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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 381 (2017)
14.12.2017

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 12 judgments on Tuesday 19 December 2017 and 26 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 21 December 2017.

*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 December 2017

Ramda v. France (application no. 78477/11)

The applicant, Rachid Ramda, is an Algerian national who was born in 1969. He is currently detained in Lannemezan Prison. The case concerns the applicant's complaint about an alleged error in the reasoning of the judgment delivered by the Special Bench of the Assize Court of Appeal which convicted him and a further complaint about his criminal conviction despite a previous final conviction by the ordinary criminal courts.

In 1995 eight terrorist attacks were carried out in France, in particular in Paris, near the Maison Blanche metro station, at the Gare d'Orsay and at the Saint-Michel RER station. Although there was no explicit claim of responsibility for the attacks, some factors, such as the existence of virulent communiqués against France and the mode of operation, pointed to the involvement of the *Groupement Islamique Armé* (GIA). In the framework of a judicial investigation geared to identifying the perpetrators, phone tapping was carried out in various phone boxes, leading to the arrest of several persons. The trail eventually led to the applicant. The latter, who is a member of the *Front Islamique du Salut*, had left Algeria to settle in London, where he was suspected of being a GIA leader in the United Kingdom, particularly owing to his involvement in the *Al Ansar* periodical, which the GIA used as an information outlet abroad.

The applicant was the subject of three international arrest warrants, for the attack carried out on 6 October 1995 near the Maison Blanche metro station, the 17 October 1995 attack at the Gare d'Orsay and the 25 July 1995 attack at the Saint-Michel RER station, respectively. On 1 December 2005 he was handed over to the French authorities, who remanded him in custody.

Proceedings in the ordinary criminal courts - By a judgment of 29 March 2006, which included over thirty pages of reasoning, the Paris Criminal Court found the applicant guilty of criminal association in the framework of a terrorist conspiracy, and sentenced him to ten years' imprisonment, banning him from French territory for life.

On 18 December 2006 the Paris Court of Appeal upheld that judgment. With explicit reference to the statement of facts set out in the judgment, it devoted some thirty pages to analysing those facts and setting out its reasoning on the charges against the applicant. Having provided further information on the development and operation of the GIA, it observed that the applicant had been the group's main spokesperson in Europe, its principal propaganda agent outside Algeria, while simultaneously playing a central role in the London cell, and, lastly, that he had played a strategic role in the external organisation of the GIA. An appeal by the applicant on points of law was dismissed on 14 March 2007.

Criminal proceedings in the Assize Court – By three judgments of 13 February, 3 August and 27 November 2001 concerning the attacks carried out in Paris on 17 October, 25 July and 6 October 1995 respectively, the Investigation Division of the Paris Court of Appeal ordered the applicant's

committal for trial before a special bench of the Assize Court (made up exclusively of professional judges). He was to be tried for complicity in crimes of murder, attempted murder, destruction of or damage to property belonging to others by the effect of explosive substances having caused death, mutilation and/or permanent disability, temporary total unfitness for work of over eight days and of a maximum eight days, committed in the framework of a terrorist conspiracy, as well as the related offence of infringement of explosives legislation in the framework of a terrorist conspiracy.

On 26 October 2007 the special bench of the Paris Assize Court, made up of seven professional judges, found the applicant guilty as charged in the framework of the three terrorist attacks. It sentenced him to life imprisonment, specifying a 22-year minimum term. The applicant appealed.

The appeal proceedings were conducted before the Paris Assize Court, sitting as a special bench of nine professional judges. One hundred and ninety-six individuals, as well as the RATP, the SNCF, the Guarantee Fund for victims of acts of terrorism and other crimes, the Treasury's judicial agent and the SOS Attentats association joined the proceedings as civil parties. Sixty-three questions concerning the applicant were put to the Assize Court of Appeal, indicating the various offences as charged and the dates and places of commission, in addition to a list of the victims' names and the types of damage they had sustained.

