

## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 15 judgments on Tuesday 8 July 2025 and 94 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 10 July 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 8 July 2025

#### [Ismailaj and Others v. Albania \(application no. 28873/22\)](#)

The applicants, Kastriot Ismailaj, Lutfije Ismailaj and Adriatic Development Corporation Ltd SHPK, are, respectively, two Albanian nationals who were born in 1963 and 1941 respectively and live in Tirana; and a company based in Albania.

Confiscation of certain assets belonging to the applicants was ordered in March 2016 in connection with money laundering under the Anti-Mafia Act (Law no. 10192 of 3 December 2009, as amended, "On preventing and combatting organised crime and trafficking through measures against assets"). The case concerns the applicants' cassation appeal before the Supreme Court.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that the participation of Judge K.K. in the cassation proceedings had rendered the court partial.

#### [Rafiyev v. Azerbaijan \(no. 81028/17\)](#)

The applicant, Vugar Karim oglu Rafiyev, is an Azerbaijani national who was born in 1980 and lives in Sumgayit (Azerbaijan). He is a follower of the Nurism teachings of Islam.

The case concerns the arrest and subsequent conviction of the applicant for holding an unauthorised religious meeting in a private house in March 2017. He was convicted of an administrative offence and fined for violating the rules on organising and holding religious meetings set out in law.

Relying on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), Article 6 (right to a fair trial), Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion), of the European Convention the applicant complains, in particular, that his arrest and detention were unlawful, that his trial was unfair as the national courts did not examine his arguments, and that the interference with his freedom of worship was unlawful.

#### [Levon v. Lithuania \(no. 27121/23\)](#)

The applicant, Anton Levon, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Vilnius.

On the morning of 25 December 2020 Mr Levon's father, who had a history of heart disease, began to feel unwell. He was taken to the hospital that evening and died there the following day. The cause of death was put down as unspecified chronic cardiovascular disease. Mr Levon instituted civil proceedings, alleging that his father had not been provided with proper medical treatment, but the courts dismissed his complaints. He also attempted to have a criminal investigation opened against the hospital for wrongful death and falsification of documents, but it was discontinued at the pre-trial stage.

Relying on Articles 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, Mr Levon alleges that the investigation into the treatment given to his father was ineffective.

### [Google LLC and Others v. Russia \(no. 37027/22\)](#)

The applicants, Google LLC, OOO Google, Google International LLC and Google Ireland Limited, are companies based respectively in the USA, Russia, the USA and Ireland.

The case concerns two sets of judicial proceedings in the Russian Federation. In the first set of administrative proceedings, Google LLC was given substantial fines for its refusal to remove certain content from the YouTube platform, including political videos, which the Russian authorities deemed unlawful.

In the second set of civil proceedings, the applicant companies were held jointly liable for failing to restore monetisation features to the YouTube channel of a Russian television outlet owned by a Russian oligarch who had been sanctioned by the United States and the European Union for his support for Russia's military operations against Ukraine.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicants complain that the Russian authorities imposed arbitrary and unprecedented fines to punish them for providing a platform for content critical of their policies, and of the recurring penalties imposed for the alleged non-compliance with the order to restore Tsargrad's YouTube account. Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), they allege that the Russian courts did not provide adequate reasons for attributing themselves jurisdiction and levying the fines.

### [B.R. v. Switzerland \(no. 2933/23\)](#)

The applicant, B.R., is a Swiss national who was born in 1988 and lives in Switzerland.

The case concerns a health insurer's refusal to cover the cost of a particular treatment for the applicant's rare illness (spinal muscular atrophy, type 2). The applicant submits that the drug Spinraza, which is very expensive, is the only treatment that is likely to be effective.

She relies on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

### [Cangi and Others v. Türkiye \(no. 2\) \(no. 65087/19\)](#)

The applicants are seven Turkish nationals.

The case concerns an environmental dispute over a nickel mine situated in the Turgutlu district in the city of Manisa (Türkiye). Three of the applicants live in Turgutlu, about 10 to 14 kms from the mine, while the others live 85 km away in İzmir. They unsuccessfully brought proceedings in the national courts to contest the official approval of extraction from the mine.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicants complain that the decisions given by the national courts, including the Constitutional Court, were not adequately reasoned because their objections to the assessment made by the court-appointed experts in respect of depletion and pollution of groundwater and the risk of sulphuric acid mist from the mine's activities had not been taken into account.

Thursday 10 July 2025

### [Wulffaert and Wulffaert Beheer NV v. Belgium \(no. 76634/16\)](#)

The applicants are two Belgian nationals and a Belgian public limited company, Wulffaert Beheer. The case concerns their criminal conviction for carrying out building work without planning permission.

The applicants – who were each ordered to pay a criminal fine of 11,000 euros – submit that the Flemish Government decree which was in force at the time of their conviction exempted certain types of work from planning permission.

They rely in this respect on the principle of the retrospective application of the more lenient criminal law, as guaranteed by Article 7 (no punishment without law) of the Convention.

