



## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 12 judgments on Tuesday 9 June 2026 and 89 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 11 June 2026.

*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 9 June 2026

### [Velev and Others v. Bulgaria \(application no. 56007/21\)](#)

The applicants are two individuals (a Bulgarian national and a Polish national, both of whom are Jehovah's Witnesses in Bulgaria) and a legal entity (The Religious Denomination of Jehovah's Witnesses in Bulgaria).

In this case, the applicants allege that a ban on door-to-door "religious propaganda" imposed in the municipality of Shumen in 2016 infringed their right to freedom of religion.

They rely in this connection on Articles 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) and 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention of Human Rights.

### [Jiitee Työt Oy v. Finland \(no. 2895/25\)](#)

The applicant company, Jiitee Työt Oy, has its registered office in Vantaa (Finland).

Jiitee Työt Oy and another limited liability company, M., entered contracts between them for repair work to rail tunnels. The contracts stipulated that certain disputes would be resolved through arbitration by the Arbitration Institute of the Finland Chamber of Commerce. In May 2022 M. lodged a request for arbitration and the two parties agreed that the Rules for Expediated Arbitration would be applied to their dispute. Those rules do not require that arbitration awards be reasoned. An arbitral award was issued in December 2022, ordering Jiitee Työt Oy to pay an award to M. No reasons were given.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention, Jiitee Työt Oy complains about the lack of any reasoning in the arbitral award.

### [Aničić v. Serbia \(no. 36639/22\)](#)

The applicant, Aleksandar Aničić, is a Serbian national who was born in 1990 and lives in Nepričava (Serbia).

In January 2018 a lorry Mr Aničić was driving collided with a car driven by M. In October 2019 a minor-offences court found Mr Aničić guilty of having caused the accident and ordered him to pay a fine. An appeal by Mr Aničić was unsuccessful. In March 2022 the Constitutional Court reviewed Mr Aničić's case and discerned no violation as regards his rights to a fair hearing or to defend himself in the minor-offence proceedings.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention, Mr Aničić complains that the minor-offence proceedings against him were unfair. In particular, he argues that the courts refused to admit expert evidence.

### [Erçin v. Türkiye \(no. 44621/19\)](#)

The applicant, Hikmet Erçin, is a Turkish national who was born in 1992 and lives in Şanlıurfa (Türkiye). He suffers from epilepsy.

In 2011 Mr Erçin went through a medical check as part of his pre-enlistment examination for compulsory military service. On 26 August 2012 he started military service. On 27 August 2012 he underwent the standard initial medical examination following conscription. The doctor diagnosed his epilepsy and requested his transfer to a neurology clinic. According to Mr Erçin, he requested medication for his epilepsy, but this was refused. On 2 September 2012 he suffered an epileptic fit during which he lost consciousness and fell. He was admitted to hospital and underwent various surgical procedures. On 1 July 2013 a medical report was issued by a medical board at the GATA Military Hospital which stated that he was unfit for military service. He was subsequently discharged from the army. Mr Erçin brought compensation proceedings before the Supreme Military Administrative Court. In September 2014 that court allowed his claim in part, finding a failure of the State authorities in the pre-enlistment examination. It awarded him 3,000 Turkish liras (approximately 1,000 euros) for non-pecuniary damage. However, it also imposed legal fees which exceeded the amount of compensation ordered.

Relying, in particular, on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Erçin complains that the negligence of State authorities before and following his conscription caused serious harm to his health. Relying on Article 6 (access to court), he complains about the legal fees imposed on him by the Military Administrative Court and the independence and impartiality of that court.

Thursday 11 June 2026

### [Congrégation chrétienne des Témoins de Jéhovah v. Italy \(no. 49687/16\)](#)

The applicant association is a duly registered religious association of Jehovah's Witnesses in Italy. Legal personality was conferred on it by Presidential Decree no. 783 of 31 October 1986.

The applicant association complains that it has been unable to enter into an agreement with the Italian State under Article 8 § 3 of the Italian Constitution despite a number of steps it claims to have taken with the authorities since 1977. The provision in question allows the State to enter into agreements with recognised non-Catholic religious denominations for the purpose of regulating its relations with them.

The applicant association complains that despite three favourable opinions issued by different iterations of the Council of Ministers and two bills introduced after lengthy negotiations, no law approving such an agreement has been passed to date. It alleges, moreover, that the governmental authorities have refused to reopen negotiations since 2016.

In particular, it points out that the State has entered into agreements with other religious denominations in that time and that a number of privileges are reserved for denominations having entered into such agreements.

