EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 112 (2019)
04.04.2019

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 10 judgments on Tuesday 9 April 2019 and 90 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 11 April 2019.

*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 9 April 2019

Navalnyy v. Russia (no. 2) (no. 43734/14)

The applicant, Aleksey Navalnyy, is a Russian national who was born in 1976 and lives in Moscow. He is an anti-corruption campaigner and an opposition political activist.

The case concerns his being held under house arrest during criminal proceedings against him and the various restrictions placed on him during that time.

In December 2012 the Investigation Committee of the Russian Federation opened a criminal file on the applicant and his brother for suspected fraud against the companies Multidisciplinary Processing Ltd and Yves Rocher Vostok Ltd and for the laundering of the proceeds of illegal transactions.

The Investigation Committee ordered the applicant to remain in Moscow but he was permitted to travel to Moscow Region, subject to an obligation to inform the investigator. In January 2014 he informed the investigator that he had visited Moscow Region, after which the Investigative Committee cancelled his travel permit and told him he should have obtained authorisation before making such a trip.

In February 2014 Mr Navalnyy attended a court in Moscow to hear verdicts handed down against people who had taken part in a political rally in May 2012, however, he was arrested twice during the day and found liable for a breach of the rules on holding public demonstrations and for failing to obey the lawful orders of a police officer. Later in February 2014 the Investigation Committee asked to have Mr Navalnyy placed under house arrest, which was granted by a court. The court cited reasons such as a risk he might abscond, threaten witnesses or continue his alleged criminal activity.

The house arrest order was extended several times and various restrictions were placed on him, including having to wear a tracking bracelet, a ban on communicating with anyone but his immediate family or lawyers, on receiving or sending correspondence, on communicating via the Internet or making statements to the media about his criminal case.

In October 2014 a court lifted the ban on making statements in the media about his criminal case, finding that it was not in compliance with the Code of Criminal Procedure. In December 2014 Mr Navalnyy and his brother were found guilty of money laundering and of defrauding MPK and Yves Rocher Vostok. The applicant was given a suspended sentence of three and half years in jail and a fine, although the fine was quashed on appeal.

In January 2015 he announced publicly that he refused to comply with the house-arrest order, cut off his bracelet and went to his office. He stated that he had not been given a written extension to the house arrest order within the legal time-limit. He was not stopped or sanctioned.

Relying on Article 5 §§ 1 (a), (b), and (c), 3 and 4 (right to liberty and security / entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial / right to have lawfulness of detention decided

speedily by a court) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains about his house arrest for 10 months, in particular that the measure was unnecessary and arbitrary.

He also complains under Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the Convention that the measures against him during that time were aimed at preventing him from pursuing his public and political activities, and alleges under Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) that the measures were politically motivated.

Tomov and Others v. Russia (nos. 18255/10, 63058/10, 10270/11, 73227/11, 56201/13, and 41234/16)

The applicants, Aleksey Tomov, Yuliya Punegova, Natalya Kostromina, Yevgeniy Rakov, Dmitriy Vasilyev, Nikolay Roshka, Nikita Barinov are Russian nationals who were born in 1966, 1985, 1978, 1969, 1958, 1965, and 1990 respectively.

The applicants allege that the conditions of their transfer between penal facilities, when they were serving custodial sentences or being held in detention pending trial, were inhuman and degrading.

While serving sentences Mr Tomov, Mr Vasilyev, Mr Roshka and Mr Barinov were transported over long distances by both road and rail. In 2009 Mr Tomov was transferred from Vorkuta to Yemva, 900 kilometres away. The journey took 21 hours in total, including stops. He also underwent another transfer in 2015, together with the applicants Mr Roshka and Mr Barinov, which took 62 hours and involved three journeys over 2,200 kilometres, the last leg being the longest as they had to spend three nights on a train. Mr Vasilyev was transferred in November 2014 from the Sverdlovsk Region to Yekaterinburg and back, both journeys lasting between 12 and 14 hours.

