EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 190 (2019)
29.05.2019

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 12 judgments on Tuesday 4 June 2019 and 89 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 6 June 2019.

*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 4 June 2019

Einarsson and Others v. Iceland (application no. 39757/15)

The applicants, Sigurður Einarsson, Hreiðar Már Sigurðsson, Ólafur Ólafsson, and Magnús Guðmundsson, are Icelandic nationals who were born in 1960, 1970, 1957, and 1970 respectively and live in Reykjavík (Mr Einarsson), Luxembourg (Mr Sigurðsson and Mr Guðmundsson), and Pully, Switzerland (Mr Ólafsson).

The case concerns criminal proceedings against the applicants related to financial transactions involving Kaupþing Bank, which collapsed in October 2008.

Mr Einarsson was the chairman of Kaupþing, Mr Sigurðsson was chief executive officer, Mr Ólafsson was the majority owner of a company which indirectly owned another company which was Kaupþing's largest shareholder, while Mr Guðmundsson was the chief executive officer of Kaupþing's Luxembourg subsidiary.

In September 2008 Kaupþing announced that a company owned indirectly by Sheik Mohammed bin Khalifa Al Thani, a member of Qatar's royal family, had bought 5.01% of its shares. An investigation revealed that the funds for the purchase had been provided by Kaupþing itself. The Financial Supervisory Authority lodged a complaint with the Special Prosecutor, appointed to investigate possible crimes linked to the collapse of Iceland's banking sector. In February 2012 the Special Prosecutor issued an indictment against the applicants.

After proceedings in the District Court and the Supreme Court, which ended in February 2015, Mr Ólafsson was found guilty of market manipulation while the others were convicted of that offence and of breach of trust. Three of them sought to have the proceedings reopened, but in January 2016 the Committee on Reopening Judicial Proceedings rejected their applications. During the criminal proceedings the applicants complained about denial of access to documents collected during the investigation, about not being able to question witnesses who had given testimony to the police but refused to appear in court, and about aspects of the authorities' telephone tapping.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial / independent and impartial tribunal) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain of a lack of impartiality because the wife of one of the Supreme Court judges worked for the Financial Supervisory Authority while it was investigating Kaupþing, while the same judge's son had worked in Kaupþing's legal department before its collapse and then afterwards while it was being wound up.

They also complain about denial of access to evidence and witnesses under Article 6 § 1 and 3 (b) (right to a fair trial and right to adequate time and facilities for preparation of defence) and Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses). Under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home, and the correspondence) they allege that conversations with their lawyers were intercepted when their telephones were tapped.

Kosaitė - Čypienė and Others v. Lithuania (no. 69489/12)

The applicants, Ms I. Rinkevičienė, Ms E. Zakarevičienė, Ms O. Valainienė, and Ms E. Kosaitė-Čypienė, are Lithuanian nationals who live in Vilnius.

The case concerns Lithuanian law on medical assistance for home birth.

The four applicants are mothers who gave birth at home with the aid of a doula (a childbirth coach), J.I.Š. They attest that their home births took place without complications.

After criminal charges were brought against J.I.Š for assisting in home births, in 2012 three of the applicants asked local hospitals to provide them with medical assistance for a home birth. However, the hospitals refused because providing such aid was prohibited under the relevant domestic legislation, namely Medical Regulation MN 40:2006.

Three of the applicants then asked that the Ministry of Health amend the legislation to permit medical personnel to assist with home births. The Ministry replied that there were no plans to amend the legislation or enact new legislation to regulate midwifery services at home, stating that giving birth in a maternity ward was the safest option and that the applicants could visit the wards to find the one most suited to their needs.

Ms O. Valainienė challenged the Ministry's reply before the administrative courts, without success. Ultimately, in 2012 the Supreme Administrative Court rejected her argument that the absence of legal regulation on medical assistance during home birth breached her right to privacy. On the contrary, domestic law guaranteed her the right to choose the most suitable medical institution and to state her wishes regarding privacy and, in any case, the right to privacy could not be given higher value than the health of mother and child.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life) of the European Convention, the applicants complain that Lithuanian law dissuaded healthcare professionals from assisting in home births.

