



## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 11 judgments on Tuesday 14 January 2025 and 104 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 16 January 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](http://www.echr.coe.int)).*

### Tuesday 14 January 2025

#### [Petrović and Others v. Croatia \(applications nos. 32514/22, 33284/22, and 15910/23\)](#)

The applicants, Slađana Petrović, Janja Šarčević and Marica Šesto, are Croatian nationals who were born between 1962 and 1973. Ms Petrović lives in Germany and the other two applicants live in Croatia.

They lodged their applications because they suspect that their new-born children, born between 1986 and 1994, were abducted in State-run hospitals and unlawfully given up for adoption. They were told that their babies had fallen ill and died.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain about the State's continuing failure to provide them with information about what really happened to their children.

#### [Pruteanu v. Romania \(no. 9308/18\)](#)

The applicants are three Romanian nationals: Vasile and Tatiana Pruteanu, born in 1960 and 1965, and their son, Vasile Pruteanu, born in 1987. They live in Braşov and Săcele (Romania).

The applicants owned three massage parlours in Romania. The case concerns the proceedings brought against them for pimping and human trafficking. The courts found in particular that the applicants had recruited women in Moldova, promising them jobs, food, lodging and help with obtaining visas, and then made them work as masseuses in their parlours, putting them under pressure to have sexual intercourse with clients.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial/right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses) of the European Convention, the applicants complain in particular that the proceedings leading to their convictions were not fair as the key witnesses against them, who had in the meantime returned to Moldova, were never examined in court, and another witness was examined by the Moldovan and not Romanian courts.

#### [Kunshugarov v. Türkiye \(nos. 60811/15 and 54512/17\)](#)

The applicant, Yeldos Kunshugarov, is a Kazakhstani national who was born in 1988. He arrived in Türkiye in 2011.

The case concerns concurrent proceedings initiated against Mr Kunshugarov in Türkiye for his deportation and extradition. In 2011 the Kazakh authorities requested his extradition; he was wanted on charges linked to his being involved in an armed jihadist organisation. This set of proceedings resulted in his extradition on 16 October 2018 to Kazakhstan. In parallel, the Turkish authorities had initiated deportation proceedings against him for possessing a forged passport and because of his alleged affiliation with terrorist organisations.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) in conjunction with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, Mr Kunshugarov complains about his expulsion to Kazakhstan, alleging that the authorities failed to adequately examine his allegations that he would be exposed to a real risk of the death penalty or ill-treatment.

He further complains, under Article 3, of poor conditions of detention at the Kumkapı Removal Centre pending the expulsion proceedings against him, in particular from 4 to 19 November 2015 and from 31 December 2015 to 12 July 2016.

Finally, he relies on Article 5 §§ 1, 2, 4 and 5 (right to liberty and security) to complain in particular that his detention pending removal was unlawful and that the national courts failed to assess effectively and speedily his requests for release.

#### [N.Ö. v. Türkiye \(no. 24733/15\)](#)

The applicant, N.Ö., is a Turkish national who was born in 1978 and lives in Ankara.

The case concerns an alleged sexual assault on Ms N.Ö. by the Chief Medical Officer of the hospital where she worked as a dentist, and her subsequent complaint to the authorities and court proceedings. She did not go to the police immediately, which was part of the grounds for the acquittal. A constitutional complaint by N.Ö. was declared manifestly ill-founded by the Constitutional Court.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair trial), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination), Ms N.Ö. complains, in particular, that the domestic courts had placed too much emphasis on the timing of her complaint, that they failed to take into account medical-expert opinions, and that she suffered discrimination.

Thursday 16 January 2025

#### [Bodson and Others v. Belgium \(no. 35834/22 and 15 other applications\)](#)

The case concerns the applicants' criminal convictions for maliciously obstructing road traffic by blocking the Brussels-Aachen section of the A3/E40 motorway, in both directions, at the Cheratte bridge near Liège.

On 19 October 2015 the applicants participated in a general protest led by the FGTB, one of Belgium's two largest trade unions. Six of the applicants had union duties within the FGTB at the relevant time. The others were affiliated members.

In 2021 the applicants were given suspended prison sentences and fines ranging from 1,200 to 2,100 euros. The Court of Appeal adjudicating on the matter found that each of them had knowingly and willingly taken part in the potentially dangerous obstruction of traffic, which was prohibited under Article 406 of the Criminal Code. The applicants' appeals on points of law were dismissed.

Before the European Court, the applicants complain that their criminal convictions breached Article 10 (freedom of expression) and Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association) of the Convention.

Six applicants also rely on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Articles 10 and 11 to argue that their union duties were used to justify the severity of their sentences.

#### [Ioannides v. Cyprus \(no. 32879/18\)](#)

The applicant, Maryanne Ioannides, is a British national who was born in 1964. She left Cyprus in 1970 and now lives in the United Kingdom.

