



## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 13 judgments on Tuesday 8 November 2022 and 112 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 10 November 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 8 November 2022

#### [Hovhannisyan and Nazaryan v. Armenia \(applications nos. 2169/12 and 29887/14\)](#)

The applicants, Hasmik Hovhannisyan and Tsovinar Nazaryan, are Armenian nationals who were born in 1949 and 1976 and live in Yerevan and Brussels respectively.

The case concerns the death of their son and brother, A. Nazaryan, allegedly by suicide, during his military service, and the subsequent investigation.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life), 10 (freedom of expression) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain about his death and allege that the investigation into the matter was ineffective.

#### [Vardanyan and Khalafyan v. Armenia \(no. 2265/12\)](#)

The applicants, Anahit Vardanyan, Vardan Khalafyan, Hmayak Khalafyan and Ani Khalafyan, are Armenian nationals who were born in 1962, 1986, 1975 and 1992 respectively and live in Charentsavan (Armenia).

The case concerns the death of their relative, Vahan Khalafyan, in police custody at the age of 24.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention, the applicants complain of the circumstances of his arrest and his death and the failure of the authorities to carry out an effective investigation.

#### [Gaggl v. Austria \(no. 63950/19\)](#)

The applicant, Hildegard Gaggl, is an Austria national who was born in 1940.

The case concerns her criminal trial and conviction for the attempted murder of her husband, Alois Gaggl. In January 2018 the 77-year-old applicant repeatedly stabbed and attempted to kill her 84-year-old spouse to whom she had been married for over 52 years. She later testified that she had intended to kill him and then to commit suicide because of their advanced age and state of health, and his not agreeing for them to move into a nursing home. Her husband testified during the trial hearing in his wife's favour, stating that he was not upset with her for what she had done.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) of the Convention, the applicant complains that her criminal conviction was unfair and the detention resulting from it unlawful. In particular, she complains of not having been provided with the opportunity to understand the reasons on which the jury based her conviction given that the conclusions of the two expert opinions on her mental state at the time of the offence were diametrically opposed and that the domestic courts dismissed her application, which had the support of the public prosecutor, to obtain a third and decisive expert opinion.

### [Aygün v. Belgium \(no. 28336/12\)](#)

The applicants, Vahit and Naciye Aygün, are Belgian nationals who were born in 1948 and 1949 respectively. They live in Meulebeke in Belgium. The applicants' two sons died of multiple gunshot wounds on 8 September 2010.

In this case the applicants complain of the refusal of the investigating judge throughout the investigation to allow them to transport their sons' bodies to Türkiye, their country of origin.

In February 2014, on conclusion of the criminal proceedings, a neighbour was sentenced to 29 years' imprisonment for the murder of the applicants' two sons.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion), the applicants complain that they were prevented from transporting their sons' bodies to their country of origin throughout the investigation, that is to say from 24 September 2010 to 4 April 2013, so that they could bury them in the family grave in accordance with their rites, beliefs and traditions.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), they allege that they did not have an effective remedy in domestic law by which to challenge the prohibition imposed by the investigating judge.

### [Nikolay Kostadinov v. Bulgaria \(no. 21743/15\)](#)

The applicant, Nikolay Kostadinov, is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1971 and lives in Versailles (France).

The case concerns the applicant's complaint about the authorities' response to a fraudulent takeover of his company, Vandom OOD, based in Sofia. He had set the company up in 2004 with his sister. They discovered in 2008, during a legal dispute over a plot of land bought by the company, that they were no longer considered shareholders in Vandom. A certain D.A., unknown to them, had had the entry in the register of companies with regard to Vandom changed using forged documents showing that the applicant and his sister had authorised him to sell their shares. D.A. was subsequently found guilty of aggravated fraud and given an 11-month suspended prison sentence. The authorities did not try to identify potential accomplices. All the applicant's subsequent efforts to defend his rights and to regain control of his company were ultimately unsuccessful, in particular because the people who took over the company after D.A.'s fraudulent actions were able to transfer the shares while the proceedings brought by the applicant against them were pending.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Mr Kostadinov complains that domestic law, as applied in his case, did not adequately protect his property rights.

