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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 407 (2016)
16.12.2016

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 55 judgments and / or decisions on Tuesday 20 December 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 20 December 2016

Ljaskaj v. Croatia (application no. 58630/11)

The applicant, Prek Ljaskaj, is a Croatian national who was born in 1942 and lives in Kutina (Croatia). The case concerns his claim that his property was sold in enforcement proceedings for a fraction of its true value.

In 1989 Mr Ljaskaj concluded a contract of sale, by which he purchased a house in Kutina from three sellers. Though the price of the property had been recorded as 47,000 German marks, Mr Ljaskaj paid only 30,000. The sellers sued him for the difference. In 1994 the Kutina Municipal Court awarded a judgment in the sellers' favour.

Over 12 years later, in 2003, the sellers applied to have the judgment enforced. They claimed the judgment debt, plus the statutory interest generated on that sum since 1989, and costs. In March 2003, the Municipal Court issued a writ of execution to enforce the judgment, applicable to Mr Ljaskaj's immoveable property. In particular, the writ applied to Mr Ljaskaj's house.

The house was valued by a court-appointed expert at HRK 384,197. However, after two failed attempts to sell it at public auction, the restriction on the minimum sale price was removed. The property was eventually sold for only HRK 70,000. The sale was upheld in a decision of the Municipal Court in June 2009. Mr Ljaskaj appealed the decision, but the appeal was dismissed by the Sisak County Court. He then lodged a constitutional complaint, alleging violations of his right to equality before the law and his right of ownership. However, the Constitutional Court declared the application inadmissible, on the grounds that the contested decision was not open to constitutional review. The final decision was served on 6 June 2011.

Earlier that year, the Municipal Court had distributed the sale proceeds to Mr Ljaskaj's creditors, and ordered his eviction from the property.

Relying in substance on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Ljaskaj complains that his house was sold in the enforcement proceedings for less than one-fifth of its value. He maintains that this was contrary to the Enforcement Act and the consistent case-law of the domestic courts, which had prohibited the sale of immoveable property in enforcement proceedings for such low amounts.

Uspaskich v. Lithuania (no. 14737/08)

The applicant, Viktor Uspaskich, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1959 and lives in Kėdainiai (Lithuania). He is a businessman and former politician. The case concerns his complaint about his house arrest pending the investigation of a political corruption case in Lithuania. The proceedings were widely reported in the national media.

In May 2006 a criminal investigation was opened into the Labour Party, of which Mr Uspaskich was chairman at the time, on suspicion of financial fraud. Mr Uspaskich was suspected of doctoring his party's accounts. The Lithuanian prosecutors attempted to call him for questioning, but were informed that he had left for Russia. In August 2006 the Lithuanian courts thus ordered his arrest and remand in custody, on the grounds that he knew about the criminal proceedings against him, but had gone into hiding in Russia. The prosecutors attempted to obtain his extradition to Lithuania, without success.

While still in exile in Russia, Mr Uspaskich was elected to the Kedainiai city municipal council in February 2007. However, he refused this mandate a few months later, and in July 2007 he was named by the Labour Party as candidate in the parliamentary elections. Between autumn 2008 and spring 2014 he was elected alternately to the Seimas and the European Parliament, each time resigning his seat in one or the other body. During this period, his immunity from prosecution was lifted on a number of occasions, notably when he was elected to the Seimas in 2008 and when the European Parliament rejected his pleas in 2010 and 2015 to shield him from prosecution in Lithuania.

In the meantime, just before the parliamentary elections, he voluntarily returned to Lithuania on 26 September 2007 and was immediately arrested, questioned and remanded in custody. The next day the courts decided to change the remand measure to house arrest. He challenged the measures against him before the Central Electoral Commission and the courts. In particular, in the municipal elections of February 2007, his argument that the order to remand him custody interfered with his electoral rights was dismissed, first by the Central Electoral Commission and then by the Supreme Administrative Court – essentially on the grounds that the lifting of Mr Uspaskich's immunity had no connection with his participation in the municipal elections. Later, in the parliamentary elections of 2007, Mr Uspaskich appealed against the decisions to place him under house arrest. The courts, taking into account his right to stand for election, found that it was still in the public interest to uphold his house arrest. They notably found that he had previously gone into hiding and that there was reason to believe that he might try to obstruct the investigation against him.