Farrugia v. Malta (no. 63041/13)

The applicant, Carmel Joseph Farrugia, is a Maltese national who was born in 1951 and lives in Paola (Malta).

The case concerns Mr Farrugia's complaint about his police questioning after an alleged robbery at his business premises in 2002.

The police suspected that the crime had been fabricated and questioned Mr Farrugia, confronting him in particular with allegations by one of his employee's that he had forced him to tie him up and simulate a robbery. Mr Farrugia denied the allegations, explaining that four individuals had tied him up in his showroom and stolen money.

He gave several statements over two days in the absence of a lawyer as domestic law at the time did not provide for legal assistance at the pre-trial stage. He was, however, informed of his right to remain silent and to not incriminate himself.

Criminal proceedings were brought against the applicant and, in 2007, the Court of Appeal found that his colleague's testimony was enough to conclude that the applicant was guilty of simulating an offence. He was given a one-year suspended prison sentence.

The court also found that the colleague's testimony was corroborated by the applicant's statements, which were inconsistent and lacked credibility. In particular, he had replied in an evasive and hesitant way to police questions concerning his business and profits and had not adequately explained why CCTV on his premises had not recorded anything on the day of the alleged crime.

Mr Farrugia brought constitutional redress proceedings to complain that his conviction had been based on statements he had given to the police without the assistance of a lawyer. His claim was dismissed in 2012, and his appeal rejected in 2013.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and right to legal assistance of own choosing), Mr Farrugia complains that he was not provided with a lawyer during police questioning.

Just Satisfaction

Moreno Diaz Peña and Others v. Portugal (no. 44262/10)

The applicants, Pilar Moreno Diaz Peña, Joaquin Peña Moreno, Marta Pilar Peña Moreno, Paloma de la Ascención Francisca Peña Moreno, Francisco Javier Peña Moreno and Maria de las Mercedes Peña y Moreno are six Spanish nationals. They were born in 1951, 1953, 1957, 1958 and 1961 respectively. They inherited land (covering a total area of 24,375 sq. m) in the municipality of Oeiras.

The case concerned the amount of compensation awarded after proceedings relating to the expropriation of the land in question, the length of the proceedings and the lack of an effective domestic remedy. The applicants relied on Articles 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights, together with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

In its judgment on the merits of 4 June 2015, the Court found that the time taken by the Portuguese courts to settle the applicants' dispute concerning the amount of the expropriation compensation, and the lack of a remedy by which to obtain redress on account of the length of the proceedings before the said courts, had entailed a violation of Articles 6 and 13 of the Convention. The Court, moreover, took the view that the applicants had sustained an interference with their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention.

Lastly, the Court found that the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) was not ready for judgment and reserved it. The Court will rule on this question in its judgment of 4 June 2019.

Rola v. Slovenia (nos. 12096/14 and 39335/16)

The applicant, Štefan Rola, is a Slovenian national who was born in 1960 and lives in Zgornja Korena (Slovenia).

The case concerns Mr Rola's complaint that he lost his licence to act as a liquidator in bankruptcy proceedings.

In 2011 the Minister of Justice revoked his licence because he had been convicted of two counts of violent behaviour committed in 2003 and 2004, which was a publicly prosecutable criminal offence. He was thus struck off the register of liquidators and could no longer be assigned any insolvency proceedings.

He brought an administrative action before the Slovenian courts against this decision. He argued that at the time he had acquired the licence in 2004 the law had not provided for revocation if convicted for a criminal offence. The revocation of his licence had been based on new legislation introduced in 2008. He therefore argued that at the time he had committed the criminal offence he could not have foreseen such a sanction and that the new legislation should not have been applied retrospectively.

