EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 077 (2017)
09.03.2017

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 17 judgments on Tuesday 14 March 2017 and 53 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 16 March 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 14 March 2017

K.B. and Others v. Croatia (application no. 36216/13)

The application is brought by K.B. on behalf of herself and her two children. All three are Croatian nationals and were born in 1968, 2001 and 2005, respectively. The case concerns access arrangements between K.B. and the children.

The relationship between K.B. and the father of the children broke down. K.B. had custody of the children, whilst the father was given access rights. However, at the end of August 2010, the father disregarded a court order to hand over the children after the summer holidays. They have been living with him ever since. Though K.B. has tried to make contact on multiple occasions, they have repeatedly refused to see her, and she has never since been able to obtain proper access to them.

In the judgment on the couple's divorce in April 2011, the father was given custody of the children, whilst K.B. was granted contact rights on a fortnightly basis. However, these contact rights have never been enforced. K.B.'s access arrangements were varied in August 2012, but that order was also never enforced. In 2015 an expert opinion indicated that the children's estrangement from their mother (and refusal to see her) was the result of their father's negative attitude toward her. It also recommended referring him to psychotherapy, which was subsequently ordered by the court. Proceedings concerning K.B.'s contact rights appear to still be pending before the domestic authorities.

K.B. complains that, by failing to secure regular contact with her sons, which was necessary to maintain family ties between them, the domestic authorities violated her rights under Article 8 (right to respect for family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights. She also complains under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) that she has not had an effective remedy by which to complain about that violation.

Ilias and Ahmed v. Hungary (no. 47287/15)

The applicants, Md Ilias Ilias and Ali Ahmed, are Bangladeshi nationals who were born in 1983 and 1980. The case concerns their border-zone detention and removal from Hungary in the direction of Serbia.

Having left Bangladesh, the applicants transited through Greece, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and Serbia, eventually arriving in Hungary on 15 September 2015. They immediately applied for asylum. For the next 23 days they stayed inside the Röszke transit zone situated on the border between Hungary and Serbia; they could not leave in the direction of Hungary as the zone was surrounded by a fence and guarded. Following two sets of asylum proceedings, they were removed from Hungary essentially on the strength of a Government Decree, introduced in 2015, listing Serbia – the last country through which the applicants had transited – as a safe third country. The asylum authorities notably found that psychiatrist reports, following their visits with the

applicants, had not shown that the applicants had special needs which could not be met in the transit zone. Nor had the applicants referred to any pressing individual circumstances to substantiate their assertion that Serbia was not a safe country for them. The domestic court upheld this decision which was served on the applicants on 8 October 2015. They were immediately escorted to the Serbian border, leaving the transit zone without physical coercion being applied.

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) and Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court), the applicants allege that the 23 days they spent in the transit zone amounted to a deprivation of liberty which had no legal basis and which could not be remedied by appropriate judicial review.

Further relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), they allege that their protracted confinement in the transit zone – in an enclosed area of some 110 square metres – in substandard conditions, especially given that they were suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder, was inhuman. Further relying on Article 3, they allege that their expulsion to Serbia, without a thorough and individualised assessment of their cases, exposed them to possible chain-*refoulement* – via Serbia and "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" – to Greece, where they were at risk of inhuman reception conditions. They further claim that the inadequacy of the asylum proceedings was aggravated by the fact that the only legal information the authorities gave the applicants, who are illiterate, was written, and that one of them was interviewed in a language he does not speak.

Kavaliauskas and Others v. Lithuania (no. 51752/10)

The applicants, Kristupas Kavaliauskas, Martynas Kavaliauskas, Romas Konstantinas Batūra, and Danutė Butkienė, are Lithuanian nationals who were born in 1972, 1980, 1937 and 1925 respectively and live in Vilnius. The case concerns their complaint about restitution proceedings in respect of a house in Kaunas, nationalised in the 1940s.

In 1991 the first and second applicants' ancestor as well as the third and fourth applicants asked the Lithuanian authorities to restore their property rights to the house. In 1995 the Kaunas City Council decided that their property rights to the house should be restored in equal parts. They were paid partial compensation in 1996. In 2008 they were paid the remaining compensation and a further amount of compensation in 2009. In subsequent proceedings the applicants requested the authorities to calculate the remaining compensation as well as the compensation already paid in accordance with the market price of the house in 2008. The Supreme Administrative Court ultimately found in 2010 that the value of the property had to be assessed in the light of values when the decision to restore property rights had been taken, namely in 1996.

