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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 321 (2016)
13.10.2016

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 16 judgments on Tuesday 18 October 2016 and 84 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 20 October 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 18 October 2016

Miessen v. Belgium (application no. 31517/12)

The applicant, Mr Vivian Miessen, is a Belgian national who was born in 1969 and lives in Braine-L'Alleud (Belgium). The case concerns the rejection by the *Conseil d'État* of an appeal on points of law lodged by the applicant on the ground that his pleadings in reply did not contain a reply to the other party's arguments.

In 2003 Mr Miessen was assaulted; his attacker was not identified.

In 2007 the Brussels Crown prosecutor informed the applicant that he did not have sufficient evidence to bring a prosecution, but that the judicial investigation was continuing. In 2008 the Brussels public prosecutor's department finally informed him that the case had been discontinued.

Mr Miessen applied for financial assistance from the Commission for Financial Aid to Victims of Intentional Violence and Voluntary Rescuers (hereafter, "the Commission").

The Commission declared Mr Miessen's claim inadmissible, on the ground that the case file on the assault against him had been discontinued from 16 June 2004 and that, given that his request had been submitted more than three years after the decision to discontinue the investigation, the legal deadline for submitting a claim had not been respected.

Mr Miessen appealed to the *Conseil d'État* on a point of law against the Commission's decision. He alleged, in particular, that the reasoning was "practically non-existent" in that it did not address his argument based on the contradictory information provided by the prosecutor's office. In its pleadings in reply, the Belgian State argued that the appeal on points of law was inadmissible on the ground that the applicant had entitled his appeal "application to have set aside", although he was in fact requesting that the Commission's decision be quashed. Mr Miessen replied by repeating the content of his initial application. In a judgment of 1 December 2011, the *Conseil d'État* rejected Mr Miessen's appeal on the ground that his pleadings in reply merely repeated the introductory appeal, without seeking to address the arguments submitted by the other party.

Relying on Article 6 (right of access to a court), the applicant complains that the *Conseil d'État* displayed excessive formalism in rejecting his appeal on points of law.

Vukota-Bojić v. Switzerland (no. 61838/10)

The applicant, Savjeta Vukota-Bojić, is a Swiss national who was born in 1954 and lives in Opfikon (Switzerland). The case concerns the lawfulness of surveillance conducted on her by an insurance company.

In August 1995, Ms Vukota-Bojić was struck by a motorcycle and fell on her back. She was diagnosed with cervical trauma and possible cranial trauma.

In 1996, Ms Vukota-Bojić, a hairdresser, underwent several medical examinations which resulted in conflicting reports about her ability to work. In January 1997, her insurer determined that her entitlement to daily allowances should end as of April 1997. She appealed to the Social Insurance Court of Zurich. Given the conflicting medical reports, the court ordered the insurer to conduct further investigations.

These investigations resulted in the issue of reports in November 2002 which concluded that Ms Vukota-Bojić had brain dysfunction and that this had been caused by her accident. Meanwhile, on 21 March 2002, the local social security authority had granted Ms Vukota-Bojić a full disability pension.

On 14 January 2005, the insurer decided that all of Ms Vukota-Bojić's entitlements to benefits should cease. The Social Insurance Court reversed that decision, however, and referred the matter back to the insurer. The insurer then invited Ms Vukota-Bojić to undergo a further medical evaluation, which she refused. The insurer subsequently decided to conduct surveillance on Ms Vukota-Bojić using private investigators. The surveillance was performed on four different dates and lasted several hours each time. Investigators followed Ms Vukota-Bojić in public places over long distances. A report ("the surveillance report") was prepared.

On 2 March 2007, the insurer confirmed that Ms Vukota-Bojić should not receive any benefits. On 12 April 2007, a neurologist appointed by the insurer, Dr H., released an anonymous expert opinion based on all available medical opinions and the surveillance report. The opinion concluded Ms Vukota-Bojić was incapacitated by 10%. On the basis of the expert opinion, the insurer granted Ms Vukota-Bojić daily allowances and a pension at this rate.

