

PRESS RELEASE

FORTHCOMING JUDGMENTS AND DECISIONS

ECHR 236 (2026) 01.10.2026

Press release issued by the Registrar of the Court



The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 15 judgments on Tuesday 6 October 2026 and 99 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 8 October 2026.

Press releases and texts of the judgments and decisions will be available at 10 a.m. (C.E.T.) on the Court's Internet site (www.echr.coe.int).

Tuesday 6 October 2026

Daci v. Albania (application no. 5232/24)

The applicant, Luan Daci, is an Albanian national who was born in 1957 and lives in Tirana.

The case concerns Mr Daci's conviction for falsifying a document. In February 2017 Mr Daci applied to become a member of one of the bodies responsible for vetting serving judges and prosecutors. In June 2017 he was appointed as a member of the Special Appeals Chamber. In 2020 criminal proceedings were opened against him on charges of falsifying a form as he had not mentioned in his application that he had been dismissed as a judge in 1997. During the investigation the offence was reclassified as the criminal offence of falsifying a document, and in December 2020 Mr Daci was found guilty of that offence. His appeals were unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 7 (no punishment without law) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Daci complains that his conduct did not amount to the criminal offence for which he had been charged and that such characterisation of his actions was not foreseeable.

Kuliçi v. Albania (no. 35801/23)

The applicant, Albert Kuliçi, is an Albanian national who was born in 1984 and lives in Tirana.

In 2020 Mr Kuliçi, a prosecutor, applied for the position of head of a prosecution office. Another candidate was ultimately appointed to the post, having been awarded the most points during the recruitment procedure. Mr Kuliçi brought proceedings before the Administrative Court of Appeal, arguing that the successful candidate lacked the required work experience and managerial skills and contesting the scoring methodology. In 2022 the Administrative Court dismissed his appeal for lack of standing. The Supreme Court upheld that dismissal, and the Constitutional Court dismissed a complaint by the applicant as not raising any constitutional questions.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial/access to court) of the European Convention, Mr Kuliçi complains about the dismissal of his complaint for lack of standing.

Anar Mammadov v. Azerbaijan (nos. 12043/19 and 50484/20)

The applicant, Anar Shahin oglu Mammadov, is an Azerbaijani national who was born in 1979 and lives in Baku. Mr Mammadov is a journalist and the chief editor of the news website criminal.az.

On 3 July 2018 an assassination attempt was made on the head of the Ganja City Executive Authority, leaving him and his bodyguard seriously injured. The incident was followed by riots in Ganja during which two police officers were killed. Between 3 and 5 July 2018 Mr Mammadov published several articles discussing the possible causes of the assassination attempt. Criminal proceedings were brought against him in respect of those articles, and a seizure operation was carried out in his flat. By a final judgment of 25 February 2020, Mr Mammadov was convicted of, among other things, disseminating open calls against the State.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private life), 10 (freedom of expression), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 18 (limitation on use of restriction on rights) of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, Mr Mammadov complains about the seizure operation carried out in his flat and the inspection of data stored on his mobile telephones and argues that his criminal conviction amounted to a violation of his right to freedom of expression.

Patsaka - Christidou v. Greece (no. 30258/24)

The applicant, Olga Patsaka-Christidou, is a Greek national who was born in 1939 and lives in Kavala (Greece). She is a former court clerk.

In 2010 Ms Patsaka-Christidou's pension was reduced and she lodged an objection with the Pension Assessment Review Committee. The Committee did not issue an express decision on her objection and in 2013 the Committee was abolished. The law abolishing the Committee provided that objections pending before it at the time it was abolished were deemed to have been tacitly refused. Ms Patsaka-Christidou appealed to the Court of Audit, but it was rejected on the basis that her appeal before the Committee had already been tacitly refused prior to its abolishment.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial/access to court), Ms Patsaka-Christidou complains of a violation of her right of access to a court owing to the abolition of the administrative Committee and the refusal of the Court of Audit to adjudicate her case on the merits. Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 she complains that she had been unlawfully deprived of part of her pension owing to the administrative act amending her pension and the subsequent failure to examine her case on the merits.

