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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 151 (2016)
12.05.2016

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing ten judgments on Tuesday 17 May 2016 and 68 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 19 May 2016.

*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 May 2016

Fürst-Pfeifer v. Austria (applications nos. 33677/10 and 52340/10)

The applicant, Gabriele Fürst-Pfeifer, is an Austrian national who was born in 1964 and lives in Mödling (Austria). The case concerns her complaint that the Austrian courts failed to protect her reputation against defamatory allegations made in a newspaper article.

Ms Fürst-Pfeifer is a psychiatrist and has been registered since 2000 as a psychological expert for court proceedings, in particular in custody and contact-rights-related cases. In December 2008 an article about her was published on a regional news website run by a private media company based in St. Pölten and in a printed weekly newspaper, distributed for free to every household of the district, which was published by another private media company based in Innsbruck. Part of the article's headline read: "Court expert for custody proceedings a case for therapy". The article stated in particular that Ms Fürst-Pfeifer suffered from psychological problems such as mood swings and panic attacks but had been working as a court-appointed expert for many years. The article then referred to a psychological expert report about her which had originally been commissioned in 1993 and which had been made public in the context of proceedings she had brought before the civil courts.

In January 2009 Ms Fürst-Pfeifer lodged an action with the St. Pölten Regional Court against the company which had published the online article, seeking damages for violation of her private life and the fact that she had been compromised publicly. In April 2009 the court allowed her action, ordering the publisher to pay damages and publish the operative part of the judgment. However, the appeal court set the judgment aside in November 2009, dismissing her action. The court confirmed that the passages about her mental state in the article affected her private life. However, the content of the article was true, as it only repeated information that had not been disputed by her. Furthermore, the article was directly linked to her public function as a court-appointed expert. In parallel Ms Fürst-Pfeifer also lodged an action with the Innsbruck Regional Court against the company which had published the article in the printed newspaper, seeking damages. The Innsbruck Regional Court granted her action, but the appeal court, in February 2010, set the judgment aside and dismissed her action.

Ms Fürst-Pfeifer complains that the Austrian courts failed to protect her rights under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Džinić v. Croatia (no. 38359/13)

The applicant, Antun Džinić, is a Croatian national who was born in 1952 and lives in Županja (Croatia). Mr Džinić, a businessman, complains about the seizure of some of his real property pending criminal proceedings against him for economic crime.

In 2002 and then 2007 Mr Džinić was indicted on charges of economic crime, including misappropriation of company shares and misuse of a company's assets and facilities. During the ensuing proceedings, real property (notably, ten plots of land, two houses and a commercial building) belonging to Mr Džinić was seized in 2012 so as to ensure effective enforcement of a probable confiscation order at the outcome of the criminal proceedings. Mr Džinić appealed the seizure, requesting the courts to reassess the scope of the restraint on his property. He argued in particular that there was a gross disproportion between the market value of the seized property (estimated at the time at 9,887,084 euros (EUR)) and the pecuniary gain for which he had been indicted in the criminal proceedings (approximately 1,060,000 euros). However, in October 2013 the Supreme Court dismissed Mr Džinić's appeal, rejecting his arguments as speculative. He challenged this decision before the Constitutional Court, which declared his complaint inadmissible in February 2014. Mr Džinić was ultimately found guilty in July 2014 on several counts of misuse of a company's assets and facilities and sentenced to two years' imprisonment. The case is pending on appeal before the Supreme Court and the seizure order remains in force.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Džinić complains that the seizure of his property had been disproportionate in the circumstances of his case, notably alleging that it was imposed and kept in force without an assessment of whether the value of the seized property corresponded to the possible confiscation claim. He also complains that he did not have an effective procedure to challenge the seizure of his property.

Liga Portuguesa de Futebol Profissional v. Portugal (no. 4687/11)

The applicant, the Portuguese Professional Football League, is a Portuguese private association based in Porto. The case concerns proceedings brought against it before the Lisbon industrial tribunal.

