



## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 23 judgments on Tuesday 7 June 2022 and 96 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 9 June 2022.

*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 7 June 2022

#### [I.G.D. v. Bulgaria \(application no. 70139/14\)](#)

The applicant is a Bulgarian national who was born in 2000. His parents separated in 2001. He was domestically abused from a young age, first by his grandmother, to whose care he was entrusted from 2004 to 2007, and then by his father, with whom he lived from 2009 to 2010. At various times he also lived with his mother, who moved house frequently and had an aggressive boyfriend.

The case concerns the applicant's placement in specialised institutions from 2011 to 2015 by the Bulgarian authorities pursuant to the Juvenile Antisocial Behaviour Act 1958. The authorities assessed him as showing deviant and aggressive behaviour, in particular after he committed a number of offences including starting a fire and, on several occasions, interfering sexually with minors.

Relying on Article 5 § 4 (right to have the lawfulness of one's detention decided speedily by a court) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant argues that Bulgarian law did not afford him an opportunity to have the lawfulness of his placement in a boarding school reviewed at regular intervals.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention, the applicant argues that his placement in the socio-pedagogical boarding schools, one aspect of which was a lack of any genuine contact with his mother, amounted to a violation of his right to respect for his private and family life. He also complains that the authorities failed to factor in his individual circumstances when considering such a measure.

#### [Kutsarovi v. Bulgaria \(no. 47711/19\)](#)

The applicants, Stanislavka Kutsarova and Dimitar Kutsarov, are Bulgarian nationals who were born, respectively, in 1951 and 1944. They live in Sofia. The case concerns the death of their son, Plamen Kutsarov, who died in 2009 while being transported by police to the offices of the Organised Crime Division. Investigators looking into the abduction of a businessman identified the applicants' son as the person who had telephoned the victim's wife to demand a ransom. On the morning of 21 January 2009 he was apprehended at his home in Sofia and taken to the Organised Crime Division for questioning. He was then taken to the Psychology Institute of the Interior Ministry. At about 8 p.m. the officers heading the investigation decided to take him back to the Organised Crime Division, and at about 8.30 p.m. four police officers took custody of him to make the transfer. He was handcuffed with his hands behind his back and put in the rear seat of the vehicle. At about 8.55 p.m. one of the officers alerted his superior that the suspect had become unwell. The officer was ordered to transport him to hospital, where he was admitted at 9.15 p.m. and died at 9.26 p.m.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) and 6 (right to a fair hearing) of the Convention, the applicants allege that the police officers who

were escorting their son are responsible for his death and that the investigation into the events was not sufficiently effective.

#### [Teliatnikov v. Lithuania \(no. 51914/19\)](#)

The applicant, Stanislav Teliatnikov, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1994 and lives in Konak (İzmir province, Turkey). He is a member of the Jehovah's Witnesses, a religion which opposes military service for its members. He rose to the status of minister within the faith.

The case concerns Mr Teliatnikov's request for an exemption from military service and application for civilian service owing to his religious beliefs as a Jehovah's Witness.

Relying on Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) of the Convention, the applicant complains that he was denied the right to refuse military service despite his genuine convictions in that connection, with no possibility of civilian service.

#### [Boboc and Others v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 44592/16\)](#)

The applicants are three Moldovan nationals, Ala Boboc, Victor Boboc and Natalia Romanciuc who were born in 1963, 1959 and 1987 respectively. They live in Bubuieci and Chişinău.

The case concerns the beating to death of the applicants' 24-year-old son/husband by the police during mass protests in the centre of Chişinău in April 2009, as well as the manner in which his ill-treatment and death were subsequently investigated.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment), the applicants complain that he was killed by the police, and that the investigation into his death was inefficient.

#### [Patrício Monteiro Telo de Abreu v. Portugal \(no. 42713/15\)](#)

The applicant, Tiago Patrício Monteiro Telo de Abreu, is a Portuguese national who was born in 1974 and lives in Elvas, Portugal. He is a member of a political party and was elected to the Elvas municipal assembly on three occasions between 2001 and 2009. In 2013 he was elected to the post of municipal councillor (*vereador*) in Elvas. At the time of lodging his application he was also an adviser to his party's parliamentary group.

The case concerns the applicant's conviction on a charge of aggravated defamation of an Elvas municipal councillor for publishing three cartoons by a painter in September 2008 on a blog which he ran at the time. The councillor lodged a criminal complaint against the applicant in 2009. The courts found that the applicant, who was a political opponent of the councillor, had caused damage to her honour and reputation by publishing the cartoons.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicant complains that his right to freedom of expression was violated.

