



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 27 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 16 July 2026.

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).

Thursday 16 July 2026

[Karičková v. the Czech Republic \(application no. 7411/24\)](#)

The applicant, Renata Karičková is a Czech national who was born in 1972 and lives in Sokolov (the Czech Republic).

The case concerns an allegedly racially motivated attack against Ms Karičková, who is of Roma origin, during a conflict between a group of tourists, later identified as members of a football ultras group, and members of the local Roma community. A criminal complaint by Ms Karičková was closed in 2022 and that decision was upheld by two levels of prosecution authorities. Her constitutional complaint was dismissed.

Relying on Articles 3 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights, Ms Karičková complains that the authorities failed to conduct an effective investigation into the attack against her, and that they had not taken sufficient action to uncover the alleged racist motive for the assault.

[S.T. v. the Czech Republic \(no. 28273/23\)](#)

The applicant, S.T., is a Czech national who was born in 1977 and lives in the Czech Republic.

The case concerns the death of her brother, on 19 June 2021, following a police intervention. Video footage of the intervention, which took place in a street inhabited predominantly by Roma residents, shows that S.T.'s brother was knelt on while in the prone position, with his hands cuffed behind his back, for over four minutes. By the time an ambulance arrived he had no vital signs. Autopsy reports concluded that his death was due to drug intoxication. Criminal proceedings initiated by the police against an unknown person for selling drugs to S.T.'s brother were discontinued in December 2021. In the meantime, in June 2021 S.T. had lodged a criminal complaint, alleging that her brother had died in connection with the police intervention and asking for a new post-mortem examination to be carried out. That request was refused and the investigation was closed in March 2022. S.T.'s constitutional complaint was dismissed.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention, the applicant complains that her brother died in connection with the disproportionate force used during the police intervention, which amounted to ill-treatment and that the authorities had failed to conduct an effective investigation into those acts. She also alleges that the authorities failed to investigate the alleged discriminatory motive behind the police intervention.

[Banca Sistema S.p.A. v. Italy \(no. 37249/24\)](#)

The applicant, Banca Sistema S.p.A., is a company based in Milan. It specialises in providing factoring services to private companies, buying debt owed to those companies by public administration authorities and becoming the creditor in their place.

Banca Sistema S.p.A. acquired several debts held by private companies and service providers against the municipality of Cosenza. The national courts determined the total amount of the acquired debt and issued orders for payment. Those orders became enforceable on dates between 2018 and 2023, and enforcement of those orders has been pending for between more than two and more than seven years. Following partial payment of the sums awarded, the municipality of Cosenza declared itself insolvent. Banca Sistema S.p.A. lodged a request to be included in its list of creditors. The company cannot, however, initiate or pursue enforcement proceedings concerning its claims registered on that list.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing/access to court) of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, the applicant company complains that the decisions issued in its favour have not been enforced and that it cannot access a court in order to obtain enforcement of those decisions.

[R.B. v. Italy \(no. 20409/23\)](#)

The applicant, R.B., is an Italian national who was born in 1948 and is detained in Genoa (Italy).

The case concerns his conviction, in 2020, for the offence of production of child pornography under Article 600-*bis* of the Criminal Code. R.B. argued during the criminal proceedings that an offence under that Article required evidence of a clear risk that the pornographic content would be disseminated, which had not been shown in his case. He argued that his conduct could, at most, be classified as falling under the lesser offence of possession of pornographic content under Article 600-*quarter* of the Criminal Code. In convicting R.B. of the more serious offence, the district court referred to a 2018 ruling of the Combined Divisions of the Court of Cassation, which had held that it had no longer been necessary to demonstrate that a specific risk that the pornographic content in question could be distributed or shared. R.B. appealed against that conviction, arguing, among other things, that in its 2018 judgment the Court of Cassation had unforeseeably departed from its previous settled case-law. The Court of Appeal dismissed his appeal. In September 2022, the Court of Cassation dismissed an appeal by R.B. on points of law.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 7 (no punishment without law), R.B. complains that his conviction was based, to his disadvantage, on a new interpretation of the law.

[Ileana Roşu v. Romania \(no. 74061/17\)](#)

The applicant, Ileana Roşu, is a Romanian national who was born in 1978 and lives in Bucharest.

