



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing six judgments on Tuesday 3 June 2025 and 14 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 5 June 2025.

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 June 2025

[Sahiner v. Austria \(application no. 21669/21\)](#)

The applicant, Özlem Sahiner, is an Austrian national who was born in 1996 and lives in Hall (Tyrol, Austria).

The case concerns the refusal by the Austrian authorities to allow Ms Sahiner to legally change her first name to "Lemilia". Essentially, the Innsbruck District Administrative Authority (*Bezirkshauptmannschaft*) asserted that as it was not a common (*gebräuchlich*) name, the request did not comply with Austrian naming laws. She was unsuccessful in appealing that decision to the courts.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Ms Sahiner complains that she should have been allowed to change her name to "Lemilia", a name she had always identified with, and that, as someone born abroad with the name Lemilia would be allowed to keep that name, the refusal was discriminatory.

[Manolache v. Romania \(no. 7908/17\)](#)

The applicant, Nicolae-Richard Manolache, is a Romanian national who was born in 1969 and lives in Câmpulung (Romania).

The case concerns the fairness of criminal proceedings against the applicant, a police officer. On trial for influence peddling, he was initially acquitted but was then convicted in a final judgment by the Court of Appeal. One of the two judges on the bench at last instance had not, however, taken evidence directly from the witnesses.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, the applicant submits that the judge's failure to take such evidence directly – including from the complainants, who were the only eyewitnesses – infringed the principle of immediacy.

[Selimi and Krasnići v. Serbia \(nos. 20641/20 and 20644/20\)](#)

The applicants, Abdurahim Selimi and Bahrije Krasnići, are Serbian nationals who were born in 1939 and 1934 respectively. They lived respectively in Gnjilane and Prizren (Kosovo¹).

The case concerns the suspension of pensions paid by the Serbian Pensions and Disability Insurance Fund (SPDIF) to the applicants, who were based in Kosovo before 1999. Following the intervention of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, in June 1999 Kosovo was placed under international

¹ All references to Kosovo, whether the territory, institutions or population, in this text is to be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

administration. The Serbian State was unable to collect pension contributions from that point in Kosovo.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, the applicants complain that they had not received their SPDIF pensions since 1999, and of the length of the administrative and judicial review proceedings.

[Zuvić v. Serbia \(no. 3592/17\)](#)

The applicant, Boban Zuvić, is a Serbian national who was born in 1972 and lives in Jagodina (Serbia).

The case concerns the Supreme Military Court's ordering, in June 2004, of a retrial before the Military Disciplinary Court of alleged abuse of office by Mr Zuvić while a lieutenant in the then Yugoslav army in 2002 (on 4 February 2003 the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was renamed the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro). He had already been discharged from service.

Owing to organisational changes in the judiciary the Military Disciplinary Court ceased to exist. He was unable to find a forum to have his case retried.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Mr Zuvić complains of the Serbian courts' refusal to adjudicate his case, and that the overall length of the disciplinary proceedings had violated his right to hearing within a reasonable time.

[Uygun v. Türkiye \(no. 9389/19\)](#)

The applicant, Emrah Uygun, is a Turkish national who was born in 1994 and lives in Muğla (Türkiye).

The case concerns the refusal by the management of the Muğla E-type Prison to send a letter by Mr Uygun to his fiancée, citing concerns about his alleged involvement with a terrorist organisation and his continued active role within it.

Mr Uygun relies on Articles 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence) and Article 8 (right to protection of correspondence).

Thursday 5 June 2025

[Anna Maria Ciccone v. Italy \(no. 21492/17\)](#)

The applicant, Anna Maria Ciccone, is an Italian national who was born in 1959. She is a radiologist by profession.

In 2008 Ms Ciccone and others were accused of complicity in involuntary manslaughter. The authorities alleged that she had failed to diagnose a fractured femur in a patient who had been hospitalised following an assault.

Ms Ciccone was acquitted by the Assize Court at first instance, then sentenced on appeal to eight months' imprisonment and ordered to pay damages to the civil parties.

She complains that the Assize Court of Appeal set aside her first-instance acquittal without summoning or taking evidence from the experts appointed by the public prosecutor's office.

She relies on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention.

[Cioffi v. Italy \(no. 17710/15\)](#)

The applicant, Andrea Cioffi, is an Italian national who was born in 1972 and lives in Naples (Italy).

The case concerns Mr Cioffi's being taken along with other individuals, during the Global Forum on Reinventing Government in Naples in 2001, to a Naples police station, where he suffered alleged

ill-treatment at the hands of police officers, including being punched on the back of the head while on his knees, and verbal and physical abuse when he attempted to request information.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) 5 (right to liberty and security) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Cioffi alleges, in particular, that he was ill-treated while in police custody, and that the time-barring of those alleged offences meant they have gone unpunished.

[Străisteanu v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 9989/20\)](#)

The applicant, Doina-Ioana Străisteanu, is a Moldovan national who was born in 1978 and lives in Chişinău. She is a lawyer by profession.

In this case, the applicant complains about the administrative courts' order to remove from her Facebook page videos showing a colleague making insulting and homophobic remarks to her.

She relies on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the Convention.

[Spivak v. Ukraine \(no. 21180/15\)](#)

The applicant, Gennadiy Igorovych Spivak, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1980 and lives in Kamyanske (Ukraine).

The case concerns Mr Spivak's compulsory psychiatric treatment at the National High Security Psychiatric Hospital in Dnipro as ordered by a criminal court in October 2012. It found that he had committed attempted murder, but was exempt from criminal responsibility. He was unable to initiate court proceedings to review the lawfulness of his continued confinement or to challenge the medical treatment administered against his will. He was discharged in October 2014. A civil case taken by Mr Spivak in Ukraine against the hospital was unsuccessful, and the outcome, if any, of a criminal complaint he made was not known.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), 5 §§ 1, 4 and 5 (right to liberty and security), and 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Spivak alleges, in particular, that his retention was contrary to the law, and that he was forcibly administered neuroleptics without medical necessity, and that he did not have a procedure to challenge his continued psychiatric confinement detention or the prescribed medical treatment, and that he was held in inappropriate conditions.

[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 June 2025

Name	Main application number
Nikolić v. Serbia	21155/22

Thursday 5 June 2025

Name	Main application number
Arginert SHPK Tiranë v. Albania	56411/15
Dais and Others v. Greece	21051/15
Sinescu and Molotac v. Italy	59706/18

Name	Main application number
Lazdiņš v. Latvia	15041/16
Lembergs v. Latvia	3613/19
Maltceva v. Monaco	48017/22
Palmero v. Monaco	1624/24
Mladenović v. Serbia	57776/16
D.J. v. Slovenia	29265/22
P.R. v. Slovenia	11101/21

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 X (Twitter) [@ECHR_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH) and Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int).

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)

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.