#### [Taganrog LRO and Others v. Russia \(no. 32401/10 and 19 other applications\)](#)

The numerous applicants are associations of Jehovah's Witnesses, publishers of religious literature and individual Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia.

The case concerns the forced dissolution of Jehovah's Witnesses religious organisations in Russia, the banning of their religious literature and international website on charges of extremism, the revocation of the permit to distribute religious magazines, the criminal prosecution of individual Jehovah's Witnesses, and the confiscation of their property.

Relying on Articles 9, 10, 11 and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, the applicants complain that the measures breached their rights to freedom of religion, expression, association and

peaceful enjoyment of possessions. One of the applicants also complains that his pre-trial detention was incompatible with the requirements of Article 5 (liberty and security).

#### [Kohen and Others v. Turkey \(no. 66616/10 and three other applications\)](#)

The applicants, Erol Maks Kohen, Nail Tahsildaroğlu, Ezra Ören and Hüseyin Özçalı are four Turkish nationals who were born in 1959, 1948, 1961 and 1944 respectively, and live in Istanbul.

The case concerns the alleged unfairness of criminal proceedings against them for running a fictitious and fraudulent export scheme.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), the applicants complain that they had no access to a lawyer during the preliminary investigation stage, and that the statements made by them and certain other co-defendants in the absence of a lawyer were used by the trial court. They also complain that there was a breach of the principle of equality of arms in relation to the collection and examination of certain expert reports at the trial stage, and that the court failed to specify the documents on the basis of which it asked the defendants to make additional submissions.

#### [Yeğer v. Turkey \(no. 4099/12\)](#)

The applicant, İhya Tamer Yeğer, is a Turkish national who was born in 1958 and lives in Istanbul.

The case concerns the alleged unfairness of the criminal proceedings against the applicant for issuing an uncovered cheque.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), the applicant complains that he was tried and convicted without having been able to exercise his right to be present and to defend himself in person. In the same vein, he complains that he was unable to lodge an appeal against his conviction owing to his trial and conviction *in absentia*. Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), he complains of the alleged unlawfulness of his resulting detention.

Thursday 9 June 2022

#### [Hasanali Aliyev and Others v. Azerbaijan \(no. 42858/11\)](#)

The applicants, Hasanali Aliyev, Rukhsara Aliyeva, Anar Aliyev, Emin Aliyev and Ramzi Aliyev are five Azerbaijani nationals who were born in 1952, 1956, 1975, 1977 and 1983 respectively. The first two are spouses; the other applicants are their sons.

The case concerns the family's eviction from a State-owned flat in a military settlement in Nakhchivan city which had been allocated to the father during his military service.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 6 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, the applicants complain that the domestic court decisions evicting them were unreasoned and that they were deprived of their property as a result.

#### [Xavier Lucas v. France \(no. 15567/20\)](#)

The applicant, Xavier Lucas, is a French national. He was born in 1967 and lives in Tournai (France).

The case concerns a requirement to issue proceedings electronically using the *e-barreau* platform. The applicant's application to set aside an arbitral award was dismissed without consideration of the merits for failure to meet that requirement.

Relying mainly on Article 6 § 1, the applicant alleges a violation of his right of access to a court.

**Azzopardi v. Malta (no. 22008/20)**

The applicant, Maria Nicolina *sive* Marlene Azzopardi is a Maltese national who was born in 1943 and lives in Żebbuġ.

The case concerns the expropriation of a tract of land measuring 3,193 square metres in the town of Qormi which belonged to the applicant following the enactment of the Building Development Areas Act.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, the applicant complains that the compensation received did not match the land's value, and that the law failed to ensure a fair balance in the circumstances.

**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 7 June 2022**

Name	Main application number
Louis v. Belgium	77190/14
Vandenbussche v. Belgium	21402/16
Foutas Aristidou v. Cyprus	11990/15
Kostovski v. North Macedonia	23773/17
C.-A.D. and L.-C.D. v. Russia	29601/20
Eldesuki v. Russia	12454/19
Sharipov v. Russia	61658/19
Centelles Mas and Others v. Spain	44799/19
Çavuş and Others v. Turkey	21385/10
Günel v. Turkey	20937/10
Önal and Others v. Turkey	20950/10
Süleyman Yıldız and Others v. Turkey	22592/10
Varol and Others v. Turkey	21453/10
Yıldız and Aydın v. Turkey	21348/10
Yılmaz and Others v. Turkey	21674/10