He was finally released from house arrest in April 2008, once the pre-trial investigation was terminated. The house arrest was replaced with an order not to leave his place of residence for longer than seven days without informing the authorities. In June 2009 this measure was also revoked.

Ultimately, in February 2016 Mr Uspaskich was found guilty on appeal of doctoring his political party's accounts. The criminal case is currently pending before the Supreme Court.

Relying on Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections) to the European Convention, Mr Uspaskich complains that his house arrest prevented him from taking part on equal grounds with other candidates in the Seimas' elections of 2007. He alleges in particular that the ongoing pre-trial investigation against him was a convenient way to restrict his electoral rights, and disputes the suggestion that he had taken part in the elections only to obtain immunity. Lastly, he complains that the State had fuelled negative press coverage about him during his election campaign on account of the criminal proceedings against him, alleging that he could not defend his reputation directly with voters as he had been under house arrest.

Sagvolden v. Norway (no. 21682/11)

The applicant, Torill Sagvolden, was a Norwegian national who was born in 1929 and died in 2015. The case concerns the enforced sale of her apartment.

In 2004 Ms Sagvolden obtained an apartment in a housing co-operative. Prior to acquiring the property, she entered into a written agreement, whereby she had stated that she would live in the apartment alone, not with her son. However, at some time thereafter her son moved in with her. On repeated occasions, he was involved in quarrels and violent episodes with certain neighbours. In

2006 and 2008 he was convicted for several instances of violence and disturbing behaviour, most of which were committed against his neighbours between 2005 and 2008. A restraining order was imposed on him with respect to four neighbours, the last one expiring in April 2009.

Later that year, the board of the housing co-operative initiated proceedings against Ms Sagvolden, in order to enforce a sale of the apartment. The Oslo City Court upheld the claim that Ms Sagvolden had substantially defaulted on her obligations, and granted the enforced sale. The court decided the case without an oral hearing, on the ground that Ms Sagvolden's objections were manifestly ill-founded. Ms Sagvolden appealed the judgment, but her appeals were rejected by both the Borgarting High Court and the Supreme Court. Ms Sagvolden and/or her son lodged numerous other proceedings relating to the sale of the apartment, but all of these were unsuccessful.

Ms Sagvolden died in November 2015. Her heirs sought to pursue the application.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), Ms Sagvolden complained that the decision not to hold an oral hearing in her case had been unjustified. Furthermore, referring to the omission to hold a hearing, she complained that the order compelling her to sell her apartment had amounted to an unjustified interference with her rights under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life and the home).

Three cases concerning the expulsion of Georgian nationals from Russia in autumn 2006

Three cases concern the collective expulsion of Georgians from Russia, an issue previously addressed by the Court in the inter-State case *Georgia v. Russia (I)* [GC] (no. 13255/07) of 3 July 2014.

The background is as follows. During the period from the end of September 2006 to the end of January 2007, identity checks of Georgian nationals residing in Russia were carried out. Many were subsequently arrested and taken to police stations. After a period of custody, they were grouped together and taken by bus to a court, which summarily imposed administrative penalties on them and gave decisions ordering their administrative expulsion from Russian territory. Subsequently, some were taken to detention centres for foreigners where they were detained for varying periods of time, then taken by bus to various airports, and expelled to Georgia by aeroplane. Others left Russian territory by their own means.

Berdzenishvili and Others v. Russia (nos. 14594/07, 14597/07, 14976/07, 14978/07, 15221/07, 16369/07 and 16706/07)

The applicants are 19 Georgian nationals who were born between 1948 and 1991 and live in Kareli, Bagdady, Tbilisi, Rustavi, Zugdidi, and Telavi (Georgia). One application is continued by the son of an original applicant, who had died before the Court considered his case.

The applicants claimed that they had been among the Georgians who were arrested and expelled from Russia in the autumn of 2006. They made the following complaints in particular.

Seven of the applicants rely on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) to complain that their expulsion decisions were based on unfair trials. 18 of the applicants rely on Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens) to complain that they were expelled collectively. These applicants also rely on Article 1 of Protocol No. 7 (procedural safeguards relating to expulsion of aliens) to the European Convention to complain that the Russian government infringed the procedural guarantees that should be applied in cases of deportation. All of the applicants relied on Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 (right to liberty and security / right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court), to complain that they were arbitrarily detained, and had no opportunity to challenge the legality of their detention. They also rely on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) to complain that the conditions of their detention were inhuman and degrading, including allegations that the cells were severely overcrowded and insanitary. Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken in conjunction with various other articles, the applicants complain that they had no effective remedy to challenge their unlawful arrests, detention

and expulsion. Furthermore, the applicants rely on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with various articles, Article 17 (prohibition of abuse of rights) and Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) to complain that the actions of the Russian authorities were taken because of their nationality or ethnicity, and were not based on infractions of the Russian immigration rules.