Kostov v. Hungary (no. 7869/25)

The applicant, Norbert Kostov, is a Slovak national who was born in 1978.

The case concerns Mr Kostov's pre-trial detention. In 2018 a criminal investigation was opened in Hungary into a double murder. On 24 July 2020 Mr Kostov was arrested in by the Slovak authorities under a European Arrest Warrant in connection with those murders and handed over to the Hungarian authorities. On 26 July 2020 the Buda Central District Court ordered that Mr Kostov be remanded in detention, finding that he posed a risk of flight and that there was a risk he would tamper with evidence or reoffend. His pre-trial detention was extended on multiple occasions until he was convicted as charged on 2 April 2025.

Relying on Article 5 § 3 (entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial), Mr Kostov complains that the courts had not given relevant and sufficient reasons for keeping him in custody and that his pre-trial detention had exceeded the "reasonable time" requirement under the Convention.

Réka Kiss and Others v. Hungary (nos. 8412/23 and 33159/23)

The applicants are Réka Kiss and Beáta Kiss-Berta, two Hungarian nationals who were born in 1993 and 1977 respectively and who live in Budapest, and two Hungarian organisations, Teachers' Trade

Union (Pedagógusok Szakszervezete) and Teachers' Democratic Trade Union (Pedagógusok Demokratikus Szakszervezete). Ms Kiss and Ms Kiss-Berta were both teachers at the material time.

The case concerns complaints by the applicants about an Act enacted in May 2022 which imposed a minimum level of service to be provided in the public education sector during strikes. In September 2022 Ms Kiss lodged a constitutional complaint, arguing that certain sections of the Act were unconstitutional as they defined the minimum services in a disproportionately broad way, thus rendering any strike impossible. Her complaint was declared inadmissible on the grounds that she had not been directly concerned by the provisions in question. In November 2022 Ms Kiss-Berta and the two applicant organisations lodged a constitutional complaint, arguing that the Act did not conform with the right to strike under Hungarian law. The complaint was rejected as having already been decided.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing/access to a court), Ms Kiss-Berta and the two applicant organisations complain that the enactment of the 2022 Act had prevented any examination by the courts of the terms of the minimum services that had to be provided during a strike and had resulted in a breach of their right of access to a court. Relying on Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association), all the applicants complained that the adoption of the 2022 Act had violated their right to freedom of assembly.

Baybasin v. the Netherlands (no. 2) (no. 36384/22)

The applicant, Mr Hüseyin Baybasin, is a Turkish national who was born in 1956 and is detained in Lelystad (the Netherlands).

The case concerns a strip search that was randomly carried out on Mr Baybasin, who is serving a sentence of life imprisonment, after a visit from his lawyer. At the time, he was incarcerated at De Schie Prison in Rotterdam.

Mr Baybasin alleges that the strip search violated his rights under Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

Veldsink-Schoonbeek and Veldsink v. the Netherlands (no. 26337/22)

The applicants, Dina Schoonbeek and Albert Johan Veldsink, are Dutch nationals who were born in 1962 and 1968 respectively and live in Dedemsvaart (the Netherlands).

The case concerns the compensation received by the applicants for legal expenses incurred from successfully appealing an order to remove modular building units from their plot of land because they had been installed in contravention of the town's zoning plan. The compensation was calculated on the basis of a flat rate for legal expenses in administrative proceedings.

Relying on Article 6 (access to court) of the Convention, the applicants allege that this type of compensation breached their right of access to a court, as the actual legal expenses incurred had been much higher.

Pavlović v. Serbia (no. 42160/21)

The applicant, Robert Pavlović is a Serbian national who was born in 2006 and lives in Valjevo (Serbia). He belongs to the Roma ethnic group.