### [Saure v. Germany \(no. 8819/16\)](#)

The applicant, Hans-Wilhelm Saure, is a German national who was born in 1968 and lives in Berlin. He is a journalist.

The case concerns the refusal to allow the applicant to have physical access to the files held by the German Foreign Intelligence Service (*Bundesnachrichtendienst*) on U.B., a former Prime Minister of the *Land* of Schleswig-Holstein who had died in a hotel in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1987. Mr Saure was interested, in particular, in the Service's findings and investigations regarding the circumstances of U.B.'s death and rumours that U.B. had collaborated with the intelligence service of an Eastern European country. However, he was refused access to the files.

Mr Saure did receive information on the files' contents from the Foreign Intelligence Service via another procedure.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), Mr Saure claims that he had a right of physical access to the files. Moreover, taking into account the role of the press as a “public watchdog” and the public interest in the information, he argued that the 30-year restriction period was too long and breached Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time) of the Convention.

#### [Moraru v. Romania \(no. 64480/19\)](#)

The applicant, Elena Moraru, is a Romanian national who was born in 1999 and lives in Geamăna (Romania).

The case concerns an allegation of discrimination in the admission process to become a military doctor. In particular, the authorities refused in 2018 to allow the applicant to sit the entrance examination for military medical school because of her size. She was 150 cm in height and weighed 44 kg.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education), the applicant complains that she was discriminated against on grounds of size.

#### [Văleanu and Others v. Romania \(no. 59012/17 and 29 other applications\)](#)

The applicants are 53 Romanian nationals.

The case concerns restitution of property, previously nationalised by the communist regime, under a series of restitution laws, the latest being Law no. 165/2013. In the applications the amounts of land at issue varies from 0.15 ha in the commune of Scărișoara to 736.9603 ha of forest along with 166.6536 ha of alpine pasture.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Articles 6 (right to a fair trial), 13 (right to an effective remedy), and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention, and Article 1 of Protocol No. 12 (general prohibition of discrimination) the applicants complain, in particular, of their inability to recover nationalised property or obtain compensation, of non-enforcement of domestic-court judgments, of the length of the domestic proceedings and the lack of adequate effective remedies for their property claims.

#### [Ayuso Torres v. Spain \(no. 74729/17\)](#)

The applicant, Miguel Ayuso Torres, is a Spanish national who was born in 1961 and lives in Madrid.

When the events in issue took place, the applicant was a member of the Military Legal Corps, with the rank of Lieutenant Colonel Auditor. The case concerns disciplinary proceedings against him for comments made in a speech on the transition process from military dictatorship to democracy in Spain, describing the Spanish Constitution as a “pseudo-constitution” and that the origins of the Constitution were “spurious and bastardised”.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) and Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Mr Torres complains that the disciplinary decision stated that he had surpassed his freedom of expression and would be sanctioned if he were to make such a statement again, and of the rejection of his appeal denying him judicial protection.

#### [Marina Aucanada Group S.L. v. Spain \(no. 7567/19\)](#)

The applicant, Marina Aucanada Group S.L., is a limited liability company based in Madrid.

The case concerns the court proceedings around a public call for tenders announced by the Port Authority of the Balearic Islands in 2015, for the management of moorings, including concessions, on the dock of the Old Port of Alcúdia (Mallorca). While the call for tenders was still open, the Alcúdia City Council brought judicial proceedings against the Port Authority, alleging that the call infringed an agreement between the City Council and the Port Authority. The High Court of the Balearic Islands ordered that any “interested party” should be invited to participate in the proceedings. The

Port Authority published a public notice in the Official Gazette of the Balearic Islands conveying this information. The tenderers were not directly served with a summons to appear in the proceedings. The applicant subsequently submitted a tender, which was selected as the most advantageous. The courts later found for the City Council and declared the call for tenders null and void.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), the applicant complains that, in not notifying it of the proceedings, Spain violated the applicant's right of access to a court.

