

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing eight judgments and / or decisions on Tuesday 7 January 2025 and eight judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 9 January 2025.

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 7 January 2025

[Minasyan and Others v. Armenia \(application no. 59180/15\)](#)

The applicants are 14 Armenian nationals, who live in Armenia. They are all activists, members of NGOs, journalists and researchers involved in the sphere of human rights, including LGBT and women's rights.

The case concerns the publication in 2014 of an article on the website of the *Iravunk* ("Law") newspaper, entitled "They Serve the Interests of the International Homosexual (*համասեռամոլ*) Lobby: the Blacklist of Enemies of the Nation and the State". The article attacked "Homosexual rights lobbyists", "the disgusting phenomenon called Eurovision", and the Eurovision winner, Conchita Wurst, who it described "human waste", among other targets. It included links to the Facebook profiles of the applicants. Other articles followed.

The applicants were unable to get satisfaction before the Armenian courts.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), Article 6 (right to a fair trial), and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain, in particular, that the article and subsequent articles had amounted to harassment and hate speech.

[Yoncheva v. Bulgaria \(no. 39127/19\)](#)

The applicant, Elena Nikolova Yoncheva, is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1964 and lives in Sofia.

The case concerns the publication of a press release by the Bulgarian public prosecutor's office on 23 January 2019 which the applicant – a well-known journalist and member of parliament (MP) – regards as having undermined her right to be presumed innocent.

Relying on Articles 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, and on Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) in conjunction with Article 6 § 2, the applicant complains that her right to be presumed innocent was undermined and that no domestic remedy was available to her in respect of that complaint. She submits that the aim of the prosecuting authorities' actions was to punish her for her activities as a journalist and an opposition MP by damaging her credibility and professional reputation.

[A.R.E. v. Greece \(no. 15783/21\)](#)

The case concerns the alleged "pushback" from Greece to Türkiye of a Turkish national, A.R.E., who was born in 1992. In 2019 the Turkish courts sentenced the applicant to imprisonment for membership of an organisation described by the Turkish authorities as the "Fetullahist Terror Organisation/Parallel State Structure" ("FETÖ/PDY").

The applicant submits that she entered Greece at around 5.30 a.m. on 4 May 2019 after crossing the Evros River from Türkiye to seek international protection. She alleges that the police arrested her shortly after 2.25 p.m., while she was awaiting a lawyer, and took her to the police station, where she claims to have requested asylum for the first time and expressed her fears of what would happen to her if she were sent back to Türkiye. According to her, she was kept by two police officers at the Orestiada border post in Neo Cheimonio until 7 p.m. and was then taken to the Evros River by lorry. During the trip, she was allegedly stripped of her possessions. She alleges that, at around 11 p.m., she was made to board a small inflatable boat to be sent back to Türkiye along with others. She was arrested by the Turkish authorities on 5 May 2019, then held in Edirne Prison before being transferred to Gebze Prison, near Izmir (Türkiye).

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 (right to liberty and security) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, the applicant alleges that she was the victim of a “pushback” to Türkiye by the Greek authorities. She also complains that she was unlawfully deprived of her liberty and submits that her removal to Türkiye placed her life at risk and amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment. Lastly, she complains that no effective remedy was available to her in respect of her complaints.

[G.R.J. v. Greece \(no. 15067/21\)](#)

The case concerns the alleged “pushback” from Greece to Türkiye of an Afghan national, G.R.J., who was an unaccompanied minor (aged 15) at the time.

The applicant alleges that he arrived on the island of Samos from Türkiye on 8 September 2020. He submits that he then went to the Samos refugee camp in Vathy, where he expressed his wish to seek international protection in Greece. According to the applicant, the following day he was forced onto a raft by coastguard officers and abandoned in the Aegean Sea. He was subsequently recovered by the Turkish coastguard.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant alleges that his return to Türkiye placed him at risk of being subjected to treatment prohibited by Article 3, in particular the risk of “*chain-refoulement*” from Türkiye to his home country of Afghanistan. He alleges, in this connection, that he is a member of the Hazara community and that he fears persecution by the Taliban as a result. He also complains that he was deprived of access to asylum procedures in Greece and that there was no effective remedy available to him at the domestic level in respect of his complaints.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 of the Convention, the applicant further submits that his alleged “pushback” placed his life and physical integrity at risk. He also submits that he was subjected to inhuman and degrading treatment before and during his removal to Türkiye. Under Article 13 of the Convention, he complains of the lack of an effective remedy in respect of his complaints under Articles 2 and 3 of the Convention.

[UAB Profarma and UAB Bona Diagnosis v. Lithuania \(nos. 46264/22 and 50184/22\)](#)

The applicants, UAB Profarma and UAB Bona Diagnosis, are two companies based in Lithuania.

The case concerns the annulment by the State of several contracts with the applicant companies for the provision of Covid-19 rapid tests, negotiated during the global Covid pandemic. The Prosecutor General had sought the annulment as the State had allegedly overpaid for the tests.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant companies complain, in particular, of being ordered by the civil courts to return part of the money they had received in the public procurement procedure.