Ms Vukota-Bojić appealed the insurer's decisions, but was ultimately unsuccessful. In a judgment of 29 March 2010, the Federal Court held that the insurer had been justified in asking Ms Vukota-Bojić to complete a medical examination, that the surveillance had been lawful and that Dr H.'s report was persuasive on the issue of her entitlement to benefits.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life) of the European Convention, Ms Vukota-Bojić complains that the insurer's investigations, coupled with an alleged lack of specificity in Swiss domestic law governing surveillance by insurers, violated her right to privacy. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair civil trial), she also complains that the Federal Court was wrong to have relied on Dr H.'s expert opinion. She alleges that the surveillance report on which it was based had been obtained unlawfully, that she did not have a proper opportunity to challenge the opinion or report, and that neither the opinion nor the report could be considered impartial.

Ali Aba Talipoğlu v. Turkey (no. 16408/10)

The applicant, Ali Aba Talipoğlu, is a Turkish national who was born in 1975 and lives in Istanbul (Turkey). The case concerns allegations of ill-treatment sustained by Mr Talipoğlu during an unauthorised demonstration.

Mr Talipoğlu, a lawyer and member of the Association of Contemporary Lawyers (*Çağdaş Hukukçular Derneği*), took part on 16 September 2000 in a demonstration, including the reading of a public statement, to protest against new regulations on body searches of lawyers at the entrance to F-type prisons. As the demonstration had not been authorised, the police asked the crowd to disperse, failing which it would use force. Mr Talipoğlu and 26 other lawyers were placed in police custody, and subsequently brought before the prosecution service, which acquitted them on the same day. Following Mr Talipoğlu's release from police custody, a forensic doctor certified that he was unfit for work for five days, noting several bruises and injuries.

On 18 September 2000 Mr Talipoğlu lodged a complaint against the police officers, accusing them of ill-treatment and abuse of office and alleging that they had beaten him severely and insulted him. On 22 December 2009 the proceedings ended when the Court of Cassation struck the case out of its

list as being time-barred. Mr Talipoğlu also made a claim for compensation for unjustified placement in police custody, but his claim was dismissed.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Talipoğlu claims that he was subjected to ill-treatment by the police officers. Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Talipoğlu considers that no effective domestic remedy was available to him, and under Article 6 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time), he complains that the time-limit for a prosecution expired because of the length of the proceedings.

Alkaşı v. Turkey (no. 21107/07)

The applicant, Ayten Alkaşi, is a Turkish national who was born in 1964 and lives in Istanbul (Turkey). The case concerns Ms Alkaşi's right to respect for her innocence, which had been established during criminal proceedings, but allegedly then ignored during subsequent civil proceedings which concerned the same set of facts.

Ms Alkaşi was a secretary at the Directorate of National Palaces, where she became involved in a conflict with a colleague. At the request of a professor, Ms Alkaşi was demoted.

Ms Alkaşi and a friend, M.G., agreed that M.G. would contact the professor who had requested that Ms Alkaşi be demoted. M.G. went on to make a number of harassing phone calls to him, which included violent threats to his son. Criminal charges were brought against M.G. and Ms Alkaşi in relation to the incident.

At trial, Ms Alkaşi claimed that she had merely asked M.G. to call the professor, because the latter was a mutual friend, and M.G. had offered to facilitate reconciliation between the parties that could lead to Ms Alkaşi's reinstatement. Meanwhile, M.G. claimed that Ms Alkaşi had incited her to make the harassing phone calls and threats. On 27 October 2005, the Istanbul Assize Court convicted M.G., but acquitted Ms Alkaşi due to a lack of corroborating evidence to support the allegations against her.

