



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 11 judgments on Tuesday 15 September 2015 and 53 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 17 September 2015.

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 15 September 2015

[Tsanova-Gecheva v. Bulgaria \(application no. 43800/12\)](#)

The applicant, Velichka Tsanova-Gecheva, is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1964 and lives in Sofia.

The case concerns a complaint regarding the allegedly inadequate judicial review of an appeal lodged by Ms Tsanova-Gecheva, a judge, against a decision on the appointment of the President of the Sofia City Court.

Ms Tsanova-Gecheva had been Vice-President of the Sofia City Court since July 2009. When the post of President became vacant, she was appointed to fill the position on an interim basis. The following month the Supreme Judicial Council published a competition notice with a view to filling the vacant post. Following an assessment by the proposals and assessment committee of the Supreme Judicial Council, Ms Tsanova-Gecheva and another candidate, V.Y., both received the top ranking. The Supreme Judicial Council voted on the appointment by secret ballot; V.Y. obtained 12 votes and the applicant nine. In the second round V.Y. obtained 18 votes compared with five for Mrs Tsanova-Gecheva. V.Y. was appointed President of the court.

V.Y.'s candidature and appointment received widespread media coverage and were vehemently criticised by numerous journalists and public figures, as V.Y. had been presented as a close friend of the Minister of the Interior. Two judges resigned from the Supreme Judicial Council and publicly criticised the appointment procedure, stating that it had been non-democratic and that the outcome had been fixed in advance.

Ms Tsanova-Gecheva appealed to the Supreme Administrative Court against the decision of the Supreme Judicial Council, arguing that it had been in breach of the law and the applicable procedural rules. In a judgment of 3 November 2011 the Supreme Administrative Court held that the failure to conduct the vote by means of a show of hands, in accordance with the statutory provisions, constituted grounds for setting aside the Supreme Judicial Council's decision. The Supreme Judicial Council and V.Y. appealed on points of law. In her observations, the applicant contested the Supreme Administrative Court judgment of 3 November 2011, which in her view had not been accompanied by sufficient reasons. She maintained that, by rejecting her arguments concerning the lack of reasons for the decision of the Supreme Judicial Council, the judgment of 3 November 2011 had not conducted a sufficiently wide-ranging review and had not examined all the legal and factual issues that were decisive for the outcome of the case. The Supreme Administrative Court, sitting as a bench of five judges, delivered its judgment on 12 January 2012. It held that the vote by secret ballot conducted by the Supreme Judicial Council had been lawful. The latter's decision had thus been valid and the judgment of 3 November 2011 setting it aside had erred in its application of the law. The Supreme Administrative Court further held that it was unnecessary to rule on the arguments raised

by Ms Tsanova-Gecheva, since the judgment complained of had been in her favour. On the merits, it dismissed her appeal against the decision of the Supreme Judicial Council.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Ms Tsanova-Gecheva alleges that the scope of the judicial review conducted by the Supreme Administrative Court was inadequate.

[Lari v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 37847/13\)](#)

The applicant, Ana Lari, is a Moldovan national who was born in 1961 and lives in Chişinău.

The case concerns Ms Lari's complaint about the investigation into the death of her 17-year-old daughter.

Ms Lari's daughter was found dead in the office of a gas company on 13 June 1999 after having gone to a party and stayed out all night. The following day a forensic report was issued which found that she had died from an overdose of sedatives, having sustained injuries just beforehand – possibly from sexual intercourse. A criminal investigation was formally instituted at the end of October 1999 and six witnesses were subsequently heard. All six – some of whom had been to the party as well as a security officer at the gas company who had called the emergency services – denied having had sexual intercourse with Ms Lari's daughter. The investigation was closed two months later, the prosecuting authorities finding that Ms Lari's daughter must have been worried that she had not told her parents that she was going to stay out all night and took sedatives so that she would be hospitalised and avoid punishment. The proceedings were reopened in 2005, suspended in 2008, resumed for one month in 2012 and then suspended again; they are currently still pending.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention, Ms Lari alleges that the investigation into her daughter's death has been superficial with no real attempt to establish what really happened or to keep her informed of the investigation's progress.