On 13 October 2009 the special bench of the Assize Court of Appeal found the applicant guilty as charged and sentenced him to life imprisonment, stipulating a 22-year minimum term and banning him indefinitely from French territory. On 15 June 2011 the Court of Cassation dismissed an appeal on points of law by the applicant, rejecting in particular his pleas concerning the failure of the Assize Court of Appeal to give reasons for its judgment and the alleged violation of the *ne bis in idem* principle owing to his previous final conviction by the Paris Court of Appeal on 18 December 2006.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, the applicant complains of the failure of the special bench of the Assize Court of Appeal to give reasons for its judgment convicting him. He also complains under Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 of a violation of the *ne bis in idem* principle owing to his criminal conviction despite his previous final conviction by the ordinary criminal courts.

Peňaranda Soto v. Malta (no. 16680/14)
Yanez Pinon and Others v. Malta (nos. 71645/13, 7143/14, and 20342/15)

Both cases concern conditions of detention and access to medical care in the Corradino Correctional Facility in Malta.

The applicant in the first case, Luis Fernando Peňaranda Soto, is a Costa Rican national who was born in 1977. The applicants in the second case are: Miguel Angel Yanez Pinon, a Mexican national; Mana Owusu, a Ghanian national; and Jose Luis Del Rosario, a Dutch national. They were born in 1963, 1976, and 1961 respectively. They are or were all detained in the Corradino Correctional Facility following criminal convictions, mostly for drug-related offences. Mr Peňaranda Soto was detained in the facility from 2010 but released in 2016 under an amnesty. Mr Yanez Pinon was also released in 2016 after serving a 13-year sentence. The other two applicants have been in detention since 2012 (Mr Owusu) and 2010 (Mr Del Rosario).

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), they all complain about the conditions of their cells, which they allege/d are poorly lit and ventilated, too hot in the summer and not equipped with running or drinking water.

Mr Peňaranda Soto, the applicant in the first case, makes a number of other claims under Article 3 about the conditions of his detention, alleging that he was kept in solitary confinement for two weeks in July 2013 after being assaulted by another prisoner. He claims in particular that he was made to wait for two hours before being given any medical assistance following the assault and that, although he was then taken to hospital and treated for a broken ankle and a head injury, there was a delay in providing him with crutches afterwards and nurses refused to visit him in solitary

confinement. He further alleges that there were subsequent failures in providing him with psychiatric treatment, physiotherapy for his ankle and follow-up appointments for his head injury.

The Government deny that Mr Peňaranda Soto was placed in solitary confinement, submitting that he was held in a cell near the guard room for his own safety before being transferred a few weeks later to another cell. It also submits that various tests were carried out and treatment provided immediately following the assault, and that a number of follow-up appointments at the hospital were on record. Furthermore, when Mr Peňaranda Soto requested psychological help in 2014 he was seen regularly by a psychologist until his release.

The applicants in the second case also make a number of additional claims about the facility's conditions, including that it is infested with rats and cockroaches, does not provide adequate food or clothing, has an asbestos problem and tolerates passive smoking. All three applicants also make complaints about inadequate medical care for various ailments: Mr Yanez Pinon for not being referred to a psychiatrist despite his requests; Mr Owusu for headaches and delayed referral to an ophthalmologist; and Mr Del Rosario for not receiving treatment for his arthritis or being provided with tablets to treat a migraine.

One of the applicants in the second case, Mr Owusu, brought domestic proceedings to complain about these conditions of detention. His complaint was however dismissed in June 2016 for failure to submit evidence to prove his case.

According to the Government, pest control is carried out in the facility on a regular basis and the food is adequate. It also submitted photographs of various dishes served at the facility and stated that the dust in the prison was not from asbestos but was from Maltese limestone used to build the prison walls. The applicants were regularly seen by doctors and prescribed the relevant medicine.

In general, the Government contended that all four applicants are/were held in individual cells which were unlocked for up to ten hours per day, and even in the highest security unit (where the first applicant had been held) for a few hours per day, allowing them to move freely around common areas and access the exercise yards.

Lastly, Mr Peňaranda Soto alleges under Article 34 (right of individual petition) of the European Convention that the prison authorities had failed to forward his letters to the European Court of Human Rights and that this was in order to dissuade him from pursuing his case.