Dzidzava v. Russia (no. 16363/07)

The applicant, Nino Dzidzava, is a Georgian national who was born in 1959 in Senaki (Georgia). The case concerns the death of her husband, Tengiz Togonidze, whilst he was being deported.

At the time of the expulsions, Mr Togonidze was living in St Petersburg without a valid visa. He was arrested and detained in October 2006. A court ordered that he be held in a special detention centre, before being expelled from the country. Despite notifying the authorities that he suffered from asthma attacks, Mr Togonidze was detained in overcrowded and insanitary conditions. The Consul of Georgia in Russia at the time visited the detention centre. He observed that Mr Togonidze was having difficulties breathing, and that his face had turned black. The consul requested that Mr Togonidze be transferred to a hospital, but no transfer was made.

Two weeks after he was first arrested, Mr Togonidze was transported with 24 other Georgian nationals by bus to Domodedovo airport, in order to be deported. However, the bus had been unventilated, and Mr Togonidze's health deteriorated during the journey. After leaving the bus and taking a few steps on his way to the terminal, he collapsed and died.

Relying in particular on Article 2 (right to life) and Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Ms Dzidzava complains that the Russian authorities held her husband in degrading conditions and provided him with insufficient medical care. This allegedly led to his death, which Ms Dzidzava claims was never properly investigated by the Russian authorities.

Shioshvili and Others v. Russia (no. 19356/07)

The applicants are Ms Lia Shioshvili (who was born in 1977 and lives in Gurjaani, Georgia), and her four children, born respectively in 1995, 1997, 2000, and 2004. They are all Georgian nationals.

Ms Shioshvili and her children settled in Russia in 2003. On 7 November 2006 the Ruzskiy District Court of the Moscow Region issued an expulsion decision against Ms Shioshvili. The applicants all left Moscow on 20 November 2006. Due to suspended transport links between Russia and Georgia, they boarded a train headed to Baku (Azerbaijan). Ms Shioshvili was eight months pregnant at the time. The four other applicants were aged eleven, nine, six and two.

At 10.30pm on 22 November 2006, the train was on its way to the Russia/Azerbaijan border. According to the applicants, the following then took place. The train was stopped by Russian migration officers. They confiscated 400 US dollars from Ms Shioshvili (on the alleged grounds that they had not been declared), before informing all of the Georgian passengers that there were irregularities in their documents, and that they could not continue. The Georgians were then made to leave the train, and walk to a bus that would eventually take them to Derbent. The journey was particularly difficult for Ms Shioshvili. She had to travel whilst carrying a suitcase and her youngest child, outside in cold weather, whilst in a state of advanced pregnancy and worrying about the health of her children and unborn child. She made repeated oral complaints to the migration officers, but to no avail. Upon arrival in Derbent, the group was asked to visit the migration service office. The applicants waited for two hours outside, before the group was taken to Derbent train station at 3 a.m. to spend the night. No food or water was provided, and the Georgians had to pay 500 rubles to the police guards if they wished to use the toilet. The following morning they returned to the migration office, where they spent the whole day waiting outside in temperatures of 5°C.

By the evening of 23 November, Ms Shioshvili's health had deteriorated, her children were crying and coughing, and no food, water or shelter was offered by the authorities. The group of Georgians

managed to rent an overcrowded flat in Derbent, where the applicants stayed whilst making repeated visits to the migration office. On 29 November, Ms Shioshvili and her three eldest children attempted to cross the border to Azerbaijan. However, they were turned back on the grounds that the decision ordering the expulsion had only concerned Ms Shioshvili, and not her children. Ms Shioshvili's health worsened, as she suffered from a cold, fever, depression and repeated asthma attacks.

Finally, by 4 December 2006, Ms Shioshvili was provided with all of the necessary documents for her and her children to leave Russia. After a further difficult journey through Azerbaijan, they arrived in Georgia the next day. However, Ms Shioshvili's health continued to weaken, as she suffered from severe cough and fever, an asthma attack and severe abdominal pain. On 15 December, she gave birth to a stillborn baby.

