



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 22 judgments on Tuesday 12 December 2017 and 73 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 14 December 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 12 December 2017

Ksenz and Others v. Russia (applications nos. 45044/06, 18796/08, 49158/09, 63839/09, 34455/10, and 36295/10)

The case concerns six Russian nationals and their allegation that they were ill-treated after being stopped and detained by the police for either using foul language or violating traffic regulations. The applicants are: Aleksandr Ksenz, Ruslan Lebedev, Vadim Korolev, Sergey Ivanov (now deceased), Vladimir Kolistratov, and Gennadiy Sergeyev. They were born in 1986, 1987, 1988, 1969, 1989, and 1971 respectively and live/d in Pskov, Novyy Toryal in the Mariy-El Republic, Diveyevo in the Nizhny Novgorod Region, Cheboksary, Novocheboksarsk, and Moscow respectively (all in Russia).

The applicants were all stopped by the police, either late at night or in the early hours of the morning, in separate incidents which occurred between 2005 and 2008. They spent a few hours in custody and were released, except for Mr Korolev who was released a few days later. They allege that they were punched and kicked or, in the case of Mr Kolistratov, that his face was hit against a wall, during their arrest, at the police station or both. In the subsequent medical reports all the applicants were found to have sustained injuries which were the result of impacts from hard, blunt objects.

Following the applicants' complaints of ill-treatment, pre-investigation inquiries were carried out. However, the investigating authorities, essentially citing statements made by the police officers involved, dismissed the applicants' allegations. They notably found that the applicants' injuries had either been self-inflicted or sustained as a result of the lawful use of force during arrest or "in other circumstances". The investigators' decisions refusing to open a criminal case were annulled between three and 20 times in each applicant's case by their superiors who, considering that the inquiries were incomplete, ordered new ones. The investigators' most recent refusals to initiate criminal proceedings were upheld by the domestic courts between 2005 and 2010. In one of the cases, that of Mr Lebedev, an additional inquiry was again ordered in 2013.

Before their release from custody, four of the applicants were found guilty of administrative offences and were either fined or suspended from driving because they had been drunk. Mr Ksenz was informed that he had been arrested for the criminal offence of insulting a public official. However, no criminal or administrative proceedings were ever brought against him. Nor were criminal proceedings brought against Mr Lebedev, who was detained for driving a car without a licence plate; administrative proceedings were brought against him a month after his release.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain/ed about the use of force by the police, also alleging that no effective investigation was carried out into their complaints. Mr Ksenz and Mr Lebedev also allege that their detention was unlawful, in breach of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security).

Malinin v. Russia (no. 70135/14)

The applicant, Aleksey Malinin, is a Russian national who was born in 1979 and lives in Nizhniy Novgorod Region (Russia).

Mr Malinin complains about domestic court orders that his sons should live with his former wife rather than him, and that she was allowed to take the children to Germany, despite his opposition, where they remain.

Mr Malinin and his wife divorced in 2011 after having two sons in 2006 and 2008. After the divorce, Mr Malinin applied in 2011, 2013 and 2014 for residence orders to have the sons live with him but the domestic courts rejected all his applications in proceedings at first instance and on appeal. He was allowed contact rights in a judgment of May 2013.

In December 2014 the courts authorised Mr Malinin's ex-wife to take the children to Germany on holiday, despite Mr Malinin's objections. She applied again for permission to take them to Germany in 2015, stating that Mr Malinin had refused to give his permission for the trip. Mr Malinin in turn asked for interim measures to stop them leaving Russia while court proceedings were on-going, an application which was rejected in March 2015. In May of the same year Mr Malinin's ex-wife received permission from a court to take the children to Germany for the summer holidays.

In July 2015, the children's mother married a German national and then left for Germany with the two children. Two months later she had another child. Mr Malinin's sons are currently living in Germany with their mother, her new husband and their half-brother.

Mr Malinin tried to enforce the 2013 court decision for contact with his sons, but that was impossible because the children were in Germany. Mr Malinin's former wife subsequently began Russian court proceedings for a residence order to allow the children to live with her in Germany and he filed a counter-claim for an order that they should live in Russia with him. The residence order proceedings are still on-going.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Mr Malinin complains about the issuing of a residence order in favour of the mother and about the courts allowing his ex-wife and their children to go to Germany while rejecting his application for interim measures.

Zadumov v. Russia (no. 2257/12)

The applicant, Roman Zadumov, is a Russian national who was born in 1980 and is detained in Bezhetsk, Tver Region (Russia).

