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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 404 (2015)
22.12.2015

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing six judgments on Tuesday 5 January 2016 and 83 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 7 January 2016.

*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 5 January 2016

Süveges v. Hungary (application no. 50255/12)

The applicant, Péter Süveges, is a Hungarian national who was born in 1972. A multiple recidivist, Mr Süveges essentially complains about the criminal proceedings against him on, among other offences, aggravated murder, armed robbery and illegal possession of firearms and explosives, as well as his related pre-trial detention and house arrest.

After more than 50 hearings before a number of different judges, Mr Süveges was found guilty of those offences in February 2014 and sentenced to life imprisonment. In July 2015 this judgment was quashed and remitted to the first-instance court where the case is currently still pending.

In the context of those criminal proceedings and on the grounds of a risk of absconding and reoffending, the courts ordered Mr Süveges' pre-trial detention which essentially covered three periods, starting on June 2005 when he was arrested and remanded in custody and still continuing. These periods of pre-trial detention were punctuated by periods when he served prison sentences in other, unrelated, criminal proceedings or was placed under house arrest (between January 2012 and November 2013). Most recently, in July 2015 he was placed in pre-trial detention again following the quashing of his conviction of February 2014.

During his house arrest, Mr Süveges made various requests for one-off leave, including visits to family, which were granted. Other requests for more regular visits to his mother and father, who were both in poor health, were refused. In December 2012, the High Court dismissed an application for leave for him to attend Mass on Sundays and this decision was upheld on appeal. From 7 to 18 January 2013, as the owner of the flat where Mr Süveges was staying could no longer provide for him, his house arrest continued, at his request, from a campsite that was unsuitable for residence during the winter. On 21 January 2013, the court re-ordered his house arrest at the flat of his acquaintance.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Süveges complains about the inadequate conditions of his house arrest from 7 to 18 January 2013 on a campsite. Further relying on Article 5 § 3 (entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial) and Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair within a reasonable time) of the European Convention, he complains about the excessive length of both his pre-trial detention – more than six years – and criminal proceedings – more than ten years – against him. Furthermore, he alleges under Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court) that the proceedings concerning his motions for release were unfair. Lastly, relying on Article 8 (right to respect for family life), and Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience, and religion), Mr Süveges complains that contact with his family was restricted and that he was unable to attend mass while under house arrest.

Cătălin Eugen Micu v. Romania (no. 55104/13)

The applicant, Cătălin Eugen Micu, is a Romanian national who was born in 1973 and is being detained in the Drobeta Turnu Severin prison (Romania).

The case concerns Mr Micu's conditions of detention in the Bucharest-Jilava prison, his alleged contamination in prison with hepatitis C and the lack of medical treatment.

Having been sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, Mr Micu has been incarcerated in various prisons in Romania, including Bucharest-Jilava. In that prison, Mr Micu was placed in a cell with an area of 33.96 m2 which was occupied by 27 prisoners and fitted with a bathroom comprising two toilets, two washbasins and two showers. Furthermore, he was apparently forced to take his meals under difficult conditions because of the lack of space and the inadequate numbers of tables and chairs. During his detention Mr Micu was hospitalised on several occasions at the Bucharest-Jilava prison hospital, where he was diagnosed with viral hepatitis C. As regards his treatment, the medical team advised him to avoid smoking and to adhere to a special diet. In prison he was put on a special diet for sick prisoners and treated with hepatoprotectors. Nevertheless, when the doctors advised him to undergo reassessment, Mr Micu twice refused to be hospitalised for the purpose. During an examination in the internal medicine and cardiology department of the Bucharest prison hospital he was diagnosed with angina and a hepatopathy which was probably toxic. Mr Micu was provided with medical treatment. His complaints about his conditions of detention and the lack of medical treatment for hepatitis C were dismissed by the judge delegated to the Bucarest-Jilava prison and the Bucharest court of first instance.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Micu complains, firstly, about the situation of overcrowding in the Bucarest-Jilava prison, and secondly, about his contamination with hepatitis C, which he has developed in prison, as well as the lack of medical treatment in prison for this condition.