#### [Veres v. Spain \(no. 57906/18\)](#)

The applicant, Márton Veres, is a Hungarian national who was born in 1967 and lives in Pomáz (Hungary).

The case concerns a legal dispute between the applicant and his ex-wife over custody of their daughter, who is currently 16 years old. The applicant's ex-wife moved to Spain with their daughter, who was eight years old at the time, without informing the applicant. The applicant applied to a Hungarian court for an order that the daughter be brought back to Hungary pending a final decision in the custody proceedings. The order was granted by the Hungarian court. The applicant went through lengthy proceedings in Spain so that the order could be recognised and enforced. Recognition and enforcement orders were ultimately granted by the Spanish courts, and the daughter was brought back to Hungary.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains that the proceedings in Spain were unreasonably long, which prevented him from seeing his daughter and affected their relationship. In addition, relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant complains that he did not have access to an effective remedy to expedite the proceedings and redress the alleged violation of his rights.

#### [Yüksekdağ Şenoğlu and Others v. Türkiye \(no. 14332/17 and 12 other applications\)](#)

The applicants are 13 Turkish nationals. Following the parliamentary elections of 1 November 2015 they were elected to the Turkish Grand National Assembly as representatives of the Peoples' Democratic Party (HDP), a left-wing pro-Kurdish political party. At the time of the events the first applicant, Figen Yüksekdağ Şenoğlu, was one of the co-chairs of the HDP.

The case concerns the applicants' pre-trial detention during their time as members of parliament, purportedly on account of political speeches given by them. Twelve of the applicants were placed in pre-trial detention in 2016 and one of them in 2017.

The full list of applicants is as follows: Figen Yüksekdağ Şenoğlu, born in 1971; İdris Baluken, born in 1976; Besime Konca, born in 1970; Abdullah Zeydan, born in 1972; Nihat Akdoğan, born in 1980; Selma Irmak, born in 1972; Ferhat Encu, born in 1985; Gülser Yildirim, born in 1963; Nursel Aydoğan, born in 1958; Çağlar Demirel, born in 1969; Ayhan Bilgen, born in 1971; Burcu Çelik, born in 1986; and Leyla Birlik, born in 1974.

Relying on Article 10, the applicants allege a violation of their right to freedom of expression.

Under Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 (right to liberty and security), the applicants complain about their pre-trial detention, which in their view was arbitrary. In that connection they allege that their placement in pre-trial detention was incompatible with the domestic legislation in that they were members of the National Assembly and as such entitled to parliamentary immunity. They also contend that there was no evidence giving rise to a reasonable suspicion that they had committed a criminal offence justifying their detention. All the applicants further complain of the length of their pre-trial detention and allege that the judicial decisions concerning their detention contained no reasons other than a mere statement of the grounds for pre-trial detention provided for by law, and were worded in abstract, repetitive and formulaic terms.

Relying on Article 5 § 4 (right to a speedy decision on the lawfulness of detention), eleven of the applicants complain of being denied access to the investigation file. In their view, they were prevented from challenging effectively the decisions ordering their placement in pre-trial detention.

Also from the standpoint of Article 5 § 4 (right to a speedy decision on the lawfulness of detention), twelve of the applicants maintain that the Constitutional Court proceedings in which they sought to challenge the lawfulness of their pre-trial detention did not comply with the requirements of the Convention, in that the Constitutional Court failed to observe the requirement of “speediness”.

The applicants also complain about their pre-trial detention from the standpoint of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention (right to free elections).

Under Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) of the Convention, read together with Article 5, the applicants complain that they were detained for expressing critical opinions about the political authorities. They argue in that regard that the purpose of their pre-trial detention was to silence them.

Relying on Article 34 (right of individual application) of the Convention, eleven of the applicants contend that the criminal investigations concerning some of their lawyers had an intimidating effect on them.

Thursday 10 November 2022

#### [Alasgarov and Others v. Azerbaijan \(no. 32088/11\)](#)

The applicants are 82 Azerbaijani nationals.