The applicants allege in particular that the compensation for the house was not calculated correctly, as it had not been calculated at 2008 values. They were also dissatisfied with the overall length of the restitution process in their case, namely from 1991 to 2009. They rely on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

Mukayev v. Russia (no. 22495/08)

The applicant, Arsan Mukayev, is a Russian national who was born in 1977. He is currently serving a life prison sentence for, among other things, murdering 12 people. The case concerns his allegation that he was tortured by the police and that he was convicted on the basis of statements he had made under duress.

Extradited from Kazakhstan to Russia on 23 February 2006, Mr Mukayev was immediately taken to a remand prison in Moscow where he was handed over to Chechen investigators and police officers for his transfer to Grozny. He alleges that he was punched, kicked and beaten with rifle butts on the journey from Moscow to Grozny, then, when handed over to the police authorities in Grozny late the same evening, was tortured with electric shocks throughout the night and the following day to

pressure him into admitting to a number of serious crimes. He eventually signed a confession on 25 February 2006. He submits that the torture continued over the following days at the police station and that, even when he had been transferred to a remand prison on 6 March 2006, he was sometimes returned to the police station for further beatings and electrocutions so that he would not complain about his ill-treatment and would memorise the crimes he had allegedly committed.

He complained to the prosecuting authorities in March 2006 about the ill-treatment. The investigating authorities took six decisions refusing to open a criminal investigation due to lack of evidence. These decisions were repeatedly set aside by the supervising authorities as unsubstantiated, unlawful or based on an incomplete inquiry.

In June 2007 Mr Mukayev lodged a judicial appeal against the refusal to investigate his allegations. In October 2007 the district court upheld his complaint in full, recognising that he had been subjected to physical violence between February and March 2006 and that the refusal to institute criminal proceedings was unlawful. The court ordered further verifications. However, in March 2008 an investigator again ruled against instituting criminal proceedings against the police officers. Mr Mukayev thus lodged another judicial appeal, which was subsequently dismissed as unsubstantiated. This decision was then upheld by the Chechnya Supreme Court in August 2008.

In the meantime, in May 2007 Mr Mukayev was found guilty and sentenced to life imprisonment. The trial court based its ruling, among other things, on his confession. The sentence was upheld on appeal by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, which also stated that unlawful methods of investigation against Mr Mukayev had not been confirmed.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Mukayev alleges that he was subjected to ill-treatment by the police and that no effective investigation was carried out into his complaints. Further relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), he makes two complaints about the unfairness of the criminal proceedings against him: first, he alleges that his conviction was not fair as the domestic courts had relied on a confession he had only given under duress; and, second, that he had not been able to defend himself with a lawyer of his choosing, and that this lawyer did not provide him with proper legal assistance.

Orlov and Others v. Russia (no. 5632/10)

The case concerns the abduction and ill-treatment of a human rights activist and three journalists, in Ingushetia (Russia), during November 2007. The first applicant, Oleg Orlov (born in 1953), was at the relevant time the chairman of Memorial, a Russian human rights NGO. The other three applicants, Artem Vysotskiy (born in 1974), Stanislav Goryachikh (born in 1986), and Karen Sakhinov (born in 1982), were a reporter and camera team for REN TV, a Russian television company. They were in the region to cover a planned protest against the abuse of power by state security services. On the night of 23 November 2007, which was the eve of the public protest, all four applicants were staying in the Hotel Assan in Nazran, Ingushetia. According to multiple witnesses, the security guards and police who were normally present at the hotel were summoned away from the premises, following a call made by a Deputy Minister of the Interior of Ingushetia.

During the night, men dressed in camouflage and armed with automatic weapons burst into hotel rooms that were occupied by the applicants. The applicants were physically assaulted, saw their belongings seized, and had their heads covered in black plastic bags. They were then abducted in a minibus waiting outside. The applicants were driven to a field, where they were beaten and told that they would be shot. Instead, an abductor said that the applicants would be killed if they returned to Ingushetia, before the abductors drove away.