The case concerns an assault on him when he was a child and the ensuing investigation into his allegations of ill-treatment. In July 2016 Mr Pavlović, who was nine years old at the time, was assaulted by a man he did not know in front of a municipal administrative building. Criminal proceedings were opened and a lawyer who worked for the municipality was identified as a suspect. In October 2016 the prosecutor's office decided to defer the criminal proceedings against the suspect contingent on his paying a contribution to the State flood relief fund (known as the principle of opportunity). He did so and the criminal proceedings against him were discontinued. In 2021 the Constitutional Court ordered the payment of 300 euros to Mr Pavlović in respect of non-pecuniary damage. While it held that the principle of opportunity was compatible with the Constitution, children, being a vulnerable group, required special protection and the decision to discontinue the

criminal proceedings had breached Mr Pavlović's rights. Mr Pavlović and his sister were subsequently awarded 850 euros each in civil proceedings, but their allegations of discrimination were dismissed.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) and Article 1 of Protocol no. 12 (general prohibition of discrimination), Mr Pavlović complains that no effective investigation had been carried out into the assault and that he had been subjected to discrimination.

Makovac and Latin v. Slovenia (nos. 15525/23 and 15532/23)

The applicants, Franka Makovac and Michael Latin, are Croatian nationals who were born in 1974 and 1985, respectively. They both live in Savudrija (Croatia).

The applicants are commercial fishing workers.

In 2018 and 2020 they were fined by the Slovenian authorities: Ms Makovac for illegally crossing a border; and Mr Latin for commercial fishing in Slovenian waters without the required permit and for failing to comply with a fisheries inspector's order to stop his vessel. The case concerns their complaints about the alleged unfairness of the proceedings in their case.

The two applications in the case belong to a group of over 800 applications against Slovenia.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (right to a fair trial), the applicants complain that they did not have an oral hearing, even though dispensing with such a hearing had not been justified, and that they were unable to examine witnesses against them and witnesses on their behalf. They also complain that they were not informed of some of the evidence on which their charges and ensuing convictions had been based, and that they were therefore unable to effectively mount a defence.

Müyesser Uğur v. Türkiye (no. 45738/22)

The applicant, Müyesser Uğur, is a Turkish national who was born in 1963 and lives in Ankara. She is an investigative journalist.

The case concerns Ms Uğur's pre-trial detention for almost five months in 2020 on charges of disclosing confidential information relating to State security. She had published six articles on a news website *odativ.com* criticising the deployment in 2019 of Turkish troops to Libya following a military agreement between the two Governments. In one article she had named the Turkish commander designated to coordinate the military operation in Libya, also providing details on his military career, region of origin and language skills. According to the latest information available, the criminal proceedings against Ms Uğur are still ongoing.

Relying on Articles 5 (right to liberty and security) and 10 (freedom of expression), she complains that the reasons for her pre-trial detention were linked to her publications and telephone conversations with a journalistic source. She also argues that the courts should have weighed in the balance press freedom, bearing in mind that disclosure of certain State secrets played a significant role in a democratic society.

Sanlav v. Türkiye (no. 44572/22)

The case concerns the circumstances surrounding the death of a prisoner, who was found hanged in his cell in Van Prison on 17 November 2014.

The applicants are six Turkish nationals who live in Van (Türkiye). They are the deceased's parents, widow and three brothers.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), they complain that the authorities failed to take the necessary measures to protect their relative's life and to conduct an effective investigation into the circumstances of his death.

Mouzin v. France (no. 15353/19)

The applicant, Eric Mouzin, is a French national who was born in 1955 and lives in Montesson (France).

The case concerns the effectiveness of the investigation into the disappearance on 9 January 2003 of the applicant's daughter, Estelle Mouzin, on her way home from school. She was 9 years old at the time. Her body was never found.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), the applicant alleges that the judicial investigation into the circumstances of his daughter's disappearance was ineffective. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), he complains about the length of the proceedings and about the judicial authorities' inaction in addressing the shortcomings in the investigation. Lastly, he submits under Article 13 that no effective remedy was available to him.

