



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 15 judgments on Tuesday 8 December 2015 and 79 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 10 December 2015.

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 8 December 2015

[Mironovas and Others v. Lithuania \(applications nos. 40828/12, 29292/12, 69598/12, 40163/13, 66281/13, 70048/13, and 70065/13\)](#)

The applicants, Bogdan Petrulevič, Ričardas Mironovas, Roman Ivanenkov, Romualdas Klintovič, Romualdas Gaska, Vidas Traknys and Dainius Zeleniakas, are Lithuanian nationals who were born between 1958 and 1986. When lodging their applications with the Court they were serving their sentences at the Pravieniškės and Alytus Correctional Homes in Lithuania.

The cases concern the applicants' complaints about the conditions of their detention. They submit in particular that cells and dormitory-type rooms were overcrowded. Some of the applicants also maintain that the hygienic conditions were poor; notably that cells were infested with rats or insects and that there were no appropriate sanitary facilities.

All of the applicants initiated civil proceedings for damages and, in all seven cases, the Lithuanian courts found that domestic legal norms had been violated.

In decisions which became final between February 2012 and May 2013 the courts awarded five of the applicants sums between the equivalent of 60 and 2,300 euros (EUR) in compensation for damages. Two of the applicants, Mr Ivanenkov and Mr Gaska, were not awarded any compensation. The Supreme Administrative Court acknowledged a violation of their rights under domestic legislation. However, it found, in particular, that pecuniary compensation was not indispensable in order to protect infringed rights.

All seven applicants complain that the conditions of their detention fell short of the standards compatible with Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

[Kalicki v. Poland \(no. 46797/08\)](#)

The applicant, Tadeusz Kalicki, is a Polish national who was born in 1955 and lives in Wieliczka (Poland). The case concerns Mr Kalicki's complaint about the investigation into his brother's death.

Mr Kalicki's brother, J.K., worked as a night guard at a bus terminus in Cracow. At around 4 a.m. on 12 November 2003, his clothes caught fire. He was taken to hospital but died from his injuries on 26 November 2003.

On 31 December 2004, the Cracow district prosecutor discontinued the investigation into the circumstances of J.K.'s death, concluding that it had been an unfortunate accident. The prosecutor found in particular that J.K. had fallen asleep or fainted and that his clothes had caught fire when they came into contact with an electric heater. On 29 November 2005, the district prosecutor reopened the investigation following an appeal by Mr Kalicki. The proceedings were again

discontinued in September 2007 on the basis that no offence had been committed. This decision was upheld by the district court in November 2007.

In the meantime, in April 2005, Mr Kalicki lodged a complaint about the actions taken by the police on 12 November 2003. On 31 January 2008, following two successful appeals by Mr Kalicki to the district court against discontinuance by the prosecutor, the district prosecutor again discontinued the investigation, referring to the testimonies given by 15 witnesses, the examination of the scene of the accident and the case file. The prosecutor referred to the two policemen who had arrived at the scene and who had spoken to Mr Kalicki's brother who had been conscious and had admitted that his clothes had caught fire because of his carelessness. On 14 April 2008, the District Court rejected Mr Kalicki's appeal and upheld the prosecutor's decision, considering that the circumstances of the case had been established sufficiently to make a decision on the merits.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), Mr Kalicki complains that the investigation into his brother's death was ineffective.

[Caragea v. Romania \(no. 51/06\)](#)

The applicant, Ovidiu Caragea, is a Romanian national who was born in 1953 and lives in Târgu Jiu. The case concerns Mr Caragea's allegations of insulting behaviour and defamation by a local journalist.

Mr Caragea was the CEO and majority shareholder of a company which had been owned by the State until 1995. Between 1997 and 2004 a number of shareholders and employees of the company lodged criminal complaints against him, alleging an improper manner in his professional activity both during and after the privatisation of the company. Several criminal investigations were conducted; none of the investigations led to Mr Caragea's indictment.

While the criminal investigations were ongoing, a journalist published an article defending Mr Caragea. On 24 September 2004, another journalist published an article in response, criticising the first journalist's article. Mr Caragea lodged a criminal complaint for defamation against the second journalist, arguing that the journalist had associated him with "persons of dubious morality, perhaps even criminals", thus damaging his reputation and putting his relations with his business partners on both local and national level at risk. On 28 March 2005, the district court acquitted the journalist. This decision was upheld by the county court on 6 June 2005, finding that there had been a sufficient factual basis for the article. The court confirmed the lower court's reasoning that the journalist's intention had not been to defame Mr Caragea but to express an opinion in relation to his professional activity.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life), Mr Caragea complains that the national authorities have failed to protect his reputation.