In July 2008, Ms Shioshvili lodged a complaint about the events with the General Prosecutor's office of the Russian Federation. She was notified that the complaint had been passed to the Prosecutor of Derbent, but received no further contact about her case. The Russian Government maintains that the border control services did not bring any Georgian nationals to the migration services on 22 or 23 November 2016.

Relying on Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement), the applicants complain that their freedom to leave Russia was restricted without any justification. Relying on Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens), they further complain that they, as Georgian nationals, were collectively expelled from Russia without an examination of their individual cases. Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), they complain that the conditions they were exposed to after being prevented from crossing the border had led to physical suffering, feelings of humiliation and negative effects on their health. They also rely on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken in conjunction with Article 3, to complain that they had no access to an effective remedy to address the alleged violations of Article 3. Finally, the applicants rely on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with various articles, to complain that they were subjected to discrimination on the ground of their ethnic origin.

Radzhab Magomedov v. Russia (no. 20933/08)

The applicant, Radzhab Gasayniyevich Magomedov, is a Russian national who was born in 1968 and is serving a prison sentence in Samara (Russia). The case concerns his prosecution for car theft.

In December 2004, Mr Magomedov was suspected of being involved in a series of car thefts. According to the government, the police applied for a judicial authorisation to tap his phone, which was provided by the Samara Regional Court. Mr Magomedov was arrested and charged later that month. He was then kept in pre-trial detention until his trial in the Samara Regional Court in March 2007. The court found Mr Magomedov guilty of 11 car thefts and sentenced him to 12 years' imprisonment. The conviction was upheld on appeal by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Magomedov complains that, during and after his arrest, he was beaten by police officers. He also complains of the conditions during his detention (including allegations of overcrowding, bedbugs, and extreme temperatures); and the conditions of his transport between prison and court (in particular, that he was given an insufficient chance to rest and barely any food; and that the conditions in the transport van made it difficult to breathe, with stiflingly hot temperatures in summer). Relying on Article 5 § 3 (entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial), Mr Magomedov claims that his pre-trial detention was excessively long. Finally, relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and the correspondence), he complains that, though his intercepted communications had been relied upon as evidence against him in trial, the court order authorising the interception was never disclosed to him.

Yusupova v. Russia (no. 66157/14)

The applicant, Petimat Yusupova, is a Russian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Grozny (the Chechen Republic, Russia). The case concerns the failure of the domestic authorities to enforce a court judgment that would grant Ms Yusupova a residence order in respect of her child.

Ms Yusupova had a child in June 2007. At the time she lived together with the father, A.A., but the couple separated three months later. The child continued to live with Ms Yusupova. However, in August 2011 the applicant's brother-in-law took the child to see A.A. who was visiting from Moscow. The child was never returned. A.A. took the boy to Moscow, and Ms Yusupova has not seen him since.

Ms Yusupova applied to the domestic courts, seeking to determine the child's place of residence as being with her. The Oktyabrskiy District Court of Grozny made an order deciding that the child should live with Ms Yusupova, which was upheld on appeal. The District Court issued a writ of execution in August 2013.

Since that time, the enforcement file has been passed between a number of different domestic authorities. However, to date none of those authorities know the whereabouts of A.A. or Ms Yusupova's child, and the District Court's order remains unenforced.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Ms Yusupova complains that the authorities failed to enforce the judgment granting her a residence order in respect of her son.

Just Satisfaction

Sociedad Anónima del Ucieza v. Spain (no. 38963/08)

The applicant company, Sociedad Anónima del Ucieza, is a limited company founded in 1978 under Spanish law, based in Ribas de Campos (Palencia).

The case concerned the company's ownership claim over religious buildings on a plot of land which had formerly belonged to the Catholic Church and which the company purchased at a public auction.

In July 1978 the company purchased land at Ribas de Campos. The entry in the land register mentioned that a church, a house, a number of norias, a poultry yard and a mill formed an enclave within the plot of land. The land had belonged to the former Premonstratensian monastery of Santa Cruz de la Zarza, which had been part of the Santa Cruz Priory, founded in the 12th century.