In the meantime, Ms Alkaşi had been dismissed from her job. In October 2003, she brought a civil claim for wrongful dismissal against the Directorate of National Palaces in the Bakirkoy Labour Court, seeking compensation. On 28 March 2006, the court found as fact that Ms Alkaşi had incited M.G. to threaten the professor. The court dismissed Ms Alkaşi's claim, holding that she had breached her employer's trust and that her dismissal had been justified. Ms Alkaşi appealed, but on 20 December 2006 the Court of Cassation upheld the Labour Court's decision.

Relying in particular on Article 6 § 2 (right to be presumed innocent), Ms Alkaşi complains that the Labour Court's dismissal of her civil claim amounted to a violation of her right to be presumed innocent, in that the Labour Court found that she had broken her employer's trust by committing the offence of incitement – even though she had in fact been acquitted of this charge in the criminal proceedings.

G.U. v. Turkey (no. 16143/10)

The applicant, G.U., is a Turkish national who was born in 1984 and lives in Istanbul (Turkey). The case concerns her complaint that she was raped and sexually assaulted by her step-father, aged 62. She was a minor at the relevant time.

On 9 October 2002 G.U. presented herself at a police station, alleging that she had been raped by her step-father (M.S.) at gunpoint. G.U. was examined in hospital on the same day. The examination revealed that her hymen had been torn some time previously but that it was impossible to determine when, and that there was no physical trace of rape. Two police officers took a statement from her. She explained to them that she had been forced to have sexual relations with her step-father on three or four occasions when her mother and sister were absent, and alleged that she had been pinched by him on the leg a year previously, in the presence of her mother.

On 18 October 2002 the public prosecutor indicted M.S. for indecent assault, rape and false imprisonment. The first hearing was held on 18 November 2002 before the Izmir Assize Court, which granted the request to join the proceedings as a civil party, submitted by G.U.'s lawyer; G.U. gave evidence in open court, as the Assize Court had not responded to a request that the proceedings be held in private. M.S. denied the charges, explaining that he had suffered from impotence for about a year.

On 27 December 2006 the Assize Court acquitted M.S., on the basis, among other evidence, of various medical reports finding that he had been impotent at the time of the alleged events and could not therefore have committed the offences with which he was charged. The Court of Cassation upheld that judgment, noting also that the offence of indecent assault had become time-barred.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), G.U. complains of the lack of an effective procedure. Under Article 6 (right to a fair hearing), she alleges that the criminal proceedings before the Assize Court were unfair. Under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), G.U. alleges that she was the victim of a crime that has remained unpunished, and criticises the fact that she had to give evidence in open court and that the report by the Institute of Forensic Medicine suggested that she might have consented to the acts of which she complained.

Mızrak and Atay v. Turkey (no. 65146/12)

The applicants, Hasan Mızrak, Besire Mızrak, Mazlum Mızrak, Deniz Mızrak and Derya Atay, are Turksih nationals who were born in 1958, 1957, 1997, 1985 and 1983 respectively and live in Diyarbakır and Adana (Turkey). They are respectively the father and mother of Mahsum Mızrak, and his brothers and sisters.

The case concerns the death of Mahsum Mızrak in the course of an unauthorised demonstration.

On 30 March 2006 Mahsum Mızrak took part in a demonstration organised following the death of 14 members of the Workers' Party of Kurdistan (PKK), an illegal armed organisation. He was injured on the head by a tear-gas grenade and died as a result of that injury. The Diyarbakır public prosecutor's office opened an investigation to identify those responsible for his death, and brought criminal proceedings for homicide against three police officers. According to the most recent information provided by the parties, the case was still pending before the domestic courts on 10 June 2014.

Mahsum Mızrak's parents also brought an action for damages against the Ministry of the Interior. By a judgment of 5 November 2009, the Diyarbakır Administrative Court awarded them 6,608 euros (EUR) in respect of the material damage sustained and EUR 2,272 in respect of non-pecuniary damage. An appeal was lodged against that judgment, and, according to the information submitted by the parties, it was still pending on 10 June 2014.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mahsum Mızrak's relatives allege that the police officers used excessive force, with fatal results for Mr Mızrak, and claim that the subsequent investigation and criminal proceedings were ineffective.

