

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing ten judgments on Tuesday 9 December 2025 and 87 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 11 December 2025.

Press releases and texts of the judgments and decisions will be available at 10 a.m. (local time) on the Court's Internet site (www.echr.coe.int).

Tuesday 9 December 2025

[Stephan Kucera v. Austria \(application no. 13810/22\)](#)

The applicant, Stephan Kucera, is an Austrian national who was born in 1981 and lives in Vienna.

The case concerns administrative criminal court proceedings which took place via videolink. On 20 April 2020 the municipality of Vienna issued Mr Kucera a penalty notice for breaching the Vienna Betting Act. It was alleged that there had been no appropriate system controlling entry into the premises of a betting shop for which he had been responsible. Mr Kucera lodged an appeal against that notice and requested a public oral hearing. On 22 October 2020 an oral hearing took place via videolink on account of the COVID-19 pandemic. The parties to the proceedings, including Mr Kucera, all joined separately via a live audio and videolink.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial; right to legal assistance of own choosing) of the European Convention on Human Rights the applicant complains that he was not permitted to participate in person at the hearing, that the public had been excluded from the hearing and that there had been an infringement of his right to be effectively defended by a lawyer.

[H.H. v. Finland \(no. 19035/21\)](#)

The applicant, H.H. is a Finnish national who was born in 1968 and lives in Turku (Finland).

The case concerns H.H.'s detention under the Mental Health Act and the compulsory administration of medication. By decisions of June and October 2020, the Administrative Court dismissed appeals brought by H.H. against three orders made in 2019 and 2020 for her compulsory detention and refused to examine her requests for the discontinuation of the administration of medication against her will and for an oral hearing to be held. The Administrative Court held that, as a rule, proceedings before administrative courts took place in writing and was in any event, unnecessary in her case. In February 2024 the national courts held that the applicant's rights under the European Convention had been violated, as she had not been given the opportunity to appeal to a court against the decisions on the administration of medication and awarded her compensation.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time) of the European Convention the applicant complains that she did not have an oral hearing before the Administrative Court. She also complains about the court's refusal to hear evidence from witnesses she had suggested.

[Aykaç v. Türkiye \(no. 31226/09\)](#)

The applicant, Ayhan Aykaç, is a Turkish national who was born in 1964 and is detained in Mardin (Türkiye).

The case concerns alleged unfair criminal proceedings against him owing to a lack of legal assistance during police custody. In November 2007 the applicant was convicted of undermining the unity of

the State and its territorial integrity and sentenced to life imprisonment. The convicting court based its decision on evidence which included statements given to the police in the absence of a lawyer.

On 16 April 2009 Mr Aykaç lodged an application with the European Court. On 23 May 2019 the Court, sitting as a three-judge committee, [decided to strike the application out of its list of cases](#), holding it was no longer justified to continue the examination of the application, taking into account the Government's unilateral declaration, which acknowledged a violation of Mr Aykaç's rights under the Convention. On 27 February 2019 Mr Aykaç's lawyer sought, unsuccessfully, the reopening of criminal proceedings in the domestic courts on the basis of that unilateral declaration. On 22 October 2024, following a request by the applicant, the European Court decided to restore the application to its list of cases.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial; right to legal assistance of own choosing) of the Convention the applicant complains that in convicting him, the domestic courts attached weight to the statements he had made without the assistance of a lawyer.

Thursday 11 December 2025

[Fliegenschnee and Others v. Austria \(no. 40054/23\)](#)

The applicants are three Austrian nationals, Peter Fliegenschnee, Klara Kornelia Butz and Monika Jasansky, who were born in 1940, 1997 and 1963, respectively, and either live in Vienna or Walpersbach (Austria); and, an association, Umweltschutzorganisation Global 2000, which is based in Vienna and recognised as an "environmental organisation" under Austrian law.