Frumkin v. Russia (no. 74568/12)

The applicant, Yevgeniy Frumkin, is a Russian national who was born in 1962 and lives in Moscow.

The case concerns a political rally in which Mr Frumkin participated, held at Bolotnaya Square in Moscow on 6 May 2012 to protest against "abuses and falsifications" in the elections to the State Duma and the presidential elections. The Moscow authorities had authorised the event and provided for an extensive crowd-control task force. The rally was attended by at least 8,000 participants – the authorities' estimate – if not 25,000, as the organisers maintain. It began peacefully, but ended up in clashes between the police and protesters, resulting in numerous arrests.

Mr Frumkin notably alleges that the authorities' crowd-control measures provoked a confrontation between protesters and police, which the police then used as a pretext to terminate the meeting early. According to him, there had been a working meeting two days before the event between the organisers and the authorities and the participants were expecting that the meeting venue would include a park at Bolotnaya Square. When they discovered that access to the park was blocked by a police cordon, some of the organisers started a "sit-down strike". According to the authorities, it was feared that protesters intended to break the cordon, either to proceed towards the nearby bridge across Moskva River and then to the Kremlin, or to stir the crowd into disorder.

At 6 p.m. one of the police colonels in charge told one of the organisers to announce that the meeting – which had been scheduled to last until 7.30 p.m. – was closed. She did so, but most demonstrators and media reporters did not hear the message. Subsequently the riot police began dispersing the demonstration. Several people were arrested, including some of the leaders of the march.

Mr Frumkin maintains that he was arbitrarily arrested at 7 p.m., having heard police orders to disperse but being unable to immediately leave the area in the general commotion and having received no warning before being arrested. According to the Russian Government, he was arrested at 8.30 p.m. at Bolotnaya Square because he was obstructing the traffic and had disregarded the police order to move away. He was taken to a police station and, charged with the administrative offence of obstructing the traffic and disobeying lawful police orders, remained in police custody until 8 May 2012 when he was found guilty as charged and sentenced to 15 days' administrative detention. His appeals were rejected.

Relying on Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association), Mr Frumkin maintains that he was prevented from taking part in an authorised public assembly, complaining, in particular, about disruptive security measures at Bolotnaya Square, the early termination of the assembly and his arrest followed by his conviction of an administrative offence. He further complains of violations of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) and of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time), maintaining that his arrest and detention pending the administrative proceedings were arbitrary and unlawful, and that the administrative proceedings were not fair. Finally, he alleges violations of Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights), of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).

Kleyn v. Russia (no. 44925/06)

The applicant, Aleksandr Kleyn, is a Russian national who was born in 1969 and lived, prior to his conviction, in Chelyabinsk (Russia). The case concerns his complaints of unlawful detention and the lack of an enforceable right to compensation.

On 13 September 2001 Mr Kleyn was convicted of murder by a court comprising one professional judge and two lay judges and sentenced to 23 years' imprisonment. On 12 April 2002 the Supreme Court upheld his conviction on appeal.

In July 2004, Mr Kleyn lodged a supervisory-review complaint alleging that the lay judges who considered the case had been appointed in contravention of the applicable legislation. On 15 June 2005 the Presidium of the Supreme Court quashed the judgments of 13 September 2001 and 12 April 2002 holding that the lay judges had not been authorised to consider the case and that this affected the lawfulness of the conviction. The case was remitted to the Regional Court for re-consideration and Mr Kleyn was detained pending a new trial.

