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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 289 (2017)
06.10.2017

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 18 judgments on Tuesday 10 October 2017 and 94 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 12 October 2017.

*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 October 2017

Tarjáni v. Hungary (application no. 29609/16)

The applicant, Attila Péter Tarjáni, is a Hungarian national who was born in 1976 and lives in Budapest. The case concerns his allegation of police brutality.

According to Mr Tarjáni, two police officers arrived at his home on 20 July 2015 following a quarrel with his wife and took him to the local police station. He alleges that he was assaulted at the station and was only taken to hospital when it became apparent that he could not walk. Two medical reports were issued as a result of his hospitalisation, the first reported that he had a broken leg as well as scratches and bruising; and the second further injuries, including broken and loose teeth.

An investigation was subsequently launched into Mr Tarjáni's allegations. In December 2015 the prosecutor decided that there was insufficient evidence against the police officers to bring criminal proceedings and discontinued the investigation. The prosecutor based his decision on statements made by Mr Tarjáni, his wife and her daughter, medical staff present during Mr Tarjáni's hospitalisation and three police officers. Mr Tarjáni's and the police's version of events differed considerably. Mr Tarjáni notably stated that he had broken his leg as a result of the ill-treatment in police custody; and his wife confirmed that he had no injuries prior to his arrest. The police officers, on the other hand, denied any ill-treatment, stating that Mr Tarjáni, who was drunk, had resisted arrest, obliging the officers to use force against him. In his decision to discontinue the investigation, the prosecutor also took into account a further medical report carried out in November 2015 by a court-appointed medical expert finding that Mr Tarjáni's main injury, a broken leg, must have occurred prior to his arrest and that his credibility was in any case questionable due to his drunkenness. Mr Tarjáni's appeal against that decision was ultimately dismissed in February 2016.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Tarjáni complains that he was ill-treated by the police and that the ensuing investigation into his allegations was inadequate.

Grigolovič v. Lithuania (no. 54882/10)

The applicant, Fabijan Grigolovič, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1941 and lives in the village of Bajorai in the Vilnius Region. The case concerns proceedings to have his property rights to part of his father's land restored.

In 2000 Mr Grigolovič requested the authorities to restore his property rights to 9.5705 hectares of land, which had been owned by his father before nationalisation by the Soviet regime, by providing him with a new plot of land. In 2002 he changed his initial request and asked for his property rights to be restored *in natura*. Following a number of enquiries concerning the land, the Vilnius county administration informed him, in 2007, that the land, part of which had already been allocated to third parties, was State redeemable and that he was on a waiting list of people who had requested to have their property rights restored. In 2009 the authorities adopted a decision restoring his

property rights to 0.18 hectares of his father's land and informed him that his rights to the remaining land would be restored at a later date. Mr Grigolovič then lodged a claim with the administrative court asking it to annul the authorities' decisions to allocate his father's land to third parties and to award him compensation. The court found that the relevant legislation did not allow for the return of the land to him *in natura* because he did not own any buildings situated on it. The decision was upheld by the Supreme Court. In 2012 Mr Grigolovič was informed by the National Land Service that following an amendment to the relevant legislation, in order to accelerate the process of property restoration, he was entitled to receive monetary compensation for the land. However, he replied that he still wished to receive the land *in natura* or a plot of land of equal value.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Mr Grigolovič complains that the authorities breached his property rights by failing to restore his property rights to his father's land or to grant him fair compensation.

Just Satisfaction

Montanaro Gauci and Others v. Malta (no. 31454/12)

The case concerned the requisitioning of property by the State.

The applicants are six members of the same family who are Maltese nationals and live in Sliema, St. Julian's and Gozo (Malta). They inherited a house in Rabat (Malta) from their late father in 1997 which had been requisitioned in 1987. The rent fixed by the authorities amounted to approximately EUR 35 annually. This amount was increased to approximately EUR 185 in 2010.

In September 2008 the applicants brought constitutional redress proceedings, requesting that the courts: award them compensation for losses incurred as a result of inadequate rent and their inability to develop their property; annul the requisition order; release the property; and establish fair conditions in respect of their property, including a fair rent. Ultimately, in November 2011 the Constitutional Court awarded the applicants EUR 14,000, but found that the requisition had been lawful and in the public interest, thus it was not required to annul the requisition order.