The case concerns the Austrian Federal Minister for Digital and Economic Affairs' refusal to ban the sale of fossil fuels to mitigate the impact of climate change. In May 2021 the applicants had requested the Minister to order, under the Austrian Trade Act, a ban on the sale of solid fossil fuels from 2025 and of fossil fuels used in aviation from 2040, or to take other equally effective measures to mitigate the effects of climate change. The Minister refused the request on the basis that she did not have authority to enforce the transition to clean energy, and the courts ultimately upheld her refusal in 2023.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants allege that the Minister's refusal to order the ban was in breach of Austria's obligation to protect their life and health as well as that of the general public, whose interests were represented by the applicant association. Ms Jasansky, a farmer, additionally complains under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) that her livelihood was in danger because of droughts caused by climate change affecting her crops.

[Diacò and Lenchi v. Italy \(nos. 15587/10, 32536/10, and 18531/14\)](#)

The applicants, Giuseppe Diacò and Maria Alessandra Lenchi, are Italian nationals who were born in 1972 and 1966 and live in Rome and Vigevano.

The case concerns the authorities' delayed payment of the applicants' fees for their work as lawyers.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain about a delay in the payment of sums owed to them – as established in payment orders – in respect of legal-aid fees.

Under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), they also complain about the delayed payment of those sums and about the impossibility of having the payment orders enforced.

Intranuovo v. Italy (no. 46569/19)

The applicant, Rosaria Intranuovo, is an Italian national who was born in 1963 and lives in Syracuse.

The case concerns the death, on 6 July 2014, of her son, A.D., who had been serving in the Italian army, following an alleged fall from a window in the army barracks in which he had been stationed.

On 7 July 2014 the public prosecutor's office opened an investigation. An initial autopsy concluded that A.D.'s injuries could be consistent with a fall, possibly suicide by jumping. In the course of the investigation that followed, Ms Intranuovo argued there were a number of factors that cast serious doubt on the conclusion that A.D.'s death was a result of suicide by jumping and that, rather, they indicated foul play. On 28 March 2019 the preliminary investigations judge issued a decision to discontinue the proceedings, concluding that the evidence collected was insufficient to substantiate charges in a potential trial.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), Ms Intranuovo complains that the national authorities failed to protect the life of her son and to adequately account for his death. She also complains under Articles 2 and 6 (right to a fair hearing) that there had been a failure to conduct an effective investigation into his death.

Roşca v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 60943/15)

The applicant, Aliona Roşca, is a Moldovan national who was born in 1977 and lives in Chişinău.

The case concerns the dismissal, in 2015, of a defamation claim brought by Ms Roşca, a former judge, following public accusations of professional misconduct by the President of the Superior Council of Magistrates.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life), the applicant complains that the domestic courts failed to provide sufficient reasons and to strike a fair balance when they dismissed her claim for the protection of her reputation.

Nejjar v. Switzerland (no. 9087/18)

The applicant is a Moroccan national who was born in 1972 and lives in Switzerland.

The case concerns her application to have set aside a summary penalty order from the public prosecutor's office imposing a fine on her. She complains that, on account of her absence from the hearing before the police court, that application was regarded as withdrawn, in accordance with Article 356 § 4 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Under that provision, "where the applicant fails to attend the hearing without being excused, and without being represented, his or her application shall be deemed to have been withdrawn".

She relies on Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a court) of the Convention.

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 December 2025

Name	Main application number
Miragayev v. Azerbaijan	29550/14
Burg Oil AD v. Bulgaria	25466/20
Tordia and Others v. Georgia	24060/23

Name	Main application number
Malatesta v. Greece	28631/18
Spasovska v. North Macedonia	28792/21
Sarić v. Serbia	38151/16
Turan v. Türkiye	10178/18

