excise duty stamps.

The bottles were eventually returned to the applicant company in March 2007, by which time the shelf life of the bottles of liqueur had expired.

The applicant company filed a claim for damages against the State, requesting that the tax authorities' decisions refusing to return the bottles be declared null and void and that it be awarded compensation for damage and lost profits, but the claim was unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant company complains that it was deprived of its property and suffered pecuniary losses because of the failure to enforce a final domestic court decision in its favour, after a series of unlawful actions by the tax and prosecuting authorities.

### ['Association Innocence en Danger' and 'Association Enfance et Partage' v. France \(nos. 15343/15 and 16806/15\)](#)

The applicants are two French child protection associations, whose registered offices are in Paris.

The case concerns the death in 2009 of an eight-year-old girl (M.) as a result of abuse by her parents. The two associations allege that the French authorities failed to protect M. from abuse by her parents.

After being born in 2001 to a mother who initially wished to remain anonymous and abandoned her child, M. was collected by her mother one month later. She then lived with both her parents and her siblings. She went to school for the first time in April 2007 at the age of six. She was absent for many days from the various schools in which she was enrolled, changing schools several times whenever her family moved house. From the first school year 2007-2008 onwards, M.'s teachers recorded various injuries that were regularly observed on the child's body.

In June 2008 a headteacher sent a "child protection report" to the public prosecutor of Le Mans and the president of the *Conseil général* (the competent local authority). She was concerned that

following a move M. had not turned up at her new school, unlike her brothers and sister. She was worried about this absence since the headteacher of the previous school had informed her of a suspicion of ill-treatment and she had received a school file referring to physical marks noticed on M.'s body by teachers of that school.

On the same day the public prosecutor's office asked the gendarmerie to investigate. In July 2008, the social services informed the public prosecutor's office of recent bruising. A forensic doctor was commissioned. M. was examined a few days later in the presence of her father. The doctor noted numerous non-recent lesions and indicated that he could not rule out violence or ill-treatment. The following week, M. was questioned on the premises of the juvenile delinquency prevention brigade; the interview was filmed.

In September 2008 the senior police officer in charge drew up a report in which he concluded that, according to the investigation, there was no evidence to presume that M. had been a victim of abuse. The following month the public prosecutor's office closed the case, considering that the alleged offence was insufficiently made out.

At the end of April 2009 the current headteacher and the school doctor ordered the father to take M. to the paediatric emergency unit, where she remained hospitalised for one month. At the same time, the headteacher reported his concerns to the president of the *Conseil général*, stating that M. had been absent for 33 days since the beginning of the school year and that she often came to school with minor injuries for which there was no obvious explanation.

In June 2009 two social workers visited the child's home on different dates. They concluded that there was no cause for particular concern.

In September 2009 M.'s father reported to the police that his daughter had disappeared from the carpark of a fast-food restaurant. A major search party was deployed to find the child. The following day, the father eventually led the investigators to the location where the child's body was found, the death probably dating back to the night of 6 to 7 August 2009.

In June 2012 the parents were sentenced to 30 years' imprisonment by the Sarthe Assize Court for torture and barbaric acts resulting in death, committed against a minor by a parent. The two applicant associations were joined to the criminal proceedings as civil parties and the parents were ordered to pay them a token euro in damages.

In October 2012 the two associations brought proceedings against the State to establish its civil liability for the malfunctioning of the justice system, arguing in particular that between June and October 2008 the investigation and prosecution services had committed gross negligence, consisting of a series of negligent failings. Their claims were all dismissed.

Relying in particular on Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment), the applicant associations complain that the French authorities failed to protect M. from the abuse by her parents which led to her death.

Under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the association *Innocence en Danger* complains about the need to establish the existence of gross negligence in order to engage the State's liability for the malfunctioning of the justice system.

### [S.L. and A.L. v. Italy \(no. 896/16\)](#)

The applicant is an Italian national who was born in 1972 and lives in Italy. He lodged the present application in his own name and on behalf of his son, an Italian national, who was born in 2006 and lives in Romania with his mother.

The case concerns child custody proceedings between parents of different nationalities (one Italian and one Romanian). The applicant complains about the length of the proceedings before the Italian courts.

In 2005 the applicant married a Romanian national and had a child with her. The couple lived in Italy. Then in 2006 the applicant's wife and son moved to Bucharest, with the applicant's consent, intending to return to Italy for the Christmas holidays. When the time came the wife decided to stay in Romania with her son.

In 2007 the applicant filed a request for legal separation before the District Court in Teramo (Italy) and sought custody of his son. The applicant's wife applied to join the proceedings. In January 2012 the court ordered the separation and in July 2013 it awarded the applicant sole custody, ordering the child's prompt return to Italy.