Relying in particular on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complained about the requisitioning of their property. They notably alleged that the compensation awarded to them was ridiculously low and did not provide sufficient redress and that, in any case, their property continued to be requisitioned for a rent much lower than its market value.

In its principal judgment of 30 August 2016 the Court found a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and held that the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) insofar as pecuniary damage was concerned was not ready for decision and reserved it for examination at a later date.

The Court will now deal with this question in its judgment of 10 October 2017.

Lachikhina v. Russia (no. 38783/07)

The applicant, Natalya Yuryevna Lachikhina, is a Russian national who was born in 1971 and lives in Barnaul (Altai region). The case concerns the seizure of a vehicle, the failure to order its return, and a dispute as to its ownership.

On 26 July 2006 Ms Lachikhina bought a car from a private individual, Mr Sh., who on 10 October 2006 became the subject of a criminal investigation. He was accused of failing to repay the loan he had taken out for the purchase of the vehicle and of selling the vehicle in breach of the loan agreement.

On 6 December 2006 the investigator in charge of the case ordered that the vehicle be seized as physical evidence in the criminal proceedings. This decision was upheld in July 2007 by the District Court. From December 2006 onwards the vehicle was held as physical evidence in the criminal proceedings, for an indeterminate period.

Ms Lachikhina made four attempts, in criminal and civil proceedings, to have the vehicle returned. Her appeals were dismissed each time by the Regional Court in cassation proceedings. On 25 April 2017 an investigator closed the criminal investigation against Mr Sh. on the grounds that the prosecution was time-barred, and told Ms Lachikhina to apply to the Head of the Department of the Interior to have her vehicle returned.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Ms Lachikhina complains of interference with her ownership rights on account of the seizure of her vehicle in 2006 and the fact that it was held continuously thereafter. She also complains that she was not given notice to appear at the hearing of 10 July 2007 at which the seizure of the vehicle was ordered, and that the decision authorising its seizure was not served on her.

Khadzhimuradov and Others v. Russia (nos. 21194/09, 21200/09, 24693/09, 24700/09, 27063/09, 27064/09, 27159/09, 27259/09, 30531/09, 30538/09, 30578/09, 32851/09, 32855/09, 32862/09, 32992/09, 18777/10, and 22304/10)

The applicants are 20 Russian nationals, the majority of whom live in Grozny (the Chechen Republic, Russia). Two applicants live in Belgium. The case principally concerns their complaint that their relatives were killed during a special operation by State servicemen and that there was no effective investigation into those killings.

According to the applicants, 21 of their relatives (spouses, children, brothers and an uncle) were killed in an operation carried out by, in particular, State servicemen of a police special task unit on 5 February 2000 in the Novye Aldy settlement on the outskirts of Grozny.

A criminal investigation into the murders was opened on 5 March 2000 by the Grozny town prosecutor's office. Over the years, the applicants or close members of their families were granted victim status in the proceedings, which were adjourned and resumed a number of times and are still ongoing.

The applicants' submissions as to the events of 5 February 2000 are related to another case previously decided by the European Court of Human Rights, *Musayev and Others v. Russia* (nos. 57941/00 and two other applications, see Chamber judgment of 26 July 2007), in so far as the applicants allege that their relatives were killed by the same persons and in the same circumstances as the relatives of the applicants in that case.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), the applicants complain that their relatives were killed in the incident of 5 February 2000 and that there was no effective investigation which would have identified and brought to justice the people responsible for the deaths of their family members. Six of the applicants also complain of a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention (protection of property). All applicants further rely on Article 13 of the Convention (right to an effective remedy).

Daştan v. Turkey (no. 37272/08)

The applicant, Suat Daştan, is a Turkish national who was born in 1975 and is serving a life sentence in Turkey following his conviction in 2006 of carrying out a bomb attack in Tunceli. The case concerns his allegation that his criminal trial was unfair.

