

## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 13 judgments on Tuesday 7 October 2025 and 105 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 9 October 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](http://www.echr.coe.int)).*

### Tuesday 7 October 2025

#### [Imanov v. Azerbaijan \(application no. 62/20\)](#)

The applicant, Yalchin Jamil oglu Imanov, is an Azerbaijani national who was born in 1973 and lives in Sumgayit (Azerbaijan). He was a human rights lawyer and member of the Azerbaijani Bar Association.

The case concerns his disbarment on account of statements that he made to the press about the alleged ill-treatment of one of his clients in Gobustan prison in 2017.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private life), 10 (freedom of expression) and 18 (limitation on the use of restrictions on rights) of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant complains that being disbarred for such a reason infringed his Convention rights.

#### [Helme v. Estonia \(no. 3023/22\)](#)

The applicant, Peeter Helme, is an Estonian national who was born in 1978 and lives in Tallinn.

The case concerns the applicant's alleged online entrapment by an undercover police officer who, while using a pseudonym and the fictional identity of a 12-year-old girl, engaged in conversations with the applicant in an online chatroom. The applicant was subsequently convicted of attempted sexual enticement of a minor.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, the applicant complains that evidence resulting from that police operation was used in criminal proceedings against him, in breach of his right to a fair trial.

#### [Misiūnas v. Lithuania \(no. 38687/22\)](#)

The applicant, Eimutis Misiūnas, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Vilnius. He is a former judge.

In accordance with the Constitution and the Law on Courts, decisions on the appointment of judges are made by the President of the Republic. The Law on Courts provides for the possibility for a former judge who has discontinued her or his career as a judge to apply, within a certain period, to be reappointed without having to undergo a competitive exam or selection proceedings.

The case concerns proceedings brought by the applicant to challenge a refusal by the President of the Republic to reappoint him as a judge following his term as a government minister.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, the applicant complains that he was denied an effective right of access to a court as the Lithuanian

courts found that they did not have jurisdiction to hear his case and that they took advantage of the lacuna in legal regulation and barred the applicant from protecting his rights.

#### [Storimans-Verhulst and Others v. Russia \(no. 26302/10\)](#)

The applicants, Maria Storimans-Verhulst, Tim Storimans, Amber Storimans, Jeroen Akkermans and Tsadok Yecheskeli are four Dutch nationals and an Israeli national, who were born respectively in 1956, 2000, 1998, 1963, and 1956. The first three, a mother and her children, live in Goirle, the Netherlands; Mr Akkermans lives in Berlin; and Mr Yecheskeli lives in Ra'anana, Israel.

The case relates to an international armed conflict that occurred between Georgia and the Russian Federation in August 2008, as described in the Court's judgment in the inter-State case of [Georgia v. Russia \(II\)](#). In particular, it concerns the death of Stanislaus Storimans, a photojournalist covering the events – the husband and father of the first three applicants –, and the injury of his colleagues, the other two applicants, on 12 August 2008. All three were carrying out their professional duties in covering the armed conflict.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life/investigation), 13 (right to an effective remedy), and 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicants complain of Mr Storimans' death and the injuries inflicted on Mr Akkermans and Mr Yecheskeli, of a lack of effective remedies in respect of their complaints, and of discrimination in the exercise of their rights under the Convention.

#### [Đorđević v. Serbia \(no. 11212/23\)](#)

The applicant, Zorka Đorđević, is a Serbian national who was born in 1940 and lives in Belgrade.

The case concerns the construction of a building in such close proximity to the applicant's flat that it blocks natural light, ventilation and direct sunlight.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant complains that her living conditions have deteriorated to the point of being incompatible with her right to respect for her home and private life and that the construction of the building has significantly reduced the flat's market value.

#### [Prenča v. Serbia \(no. 48725/12\)](#)

The applicant, Rifat Prenča, is a Serbian national who was born in 1953 and lives in Novi Pazar.

The case concerns the confiscation of a large amount of cash that the applicant had attempted to carry across the State border in breach of the relevant regulations. The customs authorities initially temporarily seized the undeclared cash and the administrative authorities subsequently imposed, as a sanction, the permanent confiscation of the cash in excess of the statutory export threshold (EUR 10,000) in respect of residents.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant complains that the imposition of a fine and the confiscation of the cash constituted an unlawful and a grossly disproportionate measure.

