

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 13 judgments on Tuesday 5 May 2026 and 17 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 7 May 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 5 May 2026

[Kefalas and Others v. Greece \(application no. 8759/14\)](#)

The seven applicants are Greek nationals who were born between 1927 and 1982. They live in Athens.

The case concerns increases in the share capital of the company of which the applicants were shareholders which were decided after the company had come within the purview of Law no. 1363/1983.

Relying on Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights, and on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the European Convention, the applicants complain that it was impossible for them to challenge these increases in the courts and obtain compensation for the damage allegedly sustained.

[Lárus Welding v. Iceland \(no. 24999/21\)](#)

The applicant, Lárus Welding, is an Icelandic national who was born in 1976 and lives in Reykjavík.

The case concerns the system for selecting expert lay judges in Iceland. In December 2015 Mr Welding was convicted at first instance on charges of fraud. The case was heard by a panel of two professional judges and one expert lay judge. The same expert lay judge was selected for Mr Welding's re-trial after the first judgment was quashed; he requested her recusal, which was rejected. Mr Welding's conviction was upheld in June 2020.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, Mr Welding alleges that the legal framework that governed the selection and appointment of the expert lay judge on his case cast doubt over the independence of the bench. He alleges in particular that the expert lay judge's repeated appointments by the same presiding judge gave the impression that she had been selected for the re-trial based on her views in the previous proceedings against him.

[Gerovska-Popchevska v. North Macedonia \(no. 2\) \(no. 30989/20\)](#)

The applicant, Snezhana Gerovska-Popchevska, is a Macedonian/citizen of the Republic of North Macedonia who was born in 1954 and lives in Skopje.

Ms Gerovska-Popchevska was dismissed in 2007 from office as a first-instance judge by the State Judicial Council ("the SJC"). She complained to the European Court which, in 2016, found a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention. The current case concerns the reopened proceedings, after the Court's 2016 judgment, for professional misconduct against Ms Gerovska-Popchevska, who has since retired. In 2020 the SJC again found that she had acted unprofessionally in adjudicating a civil case. Her appeal against the SJC decision was ultimately rejected as inadmissible.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Ms Gerovska Popčevska complains about the SJC's composition when it adopted the decision finding professional misconduct on her part, and that it did not have jurisdiction to give a ruling on professional misconduct against retired judges. She also complains about the impossibility to appeal against the SJC's decision following the remittal of her case.

[Z.A. and K.S. v. Türkiye \(no. 36449/17\)](#)

The applicant, Mr Z.A, is a Kyrgyzstani national who was born in 1973. The applicant, Mr K.S., is a Russian national who was born in 1988. They both moved to Türkiye because of an alleged risk of persecution in Tajikistan (Mr Z.A) and in Russia (Mr K.S.) on account of their religious and political opinions.

The case concerns their detention in various facilities in 2014 for approximately five and four months, respectively, in the context of immigration detention. They have since been released and live in Türkiye. They both complained to the Constitutional Court about the conditions and the alleged unlawfulness of their detention. While Mr. Z.A.'s claims were unsuccessful, Mr. K.S. obtained redress for his complaints except for those relating to his detention in the Yalova police headquarters.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants allege inadequate conditions of detention and a lack of effective remedies at national level to bring that complaint. Mr Z.A. also relies on Article 5 §§ 1, 2 and 4 (right to liberty and security), alleging that his detention pending deportation was unlawful, that he was not promptly informed of the reasons for that detention, that he had no effective remedy to challenge its lawfulness and that he did not have an enforceable right to compensation under national law for the breach of his rights.

Thursday 7 May 2026

[Jurić v. Croatia \(no. 51771/21\)](#)

The applicant, Vanessa Jurić, is a Croatian national who was born in 1982 and lives in Rijeka (Croatia).

The case concerns the taking of the applicant's land, on which an unclassified access road was built in the 1970s and covered with asphalt in 2000, pursuant to the 2011 Roads Act. The 2011 Roads Act transferred such roads into the ownership of local authorities.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Ms Jurić complains that the manner in which the national courts calculated the statutory limitation period in the civil proceedings she brought against the town of Rijeka seeking compensation for unjust enrichment, was unforeseeable and resulted in a breach of her right of access to a court and in her being deprived of her property without compensation. She also complains that, when dismissing her compensation claim as time-barred, the national courts ordered her to reimburse the town of Rijeka for its litigation costs.

[Konstantinou v. Cyprus \(no. 36862/23\)](#)

The applicant, Kostas Konstantinou, is a Cypriot national who was born in 1968 and lives in Limassol (Cyprus).

The case concerns the alleged lack of judicial review available to Mr Konstantinou in respect of a decision refusing to promote him to the post of district court president.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), Mr Konstantinou complains that he had no access to a court to challenge the allegedly arbitrary decision of the transitional Supreme Council of Judicature

(SCJ) and that the Supreme Constitutional Court (SCC) failed to act as an impartial tribunal, as the SCC judges who dismissed his complaint were, in their majority, the same judges who decided, as members of the transitional SCJ, not to promote him.

[Şener v. Poland \(no. 53371/18\)](#)

The applicant, Adin Şener, is a Turkish national who was born in 1971 and died in 2024. He entered Poland in 1989 and later married a Polish national, with whom he had a daughter, born in 2001. His daughter is pursuing the case in his stead.

The case concerns Mr Şener's expulsion on the grounds of national security. He had lived in Poland on temporary residence permits which had been repeatedly renewed, and ran a small business. His last temporary residence permit was issued in 2015. In July 2016, on his way back to Poland from a holiday in Türkiye, Mr Şener was stopped at the Turkish-Bulgarian border and refused entry to the Schengen area, despite his temporary residence permit for Poland still being valid. The Bulgarian authorities informed him that his name was on the Register of Undesirable Foreigners. In reply to his applications, the Polish authorities informed him that his entry in the Register had been made on grounds of national security and refused to disclose the underlying information, stating that it was secret. His attempts before the Polish authorities and courts to have his name removed from that Register were unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 7 (procedural safeguards relating to expulsion of aliens) and on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complained that he had never been informed about the reasons for his expulsion.

[Batou v. Switzerland \(no. 30781/22\)](#)

The applicant is a Swiss national who was born in 1994. In 2019 the collective of which she was a member was given authorisation to organise a night-time demonstration in Geneva on International Women's Day. As the appointed organiser, she was informed of the conditions attached to this authorisation and of the fact that she would be held personally liable in the event of non-compliance. The case concerns her conviction for failure to comply with these conditions. The domestic courts found, in particular, that the security team she had set up had been ineffective in the face of disruptions caused by the demonstrators.

The applicant submits that her conviction infringed her rights under Articles 6 (right to a fair trial), 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of assembly and association).

[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 5 May 2026

Name	Main application number
Bitraj v. Albania	10024/17
Metalla v. Albania	19646/20
Agayev v. Azerbaijan	6655/19
Mammadov v. Azerbaijan	22252/16
Poulsen v. Denmark	34232/24
Aravantinos v. Greece	3922/19