A preliminary hearing took place on 5 August 2005 at which Mr Kleyn requested his release arguing that he had already served over four years of the earlier imposed prison sentence making the further extension of his pre-trial detention unnecessary. The Regional Court held that the measure of preventive detention previously imposed should remain unchanged noting, in particular, that his remand in custody during the preliminary investigation was lawful and justified and that there were no grounds to replace it with a more lenient measure in view of the gravity of the charges and the character of the defendant. On 19 September 2005, the Regional Court found Mr Kleyn guilty as charged and sentenced him to 22 years and three months' imprisonment; the time already served being removed from the newly imposed sentence. The conviction was ultimately upheld by the Supreme Court on 13 October 2005.

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (a) and (c) (right to liberty and security), Mr Kleyn complains that he was unlawfully detained from 13 September 2001, when he was convicted for the first time, to 15 June 2005, when the judgment was quashed, and again pending the new trial between 15 June and 19 September 2005, when he was convicted for the second time. Finally, relying on Article 5 § 5 (right to compensation), Mr Kleyn complains that he was unable to receive compensation for his unlawful detention.

Manerov v. Russia (no. 49848/10)

The applicant, Aleksandr Manerov, is a Russian national who was born in 1963 and lives in Vladivostok (Russia). The case concerns his appeals against orders of pre-trial detention.

On 1 July 2009 Mr Manerov, a former military unit commander, was convicted of fraud by the Garrison Court and sentenced to four years' imprisonment. On 29 January 2010, the Fleet Court quashed his conviction on appeal and ordered a retrial holding that the custodial measure should continue until 1 April 2010 in view of the seriousness of the charges against him and the risk of his absconding and threatening a witness.

On 15 February 2010 the Garrison Court rejected Mr Manerov's application for release and informed him that the decision could be appealed within three days to the Fleet Court. On 26 March 2010 however the Fleet Court discontinued Mr Manerov's appeal on the basis that, in accordance with domestic law, the appeal was not amenable to a separate consideration before the final decision in the case.

In the meantime, by order dated 22 March 2010, the Garrison Court extended Mr Manerov's detention until 1 July 2010. A copy of the extension order was handed to him on 25 March 2010 after the three-day time limit-limit for lodging an appeal had expired. Mr Manerov lodged an appeal on 27 March 2010 and the Garrison Court renewed the time-limit for lodging the appeal. On 21 April 2010 the appeal was submitted to the Fleet Court for examination and on 23 April 2010 Mr Manerov was informed that a hearing would take place on that day. He requested an adjournment in light of the late notification, which was granted, and the appeal hearing was adjourned until 30 April 2010.

On 29 April 2010, the Garrison Court convicted Mr Manerov of nine counts of fraud committed in abuse of office and sentenced him to four years' imprisonment. On 30 April 2010, the Fleet Court upheld on appeal the custody order of 22 March 2010.

Relying on Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court) Mr Manerov complains that the examination of his appeal against the decision of 15 February 2010 rejecting his application for release had been discontinued and that the examination of his appeal against the custody order of 22 March 2010 had not been speedy.

Minikayev v. Russia (no. 630/08)

The applicant, Almaz Minikayev, is a Russian national who was born in 1981 and is serving a prison sentence in Bor in the Nizhniy Novgorod Region (Russia). The case concerns, in particular, his complaints of ill-treatment by the police and forced confession resulting in unfair criminal proceedings.

On 22 March 2005 Mr Minikayev was arrested during the course of a robbery. He alleges that he was assaulted by the police both at the scene and on the way to the police station. He alleges that once at the police station he was assaulted again, repeatedly questioned and threatened and that as a result he confessed to another robbery which had taken place on 30 December 2004. On 23 March 2005 Mr Minikayev was examined by a forensic medical expert who noted bruising, abrasions and haemorrhaging. She recorded Mr Minikayev's complaints of headaches and impaired vision and concluded that his injuries may have been caused by the impact of blunt objects at the time and in the circumstances he had described. The expert suggested further medical advice should be sought.

On 24 March 2005, the court authorised Mr Minikayev's pre-trial detention and he remained in custody pending trial. On the same day Mr Minikayev was questioned by the investigator in the presence of his lawyer and admitted his involvement in the robbery of 22 March 2005.

