

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing seven judgments on Tuesday 3 March 2026 and 34 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 5 March 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 3 March 2026

[Tishkina v. Bulgaria \(application no. 4711/20\)](#)

The applicant, Elka Ivanova Atanasova (previously Tishkina), is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1957 and lives in the Western Bulgarian town of Pernik, known for its mining industry.

The applicant's house is situated in an area containing shallow coal reserves. The case concerns irreparable structural damage caused to the house by people digging tunnels under it to extract coal for the black market.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights, and on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, the applicant complains that the Bulgarian State failed to take adequate measures to stop the illegal mining and to protect her property.

[Saarivuoma Sami Village v. Norway \(no. 2381/22\)](#)

The applicant community, the Swedish Sami village Saarivuoma, is registered as an organisation and holds legal personality under Swedish law.

Following legislation applied by the authorities as of 1972, the Sami village was prevented from exercising reindeer herding rights in certain parts of Norway. However, the community was of the view that, in addition to the area to which it had access, it held private-law rights in two further parts which had not been included in the area defined for its use in the legislation. The case concerns their complaints that the legislation did not reflect their rights.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention, the applicant community complains that it was unlawfully deprived of its reindeer grazing rights in the two areas from 1972 until a Supreme Court judgment of 30 June 2021, without any compensation.

[Landika v. Slovenia \(no. 45987/22\)](#)

The applicants, Kata Landika, Damjan Jugo Landika, and Vjekoslav Landika, are three nationals of Bosnia and Herzegovina, who were born in 1941, 1964 and 1971 respectively. All live in Bosnia and Herzegovina, either in Mostar or Bugojno.

The case concerns the applicants' inability to recover, under legislation enacted in Slovenia following the Court's 2014 Grand Chamber judgment in [Ališić and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia](#), their predecessor's "old" foreign-currency savings deposited in the Sarajevo branch of Ljubljana Bank, the claim relating to those savings having been transferred in 1998 to a privatisation account administered by the authorities of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, the applicants complain that, despite the entry into force of the Ališić Implementation Act, they have still not been able to recover the “old” foreign-currency deposits made by their deceased relative.

Thursday 5 March 2026

[Khattab v. Belgium \(no. 40272/18\)](#)

The application concerns the applicant’s conviction *in absentia* and the dismissal of his action to have that judgment set aside.

The applicant is a Belgian and Syrian national. In 2013 he was prosecuted in Belgium for participating in the activities of a terrorist group in Syria. He was convicted at first instance in 2016 and sentenced to seven years’ imprisonment and a fine of 18,000 euros. The court did not order his immediate arrest.

During the appeal proceedings the applicant decided to leave Belgium for Syria, but was arrested on 6 October 2016 in Türkiye while using a false identity and carrying false documents.

Meanwhile, on 3 October 2016 the Belgian authorities had summoned him to appear before the Brussels Court of Appeal on 18 November 2016. The bailiff, finding him absent, had placed the summons in his letter box.

The applicant, still detained in Türkiye, did not attend the hearing of 18 November 2016, or those held in April 2017. He was repatriated to Belgium on 24 May 2017.

In a judgment of 2 June 2017, adopted *in absentia* in respect of the applicant, the Court of Appeal upheld the first-instance judgment and ordered his immediate arrest. It subsequently declared void the applicant’s action to have that judgment set aside, finding that he was responsible for his failure to appear at the appeal hearings.

Before the Court, the applicant relies on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention, complaining that he was unable to appear in person in the proceedings before the Court of Appeal and that his action to have his conviction *in absentia* set aside was declared void. He submits in that regard that he neither waived his right to appear and to defend himself nor intended to evade justice. In addition, he alleges that he did not have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defence in that, being detained in Türkiye, he was unable to contact his Belgian lawyer for that purpose.

[Petrov v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 38066/18\)](#)

The applicant is a Moldovan national who was born in 1983. He served a prison sentence for murder between 2006 and 2021, and at the time of lodging his application, he was detained in Prison no. 9 in Pruncul.

In this case, he alleges that he belonged to the lower caste of “outcasts” within the informal prisoner hierarchy which, according to him, exists in Moldovan prisons. He submits that he was subjected to restrictions, humiliation and forced labour on account of this status.

In this connection, he relies on several Articles of the Convention, including Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) taken together with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) and Article 4 (prohibition of forced labour). He also relies on Article 9 of the Convention (right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion), arguing that it was impossible for him to attend the prison church.

