



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing ten judgments on Tuesday 10 June 2025 and 51 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 12 June 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 10 June 2025

[B.T. and B.K.Cs. v. Hungary \(application no. 4581/16\)](#)

The applicants, B.T. and B.K.Cs., are mother and son. They are Hungarian nationals who were born in 1976 and 2014 and live in Kesznyéten (Hungary). They are ethnic Roma.

At the time of B.K.Cs.'s birth, B.T. had already had five children, born between 1997 and 2010, who had been placed under child protection in September 2010 because the older children had not gone to school and the two youngest children had not received necessary medical care. They had been placed in various childcare institutions before being placed in temporary foster care (*átmeneti nevelésbe vétel*).

The case concerns the placement of B.K.Cs. in temporary State care immediately after birth.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that B.K.Cs. was unjustifiably separated from his mother and placed in temporary State care and that they had no effective avenue to raise their complaints with the national authorities.

[Á.F.L. v. Iceland \(no. 35789/22\)](#)

The applicant, Á.F.L., is an Icelandic national who was born in 1990 and lives in Seltjarnarnes (Iceland).

As a child, Á.F.L. was diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and a mild intellectual disability. The case concerns the decision to deprive him of custody of his daughter.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention, Á.F.L. complains that the Icelandic authorities violated his rights under those Articles by failing to explore and adopt measures to assist him in taking care of his daughter, which resulted in his being deprived of custody.

[Al and Demirci v. Türkiye \(nos. 34280/17 and 71800/17\)](#)

The applicants, Ayşe Al and Nevin Demirci, are two Turkish nationals who were born in 1947 and 1962, respectively, and live in Istanbul.

The case mainly concerns the loss of value of the retirement gratuities awarded retrospectively to the applicants by the administrative courts after the Constitutional Court had struck down the legislative provision that had deprived them of their entitlement to such a gratuity.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain of the loss of value of their retirement gratuity as a result of inflation between the date of their compulsory retirement and the payment of the gratuity.

[K.V. Mediterranean Tours Limited v. Türkiye \(no. 41120/17\)](#)

The applicant company, K.V. Mediterranean Tours Limited, is a Cypriot company established in 1967 and based in Nicosia. It owns a building complex located in the fenced-up area of Famagusta in the “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus”. The company abandoned the property following the Turkish military intervention in 1974, and in July 2010 applied to the Immovable Property Commission (IPC), claiming compensation for the loss of use of its property, together with the applicable statutory interest. It also claimed restitution of the property, compensation for non-pecuniary damage, statutory damage and legal costs.

The case concerns the effectiveness of the IPC, as a remedy for compensation claims brought by Greek Cypriots in the “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus”, as well as participation of a religious foundation in the IPC proceedings and the alleged lack of impartiality of the High Administrative Court (appeal panel) as a higher judicial authority for the IPC cases.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair hearing), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, the applicant company complains that the procedure for restitution of and compensation for its property was protracted and ineffective, that there was no possibility for it to complain about the participation of a third party in the proceedings, and that the High Administrative Court (appeal panel) judges were allegedly involved in transactions concerning property belonging to Greek Cypriots.

Thursday 12 June 2025

[Krpelík v. the Czech Republic \(no. 23963/21\)](#)

The applicant, Oldřich Krpelík, is a Czech national who was born in 1984 and lives in Frýdek-Místek (the Czech Republic).

The case concerns the fair-trial rights of Mr Krpelík, who has a slight intellectual disability. He was arrested and questioned in May 2016 on suspicion of burglary. He was subsequently convicted on the basis of the confession he had made at the pre-trial stage and sentenced to two years in prison.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and to legal assistance of own choosing), Mr Krpelík alleges that his conviction was not fair because he had not had legal assistance either during the initial police interviews or during a site visit to the location of the burglaries. He submits that he should have been assisted by a lawyer at this stage, and all the more so given that he was in a vulnerable position because of his intellectual disability.

[T.H. v. the Czech Republic \(no. 33037/22\)](#)

The applicant, T.H., is a Czech national who was born in 1977 and lives in Prague.

The applicant identifies as having a non-binary gender identity. From an early age he struggled considerably with the male identity assigned to him at birth, but due to concerns about potential medical complications, he refused to undergo irreversible male-to-female sex reassignment surgery. In the autumn of 2012, he changed his first name and was issued a new identity card, mentioning his male sex and a male form of his personal identity number (“personal numerical code”).