An investigation was opened. The applicants and numerous witnesses gave statements giving an account of the abduction. However, the investigation was repeatedly suspended (before being reopened), on the grounds that the perpetrators could not be identified. The authorities refused to

examine the involvement of State officials, despite being urged to do so by the applicants. The investigation was last suspended in May 2011, and is still pending.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), the applicants complain that they were abducted and subjected to ill-treatment by State agents and that the authorities failed to investigate effectively. They also complain of the unlawful deprivation of their liberty, under Article 5 (right to liberty); the seizure of their valuables and equipment, under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property); and that they had no access to effective domestic remedies against these violations, under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).

Yevgeniy Zakharov v. Russia (no. 66610/10)

The applicant, Yevgeniy Zakharov, is a Russian national who was born in 1944 and lives in Kaliningrad (Russia). The case concerns Mr Zakharov's eviction from local authority housing after the death of his partner.

Mr Zakharov divorced in 1999 and moved in with his new partner, B. They lived together for the following ten years in one of three rooms in a communal flat under a social tenancy agreement. They never married and Mr Zakharov was not registered as living in the room. When B. died in May 2009, the other occupants of the flat locked Mr Zakharov out and the local housing authority informed him that he had to vacate the room as he had no legal right to occupy it.

He thus instituted court proceedings, claiming that he should be regarded as a member of his deceased partner's family who had the right to occupy her room. In May 2010 the first-instance court granted his claim essentially on the ground that he had been cohabiting with B. in the room for ten years. However, the Regional Court quashed that judgment and dismissed his claims, finding that there was no irrefutable proof that B. had let Mr Zakharov live in the room as a family member rather than as a temporary resident. It based this conclusion on the fact that he had been registered as living at his ex-wife's place of residence throughout the ten years he had been living with B. and had not asked to be removed from the register until after her death.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life and the home), Mr Zakharov complains about being deprived of his only home after the death of his partner.

Yeltepe v. Turkey (no. 24087/07)

The applicant, Gökhan Yeltepe, is a Turkish national who was born in 1984 and lives in Ankara.

The case concerns proceedings for compensation brought by Mr Yeltepe, who, after carrying out his compulsory military service for 11 months, was declared unfit for military service.

On 25 November 2004 Mr Yeltepe joined the army in order to carry out his compulsory military service, but was demobilised on 1 November 2005 on the basis of a medical report drawn up on the same day concluding that he was unfit for military service, as the doctors had in the meantime discovered that he had had his spleen removed when he was seven or eight years old. He was not notified of the report in question.

On 24 February 2006 Mr Yeltepe lodged a claim with the Ministry of Defence seeking compensation, but received no reply. On 9 May 2006 he lodged an application with the Supreme Military Administrative Court, which, ruling as a bench of three military judges and two career officers, rejected his claim on the grounds that it was not supported by all the necessary documents and in particular the medical report of 1 November 2005. He was given a new time-limit within which to resubmit his claim.

On 27 June 2006 Mr Yeltepe submitted a fresh claim together with, among other documents, the medical report of 1 November 2005 of which he had obtained a copy on 14 June 2006. On 15 November 2006 the High Court, ruling in the same composition, rejected his claim on the grounds

that it had been submitted outside the time-limit, which, in its view, was 60 days (section 40 of Law no. 1602 on administrative acts) and that the time-limit had started to run on the date on which the report of 1 November 2005 had been approved and had become final, namely, 30 December 2005. As Mr Yeltepe had lodged his claim on 27 June 2006, he had failed to comply with the time-limit. During the proceedings Principal State Counsel delivered an opinion, which was not communicated to Mr Yeltepe.

On 25 December 2006 Mr Yeltepe sought rectification of the judgment, submitting that the time-limit was one year, according to section 43 of Law no. 1602 on administrative acts, and that he had therefore complied with the time-limit. On 31 January 2007 the High Court, ruling in the same composition, rejected his application. During the proceedings Principal State Counsel delivered an opinion, which was not communicated to Mr Yeltepe. On 8 March 2007 Mr Yeltepe unsuccessfully sought to have the proceedings reopened.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing / right of access to a court), Mr Yeltepe alleges that the Supreme Administrative Court lacked independence and impartiality on account of its composition. He also submits that the rejection of his claim on grounds of failure to comply with the time-limit infringed his right of access to a court. Lastly, he complains about the failure to send him Principal State Counsel's conclusions.