Vidberg v. France (no. 39092/21)

The applicant, Fabienne Vidberg, is a French national who was born in 1976 and lives in Strasbourg (France). Her husband, a regular soldier deployed on an overseas mission at a French military base in Lebanon, took his own life on 4 July 2014.

The case concerns the French authorities' refusal to open a judicial investigation into the circumstances of the applicant's husband's death, after she lodged a complaint with an application to join the proceedings as a civil party. The reason given for the refusal was that only the public prosecutor could institute criminal proceedings in respect of acts committed by military personnel in the performance of their duties overseas.

Relying on Article 2, the applicant submits that the provisions of Article 698-2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which restrict the ability to institute criminal proceedings to the public prosecutor's office, prevented an effective investigation into the circumstances of her husband's death.

Relying on Articles 6 § 1 and 13, the applicant also alleges that she was denied effective access to a court on account of the restriction on instituting criminal proceedings laid down in Article 698-2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 6 § 1, the applicant complains that she was not afforded the same right of access to a court as victims of offences committed by military personnel in France or by civilians abroad.

Manavidis v. Greece (no. 28849/23)

The applicant, Nikolaos Manavidis, is a Greek national who was born in 1959 and is currently serving an 11-year-and-two-months prison sentence.

The case concerns his complaints about, among other things, overcrowding in Diavata Prison in Thessaloniki where he was held from June 2022 to September 2024 and the lack of an effective remedy. He lodged two appeals under Article 6A of the Prisons Code to complain about his detention conditions. The first was dismissed as unfounded in 2023, while the second was partly upheld, with the Sentence Execution Court finding in 2024 that the conditions of his detention had infringed his human dignity and ordering either his transfer to a less crowded cell or another prison. It also reduced his sentence.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), he alleges that the conditions of detention in Diavata Prison were extremely distressing, with ten detainees being held in a 23 sq. m cell with only one toilet, a lack of natural light and ventilation and poor sanitary and hygiene.

He also argues under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) that the appeal under Article 6A of the Prisons Code was ineffective to challenge his conditions of detention.

Grassucci and Others v. Italy (no. 12952/13 and 4 others)

The applicants are Italian nationals.

The case concerns the length of tax proceedings which led to the imposition of a tax surcharge on the applicants, and the effectiveness of the “Pinto” remedy in that regard.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time), they complain about the length of the proceedings before the domestic courts.

Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), two of the applicants also submit that the “Pinto” remedy is ineffective in tax matters.

L.Z. and D.Z. v. Italy (no. 27379/24)

The applicants, L.Z. and D.Z., are two Italian nationals who were born in 1979 and 2020 respectively. They are mother and son.

The case concerns the severance of the relationship between a biological mother and her child, who was abandoned on a pavement at birth by his father. Although the mother took steps to have the child returned to her, the Italian authorities declared him abandoned and available for adoption and placed him in foster care 16 days after his birth.

The Italian courts subsequently issued decisions concerning contact arrangements and reunification, but the child has not been returned to the mother to date.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (right to respect for family life), the applicants complain about the failure to enforce the decisions ordering their reunification and characterise the severance of their relationship as an “unlawful removal”. They submit that the declarations of abandonment and availability for adoption were unfounded and that the Italian authorities did not do everything that could reasonably be expected of them in order to maintain their family ties.

Just Satisfaction

Andrzej Ruciński v. Poland (no. 22716/12)

The applicant, Andrzej Ruciński, is a Polish national who was born in 1958 and lives in Dobra (Poland).

The case concerns the question of just satisfaction in compensation for Mr Ruciński’s loss of business profits as a result of disproportionate interference by the tax authorities.

In its [principal judgment](#) of 5 October 2023, the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the European Convention (protection of property). The Court further held that the question of just satisfaction was not ready for decision and reserved its examination.

The Court will deal with this question in its judgment of 8 October 2026.

