



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing eight judgments on Tuesday 18 July 2023 and 61 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 20 July 2023.

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 18 July 2023

[Camara v. Belgium \(application no. 49255/22\)](#)

The applicant, Abdoulaye Camara, is a Guinean national who was born in 2001. He arrived in Belgium on 12 July 2022, where he lodged an application for international protection.

The case concerns his complaint of having been left without accommodation in Belgium between July and November 2022, despite the decision by which the Brussels French-Language Employment Tribunal had ordered the Belgian State to grant him material assistance and provide him with accommodation. The tribunal's order, which was delivered on 22 July 2022, had become final on 29 August 2022.

The European Court granted an [interim measure](#) in the case on 31 October 2022.

On 4 November 2022 Fedasil (Federal Agency for the reception of asylum seekers) ultimately took up the applicant's case and assigned him to a reception facility.

Relying in particular on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains of the failure to enforce the decision delivered by the Brussels French-Language Employment Tribunal on 22 July 2022 ordering that Fedasil provide him with assistance.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention, the applicant complains that he was forced to live in the street for several months and that he did not have an effective remedy by which to have his complaints examined.

[Paslavičius v. Lithuania \(no. 15152/18\)](#)

The applicant, Tadas Paslavičius, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1986 and lives in Vilnius.

The case concerns court decisions forcing the applicant to cover the legal fees incurred by his former employer when he had contested disciplinary penalties and his being made redundant. During the court cases, his former employer had been represented by an external lawyer, whereas he had represented himself.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, the applicant complains that the legal fees were excessive as his former employer could have been represented by one of its in-house lawyers.

[Manole v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 26360/19\)](#)

The applicant, Domnica Manole, is a Moldovan and Romanian national who was born in 1961. At the relevant time she was a judge at the Chișinău Court of Appeal.

The case concerns the applicant's dismissal from her duties as judge for having informed the press of the reasons for her dissenting opinion in a case she had heard, prior to publication of the full text of the decision rendered by the Court of Appeal.

In June 2017 the Chișinău Court of Appeal, sitting as a panel of three judges – one of whom was the applicant – dismissed the *Jurnal de Chișinău*'s application to reset the time-limit for appeal in a defamation case pitting that newspaper against the President of the Parliament of Moldova. In that case, the newspaper had been ordered to broadcast a retraction on the *Jurnal TV* channel belonging to the same media trust. The applicant had appended a dissenting opinion to the judgment. The operative part of the judgment, indicating the existence of the applicant's opinion, had been read out at a public hearing and information in that respect had been published on the Ministry of Justice website, where the case was presented as "pending".

Before the full text of the Court of Appeal's decision was published, a journalist with the *Jurnal TV* channel contacted the applicant, who sent him a written message via mobile phone briefly explaining the reasons for her opinion. That same day *Jurnal TV* published an article which reported the conversation with the applicant and the reasoning from her dissenting opinion which she had shared.

A judicial inspector subsequently sent the National Judicial and Legal Service Commission a "memorandum on information disseminated by the media" concerning the case and the applicant's disclosure of the content of her dissenting opinion. Finding that the applicant's conduct had fallen foul of the law on the status of judges, the Commission asked the President of the Republic of Moldova to relieve the applicant of her duties as judge. The President of the Republic acceded to that request in July 2017. The applicant lodged an application with the Supreme Court, which dismissed it as baseless in November 2018.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicant submits that her right to impart information on a matter of public interest was illegitimately and disproportionately infringed by her dismissal from her duties. She further relies on Articles 6 (right to a fair hearing), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) of the Convention.

[**D.H. and Others v. North Macedonia \(no. 44033/17\)**](#)

The applicants, D.H., S.A., I.J. and K.N. are all female Macedonians / citizens of the Republic of North Macedonia who were born between 1955 and 1986 and live in Skopje.

The case concerns their alleged ill-treatment while in police custody after they had been arrested as part of a large group of sex workers. In particular, it concerns the conditions of their detention, the taking and publishing of photographs and videos of them, and the lack of reasons in the national courts' judgments.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, the applicants complain that they were held for many hours in detention; they were not given food, water or adequate medical care; they had no access to a toilet; their photos were revealed by the Ministry of the Interior; and they were blood-tested for sexually-transmitted diseases.

[**Osman and Altay v. Türkiye \(nos. 23782/20 and 40731/20\)**](#)

The applicants, Abdulmenaf Osman and Mehmet Altunç Altay, are nationals of Syria and Türkiye respectively, who were born in 1965 and 1956.

At the relevant time they were serving reinforced life sentences in the Akhisar and Edirne maximum security prisons for activities with a view to bringing about the secession of land placed under the sovereign authority of the State or State administration and attempting to undermine the constitutional order by force.

