



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing nine judgments on Tuesday 12 June 2018 and 107 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 14 June 2018.

*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 June 2018

Beinarovič and Others v. Lithuania (applications nos. 70520/10, 21920/10, and 41876/11)

The applicants, Bronislava Beinarovič, Janina Kšivanskienė, Monika Korkuc and Sabina Dviliova, are Lithuanian nationals. Ms Beinarovič was born in 1915 and lived in Vilnius, she died in 2015. Her daughter and heir Janina Kšivanskienė, the second applicant, was born in 1943, and Sabina Dviliova, the fourth applicant, was born in 1950. Both women live in Vilnius. Monika Korkuc, the third applicant, was born in 1932 and lives in Pagiriai (Vilnius Region).

The case concerns the annulment of property rights to plots of land on the grounds that the plots were covered by forests of national importance.

On various dates in 1991 the applicants or their relatives applied for restoration of their property rights to land which had been nationalised by the Soviet regime. Between May 2003 and April 2004, the Vilnius County Administration ("the VCA") restored the applicants' property rights to plots of land, in particular in Kryžiokai or Vaidotai, areas near Vilnius. However, in subsequent proceedings, the domestic courts annulled their property rights on the grounds that the plots concerned were covered by urban forests which, according to domestic law, were forests of national importance.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants allege in particular that the annulment of their property rights was unlawful since the land concerned had always been a rural area and thus could not contain urban forests; they also submit that there were no forests on the land when their property rights were restored, and that forests which had grown there later should not preclude the restoration of those rights. They further complain about long delays and the inactivity of the authorities in the restitution proceedings which have led to them still not having their property rights restored to this day.

T.K. v. Lithuania (no. 14000/12)

The applicant, Mr T.K., is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1971 and is currently serving a prison sentence in Vilnius. He lived with a woman called V.K. They raised two boys, born in 2002 and 2004.

The case concerns the applicant's glasses being taken away from him for several months during criminal proceedings against him on sexual offence charges and his being prevented from examining key witnesses, particularly his former partner.

In November 2012 the Kaunas Regional Court convicted Mr K. of sexual assault and of possession of pornographic material depicting a child. It sentenced him to 11 years in prison as it was convinced that he had sexually abused his two sons. The trial and appellate courts did not permit the applicant to cross-examine the boys, the alleged victims, for fear of traumatising them.

The applicant argued that the boys, whose pre-trial testimony of sexual assault in 2009 was key evidence against him, had been swayed by V.K., who had later hidden from the authorities.

The appellate court eventually held that the case could be decided without her because all possible measures to locate her had been tried and her testimony was not important for the case. The applicant's appeal was rejected by the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court refused to examine his appeal on points of law.

He complains that his spectacles were taken from him during his arrest on 23 November 2011, in breach of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment).

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses), Mr K. also complains that he did not have a fair trial as he was not able to properly examine certain witnesses.

[Fernandes Pedroso v. Portugal \(no. 59133/11\)](#)

The applicant, Paulo José Fernandes Pedroso, is a Portuguese national who was born in 1965 and lives in Lisbon. At the material time he was a Socialist Party MP. He had also been Minister for Labour and Solidarity from March 2001 to April 2002.

The case concerns a criminal investigation into a paedophile ring, and in particular, Mr Fernandes Pedroso's pre-trial detention between May and October 2003 in the framework of that investigation.

Mr Fernandes Pedroso had been suspected of having had sexual relations with minors accommodated in the Casa Pia institution (a public institution responsible for running schools, training centres and boarding schools for children and teenagers from deprived backgrounds). Subsequently, in May 2004, he benefited from a decision not to commit him for trial, as the investigating authority considered, among other things, that there were serious doubts about the identification of Mr Fernandes Pedroso and that the victims had been wrong on that account. In November 2005 the court of appeal upheld the decision not to commit him for trial.

Relying on Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 (right to liberty and security of person), Mr. Fernandes Pedroso complains of the unlawfulness of his pre-trial detention and the lack of plausible suspicions and of relevant and sufficient evidence against him. Relying on Article 5 § 2 (right to be informed promptly of any charge) and Article 5 § 4 (right to a speedy decision by a court on the lawfulness of detention), he also complains about the failure to communicate the reasons for his detention, his lack of access to the investigation file and the length of the proceedings. Lastly, relying on Article 5 § 5 (right to liberty and security of person), he complains about the domestic courts' dismissal of his claim for compensation for unlawful detention.