**Thursday 9 June 2022**

Name	Main application number
Bayramov v. Azerbaijan	9120/19
Dadashov and Hajibeyli v. Azerbaijan	47915/09
Khurshidov v. Azerbaijan	24849/18
Clottemans v. Belgium	69591/11
De Vries v. Belgium	70330/14
Peeters and Mangelschots v. Belgium	12573/15
Sebbar v. Belgium	62893/15
Čorbić and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	5802/19
Mirković and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	23707/19

Name	Main application number
Šabanović v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	24139/20
Velev v. Bulgaria	11681/16
Marić and Mrđanov v. Croatia	59359/15
Mucko v. Croatia	55588/18
REAL, spol. s r.o. v. the Czech Republic	81454/12
Moulin v. France	14439/21
Paturel v. France	22154/18
Valla v. France	42920/20
Vernay v. France	12398/21
Pill v. Germany	51451/19
A.A.A. and Others v. Hungary	37327/17
A.S. and Others v. Hungary	34883/17
Antalné Botár and Others v. Hungary	11193/21
Avantgarde Stúdió és Kiadó Kft. v. Hungary	54765/20
Hanyu v. Hungary	16740/21
Magyar and Others v. Hungary	38668/20
Petőfi v. Hungary	24877/21
Zsifkovics and Others v. Hungary	25717/21
Pagliari v. Italy	44598/20
Masteiko v. Latvia	50640/18
Baldacchino and Others v. Malta	42451/20
Frans v. the Netherlands	10797/18
O.T.D. v. the Netherlands	49837/20
Fine Doo and Others v. North Macedonia	37948/13
Vangelova and Others v. North Macedonia	17218/17
Gajewska-Frechon v. Poland	71419/16
Gajowczyk v. Poland	42457/19
Łukawski v. Poland	63377/19
S. and Others v. Poland	38342/19
Sienkiewicz-Woskowicz v. Poland	32512/20
Szewczykowie v. Poland	51832/13
Zubel v. Poland	10932/18
Alexandrescu v. Portugal	54554/19
da Silva Santos Pereira and Diamantino da Silva v. Portugal	4581/20
Clopotar and Others v. Romania	3411/17
Geréd and Others v. Romania	27581/16
Gogoş and Others v. Romania	583/19
Ionescu and Others v. Romania	55795/16
Pătru and Others v. Romania	34089/16
Pişinaru and Others v. Romania	19802/16
Pop and Cernamoriţ v. Romania	34785/16
Tudoreanu and Others v. Romania	7331/16
Varga and Others v. Romania	37253/16
Andreyev v. Russia	32711/13
Bazhanov and Others v. Russia	15009/19

Name	Main application number
Belevitin and Agarkov v. Russia	9456/13
Boldyrev v. Russia	52023/08
Dilmukhametov and Others v. Russia	50711/19
Dovgiy and Sagura v. Russia	41103/10
Goryaynova and Goryaynov v. Russia	41387/20
Khaytovich v. Russia	12160/17
Kotelnikov and Others v. Russia	1519/13
Lobodova v. Russia	25321/08
Manannikov v. Russia	74201/17
Nusalova and Lyapin v. Russia	17492/16
OOO Vypmel v. Russia	28664/19
Pestrikova v. Russia	8295/20
Senotrusovy v. Russia	6207/16
Serkin and Others v. Russia	61059/19
Trishina v. Russia	46130/16
Yerokhin v. Russia	35833/18
Yudintsev and Shisterov v. Russia	78144/13
Zakharov v. Russia	2331/14
Amis Telekom doo v. Serbia	40234/16
Čelić and Others v. Serbia	33329/21
Milinković v. Serbia	20854/15
Radomirović and Others v. Serbia	31663/20
Ristović v. Serbia	42650/15
Žunić Leković v. Serbia	43076/20
Sisák v. Slovakia	58228/21
Balmer v. Switzerland	30384/19
Beregszaszy v. Switzerland	18875/19
Bill v. Switzerland	40876/20
Hofmann v. Switzerland	42059/20
Karim v. Switzerland	53526/20
U.B. v. Switzerland	17715/20
Bilgin and Others v. Turkey	6228/18
Dink and Others v. Turkey	54508/12
Koçak and Yaman v. Turkey	16165/20
Turgut v. Turkey	14445/13
Yıldırım v. Turkey	69087/17
Privacy International v. the United Kingdom	60646/14
Robinson v. the United Kingdom	65487/16
Weatherhead v. the United Kingdom	64741/16

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

**Press contacts**

[echrpess@echr.coe.int](mailto:echrpess@echr.coe.int) | tel.: +33 3 90 21 42 08

**We would encourage journalists to send their enquiries via email.**

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.