The courts dismissed his action in 2012, finding that the revocation had been entirely lawful. They also pointed out that that measure was related to the final conviction in 2011 and that the argument about not applying the law retrospectively was therefore irrelevant. The Supreme Court rejected his appeal on points of law as inadmissible.

In 2013, he applied for a new liquidator's licence, which the Ministry of Justice rejected because, under the new 2008 legislation, a licence could not be granted once it had been revoked. He lodged another administrative action, which was also ultimately unsuccessful, in a decision before the Supreme Court in 2015.

Mr Rola unsuccessfully challenged the above decisions before the Constitutional Court.

Mr Rola alleges that the revocation of his liquidator's licence breached Article 7 (no punishment without law), Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be punished twice for the same offence). He alleges in particular that such a sanction was not provided for by law at the time of his offence and that it was therefore retroactively imposed on him. Furthermore, he was only given a suspended sentence for his criminal offence, which under the applicable provisions should not have entailed any legal consequences. He also argues that the revocation was disproportionate: it was in effect permanent and led to him losing his main source of income.

Ayhan and Others v. Turkey (no. 2) (nos. 4536/06 and 53282/07)

The applicants, Mehmet Ali Ayhan, Mehmet Aytunç Altay, Cengiz Kumanlı, Mehmet Çiftçi and Zeki Şahin, are Turkish nationals who were born in 1961, 1951, 1959, 1952, and 1963. At the time of the events of the case the applicants were serving sentences in the Edirne F-type Prison (Turkey).

The case concerns the applicants' complaint that they were hindered in applying to the Court.

In September 2005 the applicants' lawyer, Mr. Tamer, sent a letter to them containing authorisation forms needed to lodge a complaint with the Strasbourg Court concerning an earlier decision taken by the prison authorities to intercept a letter sent to them by an association. The prison authorities, suspicious about Mr. Tamer's letter, sent it to the Edirne Enforcement Court to be examined. The court decided that the request to fill in the forms did not fall within the permitted professional activity of a lawyer and instead was an incitement to begin proceedings. The letter was never handed over to the applicants.

Three of the applicants filed an objection that was rejected by the Edirne Assize Court.

Mr. Tamer sent a letter to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe complaining about the authorities' refusal to give the letter to his clients as a hindrance to applying to the Court. The Registry of the Court responded to Mr. Tamer, stating that it saw his letter as an indication of the applicants' wish to lodge an application and that he should submit a completed form, which he provided on 19 October 2006.

On 18 April 2007, Mr. Tamer sent a copy to the applicants of the Court's acknowledgement of its receipt of their application, as well as forms of authority that needed to be completed. The prison authorities again sent the letter to the Enforcement Court, which, on the same grounds as before, declined to provide it to the applicants.

Mr Altay and Mr Çiftçi filed an objection that was rejected by the Edirne Assize Court. In November 2007 Mr. Tamer lodged another complaint with the Court about these proceedings. The applicants eventually provided forms of authority in 2010.

Replying in particular on Article 34 (right of individual petition), the applicants complain of an interference with their efforts to submit an application to the Court.

Yılmaz v. Turkey (no. 36607/06)

The applicant, Abdullah Yılmaz, is a Turkish national who was born in 1965 and lives in Eskişehir (Turkey).

The case concerns the refusal by the Ministry of National Education to appoint Mr Yılmaz to a teaching post abroad on account of information received about him. Mr Yılmaz, who came second in

the competitive examination, brought an action for a stay of execution and another action for annulment against the decision refusing his appointment, but the administrative courts dismissed his case.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing), Mr Yılmaz complains about the length of the proceedings, the failure to communicate the opinions of the Judge Rapporteur and the Principal Public Prosecutor at the Supreme Administrative Court, the lack of fairness in the proceedings, and an inconsistency of case-law in the administrative courts.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Mr Yılmaz complains that the domestic authorities unduly subjected him and his family to a security investigation and refused, on the basis of information concerning his private life obtained in that investigation, to appoint him to one of the posts to which he was supposed to have had access as a result of his success in the competitive appointment process.