These four applicants allege that on the railway leg of their journeys, which included at least one overnight ride, they were deprived of a night's rest because prisoners outnumbered sleeping places. The three applicants who underwent the 2,200 km journey also complain that they were only allowed two toilet visits and three pots of water per day and, at one point, were left for about 15 hours at sub-zero temperatures without heating while the train was stationary.

They all also complained of overcrowding in prison vans – less than 0.5 square metres of floor space per prisoner – when transported to and from the train stations.

When transferred by prison van during their detention, Ms Punegova and Ms Kostromina had to travel in a single-prisoner cubicle, known as a "*stakan*", which is a solid metal isolation box measuring 65 cm by 50 cm with one seat inside. The "*stakan*" are for those detainees who are considered vulnerable under the relevant regulations, such as women who are at risk of sexual harassment, and have to be transported separately.

Ms Punegova was transported in such a cubicle when being taken to and from court. In early 2010 prior to her trial, the trips lasted a few minutes each time. Over the two-month trial, spanning the end of 2010 and beginning of 2011, she was taken to and from court hearings at least 10 times, each trip lasting over one hour. She alleges that warm air from the heating unit in the central aisle of the van could not circulate in her cubicle, which was sealed off by a solid metal door, and that she thus suffered badly from the cold.

Ms Kostromina was transferred from Kineshma to Syktyvkar in the summer of 2010, transiting via three different remand centres over a three-week period. She was taken from the remand centres to the railway stations on seven occasions in a "*stakan*" along with another woman prisoner. Each trip lasted one to two hours, and she says being in such a confined space was aggravated by the fact that she is obese and has diabetes.

In February 2011 Mr Rakov was transferred to Vladivostok, 200 kilometres away from where he was serving his sentence. He complained to various authorities and the courts about this trip, alleging that it had been made particularly difficult for him because, suffering from chronic prostatitis, he

had been made to wait for hours on end to use the toilet. The courts rejected his claims, including on appeal in July 2011, without hearing Mr Rakov or his representative.

Mr Rakov, as well as two of the other applicants, also unsuccessfully challenged the guidelines set down by the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of the Interior for transporting prisoners. The Supreme Court of Russia rejected their complaints that the maximum number of detainees allowed in railway carriages was too high and led to overcrowding, finding in particular that such conditions conformed to domestic regulations and did not deliberately cause pain or suffering.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention, all seven applicants complain of the inadequate conditions of their transportation. Mr Rakov, Mr Tomov, Mr Roshka and Mr Barinov also complain under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) that there were no effective remedies in domestic law for them to challenge their conditions of transport.

Mr Rakov further relies on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) to complain that he was not given the opportunity to present his claim for compensation for inadequate conditions of detention to the courts.

V.D. and Others v. Russia (no. 72931/10)

The applicants, V.D., N.P., A.Z., M.R., M.M., L.K., A.U., and K.S., are Russian nationals who live in Astrakhan (Russia). The first applicant represents herself and the other seven applicants. She also lodged the application on behalf of R., a Russian national born in 2000.

The case concerns court orders which ended the first applicant's guardianship of R., returned him to his biological parents and denied the applicants any access to him.

The first applicant was made R.'s guardian in November 2001 after he was born with severe congenital illnesses and his parents stated that they were not able to look after him. She later became the guardian of the other seven applicants.

In 2007 R.'s parents expressed a wish to take him back into their care after his health had become more stable and the first applicant began proceedings to deprive them of their parental authority.

In November 2008 the first-instance court dismissed the first applicant's action, a decision that was upheld on appeal in March 2009. The courts ordered that R. remain living with the first applicant but in May 2009 decided on access arrangements for the parents. They later began a second set of proceedings to have R. live with them and in May 2010 the District Court granted their application, a decision which was upheld on appeal. R. was transferred to his parents in June 2010.

The courts later refused to grant the applicants any contact with R. They rejected the first applicant's argument that she had formed a close tie with him and cited domestic law that only members of the family or relatives were entitled to seek such access.

The applicants complain of a breach of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) owing to the courts' decisions to return R. to his parents, to terminate the first applicant's guardianship rights and to deny them all access to R.

A.V. v. Slovenia (no. 878/13)

The applicant, Mr A.V., is a Slovenian national who was born in 1961 and lives in Ljubljana.