Khayrullina v. Russia (no. 29729/09)

The applicant, Faniya Khayrullina, is a Russian national who was born in 1957 and lives in Novyy (Tatarstan Republic, Russia). The case concerns her allegation that her husband was ill-treated by the police when held for questioning as a witness in a murder investigation and that as a result he died three months later.

According to the official records, Ms Khayrullina's husband was taken on 13 September 2002 to a police station in order to verify his identity. He ended up though being interviewed by the investigator in charge of a murder investigation, and admitted to having had a drink at the victim's house with a friend. Immediately afterwards, on being interviewed by a field officer, he changed his testimony and admitted that his friend had punched the murder victim during a quarrel. He was apparently told he could leave at 8 p.m., but had to come back the next day for another interview.

He was, however, found unconscious the same evening at the police station. He was taken to hospital, but died three months later without ever regaining consciousness. According to the autopsy report, he had died of asphyxia following strangulation.

The authorities subsequently concluded that Mr Kharyrullin had attempted suicide which had later resulted in his death. Both in the initial stages of an internal inquiry and throughout the subsequent criminal investigation, the investigating authorities essentially relied on testimony from medical

professionals, including paramedics called to the police station to provide emergency care, stating that Mr Kharyrullin had had no visible injuries. The investigation, which is still ongoing has been discontinued on a number of occasions since 2003 but was reopened with instructions from the prosecuting authorities to clarify certain contradictions, such as the place where Mr Kharyrullin had been found – in a cell, interrogation room or on a fifth floor balcony. Most recently, in November 2010, a decision was issued discontinuing the investigation owing to a lack of evidence to prove that any police officer had driven him to suicide.

In concurrent civil proceedings brought by Ms Kharyrullina for compensation, she was awarded 250,000 Russian roubles (approximately 7,066 euros) for her own psychological suffering as result of her husband's death. The courts – ultimately the Supreme Court in 2009 – refused, however, to award her compensation for her claim related to her husband's unlawful detention and the ineffective investigation.

Relying essentially on Article 2 (right to life), Ms Khayrullina alleges that her husband was tortured while in police custody, specifically by suffocation with a gas mask. She states that this was confirmed by the suspect in the murder investigation, who had been held at the police station at the same time as her husband, as he claimed to have been ill-treated in the same way and initially even confirmed hearing her husband screaming in the interrogation room next to him. She alleges that the police were thus either directly responsible for her husband's death or drove him into attempting suicide and that the ensuing investigation was ineffective.

She further complains under Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) and Article 5 § 5 (right to compensation) that her husband was unlawfully taken to the police station and detained and that her related compensation claim was turned down.

Krsmanović v. Serbia (no. 19796/14)

The applicant, Đorđe Krsmanović, is a Serbian national who was born in 1975 and lives in Zemun (Serbia). The case concerns the investigation into his allegation of ill-treatment when he was arrested and detained in the context of a large-scale police operation ordered following the assassination in 2003 of Serbian Prime Minister, Zoran Đinđić, and the Serbian Government's declaration of a state of emergency.

Mr Krsmanović was a member of the criminal group linked to the Zemun Clan (*Zemunski klan*), held responsible for the Prime Minister's assassination. During the police operation, known as Operation Sabre (*Sablja*), all members of the Zemun Clan and groups linked to it were arrested, including Mr Krsmanović.

Mr Krsmanović alleges that he was subjected to physical and verbal abuse, both during his arrest on 1 April 2003 and over the next 11 days, when he was held in solitary confinement at a police station. Over this period, he claims that he was routinely taken out of his cell for questioning and that he was beaten, kicked and had a truncheon inserted into his anus several times. On being transferred to a prison in Belgrade, he was examined by a prison doctor who reported bruising on the soles of his feet, the palms of his hand, and on his face, shoulders and buttocks. He was eventually charged, among other things, with drugs offences and sentenced to four years and ten months' imprisonment. He was released in June 2004 pending the outcome of appeal proceedings.