[Shishanov v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 11353/06\)](#)

The applicant, Valeriy Shishanov, is a Russian national who was born in 1952. He is currently in detention in the Russian Federation.

The case concerns his allegations of inadequate conditions of detention and the censoring of his correspondence in prison.

In 1992 Mr Shishanov had a leg amputated and was fitted with a prosthesis. In 1996 he was arrested and taken into police custody by the Moldovan authorities and was subsequently placed in pre-trial detention. In May 1997 he was sentenced to 25 years' imprisonment for escaping from detention, procuring and possessing ammunition and explosives, theft of ammunition and explosives, bribery with threats of death and kidnapping, and attempted murder. He was detained in Soroco Prison no. 6, Cahul Prison no. 5 and Taraclia Prison no. 1 in the Republic of Moldova. In October 2010, while he was being detained in Bender Prison no. 12, he wrote to the European Court of Human Rights. His letter was returned after being sent to the wrong address. In February 2014 Mr Shishanov was transferred to a prison in the Russian Federation.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Shishanov complains of his conditions of detention in the prisons in the Republic of Moldova. Under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence), he complains of the censoring of his correspondence by the authorities in some of those prisons.

[Milka v. Poland \(no. 14322/12\)](#)

The applicant, Sławomir Milka, is a Polish national who was born in 1957 and is detained in Dąbrowa Górnicza (Poland).

The case concerns Mr Milka's disciplinary punishments for refusing to be strip-searched in prison.

Mr Milka was detained on remand in 2007 and 2008 and, subsequently convicted, served his sentence in various Polish detention centres and prisons. His first disciplinary punishment was a reprimand in October 2011 for refusing to undress when being transported from prison, then he was banned from receiving food parcels for two months in May 2012 when he refused to undergo a body search and finally he was placed in solitary confinement on two occasions in June and July 2012 for refusing on three further occasions to be body searched. The domestic courts dismissed Mr Milka's appeals – without examining the actual reasons for the disciplinary measures – on the ground that he had refused to undergo the body searches and that this constituted a disciplinary offence.

Mr Milka alleges that the disciplinary punishments imposed on him for refusing body searches amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment. The case will be examined under Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

[Mogielnicki v. Poland \(no. 42689/09\)](#)

The applicant, Jerzy Mogielnicki, is a Polish national who was born in 1951 and lives in Łanięta.

The case concerns the fee Mr Mogielnicki was required to pay, and which he considers excessive, in order to lodge a cassation appeal in civil proceedings, and his alleged inability to pay the sum in question.

In February 2006 Mr Mogielnicki, a former manager of a large pharmaceutical company, brought proceedings for compensation against the company, complaining of the latter's refusal to allow him to buy shares. The Regional Court dismissed the case on the grounds that Mr Mogielnicki's supposed claim and the damage he alleged had not been established. He appealed unsuccessfully and went on to lodge a cassation appeal. He requested exemption from payment of the fee relating to his cassation appeal. The Court of Appeal refused the request on the ground that it was not justified by his financial situation. Mr Mogielnicki lodged two further requests for exemption, which were declared inadmissible.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a court), Mr Mogielnicki complains of the domestic courts' refusal to exempt him from payment of the fee for lodging his cassation appeal.

[Moinescu v. Romania \(no. 16903/12\)](#)

The applicant, Dumitru Moinescu, is a Romanian national who was born in 1952 and lives in Medgidia.

The case concerns Mr Moinescu's conviction on appeal without witnesses being heard, after he had been acquitted by the lower courts on the basis of the same evidence.

In April 2006 a fight broke out in the small hours of the morning between two groups of people in a nightclub in Medgidia. The nightclub and two vehicles parked nearby were badly damaged.

Mr Moinescu, who was the mayor of Medgidia at the time, went to the nightclub and asked the municipal services to clear the scene and clean up. He then went to the town hall for a meeting with his adviser on the Roma community and the latter's brother, who had been involved in the fight.