The case concerns a dispute over plots of land that had been allocated to the applicants by the Agrarian Reform Commission in Absheron for agricultural use. The Absheron District Mehdiabad Municipality later notified some of the applicants that their plots would be reallocated so that the State could make use of the land for construction purposes. A wall was erected around the original plots for construction purposes.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that the domestic authorities unlawfully interfered with their peaceful enjoyment of their land. The applicants also complain, under Article 6 (right to a fair trial), that the judgments of the domestic courts had not been reasoned.

#### [Sládková v. the Czech Republic \(no. 15741/15\)](#)

The applicant, Lenka Sládková, is a Czech national who was born in 1983 and lives in Prague.

The case concerns Ms Sládková’s arrest in 2013 following an argument in a bar. She was taken to Nové Město police station in Prague where she allegedly suffered violence – which allegedly left marks on her body – racial abuse, threats and degrading sexual treatment.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Ms Sládková complains of ill-treatment while being held at the police station and during her transfer from the sobering-up centre to that station the following day.

#### [Bakirdzi and E.C. v. Hungary \(nos. 49636/14 and 65678/14\)](#)

The applicants, Kalliopé Bakirdzi and E.C., are Hungarian nationals born in 1959 and 1990. They live in Budapest.

The case concerns the voting rights of the applicants, registered as national-minority voters for the 2014 parliamentary elections in Hungary. Under the Fundamental Law of Hungary, national minorities have to be able to participate in the work of Parliament. On that basis, the Election

Act introduced a system of minority representation in 2014, whereby self-identified members of national minorities may register as national-minority voters. They vote for the lists of the national minority they belong to and for single-member district candidates, whereas other voters vote for a candidate in a single-member district and for a party list.

Relying on Article 3 of Protocol No.1 to the Convention (right to free elections) taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicants complain that the system of national-minority voting amounted to discrimination in respect of their voting rights. They submit that, although the intention of the Hungarian authorities was to promote the participation of national minorities in the legislature by introducing national-minority voting, the measure has had the opposite effect, leading to their disenfranchisement, since they had no prospect of attaining the quota prescribed by the legislation. They further submit that they were only able to vote for their respective national-minority lists and had no choice between candidates on those lists.

#### [I.M. and Others v. Italy \(no. 25426/20\)](#)

The applicants are three Italian nationals who were born in 1988, 2010 and 2013 respectively and live in Italy. The first applicant is the mother of the second and third applicants and is acting on her own behalf and on behalf of her two children.

The case concerns the applicants' allegation that the Italian State failed in its duty to protect and assist them during the meetings with the children's father, a drug addict and alcoholic accused of ill-treating and threatening the first applicant.

The case also relates to the decision of the domestic courts to suspend the first applicant's parental responsibility. The courts deemed her to be a parent who was "hostile to meetings with the [children's] father", on the grounds that she refused to take part in the meetings, citing the history of domestic violence and safety concerns.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants allege that they were the victims of domestic violence. They argue that the meetings with the children's father did not take place in the "strictly protected" environment ordered by the court and that the failings on the part of the authorities exposed them to a risk of further violence.

Under the same Articles, the first applicant complains of being characterised as an "uncooperative parent" and of having her parental responsibility suspended accordingly, for the sole reason that she had sought to protect her children by highlighting the risk to their safety. She thus alleges that she was subjected to secondary victimisation.

#### [Rimšēvičs v. Latvia \(no. 56425/18\)](#)

The applicant, Ilmārs Rimšēvičs, is a Latvian national who was born in 1965 and lives in Ropaži Municipality (Latvia).

At the time of the events in this case Mr Rimšēvičs was Governor of the Central Bank of Latvia (*Latvijas Banka*). He became a member of the General Council of the European Central Bank (ECB) in 2004, then a member of the Governing Council of the ECB in 2014.

The case concerns the arrest and approximately 46-hour detention of Mr Rimšēvičs on corruption-related charges in connection with a Latvian bank.

Relying on Article 5 §§ 1, 3 and 4 (right to liberty and security), Mr Rimšēvičs complains that his arrest and detention were not in accordance with the law, that he was unable to obtain a judicial review of his detention, and that he was not brought before a judge promptly to decide on that detention.