[F.D. and H.C. v. Portugal \(no. 18737/18\)](#)

The applicants, F.D. and H.C., are, respectively, a French and Portuguese national and a French national. They were born in 1970 and 2010 and live in Serpins (Portugal) and France respectively. They are father and son.

The case concerns the Portuguese authorities' enforcement of a seek-and-find order issued by the French authorities in respect of H.C. and his subsequent return to his mother, O.

Relying on Articles 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr F.D. complains, in particular, that the proceedings brought against him in Portugal at the request of the French authorities were unfair, and of H.C.'s return to O. without an assessment of the risk to the child.

[Pătrașcu v. Romania \(no. 1847/21\)](#)

The applicant, Alexandru Pătrașcu, is a Romanian national who was born in 1970 and lives in Ploiești (Romania).

The case concerns the applicant's liability for statements and comments published on his Facebook page.

As a passionate fan of opera and classical music, the applicant has been publishing articles and commentary on opera for years on his blog and his Facebook page. In 2015 he covered a scandal that involved the National Opera in Bucharest, posting and hosting third-party comments on his Facebook page. He was sued and held liable for damaging the image and reputation of the persons about whom those statements and comments had been made.

The applicant submits that the finding against him on the basis of statements posted on his Facebook page both by him and by third parties was in breach of Article 10 (freedom of expression). Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing), he also complains that the proceedings against him were unfair on the ground that the courts purportedly failed to verify the factual basis of the offending comments.

Just Satisfaction

[Văleanu and Others v. Romania \(no. 59012/17 and 27 other applications\)](#)

The applicants are 53 Romanian nationals.

The case concerns the question of just satisfaction in a judgment on restitution of property, which had been nationalised by the communist regime, under the new Law no. 165/2013.

On 8 November 2022 [the Court found a violation](#) of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 in respect of all the applications which had not been struck off its list of cases. It referred to the prolonged non-enforcement of outstanding judgments given in the applicants' favour and the lack of an effective remedy; the annulment of the applicants' titles on account of the State's failure to correctly implement the applicable law and without any compensation; and the failure of the authorities to ensure that the compensation awarded had been reasonably related to the current value of the property. It deferred pronouncing on just satisfaction on that date.

Thursday 9 January 2025

[Petrosyan v. Armenia \(no. 51448/15\)](#)

The applicant, Heghine Petrosyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1972 and lives in Hrazdan (Armenia).

The case concerns the death of Ms Petrosyan's 19-year-old son while being held in custody for evasion of military service. The official version was that he had committed suicide in his cell.

The applicant's son, H. Movsisyan, had been drafted into the Armenian army in June 2011 and assigned to a military unit in Nagorno-Karabakh. Shortly after he was found unfit and discharged for mental-health reasons. He was subsequently prosecuted and convicted for evasion of military service. On 28 November 2012 he was found hanging from the bars of his cell window with his bedsheet.

Three investigations were carried out. One internal investigation by the Nagorno-Karabakh police concluded that "no breaches [of rights] had been discovered on the part of the prison officers", while two sets of criminal proceedings, by the Nagorno-Karabakh and then authorities in Armenia, were terminated on the grounds that there was no evidence that a crime had been committed. Ms Petrosyan appealed the decisions in her son's case to the national courts, without success.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), Ms Petroysan complains, among other things, that the authorities failed to provide a plausible explanation for the death of her son. She argues in particular that they had failed to clarify how it had been possible for her son to commit suicide in the presence of six other detainees without them or the guards noticing. At the same time, she also argues that the authorities failed to take steps to protect her son's life, despite having been aware of his mental-health issues.

[Cavca v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 21766/22\)](#)

The applicant, Ivan Cavca, is a Moldovan national who was born in 1988 and lives in Cozești (Moldova).

In May 2020 Mr Cavca was dismissed from his job as a public official in the Environmental Protection Inspectorate for committing a disciplinary offence. It was found that he had accepted a chainsaw as a bribe in a complaint brought to his attention about illegal felling of trees. The case concerns the ensuing proceedings in which he unsuccessfully contested the decision to dismiss him. He argued that he had been incited to commit the offence by an undercover agent as part of random testing of the professional integrity of EPI public officials.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Mr Cavca alleges that the proceedings in his case were unfair, mainly because the courts did not examine his entrapment plea.

[Zafferani and Others v. San Marino \(no. 38127/22 and six other applications\)](#)

The applicants are seven San Marinense nationals who were officers of the Uniformed Unit of the Fortress Guard (*Nucleo Uniformato della Guardia di Rocca*), a military body of San Marino.

The applicants were originally employed on a temporary basis until January 2016 when they were made permanent. The case concerns a subsequent dispute over the retrospective adjustment of their employment rights.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants allege that a new law was brought in that affected the outcome of the dispute, causing them financial losses.

[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 9 January 2025

Name	Main application number
López Lucía and Vidal Ruiz v. Spain	3945/24
Ribot Rodriguez and Others v. Spain	27876/22
Federation of Trade Unions of Chernihiv Region v. Ukraine	40633/15
Lobko v. Ukraine	14793/14
Nikolayenko v. Ukraine	59342/19

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. To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en or follow us on X (Twitter) [@ECHR_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

Press contacts

echrpess@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)

Neil Connolly (tel.: + 33 3 90 21 48 05)

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

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.