[Dudayeva v. Russia \(no. 67437/09\)](#)

[Sagayeva and Others v. Russia \(nos. 22698/09 and 31189/11\)](#)

Both cases concern allegations of special operations carried out by Russian servicemen in Chechnya in the early 2000s.

The applicant in the first case is Zara Dudayeva, a Russian national who was born in 1953 and lives in Grozny (the Chechen Republic, Russia). Ms Dudayeva alleges that Russian servicemen killed her son and abducted her husband during a special operation on her house in Grozny in 2002. Notably, a group of about 15 Russian servicemen in uniforms and balaclavas, armed with automatic weapons, attacked her house in the early hours of the morning on 9 July 2002, shooting and throwing grenades. Her grandson, who was a police officer, shot back at the servicemen, while the rest of the family took cover. Two hours later the servicemen stormed the building and her son, Aslan Dudayev, who tried to warn the servicemen that there were women and children present, was shot in the

head. The servicemen then took Ms Dudayeva's husband, Ali Dudayev, to an armoured personnel carrier (APC) waiting outside and drove off. Her husband has been missing ever since.

The applicants in the second case are Khava Sagayeva, Roza Mukayeva and Khamzat Mukayev (husband and wife), Russian nationals who were born in 1964, 1959, and 1956 respectively. They live in the Chechen Republic (Russia) in the Urus-Martan district (Ms Sagayeva) and in the village of Duba-Yurt in the Shali district (Mr and Mrs Mukayev).

Ms Sagayeva alleges that her brother, Khasan Sagayev, was abducted from her house in Alkhan-Yurt on 8 August 2000 by a group of masked and armed Russian servicemen who arrived in APCs and UAZ minivans. The servicemen quickly searched the house and then forced her brother into an APC and drove off. He has not been seen since.

Mr and Mrs Mukayev allege that their son, Rasul Mukayev, was also abducted from his home in Duba-Yurt on 3 December 2004 by a group of masked and armed servicemen who spoke Russian without an accent. They broke into the house, carried out a search and then, handcuffing their son and pulling his t-shirt over his head, forced him outside and took him away. The couple have not seen their son since.

In all three applications the ensuing investigations, suspended and resumed on a number of occasions, with long periods of inactivity, are currently still pending without any significant progress having been made into identifying those who were responsible for the killing of Ms Dudayeva's son or for the three disappearances. Ms Dudayeva alleges in particular that the investigators failed to question either the local military commander's office or the local police station, which were located not far from her house, about their lack of response to more than an hour of intense gunfire in the middle of town during curfew hours.

The Government submit that the investigations, which are still ongoing, have not brought forth any evidence to prove that Russian servicemen had killed Ms Dudayeva's son or that her husband or the other applicants' relatives had been abducted and killed by servicemen.

Ms Dudayeva alleges that her son was killed and her husband abducted by Russian servicemen. Ms Sagayeva and Mr and Mrs Mukayev allege that their brother and son, respectively, were abducted by Russian servicemen and then disappeared. All the applicants complain about the ineffectiveness of the ensuing investigations into the killing and/or the disappearances and about the mental suffering caused to them by the disappearance of their relatives and the unlawfulness of their detention. They rely on Article 2 (right to life), Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 5 (right to liberty and security) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).

[Mäder v. Switzerland \(nos. 6232/09 and 21261/10\)](#)

The applicant, David Mäder, is a Swiss national who was born in 1982 and lives in Kreuzlingen (Switzerland).

The case concerns Mr Mäder's detention on grounds of protective care, ordered by the guardianship authority, and the length of time taken to examine his applications for release.