In December 1994, the Diocese of Palencia entered in the land register, in its own name, a plot of land comprising a Cistercian-style church, a sacristy and a capitular chamber which had once formed part of the old Premonstratensian monastery of Santa Cruz, and which were located on the land owned, according to the land register, by the applicant company. Even though its name appeared in the register as the owner of the land in question, the applicant company was neither informed of nor asked about this new entry in the register. Having been informed after the event, it submitted complaints to the Diocese, which replied that the property in question had always belonged *de facto* to the Diocese of Palencia under the Law on the dismantling of church property of 2 September 1841, which excluded churches and cathedrals and their annexes from the dismantling process. The applicant company brought an action against the Diocese of Palencia to declare void the entry made in the land register by the Diocese in 1994 concerning the church and its annexes. The company's action was dismissed, as was its subsequent appeal. On 14 June 2005 the Supreme Court declared inadmissible an appeal on points of law by the company. The company then lodged an *amparo* appeal with the Constitutional Court, which on 26 February 2008 declared the appeal inadmissible as lacking any constitutional basis.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), the applicant company submitted that it had been deprived on unduly formalistic grounds of its right of access to an appeal on points of law before the Supreme Court. Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), it complained that it

had been deprived of part of its property in the absence of any public interest and without any compensation on the basis of a law predating the Constitution.

In the judgment on the merits delivered on 4 November 2014 the Court held, unanimously, that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) of the Convention and, by a majority, that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention. It held that the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) of the Convention was not ready for decision and reserved it for decision at a later date. The Court will deal with this question in its judgment of 20 December 2016.

Lindstrand Partners Advokatbyrå AB v. Sweden (no. 18700/09)

The applicant, Lindstrand Partners Advokatbyrå AB, is a Swedish law firm. The case concerns a search undertaken on its premises by the Tax Agency in the course of audits which were being carried out on two other companies.

The Tax Agency suspected that significant amounts of money had been shielded from Swedish taxation through irregular transactions between a client company of Lindstrand Partners, SNS-LAN Trading AB, and a Swiss company.

On 4 March 2008, the Tax Agency applied to the County Administrative Court to take coercive measures in respect of SNS-LAN, in particular the search and seizure of certain documents and other material which might shed light on the ownership of the Swiss company, and its dealings with SNS-LAN. As SNS-LAN had recently been liquidated and had no business premises of its own, the Tax Agency requested that the search be conducted at two other addresses linked to an individual who had been controlling the company, Mr Jurik. One of the addresses was the offices of Lindstrand Partners, selected on the basis that Mr Jurik was an associate there. The application to search the premises was approved on 10 March 2008.

The search, which had been extended to cover the parent company of SNS-LAN, Draupner Universal AB, was conducted four days later by officials from the Enforcement Authority Agency in Stockholm and several auditors from the Tax Agency. Cupboards, shelves, and computers in the offices were searched, and a safe was opened. No material of relevance was found at the offices, but the officials did seize and search material at a flat linked to Mr Jurik. This included data drives, which Lindstrand Partners claimed belonged to them.

Lindstrand Partners and SNS appealed against the County Administrative Court judgment of 10 March 2008. On 7 April 2008, the Administrative Court of Appeal in Stockholm dismissed Lindstrand Partners' appeal stating that, while the appealed judgment did allow the use of coercive measures on the firm's premises, the firm itself had not been the subject of the measures; the search was carried out as it was assumed that documents relevant to the audit of SNS would be found there. The appellate court therefore concluded that Lindstrand Partners was not affected by the judgment in such a way that it was entitled to appeal against it. On 19 June, the Supreme Administrative Court refused Lindstrand Partners leave to appeal.

Furthermore, proceedings were initiated with a view to have certain seized material exempted from the Tax Agency's audit. The request of Lindstrand Partners was again dismissed for lack of legal standing, the final decision being taken by the Supreme Administrative Court on 28 January 2009. The request of Draupner was examined on the merits, however, leading to some documents being exempted as they were deemed to be of a private nature. These proceedings became final on 8 May 2012 through the Supreme Administrative Court's decision to refuse leave to appeal.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Lindstrand Partners complain that the firm's privacy rights were infringed by the fact that the Tax Agency had been given access to search its premises and to seize data drives allegedly belonging to the firm. Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 8, Lindstrand Partners further complain that

they were denied standing in the administrative appeal proceedings, and that a request made by them for certain documents to be exempted from the audit had been refused.

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.