Barysheva v. Ukraine (no. 9505/12)

The applicant, Marina Barysheva, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1982 and lives in Kharkiv (Ukraine). The case concerns her complaint that she was subjected to police brutality on two occasions in 2009.

Two sets of criminal proceedings for drug dealing were brought against Ms Barysheva in 2009. She alleges that she was ill-treated by the police in the context of both proceedings. On the first occasion, she submits that she was arrested in a café in January 2009, then beaten and threatened at a police station in order to make her confess. She did not seek medical assistance on her release and her complaint about the ill-treatment was subsequently rejected as unsubstantiated by the prosecuting authorities. On the second occasion, she claims that four police officers forced their way into her house on 25 June 2009, that she was hit on the head with the grip of a gun and then taken to a police station where she was threatened and punched and only released on confessing to the drug-related offences. She sought help at a hospital the next day and was diagnosed with concussion and multiple contusions. She reported her injuries soon after and a number of steps were taken over the following weeks/months, notably medical reports were organised, key witnesses questioned and evidence examined. Formal criminal proceedings were instituted within two and a half months, but did not identify those responsible for her injuries or the circumstances in which they had been sustained. A final decision in the case of November 2011 not to reinstate criminal proceedings was notably taken on the basis that her injuries, which had been re-classified as minor, could technically have been self-inflicted.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), Ms Barysheva alleges that she was ill-treated by the police and that her ensuing complaints were not properly investigated.

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.

Carneiro da Silva v. Portugal (no. 75415/13)
Comăna de Jos Greek Catholic Parish v. Romania (no. 35795/03)

Fogarasi and Others v. Romania (no. 67590/10)
Muscalu v. Romania (no. 80825/13)
Ursei v. Romania (no. 49362/08)
Karpesh v. Russia (no. 26920/09)
Litvinchuk v. Russia (no. 5491/11)
Koka Hybro Komerc DOO Broyler v. Serbia (no. 59341/09)
Tehnogradnja DOO v. Serbia (nos. 35081/10 and 68117/13)

Thursday 16 March 2017

Fröbrich v. Germany (no. 23621/11)

The applicant, Karl Hubert Fröbrich, is a German national who was born in 1934 and lives in Strausberg. The case concerns his right to a fair hearing in judicial review proceedings.

Mr Fröbrich obtained compensation and a special pension from the German authorities, on the basis that he had served a prison term in the former German Democratic Republic in 1958/59. However, the German courts withdrew the decision to award these and ordered Mr Fröbrich to reimburse sums already paid, on the basis that he had also worked as a secret informant for the GDR security services. Mr Fröbrich applied for a judicial review of this decision, but the application was rejected – the court finding that the compensation was only intended for innocent victims of the former regime. The court had decided the judicial review without an oral hearing, considering it to be unnecessary. Mr Fröbrich's appeal to the Brandenburg Court of Appeal was rejected, and the Federal Constitutional Court declined to consider his complaint.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), Mr Fröbrich maintains that an oral hearing had been crucial to his case, and that the refusal to hold one had violated his right to a fair hearing.

Louli-Georgopoulou v. Greece (no. 22756/09)

The applicant, Ms Dionysia Louli-Georgopoulou, is a Greek national who was born in 1925 and lives in Athens.

The case concerns an allegation of excessive formalism on the part of the Athens Court of Appeal. That court had declared inadmissible an application to join some proceedings as a civil party seeking damages on the grounds that the word "heir" was missing from the record of hearing at first instance.

Acting on her own behalf and as legal representative of her husband, who was senile, on 23 May 2002 Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou lodged a complaint against three individuals for fraud. Criminal proceedings were instituted and Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou applied to join the proceedings as a civil party seeking damages. Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou's husband died in August 2003. In November 2003 the Athens Criminal Court decided not to commit the defendants for trial. Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou appealed against that decision as a civil party. The Athens Court of Appeal committed I.M., one of the defendants, for trial. I.M. appealed on points of law. In April 2006 the Court of Cassation held that Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou's appeal was inadmissible, noting that she had appealed "as a civil party", without specifying whether she was appealing on her own behalf or as her husband's legal representative. Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou lodged an application with the European Court of Human Rights. In a judgment delivered on 31 July 2008 the Court held that the Court of Cassation had taken an excessively formalistic approach towards Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou, which had resulted in the inadmissibility of her appeal. It found that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

In November 2008, on the basis of the judgment delivered by the Court, Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou sought to have the criminal proceedings against I.M. reopened. The prosecutor dismissed her

application on the grounds that the Code of Criminal Procedure did not provide for a review of criminal proceedings against a person who had been acquitted.

