



## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 17 judgments on Tuesday 14 October 2025 and 40 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 16 October 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 October 2025

#### [B.F. v. Greece \(application no. 59816/13\)](#)

The applicant, Mr B.F., is an Iranian national who was born in 1980.

Mr B.F. entered Greece in August 2012. He was arrested immediately on arrival, subsequently released, then arrested again in July 2013 and placed in administrative detention for his irregular status. He applied for asylum first on account of his sexual orientation and then his religious beliefs. He was ultimately released again in September 2013 and granted refugee status. The case concerns his complaints about the unlawfulness and conditions of his detention for just over two and half months in 2013 in Kolonos police station.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr B.F. complains of overcrowding, lack of hygiene and poor food when he was detained in Kolonos police station, which he alleges was not suitable for prolonged detention. He also alleges under Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 (right to liberty and security) that his detention was arbitrary and that the proceedings for judicial review of the lawfulness of his detention pending the examination of his asylum request were inadequate.

#### [F.M. and Others v. Greece \(no. 17622/21\)](#)

The case concerns the sinking of a boat which occurred, according to the applicants, on 16 March 2018 off the coast of the island of Agathonisi (Greece).

The applicants are two Afghan and two Iraqi nationals. They all complain of the death of their relatives in that boat accident.

Three of the applicants, who were on the boat and survived, submit that their lives were put in danger owing to the acts and/or omissions of the authorities, particularly the coastguards.

All of the applicants also allege that the investigations into the accident in question were ineffective.

They rely on Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention.

#### [Tsatani v. Greece \(no. 42514/16\)](#)

The applicant, Georgia Tsatani, is a Greek national who was born in 1952 and lives in Athens. At the time of the events, she was a prosecutor at the Athens Court of Appeal.

The case concerns disciplinary proceedings brought against Ms Tsatani by the President of the Court of Cassation, V.T., after a preliminary disciplinary investigation against the applicant, conducted by V.T., for closing investigations into a criminal fraud case. Ms Tsatani requested V.T.'s recusal, alleging that she was not impartial. The recusal request was dismissed, and the Court of Cassation disciplinary councils deprived the applicant of two months' salary.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention, Ms Tsatani complains that she was not heard by an impartial tribunal as the President of the Court of Cassation had herself examined the recusal request that the applicant had submitted against her.

### *Just Satisfaction*

#### [Georgia v. Russia \(IV\) \(no. 39611/18\)](#)

The parties in this case are two States, Georgia and Russia.

The case concerns the just satisfaction to be awarded following the European Court's [ruling of 9 April 2024](#) with regard to the human-rights toll caused by the hardening of boundary lines after the 2008 conflict between the two States. In particular the armed conflict had led to a process, which started in 2009 and is known as "borderisation", blocking people from crossing the administrative boundary lines freely between Georgian-controlled territory and the Russian-backed breakaway Georgian regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

In the 2024 judgment the Court found multiple violations of the Convention by Russia, including excessive use of force, ill-treatment, unlawful restrictions on access to homes, land and families, denial of the right to education in Georgian and unlawful restrictions on day-to-day movement across the administrative boundary line.

As the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) of the Convention was not ready for decision, the Court reserved it. It will rule on this question in its judgment of 14 October 2025.

#### [Tuğluk v. Türkiye \(no. 71757/17\)](#)

The applicant, Aysel Tuğluk, is a Turkish national who was born in 1965. She is a well-known political figure, engaged in the Kurdish issue and women's rights.

Ms Tuğluk was convicted in 2018 of membership of an illegal armed organisation, namely the Democratic Society Congress (Demokratik Toplum Kongresi – "the DTK"), which the authorities considered was linked to the PKK/KCK (the Kurdish Workers' Party/Kurdistan Communities Union). She was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment. She has since been released on health grounds. The case concerns her pre-trial detention for approximately one year and three months pending those criminal proceedings.

Relying on Article 5 §§ 1, 3 and 4 (right to liberty and security), the applicant complains that the prosecuting authorities and courts failed to provide reasonable evidence that she had committed the criminal offences of which she was suspected, that the courts also failed to justify her continued detention and that she could not properly challenge her detention because of restrictions on access to the case file.