In 2002 Mr R., a professional footballer, brought an action against the Portuguese Professional Football League, seeking to have two clauses of a 1999 collective agreement declared invalid. He considered that they entailed restrictions on professional footballers' freedom to engage in an occupation if their contractual ties with their clubs were terminated. Mr R.'s claim was dismissed by the Lisbon industrial tribunal, but he lodged an appeal directly on points of law to the Supreme Court of Justice (*per saltum* appeal). On 7 March 2007 the Supreme Court quashed the contested judgment and declared invalid the disputed clauses. The League applied to the Supreme Court for a declaration of nullity, but its request was dismissed on 15 May 2007; that decision was subsequently upheld by the Employment and Welfare Division of the Supreme Court.

The League then lodged a constitutional appeal before the Constitutional Court, but this was rejected on 13 January 2010. C.A.F.C., a former judge at the Supreme Court who had presided over the bench which delivered the judgment of 7 March 2007, was the judge rapporteur at the Constitutional Court for this case. The League complained about the high court fees, and also challenged the decision, alleging that the Constitutional Court had not been impartial. That court dismissed the League's conclusions, holding that the issue decided by the Constitutional Court on 13 January 2010 had been different to that decided by the Supreme Court on 7 March 2007.

The League lodged a new appeal, which was also dismissed, as were its complaints concerning court costs. The League continued to lodge constitutional appeals and bring actions to have decisions declared invalid until the end of 2011; all of those proceedings were unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing), the applicant association complains about the failure to communicate to it certain items from the case file and the fact that the case was decided on the basis of arguments raised by the courts themselves, which had not been discussed with the parties. It also alleges that the bench of the Constitutional Court which examined its appeal was not impartial. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a court), it considers that the excessively high

court fees before the Constitutional Court breached its right of access to a court. Under the same Article, it alleges that the length of the proceedings breached the principle of a "reasonable time".

Răchită v. Romania (no. 15987/09)

The applicant, Doru Răchită, now deceased, was a Romanian national who was born in 1949 and lived in Bucharest. His son, Răzvan Răchită, continued the case on his behalf. The case concerns his complaint about the dismissal of his action seeking removal of a fence which obstructed access to his property.

In 2007 Mr Răchită brought administrative proceedings requesting to have removed a fence that was blocking access to his property, stating that the owner of the fence lived opposite his property. The administrative authorities dismissed his request on the ground that the owner of the property adjoining his had a lawful building permit.

In April 2008 he thus brought court proceedings against the Mayor of Bucharest and the local authorities seeking a court order for removal of the fence or, in the alternative, for the local council to enlarge the road and restore full access to his property. During these judicial proceedings Mr Răchită argued that the administrative authorities had been mistaken as to the identity of the owner of the fence, pointing out that his complaint concerned the neighbour whose property was located opposite and not next to his. Furthermore, he submitted to the courts that he had not been able to identify the neighbour who lived opposite as the property was empty and there was no visible postal number on the entrance gate. Mr Răchită's complaint was however dismissed by a final judgment of November 2008, essentially on the ground that he had not specified which of his neighbours had closed off part of the street with a fence.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), Mr Răchită complains that the proceedings concerning the removal of the fence were unfair, notably alleging that the courts dismissed his action without properly examining the evidence submitted to them, in particular the question of the administrative authorities misidentifying the owner of the fence. Further relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), he also complains that the dismissal of his action meant that he could not use, build on or sell his property.

Nekrasov v. Russia (no. 8049/07)

The applicant, Sergey Nekrasov, is a Russian national who was born in 1967 and is currently serving a 25-year prison sentence in a correctional colony in the Republic of Bashkortostan (Russia) for, among other things, involvement in an organised armed gang.

The case mainly concerns Mr Nekrasov's allegation that he was abducted by the police on 17 November 2004, taken to a cottage and subjected to various forms of ill-treatment for the next six days because he refused to make self-incriminating statements. He claims that he was forced to do the splits, suffocated with a plastic bag, a book was held on top of his head and hit with a mallet and his arms twisted and stretched. Two medical examinations were carried out, first on 24 November 2004 at the premises of the Organised Crime Department and then the following day when he was admitted to the remand prison. The examinations confirmed that Mr Nekrasov had a number of injuries, in particular bruises and abrasions. He also submits that for a number of days following the ill-treatment he could not walk unassisted.

