

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing eight judgments on Tuesday 17 March 2026 and eight judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 19 March 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).

Tuesday 17 March 2026

[Bülent Akçay v. Türkiye \(application no. 41669/21\)](#)

The applicant, Mr Bülent Akçay, is a Turkish national who was born in 1975 and lives in Istanbul.

The case concerns the revoking of two taxi licences belonging to the applicant for non-use exceeding 6 months.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains of an infringement of his right to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.

[Sungur v. Türkiye \(no. 56462/19\)](#)

The applicant, Ceyda Sungur, is a Turkish national who was born in 1986 and lives in Paris.

The case concerns a police officer spraying Ms Sungur with tear gas at close range during a sit-in on 28 May 2013 to protest against the replacement of Istanbul's Gezi Park with a shopping centre. Widespread protests followed and a photograph of Ms Sungur, who was wearing a red dress when sprayed, became one of the symbols of what became known as "the Gezi Park events".

The police officer was subsequently issued with a disciplinary warning. In criminal proceedings he was also found guilty of causing intentional bodily harm and ordered to plant 300 trees and tend them for six months. Ms Sungur lodged a complaint with the Constitutional Court, which found that the sanctions constituted sufficient redress.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention, Ms Sungur alleges that the use of force against her amounted to ill-treatment and that the authorities failed to punish the police officer responsible.

[D.A. and R.A. v. the United Kingdom \(no. 46692/19\)](#)

The applicants, D.A. and R.A., are two British nationals who were born in 1992 and 2017 respectively and live in Radlett (United Kingdom). They are mother and child.

The case concerns the UK Government's policy of imposing a monetary cap on the total amount of welfare benefits households may receive per year, which was first introduced in 2013. Benefit claimants who work at least 16 hours per week are exempt from the cap. In 2016, the amount of the benefit was revised. At that time, the Government offered free childcare in respect of all children aged three and four and certain children aged two, but did not offer free childcare in respect of children under the age of two.

The applicants complain that the Government's failure to exempt lone parents with children under the age of two from the revised benefit cap, in circumstances where such parents were not entitled

to free childcare to assist with entering into work, constituted unlawful discrimination within the meaning of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention, read in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and/or Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

Thursday 19 March 2026

[B.G. v. France \(no. 70945/17\)](#)

The applicant, B.G. is a French national who was born in 2000 and lives in Nieul (France).

The case concerns the alleged failure to comply with the guarantees of the right to a fair trial and the presumption of innocence during “warning” proceedings initiated by the public prosecutor against the applicant for false accusation of rape.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 2 of the Convention, the applicant complains of a breach of her right to a fair trial and of the principle of the presumption of innocence stemming from the warning. Under Article 13, she further complains that the only avenue of appeal open to her was to the public prosecutor for reconsideration of the decision or to the public prosecutor’s superior for a review.

[M.A. v. France \(no. 34324/24\)](#)

The applicant, Ms M.A., is a French and Tunisian national who was born in 1979 and lives in Maisons-Laffitte (France).

On 25 September 2009 the applicant married H.A., a Belgian and Tunisian national, in Tunisia. They had a child together, I., who was born in France and is a French and Tunisian national. H.A. decided to settle in Tunisia for professional reasons, while the applicant continued to live with I. in France. In 2015 the couple separated. On 26 February 2024 the applicant left Tunisia with I. and established her daughter’s residence at her home in France. On 22 April 2024, having located his daughter and the applicant in France, H.A. brought expedited proceedings on the merits against the latter before the Nanterre family-affairs judge in order to obtain an order for I.’s return to Tunisia, under the Hague Convention.

On 3 October 2024 the Versailles Court of Appeal upheld the judgment of 17 June 2024 ordering I.’s return to Tunisia. The Court of Cassation declared the subsequent appeal inadmissible.

The case concerns the French courts’ decision to order the return of the applicant’s daughter to Tunisia under the Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair hearing) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant submits that the French courts’ decision to order her daughter’s return to Tunisia, where the child’s father lives, violated her right to respect for her private and family life and her right to a fair hearing.

[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 17 March 2026

| Name | Main application number |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Villás v. Hungary | 33134/21 |

| Name | Main application number |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Çakar and Others v. Türkiye | 2541/19 |
| Gürmen v. Türkiye | 34365/22 |
| Öztürk v. Türkiye | 50205/20 |
| Yaman and Others v. Türkiye | 58473/17 |

Thursday 19 March 2026

| Name | Main application number |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Németh v. Hungary | 54323/22 |
| N.W. v. Iceland | 31606/19 |
| Dubjago v. Latvia | 47658/22 |
| Jeremejevs v. Latvia | 44644/21 |
| I.H. v. Norway | 19628/21 |
| Kavečanský v. Slovakia | 43341/22 |

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/org/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/UC8vXp1Y1Y1Y1Y1Y1Y1Y1Y1Y).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrp@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

echrp@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.