Mr Krsmanović's allegation of ill-treatment was investigated by three different authorities – the Inspector General's Service following a complaint brought by his mother in 2004; the prosecutor's office following a complaint lodged by Mr Krsmanović himself in 2007; and an investigative judge when Mr Krsmanović took over the criminal proceedings as a subsidiary prosecutor in 2008. However, all three investigations were terminated owing to a lack of evidence, either of ill-treatment or of someone's guilt. Several police officers were interviewed during the investigations, but no officers involved in the alleged abuse or any eyewitnesses were ever identified.

Mr Krsmanović lodged an appeal on points of law with the prosecutor's office and a constitutional appeal; both were rejected in 2010 and 2013, respectively.

Relying primarily on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Krsmanović complains of the authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into his allegations of ill-treatment.

A. v. Switzerland (no. 60342/16)

The case concerns the deportation of an Iranian asylum-seeker.

The applicant, Mr A., was born in 1982 and grew up in Iran. He entered Switzerland in 2009 and immediately claimed asylum.

He brought three sets of asylum proceedings, all without success. He was questioned in person in the first two sets of proceedings, with the help of an interpreter. Initially he stated that he had been arrested and imprisoned in Iran for demonstrating against the presidential elections, but managed to escape and flee the country with the help of a smuggler. In the meantime an Iranian court had sentenced him in his absence to 36 months' imprisonment. The asylum authorities found that this account was not credible or sufficiently substantiated. His first application was thus rejected and he was ordered to leave Switzerland in 2013.

In his second application he submitted at a hearing that he would be at risk if returned to Iran because he had meanwhile converted from Islam to Christianity. The asylum authorities doubted, however, that his conversion was genuine and lasting and again rejected his application.

In 2014 the Federal administrative Court dismissed an appeal by Mr A. against that decision. It considered that Christian converts would only face a risk of ill-treatment upon return to Iran if they were particularly exposed in the public arena on account of their Christian faith and could therefore be perceived as a threat by the Iranian authorities. This was not the case for Mr A., who was an ordinary member of a Christian circle and the Iranian authorities had most likely not even become aware of his conversion.

In 2016, in a third round of proceedings, his application was again rejected, essentially on the same grounds.

The State Secretariat for Migration thus set a deadline for Mr A.'s voluntary departure in October of the same year. However, his deportation had in the meantime been stayed on the basis of an interim measure granted by the European Court of Human Rights under Rule 39 of its Rules of Court, which indicated to the Swiss Government that he should not be deported to Iran for the duration of the proceedings before it.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) and Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr A. alleges that his conversion to Christianity puts him at a real risk of being killed or ill-treated if he were to be deported to Iran.

Kuveydar v. Turkey (no. 12047/05)

The applicant, Baykal Kuveydar, is a Turkish national who was born in 1973 and is currently serving a prison sentence of 20 years and ten months in Edirne (Turkey) for armed robbery, membership of a criminal organisation and illegally carrying weapons. The case concerns his allegation that he was ill-treated in police custody following his arrest and that the ensuing criminal proceedings against him were unfair.

In March 2001 Mr Kuveydar's house was searched in the context of an investigation into organised crime. The investigators found an unlicensed semi-automatic weapon in the house and Mr Kuveydar was immediately arrested. While in police custody he was examined on five separate occasions by different doctors. None of the medical reports indicated any trace of injury on his body. While in

custody he admitted to the police that he had threatened a certain İ.Y. and his son in order to obtain money. When subsequently questioned before the Public Prosecutor he reiterated most of his previous statements to the police, but denied being a member of a criminal organisation or threatening İ.Y.

At trial, however, during the second hearing on his case in December 2001, Mr Kuveydar retracted the statements he had made to the police and the Public Prosecutor, alleging that he had been ill-treated in police custody. Just before the third and last hearing on his case in September 2002, he requested that two witnesses – one of whom was indicated in both the bill of indictment and the public prosecutor's written observations before the court – be heard in his defence. The Istanbul State Security Court rejected his request, finding that examining the witnesses called by Mr Kuveydar would have no effect on the outcome of the case. The court thus found him guilty as charged, based on an overall assessment of the evidence. The Court of Cassation upheld this judgment in April 2004.