The case concerns Mr Zadumov's complaint that he was convicted of manslaughter in 2011 without being able to examine a key prosecution witness against him in court.

Mr Zadumov and another man were accused of attacking another person, Mr X., in October 2010 and beating him to death. A woman who had invited them to Mr X.'s apartment, Ms K., witnessed the events. Later the same month, while undergoing treatment for alcohol-induced psychosis and epileptic seizures, she was questioned by an investigator. She stated that she had seen Mr Zadumov and the other man attacking Mr X. until he died. Mr Zadumov later admitted to being in the flat but denied any part in the attack. The other man involved in the attack confessed to manslaughter committed together with Mr Zadumov.

Mr Zadumov was tried during the course of 2011. The court summoned Ms K. several times but she failed to appear at the trial. At the request of Mr Zadumov's lawyer, the court also examined Ms K.'s medical records. They showed that she had suffered from alcohol abuse and hallucinations, however, a police investigator testified at the trial that Ms K. had been rational and coherent when questioned about the attack in October 2010. The court was informed in February 2011 that Ms K. was due to be released from a clinic the following month, but the court allowed her testimony to be read out at the trial, despite objections by the defence. Mr Zadumov's lawyer stated that her

testimony could not be relied on and that in any event reading it out in court had violated Mr Zadumov's defence rights.

In April 2011 Mr Zadumov and the other man were sentenced respectively to ten and eight years in jail for manslaughter. The judgment was upheld on appeal. Both the first-instance and appeal court treated Ms K.'s testimony as decisive evidence and accepted her statements as having been reliable.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses), Mr Zadumov complains that he was unable to examine a prosecution witness.

[López Elorza v. Spain \(no. 30614/15\)](#)

The applicant, Andrés López Elorza, is a Venezuelan and Colombian national who was born in 1982 in Venezuela and is currently in detention in Valdemoro Prison (Spain) pending extradition to the United States of America, where he will be prosecuted for drug trafficking.

The case concerns a complaint that extradition will put him at risk of being sentenced to life imprisonment without parole, contrary to Article 3 of the Convention.

Mr López Elorza was arrested by the Spanish police in 2013 at the request of the United States, which had charged him in 2005 with two drugs offences, which each carried a possible sentence of life imprisonment. In March 2014 the Spanish Public Prosecutor's Office agreed to his extradition, which was approved by the domestic court in October on condition that the US authorities provided a guarantee that any life sentence would not be irreducible.

Mr López Elorza appealed unsuccessfully and in February 2015 the domestic court accepted guarantees provided by the US authorities that he would be able to seek a review of any life sentence as adequate and authorised his extradition. Mr López Elorza lodged several further appeals, which were all rejected. In June 2015 he appealed to the Constitutional Court, which, however, ruled that his case and an application for interim measures to stay the extradition proceedings were inadmissible.

In July 2015 Mr López Elorza made a request for interim measures to the Court, asking that it indicate to the Spanish Government that it should stay the extradition proceedings pending the outcome of his case before the Court. The request was granted until August the same year and the Court put questions to the Government about whether he risked a life sentence in the United States that precluded early release or release on parole and about the concrete mechanisms under US law to have any sentence reviewed.

The Government replied in July 2015, including a document prepared by the US Department of Justice. The document explained why the US authorities were seeking Mr López Elorza's extradition and laid out the sentencing procedures and possible penalties he might face. It concluded by saying that Mr López Elorza was unlikely to face the maximum sentence, however, if such a penalty was imposed there were a number of ways to have the sentence quashed, reduced or to obtain early release.

On 31 July 2015 the Court extended the interim measure and requested that the Spanish Government stay Mr López Elorza's extradition while it considered his case.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr López Elorza complains that his extradition will expose him to treatment incompatible with the European Convention as it will put him at risk of being sentenced to life imprisonment without parole.

[Çelebi and Others v. Turkey \(nos. 22729/08 and 10581/09\)](#)

The applicants are, firstly, a trade union (the Confederation of Trade Unions of Revolutionary Workers, "the DISK") and, secondly, eight Turkish nationals, including Süleyman Çelebi (the president of the DISK).

The case concerns confrontations between the security forces and demonstrators on 1 May 2007 on the occasion of a demonstration on Taksim Square in Istanbul.