Relying on Articles 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention, and on Article 1 of Protocol No.1 (protection of property), it submits that its right to manifest its religious beliefs and to worship freely, as well as its right to peaceful enjoyment of property, have been unjustifiably interfered with, and that it has been discriminated against on the ground of religion. It further submits that domestic law does not afford it any remedy in respect of the complaints it raises before the Court.

**C.P. v. Spain (no. 50181/22)**

The applicant, C.P. is a French national who was born in 1990 and lives in Posada Llanera (Spain).

C.P. became pregnant in 2018 and decided to give birth at home with the assistance of a midwife, V. On 23 April 2019, when C.P. was 42 weeks and two days pregnant, she attended a hospital check-up. The Head of the hospital's Obstetrics Department examined her and informed her that there was a risk to her unborn child. C.P. and her partner left the hospital, with the intention of consulting V. and had no further contact with the hospital that day. The next day, following an urgent application by the hospital, a duty court ordered C.P.'s compulsory admission for labour to be induced, if necessary. Police officers and an ambulance crew attended C.P.'s home and took her to hospital. The baby was born on 26 April 2019 by emergency caesarean section. Proceedings subsequently brought by C.P. seeking the annulment of the court order were unsuccessful.

Relying on Articles 5 (right to liberty and security) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life), C.P. complains about her compulsory admission to hospital.

**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 June 2026**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Main application number</b>
Doulgerakis v. Greece	5769/19
Samaras v. Greece	36734/18
L.L. and P.L. v. Norway	31423/22
Ayvaz and Others v. Türkiye	14347/17
Kesler and Others v. Türkiye	18809/18
Kışanak and Tuncel v. Türkiye	82955/17
Taş and Others v. Türkiye	41527/17
Ürküt v. Türkiye	17795/22

**Thursday 11 June 2026**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Main application number</b>
Abroyan and Others v. Armenia	26897/18
Ashghyan and Poghosyan v. Armenia	5293/16
Hovhannisyan and Azatyan v. Armenia	57499/18
Askarov v. Azerbaijan	39653/18
Babayev v. Azerbaijan	60763/19
Gurbanov and Others v. Azerbaijan	17461/24
Musavat Partiyasi v. Azerbaijan	44082/18
Dimitrov v. Bulgaria	38707/23
Georgiev v. Bulgaria	55121/22
Trifonov v. Bulgaria	57872/19
Dedić v. Croatia	16484/24
Keser v. Croatia	13709/24

Name	Main application number
Šarac v. Croatia	38309/21
Benbetka v. France	25133/24
Farsi v. France	14569/24
Minteh v. France	23624/20
SAS Sud Radio v. France	24726/24
A.Z. v. Greece	4218/20
Chondrogiannis v. Greece	71375/17
Dimou v. Greece	56059/19
E.S. and Z.C. v. Greece	54720/18
Gamouras and Others v. Greece	9778/22
Kalantzis v. Greece	11765/17
Korovesis and Kortzidis v. Greece	35813/20
Lambrinos v. Greece	33975/17
Mamtzaderias and Others v. Greece	22932/22
Tsekeridis and Others v. Greece	52588/17
V.M. v. Greece	53259/20
Bódi and Others v. Hungary	28644/25
Hajnal and Others v. Hungary	19597/25
Póka and Others v. Hungary	36300/25
Tiszta Energiával Magyarországért Egyesület and Others v. Hungary	31769/24
Török and Others v. Hungary	28172/25
Varga and Others v. Hungary	7641/25
Végh v. Hungary	21704/25
Eva María Pálsdóttir v. Iceland	10992/24
G.M. v. Iceland	14833/21
Guidetti and Others v. Italy	18220/15
Industriali Costruzioni Meccaniche Tor Cervara S.r.l. v. Italy	24104/20
Mazza and Others v. Italy	9212/25
Rizzo and Others v. Italy	52134/19
Silveri v. Italy	59906/19
Cușnir v. the Republic of Moldova	1811/18
Grafescolo S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	49552/16
Grafescolo S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	38693/15
Ursu v. the Republic of Moldova	43194/17
Milić v. Montenegro	7618/25
Aries Goran Doel import-export Skopje v. North Macedonia	34199/23
Todorovski v. North Macedonia	55482/22
Velkova v. North Macedonia	34492/21
Brandys and Others v. Poland	34416/24
Mazur-Stefaniszyn and Stefaniszyn v. Poland	9584/24
Sachadel v. Poland	29764/22
Woźniak v. Poland	3660/25
Wróblewski v. Poland	27083/24
Botorea and Others v. Romania	30737/22
Chiperi and Others v. Romania	12492/21



Claire Windsor (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 24 01)

**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.