Criminal proceedings were commenced against eight individuals and Mr Moinescu was prosecuted for harbouring a criminal, accused of seeking to hamper the investigation into the fight. The Court of First Instance acquitted the applicant after hearing evidence from him and from 21 witnesses. That judgment was upheld following an appeal by the public prosecutor's office.

The public prosecutor's office lodged a further appeal and the Court of Appeal sentenced Mr Moinescu to a suspended term of six months' imprisonment for harbouring criminals. It found that the applicant had lent assistance to persons involved in the fight, interfered in the investigation

and sought by his actions to intimidate the judicial authorities with a view to hampering the investigation.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Mr Moinescu alleges that his right to a fair trial was breached as he was convicted by the appellate court without the direct taking of evidence and despite the fact that he had been acquitted at first instance on the basis of the same evidence.

[Poede v. Romania \(no. 40549/11\)](#)

The applicant, Puiu Cristinel Poede, is a Romanian national who was born in 1975 and lives in Vaslui.

The case concerns his allegations of ill-treatment by law-enforcement officers.

Mr Poede was travelling in a car driven by his brother when the vehicle broke down. After parking the car and leaving Mr Poede to watch it, his brother went in search of some tools. Shortly afterwards, two police officers stopped and informed Mr Poede that the car was in a no-parking zone. They asked Mr Poede for his identity card and he explained that he had sent it to the authorities for renewal. The police summoned two gendarmes to the scene and Mr Poede alleges that he was subsequently beaten and kicked at the scene and at the police station where he was taken by the police officers and the gendarmes. Mr Poede was ordered to pay a minor-offence fine for parking in a no-parking zone and refusing to present his identity card. He lodged a complaint against the two gendarmes and one of the police officers for misconduct and applied to join the proceedings as a civil party seeking damages. The public prosecutor's office opened an investigation and heard evidence from Mr Poede and from the police officers and gendarmes who had participated in the arrest. The court discontinued the proceedings, taking the view that the use of force to control Mr Poede, who had started a row, had been permitted by the law and had complied with the statutory conditions. Accordingly, the law-enforcement officers had fulfilled their professional duty.

Mr Poede lodged further criminal complaints against the police officers and gendarmes for abuse of authority and misconduct. The court discontinued the proceedings.

Mr Poede contends that he was ill-treated by State agents during his arrest on 18 August 2009 and that the authorities failed to conduct an effective investigation into his allegations. The case will be examined under Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment).

[Javor and Javorová v. Slovakia \(no. 42360/10\)](#)

The applicants, Jozef Javor (now deceased) and Eva Javorová, husband and wife, are Slovak nationals who were born in 1952 and 1954 respectively. Eva Javorová, who lives in Bratislava, has continued the application both on her own and her deceased husband's behalf.

The case concerns a third-party claim for damages attached to criminal proceedings for fraud.

In October 2002 the applicant couple lodged a criminal complaint against an individual, A., for failing to renovate their flat despite payment of a sum of money. They alleged that this might have amounted to fraud. When questioned by an investigator in December 2002, Ms Javorová stated that she wished to join the proceedings as a civil party claiming damages and, in January 2003, a criminal investigation was opened into the suspicion of fraud. The criminal charges against A. brought in November 2004 were quashed by the prosecuting authorities in January 2005 and the proceedings against A., including the applicants' third-party civil claim for damages, were eventually discontinued with final effect in February 2010, as the investigator concluded that there was no criminal case to answer. In the meantime, the applicants had lodged a constitutional complaint challenging the length of proceedings on their third-party claim for damages attached to the criminal proceedings, alleging a violation of the reasonable-time requirement under Article 6 § 1 of the European Convention. This complaint was declared inadmissible in March 2010; the Constitutional Court held that an aggrieved party claiming damages in criminal proceedings only benefited from the right to a

hearing within a reasonable time under Article 6 after a charge had been brought against a specific person and, in the present case, the charges against A. had been quashed.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time), the applicants complain about the excessive length – more than seven years at the pre-trial stage of the proceedings without a decision ever having been taken on their claim – of the proceedings on their third-party claim for damages.

[Dilipak v. Turkey \(no. 29680/05\)](#)

The applicant, Abdurrahman Dilipak, is a Turkish national who was born in 1949 and lives in Istanbul.