### [N.V. and C.C. v. Malta \(no. 4952/21\)](#)

The applicants, N.V., a Maltese national, and C.C., a British national, were born in 1976 and 1968 respectively and live in Xewkija (Gozo, Malta).

The case concerns an order by the domestic court by which N.V. was prohibited from seeing her partner, C.C., (with whom she later had a child) in the presence of her child from a previous marriage who lived with them.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants complain of the court decision which remained in place for nearly five years. C.C. also complains, under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), that the domestic courts took a decision affecting him without him having had an opportunity to participate in the proceedings.

### [J.N. v. Poland \(no. 10390/15\)](#)

The applicant, J.N., is a Polish national who was born in 1977 and lives in Warsaw.

Following a violent dispute with her partner and father of her children, J.N. moved out of her partner's house. The case concerns the subsequent proceedings to decide on custody and contact rights with the children.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains that the domestic courts took too long to examine her applications for custody and contact with her children. She also complains that the domestic court's decision to have the children moved to their father's home was unjustified and contrary to their best interests.

### [The Karibu Foundation v. Norway \(no. 2317/20\)](#)

The applicant, The Karibu Foundation, is a Norwegian foundation that was set up in 1985 and is based in Oslo. It is involved in international development work, including support for ecclesiastical organisations and projects in southern Africa.

The case concerns the authorities' limiting of ground rents, in accordance with legislation that were introduced to deal with previous violations of the Convention, on property in Oslo owned by The Karibu Foundation.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention (protection of property), the applicant organisation complains that the refusal of the proposed ground rent violated its property rights.

### [Mas Gavarró v. Spain \(no. 26111/15\)](#)

The applicant, Mr Artur Mas Gavarro, is a Spanish national who was born in 1956 and lives in Barcelona. From December 2010 to January 2016 the applicant was President of the Government of the Autonomous Community of Catalonia.

The case concerns the publication of several articles in the daily *El Mundo* which, according to the applicant, damaged his reputation.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant alleges that the police, the public prosecutor and the national courts did not actively investigate the existence of an interference with the exercise of his right to the protection of his personal reputation, guaranteed by this article.

### [Kupinsky v. Ukraine \(no. 5084/18\)](#)

The applicant, Sergiy Onisiyevych Kupinsky, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1973.

The case concerns Mr Kupinskyy's life sentence which he is serving in Izyaslav Correctional Colony (Ukraine) for a double murder he committed in Hungary. He was convicted by the Hungarian courts in 2002 and transferred to Ukraine in 2007 to serve his sentence.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), the applicant complains that Ukrainian legislation did not provide for the possibility of applying for parole for prisoners serving life sentences and that this amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment as he has no hope of release. He also relies on Article 7 (no punishment without law) to complain that his situation worsened when he was transferred from Hungary to Ukraine because his sentence was converted from a "reducible" life sentence to an "irreducible" life sentence.

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 November 2022

Name	Main application number
Savitskiy v. Russia	35839/13

## Thursday 10 November 2022

Name	Main application number
Lepuri v. Albania	14918/06
Llukacaj and Others v. Albania	11220/09
Perdeda v. Albania	33544/08
Rrapi v. Albania	4616/09
Aigner and Hoppel v. Austria	50715/18
Agayev v. Azerbaijan	30138/18
Bagvanov and Others v. Azerbaijan	77919/11
Moroz and Others v. Azerbaijan	49264/12
Aleksandrowicz v. Belgium	52163/20
Clinique Psychiatrique des Frères Alexiens and Others v. Belgium	23234/16
Alaber v. Croatia	47695/21
Benić v. Croatia	60440/21
Pernar and Despot v. Croatia	55813/17
Halmai v. Cyprus	3351/20
Málek and Černín v. the Czech Republic	32193/16
A.Z. v. France	14563/21
I.A. v. Greece	12850/20
J.M. and M.S. v. Greece	19999/20
Lydakis and Others v. Greece	43441/14
Lyparis v. Greece	6047/14
T.M. and Others v. Greece	51973/19
Kormos and Others v. Hungary	19380/21
Lakatos v. Hungary	57504/16
Barricella and Others v. Italy	39637/21