During the trial, however, Mr Minikayev revoked his confessions, alleging that he had not told the investigator about the ill-treatment and confessed to the robbery because he had been threatened and pressured by the police. On 30 December 2006, he was found guilty of two counts of robbery

and sentenced to eleven years' imprisonment. On 16 April 2007 the Regional Court upheld Mr Minikayev's conviction on appeal holding that his allegations that his confession had been extracted under coercion had been considered to be unsubstantiated by the trial court.

Following his arrest Mr Minikayev made a number of complaints of ill-treatment by the police to the District Prosecutor's Office who refused to institute criminal proceedings. On 27 September 2007 a senior investigator refused to institute criminal proceedings, basing his decision on the court judgment which had held Mr Minikayev's allegations to be unsubstantiated and made in an attempt to avoid criminal liability. Most recently, on 23 September 2009, a decision refusing to open a criminal investigation was upheld by the Regional Court.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security / entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial) and Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Mr Minikayev complains that his ill-treatment by the police resulted in his confessing to a crime and that there had been no effective investigation into his complaints. Furthermore, he complains that he was detained pending investigation and trial without relevant and sufficient reasons and that the criminal proceedings against him were unfair, in particular because his right not to incriminate himself had been violated.

Thursday 7 January 2016

Vrtar v. Croatia (no. 39380/13)

The applicant, Tena Vrtar, is a Croatian national who was born in 1998 and lives in Vinkovci (Croatia). She is represented in the proceedings before the Court by her mother Marina Mamić.

The case concerns a 13-year delay in payment of child maintenance.

In January 2001 Ms Vrtar's mother applied on behalf of her daughter to the Vinkovci Muncipal Court for enforcement of a judgment of September 1999 ordering Ms Vrtar's father to pay maintenance. In February 2003 a writ of execution was issued so that the maintenance could be taken from the father's salary and the writ was forwarded to his employer. The father appealed against the writ, arguing that he regularly paid child maintenance. Between that time and September 2007 the courts invited the mother on six occasions to specify to what extent the father had not complied with his obligation to pay child maintenance. The mother reiterated each time that the father did not pay the maintenance regularly and that she was therefore unable to keep record of the payments. A hearing was held in July 2010 and the court yet again invited the mother to specify the exact amount owed by the father and to suggest further steps to be taken in the proceedings. Eventually, in June 2012 the writ of execution of February 2003 became final when the father was instructed to bring separate civil proceedings to declare the enforcement inadmissible, thus putting the onus on him to prove to what extent he had complied with his obligations. Thus, maintenance started to be taken from the father's pension from January 2014 and the writ was carried out in full by November 2014.

In the meantime, in September 2011, there was another judgment against the father which increased the level of child maintenance stipulated in the judgment of September 1999. A writ of execution for enforcement of this judgment was subsequently issued, also ordering the maintenance to be taken from his pension, and by December 2013 all outstanding maintenance instalments had been paid.

In May 2011 Ms Vrtar's mother lodged a complaint on behalf of her daughter with the Varaždin County Court about the excessive length of the proceedings to enforce payment of the child maintenance. That court, and subsequently the Supreme Court in May 2012, found in Ms Vrtar's favour and awarded her approximately 1,070 euros compensation. Ultimately, the mother's constitutional complaint lodged against the Supreme Court's decision was declared inadmissible.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Ms Vrtar complains about the delay – more than 13 years – in enforcing the judgment ordering her father to pay child maintenance, alleging that the remedy she had used to complain about the delay was ineffective.

Bergmann v. Germany (no. 23279/14)

The applicant, Karl-Heinz Bergmann, is a German national who was born in 1943 and is currently detained in a centre for persons in preventive detention on the premises of Rosdorf Prison (Germany).

The case concerns Mr Bergmann's preventive detention which was retrospectively extended beyond the maximum period of ten years permissible at the time of his offences and conviction.