The case concerns the judicial proceedings brought against the author of an article criticising high-ranking members of the military.

Mr Dilipak is a writer and journalist who describes himself as a human rights activist.

In August 2003 he published an article containing criticisms of high-ranking members of the military who were about to retire. The military prosecutor's office sought Mr Dilipak's conviction under the Military Criminal Code. Mr Dilipak raised an objection alleging that the military court lacked jurisdiction to try him as he was a civilian. While the case was pending before the Military Court of Cassation, Law no. 5530 of 29 June 2006 was enacted, amending the Military Criminal Code and doing away with the military courts' jurisdiction to try civilians for offences of the type of which Mr Dilipak was accused. The case was referred to the civilian courts, and in June 2010 a civilian court ruled that the prosecution was time-barred.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time), Mr Dilipak alleges that the length of the proceedings against him breached the "reasonable time" requirement. Relying on Articles 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) and 10 (freedom of expression), taken in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), he contends that he was tried in criminal proceedings for having expressed his opinions.

[Kaytan v. Turkey \(no. 27422/05\)](#)

The applicant, Hayati Kaytan, is a Turkish national who was born in 1968 and is currently serving a life sentence following his conviction in 2005 for terrorist activities.

The case essentially concerns Mr Kaytan's complaint that his life sentence has no possibility of a review.

Mr Kaytan was arrested in Syria following his indictment for being a member of the PKK (the Workers' Party of Kurdistan), an illegal armed organisation, and handed over to the Turkish authorities in August 2003. He was then interrogated by gendarmes and the prosecuting authorities and admitted to having been a member of the PKK and involved in several armed attacks. He later retracted his statements at trial, alleging that he had been put under psychological pressure during his interrogation. He was ultimately convicted of seeking to destroy the unity of the Turkish State and to remove part of the country from the State's control and sentenced to "aggravated" life imprisonment. His conviction was upheld on appeal in January 2005.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), he notably alleges that his sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of review amounts to inhuman punishment. He also makes a number of other complaints under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and right to legal assistance of own choosing) about the lack of legal assistance while in police custody, the lack of independence and impartiality of the court that tried him as well as the fact that he could not challenge the statements of some of the witnesses against him.

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.

Luli v. Albania (no. 30601/08)

Thursday 17 September 2015

Renard and Others v. France (nos. 3569/12, 9145/12, 9161/12 and 37791/13)

The applicants are Jacky Renard, Philippe Smadja and Rémy Chardon, French nationals, and the Banque Martin Maurel, a bank with its registered office in Marseilles (France). Mr Renard and Mr Chardon were born in 1947, and Mr Smadja in 1952. Mr Renard lives in Saint-Bris-Le-Vineux (France), while Mr Smadja and Mr Chardon live in Paris (France).

The case concerns the Court of Cassation's refusal to refer requests for a preliminary ruling on constitutionality to the Constitutional Council with a view to contesting the constitutionality of a legislative provision theoretically applicable to a set of proceedings.

Mr Renard, who was accused of making false declarations of wine harvests and stocks, raised a preliminary question of constitutionality concerning the compatibility of certain provisions of the General Tax Code with the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. Mr Smadja (who was accused, in particular, of misappropriation, fraud, receiving stolen goods, forgery and use of forged documents) and Mr Chardon (accused of complicity in the fraudulent conversion of public assets and complicity in misappropriation) each raised a preliminary question of constitutionality contesting the compatibility of the articles of the Code of Criminal Procedure on limitation periods with the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. The Banque Martin Maurel, which was ordered to pay the irrecoverable costs, raised a preliminary question of constitutionality regarding the compatibility with the Constitution of Article 700 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, on the grounds that it allowed judges to make an order of that nature without giving reasons. The Court of Cassation held in each case that the questions did not raise a new issue and had no serious merit, and decided not to refer them to the Constitutional Council.

Relying on Articles 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain that, in refusing to transmit their preliminary questions of constitutionality, the Court of Cassation substituted its own assessment for that of the Constitutional Council. They submit that the examination by the Court of Cassation of a preliminary question of constitutionality concerning its own case-law is in breach of the impartiality requirement. Lastly, they allege that the Court of Cassation did not give reasons for its refusal to refer a preliminary question to the Constitutional Council.

