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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 030 (2025)
05.02.2025

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 11 judgments on Tuesday 11 February 2025 and 52 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 13 February 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 11 February 2025

Novaya Gazeta and Others v. Russia (application no. 11884/22 and 161 other applications)

The 162 applications in this case were lodged by two Russian independent media organisations, *Novaya Gazeta* and Dozhd TV (Rain TV), and 178 individual applicants.

On 24 February 2022 the President of Russia launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine, which he described as a "special military operation". The case concerns legislation introduced shortly afterwards in Russia making it an offence to "discredit the military" or spread "fake news" about its actions.

The 178 individuals in the case were convicted under the new legislation either in criminal or administrative proceedings and the two applicant media organisations were shut down.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain about the shutdown of media organisations and prosecution of individual applicants for their war reporting or statements advocating for peace. They allege in particular that the measures amounted to censorship, with a ban on any information which did not correspond to the Russian authorities' official position.

Novaya Gazeta also alleges under Article 34 (right to individual petition) that the Russian authorities terminated its publication licence and blocked access to its websites, despite interim measures issued by the European Court.

Some individual applicants also bring complaints under Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 §§ 1, 3 and 4 (right to liberty and security), 6 (right to a fair trial), 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 13 (right to an effective remedy), 14 (prohibition of discrimination) and 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights), and Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections).

Aydoğan v. Türkiye (no. 7355/20)

The applicant, Harun Aydoğan, is a Turkish national who was born in 1992 and lives in Van (Türkiye).

The case concerns a self-inflicted gunshot wound the applicant sustained during his compulsory military service, and the ensuing proceedings.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life), 6 (right to a fair hearing) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention, he submits that the circumstances of the case breached his rights under those provisions.

Thursday 13 February 2025

Ishkhanyan v. Armenia (no. 5297/16)

The applicant, Hovhannes Ishkhanyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1988 and lives in Yerevan.

The case concerns the dispersal of a mass sit-in demonstration against an increase in electricity prices held in central Yerevan in June 2015, and the applicant's subsequent arrest.

The applicant complains that the dispersal of the sit-in demonstration was an unnecessary and disproportionate measure and that his subsequent deprivation of liberty was unlawful and effected in the absence of any grounds. He also complains that the prolonged length of time he spent in police custody in wet clothes, without any food or time to rest, amounted to inhuman treatment, and that he had no real possibility of having his rights remedied at the national level. He relies on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 (right to liberty and security), 10 (freedom of expression), 11 (right to freedom of assembly) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

Macharik v. the Czech Republic (no. 51409/19)

The applicant, Michaela Macharik, is a Czech national who was born in 1979 and lives in Želešice (Czech Republic).

The case concerns Ms Macharik's conviction for being an accomplice to tax evasion in March 2015. As part of the investigation, on 14 November 2011 a judicial order under Article 88a of the Code of Criminal Procedure had been issued, stating that a communications-service provider had to provide the police with all data on past telecommunications traffic passing through the mailbox of a particular company. The applicant's emails were among those examined by the police.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy, Ms Macharik complains, in particular, that there was no legal basis for obtaining her emails, and her conviction was based on evidence that had been obtained in breach of Article 8.

P.P. v. Italy (no. 64066/19)

The applicant, P.P., is an Italian national who was born in 1970 and lives in Pisa (Italy).

The case concerns the persecution and harassment of the applicant by her former partner, starting in 2007, and the ensuing criminal proceedings.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private life), the applicant complains of the ineffectiveness of the criminal investigation and of non-compliance with procedural safeguards. In particular, she argues that the offences were declared time-barred because of the authorities' failure to act with due promptness and diligence. She also alleges that the national authorities did not take into account the specific issue of domestic violence, since the offence of harassment did not exist until February 2009.

L.D. v. Poland (no. 12119/14)

The applicant, L.D., is a Polish national who was born in 1971 and lives in Sieradz (Poland).

The applicant had a child in 2006 with a man with whom she was in a relationship until 2011. Following their separation, both parents retained full parental custody of the child and the father exercised contact rights in accordance with a judicial decision. However, in March 2011 the father did not return the child to the applicant. The case concerns the proceedings that followed, which led

to L.D. losing custody of the child following a final decision by the Zduńska Wola District Court in March 2019.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), L.D. complains that the Polish authorities had not taken all the necessary steps to ensure her access to her child.

P. v. Poland (no. 56310/15)

The applicant, K.P., is a Polish national who was born in 1980 and lives in Koszalin (Poland). He is a qualified English and Polish teacher.