After a history of previous convictions, the Hanover Regional Court convicted Mr Bergmann, in April 1986, of two counts of attempted murder, combined with attempted rape in one case, and of two counts of dangerous assault. It sentenced him to 15 years' imprisonment and ordered his preventive detention. Relying on the assessment by two medical experts, it considered that he had a propensity to commit serious offences and that there was a high risk that if released he would again commit violent offences under the influence of alcohol.

After Mr Bergmann had served his full prison sentence and had subsequently spent ten years in preventive detention, the courts ordered the continuation of the measure at regular intervals. In 2013, the courts found that the requirements for a continuation of his preventive detention as laid down in the Introductory Act to the amended Criminal Code, as in force since 1 June 2013, were met. Namely, he suffered from a mental disorder and there was a high risk that he would commit serious sexually motivated offences if released. In October 2013 the Federal Constitutional Court declined to consider his constitutional complaint.

Since June 2013 Mr Bergmann has been detained in a new centre for persons in preventive detention. The detention regime in that centre was developed in order to comply with the constitutional requirement that preventive detention be distinguished from normal imprisonment, as lined out in a judgment of the Federal Constitutional Court of May 2011. In particular, in the centre persons in preventive detention are placed in individual apartment units and extensive possibilities for therapeutic treatment are offered.

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), Mr Bergmann complains that his right to liberty was breached by the court order extending his preventive detention beyond the maximum period of ten years permissible under the legal provisions applicable at the time of his offences and conviction. He further maintains that the retrospective extension of his preventive detention beyond the ten-year maximum period was in breach of Article 7 § 1 (no punishment without law).

Dāvidsons and Savins v. Latvia (nos. 17574/07 and 25235/07)

The applicants, Raitis Dāvidsons and Ruslans Savins, are Latvian nationals who were born in 1974 and 1980 and live in Vecumnieki and Riga (Latvia) respectively. The case concerns their allegation that the trial court which decided on criminal cases against them lacked impartiality.

Mr Dāvidsons was convicted of selling narcotics and providing unauthorised objects to prisoners in December 2005. Mr Savins was convicted of robbery and theft of personal identity documents in December 2006 and sentenced to eight years' prison.

In the ensuing appeal proceedings, both men complained that some of the judges on the bench of the trial court bench that had heard their criminal cases had, at an earlier stage of the proceedings against them, decided on their pre-trial detention. As concerned Mr Dāvidsons, he notably complained on appeal that a judge who was on the bench of the trial court which convicted him had chaired the panel of judges which had reviewed and upheld the decision to place him in pre-trial

detention on the ground that he might abscond during the investigation and trial. As concerned Mr Savins, he alleged during his appeal on points of law that the same three judges who were on the panel which examined his appeal in the criminal case against him had also taken part in the decision to detain him at the pre-trial stage. The complaints about the composition of the courts were ultimately dismissed by the Senate of the Supreme Court, in October 2006 and April 2007 respectively.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial / access to court), Mr Dāvidsons and Mr Savins allege that the composition of the trial courts in their cases was unlawful owing to the judges' prior involvement in the criminal proceedings against them.

Gerovska Popčevska v. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (no. 48783/07)
Jakšovski and Trifunovski v. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (nos. 56381/09 and 58738/09)
Poposki and Duma v. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (nos. 69916/10 and 36531/11)

The cases concerns the complaints by five judges that they were dismissed from office for professional misconduct

The applicants are Snežana Gerovska Popčevska, Goce Jakšovski, Miroslav Trifunovski, Ivo Poposki and Violeta Duma five Macedonian nationals who were born in 1954, 1959, 1946, 1963 and 1951, respectively. They live in Skopje, Ohrid and Tetovo.

The applicant in the first case was dismissed in March 2007 by the State Judicial Council (SJC) following its review of a civil case which she had adjudicated at first instance. The SJC notably found that Ms Gerovska Popčevska had wrongly applied procedural and material law in the case.