Mr Nekrasov's lawyer complained in December 2004 to the prosecuting authorities about the beatings to which his client had been subjected. Over the course of the next two and a half years (up until July 2007), at least seven decisions were taken by the national authorities refusing to institute criminal proceedings against police officers or anyone else due to lack of evidence. All but one of these decisions was quashed by the supervising prosecutors as unfounded, and additional pre-investigation inquiries were ordered. To date, however, no fully-fledged criminal investigation has ever been opened.

Mr Nekrasov, officially arrested on 23 November 2004, was detained pending the investigation and then the trial essentially on the grounds of the gravity of the charges against him and the risk of his absconding, exerting pressure on victims and witnesses, destroying evidence and obstructing justice. Pending the investigation, in May 2006 Mr Nekrasov's detention on remand was extended so that he and his lawyer could finish studying the case file (which they had started going through the previous month). In the course of the trial, the defence was also granted additional time to complete their examination of the case file. Mr Nekrasov was ultimately convicted in May 2008 notably of involvement in an organised armed gang, theft, robbery, stealing firearms, hijacking, murder and kidnapping.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Nekrasov alleges that he was ill-treated by the police and that there was no investigation into his allegation. Also relying on Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 (right to liberty and security), he alleges that his detention on remand was unlawful after May 2006 as it was not based on relevant and sufficient reasons. Lastly, he alleges under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (b) (right to a fair trial and right to adequate time and facilities for preparation of defence) that he was not given the opportunity to study the case file in full before the case was submitted to the trial court.

Yegorychev v. Russia (no. 8026/04)

The applicant, Ilya Yegorychev, is a Russian national who was born in 1968 and lives in Moscow. The case concerns the criminal proceedings brought against him for fraud and his related pre-trial detention.

Charges of fraud were brought against Mr Yegorychev in June 2001 and he had to sign a written undertaking not to leave his place of residence. From September 2001 this measure was revoked and he was remanded in custody on account of the seriousness of the charges against him, the risk of his absconding and the necessity to secure the enforcement of his future conviction. His detention was repeatedly extended for essentially the same reasons, as well as the possibility of his obstructing justice, over the next two and half years. He was convicted as charged in May 2004 and sentenced to seven years and six months' imprisonment. On appeal, Mr Yegorychev complained about the unlawfulness of the composition of the trial court examining his case – alleging that two lay judges had been called for service more than once in the same year, in breach of the rules for lay judges – as well as about the reading out at trial of testimonies of the majority of the witnesses for the prosecution without the possibility of him having them cross-examined. His complaints were rejected by the appeal court. His sentence was subsequently reduced to five and half years by way of supervisory review and he was granted conditional early release in March 2005.

Relying on Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security / entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial), Mr Yegorychev complains that the reasons justifying his detention were essentially based on the seriousness of the charges against him, without addressing his specific situation. Further relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time and access to court / right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses), he complains about the unfairness of the criminal proceedings against him, notably on account of the composition of the court which convicted him – which he alleges was in breach of the relevant domestic law – and the fact that he was not given an opportunity to question most of the witnesses for the prosecution.

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.

Norma Telecom S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 38503/08) – **Just Satisfaction**
Ojczyk v. Poland (no. 66850/12)

Bakrina v. Russia (no. 46926/09)
McInnes v. Serbia (no. 7159/12)

Thursday 19 May 2016

D.L. v. Bulgaria (no. 7472/14)

The applicant, D.L., is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1999 and lives in Pleven. The case concerns her placement in an educational centre.

On 2 August 2012 D.L., who was then aged 13, was placed in a "centre for children in crisis", on the basis of a decision by the director of social services for the municipality of Pleven, confirmed by the Pleven District Court. The placement measure was extended on several occasions until 2013.

In April 2013 the local committee for combatting anti-social behaviour by young people asked the court to order that the applicant be placed in an educational centre, in particular to protect D.L. from possible sexual exploitation. On 10 June 2013 the district court ordered that the applicant be placed in the Podem educational centre. That judgment was upheld on 16 July 2013 by the Pleven Regional Court.