Thursday 6 June 2019

Bosak and Others v. Croatia (nos. 40429/14, 41536/14, 42804/14, and 58379/14)

The applicants, Željko Bosak, Ramazan Keskin, Ahmet Basalan, and Dubravko Šošo, were born in 1973, 1979, 1984, and 1957 respectively. Mr Bosak and Mr Šošo are Croatian nationals who live in Zagreb, and Mr Keskin and Mr Basalan are Dutch nationals who live in Rotterdam (the Netherlands).

The four applicants were convicted in February 2009 on drugs-related charges and were sentenced to terms of prison ranging from six to 10 years. The trial court relied in particular on secret surveillance recordings of telephone calls made during the investigation.

The applicants appealed to the Supreme Court, complaining that the surveillance measures had not been duly authorised with proper reasons and had not been based on the correct legislation, which should have been the special law on organised crime and not the Code of Criminal Procedure.

The second and third applicants also contended that the secret surveillance orders had not been issued in respect of them, and that the secret surveillance had been conducted outside Croatian territory without a request for international legal assistance in criminal matters.

The fourth applicant complained about the trial court's refusal to examine two defence witnesses. During the appeal proceedings the prosecutor submitted a reasoned opinion proposing that the applicants' appeals be dismissed. That opinion was not forwarded to the defence.

The Supreme Court dismissed their appeals in March 2010, having decided that none of the applicants could attend the appeal session. Constitutional appeals were dismissed in January 2014.

The applicants complain that they were subjected to secret surveillance measures in violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and the correspondence).

They also raise complaints under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) and (d) (right to a fair trial / right to defend oneself in person / right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses).

In particular, they complain that evidence was obtained through unlawful secret surveillance; the first three applicants allege a violation of the principle of equality of arms as the prosecution's submission to the Supreme Court was not forwarded to the defence; the first applicant complains about not being allowed to attend the appeal session; and the fourth complains about the failure of the trial court to call two defence witnesses.

Nodet v. France (no. 47342/14)

The applicant, Antoine Nodet, is a French national who was born in 1956 and lives in Paris. The case concerns the question of the right not be tried or punished twice (*ne bis in idem*).

In early 2005 the stock-market price of shares in Fromageries Paul Renard (FPR), a subsidiary of SAS Bongrain Europe, was about 149 euros (EUR) before shooting up to EUR 4,225 on 30 March 2006. Mr Nodet, a financial analyst, traded in FPR shares using four bank accounts that he had authority to operate, in order to secure a substantial capital gain.

On 21 June 2006 the Secretary General of the financial markets regulator, the AMF, initiated an investigation into trading in FPR shares on the stock market from 1 January 2006 onwards. On 26 February 2006, the AMF's department of investigations and market surveillance filed its report, which showed that Mr Nodet's trading in FPR shares could be characterised as market manipulation. The report noted, in particular, the high level of Mr Nodet's trading in FPR shares, in view of the number of orders made and cancelled, and the completed transactions, including 25 back-to-back transactions between the four accounts under his control. The AMF report found that his activity had had the effect of triggering a rise in the share price and had led to an increase in price limits.

On 20 December 2007 AMF Enforcement Committee imposed a fine of EUR 250,000 on Mr Nodet, in addition to ordering the publication of the decision. The Paris Court of Appeal dismissed Mr Nodet's appeal and the Court of Cassation dismissed his appeal on points of law.

On 11 September 2007 the public prosecutor, informed of the facts by the President of the AMF, asked the fraud squad to carry out a preliminary investigation. On 8 April 2009, when the appeal on points of law against the AMF's sanction was pending, Mr Nodet was summoned to appear before the Paris Criminal Court to stand trial for the offence of obstructing the proper operation of the stock market. Mr Nodet, taking the view that the summons reproduced word-for-word the same charges as those for which he had been fined by the AMF, filed pleadings to show that there had been a breach of the *ne bis in idem* principle protected by Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 to the Convention. The Criminal Court dismissed his submissions and convicted him on the charges, sentencing him to a suspended term of 8 months' imprisonment. The Court of Appeal upheld the judgment, reducing the sentence to 3 months. The Court of Cassation dismissed Mr Nodet's appeal.