K.P. is gay and wrote under a pseudonym an illustrated diary on an internet website for adult gay men, until he was asked to stop by his school's principal in July 2013. The case concerns K.P.'s being removed from his position as a teacher following a decision of the Disciplinary Commission for the Teaching Profession that he had breached "the dignity of the teaching profession".

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 10 (freedom of expression) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination), K.P. alleges, in particular, that he was dismissed as a result of his sexual orientation, and that the Disciplinary Commission's conclusion that his blog was unethical breached his right to freedom of expression.

Denysyuk and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 22790/19, 23896/20, 25803/20, and 31352/20)

The applicants are: Stanislav Fedorovych Denysyuk, who was born in 1958 and lives in Kharkiv; Mykhaylo Mykhaylovych Beylin, who was born in 1977 and lives in Kyiv; Maksym Stanislavovych Berezkin, who was born in 1980 and lives in Kropyvnytskyy; and, Nazar Stepanovych Kulchytskyy, who was born in 1981 and practises law in Kyiv.

The case concerns secret surveillance measures in the context of investigations into large-scale corruption in 2016-2017. The first three applicants were the accused in the related criminal proceedings, while the fourth applicant was the second and third applicants' defence counsel in those proceedings. The first three applicants were informed during the proceedings that either there had been covert audio and video monitoring in their case or that their telephones had been tapped.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, and correspondence), the first three applicants allege that the safeguards in the applicable national law on secret surveillance are inadequate and that there is a lack of practical means of implementing the law in their respective cases. Also under Article 8, the fourth applicant alleges that there was a lack of adequate safeguards in law to protect lawyer-client communications.

Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the second, third and fourth applicants complain that they have had no effective remedies for their complaints under Article 8. Lastly, these three applicants complain that the Government's refusal to provide copies of documents requested by the Court was in breach of Article 38 (obligation to furnish necessary facilities for the examination of the case).

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 11 February 2025

Name	Main application number
Bagirov and Others v. Azerbaijan	34582/16

Name	Main application number
Merćep v. Croatia	47880/20
Glonti and Others v. Georgia	13708/18
Tetunashvili v. Georgia	29727/21
Zaalishvili v. Georgia	45681/22
AJD Tuna Ltd. v. Malta	11314/23
Benli and Others v. Türkiye	59262/15
Olcay and Others v. Türkiye	59481/16
Tosun and Others v. Türkiye	60220/16

Thursday 13 February 2025

Name	Main application number
Qiqi v. Albania	1541/13
Xheka v. Albania	57726/21
Afandiyeva v. Azerbaijan	45751/14
Gasimov and Suleymanov v. Azerbaijan	17894/13
Hajiyeva v. Azerbaijan	17937/23
Mammadov v. Azerbaijan	7551/24
Rzayev and Others v. Azerbaijan	1323/23
Sarkayev v. Azerbaijan	8938/24
Koretska v. Cyprus	38449/22
A.C. v. France	39004/21
Auffret v. France	26481/22
Masson v. France	4346/24
Sellam v. France	48145/19
M.A. v. Greece	38648/22
Garofalo and Others v. Italy	47269/18
Torrano and Others v. Italy	9043/24
Deguara Caruana Gatto v. Malta	47417/21
Crivoveazov v. the Republic of Moldova	58001/11
Bulatović v. Montenegro	27111/23
Gardašević v. Montenegro	51098/22
Novosel v. Montenegro	51894/22
Vujović and Others v. Montenegro	23862/23
Bona v. Poland	10708/23
Chmielewski v. Poland	54643/19
Gabryszewski and Buczek v. Poland	6356/21
Hetnarowicz-Sikora and Others v. Poland	9988/22
Klimek and Krakowiak v. Poland	16199/22
Mazurek and Others v. Poland	9711/23
Rutkiewicz v. Poland	18380/22
Freitas Carvalho and Dias Alves da Costa v. Portugal	21751/19
Fany Prestări Servicii S.R.L. v. Romania	26699/19
Bilalović v. Serbia	34146/20
Hrnjak and Others v. Serbia	9282/23

Name	Main application number
Ivić v. Serbia	17871/23
Pešić v. Serbia	4283/16
Skuban v. Slovakia	9152/23
A.G. v. Türkiye	36024/17
Aydın v. Türkiye	8512/20
Uzun and Others v. Türkiye	6783/18
Bilyy v. Ukraine	59945/18
Bolbas and Cherednichenko v. Ukraine	48314/15
Boyko and Kuziv-Pankov v. Ukraine	34703/21
Indylo v. Ukraine	71056/14
Kopach v. Ukraine	28212/22
Martyrosyan v. Ukraine	10838/24
Conquer v. the United Kingdom	24581/21

Press contacts
echrpress@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)