



## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing two judgments on Tuesday 6 January 2026 and 50 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 8 January 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](http://www.echr.coe.int)).*

### Tuesday 6 January 2026

#### [Altiner Akıncı v. Türkiye \(application no. 9570/23\)](#)

The applicant, Yasemin Altiner Akıncı, is a Turkish national who was born in 1973 and lives in Muğla (Türkiye).

The case concerns compulsory sports arbitration proceedings. Ms Altiner Akıncı is a professional beach volleyball referee. Invitations issued to her in 2021 and 2022 to referee in two international competitions were withdrawn as the Central Referee and Observer Committee of the Turkish Volleyball Association had not included her in the list of referees eligible to referee matches in such competitions. Proceedings brought by Ms Altiner Akıncı before the Sports Arbitration Board of the Ministry of Sports challenging those decisions were unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant alleges a breach of her right to a fair hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, a lack of sufficient judicial review and an unjustified interference with her right to exercise her profession.

#### [Yokuşlu v. Türkiye \(no. 489/24\)](#)

The applicant, Kutay Yokuşlu, is a Turkish national who was born in 1999 and lives in İzmir (Türkiye).

The case concerns a dispute between the applicant, a professional football player, and the Board of Directors of the Turkish Football Federation (TFF) about the revocation of a contract termination notice. Mr Yokuşlu's lawyer mistakenly filed a contract termination notice on behalf of Mr Yokuşlu with the TFF in early July 2023, but then, together with the Football Club, sought to retract the termination notice, submitting that it had been sent to the TFF by mistake. The Board of Directors of the TFF rejected Mr Yokuşlu's request. Proceedings brought by the applicant before the Arbitration Committee of the TFF challenging the Board of Directors' decision were unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial/access to court) of the European Convention, the applicant complains that the Arbitration Committee lacked independence and impartiality and failed to render a reasoned decision in his case. Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, he alleges that the refusal to revoke the termination notice had had serious consequences on his private and family life.

### Thursday 8 January 2026

#### [Ferrieri and Bonassisa v. Italy \(nos. 40607/19 and 34583/20\)](#)

The applicants, Mr M. Ferrieri and Mrs O. Bonassisa, live in Cerignola (Italy) and were born in 1965 and 1977 respectively. Ms Bonassisa is an accountant.

The case concerns measures implemented by the Tax Authority (*Agenzia delle Entrate*) for tax audit purposes, including access to and the examination of the applicants' banking data, bank account information, transaction histories, and details of other financial operations either related to the applicants or traceable to them.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private life), taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention, Mr Ferrieri and Ms Bonassisa complain that the national legislation gave the authorities excessive scope to decide on access to taxpayers' banking data. They also complain of the lack of sufficient procedural safeguards to protect them against any abuse or arbitrariness, in particular the lack of judicial or independent review of the contested measures.

#### [Finanziaria d'investimento Fininvest S.p.A. and Berlusconi v. Italy \(nos. 23538/14 and 23554/14\)](#)

The applicants are Finanziaria d'investimento Fininvest S.p.A. ("the applicant company"), a company incorporated under Italian law with its registered office in Rome, and Silvio Berlusconi, an Italian national who was chair of the applicant company's board of directors and its legal representative until 1994. Mr Berlusconi having died in 2023, his successors expressed their wish to pursue the proceedings before the Court.

The case concerns two applications lodged by the applicant company and Mr Berlusconi, respectively, originating in the same facts.

Application no. 23538/14 concerns the merits and the outcome of civil proceedings brought against the applicant company by CIR S.p.A. (Compagnie Industriali Riunite), seeking compensation for the damage that had resulted from the bribing of a judge who had taken part in the adjudication of a dispute between the two parties. CIR S.p.A. joined the proceedings before the Court as a third party.

Application no. 23554/14 concerns a number of statements made by the domestic courts, during the same set of civil proceedings, on the subject of Mr Berlusconi's liability for bribery.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) of the Convention, the applicant company complains that the principle of *res judicata* was breached in the aforementioned civil proceedings; that the case was assigned to a court which, in its view, was not established by law; that it lacked access to the Court of Cassation in respect of a particular point of law; that the domestic courts disregarded statements given by two witnesses during the civil proceedings; that it was found liable on the basis of a set of suppositions and in breach of the principle of equality of arms; and that the judgment on points of law did not give reasons with regard to the costs of the proceedings.