In 2015, in the context of an ongoing criminal investigation launched by the National Anti-Corruption Directorate, Ms Roşu's husband was accused of various offences, including money laundering, committed in his capacity as a lawyer. The prosecutor ordered the seizure of various assets owned jointly by Ms Roşu and her husband. They lodged a complaint against that order, arguing that the seizure of their jointly owned assets was unlawful, as in the circumstances, only a suspect's assets could be seized. On 23 February 2016 the Braşov Court of Appeal decided with final effect that the seizure order had been lawful and justified in respect of all the assets concerned. The seizure order was lifted in 2020 and in 2021 Ms Roşu's husband was acquitted with final effect. Civil proceedings brought by Ms Roşu were dismissed as inadmissible.

Relying, in particular, on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Ms Roşu complains, among other things, that the seizure of her properties was disproportionate and imposed an excessive burden on her due to its duration coupled with the absence of any review of its necessity and proportionality by a court.

[Rădulescu Dobrogea and Ciurea v. Romania \(nos. 63972/19 and 16056/20\)](#)

The applicants, Niculae Rădulescu Dobrogea and Bogdan Ciurea, are Romanian nationals who were born in 1941 and 1977 respectively and who live in Bucharest.

On 10 March 2018 one of the ruling political parties hosted an extraordinary party congress at a venue in Bucharest. A protest took place outside. The Bucharest Directorate General of Gendarmes subsequently identified Mr Dobrogea and Mr Ciurea as having been amongst the protesters and imposed fines on them for having participated in the demonstration. Those fines were upheld by the national courts.

Relying on Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of assembly and association), Mr Dobrogea and Mr Ciurea complain about the judgments by the national courts upholding fines imposed on them for having participated in a public assembly.

[Bazhenov and Others v. Russia and Ukraine \(no. 20092/18 and 11 others\)](#)

The applicants are Volodymyr Valeriyovych Bazhenov, a Ukrainian national who lives in Sevastopol; Yelena Vasilyevna Melnik, a Russian national who lives in Sevastopol; Svitlana Ivanivna Sklyarenko, a Ukrainian national who lives in Sevastopol; Oleksandr Sergiyovych Bornyakov, a Ukrainian national who lives in Odesa and Anatoliy Fedorovych Agafonov, a Ukrainian national who lives in Mykolaiv.

The case concerns the cancellation by the Russian authorities of the applicants' titles to plots of land in Sevastopol, Crimea, which had originally been transferred into private ownership by the Ukrainian authorities. They were reclaimed as public property on the basis that they were forest lands and as such should have never been privatised.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) the applicants complain that the cancellation of their titles, the reclaiming of land they had owned up to that point, and the deprivation of the proceeds from the sale of the land had been unlawful and disproportionate. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), most of the applicants also complain that they were denied a fair hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. Relying in substance on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants also complain that they had no effective remedy.

[G.K. and A.S. v. Switzerland \(nos. 55299/20 and 31515/22\)](#)

The applicants, G.K. and A.S. are Swiss nationals who were born in 1991 and 1988 and live in Vernier and Lausanne (both in Switzerland) respectively.

Between 20 November 2018 and 24 October 2019 G.K. was held in pre-trial detention. He was mainly accused of acts of damage to property committed in the context of his support for an anti-speciesism movement (an ethical concept that it is immoral to exploit or harm animals just because they belong to a different species). Between 16 February and 27 April 2021 A.S. was detained in a psychiatric hospital. On admission he informed the nursing staff that his beliefs required him to follow a vegan diet. The case concerns an alleged failure to provide the applicants with a vegan diet during their detention.

Relying on Articles 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain that during their detention, the national authorities had failed to provide them with entirely vegan diets in accordance with their ethical beliefs and that they had not had an effective domestic remedy for their complaints. A.S. also complains under Article 6 (access to court) and under Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 9.

[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.

Name	Main application number
Ordulj v. Croatia	5899/23
Punčec and Nelson v. Croatia	26869/21
M. v. the Czech Republic	36622/21
C.R. and Others v. France	12468/23
Dilmi v. France	185/24
El Bekri v. France	3650/24
Tesler v. France	43502/20
Tramier v. France	3590/23
W.C. and P.C. v. France	29342/22
S.B. v. Germany	28005/24
Vardar v. Germany	48663/20
Pouros v. Greece	74259/17
Arehta v. the Republic of Moldova	11695/17
Guzun v. the Republic of Moldova	18059/16
Mătăsar v. the Republic of Moldova	16194/18
Matei and Others v. the Republic of Moldova	49015/16
Paniuşchin v. the Republic of Moldova	23668/18
Religious cult 'Biserica Unificării' and Akhunzyanov v. the Republic of Moldova	45588/16
Z.S. v. Switzerland	20272/23

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.

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/UCk1jW13333333333333333333).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrpress@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

echrpress@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)

Claire Windsor (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 24 01)

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.