The case concerns domestic court decisions to remove the applicant's right to have contact with his children and the work of the welfare authorities.

Following their separation, the applicant and his former wife, M., in November 2002 concluded an agreement on contact arrangements with his three children. Problems with regard to its implementation arose in June 2006. Consequently, the applicant had no contact with his children between July 2006 and November 2008.

In court proceedings initiated by the applicant in July 2006 a court-appointed psychiatrist submitted that the children found contact with their father unpleasant and refused it. In April 2008 the District Court granted the applicant regular contact once a week in the presence of a school psychologist. On appeal, the Higher Court determined that contact should take place every other Wednesday in the presence of an expert caseworker from the Social Work Centre who was to provide assistance in establishing mutual trust between the applicant and the children. Subsequent contact sessions (11 in total) only lasted a few minutes before the children left the room, stating that they did not want to see their father. After four contact sessions that took place under the supervision of the Centre, the Centre initiated court proceedings, seeking to modify or discontinue contact.

In June 2011 the District Court issued a decision discontinuing contact between Mr V. and his children, finding that the sessions were no longer in the children's best interests because they were too traumatic. It further found it inappropriate to order family therapy involving the children. The Higher Court dismissed an appeal by the applicant and a constitutional complaint was also unsuccessful. The applicant lodged a complaint with the Inspectorate for Social Matters at the Ministry for Work, Family and Social Matters. In August 2011 the Inspectorate issued an audit report, which found a number of flaws in the Centre's handling of his case. It ordered the Centre to carry out several measures, which were implemented by April 2012.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, the applicant complains of a violation of his rights because of the domestic courts' decisions to end his right to contact with his three children, their refusal to order family therapy, and because of the allegedly inadequate work of the welfare authorities.

I.M. v. Switzerland (no. 23887/16)

The applicant, I.M., is a Kosovar[1] national who was born in 1964 and has lived in Switzerland since 1993.

The case concerns his expulsion to Kosovo[1] following his conviction for a rape committed in 2003.

In 1993 I.M. lodged an asylum application with the Swiss authorities, which rejected his application but granted him provisional admission. In August 1998 I.M.'s former wife, who lived in Kosovo and whom he divorced in May 1998, arrived in Switzerland with the applicant's three children. Their asylum application was accepted. Subsequently, I.M. married a Swiss national and obtained a residence permit on the basis of that marriage. The couple divorced in 2006.

In 2003 I.M. was convicted on charges of sexual coercion and rape, based on incidents which had occurred that same year. In 2005 the Court of Appeal, which only considered the charge of rape, reduced the initial sentence to two years and three months' imprisonment, and upheld I.M.'s expulsion from Swiss territory for twelve years, suspended, with a probation period of five years.

In 2006 the Basle-Rural Canton Immigration Office rejected I.M.'s request for an extension of his residence permit, noting that the fact that he had been sentenced to over two years' imprisonment for rape constituted grounds for expelling him from Swiss territory. In 2007 the Basle-Rural Canton State Council and then the Basle-Rural Cantonal Court dismissed I.M.'s appeals.

In 2010 the State Secretariat for Migration extended the cantonal expulsion order to cover the entire Swiss territory. In 2013 I.M., whose health had been affected, was awarded a full invalidity pension, with retroactive effect from 1 October 2012, his rate of disability having been assessed at 80 %.

In 2015 the Federal Administrative Court dismissed an appeal lodged by I.M. against the 2010 decision to extend the cantonal expulsion order to cover the whole country, on the grounds, in particular, that the two-years and three months' prison sentence which had been imposed on him

[1] All references to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

had clearly exceeded the threshold for admitting a breach of serious endangerment of public order and security.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), I.M. complains about his expulsion order from Swiss territory, emphasising the lack of any risk of his reoffending, as well as his health problems and the fact that he is dependent on the care provided by his relatives in Switzerland.

Altay v. Turkey (no. 2) (no. 11236/09)

The applicant, Mehmet Aytunç Altay, is a Turkish national who was born in 1956. He is serving his sentence of life imprisonment in the Edirne F-type prison (Turkey).