Relying on Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice), the applicant alleges that there has been a breach of the *ne bis in idem* principle on account of the criminal proceedings against him and his conviction, in spite of a decision of the AMF concerning exactly the same charges which had become final on 10 November 2009.

Bileski v. North Macedonia (no. 78392/14)

The applicant, Dragi Bileski, is a Macedonian/citizen of the Republic of North Macedonia who was born in 1951 and lives in Kičevo (North Macedonia).

The case concerns proceedings brought against him for alleged collaboration with the security services of the former communist regime. At the end of the proceedings in 2014 his position as a trial judge was terminated.

In 2012 the Fact Verification Commission found that Mr Bileski had been an "operational liaison" with the former security services in return for promotion, that his collaboration had been conscious and that it had caused harm to others. The decision was based in particular on notes from one of his alleged handlers.

In proceedings before the administrative courts, he challenged both the Commission's findings and the authenticity of the documents. He requested that the courts hear oral evidence from the handler and an expert, namely a university professor and former intelligence officer.

The administrative courts dismissed his claims without examining the proposed witnesses. In 2013 the lower administrative court found in particular that the applicant "had not submitted any evidence that led to different facts". In 2014 the Higher Administrative Court upheld that decision, holding that the alleged collaboration had complied with the statutory qualifying conditions and that "reports drawn up by handlers are to be regarded as facts".

Relying in particular on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial / hearing), Mr Bileski complains he was not given the opportunity to present his case effectively. In particular, the courts did not assess any of the evidence he proposed, refusing to examine witnesses or hold an oral hearing, despite repeated requests; nor did they provide sufficient reasons for their decisions. He was also given limited access to the security service files. He raises a further complaint under Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence).

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), he complains about the use of the security service files in the proceedings against him, as well as the fact that he could not effectively challenge the authorities' findings. He also alleges a breach of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in respect of his complaints under Articles 6 and 8.

Pula v. North Macedonia (no. 48835/13)

The applicant, Zenelabedin Pula, is an Albanian national, who was born in 1955 and lives in Tirana.

The case concerns the requirement for an interpreter in criminal proceedings.

In 2004 Mr Pula was involved in a head-on collision in North Macedonia that resulted in the death of the other driver.

In 2006 the investigating judge requested a report on the accident. During the trial this report was read aloud and the applicant was given a copy. Additionally, he was provided with an Albanian-speaking interpreter for court hearings.

In April 2010 the trial court found the applicant guilty, and sentenced him to eight months' imprisonment. This decision was upheld on appeal.

Mr Pula lodged an extraordinary review appeal with the Supreme Court alleging that he had not been provided with an interpreter before the trial court on 3 February 2010. The Supreme Court upheld the lower courts' decision, stating that it was apparent from the case file and a note submitted by the trial judge that there had been an error in the record of 3 February 2010 and that an interpreter had in fact been provided to the plaintiff at all court hearings.

Relying in particular on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (e) (right to a fair trial / right to an interpreter) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Pula complains that the 2006 report and the trial court's judgment were not translated into Albanian and that he was deprived of the right to an Albanian interpreter at one of the hearings on his case.

Abokar v. Sweden (no. 23270/16)

The applicant, Said Mohamed Abokar, is a Somali national who was born in 1986 and lives in Italy.

The case concerns the Swedish authorities' refusal to grant the applicant a residence permit for family reunion purposes.

Mr Abokar is married to A, a Somali national who has held a permanent residence permit in Sweden since 2009. He married A in religious and civil ceremonies in May 2011 and April 2013 respectively. They started their relationship in Sweden and have never lived together in Somalia. They have two children: B, born in 2012 and C, born in 2014. In 2013 the applicant was granted a residence permit and refugee status in Italy.

