

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing four judgments on Tuesday 19 May 2026 and 22 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 21 May 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 19 May 2026

[K.A. v. Austria \(applications nos. 44001/22 and 22881/24\)](#)

The applicant, Mr K.A., is a national of Kosovo¹ who was born in 1971. He is currently confined in a “forensic-therapeutic centre” (formerly known as an institution for mentally ill offenders) in Garsten (Austria).

The case concerns the applicant's complaint about his confinement following his conviction in 2021 for domestic violence. He was convicted in particular of regularly beating and threatening his wife and four children, locking them up and inflicting bodily harm on them. The courts sentenced him to eight years' imprisonment and ordered his confinement in an institution for mentally ill offenders under Article 21 § 2 of the Criminal Code.

He mainly complains before the European Court that it had not been reliably shown – in either the criminal proceedings against him or the subsequent proceedings reviewing the need for his continued confinement – that he is a person of unsound mind. He also alleges that during the proceedings, the psychiatric expert had examined him without the assistance of an interpreter, despite his limited command of German. Lastly, he complains that he was not able to challenge and question witnesses for the prosecution during the criminal proceedings. He relies on Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 (right to liberty and security) and Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) and (e) (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

[Stanković v. Bosnia and Herzegovina \(no. 11103/23\)](#)

The applicant, Dragana Stanković, is a citizen of Bosnia and Herzegovina who was born in 1986 and lives in Banja Luka (Bosnia and Herzegovina).

The case concerns an allegation of discrimination in the allocation of healthcare benefits during periods of temporary incapacity to work, depending on whether a person is self-employed or an employee. In 2019 the applicant, a self-employed lawyer, submitted a request for compensation of her salary when she had been on sick leave related to her pregnancy. The Health Insurance Fund rejected her request. This decision was upheld in the ensuing judicial review proceedings. Ultimately, in 2020 the Constitutional Court found that there had been no discriminatory treatment in particular, the legislation governing the rights and obligations of the self-employed and employees differed, as did the calculation of their contributions.

Relying in particular on Article 1 of Protocol No. 12 (general prohibition of discrimination) to the European Convention, Ms Stanković alleges that she was discriminated against on the basis of her professional status.

¹ All references to Kosovo, whether the territory, institutions or population, shall be understood in full compliance with United Nation's Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

[Miladze v. Georgia \(no. 41585/23\)](#)

The applicant, Irakli Miladze, is a Georgian national who was born in 1993 and lives in Tbilisi. He is a food courier who also describes himself as a civil activist.

From 2018 to 2022 Tbilisi City public transport was reformed to prioritise public transport and improve infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists. The case concerns Mr Miladze's administrative conviction for a video he posted on TikTok in 2022 criticising the new transport policies in Tbilisi and alleging misconduct by public officials. The video went viral.

The Georgian courts found in particular that he had used obscene language targeting specific public officials (including the mayor, his staff and the police) which was not protected by freedom of speech rights. They therefore held that he had "disturbed public peace and order", a punishable offence under Article 166 § 1 of the Code of Administrative Offences, and gave him a fine.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the Convention, Mr Miladze complains about his conviction for disorderly conduct, maintaining that the relevant law should not have been extended to cyberspace. He also argues that the language he had used did not amount to hate speech, that TikTok users could easily have avoided his content if it were unwanted and that, in any case, he had included a disclaimer with a warning about offensive language.

Thursday 21 May 2026

[Lena Hakobyan and Others v. Armenia \(nos. 13721/23 and 34254/23\)](#)

The applicants are all Armenian nationals.

The case concerns their complaints about the excessive length of proceedings before the civil and administrative courts, lasting between seven to over 13 years. The applicants in application no. 13721/23 also allege that there were no effective remedies at national level to seek compensation for excessive length of proceedings.

The applicants rely on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time). The applicants in application no. 13721/23 also rely on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).

[Mouelhi v. Belgium \(no. 37336/23\)](#)

The applicant is a Tunisian national who was born in 1983. He claims to have arrived in Belgium on 1 September 2020 and to have applied for international protection there on 9 December 2020.

In the present case, the applicant complains that he was not provided with material assistance or accommodation in Belgium, despite the Employment Tribunal's final judgment ordering the Belgian State to grant him such assistance in accordance with its legal obligations.

On 9 December 2020 the applicant was allocated a place in a reception centre, from which he was transferred on several occasions for disciplinary reasons. He was later expelled temporarily three times for breaching the house rules.

On 18 August 2022 the Federal Agency for the reception of asylum seekers (Fedasil) decided to bar him permanently from the asylum network on disciplinary grounds. The applicant applied to the Brussels French-Language Employment Tribunal, which set aside the decision in question and ordered Fedasil to provide him with accommodation and material assistance. Notification of the judgment was given on 24 May 2023 and it became final a month later.

On 13 October 2023 the applicant requested an interim measure from the Court to have the Belgian State provide him with accommodation and thereby enforce the Employment Tribunal's judgment. The Court granted his request on 18 October 2023 and lifted the measure on 15 June 2025.

In the meantime, the applicant had lodged an application for international protection on 18 May 2023 in the Netherlands, where he currently lives.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), he complains of the conditions in which he had to live for several months.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair hearing) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), he complains of the failure to enforce the Employment Tribunal's judgment ordering the State to provide him with accommodation.

[Sobczyńska and Others v. Poland \(nos. 62765/14, 62769/14, and 62772/14\)](#)

The applicants, Aleksandra Sobczyńska, Adrian Klepacz and Rafał Brukiewicz are all Polish nationals who were born in 1974, 1974 and 1967, respectively.

The case concerns the President of the Republic's refusal in 2008 to appoint the applicants, who had been working as junior judges (*asesorzy sądowi*), to vacant judicial posts, despite their successful participation in a competitive selection procedure conducted by the National Council of the Judiciary. The applicants' appeals to the administrative courts and complaints to the Constitutional Court were all unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (access to court) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain that the Polish courts refused to hear their cases concerning the President of the Republic's decision not to appoint them as judges, effectively denying them any 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.

Tuesday 19 May 2026

Name	Main application number
Leocádio de Lemos v. Portugal	34122/23

Thursday 21 May 2026

Name	Main application number
Start Media Ltd and Others v. Armenia	34286/15
E.R.A. v. Bulgaria	55918/22
Berišić v. Croatia	1337/22
Gradel d.o.o. v. Croatia	29338/22
Čegan and Babaieva v. the Czech Republic	30272/25
Machalický v. the Czech Republic	36160/25
J.T. v. France	5618/21
M.N. v. France	22460/21
S.C. v. France	44067/22
A.G. v. Hungary	10102/24
Gucci Barbieri and Gucci v. Italy	25712/21
Pelle v. Italy	23710/24
V.I. v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia	63750/17