The case concerns a decision by the prison authorities and the courts to have an official present when he consults his lawyer.

In August 2005 the prison authorities decided to prohibit Mr Altay, who had been sentenced to life imprisonment for attempting to undermine the constitutional order, from receiving a parcel from his lawyer which contained a book called *Globalisation and Imperialism* (*Küreselleş me ve Emperyalizm)*, a magazine with the title *Rootless Anational Publication* (*Köxüz Anasyonal Neş riyat*), and a newspaper, *Express International Sha la la* (*Express Enternasyonal Ş alala*).

The Edirne Enforcement Court upheld the prison's decision as the material had nothing to do with the rights of the defence. Mr Altay objected, but his appeal was unsuccessful.

In September of the same year the prison asked for authorisation to have an official present during Mr Altay's meetings with his lawyer, arguing that her actions in sending the material had been incompatible with her duties as a legal representative. The Edirne Enforcement Court allowed the request. Mr Altay challenged the restriction in 2008, 2010 and 2013 but was unsuccessful each time.

In 2006 the Strasbourg Court rejected an application by Mr Altay over the prohibition on him receiving the book and periodicals, holding that he had to first use the domestic remedy of applying to the Compensation Commission. The Commission held in 2016 that the refusal to hand over the reading material had violated his rights under Article 10 (freedom of expression).

In the current application he relies on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and the correspondence) to complain that the September 2005 decision to order the presence of an official during his lawyer's visits violated his right to confidential consultations with his lawyer.

Under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), he complains that neither he nor his lawyer were able to take part effectively in the proceedings on the restrictions on his meetings with his lawyer as there had been no hearings and they had not been able to present any arguments against the prison administration's application or the public prosecutor's request.

Tarak and Depe v. Turkey (no. 70472/12)

The applicants, Yasemin Tarak and her son Birtan Sinan Depe, are Turkish nationals who were born in 1967 and 1993 respectively. They live in Istanbul (Turkey).

The applicants in this case allege that Mr Depe was detained in a police station in the framework of an investigation into a burglary when he was eight years old.

In October 2001 the police carried out a search at the home of C.Ö. – a neighbour to whom Ms Tarak had entrusted her son in her absence – as part of an investigation into a burglary which had occurred the same day. According to Ms Tarak, the police officers had taken her son to the police station. Two days later Ms Tarak, who was suspected of involvement in the burglary, was arrested and escorted to Beyoğlu police station, where she saw her son asleep on a desk. The child stayed with her until her questioning by the public prosecutor the same day. Subsequently, Ms Tarak lodged a complaint, alleging that her son had been taken into police custody and been struck and threatened by the

police officers to force him to reveal his mother's whereabouts. She also requested a psychological assessment of her son.

In November 2004, criminal proceedings were brought against several police officers for acting in excess of their powers. In December 2009 a court decided to terminate the proceedings as being statute-barred. The Court of Cassation upheld that decision.

Relying, in particular, on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), the applicants submit that Mr Depe was unlawfully deprived of his liberty, which had a negative impact on his mental health. Mr Depe also complains that he was struck and threatened.

Thursday 11 April 2019

Mariyka Popova and Asen Popov v. Bulgaria (no. 11260/10)

The applicants, Mariyka Todorova Popova and Asen Asparuhov Popov, are a married couple of Bulgarian nationality who were born in 1941 and 1936 and live in Dorkovo. The case concerns the dismissal of their legal action by the Supreme Court of Cassation on the grounds of divergences in that court's case-law.

In May 2004 the applicants' daughter died in a road traffic accident. Criminal proceedings were commenced against S.V., the driver who had caused the accident. Mr and Ms Popovi, the deceased's son and husband and the other victim of the accident joined the proceedings as civil parties. The court found S.V. guilty of having negligently caused the applicants' daughter's death and inflicted traumatic injuries on the other victim. It ordered S.V. to pay damages.

The applicants and the other three civil parties were unable to recover the sums owed to them because of S.V.'s insolvency. They brought separate proceedings against S.V.'s insurance company. By two decisions and three judgments, the courts ruled that the claimants were entitled to sue the insurer of the person having caused the accident, even though the latter had already been ordered to pay damages, because they had been unable to recover the sums awarded.