In June 2010 Mr Abokar applied for asylum in Sweden under the identity of Abdirahman Mohamed Abukar, born on 22 February 1990. In August 2010 the Migration Agency rejected his application and, in accordance with the Dublin Regulation, decided to transfer him to Italy where he had previously applied for asylum and had been granted temporary residence. The Agency noted that the applicant had applied for asylum in Finland in January 2010 as Said Mohamed Abokar, born in 1986, and that he had spent time in Sweden during 2009 without registering.

In December 2012 Mr Abokar again applied for asylum in Sweden under the name of Abdirahman Mohamed Abukar, born on 22 February 1990. He requested that his asylum case be examined in Sweden where his wife, who is disabled, and their child were resident. In February 2013 the Agency rejected his application and transferred him to Italy, after confirmation from the Italian authorities that he had been granted a residence permit in the name of Said Mohamed Abokar, born in 1986.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for family life), Mr Abokar complains that Sweden's failure to grant him a residence permit on the grounds that he could not prove his identity amounted to a violation of his right to respect for his family life.

Doğan and Çakmak v. Turkey (nos. 28484/10 and 58223/10)

The applicants, Çetin Doğan and Cem Aziz Çakmak, are Turkish nationals who were born respectively in 1940 and 1963 and live in Istanbul (Turkey).

The case concerns the remanding in custody of the applicants in the context of criminal proceedings opened against them in 2010 by the Istanbul public prosecutor and concerning presumed members of the criminal organisation *Balyoz*, who were accused of planning a military coup d'état between 2002 and 2003. During the proceedings, Mr Doğan was held for one year, 10 months and 25 days, and Mr Çakmak for 18 months and 26 days.

Relying on Article 5 § 4 (right to a speedy decision on the lawfulness of detention), Mr Doğan and Mr Çakmak complain that they were not able to challenge effectively the lawfulness of their pre-trial detention, alleging that the courts denied their requests for release in breach of the equality of arms principle.

Garamukanwa v. the United Kingdom (no. 70573/17)

The applicant, George Garamukanwa, is a British national, who was born in 1970 and lives in Southampton (England, UK)

The case concerns Mr Garamukanwa's dismissal by a state-run health service after an investigation for harassment based on photographs stored on his iPhone, and on emails and WhatsApp correspondence.

Mr Garamukanwa was employed by a National Health Service Trust ("the Trust") from October 2007 as a clinical manager. In June 2012 L.M., a colleague with whom he had had a relationship, raised concerns with her manager about emails he had sent her and other employees about her alleged relationship with a junior member of staff. The manager warned the applicant that his behaviour was inappropriate.

He was suspended in April 2013 when the police informed the Trust that they were investigating claims by L.M. that he had been stalking and harassing her and sending anonymous malicious emails to employees of the Trust.

After an internal investigation and disciplinary proceedings, the hospital dismissed the applicant in December 2013 for gross misconduct. It relied in particular on photographs stored on his iPhone, passed to it by the police, linking him to certain anonymous emails, as well as personal emails and WhatsApp messages exchanged by the applicant and other employees, including L.M. The applicant had voluntarily provided some of the communications at one of the disciplinary hearings.

He challenged his dismissal in court, notably arguing that the Trust had relied on private material. His claim was ultimately dismissed in 2016 on appeal. The courts found that he could have had no reasonable expectation that the evidence relied on by the Trust would remain private.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and the correspondence), Mr Garamukanwa complains that the domestic courts' decisions upholding his dismissal constituted a breach of his right to privacy.