On 5 May 2008 a fresh trial against I.M. started before the Athens Assize Court on another charge of fraud. Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou applied to join the proceedings as a civil party. On 26 June 2008, the Assize Court found I.M. guilty and sentenced him to fifteen years' imprisonment and ordered him to pay Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou 44 euros for non-pecuniary damage in her capacity as the victim's heir. I.M. appealed against the judgment. Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou declared herself a civil party on her own behalf and as her husband's heir. The Court of Appeal declared the application to join the proceedings as a civil party inadmissible on the grounds that her application to join as a civil party at the hearing at first instance was not valid because she had not declared that she was acting as her husband's heir. Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou sought to have the transcript of the judgment rectified in order to include that detail. The President of the Assize Court refused to order rectification. The Court of Appeal sentenced I.M. to six years' imprisonment for fraud and two years for fraudulently obtaining a false statement and dismissed the applicant's request for recognition of her status as civil party. On 24 June 2010 the Court of Cassation dismissed an appeal by I.M. against the Court of Appeal's judgment and an appeal by Mrs Louli-Georgopoulou concerning non-recognition of her civil-party status, on the grounds that she did not have standing to act.

Relying in particular on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), the applicant complains of a violation of her right to a court on account of the excessively formalistic approach taken by the Athens Court of Appeal, which had held that her application to join as a civil party was inadmissible on the grounds that the word "heir" was missing from the record of the hearing at first instance, whereas it was unequivocally clear from all the documents in the file that she had that status.

Modestou v. Greece (no. 51693/13)

The applicant, Mr Mamas Modestou, is a Cypriot national who was born in 1976 and lives in Athens. He is a businessman and also chairman of a public limited company.

The case concerns a search carried out in his absence, as part of a preliminary investigation, of his private home and business premises.

In September 2010 the public prosecutor at the Athens Court of Appeal ordered the police to carry out a number of searches at the premises of fifteen residences and offices, including that of the applicant, in the context of a preliminary investigation. A police officer, accompanied by a locksmith, had the front door unlocked and carried out a search at Mr Modestou's home, seizing a number of items – two computers and hundreds of documents – in the presence of just one witness, a Dutch neighbour.

In May 2012 the prosecutor instituted proceedings against a number of people, including the applicant, for involvement in a criminal organisation. On 8 November 2012 Mr Modestou applied to the Athens Court of Appeal to have the search declared null and void and the seizure order lifted and the seized items returned. The Indictments Chamber dismissed the application. It observed that the preliminary search and the pre-trial investigation had jointly sought to establish the truth, the latter in respect of an "accused" and the former a "suspect" who, it maintained, enjoyed all the rights granted to the accused. The Indictments Chamber observed that the preliminary investigation was judicial in nature and not administrative and represented a phase in the criminal proceedings. Accordingly, in deciding whether criminal proceedings should be instituted, the prosecution had to use all the means at its disposal to gather evidence. The Indictments Chamber found that the Article of the Code of Criminal Procedure providing for the right of the occupant of the premises being searched to be present did not impose an obligation and that, in the latter's absence, the presence of a neighbour was sufficient. With regard to the authorities' refusal to return the seized property, the Indictments Chamber stated that these items, which were particularly decisive and crucial for

the investigation of the case, should remain in the file. An appeal by Mr Modestou against that decision was dismissed.

Mr Modestou alleges that the search of his private home and business premises as part of the preliminary investigation gave rise to a violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

Olafsson v. Iceland (no. 58493/13)

The applicant, Steingrímur Sævarr Ólafsson, is an Icelandic national who was born in 1965 and lives in Reykjavik. The case concerns his liability for defamation, for publishing insinuations that A, who was standing for public elections, had committed child abuse.