Mr Mäder was first detained in a psychiatric clinic on 2 April 2008 on grounds of protective care. He applied to the guardianship authority to have the detention order lifted. Before the guardianship authority had given a decision, he lodged an application for release with the Vice-President of the District Court. The District Court declined to examine his application on the ground that a decision had to be taken first by the guardianship authority. The Supreme Court of the Canton of Thurgau upheld that ruling. In the meantime, the guardianship authority ordered the applicant's release subject to four conditions. Mr Mäder refused to comply, and maintains that he was kept in detention against his will, an assertion denied by the authorities. He appealed without success to the Federal Court, alleging in particular a violation of Article 5 § 4 of the Convention. Mr Mäder also applied to the cantonal Department of Justice and Security, requesting that the temporary

withdrawal of his civil capacity be suspended and that he be released immediately. The guardianship authority was requested to submit observations but did not respond. However, it lifted the temporary withdrawal of civil capacity and the conditions attached to the applicant's release. As a result, the Department held that Mr Mäder's application was devoid of purpose. The Cantonal Administrative Court dismissed an appeal by Mr Mäder against that decision. The applicant appealed again to the Federal Court, alleging that he was at risk of further detention and of a violation of Article 5 § 4, but that appeal too was dismissed.

Relying on Article 5 § 4 of Convention (right to a speedy review of the lawfulness of detention), Mr Mäder complains about the requirement to obtain a prior decision from the guardianship authority before applying to the courts, and about the length of time taken to examine his requests concerning the deprivation of his liberty. Under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), he also alleges a violation of his right to obtain a reasoned decision concerning his application for release.

[Z.H. and R.H. v. Switzerland \(no. 60119/12\)](#)

The applicants, Ms. Z.H. and Mr. R.H. are Afghan nationals who were born in 1996 and 1992 respectively and live in Geneva (Switzerland). The case concerns the applicants' asylum claims.

The applicants entered Switzerland, via Italy, and, presenting themselves to the authorities as a married couple, applied for asylum in September 2011. According to the couple they had married in a religious ceremony in Iran in 2010. At the time, Ms Z.H. was 14 years old and Mr R.H. was 18 years old.

Their asylum request was rejected in December 2011 and March 2012, the migration authorities considering that under European Union law (the "Dublin II Regulation"), Italy was responsible for examining their asylum application as it was the first EU state that they had entered.

In the subsequent appeal proceedings, the domestic courts upheld the rejection of their asylum request, finding that the couple had failed to submit a certificate of marriage and that in any event their religious marriage could not be validly recognised in Switzerland because the law in Afghanistan prohibited marriage for women under the age of 15. Furthermore, the couple's marriage was incompatible with Swiss law on grounds of public policy given that sexual intercourse with a child under the age of 16 was a crime in Switzerland. As such, Ms Z.H. could not be qualified as a member of Mr R.H.'s family under EU law and they could not claim a right to family life under the European Convention.

Mr R.H. was expelled to Italy on 4 September 2012 but returned to Switzerland illegally a few days later.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (Right to family life), the applicants complain that the expulsion of Mr R.H. to Italy in 2012 breached their right to respect for family life.

[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.

Euroatlantic Airways - Transportes Aéreos, S.A. v. Portugal (no. 34676/13)

Leong Poy v. Portugal (no. 5190/14)

Sales v. Portugal (no. 64137/12)

Kashpruk v. Russia (no. 37894/07)

Klimova and Others v. Russia (nos. 22419/05, 26493/06, and 41910/06)

Kovalenko and Others v. Russia (nos. 36299/03, 14222/04, 15030/04, 36581/04, 1407/05, 2071/05 and 24618/05)

Kulyuk and Others v. Russia (nos. 47032/06, 6415/07, 39249/08, and 39251/08)

Pegov and Others v. Russia (nos. 57019/08, 57021/08, 7548/09, 7551/09, 7785/09, 10178/09, 10180/09, 10184/09, 10186/09, 10188/09, 10190/09, and 10374/09)

Thursday 10 December 2015

[Dolopoulos v. Greece \(no. 36656/14\)](#)

The applicant, Sotirios Dolopoulos, is a Greek national who was born in 1962 and lives in Thessaloniki (Greece).

The application concerns the circumstances in which a bank branch manager developed a psychiatric disorder and severe depression, allegedly caused in part by harassing tactics on the part of his managers.