[Alpeyeva and Dzhalagoniya v. Russia \(nos. 7549/09 and 33330/11\)](#)

The case concerns the Russian authorities' practice of invalidating Russian passports issued to former Soviet nationals on the grounds of administrative irregularities.

The applicants, Lyubov Alpeyeva and Datuna Dzhalagoniya, are Russian nationals who currently live in Volzhskiy in the Volgograd Region and in Kostroma (Russia).

Ms Alpeyeva was born in 1951 in Kyrgyzstan in the former Soviet Union. She left Kyrgyzstan in 1994 when the Russian embassy in Bishkek put a stamp in her Soviet passport confirming that she had obtained Russian citizenship and moved to Russia. She has been living there ever since and was issued with an internal Russian passport in July 2001.

Mr Dzhalagoniya was also born in the former Soviet Union, in 1965, in Georgia. He has been living in Russia since the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991. His Soviet Union passport was issued

with an insert certifying his Russian citizenship in 1998 and he was granted a Russian passport in 2002.

However, both applicants were subsequently informed that they had never properly acquired Russian citizenship, in particular because there were no records in the relevant databases. Thus, when applying to the migration authorities for an international passport in 2006, Ms Alpeyeva's passport was seized. Mr Dzhlagoniya applied to exchange his passport in 2010, but was refused.

Both applicants contested the migration authorities' decisions before the domestic courts, without success. In particular, a claim by Ms Alpeyeva concerning inaction by the migration authorities in issuing her with a passport was dismissed by a final decision of August 2009, while Mr Dzhlagoniya's appeal with regard to the refusal to exchange his passport was dismissed by a final decision of December 2010.

Both applicants have since been granted Russian citizenship and issued with Russian passports.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), both applicants complain about the impact on their everyday lives of not having a valid passport, namely they could not find employment or obtain medical assistance, pensions or social benefits.

[Gaspar v. Russia \(no. 23038/15\)](#)

[Zezev v. Russia \(no. 47781/10\)](#)

Both cases concern the exclusion of foreign nationals from Russia on national security grounds.

The first applicant, Jennifer Suzanne Gaspar, is an American national who was born in 1971 and now lives in Prague (the Czech Republic). She lived in Russia from 2004 to 2014 on the basis of regularly extended residence permits, marrying a Russian national and having a daughter with him. However, on applying for Russian citizenship in 2013, a report was issued about her by the security services finding that she posed a threat to national security and recommending that the migration authorities reject her application and revoke her residence permit. The migration authorities followed these recommendations and informed Ms Gaspar that she had to leave the country, which she did on 23 August 2014. She brought two sets of proceedings attempting to obtain a judicial review of the decision to revoke her residence permit, without success.

The second applicant, Aleksandr Zezev, is a Kazakh national who was born in 1979 and apparently now lives in Kazakhstan. He moved to Russia in 2005 to live with his parents and brother, who are Russian nationals, living there on the basis of visas and temporary residence permits. He later married a Russian national and had two children with her. In 2009 the migration authorities also rejected his application for Russian nationality owing to a report by the security services which found that he was a threat to national security. He was asked to leave, but continued to reside in the country until he was eventually detained and deported in 2013, all his appeals before the courts against the exclusion order having been rejected.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants complain of a disruption to their family life because of being forced to leave Russia. They both stress in particular that they could not refute the security services' reports which were used to exclude them because the documents were kept secret during the judicial review of their cases.

Ms Gaspar further complains under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 8 that the judicial review proceedings did not give her the opportunity to refute the allegations against her.

Just Satisfaction

Knick v. Turkey (no. 53138/09)

The case concerned the question of just satisfaction with regard to Mr Knick's complaint that he had been deprived of his shares in Demirbank, following its transfer and subsequent sale in 2000. Demirbank was Turkey's fifth largest private bank at the time.

In its [principal judgment](#) of 7 June 2016 the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights.

The Court further held that the question of just satisfaction was not ready for decision and reserved it for examination at a later date.

The Court will deal with this question in its judgment of 12 June 2018.