#### [Sakkou v. Cyprus \(no. 4429/23\)](#)

The applicant, Charalambos Sakkou, is a Cypriot national who was born in 1979 and is serving a prison sentence in Nicosia.

In 2020 Mr Sakkou was convicted of multiple drug offences and sentenced to six years' imprisonment. The conviction was based on the testimony of one of his accomplices, R., evidence given by two police officers and telecommunications data. R. was himself also convicted of various drug offences. The case concerns Mr Sakkou's allegation that his conviction was not fair because it had been based, to a decisive extent, on the testimony of R., his accomplice.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Mr Sakkou argues in particular that the admission of R. into a witness protection programme, the suspension of his prison sentence and his subsequent removal from Cyprus under a new identity – albeit subsequent to the applicant's conviction – showed that R.'s testimony as a prosecution witness had been unreliable.

#### [Gullotti v. Italy \(no. 64753/14\)](#)

The applicant, Giuseppe Gullotti, is an Italian national who was born in 1960 and is currently detained in Parma Prison after his conviction for mafia-type offences.

Mr Gullotti was arrested in 1998 and imprisoned under a special regime with restrictions on visits, using the telephone, incoming and outgoing correspondence, and going outdoors. In January 2013 the limitation on the number of people with whom he could correspond was renewed. This right to correspond was limited to only relatives admitted for family visits. The reason for this was his prominent role within the mafia-type organisation, Cosa Nostra. The case concerns his complaint that the January 2013 order and subsequent decisions by the courts in the appeal proceedings were not adequately reasoned.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for correspondence), Mr Gullotti alleges that the January 2013 order was based on stereotyped reasoning. He also relies on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) to complain that his appeal was ineffective because by the time it had been adjudicated the January 2013 order had expired and the restrictions on his rights already renewed by subsequent identical orders.

#### [Rodina and Borisova v. Latvia \(nos. 2623/16 and 2299/16\)](#)

The applicants are, Rodina, an association based in Latvia, and Anda Borisova, a Latvian national who was born in 1972 and lives in Riga. Rodina ("Motherland" in Russian) is aimed at the representation of the Russian-speaking community in Latvia and the protection and development of the national identity of Russians in Latvia.

The case concerns the authorities' refusal to allow the applicants to organise specific public assemblies. Rodina wanted to host two events on 9 May 2014 (the former Victory Day in the USSR, considered by many in Latvia to symbolise atrocities following its unlawful occupation and annexation by the USSR) near the Soviet Victory Monument. In Ms Borisova's case, it was to be a protest in front of the Ukrainian embassy in Riga on 23 September 2014 allegedly aimed at ending the war in south-east Ukraine.

Relying on Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of assembly and association), the applicants complain of the refusal to allow them to hold assemblies.

### [Bednarek and Others v. Poland \(no. 58207/14\)](#)

The applicants are, Stanisław Bednarek and Dawid Durejko, two Polish nationals who were born in 1991; and Vyacheslav Melnyk, a Ukrainian national who was born in 1992. They all live in Warsaw.

The case concerns the applicants' complaint about the authorities' inadequate response to a homophobic attack against them.

On 1 January 2013 at about 3 a.m. they were assaulted and beaten by two brothers and another person while walking in one of Warsaw's main streets. The first and the third applicants, who were a couple at the time, had been holding hands. They complained to the police and the three aggressors were subsequently indicted and convicted of battery. All three were given a one-year suspended prison sentence and fined 100 Polish zlotys (approximately 25 euros).

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicants complain that the authorities had not taken into account the homophobic motivation of their attackers, and, instead, had investigated, prosecuted and tried them for ordinary criminal offences. They also complain of a lack of adequate legislative and other measures in Poland to prosecute and combat hate crimes motivated by victims' sexual orientation.

### [Korniyets and Others v. Ukraine \(nos. 2599/16, 6904/16, and 12704/16\)](#)

The applicants, Oleksandr Pavlovych Korniyets, Tetyana Maksymivna Zhabo, Oleksandr Viktorovych Yashchyshen and Olena Fedorivna Yashchyshena, are Ukrainian nationals who were born between 1958 and 1979. They live in Kyiv apart from Ms Zhabo, who lives in Rozsoshentsi (Ukraine).

The case concerns police searches of the applicants' homes carried out in 2015, allegedly without a prior court order.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain, in particular, that the search and seizure operations carried out at their homes without a prior warrant were unlawful and arbitrary and that they had no possibility to participate in the proceedings on retrospective validation of the searches. Ms Zhabo also complains, under Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), of police ill-treatment during the search of her home, and an ineffective investigation in that regard.

### [Tomenko v. Ukraine \(no. 79340/16\)](#)

The applicant, Mykola Volodymyrovych Tomenko, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1964 and lives in Kyiv. He was at the time of events a member of the Ukrainian Parliament, the Verkhovna Rada.

The case concerns the early ending of Mr Tomenko's term as an MP in 2016. It was ended by his party, Solidarity (the Bloc of Petro Poroshenko). This appears to have been the first time a party had ended a term of office.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 10 (freedom of expression) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), and Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections), Mr Tomenko complains, in particular, of the truncating of his term of office.