#### [Šabanović and Others v. Serbia \(no. 39819/16 and four other applications\)](#)

The applicants, Safet Šabanović, Dragan Boričić, Zoran Tešić, Tijana Majstorović and Zoran Pifar are Serbian nationals and police officers.

The case concerns domestic case-law in respect of claims for the payment of salary supplements for overtime, night work and work on public holidays performed by police officers employed by the Ministry of the Interior.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) the applicants complain, in particular, that inconsistent rulings have created legal uncertainty. Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No 1, two applicants also complain that they have been deprived of their property because the courts dismissed their claims.

#### [Hastaoğlu v. Türkiye \(no. 29061/21\)](#)

The applicant, Yurdagül Hastaoğlu, is a Turkish national who was born in 1941 and lives in Sakarya (Türkiye).

The case concerns restrictions on her right of property after several plots of land she owned were classified as being in a coastal zone, and her inability to obtain compensation.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), she complains of a breach of her entitlement to the peaceful enjoyment of her possessions.

Thursday 9 October 2025

#### *Just Satisfaction*

#### [Hrachya Harutyunyan v. Armenia \(no. 15028/16\)](#)

The applicant, Hrachya Harutyunyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1953 and lives in Yerevan.

The judgment will concern the just satisfaction to be awarded following the European Court's ruling of 27 August 2024 with regard to proceedings brought against the applicant for defamation and insult after he had reported to the management of his former employer, the Electric Networks of Armenia, corruption on the part of one of his colleagues. In that ruling the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention.

As the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) had not been ready for decision, the Court had reserved it. It will rule on this question in its judgment of 9 October 2025.

#### [Sahiti v. Belgium \(no. 24421/20\)](#)

The applicant, Sabit Sahiti, is a Kosovar national who was born in 1985 and lives in Verviers (Belgium).

The case mainly concerns the lack of a final decision by the relevant authorities regarding the application for a residence permit on medical grounds lodged by the applicant in Belgium in 2010.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), the applicant alleges that his expulsion to Kosovo would give rise to a risk of inhuman and degrading treatment on account of his state of health.

Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant further complains that he is the victim of a "procedural ping-pong match" between the Aliens Office and the Aliens Appeals Board. Lastly, he submits that he has been waiting for the outcome of the proceedings at issue since 2012 (when his application was first rejected). During most of that time, he asserts, he has been without either a residence permit or social and medical assistance, and has had to bring numerous actions before the employment tribunals.

#### [Georgios Papadopoulos v. Cyprus \(no. 21454/21\)](#)

The applicant, Georgios Papadopoulos, is a Cypriot national who was born in 1965 and lives in Limassol (Cyprus).

The case concerns the failure to resolve a legal gap concerning the filling of a parliamentary seat for almost an entire parliamentary term. Mr Papadopoulos was a candidate in the 2016 parliamentary

elections for the Solidarity Movement. A Member of the European Parliament was elected but she decided not to take the seat prior to the start of the parliamentary term. The authorities appointed the applicant who was runner-up but his appointment was subsequently annulled.

Relying on Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections), Mr Papadopoulos complains that the Electoral Court annulled the authorities' decisions to appoint him as a member of parliament in 2017, 2018 and 2020 because it considered that there was no legal framework allowing such substitution. Cypriot law at the time did not provide for the possibility to fill a seat that had become vacant before the start of the parliamentary term, only after.

#### [Petruzzo and Others v. Italy \(nos. 1986/09 and 67556/13\)](#)

The case concerns two applications lodged by eight Italian nationals. They complain that the authorities confiscated their land and buildings because they considered that they constituted unlawful site development, an offence.

Relying on Article 7 (no punishment without law), the applicants submit that they were sentenced to an – unforeseeable – penalty without being convicted.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), they also argue that the confiscation of their property was unlawful and disproportionate.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing), some of the applicants further allege that the Court of Appeal was not impartial, no public hearing was held and the adversarial principle was infringed.