Mr Kuveydar was not represented at any stage of the criminal proceedings against him.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Kuveydar claims that he was blindfolded, beaten, subjected to Palestinian hanging and given electric shocks to his genitals while in police custody. He further alleges under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses) that the criminal proceedings against him were unfair because of the refusal to hear any witnesses for the defence, the use of statements he had made under duress to convict him and owing to unlawfully intercepted telephone conversations.

Öğrü and Others v. Turkey (nos. 60087/10, 12461/11, and 48219/11)

The three applicants, Mr Adnan Öğrü, Mr Veysel Kurtuluş Alabaş and Ms Beyhan Günyeli, are Turkish nationals who were born in 1954, 1986 and 1972 respectively. The case concerns the administrative fines imposed on the applicants for participating in demonstrations.

Between December 2009 and April 2010 the applicants, two of whom – Mr Öğrü and Ms Günyeli – were members of the local branch of the Human Rights Association, took part in peaceful demonstrations in the town of Adana. Mr Öğrü took part in three demonstrations, Mr Alabaş in five and Ms Günyeli in one. During the demonstrations scores or hundreds of people met up and marched, holding placards and chanting slogans and sometimes blocking road traffic. All the demonstrations broke up peacefully after the reading-out of a public statement. Some of them were preceded or accompanied by sit-ins.

Under a Gubernatorial Decree of November 2009 restricting the places and times demonstrations were authorised and prohibiting the carrying of placards and the chanting of slogans, the three applicants were ordered, on several occasions in the case of Mr Öğrü and Mr Alabaş, to pay administrative fines of 143 Turkish lira, or about 70 euros.

All three applicants appealed against the fines. Their appeals were dismissed under a series of decisions by the Adana District Court, which ruled that the fines imposed had been in conformity with the law and that the veracity of the charges against the applicants had not been contested. Only Mr Öğrü had one of his fines, imposed during a demonstration which was not one of those giving rise to the present application, cancelled by the district court by a decision of 19 April 2010. In its decision, the court, with reference to Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention and the case-law of the Court, concluded that the imposition of the fine had amounted to an indirect deprivation of the applicant's freedom of assembly.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) and Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association), the applicants allege that their fines amounted to a violation of their rights to freedom of expression and of peaceful assembly as secured under the Convention. The second applicant also relies on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) owing to the lack of a hearing during his appeal to the district court, and

on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) because he was unable to contest the dismissal of his appeal.

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.

Mandić and Popović v. Bosnia and Herzegovina (nos. 73944/13 and 78987/13)
Pleshchinskiy v. Russia (no. 37/06)
Sashchenko v. Russia (no. 50877/06)
Milovanović v. Serbia (no. 19222/16)

Thursday 21 December 2017

Gjikondi and Others v. Greece (no. 17249/10)

The applicants, Sefit Berdellima, Violeta Berdellima and Ana Gjikondi, are Albanian nationals who were born in 1938, 1948 and 1972 respectively and live in Gramsh (Albania). They are the parents and sister respectively of Luan Berdellima, who was killed in the centre of Athens in 2004 by an unidentified individual. The case concerns the investigation into the murder and the related court proceedings.

On 11 August 2004 Luan Berdellima and two other Albanian nationals (V.D. and I.S.) had a verbal altercation with I.L. outside a pizzeria in the centre of Athens. I.L. then left the scene of the altercation. After a while, the same day, Luan Berdellima went back to the pizzeria to meet his friend V.D.; he was struck in the face by a man who had dismounted from a motorbike, and remained unconscious on the ground. He was taken to hospital and died of his injuries on 25 August 2004.

On 26 August 2004, V.D. lodged a complaint with the public prosecutor with the Athens Criminal Court against I.L. and an unidentified person, alleging that they had committed the attack. He explained, in particular, that during their altercation I.L. had told them, in a threatening tone, "*you're going to find out who I am and what I'm going to do about you, and you'll regret ever having set foot in Greece*". On 30 August 2004 the Sub-Directorate on Offences against Life and Property found that the incident had amounted to deliberate homicide committed by two unidentified persons, and transmitted the file to the prosecution, which ordered an investigation in order to identify the perpetrators. On 23 June 2005 the applicants applied to join the proceedings as civil parties. On 14 December 2007 the Indictments Division of the District Court committed I.L. for trial. That decision was upheld on appeal and at cassation level. According to the applicants, they were not notified of those decisions.