Also relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), she alleges that the reasons for her pre-trial detention were based on press statements, meetings, demonstrations and speeches she had made as co-chair of the DTK, which she stresses were not an incitement to violence as alleged, but aimed at finding peaceful solutions to the Kurdish problem.

Lastly, she alleges under Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) that she had been detained in 2016, like many other members of the Peoples' Democratic Party (Halkların Demokratik Partisi), the country's second-largest opposition party, as part of a broader policy to silence political debate.

Thursday 16 October 2025

[Fajstavr v. the Czech Republic \(no. 48303/21\)](#)

The applicant, Aleš Fajstavr, is a Czech national who was born in 1957 and lives in Jihlava (Czech Republic).

In September 2019 the applicant was convicted of manufacturing and trafficking illegal drugs committed with an organised group and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment. His conviction was based to a decisive extent on the testimony of one of his co-accused, who had been granted the status of "cooperating accused". The domestic court found her statements to be reliable since, among other things, they described the actions of all members of the group in a logical and consistent way. It also found the applicant's alibis to be untenable. The case concerns the applicant's complaint that his conviction was not fair.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 2 (right to a fair trial) the applicant alleges in particular that his criminal conviction was based on unreliable statements of one of his co-accused, who had cooperated with the criminal authorities in exchange for a reduction of her sentence.

[Brun and Lledo v. France \(no. 53686/21\)](#)

The applicants, Stéphanie Brun and Frédéric Lledo, are French nationals who were born in 1972 and 1957 and live in La Batarelle (Bouches-du-Rhône).

The case concerns the death of the applicants' relative in hospital four months after being admitted following a serious road-traffic accident, as well as the criminal investigation and the claims for compensation brought by the applicants before the ordinary and administrative courts.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), the applicants allege that the death of their relative was caused, or at the very least hastened, by various failings on the part of the hospital's medical personnel. They complain about the proceedings before the administrative courts and their outcome. Furthermore, Ms Brun alleges that the police investigation conducted following her relative's accident was not effective.

Finally, relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life), the applicants complain of a violation of their relative's rights to health and bodily integrity, alleging that he did not receive the appropriate medical care.

[Italmoda Mariano Previti and Others v. the Netherlands \(no. 16395/18\)](#)

The applicants are a company, Schoenimport Italmoda Mariano Previti ("Italmoda"), registered in 1994 in the Netherlands, and four Italian and Dutch nationals, Giovanna Previti, Maurizio Previti, Stefano Previti and Maria Previti-Van Ginkel, who were born in 1971, 1973, 1969 and 1947 respectively and live in Daverio (Italy) and Bergen (the Netherlands).

The case concerns the issuing of supplementary tax assessments on the ground that the conditions for eligibility for value added tax (VAT) benefits were not met.

The applicant company was a registered partnership that was created in 1994 and dissolved in 2000. The other four applicants were members of the partnership. The company acquired goods from vendors in the Netherlands and Germany for resale to clients in Italy. The applicants applied the "zero-rate" tariff for sales carried out in the European Union in respect of those goods – that is, they paid no VAT in the Netherlands, on the assumption that such sales were exempt from VAT. In 2002 and 2005 the Tax and Customs Administration issued supplementary tax assessments on the grounds that the company had not complied with the conditions for applying the zero-rate exemption.

Following a preliminary ruling by the Court of Justice of the European Union in 2014, domestic proceedings brought by the applicants in connection with those supplementary tax assessments were ultimately unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 7 (no punishment without law), the applicants complain that the issuing of supplementary tax assessments amounted to a “penalty” without a legal basis in national law.

#### [Basyuk and Others v. Ukraine \(no. 55156/19 and ten other applications\)](#)

The applicants are 11 Ukrainian nationals, former employees of the State enterprise “Donetsk Railways” (later – of “Ukrzaliznytsya”).

As of May 2014, the government of Ukraine lost control over the Donetsk and Luhansk regions where the applicants were employed (see the 2022 decision in [Ukraine and the Netherlands v. Russia](#)). The applicants were ultimately dismissed from their jobs in 2017. Civil proceedings instituted by them seeking, among other things, unpaid wages and compensation for their untimely payment were in part unsuccessful. The key issue before the courts was related to the fact that the labour law, as it stood at the time, did not provide any specific rules in the event an employer was unable to ensure timely payment of wages and arrears on account of objective impediments, such as military activity. The applicants’ claims for compensation were eventually dismissed on the grounds of *force majeure*.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain about the refusal of the courts to grant their claims for salary and various dismissal-related payments, in particular on the grounds of *force majeure*, and that the courts relied on improper evidence to confirm *force majeure*.