[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 8 July 2025

Name	Main application number
Gurbanova v. Azerbaijan	16276/13
Iskolskiy v. Azerbaijan	54143/13
Zeynalov and Sadigov v. Azerbaijan	29041/14
Hölscher v. Germany	44567/22
Siozopoulos v. Greece	50261/16
Theodoros Vavoulas & Sia OE v. Greece	27916/19
Mariana Popa and Others v. Romania	42163/18
Radu and Others v. Romania	2246/19
Tüzemen and Others v. Türkiye	66683/16

## Thursday 10 July 2025

Name	Main application number
Kaçorri v. Albania	55662/22
Pajova and Bajrami v. Albania	83902/17
Ter-Arakelyan v. Armenia	20348/18
Karimli v. Azerbaijan	71846/13
Mehdiyev and Others v. Azerbaijan	55670/22
Ivanković and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	27237/24
Stoyanova and Others v. Bulgaria	2266/21
Šperlich v. the Czech Republic	26867/21
Větrovec v. the Czech Republic	20342/23
Muller v. France	38919/20
Société d'exploitation de l'hebdomadaire le Point-SEBDO v. France	39584/23
Mamaladze v. Georgia (no. 2)	5855/23
Delopoulos v. Greece	33036/16
Manessi-Kerastari v. Greece	32317/18
Jáger and Others v. Hungary	27930/24
Kálnai and Others v. Hungary	31156/24
Német and Others v. Hungary	31170/24
Papp v. Hungary	22891/24
Archinà and Commissov. Italy	43413/11
Azienda Valliva il Capanno di Visentin Mario & C. S.a.s. v. Italy	45122/16
Cassone v. Italy	7781/09
Società Agricola Valle La Bianca S.a.s. di Zoggia Aldo & C. v. Italy	44779/16
Škavronskis v. Latvia	4207/19
Maksić v. Montenegro	37787/23
Kiprijanovski and Others v. North Macedonia	31861/23
Shojleva v. North Macedonia	42938/23
Bardygula v. Poland	41059/23
Halaba and Others v. Poland	52951/22
Rackowski v. Poland	33082/22
Salamon and Others v. Poland	40158/20
Słowiński v. Poland	22407/20

Name	Main application number
Zawiślak v. Poland	18632/22
Martins Barreira Fernandes v. Portugal	78528/17
Socolovschi v. the Republic of Moldova	25276/16
Andronache v. Romania	3485/21
Ciomag v. Romania	53705/21
Dragomir v. Romania	48719/19
Galben v. Romania	41088/19
Hirghiligiu and others v. Romania	449/22
Kenez and Pósze v. Romania	52944/21
Mezei v. Romania	15499/17
Mititean and Others v. Romania	29387/22
Negru and Others v. Romania	7868/20
Preda and others v. Romania	8552/22
Zăgrean v. Romania	13867/19
Bobylev and Bychkov v. Russia	45240/20
Bykova and Others v. Russia	7657/18
I.M. and Others v. Russia	340/18
Ivanov v. Russia	45317/14
Kirilyuk and Others v. Russia	46051/21
Kirov LRO and Dmitriyevykh v. Russia	29296/18
Kostylenkov v. Russia	54308/18
Lasdorf v. Russia	46293/17
Mavlikayeva v. Russia	37483/19
Mishkina v. Russia	61953/15
Poletayev and Others v. Russia	28044/20
Racheyev v. Russia	41592/20
Sevostyanova and Others v. Russia	45840/17
Sokolov and Medvedkova v. Russia	42076/20
Starodubovskaya v. Russia	51676/20
Stomakhin and Others v. Russia	5804/15
Tingayev and Others v. Russia	42870/16
Vysokovskiy and Others v. Russia	28054/20
Zlobin and Others v. Russia	9096/13
Batanjski and Others v. Serbia	3651/24
Ćebić v. Serbia	38287/21
Đukanović and Others v. Serbia	18071/24
Lazić v. Serbia	15535/23
Prica v. Serbia	16242/23
LINEA Property, s.r.o. v. Slovakia	36731/22
SOFTEL spol. s r.o. v. Slovakia	34043/23
Pellegrinelli and Others v. Switzerland	18509/19
S.M.A. v. the Netherlands	32184/23
Akarsu v. Türkiye	9118/24
Aksakoğlu v. Türkiye	24267/19
Ceylan v. Türkiye	62967/19

Name	Main application number
Emen v. Türkiye	14765/22
Sel and Others v. Türkiye	29067/19
Şimşek v. Türkiye	54578/19
Şimşek v. Türkiye	60639/19
Yıldırım v. Türkiye	24775/19
Losikhin and Others v. Ukraine	22357/18
Lyzogub and Kravchenko v. Ukraine	10302/24
Mediakompaniya Slovo, TOV and Others v. Ukraine	22347/14
Paraskun and Others v. Ukraine	9714/17
Shufrych v. Ukraine	1143/24
Yurovskyy v. Ukraine	19756/24

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 X (Twitter) [@ECHR\\_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH) and Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int).

#### 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)

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.