Pirgurban v. Azerbaijan (no. 39254/10)
Atanasov v. Bulgaria (no. 47023/11)
Esposito and Frongillo v. Italy (nos. 61375/10 and 48678/11)
Smaniotto v. Luxembourg (no. 63296/14)
Baciună and Others v. Romania (nos. 35402/15, 39466/15, and 41691/15)
Bona-Mura and Others v. Romania (nos. 15291/15, 29590/15, 46140/15, 46243/15, 54957/15, 55343/15 and 19331/16)
Bota and Dragomir v. Romania (nos. 29917/15 and 51851/15)
Botomei and S.C. Bartolo Prod Com S.R.L. v. Romania (no. 59097/09)
Fâțan and Others v. Romania (nos. 75151/14, 10126/15, 17363/15, 19620/15 and 44935/15)
FIN.CO.GE.RO SpA v. Romania (no. 42556/13)
Fodor and Others v. Romania (nos. 41139/14, 77366/14, 222/15, 3527/15, 3601/15, 18122/15, 18729/15, 41655/15, 50505/15, 51773/15, 60530/15 and 8342/16)
Martinescu v. Romania (no. 9164/10)
Miclea and Others v. Romania (nos. 75732/14, 20243/15, 46508/15, 48826/15 and 3895/16)
Serbanescu v. Romania (no. 43638/10)
Sidor and Găbudean v. Romania (nos. 15558/15 and 41091/15)
Silaghi and Others v. Romania (nos. 57224/14, 59443/14, 44077/15, 53580/15, 1414/16 and 7495/16)
Urbanovici v. Romania (no. 49989/15)
Alekseyev and Others v. Russia (nos. 20786/10, 15542/11, 43632/11, 69849/11, 77929/11, 7996/12, 31624/12, 33995/12 and 35733/12)
Akhmedzhanov v. Russia (no. 63793/10)
Bezrukov and Shcherbakov v. Russia (nos. 34550/08 and 59065/10)
Chernova v. Russia (no. 53346/10)
Devyatov and Others v. Russia (nos. 24967/06, 13708/08, 43584/11, 2906/14, 68255/14, 72879/14 and 77966/14)
Golubev and Others v. Russia (nos. 11032/08, 35021/09, 4303/11, 8820/14, 43487/14 and 153/15)
Kalacheva and Others v. Russia (nos. 16058/12, 57607/12, 34075/14, 62799/14 and 77796/14)
Lyubimov and Others v. Russia (nos. 26374/04 and 46993/06)
Meshkov and Others v. Russia (nos. 12505/06, 20767/08, 26434/08, 7690/09, 40611/09, 64856/09 and 15672/10)
Prokhorenkov and Others v. Russia (nos. 57872/13, 59590/13 and 1618/15)
Rogov and Others v. Russia (nos. 59396/08, 9411/10, 54964/10, 23104/11, 66611/11, 76879/14 and 21806/15)
Silayev and Others v. Russia (nos. 48336/13, 4065/14, 5387/14, 12365/14, 27560/14, 32628/14 and 35197/14)
Terekhin and Others v. Russia (nos. 21827/05, 11724/06, 44850/09, 41275/10, 46152/10, 27931/11, 42232/11, 42594/11 and 44400/11)
Zakharov and Others v. Russia (nos. 58480/10, 50349/13, 56745/13, 57256/13, 61172/13, 78686/13 and 728/14)
Maxian and Maxianová v. Slovakia (no. 65579/14)
Comunidad de Proprietarios Pando Número 20 v. Spain (no. 64204/10)

Ruiz-Villar Ruiz v. Spain (no. 16476/11)
Kazic and Others v. Sweden (no. 41252/16)
Ivanchenko and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 13001/08, 27356/09, 50052/10 and 755/11)
Kalinichenko and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 22325/08, 61722/08, 62604/15 and 19184/16)
Kheyfets and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 51239/07, 73143/10, 18896/11 and 9178/14)
Kovalyov and Sakhanenko v. Ukraine (nos. 23645/08 and 51152/11)
Kupenko and Others v. Ukraine (no. 26570/13 and 37 other applications)
Logusheva and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 42819/09, 46757/09 and 16214/10)
Malitskaya and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 15962/07, 51907/07, 20387/09 and 25898/15)
Semkovych and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 27758/05, 36957/06, 47763/08, 23969/15 and 59799/15)
Viznyura and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 23975/07, 4125/08, 10614/10 and 2705/11)
Zhuravel and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 53967/07, 47800/09, 26292/10, 23464/11, 32214/11 and 14721/15)

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)