



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing four judgments on Tuesday 2 June 2026 and 13 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 4 June 2026.

*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 June 2026

[OÜ Parem Kallas v. Estonia \(application no. 18440/23\)](#)

The applicant, OÜ Parem, is a private limited company based in Pärnu (Estonia).

In 2002 the applicant company became the owner of a parcel of land on the right bank of Pärnu River, part of which had been earmarked for the future extension of a public road. The applicant company and the municipal authorities eventually agreed in 2022 on the sale of the parcel for 30,000 euros. The case concerns the proceedings for the municipality to acquire the land and the proceedings brought by the applicant company claiming compensation.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant company complains about the delay in establishing the price for the land and the fact that this delay was not taken into account when deciding on the sum the applicant company would receive for the parcel, which was calculated on a 2001 basis.

[Serbian-Chinese Friendship Society FDH v. Serbia \(no. 54936/20\)](#)

The applicant, Serbian-Chinese Friendship Society FDH, is an organisation based in Belgrade.

The case concerns the applicant society's attempt to hold public protests in Belgrade against the alleged persecution of Falun Gong in the People's Republic of China. Falun Gong describes itself as a spiritual practice rooted in the Buddhist tradition. The protests were ultimately banned by the Serbian authorities on the grounds of public safety. In particular, they considered that the gatherings were timed to coincide with the official visit of the Chinese President on 17 and 18 June 2016, which could have led to counter-demonstrations and clashes.

Relying on Article 11 (freedom of association) of the European Convention, the applicant society argues in particular that the official assessment of a threat to public safety was merely speculative and, even if there was a risk of counter demonstrations, this was not a reason to ban a peaceful protest. Also relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant society complains that the judicial review proceedings in the administrative courts and constitutional appeal proceedings were not effective remedies for its complaints.

Thursday 4 June 2026

[Albertani v. Italy \(no. 15994/20\)](#)

The applicant is an Italian national who was born in 1983 and suffers from psychiatric disorders. The case concerns her detention in prison following a reform which led to the closure of forensic psychiatric hospitals.

In 2011 the applicant was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment for several offences, including the murder of her sister and the attempted murder of her mother. After psychiatric assessments found that she was dangerous and partly incapable of understanding and controlling her actions, the courts ordered her placement in a forensic psychiatric hospital for an initial three-year period as a security measure. At the end of the three years, the courts decided that her state of health required her to remain in a forensic psychiatric hospital, on the basis of Article 148 of the Criminal Code. In the meantime, a reform was passed providing for the closure of forensic psychiatric hospitals and their replacement by residential centres for the enforcement of security measures (*residenze per l'esecuzione delle misure di sicurezza*) by 31 March 2015 at the latest. As those centres were not intended for prisoners detained under Article 148 of the Criminal Code, the applicant was transferred to prison.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention, the applicant complains about her detention in prison, where she allegedly does not receive appropriate treatment for her disorders.

Relying on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), she submits that she is being unlawfully detained in a manner incompatible with her health needs. Under Articles 5 and 13 (right to an effective remedy), she further alleges that there is no effective remedy by which to complain of the unlawfulness of her detention and the ill-treatment she has received.

[Andrea Ciotta v. Italy \(no. 368/21\)](#)

The applicant is an Italian national who was born in 1984 and suffers from psychiatric disorders. The case concerns his continued detention in prison, despite a domestic court decision ordering his placement in a residential centre for the enforcement of security measures (*residenza per l'esecuzione delle misure di sicurezza*).

In April 2020 the applicant was placed in pre-trial detention on charges of harassing his former partner. In prison a psychiatric team diagnosed him with a delusional disorder. In July 2020 the Rome District Court granted his request to replace his pre-trial detention with a pre-trial security measure in the form of placement in a residential centre for the enforcement of security measures. As there were no free places, he remained in prison until 2 March 2021, when he was transferred to a therapeutic community in Latina province, where he currently resides.

In the meantime, at the applicant's request, the European Court had indicated an interim measure under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court in January 2021, asking the Government to transfer the applicant to a more suitable facility.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 5 (right to liberty and security) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant submits that his continued detention in prison was unlawful; that it was incompatible with his psychiatric illness and prevented him from receiving appropriate therapeutic care for his mental health; and that there was no effective remedy available to him. Under Article 34 (right of individual application), he also complains about the delay in implementing the interim measure indicated by the European Court.

[Just Satisfaction](#)

[Seksimp Group SRL v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 30085/13\)](#)

The applicant company, Seksimp Group SRL, was incorporated in Moldova in 2002 by a Slovenian national, who is its sole associate.

The case concerns a private dispute over the alleged failure to fulfil the contractual obligations of a tenancy agreement, following which the domestic courts ordered the applicant company to pay an allegedly disproportionate amount of compensation without providing sufficient reasoning; the

enforcement of that court order resulted in the sale of the applicant company's property, all without its knowledge.

In its [principal judgment](#) delivered on 15 May 2025, the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention in relation to the lack of adequate reasoning in the domestic courts' judgments and that the State had failed to set up a proper forum allowing the applicant company to assert its rights effectively, in breach of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention.

The Court further held that the question of just satisfaction was not ready for decision and reserved it for examination at a later date.

The Court will deal with this question in its judgment of 4 June 2026.

[Brun v. Switzerland \(no. 50885/16\)](#)

The applicant, Fabian Brun, is a Swiss national who was born in 1980 and lives in Merenschwand (Canton of Aargau, Switzerland).

The case concerns the applicant's obligation to pay a military-service exemption tax under the Swiss Constitution; he had completed a total of 104 days of military service when he was declared unfit on medical grounds.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 4 §§ 2 and 3 (prohibition of slavery and forced labour), the applicant complains that, as a man of Swiss nationality who was required to perform compulsory military service, he had been exposed to discriminatory treatment on account of his sex and nationality by being made to pay the military-service exemption tax following the declaration that he was unfit, whereas women of Swiss nationality and foreign nationals residing in Switzerland were not obliged to pay the tax in question.

[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 June 2026

Name	Main application number
Abdullayeva and Sarijanova v. Azerbaijan	39092/23
Azimov and Others v. Azerbaijan	38244/12

Thursday 4 June 2026

Name	Main application number
Kishon v. Azerbaijan	42227/14
PASSUS PROSPERUS d.o.o. v. Croatia	32637/21
Raspović v. Croatia	51775/21
P.S.D. v. the Czech Republic	19260/24
Mathiantonis v. Greece	46065/16
Addonizio and Others v. Italy	67766/11
Di Girolamo and Others v. Italy	35016/20
Feodosiyska Sudnobudivna Kompaniya More, VAT and Others v. Russia	19852/16

Name	Main application number
Kmetijsko gospodarstvo Lendava d.d. v. Slovenia	32657/24

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.

Follow the Court on Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int), X [ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH), [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/company/echr), and [YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCk1jW0F0t1jW0F0t1jW0F0t).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrpess@echr.coe.int) to subscribe to the press-release mailing list.

Where can the Court's press releases be found? [HUDOC - Press collection](#)

Press contacts

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

We are happy to receive journalists' enquiries via either email or telephone.

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)

Jane Swift (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 29 04)

Claire Windsor (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 24 01)

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.