On 19 April 2007 the DISK, the Turkish Union of Doctors (“the TBB”) and the Revolutionary Trade Union of Health Workers (“the DSIS”) informed the governor’s office of their intention to hold a demonstration on 1 May 2007 on Taksim Square (a symbolic location on account of the events of 1 May 1977, during which 34 people died). The three organisations planned to lay a wreath at the the monument to Atatürk and to hold a press conference calling for the recognition of 1 May as a public holiday (such a law was enacted on 22 April 2009).

On 30 April 2007 the Istanbul Security Directorate informed the DISK that the governor’s office had refused to authorise the demonstration, but that authorisation could be granted for a wreath-laying ceremony in which only the representatives of the trade union’s administrative board would take part.

On 1 May 2007 the trade unionists, including the applicants, gathered with a view to proceeding towards Taksim Square. The police ordered them to end their meeting and disperse, but the demonstrators refused to comply. The security forces then began to disperse the group but the demonstrators resisted and a confrontation developed. The police used tear gas and water hoses. Over the course of the day 234 people, including three of the applicants, were placed in police custody and detained overnight.

On different dates the applicants lodged complaints against the governor and against the Istanbul Security Director and his deputy, alleging an abuse of power. They also lodged complaints against all the members of the security forces, submitting that they had used disproportionate force in dispersing the demonstrators. Those complaints gave rise to findings that there was no case to answer.

On 27 April 2007 Mr Çelebi was charged, among other things, with incitement to take part in an illegal demonstration in his capacity as president of the DISK. He was acquitted in July 2008. A total 234 people, including three applicants, were also referred to the prosecutor’s office for having taken part in a prohibited demonstration. The proceedings against them were discontinued in September 2007.

Relying on Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of assembly and association), the applicants complain about the security forces’ intervention. Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken together with Article 11, the applicants allege that they had no remedy that would have enabled them to challenge the conduct of the governor and the heads of the Istanbul Security Directorate.

[Çölgeçen and Others v. Turkey \(nos. 50124/07, 53082/07, 53865/07, 399/08, 776/08, 1931/08, 2213/08, and 2953/08\)](#)

The case concerns seven Turkish students who were either expelled or suspended from university after requesting Kurdish language classes.

In 2001 the applicants, seven Turkish nationals of Kurdish ethnic origin who were studying at Istanbul University, requested that Kurdish language classes be introduced as an optional module. The university initiated disciplinary investigations against them and in February 2002 they were either suspended or expelled.

These disciplinary sanctions were, however, suspended a few months later pending administrative proceedings brought by the applicants. They were all thus re-enrolled in their respective faculties and allowed to sit exams they had missed. All but one of the students graduated between 2003 and 2007.

In the meantime, in December 2002 the administrative courts annulled the disciplinary sanctions against the applicants on the ground that they were unlawful. The courts found in particular that neither the views expressed in the students' requests nor the form in which they had been conveyed warranted such sanctions.

The applicants subsequently brought claims for compensation before the administrative courts, without success. The courts notably rejected their claims because they considered that the university authorities had allowed the students to take repeat exams, thus compensating for the exams which they had been unable to sit when suspended or expelled.

Relying on Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education) read in the light of Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicants complain that expelling or suspending them from university for requesting an optional Kurdish language course had been an exaggerated response on the part of the authorities.

The applicants are Mehmet Halit Çölgeçen, Mürsel Bek, Übeyt Salim, Yavuz Uçak, Mustafa Çalışkan, Münür Ay, Ruken Buket Işık and Ali Turğay. They were born in 1977, 1978, 1977, 1981, 1981, 1980, 1982, and 1980 respectively. They lived in Hakkari (Mr Çölgeçen), Bingöl (Mr Bek), İstanbul (Mr Salim, Mr Uçak, Mr Çalışkan, and Mr Turğay), Diyarbakır (Mr Ay) and Muş (Ms Işık) at the time their applications were lodged with the Court.

[Joannou v. Turkey \(no. 53240/14\)](#)

The case concerns a complaint about the excessive length of proceedings to obtain compensation for property located in northern Cyprus. The proceedings commenced in 2008 and are still pending.

The applicant, Adriani Joannou, is a British and Cypriot national who was born in 1953 and lives in Enfield (United Kingdom). In 1997 she received five plots of land in the village of Koma Tou Yialou, located in the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" (the "TRNC"), as a gift from her aunt who had owned it prior to the Turkish military intervention in 1974.