Furthermore, by judgment of 21 February 2008, a court upheld the applicants' claim and ordered the insurance company to pay them compensation. The Sofia Court of Appeal set that judgment aside on the grounds that the applicants were not entitled to sue the insurance company given that they had already secured a court order against the insured person to pay the same amount for the same contingency, that is to say their daughter's death. Mr and Mrs Popovi lodged an appeal on points of law. They argued that there had been a contradiction between the appellate court's finding that section 407 (1) of the Trade Law was inapplicable to their case and the conclusions of the Supreme Court of Cassation in similar cases. The Supreme Court of Cassation dismissed their appeal on points of law as being inadmissible.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicants complain of the dismissal of their civil action. They allege that divergences in the case-law of the Supreme Court of Cassation as regards the interpretation of section 407 (1) of the Trade Law amounted to a violation of their right to fair civil proceedings.

Bonnemaison v. France (no. 32216/15)

The applicant, Nicolas Bonnemaison, is a French national, a GP by profession, who was born in 1961 and lives in Bayonne (France). The case concerns his being struck off the register following a series of sudden deaths of patients in the short-stay unit (UHCD) of the Côte Basque Hospital in Bayonne, in which he worked as an accident and emergency doctor.

In 2011 a medical worker sent a serious incidents report to the Director of the Côte Basque Hospital. He suspected Mr Bonnemaison of having triggered the deaths of four end-of-life patients, without

the knowledge of their families or his colleagues, with the deaths occurring very quickly after he had left their hospital rooms. In an article published in 2011, counsel for Mr Bonnemaison stated that his client had admitted that he had intervened in order to put an end to the patients' suffering.

The applicant was charged by an investigating judge, before being finally acquitted by an assize court in 2014. The court held that even though he had administered lethal injections without informing the healthcare team and the families or updating the patients' medical files, in view of the possible undesired effects of the products used, no intent to kill had been established. In 2015, on appeal, the assize court acquitted Mr Bonnemaison of six deaths, but found him guilty of the death of one female patient and gave him a two-year suspended prison sentence. Mr Bonnemaison did not appeal on points of law.

In September 2011, concurrently with the criminal proceedings, the National Council of the Medical Association submitted the case to its disciplinary department.

In 2012, after the applicant had orally acknowledged the seriousness of the alleged acts, the first-instance Disciplinary Division of the Medical Association decided to strike Mr Bonnemaison off the medical register on account of his repeated, very serious ethical breaches. In 2014 the National Disciplinary Division of the Medical Association dismissed appeals lodged by Mr Bonnemaison and the Departmental Council, on the grounds, in particular, of the lawfulness of the disciplinary proceedings, the independence of the criminal and disciplinary proceedings and the applicant's failure to contest the veracity of the facts.

The *Conseil d'État* dismissed the appeal on points of law by an extensively reasoned judgment of 30 December 2014. In 2016 the National Disciplinary Division of the Medical Association, examining an application for the reopening of proceedings submitted by the applicant, upheld the sanction imposed.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicant complains of the lack of independence of the disciplinary divisions and the partiality of the *Conseil d'État*. Relying on Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence), he alleges that the *Conseil d'État* ought not to have dismissed his applications and that his acquittal at first instance exonerated him from any disciplinary sanction. Lastly, in view of the financial consequences of his ban from exercising the medical profession, the applicant considers that his being struck off the register is in breach of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

Guimon v. France (no. 48798/14)

The applicant, Laurence Guimon, is a French national who was born in 1969. She was detained in Rennes Prison at the material time. The case concerns the refusal to allow the applicant to travel to the Bayonne funeral home to pay her last respects to her deceased father.

Ms Guimon, an active member of ETA until her arrest in 2003, was convicted three times, primarily for involvement in a criminal organisation planning terrorist offences, handling assets obtained by racketeering, and possession and transport of arms and explosive substances and devices in connection with terrorism.

