

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 12 judgments and / or decisions on Tuesday 12 May 2026 and 47 judgments and / or decisions on Wednesday 13 May 2026.

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 12 May 2026

[Asen Asenov v. Bulgaria \(application no. 38741/19\)](#)

The applicant, Asen Martinov Asenov, is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1985 and lives in Shumen (Bulgaria). He is of Roma ethnic origin and is a Roma rights activist.

Following statements concerning Roma in Bulgaria made in parliament by the leader of a political party, Mr Asenov complained to the Commission for Protection from Discrimination, which upheld his complaint. The case concerns the subsequent quashing of that decision by the Supreme Administrative Court following a request for judicial review by the politician.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Asenov complains that by quashing that decision, the Supreme Administrative Court deprived him of protection from hostile speech, and that the reasons given showed disregard towards the protection of the rights of minorities.

[Budinova and Isaev v. Bulgaria \(no. 60342/19\)](#)

The applicants, Kremena Goshova Budinova and Ognyan Isaev Isaev, are Bulgarian nationals who were born in 1970 and 1986 and live, respectively, in Sofia and in Varbitsa in the Shumen Region of Bulgaria. They are both of Roma ethnic origin, freelance journalists and Roma rights activists.

The case concerns a civil claim that the applicants brought against the leader of a political party in relation to statements about Roma that he had made in Bulgaria's Parliament. The first-instance court partly allowed the claim, finding that parts of the politician's speeches had constituted harassment towards the applicants, but that ruling was overturned by the appellate court, whose judgment was in turn upheld by the Supreme Court of Cassation.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair hearing), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention, the applicants complain that Bulgaria's civil courts dismissed their claim and also gave racist reasons for doing so.

[Eisenauer and Others v. France \(no. 47090/22 and 9 others\)](#)

The 15 applicants are nationals of France, Pakistan, Côte d'Ivoire and Morocco who were born between 1955 and 2021 and live in Paris, Sarcelles and Vitry-sur-Seine.

The case concerns the lengthy delay (ranging from two years and ten months to eight years) in the execution of decisions by the administrative courts ordering prefects to house or rehouse the applicants, who were recognised by the mediation commissions of their respective *départements* as persons to be given priority as being in urgent need of housing or rehousing, in accordance with the

Law of 5 March 2007 on the right to decent and independent housing (or, “on the enforceable right to housing” (*droit au logement opposable* – “DALO”)).

Relying on Articles 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, all but one of the applicants (who does not rely on Article 6 § 1) complain of the delay in executing the judicial decisions ordering them to be housed or rehoused and allege an infringement of their right to physical and mental well-being.

[Trade Union of Social Sector Workers and Others v. Hungary \(no. 33144/21\)](#)

The applicants are the Trade Union of Social Sector Workers (*Szociális Ágazatban Dolgozók Szakszervezete*) registered in Budakalász in 2015, and three of its members, Norbert Ferencz, Mónika Koloszi and Bulcsú Mihál, all Hungarian nationals, born in 1966, 1980 and 1981 respectively. Ms Koloszi lives in the Hungarian city of Esztergom and the other two live in Budapest.

The case concerns the arbitration proceedings that set the minimum level of services to be provided during planned monthly strike action by social sector workers between February and December 2020. They were asking for measures to improve their working conditions and pay and pension rights and the establishment of a national labour roundtable but, due to delays in the proceedings, the strikes were unable to go ahead as planned.

Relying on Articles 11 (freedom of assembly and association) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, the applicants complain about the protracted nature of those arbitration proceedings, which interfered with their right to strike.

[Skrcheski v. North Macedonia \(no. 37954/21\)](#)

The applicant, Trajche Skrcheski, is a Macedonian/citizen of the Republic of North Macedonia who was born in 1956 and lives in Ohrid (North Macedonia).

Mr Skrcheski was a judge. The case concerns proceedings against him for professional misconduct, which were completed after he retired in April 2020.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), he complains about the manner in which the State Judicial Council applied the relevant provisions of the Courts Act to his case.

[Y v. Serbia \(no. 28322/20\)](#)

The applicant, Y, is a Serbian national who was born in 2007.

In 2015 she was placed in foster care, along with her three siblings. The parents were subsequently deprived of their parental rights as they made no effort to maintain contact with the four children, and the social services decided that it would be in the children’s best interests to be adopted. In September 2017 a couple from abroad expressed an interest in adopting Y and her half-brother, X. However, Y, who had just turned ten and had the right to decide whether she wished to be adopted or not, expressed the wish to continue living with her foster carer.

The case concerns Y’s complaint about the lack of contact with X after he was adopted by the family abroad. She challenged at length the adoption with the help of her foster carer, to no avail.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Y complains that the adoption resulted in the severance of all ties with X, arguing that it had not been in her or X’s best interest to separate them. She also submits that the adoptive parents had promised to maintain contact between her and X after his adoption, which had not happened.