In May 2008 Ms Joannou, through her Turkish Cypriot lawyers, filed a claim with the Immovable Property Commission for compensation amounting to 1,800,000 British pounds (approximately 2,285,000 euros). The commission had been set up in 2005 following the introduction of new legislation (Law no. 67/2005) on the compensation, exchange or restitution of immovable property to which owners no longer had access in the "TRNC".

Two years later, the "TRNC" authorities submitted an opinion to the commission on Ms Joannou's claim, finding that she had failed to prove that she was the legal heir to the property and that her claim was excessive.

A number of preliminary hearings ensued before the commission over the next seven years, which have been repeatedly adjourned, essentially because the "TRNC" authorities made requests for Ms Joannou to provide additional documents concerning her property claim. These included requests: in June 2010, for a document showing that she used a Turkish Cypriot house in the South; in April 2013, for additional certificates proving her and her aunt's identity; and, in October 2013, for clarification of the different spellings of the names of Ms Joannou's mother and aunt, the marital status and succession of her aunt as well as the status of liabilities related to the property.

Further hearings were adjourned in 2016 after Ms Joannou's lawyers withdrew from the case. Most recently that happened in March 2017 because the "TRNC" representatives argued that she could not be considered as a legal heir to the property as her aunt had given it to her while she was still alive.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), Ms Joannou complains that the proceedings before the commission concerning compensation for her property were protracted, ineffective and discriminatory.

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.

Ialamov v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 65324/09)

Dimitrijević v. Montenegro (no. 17016/16)

Avdyushkin v. Russia (no. 10511/04)

Inderkiny v. Russia (no. 10535/09)

M.M. v. Russia (no. 7653/06)

M.S.A. and Others v. Russia (nos. 29957/14, 29961/14, 53980/15, 10583/16, 10796/16, 10803/16, 19980/16, 35675/16, and 38237/16)

Sochnev v. Russia (no. 27972/07)

Çulhaoğlu v. Turkey (no. 38958/12)

Dik v. Turkey (no. 24536/09)

Kaya v. Turkey (no. 332/13)

Kılıç v. Turkey (no. 46227/11)

Kumbaracıbaşı v. Turkey (no. 23453/06)

Özçayır and Çiçek v. Turkey (no. 1962/07)

Şahin v. Turkey (no. 27303/09)

Yumuşak and Others v. Turkey (nos. 54957/09, 14242/10, 22161/10, and 53804/11)

Thursday 14 December 2017

Just Satisfaction

Wolter and Sarfert v. Germany (nos. 59752/13 and 66277/13)

The case concerns the question of just satisfaction in a judgment on the inheritance rights of children born outside of marriage.

The applicants, Rolf Wolter and Jürgen Sarfert, are German nationals who were born in 1943 and 1940 and live in Cologne and Stuttgart (Germany), respectively. They were both born out of wedlock to different parents.

Following the death of their natural fathers, the applicants applied to be recognised as heirs to their fathers' estates. However, the German law applicable at the time stated that children born out of wedlock prior to 1 July 1949 were not entitled to inherit. The German courts therefore rejected the applicants' claims. They appealed – ultimately to the Federal Constitutional Court – which also dismissed the claims. The court noted that following the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of *Brauer v. Germany* (no. 3545/04, 28 May 2009), the German legislature had amended the law so that the difference in inheritance rights between children born outside of marriage before and after 1949 had been set aside in cases where the deceased had died after 28 May 2009. However, where the deceased had died before 28 May 2009, the difference remained in force. As the fathers of both of the applicants had died before the cut-off date, the difference in treatment applied and the applicants were not entitled to inherit. The court held that it was not necessary to apply the legislative change retrospectively before the cut-off date because of the need to preserve legal certainty.

Relying in particular on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complained that the rulings by the German courts meant that they had been discriminated against as children born outside of marriage when compared to children born within marriage.

In its principal [judgment on the merits](#) of 23 March 2017 the Court found a violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 – in respect of both Mr Wolter and Mr Sarfert. Mr Wolter did not make any claim in respect of non-pecuniary damage; the Court awarded him EUR 5,000 in respect of costs and expenses. As regards Mr Sarfert, the Court held that the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) of the Convention 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 14 December 2017

[Orlandi and Others v. Italy \(nos. 26431/12, 26742/12, 44057/12, and 60088/12\)](#)

The applicants are six same-sex couples. They are eleven Italian nationals and one Canadian national, namely Francesca Orlandi and Elisabetta Mortagna; Mr D.P. and Mr G.P.; Mario Isita and Grant Bray; Gianfranco Goretti and Tommaso Giartosio; Fabrizio Rampinelli and Alessandro Dal Molin; and Antonio Garullo and Mario Ottocento.