The case concerns a two-storey house originally situated in a residential area of Nicosia which Ms Ioannides' father had transferred to her name in 1973. The house ended up being situated in the buffer zone after Türkiye invaded Cyprus. In 2001 peacekeeping forces occupied the house. In 2007 Ms Ioannides brought an unsuccessful civil action against the State claiming the return of her property, damages for trespass and rent arrears.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Ms Ioannides complains about the lack of access to her property and the State letting peacekeeping forces occupy it without payment of rent.

#### [A.C. v. France \(no. 15457/20\)](#)

The case concerns a Guinean national who claims to have been an unaccompanied minor when he arrived in France. He submits that he did not receive the care provided for under French child-protection laws because the domestic authorities contested that he was a minor.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 3, the applicant complains, first, of his living conditions while he was not in the care of the domestic authorities yet was still a minor and, second, of the lack of an effective remedy available to him in respect of his grievances under Article 3 of the Convention.

He also relies on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) to argue that the lack of protection resulting from the domestic authorities' refusal to recognise him as an unaccompanied minor should be regarded as a violation of his right to respect for his private life.

Lastly, relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and on Article 13 in conjunction with Article 8, he submits that he had no effective remedy in respect of the decision to refuse him care as a child. This, he claims, was notably owing to the lack of an avenue of redress with suspensive effect and to the assessment of the evidence he had provided in support of his minor status.

#### [Association confraternelle de la Presse Judiciaire v. France \(no. 49526/15 and 13 other applications\)](#)

The 14 applicants are journalists, lawyers and the professional associations that represent them.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life) and Article 10 (freedom of expression) taken together, the applicants who work as journalists or defend that profession's interests submit that French intelligence-gathering legislation infringes the right to protection of journalistic sources and the right to respect for private life.

The applicants, who practise as lawyers or defend that profession's interests, rely on Article 8 of the Convention to argue that French intelligence-gathering legislation breaches the confidentiality of communications between lawyers and their clients, as guaranteed by the right to respect for private life.

On the basis of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Articles 8 and/or 10, all the applicants claim that remedies before France's intelligence oversight agency, the CNCTR, under Article L. 833-4 of the Domestic Security Code, and before the *Conseil d'État* under Article L. 841-1 of that same Code, fail to satisfy the requirements of accessibility, promptness and effectiveness.

Lastly, under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), two applicants argue that the restrictions placed on the principle of equality of arms and the adversarial principle before the specialised bench of the *Conseil d'État* have reduced the very effectiveness of the remedy provided for in Article L. 841-1 of the Domestic Security Code.

**Ghaoui v. France (no. 41208/21)**

The applicant, Ryad Ghaoui, is a French national who was born in 1986 and lives in Marseilles.

During the night of 14 to 15 April 2009 Mr Ghaoui was with another individual in a car park in the town of Tours. He was carrying a sports bag containing more than 125,000 euros intended for drug trafficking. Three patrol officers from the night dog squad entered the car park. Upon seeing the officers, Mr Ghaoui and the other individual each returned to their vehicles to leave the scene. Just after Mr Ghaoui had got into his Audi and started the engine, a police officer walked in front of the car on his way to speak with him, while another officer stood beside the vehicle to provide cover. Despite the first police officer's signal to stop, the applicant drove towards him, injuring him in the leg and foot. The second police officer, believing that the car would hit his colleague, fired two shots in the applicant's direction.

The applicant was seriously injured and became paraplegic. Several sets of criminal proceedings followed.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), the applicant complains about the finding that there was no case to answer for the police officer who had fired the shots.

**Tverdokhlebova v. Ukraine (no. 15830/16)**

The applicant, Roza Borisovna Tverdokhlebova, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1965 and lives in Kyiv.

The case concerns proceedings which led to the applicant's deprivation of her title to a plot of farming land. She had acquired the land in 2013 from a private person. However, in 2015 the courts found irregularities concerning the location and the right of disposal of the land. They thus invalidated her title and restored the land to the village of Bohdanivka.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), she alleges that the proceedings were not fair because she had not been informed of them and had thus not been able to present her case to the courts.

Also relying on Article 1 of Protocol No.1 (protection of property), she complains that her deprivation of property had been a result of mistakes by the authorities for which she should not bear any responsibility.