The applications concern the prison authorities' withholding of four issues of a bi-weekly periodical sent to the applicants by post.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicants complain that the periodicals sent to them were withheld by the prison authorities.

Russia v. Ukraine (no. 36958/21)

The case concerns the Russian Government's allegation of an administrative practice in Ukraine of, among other things, killings, abductions, forced displacement, interference with the right to vote, restrictions on the use of the Russian language and attacks on Russian embassies and consulates. They also complain about the water supply to Crimea via the North Crimean Canal being cut off and allege that Ukraine was responsible for the deaths of those on board Malaysia Airlines Flight MH17 because it failed to close its airspace.

It originated in an application lodged against Ukraine by the Government of Russia on 22 July 2021 under Article 33 (Inter-State cases) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

The Russian Government notably alleges violations of Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 (right to liberty and security), 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 10 (freedom of expression), 13 (right to an effective remedy), 14 (prohibition of discrimination), 18 (limitation on use of restrictions of rights), and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Article 2 of Protocol no. 1 (right to education), Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 12 (general prohibition of discrimination).

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 18 July 2023

Name	Main application number
Nakovski v. Bulgaria	78684/17
Argalioti v. Greece	46882/16

Thursday 20 July 2023

Name	Main application number
Dea 7.co v. Albania	65320/09
Hamitaj v. Albania	11254/11
Selimaj v. Albania	27039/10
Ahmadli and Others v. Azerbaijan	4621/19
Aliyev v. Azerbaijan	38774/22
Hasanov and Sadigov v. Azerbaijan	11108/19
Mahmudov and Others v. Azerbaijan	22052/20
Rustamova v. Azerbaijan	1063/22
B.K. and B.B.K. v. Bulgaria	731/22
Neshkov v. Bulgaria	46563/15
Croatian Radio-Television v. Croatia	3627/21
Tulej v. the Czech Republic	3762/22

Name	Main application number
Ilhan v. Denmark	41157/20
M.P. v. Denmark	25263/22
Resthtin v. Denmark	61203/19
Kalotarani and Others v. Greece	42267/14
Csapó and Others v. Hungary	49585/22
Pál and Danku v. Hungary	49962/22
Acquaviva and Others v. Italy	63312/13
Alfini and Others v. Italy	68602/13
Chisilița and Galușceac v. the Republic of Moldova	4932/12
Martyniuk v. Poland	35815/20
Popis and Others v. Poland	4765/22
Ścisło and Others v. Poland	47321/18
Năstăsescu and Others v. Portugal	11749/21
Oliveira Rodrigues and Others v. Portugal	42563/21
Babii v. Romania	40133/16
Celeniuc v. Romania	3440/17
Cioc and Others v. Romania	23331/16
Curiban v. Romania	51229/16
Diaconu and Safta v. Romania	25393/20
Hetes v. Romania	71046/16
Ispir v. Romania	2060/17
Ivanov and Others v. Romania	37470/17
Munteanu v. Romania	55057/16
Nedelcia and Others v. Romania	38890/16
Neicuț and Others v. Romania	25842/16
Nicu Feraru and Others v. Romania	58566/15
Păcurar and Others v. Romania	45893/16
Pandele and Others v. Romania	70084/16
Abdulmanov and Others v. Russia	5053/18
Benyash and Others v. Russia	2926/19
Dolgushin and Others v. Russia	15492/19
Gabdulvaleyev and Others v. Russia	60966/17
Tikhenko and Others v. Russia	29316/13
Yartsev and Others v. Russia	35101/21
Bracci v. San Marino	31338/21
Bobić and Others v. Serbia	34132/21
Sarkocy v. Slovakia	51334/21
Del Pino Ortiz and Others v. Spain	20942/19
Dunant v. Switzerland	20341/18
Vaccalluzzo v. Switzerland	74063/17
Cerit and Others v. Türkiye	6517/20
Şimşek İnşaat Nakliyat Elektrik Otomotiv Plastik Ticaret Sanayi A.Ş. and SMK Enerji Petrol İnşaat Turizm Lojistik Sanayi Ticaret A.Ş. v. Türkiye	34856/20
Bondarenko and Others v. Ukraine	42664/21
Chebotar v. Ukraine	3790/21
Myrchenko and Others v. Ukraine	49256/21

Name	Main application number
Rozhnov and Others v. Ukraine	7501/22
Shvets and Others v. Ukraine	50415/21
Skrypka and Others v. Ukraine	20390/19
Voloboyev and Others v. Ukraine	47900/21

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 [@ECHR_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

Press contacts

echrpress@echr.coe.int | tel.: +33 3 90 21 42 08

We would encourage journalists to send their enquiries via email.

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)

Neil Connolly (tel.: + 33 3 90 21 48 05)

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.