The applicants in the second case were dismissed by the SJC in December 2008 and February 2009, respectively. It was found that Mr Jakšovski had not been diligent in conducting proceedings in a civil case and that Mr Trifunovski had not been diligent in investigating the alleged suicide of a prisoner.

The applicants in the third case were dismissed by the SJC in December 2009 and June 2010, respectively. Mr Poposki was dismissed for violating the rules on legal representation of parties in a civil case which he had adjudicated. Ms Duma was dismissed on two grounds: first, because she had failed to determine the real identity of a convicted person in a criminal case which she had adjudicated and, second, because she had not withdrawn from another criminal case in which there was a possible conflict of interests.

All five applicants challenged their dismissals at second instance, namely before an appeal panel formed within the Supreme Court. All their appeals were dismissed. Ms Gerovska Popčevska and Ms Duma also lodged constitutional appeals, which were rejected on the ground that the Constitutional Court had no jurisdiction to review the lawfulness of the SJC's decision. Mr Trifunovski also challenged his dismissal via an administrative-dispute action, but his action was rejected as inadmissible.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), all five applicants essentially allege that the bodies which had considered their cases (namely the SJC and/or the Appeal Panel set up within the Supreme Court) were neither independent or impartial. Ms Gerovska Popčevska notably complained about the participation of the then President of the Supreme Court and Minister of Justice in the SJC's decision to dismiss her, alleging that both men had preconceived ideas about her case: the former on account of his participation in the Civil Division and plenary of the Supreme Court where he had voted for legal opinions which were unfavourable to her; and the latter, as Chairman of the State Anti-Corruption Commission, had triggered the proceedings against her and later, as member of the SJC, had voted in favour of her dismissal. The other four applicants all complain that members of the SJC who had instituted the proceedings against them subsequently took part in the SJC's

decision to dismiss them. The applicants in the second case – Mr Jakšovski and Mr Trifunovski – also complain that the Appeal Panel set up within the Supreme Court was composed of judges whose career was completely dependent on the SJC.

Andrey Zakharov v. Ukraine (no. 26581/06)

The applicant, Andrey Yevgenyevich Zakharov, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1954 and is serving a 15-year prison sentence in Gorodyshche Town (Ukraine) following his conviction in May 2005 of having forcefully held three people in his house, resulting in the death of two of them.

The case concerns Mr Zakharov's allegation that, during and after his arrest in February 2004, he was physically and psychologically ill-treated by the police into making self-incriminating statements. Notably, he admitted to having agreed to keep a man at his house from July to August 2003, who was subsequently released, and then from September 2003 a man and a woman in his basement, who both died in November 2003 because of the cold and who he buried in his backyard. As a result of his confession, Mr Zakharov had criminal proceedings brought against him and his detention pending trial was ordered.

During the ensuing investigation Mr Zakharov confirmed his statements on two occasions, but then – on changing lawyers – denied all his earlier statements, first stating that he had been in a state of shock when making them and then alleging that he had been ill-treated by three police officers. In July 2004 the investigator refused to institute a criminal investigation into the allegations of police ill-treatment; Mr Zakharov did not appeal that decision.

The pre-trial investigation was completed in September 2008 and Mr Zakharov was indicted on the grounds that he was part of an organised group which was involved in flat fraud. Mr Zakharov's role was to keep the flat owners in his house, in return for payment, to prevent them from hindering the illegal sale of their flats and this had resulted in two of the victims dying from the cold in his basement. The trial started in February 2005 and, after having heard a number of witnesses including Mr Zakharov and his girlfriend, the investigator, experts and the other man who had been held in Mr Zakharov's house and who had been released, the Kyiv Court of Appeal convicted him and sentenced him to 15 years' imprisonment. His conviction and sentence were upheld by the Supreme Court in December 2005.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Zakharov complains that he was ill-treated by the police and that his allegation had not been investigated. Further relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) and (d) (right to a fair trial / right to legal assistance of own choosing / right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses), he makes a number of complaints about the quality of the services of the lawyers who represented him, the alleged lack of impartiality of the judges who decided on his case and their failure to call and question certain witnesses. Lastly, he complains under Article 34 (right of individual petition) that, in May 2007, the Kyiv Court of Appeal refused to send him certain documents from his case file which the European Court had asked him to provide following the lodging of his application.