Thursday 11 December 2025

Name	Main application number
Artan Zanele v. Albania	41560/19
Kujxhija v. Albania	4952/20
Khachatryan v. Armenia	45049/14
Engelbrechtsmüller v. Austria	21056/24
Alasgarov and Nasirov v. Azerbaijan	9299/23
Hajiyeva and Safarov v. Azerbaijan	23311/18
Musayev and Others v. Azerbaijan	42799/22
V.S. v. Bulgaria	32501/22
RAVAK a.s. v. the Czech Republic	15866/23
Bild GmbH v. Germany	32253/22
Hahn v. Germany	20397/25
Wack v. Germany	35698/23
M.A. and Others v. Greece	30903/18
Margetakis v. Greece	14848/21
Koncsik v. Hungary	28637/23
Kovács and Others v. Hungary	5976/25
Agrisud 2014 S.r.l. semplificata and Others v. Italy	32539/18
Barone v. Italy	32993/24
Girone and Sarro v. Italy	33992/24
Marini and Others v. Italy	711/17
Lux-Stil S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	6705/23
Dutca v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia	35739/17
Ghiofrig S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	55374/16
Stepanov v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia	9200/15
Andrea v. the Netherlands	42069/22
H.A. v. Norway	2284/22
Cymerman v. Poland	28238/23
Fundacja Instytut Reportażu v. Poland	459/20
Kieltyka v. Poland	37483/20
Kozłowski v. Poland	4234/23
Pietka and Piotrowski v. Poland	17083/21
Pionka v. Poland	26004/20
Sochacki v. Poland	54779/22
Sznajder-Malczevska and Others v. Poland	36496/24
Szprot v. Poland	10475/21
Terczyński v. Poland	10236/24
Castelo Branco v. Portugal	36466/23

Name	Main application number
Chinita Rodrigues v. Portugal	17655/19
Cintra Coimbra Torres v. Portugal	34788/23
Costa Tavares v. Portugal	4655/24
Matos dos Santos Gil v. Portugal	13933/23
Seixas da Costa v. Portugal	25504/23
Guzganu and Others v. Romania	41824/17
Muntean v. Romania	62815/19
Sandu and Others v. Romania	33535/21
Drokin and Others v. Russia	54225/14
Filippov and Others v. Russia	28543/21
Golovizin and Others v. Russia	21177/21
Grushko v. Russia	50851/21
Kanalyuk and Others v. Russia	44466/15
Karaulov and Others v. Russia	19186/15
Kostromina and Others v. Russia	56957/15
Makichyan and Others v. Russia	33684/20
Manion and Others v. Russia	35395/22
Margovich and Others v. Russia	38691/21
Monakhov and Others v. Russia	75484/14
Navalnyy v. Russia	67894/17
Pokatilov and Others v. Russia	22224/21
Shalyakin and Others v. Russia	2453/22
Sokolov and Others v. Russia	32184/21
Sychev and Others v. Russia	47310/20
Vinogradova and Others v. Russia	54829/12
Voyevodina and Others v. Russia	27202/21
Zboroshenko v. Russia	76249/17
Magát v. Slovakia	54110/22
Papajová v. Slovakia	12862/22
Sušinski v. Slovenia	46884/22
Buruşukoğlu v. Türkiye	54208/11
Sarp v. Türkiye	1867/23
Sayinyiğit and Others v. Türkiye	53256/19
Yazıcı and Others v. Türkiye	13722/22
Burkovskyy and Others v. Ukraine	30753/24
Dabyka and Others v. Ukraine	40411/23
Eko-Komunenergo, Tov v. Ukraine	17880/17
Fedyukina v. Ukraine	42906/18
Kostenko v. Ukraine	45800/21
Kyrychenko v. Ukraine	49472/19
Levadnyy and Others v. Ukraine	3727/18
Muzyka and Yakusevych v. Ukraine	6308/24
Pavliv v. Ukraine	14692/14
Rublev v. Ukraine	17368/10
Yatsun and Others v. Ukraine	61401/15

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.

Follow the Court on Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int), X [ECHR_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH), [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/company/echr), and [YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCvK1L1v1v1v1v1v1v1v1v1v).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrp@echr.coe.int) to subscribe to the press-release mailing list.

Where can the Court's press releases be found? [HUDOC - Press collection](#)

Press contacts

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

We are happy to receive journalists' enquiries via either email or telephone.

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

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

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

Jane Swift (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 29 04)

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.