ATRESMEDIA CORPORACION DE MEDIOS DE COMUNICACION S.A. v. Spain (no. 29807/23)

The applicant company is a private media broadcasting group which was established in 1988 and is based in San Sebastian de Los Reyes (Madrid). It broadcasts news and entertainment programmes.

The case concerns a political debate it intended to air on Antena 3 ahead of the 2019 national parliamentary elections. It wanted to invite five candidates for the office of Prime Minister from political parties that were expected to obtain more than 10% of the votes, including the candidate representing the political party Vox. However, following complaints lodged by three regional political parties, on 16 April 2019 the Central Electoral Commission refused to accept the format of the proposed political debate. It found that the applicant company had not complied with the principle of proportionality in selecting the participants, in particular that political parties had to be treated

according to the results achieved in previous equivalent elections. It noted that at the time Vox held no seats in the national parliament at the time, having received only a small share of the vote in the previous general election.

The Supreme Court endorsed the decision and the Constitutional Court ultimately, in 2023, declared the applicant company's amparo appeal inadmissible.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicant company complains that the CEC's 2019 decision banned the broadcasting of the election debate in its originally planned format, and therefore amounted to a breach of the freedom to impart information and the public's right to receive it.

Borovyk and Toporkova v. Ukraine (nos. 2091/19 and 22953/19)

Cherkasov and Kuzin v. Ukraine (nos. 72982/17 and 74407/17)

Both cases concern suspension of pension payments in connection with the armed conflict.

The applicants in the first case are two Ukrainian nationals, Vira Semenivna Borovyk, born in 1947, and Lyubov Ivanivna Toporkova, born in 1935. They are both now deceased. As of August 2014, their pension payments were suspended owing to armed hostilities where they lived, in the eastern parts of Ukraine (Donetsk and Vuhlehirsk, the Donetsk Region). They could not relocate to government-controlled areas because of poor health and old age.

The applicants in the second case are Oleksandr Volodymyrovych Cherkasov and Sergiy Volodymyrovych Kuzin. They were born in 1958 and 1952, respectively, and live in Ivano-Frankivsk Region and Kyiv. They both used to live in Donetsk but, owing to hostilities in the area, they relocated to government-controlled territories where they obtained status as internally displaced persons ("IDPs"). Their pensions were suspended in 2016 because they had not opened a State-designated bank account, which IDPs were required to do to continue receiving social benefits.

All four applicants' challenges with the pension fund authorities and in the courts were ultimately unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants in the first case complain that the suspension of their pension payments was unlawful and that the requirement to relocate and register as IDPs was excessive in view of their old age and poor health. They argue in particular that the authorities had not explored any other less excessive measures. They also rely on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

Also relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicants in the second case complain that the obligation to have a State-designated bank to receive their pensions lacked certainty and was discriminatory as other pensioners who were not IDPs could receive their payments through any bank.

The Court will also 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 6 October 2026

Name	Main application number
Adnand Kosova v. Albania	7192/21
Mirgadirov v. Azerbaijan	16077/18
S.B. v. Russia	26760/21