Mr Daştan was arrested in August 2004 on suspicion of membership of an illegal organisation, namely the PKK (the Kurdistan Workers' Party). He was later accused of being involved in two attacks which had injured soldiers in October and November 2003. Throughout the criminal proceedings Mr Daştan confirmed that he was a member of the PKK, but repeatedly denied his involvement in any attacks. When convicting him in May 2006 the trial court essentially relied on witness statements from six suspects in other criminal proceedings concerning the PKK. One of those witnesses stated that the attack in October 2003 had been carried out by a man with the code name

"Hamza", and whom he identified as Mr Daştan when testifying before the trial court. He did not however personally witness the attack or have knowledge of Mr Daştan's illegal activities for the PKK. The sixth witness, D.T., who gave testimony before another court, stated that he had heard that Mr Daştan had placed and set off the mines causing the explosion in October 2003. Mr Daştan asked the trial court to hear D.T. in person, but his request was rejected as it considered that D.T.'s statement before another court was sufficient. His conviction was upheld by the Court of Cassation in February 2008.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) and (d) (right to a fair trial / right to legal assistance of own choosing / right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses), Mr Daştan alleges that the proceedings against him were unfair, because he had been both denied legal assistance during the preliminary investigation stage as well as the opportunity to question and confront the key witness against him, D.T.. He emphasises in particular that, in view of the fact that he was tried and punished for an offence carrying the heaviest penalty in Turkey (life imprisonment), he should at the very least have been able to question the only witness who had made incriminatory statements against him.

Fatih Taş v. Turkey (no. 2) (no. 6813/09)

The applicant, Fatih Taş, is a Turkish national who was born in 1979 and lives in Istanbul. The case concerns his criminal conviction following the publication of an article in a magazine edited by him.

In 2004, an article with the heading "On the Kurdish Intellectual" was published in the magazine *Vesta*, published by an editorial house of which, at the time, Mr Taş was the owner and editor-in-chief. Following the publication, he was charged with disseminating propaganda in favour of a terrorist organisation and, in 2008, he was convicted as charged. The trial court found that the article in question had constituted propaganda in favour of the PKK, an illegal armed organisation. It sentenced him to ten months imprisonment and ordered him to pay a fine. The pronouncement of his conviction was suspended on the condition that he did not commit another intentional offence for a period of five years. His objection against the judgment was dismissed.

Mr Taş complains that his criminal conviction was in breach of Article 10 (freedom of expression).

Güler and Tekdal v. Turkey (no. 65815/10)

The applicants, Fatma Güler and Emin Tekdal, are Turkish nationals who were born in 1981 and 1966 respectively and live in Ecemiş village, in the province of Diyarbakır (Turkey). The case concerns the killing of their 30-year-old brother and nephew, respectively, Murat Tekdal, by the military.

On 12 September 2008 Murat Tekdal left his home to walk to a nearby village. His body was found the next day by soldiers near to a brook not far from his village. According to a report drawn up the next day by the soldiers, Murat had been killed in an armed clash with a group of five members of the PKK, an illegal organisation. His body had been found during the search conducted by the soldiers the following morning, lying next to a loaded hunting rifle with two unexploded cartridges. The soldiers concluded that Murat had been one of the terrorists. Apart from this report, other steps taken included an inspection of the crime scene and an autopsy – both concluded that the cause of death had been from gunfire. The prosecuting authorities launched an investigation into the applicants' relative for membership of the PKK, but they decided just over a month later not to bring criminal proceedings against him because he was dead. The applicants lodged an objection with the courts against this decision, urging an order to be issued for the authorities to carry out an investigation into their relative's death. In April 2010 the courts found that the applicants had no standing to bring such an objection as there was no investigation into the killing of their relative, only an investigation to prosecute him for membership of the PKK.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), the applicants allege that their relative had been killed unlawfully by the military and that no investigation at all had been conducted into his killing. They submit that no armed clash had taken place at all, as evidenced by the fact that their relative's hunting rifle was

still fully loaded. Indeed, they allege that everything in the incident indicated that their relative had been an innocent civilian, and not the member of an outlawed organisation that he had been portrayed to be by the security forces in order to avoid prosecution.

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.