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.

Bak and Others v. Hungary (no. 52257/11)
Kézdiszentkereszti Bíró v. Hungary (no. 236/12)
Rácz v. Hungary (no. 20264/12)
Temesfői and Others v. Hungary (no. 43355/11)

Grigaliūnienė v. Lithuania (no. 42322/09)
Dumitru v. Romania (no. 71851/13)
Davlyashova v. Russia (no. 69863/13)
Gavrilova v. Russia (no. 52431/07)
Zaushkin and Others v. Russia (nos. 25697/13, 48185/13 and 62442/13)
Zhulin v. Russia (no. 22965/06)

Thursday 20 October 2016

Ara Harutyunyan v. Armenia (no. 629/11)

The applicant, Ara Harutyunyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1989 and lives in Vanadzor (Armenia). The case concerns the justification for his pre-trial detention for four months.

On 2 August 2010, Mr Harutyunyan appeared voluntarily at the Gugark Town Police Department. He confessed to injuring another person (Y.P.) with a knife. He said that Y.P. had threatened him with a gun, and that he had acted in self-defence. Mr Harutyunyan also provided both weapons to the authorities. He was charged with assault and an investigation was launched. The investigator asked Mr Harutyunyan to provide a written undertaking that he would not leave his place of residence during the investigation, which was provided. Detention was not sought at that time.

On 9 August 2010, the investigator substituted the assault charge for a new, more severe charge, namely wilful infliction of harm which is life-threatening or very serious. The same day, the investigator filed a motion with the Lori Regional Court, seeking the detention of Mr Harutyunyan on the basis that he might offend again, or might otherwise obstruct the investigation, given the seriousness of the new charge. The Regional Court found that Mr Harutyunyan might obstruct the investigation and/or abscond, and ordered his pre-trial detention. Mr Harutyunyan appealed, arguing that there was no relevant and sufficient evidence to support his detention. However, his appeal was dismissed, and a further appeal to the Court of Cassation was declared inadmissible in October 2010.

The investigator applied to extend Mr Harutyunyan's detention on three occasions to allow for further investigation. These applications were successful. Mr Harutyunyan only sought to appeal the first extension of his detention, which had been granted by the Regional Court on 4 October 2010. That appeal was unsuccessful, and the Court of Cassation dismissed a further appeal in December 2010.

Between October and December 2010, Mr Harutyunyan applied for bail repeatedly but unsuccessfully. However, on 16 December 2010 the court ordered his release of its own motion.

On 25 January 2011, the investigator dropped the charges against Mr Harutyunyan and terminated the criminal proceedings, having determined that the alleged assault had been committed in self-defence.

Relying on Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security / entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial), Mr Harutyunyan complains that the domestic courts failed to provide relevant and sufficient reasons for his detention.

Eleftherios G. Kokkinakis - Dilos Kykloforiaki A.T.E. v. Greece (no. 45826/11)

The applicants, a consortium made up of an individual, Elefterios Kokkinakis, and a legal entity, Dilos Kykloforiaki A.T.E., a public limited company, allege an interference with their possessions and complain about an excessive length of proceedings before the Greek courts.

In December 1995 and March 1996 Athens Municipal Council awarded the consortium a contract for installing and operating single-space and multi-space parking meters for the city. The Supreme

Administrative Court set aside the tender award in 1998, considering, firstly, that it had not been decided by Athens Municipal Council with the required two-thirds majority, and, secondly, that the concession to operate the parking meters was based on unconstitutional provisions of the Code of Territorial Authorities, as the consortium had been granted police powers with regard to fines and the possibility of immobilising offenders' vehicles.