#### [X v. Italy \(no. 42247/23\)](#)

The applicant, X, is an Italian national who was born in 2018. His biological mother is acting on his behalf.

X was born in Italy to a same-sex couple by means of assisted reproduction abroad. The case concerns the annulment of the registration of the details of his birth certificate in so far as it concerned his intended second mother.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains of a violation of his private and family life on account of the loss, five years after his birth, of the legal parent-child relationship he shared with his intended mother.

#### [Platon v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 74995/17\)](#)

The applicant, Veaceslav Platon, is a Moldovan and Ukrainian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Chişinău.

The case concerns the conditions of the applicant's detention. In 2014 the applicant, a former member of Parliament, was charged with fraud and money laundering and was detained in prison pending trial. During his detention he was held in solitary confinement and was guarded by members of the "Pantera", a special forces unit. According to the applicant, members of that unit failed to forward his requests for medical treatment, insulted and provoked him. The applicant was unable to receive visits from his relatives as a result of sanctions imposed on him for breaches of the prison rules.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), Article 8 (right to respect for private life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant complains about a lack of medical treatment and of a severe limitation of his right to be visited by his family during his detention.

#### [A.W. v. Poland \(no. 1307/21\)](#)

The applicant, A.W., is a Polish national who was born in 1975 and lives in J.

The case concerns the applicant's right of access to a court and the length of proceedings concerning the recognition of his paternity of and contact with two children born during an informal relationship with a married woman, a judge. On the basis of the legal presumption of paternity, the mother's husband was indicated as the children's father in the birth register. During domestic proceedings the applicant submitted the results of DNA tests showing that he is the children's biological father.

In 2010, following the end of the relationship between the applicant and the married woman, and having no standing to institute proceedings himself, the applicant petitioned the public prosecutor to institute proceedings to challenge the husband's paternity of both children. Proceedings were eventually instituted in 2013. The applicant was not permitted to take part in those proceedings, despite his request to do so. Those proceedings are still pending.

In 2011 the applicant applied for a contact order in respect of the children. A final contact order was made in 2014. The children's mother and her husband have been refusing to comply with the order and the applicant has had no contact with the children.

Relying on Article 8 (right to private life), the applicant complains that the domestic authorities failed to provide him with effective access to a court, which could rule, in an expeditious manner, on matters concerning his paternity of the children and his contact with them.

#### [Chaykovskyy v. Ukraine \(no. 48879/19\)](#)

The applicant, Vitaliy Viktorovych Chaykovskyy, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1967 and is serving a life sentence in a prison in the Ukrainian city of Berdychiv.

In 2005 the applicant, together with several accomplices, was convicted of banditry and several accounts of robbery and murder; the decision was upheld on appeal and on cassation. On 10 November 2016 the European Court found a violation in respect of Mr Chaykovskyy and some of his accomplices (application no. 7183/04 and [applications nos. 48016/06 and 7817/07](#)) on account, among other things, of restriction on access to legal advice at the investigation stage and the use of untested witness statements.

The case concerns the alleged unfairness and excessive length of the proceedings before the Supreme Court for the review of his conviction based on the European Court's findings in his case.

The Grand Chamber of the Supreme Court remitted part of the applicant's convictions for fresh examination by the trial court. However, since no violations of Mr Chaykovskyy's rights had been found by the Court in regard of other conviction, the Supreme Court upheld the verdict in that part and maintained the sentence of life imprisonment. Five judges of the Grand Chamber of the Supreme Court wrote a separate dissenting opinion.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant complains that the Supreme Court reassessed the facts and evidence itself when it had no jurisdiction to do so. He also complains that the Supreme Court erred in its assessment of the impact that the admission of improperly obtained evidence leading to the conviction of any co-defendant had on other defendants and the case generally, and that the length of the proceedings was excessive. Also, given that the Supreme Court had "unexpectedly" conducted the reassessment of evidence, he had had no adequate knowledge of the charges against him and no opportunity to prepare his defence.

#### [Religious Community of Svyato-Uspenskyy Parish of Rivne Eparchy of Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ptycha Village of Dubensky District v. Ukraine \(no. 8906/19\)](#)

The applicant is a religious community that belongs to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC) which, when the application was lodged in 2019, was associated with the Moscow Patriarchate and headed by the Metropolitan of Kyiv and All Ukraine, Onufriy.