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), D.L. complains about her placement in an educational centre. Further relying on Article 5 § 4 (right to have the lawfulness of one's detention examined speedily), she considers that it had been impossible to have that measure reviewed regularly by a court, in violation of her rights. Lastly, under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), she complains about the fact that correspondence and telephone conversations were automatically monitored in the establishment in question.

Kolonja v. Greece (no. 49441/12)

The applicant, Stefan Kolonja, is an Albanian national who was born in 1968 and currently lives in Albania. Mr Kolonja, who is of Greek origin and married to a Greek national with whom he has two children (also Greek nationals), began working in Greece in 1989. His three brothers also live in Greece. The case concerns his expulsion to Albania and the lifetime ban on him returning to Greece.

On 12 October 1999 Mr Kolonja was sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment for purchasing drugs; an order permanently excluding him from Greek territory was also made. Released on parole, he was deported to Albania, and he then returned to Greece. He was arrested there in 2011 and detained pending expulsion. He lodged several appeals against the permanent nature of the ban on entering Greece, his detention, and the decision to deport him. In spite of certain decisions in his favour, the expulsion measure was held to be valid and Mr Kolonja was returned to Albania. His subsequent appeals and requests to be able to return to Greece were dismissed.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Mr Kolonja complains that the obligation to leave Greece, and the lifetime ban on returning there, entailed a disproportionate interference with his right to respect for family life.

Barik Edidi v. Spain (no. 21780/13)

The applicant, Zoubida Barik Edidi, is a Spanish national who was born in 1970 and lives in Getafe. The case concerns a lawyer (the applicant) who wore the hijab in court and was asked by the president of the court to return to the area reserved for members of the public, on the ground that lawyers appearing before the court could only cover their head with the official cap (biretta).

In October 2009 Ms Barik Edidi, a lawyer, attended hearings held before the *Audiencia Nacional* as part of a trial concerning offences related to Islamic terrorism. During the first hearings, Ms Barik Edidi, who was sitting in the area reserved for members of the public, wore a hijab (Islamic headscarf) without any comments being made by the court. At the hearing of 20 October 2009, she

sat in the part of the courtroom reserved for the parties, wearing a lawyer's gown and with her head covered by the hijab, again without any comments being made. At the hearing of 22 October the president of the court asked her to return to the part of the courtroom reserved for members of the public, on the ground that the lawyers appearing before the court ought not to have their heads covered. On the following day Ms Barik Edidi informed the Observatory of Justice of the Madrid Bar about the incident.

On 11 November 2009 Ms Barik Edidi lodged an *alzada* appeal (hierarchical appeal challenging an administrative decision) with the division of the *Audiencia Nacional* that had jurisdiction for matters concerning the internal functioning of the courts. The *Audiencia* replied that it did not have jurisdiction, since the applicant was complaining about an act that was purely organisational in nature, rather than judicial, and referred the case to the General Council of the Judiciary (CGPJ). Having received no response from the latter body, Ms Barik Edidi applied to the Supreme Court for special judicial review, seeking protection of her fundamental rights; the Supreme Court dismissed her appeal. Holding that the referral of the case to the CGPJ was not justified, the Supreme Court dismissed the appeal without going into the merits of the case, considering that a body that did not have jurisdiction could not be criticised for remaining silent, and noting that the applicant had not objected to the case being referred. Ms Barik Edidi applied to have the Supreme Court's decision declared invalid, but her request was dismissed.

She lodged an *amparo* appeal with the Constitutional Court against the dismissal of her application to have the Supreme Court's decision declared invalid, then applied again to the *Audiencia Nacional*; it declared her appeal inadmissible as being out of time, noting that the applicant had lodged her *alzada* appeal beyond the 5-day period laid down by law. For its part, the Constitutional Court declared the *amparo* appeal inadmissible on the ground that there had been no violation of a fundamental right.

At the same time, Ms Barik Edidi requested that disciplinary sanctions be imposed on the president of the court who had asked her to return to the area of the courtroom for members of the public. The disciplinary committee decided that no further action should be taken on the complaint.

Relying on particular on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), Ms Barik Edidi alleges that her complaints were not examined on their merits. She further relies on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 9 (freedom of religion) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 12 (general prohibition of discrimination)'.