On 7 May 1999 the applicants brought an action for damages before the administrative court, against the City and the State. Their court action resulted in a judgment by the Supreme Administrative Court in March 2011, confirming the refusal to grant their claims.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain about the court decisions and allege that they did not receive compensation for the damage sustained. Under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time), they complain about the length of the proceedings.

Gukovych v. Ukraine (no. 2204/07)

The applicant, Andriy Gukovych, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1974 and lives in Lviv (Ukraine). The case concerns his confinement in a sobering-up centre, and allegations of ill-treatment during his detention.

According to Mr Gukovyych, at around 7pm on 20 February 2002 he was stopped in the street by officers of the municipal guard, and detained in the Lviv medical sobering-up centre. He was released at around 8 a.m. the next day.

Over the next few months, Mr Gukovyych repeatedly lodged complaints with the authorities, claiming that he had been sober when he had been detained, that his confinement in the sobering-up centre had been arbitrary, and that he had been beaten by officers when he had objected to his detention. All of his complaints were dismissed as ill-founded.

In July 2002 Mr Gukovyych lodged a civil suit against the relevant municipal guard officers, and a paramedic at the sobering-up centre who had found that he had been intoxicated. Mr Gukovyych sought damages, alleging that he had been arbitrarily detained and ill-treated.

On 6 June 2003 the Shevchenkivsky District Court dismissed his claims. The court found that they were unsubstantiated, in particular on the grounds that: he had acknowledged that he had drunk 250 millilitres of vodka in a note that he had signed whilst at the sobering-up centre; he had failed to convincingly explain why he had delayed making any complaint until 30 hours after he had been released; and that he had most likely sustained his injuries after his release.

Mr Gukovyych lodged an appeal of this decision, but this was rejected by the Lviv Regional Court of Appeal, which found that his claims were unsubstantiated. On 28 March 2006, the Supreme Court rejected Mr Gukovyych's request for leave to lodge a further cassation appeal.

Relying in particular on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 5 § 1 (e) (right to liberty and security), Mr Gukovyych complains that he was arbitrarily detained in the sobering-up centre, and that he was subjected to ill-treatment during his confinement.

Vinniychuk v. Ukraine (no. 34000/07)

The applicant, Valentyna Vinniychuk, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1955 and lives in Stryy (Ukraine). The case concerns the alleged failure of the Government to restore her housing rights, pursuant to a court order.

In February 1998, the Stryy Court declared that Ms Vinniychuk had lost her right to occupy a flat provided to her under a social tenancy scheme, on the grounds that she had abandoned it. Ms Vinniychuk complained that she had not abandoned the flat, but had had to leave Stryy to serve a prison sentence in Russia. She had two dependent children and no other residence. However,

Ms Vinniychuk was evicted from the property in May 1998, after which she maintains that she had to rent rooms in the flats of various acquaintances without ever being able to establish a stable home.

Ms Vinniychuk engaged in a prolonged series of different proceedings, in an attempt to restore her right to occupy the flat. Eventually she did obtain an order quashing the original declaration, and in October 2002 the courts upheld her right to occupy the premises.

However, by this time the flat had been privatised, sold and occupied by somebody else. Ms Vinniychuk instituted civil proceedings, seeking the invalidation of these transactions, and an order allowing her to move back into the flat. However, in July 2005 the Stryy court held that it should not divest the new owner of their title to the property, as it had been purchased in good faith. Instead, it ordered the City Council to provide Ms Vinniychuk with replacement housing of an equivalent value.

Despite this, the City Council informed Ms Vinniychuk that it could not comply with the court's judgment, because it had no available housing or funds. Despite making numerous complaints, Ms Vinniychuk maintains that she was never offered a replacement flat. Eventually she found a flat on her own, which had been left vacant after the death of its owner. In October 2010 the court awarded the new flat to the municipality as intestate property, and granted Ms Vinniychuk the right to occupy it.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life and the home) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Ms Vinniychuk complains that the Ukrainian authorities unlawfully and unfairly deprived her of her flat in 1998; that they failed to redress their mistake in good time; and that she could not obtain an appropriate remedy for the non-enforcement of the court order ordering the municipality to provide her with new housing.