[Fal v. Spain \(no. 25828/23\)](#)

The applicant, Najib Fal, is a Moroccan national who was born in 1975 and lives in Casablanca (Morocco).

The case concerns an expulsion and re-entry ban imposed on him, as an administrative sanction, on national security grounds. Prior to his expulsion, Mr Fal lived in Spain lawfully with his wife, a Moroccan national, and their two daughters, who were born in Spain. In 2019 Mr Fal was identified as having been a key member of a group which had sent several young people from Madrid to Syria and Iraq to enrol in jihadist terrorist groups. On 3 May 2019 the Secretary of State ordered his expulsion from Spanish territory with a ten-year entry ban and he was expelled to Morocco on 18 June 2019. He was not criminally charged or convicted. In January 2021 the Audiencia Nacional dismissed an application by Mr Fal for judicial review, finding that the expulsion order and re-entry ban had been sufficiently reasoned and had struck a fair balance between Mr Fal's family life and the national security considerations.

Relying principally on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Mr Fal complains, in particular, that the domestic authorities authorised his expulsion without an adequate assessment of his family circumstances.

[B.M. v. Switzerland \(no. 50227/21\)](#)

The applicant is a Swiss national who was born in 1946.

The case concerns the rejection of the application for release on licence made by the applicant, who has been in preventive detention since 2005 following his conviction for sexual assault of minors.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private life) of the Convention, the applicant complains of his detention conditions, in particular the failure to make accommodations in view of his age and to authorise escorted leave.

Under Article 5 (right to liberty and security), the applicant complains that his application for release on licence was dismissed by the Federal Supreme Court.

Relying on Articles 5 (right to liberty and security) and 6 (right to a fair hearing), the applicant complains that the Administrative Court did not hold a hearing in his case. Under Article 5 taken separately, he further alleges that the Administrative Court did not have full power of review, that its decision was not delivered "speedily" and that he sustained damage as a result. He also argues that the expert report on which the Administrative Court based its decision was not sufficiently recent.

[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 12 May 2026

Name	Main application number
Nikolov v. Bulgaria	51011/20
Mironiuk v. Lithuania	60964/21
Zigmantavičius v. Lithuania	57967/22
Akat v. Türkiye	45874/19

Wednesday 13 May 2026

Name	Main application number
Harutyunyan v. Armenia	10804/17

Name	Main application number
Matsakyan v. Armenia	28350/18
Agajaniani v. Georgia	57310/22
Galitskaya v. Georgia and Russia	31741/18
Ltd. Iliyad v. Georgia	4637/23
Boutzas v. Greece	30574/17
Salah v. Greece	76024/17
Talija v. Greece	27338/17
Bernáth and Others v. Hungary	2366/25
Gazsovcics and Others v. Hungary	37500/24
Horváth and Others v. Hungary	20698/25
Rafael and Others v. Hungary	25240/25
Szilvásy v. Hungary	54820/19
Bordogna and Others v. Italy	27200/24
Servizi Ecologici di Marchese Giosè v. Italy	12341/23
Živković and Others v. Montenegro	19333/23
Jurukoski Seko Doel v. North Macedonia	471/19
M.P. and N.B.K. v. North Macedonia	36730/23
Smilkov v. North Macedonia	57830/21
J.K. v. Norway	24657/21
Dzioba v. Poland	5126/22
Grabosz and Others v. Poland	36204/23
Lew-Kiedrowska and Poludniak v. Poland	33182/24
Szkaradek-Siwińska and Others v. Poland	10160/24
Szostak and Rybacki v. Poland	6344/24
Urbańska and Others v. Poland	42082/23
de Jesus Seca v. Portugal	21591/23
Bălan and Others v. Romania	12769/20
Mihalcea and Others v. Romania	52700/20
Ashyrov and Skokov v. Russia	11890/21
Grebenyuk and Others v. Russia and Ukraine	3238/17
Starunov and Others v. Russia and Ukraine	3285/17
Tierce v. San Marino	23793/24
N.A. v. Sweden	36702/23
Acar v. Türkiye	13662/20
Baltacı v. Türkiye	1911/24
Koçum v. Türkiye	36961/20
Yavuzkan v. Türkiye	9012/21
Yıldız v. Türkiye	9628/20
Karavanova v. Ukraine	23510/25
Kovalevskyy v. Ukraine	712/25
Ozhog and Others v. Ukraine	50418/22
Rast, TOV v. Ukraine	57790/17
Shaykin and Others v. Ukraine	1820/25
Usatyuk v. Ukraine	1902/25
Zagor and Kalyuzhnyy v. Ukraine	10869/25