[Kaganovskyy v. Ukraine \(no. 2\) \(no. 5694/19\)](#)

The applicant, Volodymyr Volodymyrovych Kaganovskyy is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1958 and died in 2019.

The case concerns Mr Kaganovskyy's stay in a State-run social care institution. Mr Kaganovskyy had a long history of psychiatric conditions, including paranoid schizophrenia. In 2012 a district court declared him legally incapable and in 2013 he was assigned a legal guardian. In 2014 he was admitted to the Kyiv Psychoneurological Residential Institution, where he remained until his death.

Relying mainly on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), Mr Kaganovskyy complained that he had not been able to leave the institution's premises and argued that under national law, he was unable to challenge the lawfulness of that prohibition in court and obtain compensation.

[Kryuk v. Ukraine \(nos. 50474/20 and 50480/20\)](#)

The applicants, Pavlo Ivanovych Kryuk and Oleksandr Ivanovych Kryuk, are brothers and Ukrainian nationals who were born in 1990 and 1986 respectively and live in the Ukrainian city of Zaporizhzhya.

The brothers, police officers at the time, were suspected of taking part in a violent collective robbery. Following their arrest in June 2017, they were first detained on remand due to the gravity of the charges against them and the risk that they might abscond or interfere with the investigation, and then placed under 24-hour house arrest. During court hearings held between January 2018 and April 2020, they were held in a glass dock along with four other co-accused.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 § 3 (entitlement to release pending trial), 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court) and 5 § 5 (right to liberty and security), the applicants complain about their confinement in a glass dock during the court hearings and about their placement under house arrest.

[Zinchenko and Tamtura v. Ukraine \(nos. 46839/17 and 74462/17\)](#)

The applicants, Sergiy Pavlovych Zinchenko and Sergiy Borysovych Tamtura, are Ukrainian nationals who were born in 1989 and 1990 respectively and live in Kyiv.

The applicants, law-enforcement officers at the time, were arrested on suspicion of using firearms against protesters during the Maidan events in Kyiv, which had begun in November 2013, and which had led to 48 persons being shot dead and 80 persons being injured. Shortly after the applicants' arrest on 2 April 2014 and 23 February 2015 respectively, the Ukrainian courts ordered their detention in the context of the criminal proceedings, referring to the gravity of the charges, the public interest in the progress of the investigation, and the risk that they might abscond or interfere with the investigation. According to the applicants, at the hearings during their trial between 12 May 2016 and 4 October 2017, they were held together with three other co-accused in a glass dock.

The applicants complain that their confinement in the glass dock during the court hearings was inhuman and degrading in violation of Article 3, and that they had no effective domestic remedy in violation of Article 13. Mr Tamtura also complains that his detention was too long and unjustified, in breach of Article 5 § 3.

[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 3 March 2026

Name	Main application number
Stănoiu and Others v. Romania	26206/04
Stoicovici and Mateevici v. Romania	24861/07
Tiryaki v. Türkiye	16373/18
Türkmen v. Türkiye	27818/17

Thursday 5 March 2026

Name	Main application number
F.T. v. Belgium	58765/21
Dedović v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	15691/22
Šabanija Muhić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	55257/22
Mafalani v. Croatia	13255/22
Lasseur v. France	27181/24
M.R.Z. and Others v. France	35096/24
Diakomanolis v. Greece	1216/17
F.A.Y. and Others v. Greece	26657/16
Chertok v. Hungary	53130/20
Edilsud 2014 S.r.l. Semplicata and Ferreri v. Italy	32961/18
Gribuste v. Latvia	39639/18
Studente and Students v. Latvia	9276/19
Adam v. the Republic of Moldova	40846/15
C.N. v. the Republic of Moldova	54210/15
Legal Tur S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	18207/14
Tegulum S.A. v. the Republic of Moldova	53982/11
Teixeira Fernandes Lopes v. Portugal	50037/19
Constanda v. Romania	70972/16
P.D. v. Serbia	42112/21
Forai v. Slovakia	17242/22
Garcia Lopez-Azcutia v. Spain	9564/24
Garrido Herrero v. Spain	54633/22
Sarmiento Alvarez v. Spain	6472/25
Akşit v. Türkiye	8253/21
Ioannou Chira and Others v. Türkiye	51898/17
Sarıpınar Gıda Sanayi ve Ticaret Ltd. Şti. v. Türkiye	27814/17
Uzun v. Türkiye	40797/20
Gazin v. Ukraine	43898/19
Mulundkar v. Ukraine	19395/24

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.