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.

Lachezar Petrov and Others v. Bulgaria (nos. 45568/12, 47100/12, 47831/12, 74925/12, and 75321/12)
Marcan v. Croatia (no. 67390/10)
Stimac and Kuzmin-Stimac v. Croatia (no. 70694/12)
Ausad Valimised MTÜ v. Estonia (no. 40631/14)
Kondratjev and Kondratjeva v. Estonia (no. 46779/15)
Kvantaliani v. Georgia (no. 38736/05)
Mintken and Aydin v. Germany (nos. 37963/15 and 40208/15)
Jenei v. Hungary (nos. 7952/12, 21990/12, and 30382/12)
Kende and Others v. Hungary (nos. 12471/12, 22414/12, 25206/12, 32091/12, and 62755/12)
Kharon Kft and Freha v. Hungary (nos. 60670/11 and 64387/12)
Máthé and Szabó v. Hungary (nos. 6018/12 and 72264/12)
Szebellédi and Others v. Hungary (nos. 2240/12, 7911/12, and 44703/12)
Kiršteins v. Latvia (no. 36064/07)
Arias Mena v. Malta (no. 22411/14)
Valerio Polanco v. Malta (no. 25248/15)
Murzacov and Others v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 40821/06)
Nicolschi v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 11726/09)
Stadnitchi v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 47764/09)

Uniunea Inventatorilor și Raționalizatorilor 'Inovatorul' and Uniunea Societăților Tehnico-Științifice v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 11955/07)
Ćosović v. Montenegro (nos. 38584/10, 72214/12, 45474/13, 53053/13, 64764/13, and 5913/15)
Sukovic v. Montenegro (no. 63520/12)
Jaczek v. Poland (no. 13603/13)
Lonski v. Poland (no. 67974/14)
Pawlak v. Poland (no. 78490/11)
Zawadzki v. Poland (no. 14960/15)
Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Malacu and Others v. Romania (no. 55093/09)
Dimieru and Others v. Romania (no. 17369/14, 46349/14, and 45490/15)
Dregan v. Romania (no. 30996/10)
Federeac and Others v. Romania (nos. 60494/14, 54841/15, and 62751/15)
Fîc and Others v. Romania (nos. 48204/13, 44127/14, 47189/14, and 28789/15)
Luca and Others v. Romania (nos. 72582/13, 5560/14, 34094/14, 43101/14, 52272/14, 54417/14, 56807/14, 63560/14, 69098/14, 70235/14, 77231/14, 20620/15, 36636/15, 40064/15, 42402/15, 42454/15, 42698/15, 43936/15, 45433/15, 45820/15, 49400/15, 51988/15, 52307/15, 53754/15, 56198/15, 56205/15, 56661/15, 57659/15, 58150/15, 58248/15, 58438/15, 58530/15, 59794/15, 59870/15, 60327/15, 62532/15, and 1770/16)
Marcus v. Romania (no. 47867/14)
Mocanu and Hendre v. Romania (nos. 54136/14 and 14368/15)
Papafil v. Romania (no. 63961/10)
Teică and Others v. Romania (nos. 2337/04, 25482/04, 26485/04, 28121/04, 32099/06, 40757/06, 47515/06, 30883/07, 23243/08, 45244/08, 35783/09, 37240/09, 61891/09, 65865/09, 10460/10, 48595/10, 74375/10, 6692/12, 9633/12, 56627/12, 29229/13, 41128/13, and 76265/13)
Tocoian and Others v. Romania (nos. 3799/14, 53996/14, 58911/14, 65162/14, 9789/15, 29309/15, 44664/15, 45231/15, and 57044/15)
Guseynov v. Russia (no. 45013/09)
Neklyudov v. Russia (no. 52671/07)
Parkhachev v. Russia (no. 12084/14)
Pugin v. Russia (no. 28342/10)
Skripkin v. Russia (no. 63619/10)
Usmanov v. Russia (no. 17731/11)
Vasyanovich v. Russia (no. 9791/05)
Yefimenko v. Russia (no. 59989/11)
Mihal v. Slovakia (no. 57787/12)
Godoy Ruiz and Others v. Spain (no. 62653/10)
Milosevski v. 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' (no. 38127/06)
Acar v. Turkey (no. 30495/11)
Akbas v. Turkey (no. 41287/09)
Çakmak and Others v. Turkey (nos. 39258/05, 39270/05, 4058/06, 2106/07, 19566/07, 836/08, 872/08, 53290/08, 53304/08, 41810/09, 41811/09, 41812/09, 41813/09, 41814/09, 41815/09, 41816/09, 41817/09, 41818/09, 41819/09, 41820/09, 41821/09, 41822/09, 41823/09, 44015/09, and 44017/09)
Celik v. Turkey (no. 19526/07)
Cosar v. Turkey (no. 47239/08)
Devrim v. Turkey (no. 43708/06)
Eser v. Turkey (no. 78852/11)
Gur and Others v. Turkey (nos. 55463/10, 40707/11, 68070/11, 69492/12, 70360/12, 75640/12, 76434/12, 77480/12, 77652/12, 78670/12, and 143/13)
Kucuk v. Turkey (no. 18379/09)
Nisanci v. Turkey (no. 33617/08)