On 15 and 21 January 2010 the Assize Court held two hearings in the absence of the applicants and of V.D. and I.S. The statement filed by V.D. during the preliminary investigation was read out at the hearing, his appearance in court having been deemed impossible because he lived abroad. Before the Court the applicants allege that V.D. and I.S. had been intimidated and, fearing for their lives, had left Greece for Albania and had refused to testify. On 12 February 2010 I.L. was acquitted for lack of evidence.

Meanwhile, three further procedures were initiated – proceedings concerning allegations of flaws in the main proceedings, an investigation into a police officer's possible involvement in the events and an investigation into alleged omissions by the judges responsible for the case – and subsequently discontinued.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain about the investigation and the judicial proceedings conducted in the present case. Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) read in conjunction with Articles 2 and 6, the applicants complain that the authorities committed several procedural errors, and that in particular they failed in their obligation to ascertain whether the events had been motivated by racism and did not examine the Albanian witnesses. Relying on Article 34 (right of individual application) they complain that they had on several occasions been refused access to the different case files in order to obtain copies and apply to the Court. Relying on Article 46 (binding force and execution of judgments), the applicants invite the Court to ask the Government to reopen the criminal proceedings.

Feldman and Slovyanskyy Bank v. Ukraine (no. 42758/05)

The case concerns the liquidation of a bank, Slovyanskyy Commercial Joint-Stock Bank, based in Zaporizhzhya in Ukraine. The applicants are the bank and its founder and majority shareholder, Borys Feldman, a Ukrainian national who was born in 1958 and lives in Dnipro, Ukraine.

In 2000 the Ukrainian authorities brought criminal proceedings for tax evasion and abuse of office by the management of the applicant bank. Mr Feldman was arrested as part of those proceedings.

An administrative procedure ensued, which was entrusted to the National Bank of Ukraine ("the NBU"). As a preliminary measure, the NBU suspended the applicant bank's licence. It was then put under temporary administration until 2001 when the NBU issued a resolution revoking the licence, terminating the powers of the bank's statutory bodies and ordering the bank's liquidation. A liquidation commission, essentially composed of NBU employees, was thus approved and set up. This eventually led to the bank's complete liquidation in 2012.

In the meantime, Mr Feldman attempted to challenge the NBU's decision revoking the licence before the courts, to no avail. Ultimately in April 2005 the Supreme Court of Ukraine rejected his claim as inadmissible because it found that he did not have standing to institute proceedings on behalf of the applicant bank and the claim fell under the jurisdiction of the commercial courts.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (access to court) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain about the decision to liquidate the applicant bank, alleging that it was unlawful and that they were unable to challenge it in 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.

Meskhidze v. Georgia (no. 55506/08)
Zoidze v. Georgia (no. 34989/12)
Hersi Muhyadin and Others v. Hungary (no. 22934/17)
Ján v. Hungary (no. 55021/15)
Lendvay v. Hungary (no. 60989/12)
Tinta v. Hungary (no. 16049/11)
M.B. v. the Netherlands (no. 63890/16)
Gerö Almeida Freitas v. Portugal (no. 81375/12)
Borlan v. Romania (no. 25091/13)
Dima and Reghiș v. Romania (no. 49392/09)
Mujea v. Romania (no. 68964/13)
Nonn and Others v. Romania (no. 21428/11)
Ţiglar v. Romania (no. 47600/10)

Khanipov v. Russia (no. 9829/11)
Shukyurov v. Russia (no. 59020/09)
Zverkov v. Russia (no. 21466/05)
Antić and Haliti v. Serbia (no. 10439/17)
Lakatoš v. Serbia (no. 31318/16)
Živojnović v. Serbia (no. 10354/17)
Peršuh v. Slovenia (no. 66721/14)
Bora v. Turkey (no. 30647/17)
Ivanishen v. Ukraine (no. 32566/08)
Shestopalova v. Ukraine (no. 55339/07)
Zakarpatturyst, Pat and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 41939/14, 42038/14, 49481/14, 43041/14, and 43049/14)

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)
Patrick Lannin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 44 18)