They complain about the lack of a possibility to register their marriages, which were contracted abroad, or have their union recognised in any form in Italy, alleging, among other things, discrimination on the grounds of their sexuality.

All the couples were married outside Italy, the first three in Canada, the fourth in California in the United States, and the last two in the Netherlands. On their return to Italy, before applying to the Court in 2012, they all attempted to have their marriages registered in Italy, but were refused.

In particular, Ms Orlandi and Ms Mortagna and Mr D.P. and Mr G.P. tried to register their marriages in the Italian municipalities where they lived, in 2011 and 2012 respectively. However, both couples were told that the Italian legal order did not allow marriage between couples of the same sex. The authorities also made reference to a 2001 circular from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, which stated that a marriage contracted abroad by persons of the same sex, one of whom was Italian, could not be registered as it was contrary to the norms of public order.

Mr Isita and Mr Bray and Mr Goretti and Mr Giartosio were initially refused registration of their marriage in 2011 by the municipalities where they lived, Naples and Rome, but were then granted it in 2014 after new guidance was issued by the mayors of those cities. However, the registration was later cancelled after a further Ministry of Internal Affairs circular ordered the reversal of such registration decisions. The fifth couple were equally unsuccessful in having their marriage registered.

After marrying in The Hague in 2002, Mr Garullo and Mr Ottocento asked to register their marriage in Latina, but were refused on the grounds that the Italian legal order did not provide for the possibility of two persons of the same sex to marry. They began court proceedings to have the marriage registered, but lost their case, the final decision being handed down by the Court of Cassation in 2012.

Some of the couples have since benefited from 2016 legislation, passed after the European Court of Human Rights' judgment in [Oliari and Others v. Italy](#), and further decrees, which provided for civil unions and allowed for marriages contracted abroad to be registered as civil unions.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) read in conjunction with Article 8 and Article 12 (right to marry), the couples complain about the refusal to register their marriages contracted abroad and the fact that they were not able to marry or gain any other legal recognition for their family union in Italy. They further allege that the situation was discriminatory and was based solely on their sexual orientation.

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.

Leutgeb v. Austria (no. 40146/16)

Dinchev v. Bulgaria (no. 17220/09)

Raykov v. Bulgaria (no. 28106/09)

Karabulut v. Germany (no. 59546/12)

Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands (NPD) v. Germany (no. 37054/17)

Balogh v. Hungary (no. 80104/12)

Csikós and Others v. Hungary (nos. 33710/13, 34632/13, 48212/13, 48477/13, 42475/14, 53522/16, 57269/16, and 22427/17)

Czingula v. Hungary (no. 81196/12)

Hoós v. Hungary (no. 13942/13)

Kósa v. Hungary (no. 53461/15)

Vargyai and Others v. Hungary (nos. 48484/13, 50448/13, 65848/13, 66365/13, 69560/13, 72079/13, 72829/13, and 72127/13)

Cupini and Others v. Italy (nos. 33175/15, 33283/15, 328/16, 402/16, 507/16, 683/16, 689/16, 803/16, 872/16, 1059/16, 1166/16, 1191/16, 1253/16, 1302/16, 1341/16, 1366/16, and 2656/16)

Schneider and Others v. Italy (nos. 78726/12, 72728/14, 76448/14, 12087/15, 47925/15, 57413/15, 11728/16, 13208/16, and 34466/16)

Cornei v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 11735/09)

Lisnic Nicolae & Co v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 48747/09)

Ballegeer v. the Netherlands (no. 70043/13)

Anca and Others v. Romania (nos. 45653/13, 56513/13, 75874/13, 76774/13, 16979/14, 18518/14, 18621/14, and 30310/14)

Gavrilă and Others v. Romania (nos. 27514/04, 34573/09, and 28090/10)

Investar International Holding S.A. and Others v. Romania (no. 6248/04)

Mihali and Others v. Romania (nos. 625/15, 2340/15, 5789/15, 7523/15, 8615/15, 23679/15, 29127/15, 34015/15, and 42700/15)

Poca and Others v. Romania (nos. 71601/14, 77502/14, 78443/14, 3558/15, 8679/15, 10385/15, 13766/15, 14100/15, 18400/15, 20858/15, 21477/15, 28884/15, 32603/15, 32777/15, 33403/15, 34069/15, 34184/15, and 36047/15)

Țurcanu v. Romania (no. 51969/15)