M.T.B. v. Turkey (no. 47081/06)

The applicant, Mr M.T.B., is a Turkish national who was born in 1953 and lives in Istanbul (Turkey).

The case concerns his complaint that he was tried and convicted in his absence and not given the possibility for a rehearing after learning of his conviction.

The applicant was convicted in October 2004 for issuing an uncovered cheque and given a fine. The trial had taken place in his absence as the court had served the summons at the address of the applicant's company on the cheque, which the applicant had since left.

In 2006 the applicant learned of his conviction when police arrived at his apartment in Istanbul with an arrest warrant and took him to the police station where he was told that he would be put in prison unless he paid the fine. He challenged the 2004 judgment, without success. The courts found in particular that the trial court had complied with the law then in force for serving a summons.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Mr M.T.B. alleges that his conviction was unfair. He complains in particular that the trial court did not make enough of an effort to locate him to serve the summons and that he was therefore tried and convicted in his absence without having waived his right to appear or having tried to evade justice. Despite this, he alleges, all his appeals to have a fresh determination of the case were rejected.

The Court will give its ruling in writing on the following case, which concerns issues which have already been submitted to the Court.

This ruling can be consulted from the day of its delivery on the Court's online database [HUDOC](#).

It will not appear in the press release issued on that day.

Gorchakova and Others v. Russia (no. 21772/06)

Thursday 14 June 2018

Revision

E.B. and Others v. Austria (nos. 31913/07, 38357/07, 48098/07, 48777/07, and 48779/07)

The case concerns a request for the revision of a judgment of the European Court of Human Rights with regard to a complaint brought by four Austrian nationals about the domestic authorities' refusal to delete their convictions from their criminal records. They had all in the past been convicted of the offence of having, as a male adult, had consensual sexual relations with a male minor aged between 14 and 18 years.

In a [judgment](#) delivered on 7 November 2013, the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) read in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for

private and family life) and a violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy). It awarded 5,000 euros (EUR) to each of the four applicants in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and EUR 11,000 to Mr E.B., EUR 16,000 to Mr H.G. and EUR 9,000 each to Mr A.S. and Mr A.V. in respect of costs and expenses.

On 16 November 2013 Mr E.B.'s lawyer requested a rectification or revision of the judgment as regards the award made to his client for costs incurred in the domestic proceedings.

The Court will consider this request in its judgment of 14 June 2018.

[Rungainis v. Latvia \(no. 40597/08\)](#)

The applicant, Mr Ģirts Rungainis, is a Latvian national who was born in 1967 and lives in Riga.

The case concerns his complaint about a court ruling which found that he had defamed a businessman-turned-politician via interviews in the national media.

In 2002 Mr Rungainis was chairman of the board of a bank, Latvijas Krājbanka, in which the State held about one third of the shares.

In September of that year he presented a report to the board which showed that money had been paid to an advertising agency without any supporting documents, raising suspicions that the funds had been misappropriated. Internal and external audits showed that in actual fact all the services provided by the agency had been accounted for.

In October 2002, Mr Rungainis gave interviews to a leading newspaper, Neatkarīgā Rīta Avīze ("NRA"), on the basis of which NRA wrote that a former president of the bank, A.L., might have been responsible for siphoning money out of the bank to pay the advertising company, which in turn had carried out an advertising campaign for a political party for which A.L. was running for Parliament. The applicant was quoted as saying: "This money has been stolen from the shareholders."

A.L. launched defamation proceedings against Mr Rungainis in July 2003. Mr Rungainis admitted to the first-instance court that the information he had provided had been wrong and apologised to A.L. and the journalists. The first-instance court dismissed the defamation charges. However, the appeal court later found for A.L. and ordered Mr Rungainis to pay 10,000 Latvian lats (about 14,000 euros) to him. That decision was upheld by the Senate of the Supreme Court in January 2008.

Mr Rungainis complains about the domestic court judgments against him as an unjustified interference under Article 10 (freedom of expression).

[Antkowiak v. Poland \(no. 27025/17\)](#)

The case concerns a custody dispute over a child between prospective adoptive parents and the biological parents.

The applicants, Monika and Patryk Antkowiak, a married couple, are Polish nationals, who were born in 1981 and 1983 respectively and live in Psary Małe (Poland). They wanted to adopt a baby from K.D., a woman they had found on the Internet who agreed during her pregnancy to give her child up for adoption. A baby boy was born in February 2011 and he has been in the care of the applicant couple ever since.