Under Article 6, Mr Berlusconi complains of an infringement of his right to be presumed innocent, alleging that liability for bribery was attributed to him by the civil courts, even though the criminal proceedings against him had been discontinued.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol no. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant company complains that its right to peaceful enjoyment of its possessions was infringed on account of the allegedly arbitrary and disproportionate compensation it was ordered to pay.

#### [Tafzi El Hadri and El Idrissi Mouch v. Spain \(no. 7557/23\)](#)

The applicants, Khalil Tafzi El Hadri and Omar El Idrissi Mouch, are Spanish nationals who were born in 1966 and 1969, respectively. Mr Tafzi El Hadri lives in Hospitalet de Llobregat (Spain), while Mr El Idrissi Mouch lives in Brussels.

Both applicants were social educators at a residential centre for minors in Barcelona. In September 2011 a best-selling national newspaper (*ABC*) published an article about radicalisation of minors in

its online and print editions. The article was entitled “Centres for minors, seedbeds for fundamentalism”, referring to the centre where the applicants worked and citing their names. The case concerns the civil claim for defamation the applicants subsequently brought against the newspaper, which was ultimately dismissed by the courts in 2022.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants allege that the national courts failed to strike a fair balance between protecting their reputation and ensuring freedom of the press. They complain in particular that the journalist had not properly checked the facts concerning them before publishing the article and that the courts had not looked at the impact of the publication on their professional lives or the possibility of it encouraging Islamophobia.

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.

Thursday 8 January 2026

Name	Main application number
K.P. v. Belgium	8643/24
Čavar v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	953/24
Georgiev v. Bulgaria	31792/22
Zovak v. Croatia	19894/21
L.T. v. the Czech Republic	22850/24
Mullis v. the Czech Republic	16273/22
Klein v. Denmark	5855/25
Boivin v. France	39321/19
Kameneff and Others v. France	40592/23
Buknicz v. Hungary	7767/25
Rácz and Others v. Hungary	12257/25
Turi and Others v. Hungary	7357/25
Zöldi v. Hungary	46862/22
Biondi v. Italy	3072/24
Canzoniero and Others v. Italy	18692/23
Istituto diocesano per il Sostentamento del Clero di Capua v. Italy	73174/17
Paparella v. Italy	40608/19
Saiseb Tor di Valle S.r.l. v. Italy	14005/16
Svirplys and Latvys v. Lithuania	9195/23
A.H. and Others v. Monaco	48995/22
Isa v. North Macedonia	25431/23
Borkowski v. Poland	39104/23
I.A. and Others v. Poland	53181/21
Kierczyński v. Poland	4732/24
Kos and Others v. Poland	47707/20
Lamenta v. Poland	14681/22
Leśniewski v. Poland	18756/23
Ostrowski and Gągorowski v. Poland	37221/20

Name	Main application number
Szamotołski and Others v. Poland	18383/22
Bătu and Others v. Romania	17624/22
Bonciu and Others v. Romania	24267/21
Căpătoiu and Others v. Romania	38588/16
M.C. v. Romania	19536/22
Năstase and Others v. Romania	34429/22
Magát and Čmiľanský v. Slovakia	37522/24
Petejová and Pjonteková v. Slovakia	18062/22
X and Others v. Sweden	34685/23
Can v. Türkiye	27025/23
Güner v. Türkiye	28912/20
Chornodubravskyy and Others v. Ukraine	12982/24
Iov and Others v. Ukraine	33442/24
Nedybalyuk v. Ukraine	17279/25
Ostrovskyy and Others v. Ukraine	13789/20
Sarkisyan v. Ukraine	1923/19
Skrypnyk and Andreyev v. Ukraine	9139/24
Vityuk and Others v. Ukraine	29659/23
Zholinskyy v. Ukraine	12577/20

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](http://www.echr.coe.int).

Follow the Court on Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int), X [ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH), [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/company/echr), and [YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCk1jW1W1W1W1W1W1W1W1W1).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrpress@echr.coe.int) to subscribe to the press-release mailing list.

Where can the Court's press releases be found? [HUDOC - Press collection](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/press)

#### Press contacts

[echrpress@echr.coe.int](mailto:echrpress@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)

Jane Swift (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 29 04)

Claire Windsor (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 24 01)

**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.