Nedić v. Montenegro (no. 15612/10)
Bağlar v. Turkey (no. 40708/11)
Balbal v. Turkey (no. 66327/09)
Çamyar v. Turkey (no. 16899/07)
Fellner and Others v. Turkey (no. 13312/08 and 840 other applications)
Genç and Demirgan v. Turkey (nos. 34327/06 and 45165/06)
Palitkıran v. Turkey (no. 72006/10)
S.S. Yeniköy Konut Yapı Kooperatifi v. Turkey (no. 10375/08)
Surat v. Turkey (no. 50930/06)
Taşçı v. Turkey (no. 43868/06)

Thursday 12 October 2017

Adyan and Others v. Armenia (no. 75604/11)

The case concerns four Jehovah's Witnesses who were convicted for refusing to perform either military or alternative civilian service.

The applicants, Artur Adyan, Garegin Avetisyan, Harutyun Khachatryan and Vahagn Margaryan, are Armenian nationals. Mr Adyan was born in 1991; the other three applicants were all born in 1993. They live in Yerevan, Tsaghkavan and Kapan (all in Armenia).

In May and June 2011 the applicants were called up for military service. Addressing letters to the local authorities, they refused to appear either for military or alternative service. They stated that their opposition was based on their religious beliefs. Furthermore, even though domestic law did provide for alternative service, they claimed that it was not of a genuinely civilian nature, as it was supervised by the military authorities. They submitted the same arguments in the ensuing proceedings brought against them for draft evasion. They were however all convicted in July/November 2011 and sentenced to two years and six months in prison. They appealed, further arguing that the alternative labour service programme was essentially under military control and supervision in as far as it concerned transfers, sanctions and orders. They also pointed out that they were required to wear a uniform which resembled that of the military and to be at their place of assignment 24 hours a day. Moreover, alternative service was punitive in nature as it lasted 42 months (rather than the 24 months for military service). The Court of Appeal subsequently upheld the applicants' convictions: it found that, although the labour service available contained a few formal elements of military supervision – such as provision of clothing, food and financial means as well as other organisational work - it was still civilian in nature. The applicants' further appeals on points of law were ultimately – between February and May 2012 – declared inadmissible for lack of merit.

The applicants were released from prison in October 2013 following a general amnesty, after having served between 26 and 27 months of their sentences. Three out of the four applicants spent periods in pre-trial detention which formed part of their convictions.

Relying on Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience, and religion), the applicants allege in particular that it had not been necessary to prosecute and imprison them, especially in view of the fact that the law on alternative service was amended in 2013 to remove all military control and supervision and to place the programme under purely civilian administration. Further relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), three of the four applicants allege that the decisions to detain them - pending the criminal proceedings against them – were not sufficiently justified.

Cafagna v. Italy (no. 26073/13)

The applicant, Gaetano Cafagna, is an Italian national who was born in 1970 and lives in Barletta (Italy). The case concerns his conviction on the basis of a statement made by an individual who claimed to have been assaulted by him but who did not give evidence at the hearing.

On 3 June 1996 an Italian national, C.C., lodged a criminal complaint against Mr Cafagna, alleging that the applicant and an accomplice had attempted to rob him in the street. C.C. claimed that when he had tried to run after them, he had been punched in the face by Mr Cafagna. When he made his statement, which was taken by L.R., a member of the *carabinieri*, C.C. formally identified Mr Cafagna and his accomplice from photographs.

On 13 September 1996 the public prosecutor requested that evidence be heard from C.C. and that an identification parade be held. Despite being summoned and compelled to appear on several occasions, C.C., who according to his parents no longer lived with them, could not be traced and never confirmed before a court his allegations concerning his assailant's identity.

In a judgment of 11 April 2005 the District Court sentenced Mr Cafagna to one year and four months' imprisonment. It found that the precise and detailed statement made by C.C. to the *carabinieri* was sufficient to establish Mr Cafagna's guilt. In the court's view, the fact that a witness's whereabouts were unknown made it "objectively impossible" to examine him at the hearing. The District Court also found that Mr Cafagna's conviction rested on other evidence arising out of the testimony given by L.R., the member of the *carabinieri* who had taken C.C.'s statement.