**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 14 January 2025**

Name	Main application number
Ibrahimi and Others v. Albania	81057/17
Bagvanov and Others v. Azerbaijan	77919/11
Lakatoš and Others v. Serbia	43411/17
Simić v. Serbia	9172/21
Vasilev v. Serbia	48150/18
Demiryürek and Others v. Türkiye	55005/14
Eren and Yumlu v. Türkiye	29312/20

Thursday 16 January 2025

Name	Main application number
Chilingaryan v. Armenia	19186/20
Jahangirov and Others v. Azerbaijan	73530/11
Musavat Partiyasi v. Azerbaijan	47324/20
Eurofootball OOD and Others v. Bulgaria	1284/21
Radev v. Bulgaria	35472/20
Marković v. Croatia	29935/23
Grigoriou v. Cyprus	27538/24
Benmouna and Others v. France	20859/23
Waldner v. France	40294/22
Zabala Martinez v. France	50069/22
Haschke v. Germany	58853/18
Türk v. Germany	61347/16
A.A. and Others v. Greece	36527/21
A.R. and F.R. v. Greece	39978/21
Apostolakis v. Greece	60740/21
Vasilopoulos and Others v. Greece	43861/20
Kiss and Others v. Hungary	11468/24
Sárosi v. Hungary	14825/24
Schultz and Others v. Hungary	2370/24
Abbate and Others v. Italy	27814/23
Accetta and Others v. Italy	29876/23
Banca sistema S.p.a. v. Italy	31795/23
BFF BANK S.P.A. v. Italy	1488/24
Bonanni v. Italy	59638/15
Carotta and Others v. Italy	71211/14
Cataldo and Others v. Italy	35860/23
Landolina v. Italy	37057/23
Laviani Mancinelli and Others v. Italy	5752/24
Liguori v. Italy	18465/23
Pagliuca and Others v. Italy	38377/23
Pasquariello and Mazzitelli v. Italy	27984/23
Raggruppamento Temporaneo di Imprese v. Italy	58812/18
Sberzi and Others v. Italy	26252/17
Zanotti v. Italy	2929/13
Balcan and Romaşcu v. the Republic of Moldova	61276/15
Budescu v. the Republic of Moldova	79632/13
Paslari v. the Republic of Moldova	7401/23
Silumin S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	35393/11
Spiridonov v. the Republic of Moldova	24510/17
Suşco v. the Republic of Moldova	64990/16
Bijelić v. Montenegro	9729/23
A.K. v. Poland	904/18

Name	Main application number
Cupał and Others v. Poland	30049/22
Kraj v. Poland	17004/22
Łabudek and Others v. Poland	43727/21
Nawrot and Others v. Poland	12689/22
Passella v. Poland	78099/14
Prokopcow and Maciejko v. Poland	31053/21
Ręclawowicz v. Poland	10911/23
Sterkowicz and Others v. Poland	3685/20
Zieliński and Others v. Poland	3423/22
Loghin v. Romania	21582/20
Lupu v. Romania	25467/20
Pașca v. Romania	39809/22
Pretor and Others v. Romania	18857/20
Rachieru v. Romania	17441/21
Stoica v. Romania	29911/20
Arutyunyan and Others v. Russia	19880/18
Degtyarev and Others v. Russia	19573/21
Fadeyeva and Others v. Russia	50345/18
Grabetskaya and Others v. Russia	13024/18
Kuchev and Others v. Russia	3234/17
Malgazhdarov and Others v. Russia	4562/23
Malov and Others v. Russia	9837/18
Mezyayev v. Russia	42228/20
Navalnyy v. Russia	46413/20
Pulyalin and Others v. Russia	1058/17
Rakov and Others v. Russia	53786/21
Rudnikov v. Russia	749/07
Silivonchik and Others v. Russia	27077/19
Sokolov and Others v. Russia	34071/18
Stepanov and Others v. Russia	6607/20
Syazin and Others v. Russia	73042/17
Tanskiy and Others v. Russia	14718/19
Urazalin and Others v. Russia	30580/21
Y.G. and M.G. v. Russia	15152/17
Yelisseyev v. Russia	46205/15
Mirkovski and Others v. Serbia	84712/17
Mišić and AD Teretni Transport Bor v. Serbia	59268/16
Stevanović and Others v. Serbia	28255/23
Ayvaz v. Türkiye	23393/23
Gülmez and Others v. Türkiye	27499/20
Karadeniz v. Türkiye	56471/21
Korkmaz v. Türkiye	1618/23
Özer and Others v. Türkiye	58734/16

Name	Main application number
Özoğlu and Others v. Türkiye	10299/19
Yılmaz v. Türkiye	1384/18
Kadyrov and Others v. Ukraine	14359/13
Korolyov and Others v. Ukraine	11882/22
Kosov and Others v. Ukraine	15959/23
Logoyda v. Ukraine	1536/24
Nevyadomskyy and Others v. Ukraine	6391/24
Orlov and Others v. Ukraine	8134/22
Ostapenko and Others v. Ukraine	2588/09
Shemyakin and Others v. Ukraine	23951/17
Starzhynska and Others v. Ukraine	30464/23
Volenshchak and Others v. Ukraine	1696/18
Zhabynets v. Ukraine	16706/16

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](http://www.echr.coe.int). To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: [www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en](http://www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en) or follow us on X (Twitter) [@ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

#### Press contacts

[echrpess@echr.coe.int](mailto:echrpess@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)

**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.