Mr Dolopoulos, a bank branch manager, was involved in a conflict with his line manager and was accused of providing a customer with illegal financing. He was twice summoned before the bank's disciplinary board. The day after his second summons, Mr Dolopoulos collapsed outside his place of work and was taken to the emergency department of Thessaloniki psychiatric hospital. He was diagnosed with serious work-related depression and anxiety and was on sick leave for 311 days. Mr Dolopoulos complained to the Labour Inspectorate that the bank had omitted to declare his illness which, in his view, was caused by his working environment. He also lodged a complaint for harassment against five managers and the company doctor, claiming in particular that they were responsible for his illness because of their conduct, which had infringed his honour and reputation and made his working environment intolerable. In its observations the bank disputed Mr Dolopoulos's claims and stated that neither the doctor nor the bank had been responsible for any omission. It added that since psychiatric disorders, including those linked to stress at work, were not regarded as occupational diseases, it had not been required to declare the illness. The Labour Inspectorate sent its report to the public prosecutor's office, which dismissed Mr Dolopoulos's complaint, emphasising that psychiatric disorders were not included on the list of occupational diseases and that the applicant had not brought proceedings against the bank in the civil courts in order to complain of a deterioration in his working conditions. Mr Dolopoulos appealed but the public prosecutor at the Court of Appeal held that his appeal was unfounded, finding that there was no evidence in the file establishing a causal link between his illness and the conduct of the bank's management. Mr Dolopoulos, who had returned to work in the meantime, was dismissed without compensation. He lodged an unsuccessful application with the Court of First Instance seeking to have the termination of his employment contract set aside and claiming compensation in respect of non-pecuniary damage on account of injuries resulting from a work-related accident. The appeal proceedings are still pending.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) and Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Dolopoulos alleges a breach of the State's duty to protect employees in his situation against the risk of work-related illness.

[Spycher v. Switzerland \(no. 26275/12\)](#)

The applicant, Iris Spycher, is a Swiss national who was born in 1971 and lives in Oberstocken (Switzerland).

The case concerns the rejection of an application for an invalidity pension made by a person suffering from a somatoform pain disorder without demonstrable organic disease.

Ms Spycher, who suffered from persistent pain following a non-work related accident, applied to the Invalidity Insurance Office of the Canton of Berne for an invalidity pension. In support of her application she furnished a private expert report which stated that she was unfit to carry on any

occupation. The Office rejected her application, citing the case-law of the Federal Court according to which individuals suffering, like the applicant, from a somatoform pain disorder in the absence of demonstrable organic disease were not eligible for the benefit in question. The Cantonal Administrative Court dismissed an appeal by the applicant on the same grounds. Ms Spycher appealed to the Federal Court, which ordered a fresh expert report. However, Ms Spycher contested the choice of centre which was to carry out the expert examination. On the basis of this fresh expert report, according to which she was fully fit to carry on her most recent occupation or other suitable occupations, the Office again refused Ms Spycher's pension application. That decision was upheld by the Administrative Court, which declined to take oral evidence from the two doctors proposed by Ms Spycher as witnesses at a public hearing. The Federal Court also dismissed her appeal.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), Ms Spycher alleges that she was not given a fair hearing. She contends that the centre chosen for the expert examination was not independent and impartial *vis-à-vis* the invalidity insurance scheme, since the latter paid for the expert examinations, and that the courts were likewise not independent and impartial as they based their judgment on the expert report prepared by a medical centre used by the insurer, without ordering their own expert report.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) read in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), and on Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Ms Spycher alleges that the case-law of the Federal Court discriminates against people suffering from pain disorders without a demonstrable organic disease compared with those suffering from disorders with an underlying organic cause.

[Asllani v. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" \(no. 24058/13\)](#)

The applicant, Esat Asllani, is a Macedonian national who was born in 1962 and lives in Ohrid ("The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"). The case concerns his allegations of ill-treatment by the police.

Mr Asllani was employed by a local company operating a bakery in Resen when he was taken to the Resen police station in the early morning hours of 21 March 2008, together with the company's owner, for questioning. According to Mr Asllani, at the police station he was insulted by a police officer – who later became the mayor of Resen – using offensive language referring to Mr Asllani's ethnic origin. The officer physically assaulted him. In particular, he took a newspaper out of Mr Asllani's bag and tried to stuff it in his mouth; he then punched him three times, causing some injuries, including a broken nose.

Mr Asllani subsequently complained of ill-treatment by the police to the public prosecutor and to the Ministry of the Interior. After some preliminary enquiries, the Resen Court of First Instance opened a criminal investigation in October 2008. During the proceedings, the owner of the local company – who had initially made similar complaints to the authorities as Mr Asllani, stating that he had been insulted and ill-treated by the police on the same occasion – gave evidence maintaining that, while he had been at the police station that night, he had not been ill-treated and that Mr Asllani had made up the story. In March 2009 the investigation was closed. In April 2009 Mr Asllani, on advice by the authorities, brought a private indictment against the police officer on charges of ill-treatment and bodily injury. After holding several hearings and hearing evidence from several police officers – without, however, being able to secure the attendance of the owner of the local company, who had left the country – the Bitola Court of First Instance acquitted the police officer in February 2011 for lack of evidence. On appeal the case was remitted to the first-instance court for fresh examination. Subsequently that court acquitted the police officer three more times, those judgments being quashed each time by the appeal court and the case being remitted. Most recently the case was remitted in July 2015, the proceedings remaining pending before the first-instance court.