Mr Cafagna appealed against the judgment, which was upheld by the Court of Appeal. He then lodged an appeal on points of law. In a judgment of 17 October 2012 the Court of Cassation dismissed his appeal, finding that C.C., who had been convicted *in absentia* in another set of criminal proceedings, could not be traced, that this fact could not have been foreseen at the time of his statement to the *carabinieri*, and that the District Court had therefore been entitled to admit C.C.'s statements in evidence.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time) and 3 (d) (right to examine witnesses), Mr Cafagna alleges that the criminal proceedings against him were unfair.

Tiziana Pennino v. Italy (no. 21759/15)

The applicant, Tiziana Pennino, is an Italian national who was born in 1969 and lives in Benevento (Italy). The case concerns her allegations of ill-treatment by the police and her complaint that there was no adequate investigation into the matter.

Ms Pennino submits that, in the afternoon of 2 April 2013, after being stopped in her car by the Benevento municipal police – who suspected her of being intoxicated, which she denied – she was ill-treated by several officers. In particular, when she had returned to her car, one officer dragged her out by her arm. She was taken to the municipal police station where an officer started drafting an offence report for drunk driving. Her requests to use the telephone were denied. When she tried to pick up a telephone, one officer hit her. He twisted her arms behind her back and handcuffed her. Once she started screaming, the officer removed the handcuffs in a violent manner, thus fracturing her thumb and causing injuries to her wrists.

According to the police reports, Ms Pennino was stopped because she had been driving in an erratic manner. She smelled of alcohol, was unsteady on her feet and insulted and threatened the police officers. At the municipal police station, she again insulted and threatened the officers. After she had pushed and kicked two of them, she was handcuffed, but the handcuffs were removed after she had calmed down.

Medical reports of two hospitals, where Ms Pennino was examined on the same day after leaving the police station and again on the two following days, noted that her thumb was fractured and that she had bruises resulting from traumatic injury on several parts of her body.

Ms Pennino lodged a criminal complaint against the officers who had stopped her in her car and the other officers who had been present at the police station, alleging in particular assault and infliction of bodily harm. The investigation was eventually discontinued in October 2014 despite her objection in which she had complained that the investigators had neither questioned her nor the officers who had allegedly been involved in the ill-treatment at the police station.

Criminal proceedings were brought against Ms Pennino on a number of charges. She was given a suspended sentence of 28 days' imprisonment for causing bodily harm to a police officer. The proceedings were suspended as far as the remaining charges were concerned.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Ms Pennino complains of having been ill-treated by the police and of the ensuing investigation which, she maintains, was neither thorough nor effective.

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.

Thor v. Austria (no. 67656/12)
Vorbeck v. Austria (no. 11332/12)
Arif Islamzade v. Azerbaijan (nos. 57745/11, 33585/13, 36130/13, 42843/13, 53125/13, 54494/13, 17212/14, 17225/14, 41015/14, 46520/14, 46522/14, 57382/14, 70660/14, 13873/15, 35865/15, 37075/15, 40227/15, 60598/15, 9308/16, 12222/16, 15499/16, and 17069/16)
A.S. v. Belgium (no. 68739/14)
Arkania v. Georgia (no. 26344/13)
Darsalia v. Georgia (no. 3693/13)
Datunashvili v. Georgia (no. 40099/09)
Diakonidze v. Georgia (no. 33201/07)
Elbakidze v. Georgia (no. 5137/09)
Gabaidze v. Georgia (no. 13723/06)
Gabunia and Others v. Georgia (no. 37276/05)
Georgia Red Cross Society v. Georgia (no. 56006/11)
Ghviniashvili v. Georgia (no. 2692/12)
Mariamidze v. Georgia (no. 9154/06)
Ogbaidze and Others v. Georgia (no. 36298/12)
Otiashvili v. Georgia (no. 10145/08)
Pataridze and Others v. Georgia (no. 43655/09)
Sharadzenidze v. Georgia (no. 43486/07)
Topuria v. Georgia (no. 56283/08)
Zlobini v. Georgia (no. 10057/09)
Zurashvili v. Georgia (no. 52168/12)