Subsequently the applicant applied for recognition and enforcement of this judgment by the Romanian courts. However, the Court of Appeal of L'Aquila (Italy), hearing the case on an application from the applicant's wife, suspended the enforcement proceedings on noting that in the meantime she had obtained a divorce and sole custody of the child in Romania, under a final decision of the Bucharest Court in December 2012. The applicant's application for sole custody was thus declared inadmissible by the Italian Court of Appeal and his appeal on points of law was dismissed in 2019.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant alleges that the District Court of Teramo (Italy) took six years to give a ruling in his case and thus complains about the inaction of that court.

### [Boshkoski v. North Macedonia \(no. 71034/13\)](#)

The applicant, Ljube Boshkoski, is a Macedonian/citizen of the Republic of North Macedonia and a Croatian national who was born in 1960 and lives in Skopje. He was a former member of Parliament and Minister of Internal Affairs.

The case concerns criminal proceedings against Mr Boshkoski on charges of abuse of office and unlawful financing of an electoral campaign in 2011 when he was chairing United for Macedonia, a political party.

He was arrested on 6 June 2011, the day after the parliamentary elections, on suspicion of having received a total of 130,000 euros (EUR) from a friend to finance his political party. He was remanded in custody for the rest of the proceedings against him.

The investigating judge decided to grant the applicant's friend protected witness status as he had expressed fears for his and his family's safety and on account of the nature and gravity of the alleged crimes. Special arrangements were made for the witness to be heard via a streaming device which distorted his face and voice.

The special arrangements were continued at trial as the first-instance court found that the witness was still at risk. The trial court also excluded the public from three of the hearings, namely when the protected witness was to be heard and when audio/video recordings from secret surveillance of meetings between the applicant and the witness were to be examined.

The trial court convicted the applicant as charged and sentenced him to seven years' imprisonment in 2011. The judgment was based on the statement of the protected witness, as well as several expert opinions (including one which had found the applicant's fingerprints on the confiscated money), photographs of the confiscated money and the audio and video recordings.

During the trial and on appeal, the applicant protested about the protected status of the witness, submitting that it was pointless as they were friends and that he had never threatened him, and about the exclusion of the public from the hearings.

The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal in part and reduced his sentence to five years, but upheld the remainder of the judgment.

Ultimately, in 2013 the Supreme Court upheld the lower courts' judgments, finding that all of the evidence against the applicant had been lawfully obtained. In particular, the protected witness had been examined in accordance with the law, and the use of a streaming device to examine him was an established practice in other States.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses), Mr Boshkoski complains of the overall unfairness of the proceedings against him. In particular, he argues that the special arrangements for the protected witness breached his defence rights and that the exclusion of the public from three trial-court sessions was in violation of his right to a public hearing.

### [Kaman v. Turkey \(no. 29798/18\)](#)

The applicant, Ms Halime Kaman, is a Turkish national who was born in 1984 and lives in Istanbul. The case concerns the applicant's custody on remand from 29 December 2017 until 25 October 2019, in the aftermath of the attempted coup d'état in July 2016.

An attempted coup took place during the night of 15-16 July 2016, led by a group belonging to the Turkish Armed Forces and accused of being linked to the illegal organisation FETÖ/PDY (Gülenist terrorist organisation/parallel State structure). During the night, more than 240 people, mostly civilians, lost their lives opposing the insurgents and several thousand others were injured.

Accused of having links with the FETÖ/PDY organisation, Ms Kaman was arrested on 29 December 2017 and remanded in custody. As regards the reasons for her detention, the Istanbul Criminal Court referred to a computer application used by members of the organisation for encrypted exchanges before the attempted *coup d'état*. The application used by Ms Kaman and her correspondence were analysed. The court indicated that there was a strong suspicion that Ms Kaman had committed the offence of aiding and abetting the organisation in question.

Ms Kaman has two children, who at the time of the events were one month and four years old. They were placed with her in the women's remand centre at Bakırköy, which had facilities for children.

In a decision of 4 May 2018 the Istanbul Assize Court hearing the case extended her detention on remand, invoking the risk of destruction of evidence in the event of her release.

Ms Kaman made several requests for release, all of which were rejected.

On 12 June 2018 she submitted an individual application to the Constitutional Court with a request for an interim measure. On 27 June 2018, on the basis of the information provided by the Ministry of Justice and the prison, that court rejected the request for an interim measure, considering that there was no threat to the life or well-being of the applicant or her baby. The case remains pending before the Constitutional Court and the criminal case against her is still before the Istanbul Assize Court.

On 25 October 2019 Ms Kaman was released from custody.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), the applicant argues that the sanitary conditions in the prison were ill-adapted to her sick child and endangered the child's life. Under Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 (right to liberty and security), 6 (right to a fair hearing), 8 (right to respect for private life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), she complains that she was subjected to humiliating detention and that insufficient reasons were given in support of the measure; that the judicial authorities lacked independence and impartiality; that the principle of the presumption of innocence was breached; that she was deprived of legal assistance while in police custody; and that there were no remedies by which to have any of these complaints examined.