Relying in substance on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Asllani complains that he was ill-treated by the police and that the investigation into his allegations has been ineffective.

Tikhonov v. Ukraine (no. 17969/09)

The applicant, Igor Tikhonov, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1979. At the time of his application to the Court he was detained in prison in Vinnytsya (Ukraine). The case concerns his complaint of not having had access to a lawyer at the initial stage of the criminal proceedings against him, during which he made self-incriminating statements.

Mr Tikhonov was arrested in February 2006, initially on suspicion of an administrative offence. According to his submissions, he was then subjected to psychological pressure and physical violence by police officers with a view to making him confess to a murder which had taken place shortly before his arrest. When questioned by an investigator from the district prosecutor's office two days after his arrest, without being represented by a lawyer, he confessed to the murder. Subsequently he retracted his confession, submitting that he had made it as a result of ill-treatment. During a court hearing in the presence of his lawyer in December 2006, he denied his guilt. In June 2007, Mr Tikhonov was convicted of murder and sentenced to nine years' imprisonment. The trial court relied in particular on his initial confession, finding that it was consistent with other evidence. The judgment was eventually upheld in October 2008.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Tikhonov complains that he was ill-treated by the police. Relying further on Article 5 § 1 (c) (right to liberty and security), he maintains that his arrest and initial detention during the first two days was unlawful. Finally, he complains of a violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and right to legal assistance of own choosing), as he did not have access to a lawyer at the initial stage of the proceedings, when he made the self-incriminating statements.

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.

Harri v. Albania (no. 78187/13)

Lako v. Albania and two other applications (nos. 48693/08, 72462/11 and 30946/12)

A.P. v. Azerbaijan (no. 61737/14)

Pranjić Lukić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina (nos. 65062/11, 48076/13, 73966/13, 7636/14, and 11107/14)

K.S. v. the Czech Republic (no. 80365/13)

'Das Universelle Leben Aller Kulturen Weltweit e.V.' v. Germany (no. 60369/11)

Rupp v. Germany (nos. 60879/12, 60889/12, and 60893/12)

Aggelakis v. Greece (no. 25932/09)

Barzi and Others v. Greece (no. 47739/14)

Halimllari v. Greece (no. 9/15)

Ioseliani v. Greece (no. 43506/14)

Kalavros v. Greece (no. 27602/14)

Kravelidze v. Greece (no. 43442/14)

Lagos v. Greece (no. 27511/10)

Loulakis v. Greece (no. 58821/09)

Malachias v. Greece (no. 12639/11)

Nastoulis v. Greece (no. 49732/10)

Preci v. Greece (no. 9387/15)