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.

Theodhosi v. Albania (no. 75175/13)
Deyanov v. Bulgaria (no. 10054/08)
Hristov v. Bulgaria (no. 13300/10)
Švandrlík and Others v. the Czech Republic (nos. 70389/11, 28478/12, 17936/13, 29908/13, and 13170/15)

B.M. and Others v. Denmark (no. 4346/12)
H.H. v. Denmark (no. 9624/14)
K.K. and F.R. v. Denmark (no. 18136/14)
L.K. and Others v. Denmark (no. 53757/14)
M.A. and K.M. v. Denmark (no. 17913/14)
S.H.N. and M.N. v. Denmark (no. 16359/14)
Valkeajarvi v. Finland (no. 34015/14)
Davitashvili v. Georgia (no. 11182/10)
Georgakis v. Greece (no. 40279/14)
Karahalios v. Greece (no. 46979/11)
Kartelis and Others v. Greece (no. 53077/13)
Kekelidze v. Greece (no. 5478/15)
Kyvelou v. Greece (no. 9750/12)
Louli-Georgopoulou and Others v. Greece (nos. 28471/10, 35267/11, 44851/11, and 66773/11)
Mirza v. Greece (no. 11961/15)
Papadimas v. Greece (no. 11609/15)
Popiashvili v. Greece (no. 9392/15)
Semigdalas and Others v. Greece (nos. 77155/12, 63070/13, 73318/13, 28679/14, 31582/14, 31593/14, 45258/14, 52347/14, 52925/14, and 55101/14)
Stamatiadis v. Greece (no. 12830/15)
Valakos v. Greece (no. 33054/12)
Bakos and Others v. Hungary (nos. 29644/13, 31766/13, 32647/13, 33213/13, 62914/13, 64329/13, 18212/14, and 20263/14)
Bóday and Others v. Hungary (nos. 53398/13, 54330/13, 55601/13, 56806/13, 65103/13, 18201/14, 21840/14, 22180/14, 22958/14, and 23555/14)
Juhász and Others v. Hungary (nos. 6467/13, 31957/13, 33715/13, 44029/13, 44056/13, 45122/13, 64543/13, 593/14, 597/14, 1384/14)
Magyar and Others v. Hungary (nos. 16599/12, 29759/12, 34757/12, 45132/12, 45141/12, 69916/12, 73694/12, 46646/13, 56700/13, 57386/13, and 58862/13)
Tamási and Others v. Hungary (nos. 65853/13, 66364/13, 67136/13, 67607/13, 69003/13, 71318/13, 71359/13, 71523/13, 72597/13, and 79737/13)
Antignano and Others v. Italy (nos. 49403/07, 21396/08, 21401/08, 61106/08, 61117/08, 61650/08, 61944/08, 61955/08, 61962/08, 61966/08, 61971/08, 61973/08, 61975/08, 61979/08, 61982/08, 61984/08, 1155/09, and 17466/09)
Dell'Anna v. Italy (no. 50521/13)
Fischetto and Forte v. Italy (no. 25113/06)
Florio and Luti v. Italy (nos. 28845/08 and 39609/08)
L&R Leasing e Rappresentanze Snc and Others v. Italy (nos. 5380/10, 23363/10, 23368/10, 23370/10, 23373/10, 23375/10, 23383/10, 23387/10, 23388/10, 23389/10, 23390/10, 23393/10, 23397/10, 23400/10, 23402/10, 23405/10, 23406/10, 23409/10, 23410/10, 46768/10, and 53234/10)
Massimo and Others v. Italy (nos. 73053/11, 73057/11, 12360/12, 20097/12, 20129/12, and 30978/12)
Jevdokimovs v. Latvia (no. 28135/07)
Camilleri v. Malta (no. 20671/13)
Gardocki v. Poland (no. 53811/13)
Pawelec v. Poland (no. 73643/10)
Tarlecki v. Poland (no. 24594/12)
Al-Barri and Others v. Romania (nos. 6742/06, 60147/08, 46126/09, 24244/10, 60878/11, 65260/11, 3067/12, 42017/12, 66696/12, 20642/13, 38434/13, 568/14, and 569/14)
Cupetiu v. Romania (no. 72795/13)