On 26 April 2006 she was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment, on 29 November 2006 she was sentenced to seventeen years' imprisonment with a minimum term of 2/3 of the total sentence, and on 17 November 2008 she was sentenced to seventeen years' imprisonment, the last sentence to run concurrently with the previous one. In 2011 the courts ordered the partial (five years maximum) concurrent serving of the eight-year and the seventeen-year prison terms.

On 21 January 2014 counsel for the applicant lodged a request for a short period of leave under escort, so that she could be at the bedside of father, who had died that day in a clinic in Bayonne.

On 22 January the request was rejected by the Vice-President responsible for sentence enforcement of the Paris Regional Court, on the grounds that although a death in the family could constitute grounds for authorising leave under escort, the request had to be assessed in the light of the prisoner's character and the risk of escape.

On 23 January Ms Guimon appealed. On 24 January 2014 the order of 22 January was upheld. The Court of Appeal held that while the request for authorisation seemed justified in human terms, the risk of public disorder necessitated special surveillance, especially because of the geographical distance to be covered, and because it was materially impossible to organise the escort at such short notice.

Ms Guimon appealed against that decision. By an order of 29 April 2014 the Court of Cassation dismissed the appeal for the lack of serious grounds of cassation.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complained of the judicial authorities' refusal to authorise her prison leave under escort to travel to a funeral home so that she could pay her last respects to her deceased father.

Harisch v. Germany (no. 50053/16)

The applicant, Klaus Harisch, is a German national who was born in 1964 and lives in Munich (Germany).

The case concerns civil proceedings in which the applicant requested a referral to the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU).

Mr Harisch was one of the two founders of T.AG, a directory enquiries service. T.AG received, for a fee, the required subscriber information from DTAG. In 2007 and 2008 DTAG was ordered to refund T.AG part of the fees paid as they had been excessive.

Mr Harisch brought an action against DTAG, claiming that as a result of such excessive prices he and his cofounder had had to reduce their shares in the company before its stock market launch. For that reason, and also because the company's valuation was lower on the day of the launch, he had sustained damage. In May 2013 the Regional Court dismissed the claim.

Mr Harisch appealed. During an oral hearing before the Court of Appeal he called for the proceedings to be suspended and for a preliminary CJEU ruling to be obtained. In July 2014 the Court of Appeal dismissed his appeal by giving a detailed reasoning why his legal opinion was not supported by the CJEU's case-law. It also saw no reason to grant leave to appeal on points of law since there was no need to clarify the legal questions raised.

He filed a complaint against the refusal of leave to appeal on points of law, in which he repeated his request for a referral to the CJEU. The Federal Court of Justice rejected it, briefly indicating the reasons for refusing leave to appeal on points of law and dispensed with any further reasoning pursuant to Article 544 § 4 of the Code of Civil Procedure, to which it referred to in its decision.

Mr Harisch further filed a complaint concerning a violation of his right to be heard (*Anhörungsrüge*). The Federal Court of Justice also rejected this complaint, stating that a decision by a court of last instance did not require more detailed reasoning. In February 2016 the Federal Constitutional Court declined to consider Mr Harisch's constitutional complaint.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) Mr Harisch complains about the domestic courts' refusal to refer questions to the CJEU for a preliminary ruling and of a failure to provide adequate reasoning for that refusal.

Sarwari and Others v. Greece (no. 38089/12)

The applicants are 10 Afghan nationals who were born between 1975 and 1988.

The case concerns allegations of ill-treatment suffered by the applicants at the hands of police officers seeking an Afghan fugitive who had absconded from the courtroom, while under the surveillance of those officers. The events took place in December 2004.

Relying, in particular, on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 6 (right to a fair trial), the applicants allege that they were ill-treated by the police officers. They also complain about the investigation and the judicial proceedings, as well as the length of the latter.