After the birth, the applicants instituted proceedings to adopt the child, to deprive the biological parents of their parental rights and to be granted custody. In the meantime, K.D. had however changed her mind, withdrew her consent for adoption and asked to be reunited with the child.

The case was examined at two levels of jurisdiction between April 2011 and December 2016. The courts ultimately held that the child should be reunited with his biological parents by 18 March 2017. The biological parents have since instituted proceedings to enforce this decision, which are still pending.

However, the applicant couple has subsequently instituted another set of proceedings, which are also still pending, asking to restrict the biological parents' parental rights over the baby and to be appointed foster parents. The courts issued an interim order that the child should reside with the applicant couple for the duration of those proceedings.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant couple complain about the domestic courts' decision ordering the child's removal from their care and placement with his biological parents.

Euromak Metal DOO v. 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' (no. 68039/14)

The applicant company, Euro Mak Metal, was a family business, based in Skopje, which traded in scrap metal. It was removed from the register of companies and ceased to exist in 2017.

The case concerns the company's complaint that it was ordered to pay, with interest, value-added tax it had previously deducted from its tax obligations.

Following an audit by the Internal Revenues Office in 2009, the applicant company was informed that it had made errors in calculating its VAT declaration on received goods because its suppliers had failed to declare or pay tax to the State. Therefore the company could not profit from VAT deductions, as it had done in the past. These reasons were subsequently upheld by all the relevant domestic authorities and the administrative courts.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the company complains that, in spite of the fact that it had fully complied with its own VAT obligations, the domestic authorities deprived it of the right to deduct VAT it had paid on received goods, owing to circumstances beyond its control, namely its suppliers' failure to meet its tax obligations.

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.

Čalušić v. Croatia (no. 41988/13)

Spreicer v. Croatia (no. 54356/14)

Alegra v. Greece (no. 26594/15)

Dimitras and Others v. Greece (no. 45486/12)

Karela v. Greece (no. 8771/14)

Katsardis and Others v. Greece (no. 46152/16)

Loyalward Ltd v. Greece (no. 6167/12)

Stranis v. Greece (no. 11433/15)

Theocharis v. Greece (no. 44287/14)

Tzemini N.E. v. Greece (no. 76342/16)

Zafiropoulos v. Greece (no. 27627/14)

Bures and Rácz v. Hungary (nos. 33245/13 and 43866/13)

Csébiné Gyetván and Others v. Hungary (nos. 28132/14, 60630/14, 68326/14, 12225/15, 47600/15, 51634/15, and 51647/15)

Illés and Others v. Hungary (nos. 30122/15, 49791/15, 53445/15, 9576/16, 20492/16, 22181/16, 22989/16, 50938/17, and 70400/17)

Koronczai and Others v. Hungary (nos. 78127/13, 63551/14, 65688/14, 6905/15, 14451/15, 36100/15, 36103/15, 36105/15, 41408/15, 59862/15, 60643/15, and 6100/16)

Krisztin and Others v. Hungary (nos. 79393/13, 80989/13, 618/14, 942/14, 1976/14, 5265/14, 14487/14, 21758/14, and 45180/15)