Daianu and Fischer v. Romania (no. 41251/04)
Mailat v. Romania (no. 3095/14)
Păşcoi and Others v. Romania (nos. 8675/06, 60826/10, 27616/11, 67634/11, 74155/13, 1152/14, 10538/14 and 41786/14)
Cristiana-Crenguța Radu and Others v. Romania (nos. 26349/11, 3636/13, 36931/14, 40636/14, 45232/14, 51081/14, 53248/14, 58195/14, and 65134/14)
Kibizov v. Russia (no. 13755/11)
Kuriyev and Others v. Russia (nos. 8542/07, 51680/07, 25968/08, and 44302/08)
Povarnitsina v. Russia (no. 44387/10)
Stribul v. Russia (no. 8508/05)
Urakov and Menshchikov v. Russia (nos. 52122/10 and 33874/11)
Yemelin v. Russia (no. 56685/11)
Ivanović and Others v. Serbia (no. 77268/13 and 38 other applications)
Katić and Others v. Serbia (no. 76895/13 and 39 other applications)
Holanova v. Slovakia (no. 76324/14)
Kohutek and Kohutekova v. Slovakia (no. 32970/13)
Snopko v. Slovakia (no. 5317/14)
Tudor v. Slovakia (no. 4716/15)
Pshenkina v. Sweden (no. 7528/15)
W.N. v. Switzerland (no. 56069/14)
Janev and Others v. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (nos. 13847/11, 72402/14, and 12296/15)
Pehčevska and Others v. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (nos. 17900/15, 18389/15, 23984/15, and 27798/15)
Ari v. Turkey (no. 3584/10)
Bilici and Others v. Turkey (no. 31139/10 and 69 other applications)
Caliskan v. Turkey (no. 47936/11)
Dagtekin v. Turkey (no. 43452/12)
Deniz and Others v. Turkey (nos. 56702/10, 65791/10, 65795/10, 39243/11, 39246/11, 40190/11, 43206/11, 43213/11, 43216/11, 43221/11, 43222/11, 43223/11, and 43226)
Simsek v. Turkey (no. 55125/11)
Yildirim and Others v. Turkey (nos. 58268/10, 60913/10, and 61939/10)
Zengin v. Turkey (no. 41585/10)
Gorodnichenko and Others v. Ukraine (no. 79754/12 and 115 other applications)
Kushinskaya and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 42326/05, 45610/07, 20358/08, 25243/08, 43804/08, 32697/09, 17310/10, 50961/10, 34222/11, 65235/13, and 2949/15)
Vladimir Sklyarov v. Ukraine (no. 6379/12)
Stryelka and Others v. Ukraine (no. 69256/12 and 81 other applications)
Zhuravlyev and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 2710/07, 55487/08, 30782/09, 240/10, 17415/10, 28882/10, 60462/10, 12037/11, 63079/12, 73059/14, and 5405/15)
G.H. v. the United Kingdom (no. 11727/12)

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

Tracey Turner-Tretz (tel: + 33 3 88 41 35 30)

Nina Salomon (tel: + 33 3 90 21 49 79)
Denis Lambert (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 09)
Inci Ertekin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 55 30)

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.