[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](#).

## Press Release

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

### Tuesday 2 June 2020

Name	Main application number
Firstov v. Russia	67312/12
Solodnikov v. Russia	61582/10

### Thursday 4 June 2020

Name	Main application number
Ringler v. Austria	2309/10
Mammadov and Others v. Azerbaijan	72489/11
Mammadov and Others v. Azerbaijan	52158/13
De Leersnyder v. Belgium	18602/15
Detry and Others v. Belgium	26565/16
Npone v. Belgium	12504/19
SUEZ Facilities Belgium NV v. Belgium	77005/12
Chobanov and Koyrushki v. Bulgaria	53942/16
Ivanov and Others v. Bulgaria	2727/19
Yordanov and Dzhelebov v. Bulgaria	31820/18
Bevc v. Croatia	36077/14
Butijer v. Croatia	21126/13
Uzelac and Đekić v. Croatia	6161/13
Dieng v. France	1560/18
O.R. v. France	25545/18
Balanou v. Greece	27760/13
Kousios v. Greece	75462/14
Michalakis v. Greece	8744/14
Berzsényi v. Hungary	53626/19
Bónis v. Hungary	49299/19
Csurgai and Others v. Hungary	27042/15
Hortobágyi Lúdtenyésztő Zrt v. Hungary	22137/16
Molnár and Others v. Hungary	14128/19
Mujahid v. Hungary	52284/17
Németh and Others v. Hungary	57457/19
Citraro and Molino v. Italy	50988/13
Morelli v. Italy	24813/03
Ipate v. the Republic of Moldova	5131/10
Yesipov v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia	56218/07
A.B. and Others v. Poland	15845/15
Garski v. Poland	17864/18
Jezior v. Poland	31955/11
Łabudek v. Poland	37245/13
Costache and Others v. Portugal	51671/17

## Press Release

Name	Main application number
Albu v. Romania	12420/17
Duță v. Romania	8783/15
Gabur and Others v. Romania	34717/16
Gosav and Others v. Romania	52526/17
Nemțeanu v. Romania	52623/15
Nițulescu and Others v. Romania	59286/15
Sărdaru v. Romania	32381/16
Andreyev v. Russia	77722/13
Barsukov v. Russia	14204/06
Degtyarev and Others v. Russia	37147/17
Dikin and Others v. Russia	52295/07
Durnyak and Others v. Russia	76876/17
Glazkov and Others v. Russia	1483/18
Ivanov and Others v. Russia	44363/14
Kirillov and Others v. Russia	77369/17
Kudryavtsev v. Russia	48013/16
Mamontov and Others v. Russia	28567/18
Oshchepkova and Others v. Russia	49125/15
Radnev v. Russia	21017/18
Samarin and Others v. Russia	14486/18
Saprykin and Others v. Russia	43753/13
Semilutskiy and Others v. Russia	53079/16
Senchenko and Others v. Russia	58917/15
Shelukha and Others v. Russia	4103/18
Steklyanov v. Russia	51145/09
Utyuzhnikov and Others v. Russia	8584/17
Vlasova and Others v. Russia	60908/12
Zaytsev and Others v. Russia	54797/18
Dika and Lena v. Serbia	26705/13
Akın v. Turkey	29386/09
Altunay v. Turkey	76358/14
Bardak v. Turkey	2443/15
Bardak v. Turkey	36837/15
Çakar and Others v. Turkey	43186/17
Can v. Turkey	38578/11
Çardak v. Turkey	4378/12
Ek-İl İnşaat Taahhüt Ticaret Ve Sanayi Anonim Şirketi and Ekşi v. Turkey	38927/06
Ertekin v. Turkey	19771/09
Güder v. Turkey	24695/09
Karakuş v. Turkey	58429/12
Şenoğul and Others v. Turkey	66728/10
Şeylan and Others v. Turkey	4201/09
Teker and Others v. Turkey	77527/14
Türkoğlu v. Turkey	9541/13
Uzundağ and Others v. Turkey	59796/10

## Press Release

---

Name	Main application number
Yalazan and Others v. Turkey	42710/13
Alekseyev v. Ukraine	15517/19
Garagulya and Sych v. Ukraine	42361/12
Goncharuk and Others v. Ukraine	25837/18
Maslennikov v. Ukraine	41893/14
Povoroznyy v. Ukraine	5276/13
Yuldashev and Others v. Russia and Ukraine	35139/14
Zharchenko v. Ukraine	45467/19
Brooks v. the United Kingdom	9577/18

---

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](http://www.echr.coe.int). To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: [www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en](http://www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en) or follow us on Twitter [@ECHR\\_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

### Press contacts

Journalists can contact the Press Unit via [echrpress@echr.coe.int](mailto:echrpress@echr.coe.int)

**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.