Umnikov v. Ukraine (no. 42684/06)

The applicant, Sergey Umnikov, is a Ukrainian national who lives in the Odessa region. The case concerns his complaint about being beaten by the police and his conviction in an unfair trial.

In April 2005 Mr Umnikov was arrested on suspicion of having raped a seven-year-old boy. Mr Umnikov was taken to a police station where, according to his submissions, he was beaten by several police officers. Subsequently he was taken to a temporary detention centre, where he was kept for four weeks and where, according to him, he was held in inhuman conditions. In May 2005 he was transferred to a pre-trial detention facility. In January 2006 a district court convicted Mr Umnikov, who had pleaded not guilty, of having raped the boy and sentenced him to ten years' imprisonment. Mr Umnikov was absent from the court hearing, but his lawyer and his mother – who, at his request, was representing him in the proceedings – were present. The court based his conviction mainly on the testimony of the victim, but also on a witness statement and a report by a psychiatrist who had examined the victim. The judgment was upheld on appeal, again at a hearing held in Mr Umnikov's absence but in the presence of his lawyer. Mr Umnikov's cassation appeal was eventually rejected by the Supreme Court in November 2007.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Umnikov complains that he was beaten by the police and that there was no adequate investigation into the matter, and that he

was held in poor detention conditions. Furthermore, relying in particular on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) and (d) (right to a fair trial / right to legal assistance of own choosing / right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses), he complains that he was unable to defend himself because he was not present at the appeal hearing in his case and that his conviction was based on insufficient evidence. Finally, he complains that the Ukrainian authorities did not react to his requests for copies of documents which the European Court of Human Rights had asked him to provide, in breach of Article 34 (right of individual petition).

J.N. v. the United Kingdom (no. 37289/12)

The case concerns a complaint about the system of immigration detention in the United Kingdom.

The applicant, Mr J.N., is an Iranian national who was born in 1971 and lives in Barking (England, UK).

Mr J.N. arrived in the UK in January 2003 and claimed asylum. His claim was refused in October 2003. He was subsequently convicted of indecent assault, sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment and served with a deportation order. On completion of his sentence, he remained in immigration detention for a total of 55 months, notably from March 2005 to December 2007 and then from January 2008 to December 2009.

During the first period of detention Mr J.N. indicated that he wished to return to Iran and eventually, in November 2007, the Iranian Embassy agreed to issue a travel document provided that he sign a "disclaimer" consenting to his return. He refused, however, to sign the disclaimer. He was released in December 2007 pursuant to a court order but became liable for detention again because of failure to comply with the conditions for his release, namely that he take the necessary steps to obtain travel documents. He was thus detained again one month later while reporting to the immigration authorities. During this second period of detention, Mr J.N. continued to repeatedly refuse to cooperate with the authorities' attempts to engage him in a voluntary return or to sign a disclaimer. He was released in December 2009 when the High Court granted him permission to apply for judicial review and the Home Office was ordered to release him on bail.

Mr J.N. brought two sets of judicial review proceedings: the first during his initial period of immigration detention, which he failed to pursue following his release in December 2007; and the second, which resulted in the Administrative Court finding that his detention had been unlawful from 14 September 2009 and awarding him 6,150 British pounds in damages. The Administrative Court notably concluded that "the woeful lack of energy and impetus" applied to Mr J.N.'s case from at least the middle of 2008 meant that it could not be said that his deportation was being pursued with the obligation under the relevant national law to act with "reasonable diligence and expedition".

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (f) (right to liberty and security), Mr J.N. complains about the excessive length of his detention as well as the system of immigration detention in the UK, notably alleging that the time-limits on the maximum period of immigration detention were unclear and that there was no automatic judicial review.

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.