Varga and Others v. Romania (nos. 66094/14, 68929/14, 69412/14, 3519/15, 36755/15, 48681/15, 50500/15, 50525/15, 51777/15, 53903/15, 57661/15, 60373/15, 60914/15, 60991/15, 61978/15, and 1368/16)

Artyushkova and Others v. Russia (nos. 20435/09, 8854/10, 11703/10, 16381/10, 16410/10, 62865/10, 7016/12, and 28538/13)

Gavrilov and Allakhverdiyev v. Russia (nos. 18265/13 and 48784/14)

Ilyin and Others v. Russia (nos. 2771/17, 3267/17, 3457/17, 9893/17, 9899/17, 10005/17, 10270/17, and 10495/17)

Kolchanov and Others v. Russia (nos. 47563/16, 50004/16, 51355/16, 63004/16, 63747/16, 64433/16, and 75870/16)

Koroteyev and Sitarskiy v. Russia (nos. 70371/13 and 19972/14)

Kotov and Others v. Russia (nos. 40122/16, 40508/16, 41113/16, 41822/16, 61993/16, 72722/16, 8320/17, 8325/17, 9999/17, and 10191/17)

Nenich and Others v. Russia (nos. 32802/09, 17137/10, 2543/12, and 44202/14)

Nochevka and Others v. Russia (nos. 31681/16, 36260/16, 39451/16, 61780/16, 68809/16, 73268/16, and 75335/16)

Novinskiy and Others v. Russia (nos. 28262/07, 23591/16, 36825/16, 57399/16, 58980/16, 60797/16, 61695/16, and 64181/16)
Serdyuk v. Russia (no. 22134/05)
Sokolov and Others v. Russia (nos. 19337/16, 29396/16, 37902/16, 38191/16, 64397/16, 72695/16, 3135/17, and 7671/17)
Yegorov and Others v. Russia (nos. 33709/16, 34337/16, 36254/16, and 40416/16)
Demo v. Slovakia (no. 74194/16)
Juriš v. Slovakia (no. 47510/16)
Pauer and Others v. Slovakia (nos. 55648/15, 2278/17, and 14825/17)
VENUS PROJECT Slovakia, s.r.o. v. Slovakia (nos. 58982/16, 29335/17, and 33395/17)
Društvo za varstvo upnikov v. Slovenia (no. 66433/13)
H.I. v. Switzerland (no. 69720/16)
Eşref Aktaş and Others v. Turkey (no. 40425/11)
Arik v. Turkey (no. 46360/10)
Atalay v. Turkey (no. 15055/11)
Atsız and Others v. Turkey (no. 6084/06)
Aydoğan and Others v. Turkey (no. 459/12)
Bacaksız v. Turkey (no. 63001/12)
Birsözler Tekstil Ürünleri Ticaret ve Sanayi Ltd. Ştd and Birsöz v. Turkey (no. 17554/08)
Çakmak v. Turkey (no. 34872/09)
Demir and Others v. Turkey (no. 39534/10 and 30 other applications)
Enön and Others v. Turkey (no. 32037/06)
Günay v. Turkey (no. 36596/09)
Gürbüz v. Turkey (no. 38337/05)
Kılıç v. Turkey (no. 34550/06)
Kulduk and Taşkın v. Turkey (nos. 54367/10 and 52081/12)
Otludere v. Turkey (no. 31953/07)
Saday and Others v. Turkey (no. 47992/12)
Sayan and Akgül v. Turkey (no. 23475/10)
Şensoy v. Turkey (no. 58227/08)
Tanyeli v. Turkey (no. 16578/12)
Uzan v. Turkey (no. 13567/09)
Yazgan and Others v. Turkey (nos. 8741/10, 9415/10, 19814/10, 19821/10, 26286/10, 26811/10, and 39588/10)
Abdul Zakir and Others v. Ukraine (no. 60986/09)
Argunov v. Ukraine (no. 58819/08)
Dakus v. Ukraine (no. 19957/07)
Doru v. Ukraine (no. 7158/11)
Gryb v. Ukraine (no. 65078/10)
Krasnyakovy and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 3011/06, 42733/08, 52865/08, 60072/08, 675/11, 1494/11, 52523/12, 60181/13, 61941/13, 22755/14, and 38340/16)
Pudenzkov v. Ukraine (no. 286/16)
Urzhanov v. Ukraine (no. 24392/06)
Harvey v. the United Kingdom (no. 80237/13)

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)

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.