Name	Main application number
Carro and Perrone v. Italy	21189/11
Corrias and Giorgi v. Italy	49393/20
De Matteis and Others v. Italy	26841/06
De Pauli and Others v. Italy	4872/21
Ferrara and Others v. Italy	34488/20
Ferrara v. Italy	37801/20
Menduni and Others v. Italy	30797/17
Palaia v. Italy	23593/14
Preuschoff v. Italy	42627/20
V.T. v. Italy	50023/20
B.I. v. North Macedonia	22849/20
B.B. v. Poland	67171/17
Kaszubski v. Poland	15466/19
Năstase v. the Republic of Moldova	59794/18
AutoInterBus-Tur S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	13175/14
Ipate and Motrică v. the Republic of Moldova	56808/11
Sajin v. the Republic of Moldova	31667/10
Țurcan v. the Republic of Moldova	5895/15
Anca and Others v. Romania	26027/16
Dobre and Others v. Romania	35388/16
Grigorie and Dărăban v. Romania	17868/16
Neagu and Others v. Romania	9420/17
Radu and Others v. Romania	35238/16
Sora v. Romania	39001/16
Sușnescu v. Romania	19034/21
Ungurianu and Cetănaș v. Romania	37282/16
Abramovich and Others v. Russia	43830/14
Akhmedyanov and Others v. Russia	11243/17
Akhtyamov and Others v. Russia	17105/18
Aleksandrov and Others v. Russia	45733/13
Asyutin and Others v. Russia	50774/20
Derunov and Others v. Russia	64021/16
Dyakov and Others v. Russia	79217/17
Gabidullin and Others v. Russia	43125/17
Grebneva v. Russia	22835/11
Kharitonov and Others v. Russia	79256/17
Khasanova and Others v. Russia	198/20
Kruglova and Others v. Russia	12283/14
Maltzov and Others v. Russia	18089/20
Mikhaylov and Others v. Russia	47557/12
Nagoyev and Others v. Russia	63528/16
Paramonov and Others v. Russia	29388/18
Petrova and Others v. Russia	22537/18
Polishchuk and Others v. Russia	29308/18
Razgon and Others v. Russia	5386/20

Name	Main application number
Rodina and Others v. Russia	81202/17
Rogatykh and Others v. Russia	49297/18
Sizov and Others v. Russia	43318/19
Solovey and Others v. Russia	27990/18
Tsvetkov and Others v. Russia	17230/19
Utin and Others v. Russia	54784/16
Viktorov and Others v. Russia	49592/14
Vorobyeva and Others v. Russia	7440/07
Yefimov and Others v. Russia	19775/18
Yelistratov and Others v. Russia	24453/17
Antonijević v. Serbia	48137/21
Lazić and Others v. Serbia	58108/21
Mitrović and Others v. Serbia	30808/21
Radonjić and Others v. Serbia	30719/21
Stepanović and Others v. Serbia	30695/21
Tasić and Others v. Serbia	58044/21
Özen v. Türkiye	23583/19
Yıldırım v. Türkiye	30061/20
Bogomol v. Ukraine	15528/11
Bratko v. Ukraine	19867/21
Ivanov and Others v. Ukraine	47391/15
Kotlyar v. Ukraine	36124/13
Labudyak and Others v. Ukraine	60928/12
Melnyk v. Ukraine	14735/15
Minsky and Others v. Ukraine	33518/20
Podvezko v. Ukraine	10549/18
Semerzhyy and Others v. Ukraine	55064/18
Shapkin and Makovskyy v. Ukraine	13795/20
Sidak v. Ukraine	68678/17
Vitko and Others v. Ukraine	1907/16
Voytkiv v. Ukraine	9481/21
Yermolenko and Others v. Ukraine	27231/21
Zakharov v. Ukraine	52784/19

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](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.