Strasser v. Austria (no. 34948/12)
Kongresna narodna stranka and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina (no. 414/11)
Mikovic v. Croatia (no. 18329/14)
Terzic v. Croatia (no. 20284/13)
A.I. and Others v. Denmark (no. 20570/14)

A.M. and Others v. Denmark (no. 53045/14)
A.T. and Others v. Denmark (no. 19790/14)
Z.A. and Others v. Denmark (no. 20617/14)
Schrade v. Georgia (no. 52240/07)
Farmakidou v. Greece (no. 34333/10)
Foutri v. Greece (no. 78201/11)
Koulakidis v. Greece (no. 59027/11)
Koulakidis v. Greece (no. 62165/11)
Tserpes v. Greece (no. 27805/13)
Valigiannopoulos v. Greece (no. 76907/11)
Xynopoulou and Papazoglou v. Greece (no. 62674/12)
Zorba v. Greece (no. 74676/10)
Chiusolo and Others v. Italy (no. 52144/08 and 62 other applications)
Gjonbocari v. Italy (no. 17911/11)
Kijowska and Others v. Italy (nos. 46908/06, 47193/07, 16530/13, and 20238/13)
Pupkowska-Rulent v. Italy (no. 45763/12)
Minić and Others v. Montenegro (nos. 17335/07, 17337/07, 17389/07, 17403/07, 50417/07, and 37837/07)
Stecki v. Poland (no. 30738/15)
Zaluska v. Poland (no. 65709/09)
Andronache v. Romania (no. 55839/14)
Antonescu v. Romania (no. 49260/14)
Balassy v. Romania (no. 37792/12)
Chiriac and Others v. Romania (nos. 1439/15, 3276/15, 6162/15, 11883/15, 18232/15, 26068/15, and 29776/15)
Chirilă and Others v. Romania (nos. 53015/13, 57097/13, 61357/13, 70805/13, and 71016/13)
Grigoraș v. Romania (no. 39628/14)
Iagar and Christian v. Romania (nos. 59328/10 and 60732/10)
Mogosanu v. Romania (no. 32141/14)
Munteanu and Others v. Romania (nos. 62783/13, 71602/14, 78441/14, 938/15, 11073/15, 12676/15, 14512/15, 20067/15, and 21924/15)
Olaru and Others v. Romania (nos. 17193/07, 22222/07, and 52053/07)
Olteanu and Buruiană v. Romania (nos. 26323/14 and 69696/14)
Pascu and Others v. Romania (nos. 11188/14, 24983/14, 25675/14, 25725/14, 30804/14, 40032/14, 41145/14, 47184/14, 49345/14, 55846/14, 66956/14, 75624/14, 75673/14, 76160/14, 77023/14, and 78596/14)
Popovici v. Romania (no. 31270/13)
Sâncrăian and Others v. Romania (nos. 54582/14, 57175/14, 58123/14, 72393/14, and 28435/15)
Somogyi and Others v. Romania (nos. 27169/10, 27028/13, and 73478/13)
Ungureanu v. Romania (no. 47800/10)
Akhatov v. Russia (no. 19476/05)
Akhmadullina v. Russia (no. 56398/08)
Chernysheva v. Russia (no. 47387/15)
Demidov v. Russia (no. 49194/09)
Kostina and Others v. Russia (nos. 25198/09, 43493/11, and 71445/11)
Lobanov v. Russia (no. 20861/09)
N. and M. v. Russia (nos. 39496/14 and 39727/14)
Suliyev v. Russia (no. 10503/09)
Milosevic v. Serbia (no. 25718/08)
Vasiljevic v. Serbia (no. 43488/07)
JUPITER SK s.r.o. v. Slovakia (no. 11261/14)

Coban v. Turkey (no. 13484/12)
Cobanoglu v. Turkey (no. 28721/09)
Kisakol v. Turkey (no. 24702/14)
Kulpu v. Turkey (no. 47098/10)
Oner v. Turkey (no. 81703/12)
Urun v. Turkey (no. 19588/12)
Berzhavych v. Ukraine (no. 23254/06)
Chumak v. Ukraine (no. 60790/12)
Gryshko and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 16407/09, 26165/11, 27266/13, 71906/13, 33792/14, and 58917/14)
Komar and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 43444/10, 74860/10, 2776/12, 32236/15, and 39578/15)
Kravets v. Ukraine (no. 463/06)
Nykyforenko and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 40519/09, 16551/15, 21047/15, and 24934/15)

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)
Inci Ertekin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 55 30)