Berecz and Others v. Hungary (nos. 1195/13, 36195/13, 53387/13, 56018/13, 57769/13, and 66156/13)
Coretti and Others v. Italy (no. 28449/03 and 41 other applications)
Sanci and Others v. Italy (nos. 7523/03, 7711/04, 24975/04, 26880/04, 10466/10, and 10475/10)
Vernillo and Others v. Italy (nos. 22481/03, 24685/03, 25115/03, 26327/03, 26425/03, 26427/03, 26438/03, 28139/03, 28473/03, 31047/03, 33457/03, 2927/04, 7566/04, 18805/04, 24972/04, 24989/04, 43395/04, and 2353/05)
Špakauskas v. Lithuania (no. 54909/13)
Vaišnoras and Others v. Lithuania (nos. 41382/09, 43584/13, 6858/14, and 26014/14)
Schembri v. Malta (no. 66297/13)
Anuța and Others v. Romania (nos. 39398/14, 41715/14, 1881/16, 63564/14, 6511/15, 29840/15, 45189/15, 48696/15, 1793/16, and 9166/16)
Ariciu v. Romania (no. 36001/15)
Baciu and Others v. Romania (nos. 34638/15, 53213/15, 15240/16, and 20430/16)
Ciotău and Others v. Romania (nos. 77738/14, 4062/15, 40430/15, 42832/15, 43315/15, 51983/15, 55789/15, 60974/15, 133/16, 1753/16, 2855/16, 6813/16, 8823/16, 8826/16, 9885/16, 12869/16, 16630/16, 17827/16, 19675/16, 20012/16, 21877/16, 23744/16, 24190/16, 26977/16, 31422/16, and 31426/16)
Iancu and Others v. Romania (nos. 36605/03, 38236/03, 28157/04, 10672/06, 15084/06, 33860/06, 24053/07, 26025/07, 39724/07, and 40065/07)
Matei and Others v. Romania (nos. 32435/13, 34092/14, 46833/14, 48459/14, 49302/14, 51491/14, 52446/14, 53438/14, 54354/14, 54542/14, 54682/14, 55491/14, 56258/14, 58288/14, 59242/14, 60919/14, 61680/14, and 62661/14) – **Revision**
Postolachi and Others v. Romania (nos. 33196/03, 31566/04, 27200/05, 44771/07, 23498/08, 3651/09, 49475/09, 52486/10, and 76957/14)
Timoce and Others v. Romania (nos. 59297/15, 62388/15, and 7474/16)
Tobu and Iancu v. Romania (nos. 9379/16 and 16340/16)
Avdeyev and Others v. Russia (nos. 35187/07, 12724/08, 19122/08, 39659/08, 56636/09, and 54398/13)
Baykina and Others v. Russia (nos. 33614/12, 51165/12, 67355/12, 72229/13, 76562/13, and 20387/14)
Belonozhko and Others v. Russia (nos. 48691/13, 52355/13, 39924/14, 40131/14, 45207/14, and 45292/14)
Chernova and Others v. Russia (nos. 20443/06, 13572/10, 77873/11, 21872/16, 29351/16, 34662/16, and 4516/17)
Chibotar and Others v. Russia (nos. 72221/11, 433/13, 51988/14, 52515/14, 53236/14, 53537/14, 63426/14, 47129/16, 49719/16, and 1695/17)
Dolgov and Others v. Russia (nos. 7369/09, 34580/16, 44329/16, 45603/16, 57720/16, 65299/16, 66889/16, and 73764/16)
Dubinin and Others v. Russia (nos. 37783/16, 46834/16, 48299/16, 50497/16, 50828/16, 50946/16, 52555/16, 52563/16, 66925/16, and 69653/16)
Dukhanin and Others v. Russia (nos. 2349/06, 40373/06, 9438/08, 39377/08, 58421/08, 57878/09, 75585/11, and 32131/13)
Fedorenko and Others v. Russia (nos. 522/06, 12975/06, 18927/06, 38818/06, 42364/10, and 42379/11)
Kolesnik and Others v. Russia (nos. 13852/13, 28694/15, 16206/16, 31638/16, 34570/16, 43810/16, and 46447/16)
Koshelev and Others v. Russia (nos. 29647/16, 41520/16, 48000/16, 48005/16, 52755/16, 52816/16, and 54236/16)
Lipkin and Others v. Russia (nos. 62579/15, 21040/16, 30416/16, 30785/16, 42283/16, 63590/16, 64395/16, and 64398/16)