Özel Feza Eğitim Öğretim Yurt ve Kantin İşletmeciliği Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Turkey (no. 16318/16)
Sönmezer and Others v. Turkey (nos. 26256/06, 31839/06, 49636/06, 44079/07, 46757/07, and 55043/07)
Yucel v. Turkey (no. 17869/10)
Arkhipova and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 31431/08, 47366/08, 48500/08, 5212/10, 8122/11, 69043/12, 20060/13, and 42201/14)
Babiy and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 9110/08, 50269/08, 23793/10, and 58079/10)
Barabash and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 24338/08, 26614/08, 4825/10, 70573/12, 12746/15, 21784/15, and 26039/15)
Bunyak and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 44088/12, 10774/15, 17326/15, and 42914/15)
Derevyanko and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 31386/05, 28938/06, 50428/06, 42025/07, 18266/08, 3469/10, and 74269/11)
Dovgalets and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 1434/08, 48464/09, 4439/10, 23415/11, 38177/11, 40222/15, and 43769/15)
Godnya and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 9638/09, 33693/09, and 30017/13)
Kin and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 19451/04, 41402/05, 5622/06, 8747/06, 8790/06, 10473/06, 15153/06, and 42373/06)
Korol v. Ukraine (no. 4939/08)
Lozovskoy and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 68236/10, 39598/13, and 58921/15)
Petrenko and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 7581/05, 22320/09, 35084/09, 21822/10, 50824/10, 24402/11, and 9075/16)
Rudenko and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 9784/09, 71414/10, 524/11, 66841/14, and 45541/15)
Rusyn v. Ukraine (no. 5462/10)
Semenenko and Others v. Ukraine (no. 52819/08)
Serebryakova and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 2592/07, 9017/07, 54449/10, and 23954/11)
Shubelik and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 22328/08, 28646/09, 47896/09, 61677/09, 55891/12, 59950/15, and 6960/16)
Torosh and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 4682/09, 39179/09, 74171/10, and 77802/13)
Treshchev and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 55936/09, 47935/10, 73634/10, 54731/11, 73725/11, 78806/13, and 37818/14)
Varvanskaya and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 19708/09, 53939/10, 16399/15, and 39520/15)
Vilkhovskiy and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 59255/09, 62905/09, 3007/10, 21297/10, 30239/10, 5438/11, 75291/14, and 29307/15)

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

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)
George Stafford (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 71)