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 4 June 2019

Name	Main application number
Grech and Others v. Malta	62978/15
Abubakarova and Others v. Russia	867/12
Esambayeva and Others v. Russia	2660/12
Mukhtarova and Others v. Russia	13916/12
Zajkesković v. Serbia	34630/11

Thursday 6 June 2019

Name	Main application number
Mammadov and Others v. Azerbaijan	49417/11
Škrbić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	37444/17
Stefanović v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	36168/17
Panayotova and Others v. Bulgaria	12509/13
Glavašić and Tankosić v. Croatia	33797/17
Kuzmanović v. Croatia	21550/12
M.A. v. Estonia	4327/18
Theocharis v. Greece	23162/15
Bebők and Others v. Hungary	80694/17
Kis-Kecskemét Kft and Others v. Hungary	12016/15
Kovács and Others v. Hungary	50782/15
Laborc and Others v. Hungary	23076/16
Turner v. Hungary	39854/14
Vektor-Holding Kft v. Hungary	35821/18
Vígh and Kovács v. Hungary	55580/13
Adami and Others v. Italy	26056/07
Aiello and Others v. Italy	20035/07
Az S.r.l. v. Italy	9284/10
Barone and Della Rocca v. Italy	64105/13
Colazzo and Others v. Italy	36944/06
Condominio Porta Rufina v. Italy	14346/05
Gromme and Others v. Italy	69239/10
Jubail v. Italy	72234/17
Mideo v. Italy	19169/02
Muratore v. Italy	5740/19
Ciobanu v. the Republic of Moldova	4720/11
Veronica-P S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	50211/09
Puhalo v. Montenegro	24818/12
Asp Pp Dooel v. North Macedonia	66313/14

Name	Main application number
Paunoski v. North Macedonia	18669/08
Ziberi v. North Macedonia	2166/15
Giełzak v. Poland	62187/15
Mirosław Garlicki v. Poland	67068/10
Niemczyk v. Poland	48174/11
Tyrka v. Poland	37734/14
Gonçalves Barata v. Portugal	46399/14
Brumă v. Romania	29596/16
Cherciu v. Romania	45585/13
Cioată and Others v. Romania	48095/07
Cojan v. Romania	19108/16
Comăniciu v. Romania	2968/15
Cornel Popa and Others v. Romania	6920/16
Dercaci v. Romania	54340/15
Dobocan and Others v. Romania	23348/15
Dumitrescu and Others v. Romania	18895/04
Dumitrescu and Others v. Romania	23365/15
Dumitru v. Romania	73285/14
Florian Petrică Călin and Others v. Romania	55593/15
Mangu and Others v. Romania	33079/16
Mardare and Others v. Romania	12086/14
Orghidan and Others v. Romania	62744/15
Păun and Others v. Romania	6036/16
Petrachi and Others v. Romania	61961/15
Pisău and Others v. Romania	61145/15
Prodan v. Romania	22552/16
Simulescu and Others v. Romania	17090/15
Ștefu v. Romania	71299/14
Vulpe v. Romania	15005/13
Ivanov and Chumakov v. Russia	2833/18
Naumova v. Russia	63142/11
Orlov v. Russia	7335/09
Đorđević v. Serbia	12608/18
Gvozdić v. Serbia	59130/16
Housing Cooperative Tehničar Novi Sad v. Serbia	52474/16
Markišić v. Serbia	45825/15
Tomić v. Serbia	31506/17
Zabaleta Elosegui and Others v. Spain	17988/17
Artemenko v. Ukraine	54574/10
Belyayev and Others v. Ukraine	34345/10
Belyayev v. Ukraine	54984/17
Braylovska v. Ukraine	14031/09
BUSHBM-PLYUS, TOV v. Ukraine	20880/07
Garumov v. Ukraine	70043/17
Kazimir Ukraine Convergence Fund Limited v. Ukraine	2188/11

Name	Main application number
Kukurudza v. Ukraine	32801/12
Moldavska v. Ukraine	43464/18
Myronenko v. Ukraine	25664/18
Nedilenko and Kogut v. Ukraine	42058/08
Pryshlyak and Nekrasova v. Ukraine	4498/18
A.A. and F.A. v. the United Kingdom	6796/16
L.V. v. the United Kingdom	50718/16
McGill and Hewitt v. the United Kingdom	7690/18

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

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)
Patrick Lannin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 44 18)
Somi Nikol (tel: + 33 3 90 21 64 25)