Thursday 8 October 2026

Name	Main application number
Bianku v. Albania	26755/22
Iravunki Yevropa Miavorum v. Armenia	22685/17
Yeghiazaryan v. Armenia	21915/18
Bier and Others v. Austria	10845/26
Ahmadli v. Azerbaijan	3395/17
Aliyev v. Azerbaijan	40258/23
Jeyhan v. Azerbaijan	57948/17
Abujazar and Others v. Belgium	52465/22
SIRVA NV v. Belgium	24900/24
Dimitrov and Spasov v. Bulgaria	25173/23
Jelavić v. Croatia	3249/22
Ziya v. Cyprus	14182/25
Švaříčková v. the Czech Republic	36550/25
A.D.S. v. France	10844/23
J.A. v. France	42429/23
Ahmed and Others v. Greece	21206/21
Antoniou v. Greece	55579/19
Beltek and Others v. Greece	48272/17
Koxas and Tomescu v. Greece	54989/21
Lowbokorae and Others v. Greece	7845/18
Migdos and Others v. Greece	29689/20
O.M. v. Greece	14354/21
Potskhverashvili and Others v. Greece	12584/21
Vlami and Others v. Greece	29655/20
Bischof and Others v. Hungary	38593/25
Farkas and Others v. Hungary	37835/25
Jakab v. Hungary	61045/21
Kerekes and Others v. Hungary	16660/25
Kovács and Others v. Hungary	38915/25
Ország and Others v. Hungary	2923/26
Teachers' Trade Union and Teachers' Democratic Trade Union v. Hungary	45299/22
Tordai v. Hungary	24731/21
Aversano and Others v. Italy	16670/25
Brenna and Others v. Italy	2850/25
Campedelli v. Italy	8726/20
Cuoco and Sauro v. Italy	32015/25
Famiglietti and Others v. Italy	2710/26
Farina and Others v. Italy	8447/25
Farina v. Italy	30389/24
IFM S.r.l. and Others v. Italy	4562/24
M.A.X.O. Audioprotesi S.r.l. and Others v. Italy	202/25
Marinacci v. Italy	37103/22
Morelli v. Italy	2829/25
Tamburrino and Campochiaro v. Italy	13676/25
Silonov v. Latvia	43134/22
Berdzenishvili and Others v. the Republic of Moldova	31928/19

Name	Main application number
Bugai v. the Republic of Moldova	19024/15
Ouş v. the Republic of Moldova	36414/22
Selevestru v. the Republic of Moldova	1513/15
ŠAJO doo and Others v. Montenegro	8610/25
Alichniewicz and Others v. Poland	12185/24
Bem and Nowak v. Poland	2675/24
Bisialski v. Poland	36867/24
Brazewicz v. Poland	46788/21
Burzyński and Kowalczuk v. Poland	25861/25
Chmielewski v. Poland	41743/21
Dąbrowski and Dąbrowska and Others v. Poland	2806/24
Godula v. Poland	22206/25
Haciska v. Poland	33019/24
Kraczkowski and Bryk v. Poland	13990/24
Leszczyńska-Furtak and Others v. Poland	39471/22
Łysień and Wrzecion v. Poland	43176/21
Mitzner v. Poland	15824/24
Nabrdalik and Moskwa v. Poland	30614/22
Piotrowska and Janas v. Poland	44015/22
Skwarliński v. Poland	36284/25
Stefaniak and Others v. Poland	20941/25
Święcicka and Others v. Poland	9652/25
Tomczak and Others v. Poland	14064/24
Wach v. Poland	30884/23
Andrieş and Others v. Romania	6460/22
Grujičić and Others v. Serbia	43875/22
Pjević v. Serbia	34524/23
Hajdin v. Slovakia	39349/25
Horváth v. Slovakia	8333/23
Talán and Others v. Slovakia	5798/23
L.C.G. and A.S. v. Spain	15076/25
Mar Menor Y Su Cuenca v. Spain	34757/24
Rodríguez Quintero and Martínez Martín v. Spain	473/24
D.S.N.K. v. Switzerland	25281/25
Y.F.N.N. v. Switzerland	12055/25
A.E. v. Türkiye	16054/22
Fly Service, PP v. Ukraine	73173/17
Getmanchuk and Others v. Ukraine	15347/25
Lavrentyev and Others v. Ukraine	12573/16
Nikitin and Moroz v. Ukraine	8819/24
Pinchuk v. Ukraine	11053/23
Shvedov and Others v. Ukraine	80617/17
Tomilin and Others v. Ukraine	21036/25
Yamshchykova v. Ukraine	1574/25

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.

FOLLOW THE COURT ON:



Contact [ECHR Press](#) to subscribe to the press-release mailing list.

Find the Court's press releases: [HUDOC - Press collection](#)

Press contacts

✉ echrpess@echr.coe.int | tel.: +33 3 90 21 42 08

Media enquiries are welcome by email or phone.

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.