The community owns and uses a church building in the village of Ptycha in the Rivne Region. The case concerns the applicant community's liturgical use and peaceful possession of its church building in the context of a dispute over that building with another religious group.

In 2014 tensions arose between parishioners who had remained part of the UOC and those who followed the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate. A conflict began over the use of the church building, resulting in clashes. In January 2016, the Rivne Town Court seized the church building and banned its use. When that decision was lifted in April 2018, unidentified individuals tried to occupy the church building, causing damage to the building and injuries to one of its parishioners. The following day, the Rivne Town Court seized the building again to prevent further clashes and banned people from using it. In 2018, the applicant community was granted victim status in the investigation of those events but lost their appeals for the ban to be lifted.

The applicant community alleges that the national authorities failed to comply with their obligations under Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) in respect of those events.

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 October 2025

Name	Main application number
Mammadzade and Others v. Azerbaijan	71454/13
Sadigov v. Azerbaijan	54572/13
Kokkinogennis v. Greece	55905/18
Stănoiu and Others v. Romania	35415/06
H.G.D. v. Serbia	3158/20

## Thursday 9 October 2025

Name	Main application number
Hoxha v. Albania	40492/20
Ndreca v. Albania	34288/19
Mosiyan v. Armenia	43565/21
Vasilyan and Others v. Armenia	9047/14
Aliyev v. Azerbaijan	48832/15
Gahramanli v. Azerbaijan	74009/16
Hashimov v. Azerbaijan	31564/14
Jabbarov v. Azerbaijan	31581/16
Mammadov and Others v. Azerbaijan	57978/14
Mukhtarli and Others v. Azerbaijan	31340/13
Orujov v. Azerbaijan	48834/18
Ahmed v. Bulgaria	34018/22
Ahmedov v. Bulgaria	6891/23
Kalaydzhiev and Others v. Bulgaria	49951/21
Memishev and Others v. Bulgaria	49554/21

Name	Main application number
Nikolova and Others v. Bulgaria	42737/21
Shasov and Others v. Bulgaria	3812/22
Arula and Bjedov v. Croatia	16440/21
Beroš v. Croatia	31454/24
Lukša and Arps v. Croatia	43940/22
Mamuzić and Others v. Croatia	53358/21
Marić v. Croatia	13887/24
Zembylas v. Cyprus	22443/21
Société Touristique de La Trinité v. France	41609/20
Dobos and Others v. Hungary	32946/24
Filipovics and Others v. Hungary	31779/24
Furák and Others v. Hungary	37497/24
Gallai and Others v. Hungary	1628/25
Kabelács and Others v. Hungary	725/25
Canti v. Italy	8528/21
Crea v. Italy	7003/22
Giugliano and Others v. Italy	16303/24
Imparato and Ferrara v. Italy	69154/17
M.G.V. and Others v. Italy	39552/23
Tralci v. Italy	28548/12
Finbergs v. Latvia	57845/21
Comendant v. the Republic of Moldova	802/16
Ozimoc v. the Republic of Moldova	564/21
Vataga v. the Republic of Moldova	15666/18
Galben v. the Republic of Moldova	72211/14
Serafimovska v. North Macedonia	38983/21
Velinov v. North Macedonia	1441/21
Association Jedność v. Poland	60951/14
B.N. v. Poland	23032/22
Baczyński and Others v. Poland	4979/24
Kapliński v. Poland	42632/20
Kowalik and Others v. Poland	1571/24
Kowalski v. Poland	40076/22
Nowak v. Poland	15885/21
Orłowski v. Poland	5547/15
Orzechowski v. Poland	24622/24
Raznowiecki and Others v. Poland	32024/23
Sznajder-Malczewska and Others v. Poland	17562/24
Žuk and Others v. Poland	32015/23
Andrei and Others v. Romania	28695/22
Aneculăesei and Others v. Romania	42/22
Bucureşteanu v. Romania	27767/22
Chiric and Others v. Romania	4411/21
Ciobanu v. Romania	44562/21
Cojocar v. Romania	49/21



**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)

**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.