Langner v. Germany (no. 14464/11)

The applicant, Rolf-Udo Langner, is a German national who was born in 1955 and lives in Pirna (Germany).

The case concerns Mr Langner's complaint that he was dismissed from his job in local government for criticising his superior at a staff meeting.

In December 1998 Mr Langner, employed at the Dresden Housing Office as head of the sub-division responsible for sanctioning misuse of housing property, took the floor during a staff meeting and accused his superior, the Deputy Mayor for Economy and Housing, of perversion of justice. He alleged in particular that the Deputy Mayor had ordered the unlawful demolition of a block of flats in 1995/1996. Mr Langner subsequently substantiated his allegations in writing. He was dismissed with

effect from June 1999. In the ensuing labour law proceedings the Saxon Labour Court of Appeal, after thorough examination of the legal and factual situation surrounding the demolition permit, held in November 2004 that the decision taken by the Deputy Mayor on the permit had been lawful and that Mr Langner's accusations had been unfounded. The Court of Appeal also found that the nature of the accusations – notably, the crime in question was a felony – were not only likely to damage the Deputy Mayor's reputation, but also to seriously interfere with the working atmosphere within the Housing Office. It also considered that no alternative to dismissal could have been envisaged given Mr Langner's refusal to revise his opinions on his superior during the domestic proceedings. Mr Langner's appeal on points of law was then dismissed and, ultimately, in August 2010, the Federal Constitutional Court refused to entertain his constitutional complaint.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), Mr Langner complains that his dismissal breached his right to freedom of expression.

[Kovyazin and Others v. Russia \(nos. 13008/13, 60882/12 and 53390/13\)](#)

The applicants, Leonid Kovyazin, Artem Savelov, and Ilya Gushchin, are Russian nationals who were born in 1986, 1979, and 1988 respectively and live in Kostino (in the Kirov Region), Moscow and Khimki (in the Moscow Region), all in Russia.

The case concerns the applicants' arrest and pre-trial detention following their participation in a demonstration in 2012 to protest against allegedly rigged presidential elections.

The demonstration "March of Millions" took place on 6 May 2012 in central Moscow and resulted in numerous clashes between police and protestors at Bolotnaya Square. The applicants, who took part in the demonstration at Bolotnaya Square, were subsequently arrested and charged with participation in mass disorders. Mr Kovyazin was arrested in September 2012 and released in December 2013 following an amnesty. Mr Savelov and Mr Gushchin, who were also charged with violent acts against police officers, were arrested in June 2012 and February 2013, respectively. They were convicted as charged in February 2014 and August 2014, respectively. The domestic courts, when ordering, extending or reviewing the applicants' pre-trial detention, relied on the seriousness of the charges against the applicants and the likelihood that they would abscond or influence witnesses. At the advanced stage of the proceedings, when the applicants' criminal case files were submitted to court, the courts extended their detention by means of collective detention orders, namely in June 2013 and November 2013 (Mr Kovyazin and Mr Savelov) and in April 2014 (Mr Gushchin).

Relying in particular on Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security / entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial), all three applicants complain that such lengthy pre-trial detention had not been justified in their cases and that the courts, not taking into account the fact that they had no criminal record, had fixed places of residence and stable family backgrounds, refused all their requests for alternative preventive measures. Mr Savelov, relying on Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court), also complains that his appeals against his detention were examined with unacceptable delays.

[Andonoski v. 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' \(no. 16225/08\)](#)

The applicant, Denis Andonoski, is a Macedonian national who was born in 1968 and lives in Prilep ('the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia').

Mr Andonoski is a taxi driver: the case concerns the authorities' confiscation of his car.