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 9 April 2019

Name	Main application number
Cocu and Calentiev v. the Republic of Moldova	20919/05
Romanenco v. the Republic of Moldova	59252/13
Taziyeva and Others v. Russia	32394/11

Thursday 11 April 2019

Name	Main application number
Gadirov v. Azerbaijan	42221/14
Gahramanli and Oil Workers Rights Protection Organisation v. Azerbaijan	74309/14
Isayev v. Azerbaijan	28440/11
Mammadov v. Azerbaijan	19160/11
Compere v. Belgium	66102/12
Pîrjoleanu v. Belgium	26404/18
Urbieta Alcorta v. France	28390/16
Dzasokhov v. Georgia	70243/11
Schnepp v. Germany	9608/16
Georgiou v. Greece	1406/13
Kaltakis and Kaltaki v. Greece	45219/15
Sayed Elahl v. Greece	80306/17
Domokos and Others v. Hungary	27943/15
Gróf and Others v. Hungary	31753/14
Horváth and Others v. Hungary	51063/14
Szilvási and Others v. Hungary	60475/14
Zálogfiók Zrt and Others v. Hungary	17800/15
Fraccola and Others v. Italy	36358/07
Andriuta v. the Republic of Moldova	55289/13
Ipate v. the Republic of Moldova	46114/11
Kommersant Moldovy v. the Republic of Moldova	10661/08
Bilici v. Romania	67581/16
Botea and Others v. Romania	36298/15

Name	Main application number
Broască and Mălureanu v. Romania	62854/15
Chiriac and Others v. Romania	37343/16
Cioarec v. Romania	9516/15
Cuzub v. Romania	20770/16
Deji-Broșteanu v. Romania	22121/06
Gheorghe v. Romania	5605/16
Iuliana Ionescu v. Romania	52313/14
Lascarache v. Romania	26188/06
Lucian Manafu and Ganea Ardelean v. Romania	8625/16
Manu v. Romania	38870/15
Stoica v. Romania	35986/16
Antonov v. Russia	34644/17
Chistyakova v. Russia	58190/18
Damayev and Others v. Russia	58935/17
Dezhin and Others v. Russia	29253/17
Fadeyev and Others v. Russia	5027/17
Kaldaras and Others v. Russia	3241/18
Kozlov and Others v. Russia	23686/13
Mansurov v. Russia	37874/11
Mikhaylova and Others v. Russia	27870/12
Patsukov and Others v. Russia	11590/18
Publisher Ezhayev A. K. Ltd v. Russia	25051/11
Rozyyev and Others v. Russia	41917/06
Sankin v. Russia	32186/10
Subbotin and Others v. Russia	54092/14
Tkachev and Others v. Russia	63868/12
Vyshkevich v. Russia	28751/18
Putnik Ekspres Doo v. Serbia	43197/16
Vladić v. Serbia	46288/15
Hnidka v. Slovakia	37844/18
Hudák and Bača v. Slovakia	26730/18
Jozefko v. Slovakia	45511/18
Alkan v. Turkey	38006/15
Alyamaç v. Turkey	4562/12
Arbağ v. Turkey	30646/10
Arpaç v. Turkey	53105/09
Çeliksan Çelik Sanayi ve Ticaret Ltd. Şti. v. Turkey	42375/09
Dirik v. Turkey	23640/12
Doğan v. Turkey	12820/17
Gürkal v. Turkey	30317/11
Kaçalay v. Turkey	33608/09
Karakuş and Others v. Turkey	43122/09
Kaya v. Turkey	39063/11
Kırtay v. Turkey	2281/10
Konur v. Turkey	48654/06

Name	Main application number
Öztunç v. Turkey	42820/07
Pilav and Rapayazdıç v. Turkey	28523/11
Sabaz v. Turkey	5415/08
Tunç v. Turkey	30320/11
Üstün and Others v. Turkey	49505/07
Yahli v. Turkey	56744/15
Yolcu v. Turkey	15063/10
Abramovych v. Russia and Ukraine	62529/14
Kalka v. Ukraine	37915/14
Kravchenko v. Ukraine	1906/13
Levchenko and Others v. Ukraine	46993/13
Malyy v. Ukraine	14486/07
Mudriyevskyy v. Ukraine	77829/13
Pershyna v. Ukraine	10202/16
Rudyy v. Ukraine	19019/18
Sholokh v. Ukraine	73007/14
Miller and Others v. the United Kingdom	70571/14

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.

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

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)
Patrick Lannin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 44 18)
Somi Nikol (tel: + 33 3 90 21 64 25)

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.