

## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing ten judgments on Tuesday 19 March 2024 and 23 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 21 March 2024.

*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](http://www.echr.coe.int)).*

### Tuesday 19 March 2024

#### [Almeida Arroja v. Portugal \(application no. 47238/19\)](#)

The applicant, José Pedro Almeida Arroja, is a Portuguese national who was born in 1954 and lives in Oporto. He is an economist and university professor and was a weekly political commentator on a daily news programme broadcast by the private television channel Porto Canal.

The case concerns his criminal conviction for aggravated defamation and insulting a legal entity for having implied, during one such broadcast, that a legal opinion provided to a public hospital by the director of a law firm, who happened to be a well-known politician and member of the European Parliament, had been motivated by political interests.

The applicant complains that his conviction was in breach of his right to freedom of expression under Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

#### [B.T. v. Russia \(no. 15284/19\)](#)

The applicant, B.T., is a Russian national who was born in 1982 and lives in Vladikavkaz (Russia).

At the time of the events in question B.T. was a police officer. The case concerns the refusal to grant him parental leave after the birth of his daughter in 2017. The child's mother, who was hospitalised, refused to bring up the child and so he was left as the only parent responsible. Parental leave was denied as under the law it could be granted to male-employee fathers only if they were bringing up children on their own because there were objective reasons as to why the mother could not take care of the child.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention B.T. complains that the refusal to grant him parental leave amounted to sexual discrimination.

#### [K.J. and Others v. Russia \(nos. 27584/20 and 39768/20\)](#)

The applicants are two nationals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), K.J. and C.C., and the Institute for Human Rights, a non-governmental organisation representing S.K., another DPRK national.

K.J. and C.C. were convicted of illegally fishing in Russian territorial waters in 2020 and were given prison sentences. S.K. was a student in Vladivostok in 2019 and after a year's study decided not to go back to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). He alleges that he was subsequently detained without a record of that detention. The case concerns their ordered removal to the DPRK.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of torture), and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, the applicants complain that if removed to the DPRK they will face torture and death and that they do not have an effective remedy for these complaints.

Under Article 5 (right to liberty and security) K.J. complains that his detention was arbitrary and prolonged, and the Institute for Human Rights alleges that S.K.'s detention on 10 September 2020 was unlawful.

#### [Kural v. Türkiye \(no. 84388/17\)](#)

The applicant, Suat Kural, is a Turkish national who was born in 1965 and lives in Bolu (Türkiye).

Mr Kural was a deputy chief of police in Eskişehir when the authorities decided to transfer him to the Samsun Police Academy. The case mainly concerns the stay of execution ordered by the national courts in respect of that decision, following Mr Kural's taking a case against the transfer. The authorities nevertheless reissued the transfer order.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention Mr Kural alleges a failure to comply with the Administrative Court's stay-of-execution decision.

#### [Parıldak v. Türkiye \(no. 66375/17\)](#)

The case concerns the decisions to place and keep a journalist in pre-trial detention on suspicion of belonging to an organisation known by the Turkish authorities as "FETÖ/PDY" (Fetullahist Terror Organisation/Parallel State Structure).

The applicant, Ayşenur Parıldak, is a Turkish national who was born in 1990. At the relevant time, she was a student at the Ankara University Faculty of Law. Between 2012 and 2016 she had worked as a legal columnist for the daily newspaper *Zaman*, which was viewed as the principal publication medium of the "Gülenist" network. *Zaman* was closed down following the adoption of Legislative Decree no. 668, issued on 27 July 2016 in connection with the state of emergency.

In August 2016 the Ankara Security Directorate received an anonymous tip-off stating: "Ayşenur Parıldak, who gives information to Fuat Avni and is followed by that account on Twitter, has her bags packed at the Ankara University Faculty of Law and is going to flee after her last exam". The following day Ms Parıldak was arrested and taken into police custody. After police questioning, she was brought before the Ankara First Magistrate's Court, which placed her in pre-trial detention on 11 August 2016. The applicant's appeals against the decisions to place and keep her in pre-trial detention were dismissed by the domestic courts.

In November 2017 the Ankara Assize Court sentenced Ms Parıldak to seven years and six months' imprisonment for membership of an armed terrorist organisation. It based its decision on the applicant's use of the ByLock application, her social media posts and the fact that she had exchanged private messages with the owner of the "fuatavni" account, which followed her on Twitter. The Assize Court also ordered that the applicant remain in prison. The applicant's conviction became final in December 2018. Her individual application to the Constitutional Court was declared inadmissible.

Ms Parıldak has complained to the Court about being placed and kept in pre-trial detention, relying in particular on Articles 5 (right to liberty and security) and 10 (freedom of expression) of the Convention.

Thursday 21 March 2024

#### [Sieć Obywatelska Watchdog Polska v. Poland \(no. 10103/20\)](#)

The applicant, Sieć Obywatelska Watchdog Polska, is a non-governmental organisation based in Poland which has the aim of enhancing transparency in the public domain and raising awareness of good governance and the accountability of power in Poland.

The case concerns the applicant organisation's attempts to gain access to the meetings diaries of two judges of the Constitutional Court, which the court refused to give. It was unsuccessful in taking its case to the national courts, with the Supreme Administrative Court finding in 2019 that a diary of meetings of the President of the Constitutional Court or Vice-President of that Court was an internal document which was not subject to disclosure as "public information". It also held that there was no obligation in domestic law to keep a diary of meetings or to keep records of persons entering and leaving public buildings.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the application organisation complains of the denial of access to the information it sought from the Constitutional Court.

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 19 March 2024

Name	Main application number
Genç and Others v. Türkiye	41210/19
İ.K. v. Türkiye	73990/11
Özbarış Demirel v. Türkiye	8035/20
Subaşı and Karaca v. Türkiye	37629/21
Topla and Others v. Türkiye	64140/19

## Thursday 21 March 2024

Name	Main application number
M.J. v. Azerbaijan	19657/18
Talibova v. Azerbaijan	56716/16
Sebbar v. Belgium	46540/15
Dimitrova v. Bulgaria	28854/17
Kadzanaia v. Georgia	27178/21
Trapeza Eurobank Ergasias A.E. v. Greece	25101/15
Tsourikas v. Greece	65067/16
L. v. Hungary	6182/20
Jankauskas v. Lithuania	26488/18
Chemel and Tabone v. Malta	37474/21
R.A. v. Norway	1461/21
Borisova and Others v. Russia	53913/15
Borovkov and Others v. Russia	46694/21
Ilyin and Others v. Russia	25863/21
Kanygin and Others v. Russia	49997/21
Kirsanov and Others v. Russia	43191/21
Progunov and Others v. Russia	39222/21
Skobelev and Others v. Russia	13038/18
Strelets and Others v. Russia	31649/22
Vakulko and Others v. Russia	52365/22

Name	Main application number
B.S. v. Türkiye	14820/19
Petrakovskyy and Leontyev v. Ukraine	26815/16

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](http://www.echr.coe.int). To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: [www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en](http://www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en) or follow us on Twitter [@ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

**Press contacts**

[echrpess@echr.coe.int](mailto:echrpess@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.