



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing three judgments on Tuesday 11 April 2023 and 70 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 13 April 2023.

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 April 2023

[Simonova v. Bulgaria \(application no. 30782/16\)](#)

The applicant, Veska Atanasova Simonova, is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1972 and lives in Kuklen (Bulgaria).

The case concerns the demolition of an illegally erected building, which was allegedly the only place she and her children had to live in. The building had no electrical or water-supply and no sewage facilities. When having it built, the applicant had declared that it would be used for agricultural purposes. She had obtained a permit, but it was later found that it had been partly built on land that did not belong to her, that no papers had been drawn up to certify its conformity with the building regulations, and that she was using it for residential purposes, in breach of the planning legislation.

The applicant complains that the order for the demolition of the building in which she and her children lived went against her right to respect for her home, in breach of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

[T.H. v. Bulgaria \(no. 46519/20\)](#)

The applicant, Mr T.H., is a Bulgarian national, who was born in 2004 and lives in Sofia.

In 2012 Mr T.H., who had behavioural difficulties, was diagnosed with a hyperkinetic disorder and a “specific developmental disorder of scholastic skills”. The case concerns his allegation that he was discriminated against in his first two years of primary school by his teachers and head teacher on account of his disability. He interrupted his schooling there in the second term of his second year and completed his primary education in another mainstream school.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention, the applicant alleges that the staff in his first primary school harassed him and treated him in the same way as pupils without a disability because they assumed that his behaviour was due to lack of proper parenting. He complains that, as a result, the school failed to adapt his schooling to his special educational needs.

[Loukili v. the Netherlands \(no. 57766/19\)](#)

The applicant, Farid Loukili, is a Moroccan national who was born in 1978 and lives in Rotterdam (the Netherlands). His family moved to the Netherlands in 1981, and he lived there from then on, obtaining a permanent residence permit in 2001. He has two children of Dutch nationality.

The case concerns the revocation of his residence permit, a return decision and a 10-year ban on him re-entering the country following several convictions for drug trafficking, possession of cocaine and heroin, assault, intentional and unlawful destruction of property, and intentional handling of stolen goods.

Relying on Article 8 (right to family life) of the Convention, the applicant complains that the decisions to revoke his residence permit and to impose an entry ban on him were disproportionate, and interfered unjustifiably with his family life. He holds that the national courts did not sufficiently take into account his and his children's interests.

Thursday 13 April 2023

[Jírová and Others v. the Czech Republic \(no. 66015/17\)](#)

The applicants, V. Jírová, M. Jíra and V. Bláha, are Czech nationals who were born in 1958, 1958 and 1998 respectively and live in Hodkovice and Mohelkou (the Czech Republic).

The case concerns a court-ordered prohibition on contact between Ms Jírová and Mr Jíra and their former foster child, Mr Bláha. The order took place following Mr Bláha's placement in institutional care owing to questions over the quality of foster care he was receiving.

Relying on Article 8 (right to protection for private and family life) and Article 6 (right to a fair trial), they complain of the prohibition on contact, and that they did not have a reasonable opportunity to submit certain claims before the national courts.

[E.K. v. Latvia \(no. 25942/20\)](#)

The applicant, Mr E.K., is a Latvian national who was born in 1983 and lives in Saldus County (Latvia).

The case concerns the applicant's complaint about non-enforcement of a judgment granting him contact rights with his daughter, born in 2013. He and the child's mother separated in 2016. The courts dissolved the marriage in 2018 and determined his contact rights, which, according to him, have however been extremely limited due to obstruction by the mother.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains that the Latvian authorities have not helped him to enforce his contact rights with his daughter, in the face of the mother's opposition. He alleges that in 2017 he had an excellent relationship with his daughter, but that over time her opinion has changed owing to the mother's influence.

[Mayboroda v. Ukraine \(no. 14709/07\)](#)

The applicant, Lyudmyla Ivanivna Mayboroda, was a Ukrainian national who was born in 1952 and lived in Svalyava (Ukraine). She died in 2016 while the proceedings before the European Court were still ongoing.