Maksimov v. Russia (no. 21297/09)
Markiny and Others v. Russia (nos. 66076/11, 2273/12, 33370/12, 44948/12, 19425/13, and 31134/14)
Morozov and Others v. Russia (nos. 34867/06, 46260/09, 13609/11, 17733/11, 25947/11, 39181/12, 45000/12, and 66896/12)
Mulyukov and Others v. Russia (nos. 31044/08, 10669/09, 62849/10, 63203/11, 3076/13, 36851/13, 16903/14, 64207/14, 16117/16, and 55353/16)
Nasyrov and Others v. Russia (nos. 44844/07, 52705/08, 71485/11, 39983/13, 39987/13, and 37940/14)
Okolelov and Others v. Russia (nos. 8356/08, 21561/08, 395/09, 15344/13, 30086/13, and 40295/14)
OOO Khabarovskaya Toplivnaya Kompaniya v. Russia (no. 10114/06)
Potapov and Others v. Russia (nos. 40016/16, 42313/16, 64760/16, 67671/16, 69643/16, 11009/17, 11273/17, 11281/17, 12934/17, and 13727/17)
Shevchenko and Others v. Russia (nos. 4991/06, 8015/06, 1898/07, 18026/07, 3276/08, and 33224/11)
Smirnov and Others v. Russia (nos. 34649/16, 65019/16, 65629/16, 65638/16, 74100/16, 77794/16, and 77807/16)
Sokolova and Others v. Russia (nos. 25102/07, 34919/08, 65065/13, 45443/15, 17102/16, 34667/16, 1139/17, and 3442/17)
Tsybriy v. Russia (no. 8517/10)
Yegorov and Others v. Russia (nos. 32795/16, 33543/16, 44913/16, 45190/16, 64785/16, 65913/16, 76874/16, and 76903/16)
Zaynetdinov and Others v. Russia (nos. 325/07, 53462/07, 60787/08, 37712/09, 11176/10, 39001/11, 47888/11, and 31984/12)
Zaytsev and Others v. Russia (nos. 57476/09, 761/10, 3459/10, 54773/10, 11420/12, 36421/12, 38110/12, 74969/13, 35673/14, and 48873/14)
Tordaj v. Serbia (no. 19728/08)
Jánošík v. Slovakia (no. 5747/17)
Perhács and Others v. Slovakia (nos. 12927/16, 16230/17, 20839/17, and 27450/17)
Sarkocy v. Slovakia (nos. 52936/16 and 65278/16)
Knežević and Others v. Slovenia (no. 51388/13)
Beştaş v. Turkey (no. 520/12)
Cesur v. Turkey (no. 27368/12)
Fidan v. Turkey (no. 43609/11)
Gökçe v. Turkey (no. 3454/08)
Önal and Others v. Turkey (no. 11605/07)
Sezer and Others v. Turkey (no. 26741/09)
Tercan v. Turkey (no. 64964/09)
Türkeli v. Turkey (no. 42536/13)
Uğur v. Turkey (no. 56254/11)
Zengin v. Turkey (no. 58440/10)
Balabolka and Varkholyak v. Ukraine (nos. 55644/16 and 64700/16)
Bezborodov and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 69816/13, 31751/15, and 22642/16)
Goncharenko v. Ukraine (no. 20618/14)
Ishchenko v. Ukraine (no. 2788/12)
Kalyuga v. Ukraine (no. 4928/08)
Krivorotova and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 57166/08, 61151/08, 61344/08, and 32181/10)
Lisnyak v. Ukraine (no. 836/10)
Myronchuk v. Ukraine (no. 26996/09)
Semyroda and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 45879/07, 29589/11, 31510/11, 15986/16, and 59784/16)

Shevchuk and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 29663/08, 43188/09, 17446/10, 66517/10, 9293/12, 51111/13, and 67253/16)
Skutelnyk and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 15387/08, 13561/12, 10386/14, and 79022/16)
Tamiz v. the United Kingdom (no. 3877/14)

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)