#### [M.S.L., TOV v. Ukraine \(no. 18049/18\)](#)

The applicant, M.S.L., TOV, is a limited liability company based in Ukraine. It is a major operator of State lotteries in Ukraine.

Since 2014 Ukraine has faced unprecedented threats to its national security and territorial integrity. Notably, in the spring of 2014 Russia’s armed forces occupied and assumed effective control over Crimea (see judgment [Ukraine v. Russia \(re Crimea\)](#) of 2024), and in parallel a conflict began in eastern Ukraine with the arrival in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions of pro-Russian armed groups (see [Ukraine and the Netherlands v. Russia](#) of 2025). Against this background, the *Verkhovna Rada* (Parliament) adopted the Sanctions Act which was specifically designed to address urgent security needs.

The case concerns the economic sanctions imposed on the applicant company between 2015 and 2018 under this legislation and its unsuccessful attempts to challenge them.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant company complains that the sanctions, in particular the freezing of its assets, were unlawful and disproportionate, and that the decisions to impose them lacked proper judicial review. In particular, it complains that the grounds for imposing the sanctions, alleged money laundering, tax evasion, illegal gambling and affiliation with the Russian Federation, were speculative and never established in any judicial proceedings.

It also relies on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) to complain that the proceedings in two of the sets of administrative proceedings in its case were too long and that there was no effective remedy at national level to complain about the breach of its property rights.

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 October 2025

Name	Main application number
Rarani and Others v. Albania	19017/18
Ismayilova v. Azerbaijan	10952/17
Jabrayilzade v. Azerbaijan	18180/14
Medarov v. Bulgaria	38985/21
Costa Figueiredo v. Portugal	6928/19
Flori v. Romania	47429/21
Iancu and Ristea v. Romania	9791/19
Budak and Others v. Türkiye	26831/17
Çetin and Others v. Türkiye	30185/17
İmrak and Yıldız v. Türkiye	19815/19
Ölmez v. Türkiye	54328/20
Parlas and Others v. Türkiye	9413/22

## Thursday 16 October 2025

Name	Main application number
Çini and Others v. Albania	32645/16
Malaj v. Albania	23101/20
Marku v. Albania	57271/14
T.T. v. Poland	51505/20
Badea v. Romania	61547/19
Beian v. Romania	6380/20
Bîzu v. Romania	36070/22
C.I.T. and C.S.T. v. Romania	9665/23
Covaciu v. Romania	23884/19
Munteanu v. Romania	81708/17
Pandiu v. Romania	9348/19
Andreyevskaya and Others v. Russia	33621/22
Bogdanov v. Russia	55277/20
Kanevskiy and Others v. Russia	43258/21
Kirsanov and Others v. Russia	50557/21
Komornikov and Maksimova v. Russia	64339/19
Krylenkov and Others v. Russia	41210/21
Kuchukyan and Others v. Russia	24866/21
Malobrodskiy v. Russia	21736/18
Malykhina and Others v. Russia	42001/21
Markin and Others v. Russia	20519/18
Namchyl-Ool and Others v. Russia	29715/11

Name	Main application number
Simonov and Others v. Russia	5568/19
Skorobogatov and Others v. Russia	46218/21
Tsoy and Others v. Russia	10050/21
Zakharova and Others v. Russia	33482/21
Air Europa Líneas Aéreas, S.A.u v. Spain	1400/24
De Pedro Guri v. Spain	44582/21
Mendieta Borrego v. Spain	3958/24
Cıngı v. Türkiye	52889/19
Türk v. Türkiye	38198/19
Beshtynarska v. Ukraine	66917/16
Goranin v. Ukraine	15981/17
Strikhar v. Ukraine	3683/19
Zabrodskyy v. Ukraine	5074/16

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).

Follow the Court on Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int), X [ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH), [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/company/echr), and [YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCk1jW1W1W1W1W1W1W1W1W1W).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrpess@echr.coe.int) to subscribe to the press-release mailing list.

Where can the Court's press releases be found? [HUDOC - Press collection](#)

#### 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)

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.