The case concerns the applicant's allegation that her kidney was removed without her consent or even knowledge during emergency surgery for internal bleeding in March 2000. The intervention was carried out in Lviv Regional Clinical Hospital, a public hospital. She found out a few months later via an anonymous telephone call that her left kidney "had been stolen".

An official investigation concluded that the kidney had been removed to save her life, while a civil action she brought resulted in her being awarded damages against her consulting physician.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life), Ms Mayboroda complains of a failure to protect her right to informed consent about the removal of her kidney and of the physicians' concealing this information from her in the post-operative period.

[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.

Thursday 13 April 2023

Name	Main application number
Hovhannisyan v. Armenia	17593/18
Abulov and Others v. Azerbaijan	28177/19
Hasanov and Others v. Azerbaijan	25478/18
Huseynov and Others v. Azerbaijan	82503/17
Safarov and Others v. Azerbaijan	1476/18
Leus v. Belgium	52972/12
Vandeputte v. Belgium	44042/18
Georgiev v. Bulgaria	73086/12
Kulinov and Others v. Bulgaria	28151/15
Stefanov and Others v. Bulgaria	50986/16
Stoilov v. Bulgaria	52550/20
Stoyanov and Tabakov v. Bulgaria	30005/13
Yankabakov v. Bulgaria	46067/16
Krunić v. Croatia	33577/21
Sládek v. the Czech Republic	32671/13
NRJ SAS v. France	14197/19
Dogiakos v. Greece	10294/17
Mohammad v. Greece	25050/17
O Pelasgos v. Greece	61157/15
Rasimoglou and Others v. Greece	13152/20
Átlátszó.hu Kft and Others v. Hungary	7286/22
Varga and Others v. Hungary	33409/22
Biondi and Others v. Italy	39879/21
Iseini and Others v. North Macedonia	35172/22
Chmielewski v. Poland	46466/19
Kolasa and Others v. Poland	57723/19
Kowalski v. Poland	3458/19
Lewiński v. Poland	24730/20
Zych v. Poland	59214/18
da Nave de Almeida v. Portugal	2725/21
do Nascimento da Graça Mendes v. Portugal	42101/18
Mitrache and Others v. Portugal	2215/21
Avroian and Others v. Romania	39776/16
Barsony v. Romania	41955/16
Deaconescu and Brătănescu v. Romania	26442/19
Din v. Romania	43038/16
Gerenyi and Others v. Romania	11891/16
Gîță v. Romania	26174/16
Lazăr and Others v. Romania	33430/16
Negreanu and Others v. Romania	27232/16
Petre v. Romania	31145/16
Szentgyorgyi and Others v. Romania	45197/16
Tudorache v. Romania	5782/17
Arbatskiy and Others v. Russia	80289/17

Name	Main application number
Slastenin and Others v. Russia	70345/17
Uvarkina and Others v. Russia	70089/12
Yench and Others v. Russia	6494/20
Zenkin and Others v. Russia	8507/20
Ilić v. Serbia	28662/16
Janjić and Others v. Serbia	48936/17
Kostić and Others v. Serbia	14203/22
Pipuš v. Slovenia	3815/21
Plut v. Slovenia	27464/21
Savič v. Slovenia	21466/22
Atılğan and Others v. Türkiye	7942/18
Kaya v. Türkiye	49072/20
Özbek and Others v. Türkiye	84/18
B&H PJSC v. Ukraine	71542/12
Bevza v. Ukraine	45323/20
Brazhevska v. Ukraine	6578/12
Korniyenko and Others v. Ukraine	24520/19
Laptyev v. Ukraine	30666/13
Mazur v. Ukraine	50436/18
Tsekhanovych and Others v. Ukraine	71105/14
Tymchyshena v. Ukraine	45230/15
Zastavska v. Ukraine	57960/19
Independent Print Ltd and Evening Standard Ltd v. the United Kingdom	2511/22

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 Twitter [@ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

Press contacts

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

We would encourage journalists to send their enquiries via email.

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.