Tóth and Others v. Hungary (nos. 9063/17, 10740/17, 11429/17, 11439/17, 11746/17, 14465/17, 14888/17, 16221/17, and 16278/17)
Cristaldi v. Italy (no. 29923/13)
Reti Televisive Italiane R.T.I. S.p.A. v. Italy (no. 76826/12)
Soročinskis v. Latvia (no. 21698/08)
Kanišauskas and Others v. Lithuania (nos. 10776/15, 19406/15, and 53529/16)
Bartosiewicz v. Poland (no. 6874/16)
Parowa Fabryka Cukrów i Czekolady Kryształ and Others v. Poland (nos. 1041/12, 38617/13, and 50598/14)
Pawlak v. Poland (no. 2647/14)
Raczyńska and Palińska v. Poland (no. 4830/14)
Romaszewski v. Poland (no. 43654/15)
Stramska v. Poland (no. 24021/06)
Syrjczyk v. Poland (no. 13584/15)
Tarnowski and Others v. Poland (nos. 65312/10, 52793/11, 68157/10, and 75846/11)
Anghel and Others v. Romania (nos. 5192/16, 24073/16, 24624/16, 26561/16, 31177/16, 33522/16, 35627/16, 37189/16, 38096/16, 39814/16, and 47442/16)
Apetroaei and Others v. Romania (nos. 54657/14, 48768/15, 62863/15, 12181/16, 20215/16, 39107/16, and 67384/16)
Beciu and Others v. Romania (nos. 70012/14, 59285/15, 19761/16, and 21214/16)
Ciobotaru and Others v. Romania (nos. 23572/14, 73773/14, 22053/15, and 41700/15)
Coman and Others v. Romania (nos. 20348/16, 37340/16, and 37484/16)
Dima and Others v. Romania (nos. 25401/15, 44014/15, 1639/16, 5711/16, 15353/16, 24969/16, 28444/16, 31300/16, 39894/16, 40720/16, 49458/16, 49471/16, 49474/16, and 49479/16)
Fandarac v. Romania (no. 19650/16)
Halip and Velea v. Romania (nos. 30008/13 and 37370/14)
Iacob v. Romania (no. 64952/14)
Ion v. Romania (no. 22607/16)
Lăcătuș and Others v. Romania (nos. 19624/15, 25838/15, 8895/16, 9950/16, 18104/16, 42259/16, and 61775/16)
Lae and Others v. Romania (nos. 7448/16, 14726/16, 14898/16, 16170/16, 16200/16, 28362/16, 33673/16, 38834/16, 38846/16, 40581/16, 43750/16, 44466/16, 46293/16, 48282/16, and 49508/16)
Lascău and Others v. Romania (nos. 36701/15, 49842/15, 49850/15, 60129/15, 60874/15, 60922/15, 61723/15, 1411/16, 5185/16, 29066/16, and 38602/16)
Moldovan and Others v. Romania (nos. 21037/15, 31437/15, 46377/15, 2101/16, 5161/16, 9501/16, 10365/16, 10687/16, 12531/16, 17866/16, 18073/16, 21937/16, 32827/16, 33349/16, 44495/16, 51015/16, 55790/16, and 2178/17)
Motoi and Others v. Romania (nos. 41088/14, 9376/15, 9792/15, 21161/15, 39632/15, 51462/15, 226/16, 5824/16, 13832/16, 19583/16, 20779/16, 23055/16, 41000/16, 42318/16, and 58818/16)
Mureșan and Others v. Romania (nos. 7528/16, 7972/16, 20058/16, 32405/16, 33993/16, and 72763/16)
Neculoiu v. Romania (no. 14971/16)
Partin v. Romania (no. 46489/15)
Stanciuc v. Romania (no. 9728/15)
Stroe and Drăgună v. Romania (nos. 13352/15 and 46753/15)
Uță and Others v. Romania (nos. 33064/15, 36070/15, 36659/15, 36666/15, 37029/15, 39095/15, 39242/15, 42335/15, 11542/16, 38099/16, and 39892/16)
A.C. and Others v. Russia (nos. 46966/14, 14076/16, 45716/16, 57406/16, 60447/16, 60737/16, 51002/17, and 53613/17)

Alyabyev and Others v. Russia (nos. 33975/16, 53476/16, 56007/16, 41370/17, 42924/17, and 43327/17)

Bashlykov and Antonov v. Russia (nos. 67182/16 and 79180/16)

Baykov and Others v. Russia (nos. 9094/05, 5867/17, 19014/17, 25738/17, and 30833/17)

Bodrenko and Others v. Russia (nos. 31987/10, 33471/10, 49584/10, 50398/10, 51853/10, 53844/10, and 62219/10)

Chernigin v. Russia (no. 39797/07)

Dombrovskaya and Prokhorov v. Russia (nos. 18849/04 and 12715/09)

Dzhanaraliyev and Others v. Russia (nos. 67947/13, 24632/15, and 53248/15)

Gofman and Others v. Russia (nos. 63149/13, 53122/15, and 55477/16)

Gorshkov and Others v. Russia (nos. 12639/17, 24702/17, 25277/17, 25567/17, 27845/17, 27931/17, and 28598/17)

Ivanov and Others v. Russia (nos. 38347/16, 38364/16, 38369/16, 45047/16, 19161/17, 19166/17, and 22012/17)