On 25 July 2007 Mr Andonoski was stopped by the police when driving three Albanian nationals to the village of Vitolište (in Mariovo). His passengers had no travel documents and the police therefore arrested them. Mr Andonoski was also arrested and his car was seized. An investigation was subsequently opened against him on suspicion of smuggling migrants but the charges were

withdrawn in August 2007 for lack of evidence. The prosecutor, noting that Mr Andonoski had not been aware that his passengers were illegal migrants, thus discontinued the investigation against him. However, the investigation continued as concerned one of the passengers, who was ultimately convicted in September 2007 of migrant smuggling and sentenced to one year's imprisonment. The trial court in those proceedings ordered the confiscation of Mr Andonoski's car as the means by which a criminal offence had been committed. Mr Andonoski appealed but the confiscation order was upheld in November 2007.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Mr Andonoski complains about the confiscation of his car, despite the fact that he was never convicted in the related proceedings.

[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.

Agalarov v. Azerbaijan (no. 68672/11)
Alamdar Hasanov v. Azerbaijan (no. 63062/11)
Arsalam Huseynov v. Azerbaijan (no. 63065/11)
Dovlatov v. Azerbaijan (no. 63066/11)
Fazil Aliyev v. Azerbaijan (no. 63064/11)
Gurbanov v. Azerbaijan (no. 63067/11)
Neymatov v. Azerbaijan (no. 63069/11)
Rasim Hajiyev v. Azerbaijan (no. 63068/11)
Tahir Rustamov v. Azerbaijan (no. 63063/11)
Petrovi v. Bulgaria (no. 2) (no. 11186/12)
Damjanovic v. Croatia (no. 5306/13)
Matasović and Pečić v. Croatia (nos. 24335/13 and 38734/13)
Vukovic and Others v. Croatia (no. 3430/13)
B.A. v. France (no. 74694/14)
M.B. v. France (no. 72095/13)
Khachirov v. Georgia (no. 4769/10)
Khergiani v. Georgia (no. 12928/10)
Saure v. Germany (no. 78944/12)
Is.B. v. Greece (no. 28507/12)
Kaggali v. Greece (no. 47444/09)
Keci v. Greece (no. 70867/13)
Samsarellos and Others v. Greece (no. 26666/09)
Vejuka v. Greece (no. 57900/09)
Cacucci and Sabatelli v. Italy (no. 29797/09)
Bednarek v. Poland (no. 57374/09)
Sobczyk v. Poland (no. 73446/10)
Witkowska v. Poland (no. 67408/11)
Zamet - Budowa Maszyn Spolka Akcyjna v. Poland (no. 1485/11)
Zima v. Poland (no. 19186/10)
De Jesus Afonso and Teixeira Rodrigues Da Cruz v. Portugal (no. 22256/14)
Esteves Rodrigues Nobre Sequeira and Pinto Carrasqueira Sequeira v. Portugal (nos. 63588/13 and 29611/14)
Dor v. Romania (no. 55153/12)
Baryshnikov v. Russia (no. 11323/05)
Dolina v. Russia (no. 44238/08)
Khuzin v. Russia (no. 10677/09)

Kokorin and Others v. Russia (nos. 46320/07, 30282/08, 51457/08, 54871/08, 60324/08, 23952/09, 32071/09, 38993/09, 55508/09, and 30362/12)

Lelyuykin v. Russia (no. 70841/10)

Lytkin v. Russia (no. 4198/09)

Rezachkin and Galyus v. Russia (nos. 49956/07 and 18910/09)

Saidova and Others v. Russia (nos. 26628/08, 56252/08, and 7403/09)

Sergeyev v. Russia (no. 29699/09)

Shovgurov v. Russia (no. 17601/12)

Stadukhin v. Russia (nos. 6231/08, 17707/08, and 57913/08)

Tomayly v. Russia (no. 25604/06)

Vydrin v. Russia (no. 47599/08)

Zakirov and Others v. Russia (nos. 10760/06, 40825/06, 16618/07, 30288/09, 63462/09, 64267/09, 30936/10, 23790/12, 34140/12, 37206/12, 46191/12, and 71680/12)

Podhradsky v. Slovakia (no. 10212/11)

Karacay v. Turkey (no. 29604/05)

Tutar v. Turkey (no. 45008/08)

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)

Nina Salomon (tel: + 33 3 90 21 49 79)

Denis Lambert (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 09)

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.