Ramadani v. Greece (no. 43491/14)
Sarukhanyan v. Greece (no. 16882/15)
Sideris v. Greece (no. 63879/11)
Tzouvalopoulou v. Greece (no. 43822/15)
Xanthi Turkish Union and Others v. Greece (nos. 55557/12 and 73646/13)
Balogh and Others v. Hungary (nos. 26982/12, 131/13, 6764/13, 19712/13, 19892/13, 37487/13, 42486/13, 42808/13, 43610/13, and 43868/13)
Bota and Others v. Hungary (nos. 34753/12, 34754/12, 45140/12, 45848/12, 48473/12, 56357/12, 56362/12, 56368/12, 58632/12, 72055/12, 73195/12, 76492/12, and 79146/12)
Ligeti and Others v. Hungary (nos. 29176/12, 30412/12, 34750/12, 11581/13, 13378/13, 36245/13, 46623/13, 51719/13, 76213/13, and 80997/13)
Polgár and Others v. Hungary (nos. 29213/13, 36214/13, 44381/13, 44661/13, 44763/13, 46576/13, 46587/13, 46588/13, 46644/13, and 51608/13)
Cinque and Others v. Italy (nos. 47425/10, 51980/10, 51981/10, 51982/10, 51983/10, 51984/10, 51985/10, and 51986/10)
De Falco and Others v. Italy (nos. 29764/11, 29770/11, 29771/11, 29775/11, 29778/11, 29779/11, 29780/11, 54065/11, 54066/11, 54067/11, 54068/11, 54069/11, 54070/11, 54071/11, 25240/12, and 25242/12)
Galasso and Rana v. Italy (nos. 9383/11, 9439/11, and 9444/11)
Giovanelli and Others v. Italy (no. 19975/09 and 23 other applications)
Greco and Others v. Italy (nos. 10937/09, 11579/09, 13979/09, 14326/09, 34197/09, and 34252/09)
Lucidi and Others v. Italy (nos. 41660/11, 41660/11, 41661/11, 41662/11, 41663/11, 41664/11, and 41665/11)
Maio and Others v. Italy (no. 17694/10 and 18 other applications)
Maso and Others v. Italy (nos. 38148/12, 38276/12, and 38277/12)
Mastandrea and Others v. Italy (nos. 19942/08, 45012/08, 29209/09, 44801/09, 10534/10, 59285/10, 63854/10, 64785/10, 64786/10, 30533/11, 42770/11, 64980/11, 64996/11, 69071/11, 28263/12, and 29736/12)
Pasquariello and Others v. Italy (no. 44846/10 and 19 other applications)
Randazzo and Others v. Italy (no. 23658/11 and 27 other applications)
Tondone and Others v. Italy (no. 8176/09 and 90 other applications)
Vanacore and Others v. Italy (no. 45162/10 and 74 other applications)
Vitale and Others v. Italy (nos. 69260/11, 69275/11, 69286/11, 715/12, 738/12, 744/12, 5486/12, 5489/12, 8415/12, 8570/12, 9918/12, 9919/12, 9925/12, 11073/12, 11077/12, 13121/12, and 37496/12)
A.T.H. v. the Netherlands (no. 54000/11)
F.J. and Others v. the Netherlands (nos. 37504/12 and 78146/12)
Herman v. the Netherlands (no. 35965/14)
L.N.T. v. the Netherlands and Italy (no. 28686/14)
Nzapali v. the Netherlands (no. 6107/07)
S.B. and M.R. v. the Netherlands (nos. 63999/13 and 60814/14)
A.N. v. Poland (no. 59250/13)
Bento Vieira and Vieira Batista v. Portugal (no. 52761/13)
Cascalheira v. Portugal (no. 59513/13)
Esteves David v. Portugal (no. 54872/13)
Magalhães Duarte Ferreira v. Portugal (no. 59685/13)
Marques Alexandre and Marques Cruz Alexandre v. Portugal (no. 59694/13)
Marques v. Portugal (no. 59459/13)
Neves Barracas v. Portugal (no. 67064/13)
Bandulea v. Romania (no. 52804/13)
Catană v. Romania (no. 40102/13)

Florea v. Romania (no. 60712/13)
Ghelbează v. Romania (no. 7230/14)
Postelnicu and Others v. Romania (nos. 72300/13, 24198/14, 29062/14, 29919/14, 39922/14, 40733/14, 44566/14, and 55822/14)
Roșca Murariu v. Romania (no. 69705/13)
S.C. Your Friend S.R.L. v. Romania (no. 44669/05)
Sinitean v. Romania (no. 1337/14)
Traicu and Others v. Romania (nos. 77101/12, 37929/13, 47824/13, and 54981/13)
Turcuț and Others v. Romania (nos. 55159/09, 34017/11, 70120/14, 70124/14, 3520/15, 3769/15, and 4662/15)
Ostanin v. Russia (no. 30692/11)
Sviridovskiy v. Russia (no. 67024/09)
Zhuk v. Russia (no. 23906/09)
Kadric v. Serbia (no. 54271/13)
C.B.C. v. Spain (no. 68802/11)
Nomoah v. Sweden (no. 47141/14)
Ozdemir v. Turkey (no. 16197/06)
Lutsishina and Karpets-Volkovinskiy v. Ukraine (no. 59704/11)
Shchichka v. Ukraine (no. 64511/12 and 572 other applications)
Terletskiy v. Ukraine (no. 22611/12 and 359 other applications)

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 Twitter [@ECHRpress](https://twitter.com/ECHRpress).

Press contacts

echrpress@echr.coe.int | tel: +33 3 90 21 42 08

Tracey Turner-Tretz (tel: + 33 3 88 41 35 30)

Nina Salomon (tel: + 33 3 90 21 49 79)

Denis Lambert (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 09)

Inci Ertekin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 55 30)

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.