At the relevant time, Mr Ólafsson was an editor of the web-based media site *Pressan*. Between November 2010 and May 2011, *Pressan* published a series of articles relating to allegations of child abuse against A, which had been made by two adult sisters with family ties to A. At the time of the first articles, A. was standing in the forthcoming Constitutional Assembly elections. The two sisters maintained that they had been sexually abused by him and suggested that he was not fit for public office. A. denied the allegations. One article stated that A.'s lawyer had contacted the sisters, offering to settle the matter, failing which A would bring defamation proceedings against them.

However, A. brought a defamation claim against Mr Ólafsson. At first instance, the court rejected the claim, essentially on the grounds that the statements made in the articles had been in the public interest, and Mr Ólafsson was not making the allegations himself but was merely disseminating them. However, the Supreme Court overturned much of this judgment. It held the statements which had insinuated that A had committed child abuse had been defamatory. The court declared the statements null and void, and ordered Mr Ólafsson to pay 200,000 Icelandic *Krónur* (approximately 1,600 euros) for non-pecuniary damage, and 800,000 *Krónur* (approximately 6,500 euros) in costs. Whilst the court accepted that candidates for public service have to endure a certain amount of public scrutiny, it held that this could not justify the accusations of criminality against A. in the media – in particular, because A. had not been found guilty of the alleged conduct and had not been under investigation for it.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), Mr Ólafsson complains that the Icelandic Supreme Court's judgment against him had unlawfully interfered with his right to freedom of expression.

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.

B.D. v. Belgium (no. 50058/12)
Kostov v. Bulgaria (no. 3851/13)
Ghogheliani v. Georgia (no. 44674/07)
Lagvilava v. Georgia (no. 65879/10)
Keskin and Others v. Germany (no. 24705/14)
Muller v. Germany (no. 13240/15)
Sokolow v. Germany (no. 11642/11)
Astridou and Others v. Greece (nos. 57466/13, 60013/13, 64648/13, 75690/13 and 78942/13)
Bourikou v. Greece (no. 2264/13)
Castren-Niniou v. Greece (no. 34653/10)
Georgidakis v. Greece (no. 14334/12)
Kalambalikis v. Greece (no. 13822/15)
Karahalios v. Greece (no. 50640/10)

Koliofoti and Others v. Greece (no. 27641/14)
Konstantinopoulos and Konstantinopoulou v. Greece (no. 67439/12)
Kourtis v. Greece (no. 22234/15)
Mastoropoulos and Others v. Greece (nos. 76930/12 and 76935/12)
Melemenis and Others v. Greece (no. 48405/12)
Nakou and Others v. Greece (no. 65147/14)
Papadimitriou and Others v. Greece (no. 65282/14)
Paraskevopoulos and Others v. Greece (nos. 20647/11, 31173/13, 40657/13, 62799/13, 66764/13 and 69490/13)
Politis and Others v. Greece (no. 5988/15)
Sakkas v. Greece (no. 38560/15)
Sbonia and Others v. Greece (no. 27650/14)
Theodorakis and Others v. Greece (no. 63499/11)
Thymiatzi v. Greece (no. 35278/11)
Vrettos and Others v. Greece (no. 3016/11)
X v. Greece (no. 18209/15)
Kovacs v. Hungary (no. 78126/13)
Szanto v. Hungary (no. 58886/13)
Vitiene v. Lithuania (no. 65611/10)
Dul v. Poland (no. 35730/16)
Felbur v. Poland (no. 34165/16)
Grzes v. Poland (no. 66735/11)
Silva Coelho and Brito Duarte Coelho v. Portugal (no. 42764/13)
'Paroisse de Şura Mică de l'Église Roumaine Unie à Rome' v. Romania (no. 46347/08)
S.C. S.E.A.C.I.D. S.R.L. v. Romania (no. 55365/09)
Tod v. Romania (no. 18034/08)
Aliyev v. Russia (no. 22134/08)
Cherbizhev v. Russia (no. 53155/09)
Ulimayev v. Russia (no. 23324/04)
Vakhrusheva and Others v. Russia (nos. 18860/05 and 52573/08)
Vasilyev v. Russia (no. 31350/09)
Milićević v. Serbia (no. 52498/13)
Perme v. Slovenia (no. 6368/10)
Frolov v. Ukraine (no. 47753/15)
Garunov v. Ukraine (no. 32638/09)
Gorodnyk v. Ukraine (no. 4831/09)
J.M.O. v. the United Kingdom (no. 54318/14)

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)
George Stafford (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 71)

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.