The case concerns the authorities’ refusal to grant the applicant’s request to change his personal numerical code denoting gender on the ground that he had not undergone the irreversible surgery required by domestic law for gender reassignment.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains about the refusal to grant his requests, saying that the sterilisation requirement made him face an “impossible dilemma”. The applicant also complains that he was forced to repeatedly and involuntarily disclose his gender identity every time he had to present his identity documents, in breach of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8.

[S.S. and Others v. Italy \(no. 21660/18\)](#)

The 17 applicants are Nigerian and Ghanaian nationals who were born between 1980 and 1997.

The case concerns a maritime operation to rescue an inflatable raft transporting a group of some 150 people, which had left Libya in the night of 5-6 November 2017 with a view to reaching European shores.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), read in conjunction with Article 1 (obligation to respect Human Rights), the applicants complain that, by allowing the Libyan ship *Ras Jadir* to take part in the rescue operations, the Rome Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre (MRCC) placed them at risk of ill-treatment and death. Six applicants also allege that they were injured and mistreated by the Libyan coast guards during the rescue operations. Two applicants complain of the death of their children, which occurred as the vessel sank. All the applicants complain, under Articles 3 and 4 (prohibition of slavery and forced labour), that they were exposed to the risk of being returned to Libya, a country in which unlawful migrants are held in inhuman and degrading conditions and can be subjected to slavery. In addition, under Articles 3 and 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens), read in conjunction with Article 1, two applicants submit that they were subjected to an unlawful “pushback” to Libya and further complain of the conditions of their return to Nigeria, which, in their view, was decided in the absence of sufficient safeguards. Lastly, relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), read in conjunction with Articles 2 and 3 of the Convention and Article 4 of Protocol No. 4, the applicants complain that it was impossible for them to bring claims before the Italian judicial authorities in respect of the ill-treatment to which they were subjected by the crew of the *Ras Jadir*, the unlawful “pushback” of some of them to Libya, the abuse suffered there and the risk of being sent back to their country of origin.

[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 10 June 2025

Name	Main application number
Iliev v. Bulgaria	34656/18
Csatári and Others v. Hungary	18514/24
Altun and Others v. Türkiye	75370/17
Cömert v. Türkiye	16537/18
Kacı and Others v. Türkiye	9587/19
Özdemir v. Türkiye	38351/20

Thursday 12 June 2025

Name	Main application number
Broci v. Albania	57935/18
Lamaj v. Albania	12756/22
Abdurahmanov and Others v. Azerbaijan	48155/18
Aslanov v. Azerbaijan	59925/18
Sadigova v. Azerbaijan	41247/17
Chapadzhievi v. Bulgaria	25039/21
Mestan and Others v. Bulgaria	29440/17
National Lottery AD and Others v. Bulgaria	50643/20
Kalember and Others v. Croatia	319/19
Radočaj v. Croatia	22092/21
Ádám and Others v. Hungary	17335/24
Szabó v. Hungary	48725/17
Szél and Hadházy v. Hungary	80686/17
Szél and Hadházy v. Hungary	27307/18
Tejfel and Others v. Hungary	33378/24
Bosti v. Italy	37887/22
Capilongo v. Italy	35976/22
De Santi v. Italy	712/21
Landolfi and Others v. Italy	14301/07
Iaroslavschi v. the Republic of Moldova	23609/14
SCI Esperanza v. Monaco	28275/23
Gacek v. Poland	8050/21
Górski and Others v. Poland	23642/24
Andrei and Others v. Romania	40342/22
Chivu v. Romania	55001/20
Gyöngy and Others v. Romania	470/22
Bayguzov v. Russia	2621/23
Borovinskikh and Others v. Russia	50074/18
Dmitriyevskiy and Others v. Russia	22646/07
Domashnev and Others v. Russia	22832/18
Domozhirov and Others v. Russia	23218/17
Kalinychev and Others v. Russia	20919/18
Khubiyev v. Russia	11687/21
Krepkin and Others v. Russia	26009/18
Kulyamina and Others v. Russia	19338/20
Lukomskaya and Others v. Russia	15395/18
Pravdin and Others v. Russia	20544/19
Ryasnova and X v. Russia	11200/18
M.W. v. Serbia	70923/17
Veen v. Slovakia	50704/21
Paic and Wernersson v. Sweden	12908/23
Aydın and Others v. Türkiye	24077/19
Bilgin and Others v. Türkiye	23550/22
Çukurova Elektrik Anonim Şirketi v. Türkiye	12412/15

Name	Main application number
Hindioğlu v. Türkiye	52544/18
Lyubovetsky v. Ukraine	42171/17
Melnikov v. Ukraine	65805/17
Poryadynska v. Ukraine	68317/17

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 X (Twitter) [@ECHR_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH) and Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int).

Press contacts

echrpess@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)

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.