Kazakova v. Russia (no. 26277/09)

Kiselev and Others v. Russia (nos. 18408/16, 5555/17, 20455/17, 25282/17, 33662/17, and 37208/17)

Klimnenko and Others v. Russia (nos. 1532/13, 2808/17, 3645/17, 5619/17, 17313/17, 17586/17, and 18305/17)

Kolosyuk and Others v. Russia (nos. 45162/13, 72335/14, 46121/16, 9902/17, and 12954/17)

Krivosheyeva and Others v. Russia (nos. 11808/11, 70889/14, 15111/15, 21506/15, and 9835/17)

Lazarev and Others v. Russia (nos. 31293/11, 1174/15, and 4759/15)

Manasypov and Others v. Russia (nos. 11633/13, 36659/17, 38821/17, 38927/17, 45980/17, 49927/17, 53206/17, and 61325/17)

Naumkin and Others v. Russia (nos. 44204/05, 31448/08, and 42289/08)

Nikonov v. Russia (no. 60875/11)

Ostapko and Manyuk v. Russia (nos. 45302/16 and 11061/17)

Ovchinnikova and Others v. Russia (nos. 19524/05, 54383/09, 31192/10, 2528/11, and 6260/12)

Pfayffer and Sukhobayevskiy v. Russia (nos. 8200/11 and 11304/11)

Rumyantsev and Others v. Russia (nos. 40913/14, 49808/14, 68723/14, 76865/14, and 17708/15)

Samesov and Kudryavtsev v. Russia (nos. 14585/17 and 34196/17)

Shakirova and Others v. Russia (nos. 31393/08, 1017/10, 35760/14, 19317/15, and 41451/16)

Skripnikov and Others v. Russia (nos. 27365/06, 16153/11, 8684/12, and 38268/14)

Smirnov and Others v. Russia (nos. 74889/16, 71845/17, 71866/17, 71925/17, 71945/17, 71962/17, 73984/17, and 74152/17)

Spiridonov and Mikhaylov v. Russia (nos. 31164/15 and 31193/16)

Trubnikov v. Russia (no. 48136/15)

Tyurin and Others v. Russia (nos. 53555/14, 57608/14, 74227/14, 76108/14, 77356/14, 18418/15, and 19525/15)

Ulezkin and Others v. Russia (nos. 12683/16, 17029/16, 19092/16, 43394/16, 47807/16, 8974/17, 20305/17, and 20324/17)

Ustimenko and Others v. Russia (nos. 74612/11, 49085/13, and 49192/15)

Valaytis v. Russia (no. 49690/13)

Vereshchagin and Others v. Russia (nos. 30155/05, 81155/12, and 3464/17)

Veselkov v. Russia (no. 6229/13)

Vorontsov and Others v. Russia (nos. 24753/16, 38346/16, 79443/16, 35610/17, 47100/17, 60009/17, and 63407/17)

Zhadov and Others v. Russia (nos. 33615/17, 46200/17, 73429/17, 74315/17, 76926/17, 78023/17, 78169/17, and 78171/17)

Zhavoronkov v. Russia (no. 5059/13)

Zhibinov v. Russia (no. 59014/16)

Yegorov v. Slovakia (no. 4698/13)
Baysal v. Turkey (no. 29698/11)
Tursun v. Turkey (nos. 23307/10 and 64591/11)
Archebasov v. Ukraine (no. 35640/08)
Ashayev and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 24329/08, 32126/11, 21404/13, 23464/14, 56394/17, 70768/17, and 72706/17)
Burlakov v. Ukraine (no. 16142/08)
Dyak v. Ukraine (no. 24231/14)
Khosha v. Ukraine (no. 26727/16)
Soldatenkov v. Ukraine (no. 59815/16)
Sylevych v. Ukraine (no. 5943/10)
Tkachenko v. Ukraine (no. 59372/08)
Trishkovskaya and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 47424/13, 44303/17, 70556/17, and 70927/17)
Yeremenko and Kochetov v. Ukraine (nos. 68183/10 and 62963/13)

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 [@ECHRpress](https://twitter.com/ECHRpress).

Press contacts

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

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)

Patrick Lannin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 44 18)

Somi Nikol (tel: + 33 3 90 21 64 25)

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.