



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing nine judgments on Tuesday 21 September 2021 and 26 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 23 September 2021.

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 21 September 2021

[Barseghyan v. Armenia \(application no. 17804/09\)](#)

The applicant, Levon Barseghyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1967 and lives in Gyumri.

The case concerns the police preventing the applicant from holding a political protest in Theatre Square in central Gyumri on 2 March 2008, the day after a state of emergency had been declared in Yerevan following clashes between protestors and law enforcement. The clashes had occurred in the context of nationwide rallies alleging election irregularities after the February 2008 presidential election. The applicant refused to leave the area, and he was arrested and later fined in administrative proceedings.

Relying on Article 11 (freedom of assembly) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant argues that the ban on his protest was not justified as there had been no violence or uncontrollable emergency situation in Gyumri; in reality the police had cordoned off the square and no one could enter.

[Dareskizb Ltd v. Armenia \(no. 61737/08\)](#)

The applicant, Dareskizb Ltd, is an Armenian company which was founded in 1999 and has its registered office in Yerevan.

The case concerns actions by State authorities during a state of emergency following a presidential election in 2008, during which the applicant company was prevented from publishing its newspaper, *Haykakan Zhamanak*. It furthermore concerned the court proceedings that followed.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) and Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, the applicant complains of the ban on its publications issued as part of the state of emergency, that the court that examined its appeal was not a “tribunal established by law”, and of its inability to access a court.

[Aliyeva and Others v. Azerbaijan \(no. 66249/16 and six other applications\)](#)

The applicants are seven Azerbaijani nationals who all live in Baku.

The case concerns the applicants' complaint that the domestic courts failed to award them additional compensation, provided for under domestic law, for flats they owned in the Sabail District of Baku which had been expropriated in 2011 and early 2012 in order to expand a highway.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicants allege that the authorities had told them that additional compensation would only be possible after they had sold their flats to the State and that the domestic courts' refusal to make such awards contradicted other similar cases involving individuals living in the same neighbourhood.

Willems and Gorjon v. Belgium (nos. 74209/16 and three other applications)

The applicants, Ms C. Willems and Mr Y. J. Gorjon, are Belgian nationals who were born in 1971 and 1966 respectively and live in Gesves. Together with other defendants, they were tried before the Namur Criminal Court on various charges of avoiding value-added tax and were convicted in criminal proceedings.

The two initial applications (nos. 74209/16 and 75662/16) concern the alleged formalism arising from the Belgian Court of Cassation's refusal, in a judgment of 1 June 2016, to accept appeals on points of law lodged by the applicants against the judgments convicting them. The two other applications (nos. 19431/19 and 19653/19) concern the refusal by the Court of Cassation to reopen the criminal proceedings in spite of the Belgian Government's unilateral declaration, on the basis of which the Court had struck the applications out of its list of cases.

The applicants rely on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial).

Bērziņš and Others v. Latvia (no. 73105/12)

The applicants are three Latvian nationals who live in Katlakalns and Riga, Latvia.

The case concerns the applicants' complaints that they have not been able to access their plot of land in the parish of Garkalne since 2005 because of decisions designating the property as a protected water zone.

Relying on Article 1 Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain that they have not been able to access and use their property, without compensation or offer of a comparable plot of land.

Milosavljević v. Serbia (no. 2) (no. 47274/19)

The applicant, Ranko Milosavljević, is a Serbian national who was born in 1960 and lives in Kragujevac (Serbia).

The application concerns a civil defamation case brought against Svetlost, a weekly news magazine based in Kragujevac, and the applicant, the magazine's editor-in-chief, following publication in 2009 of an article alleging corruption in the management of the city's cemetery. The domestic courts found that the article had damaged the honour and reputation of the cemetery's director and ordered the applicant and the other defendants to pay compensation plus costs in the amount of approximately 1,241 euros.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicant complains about being sanctioned for the article's publication, arguing that it contributed to a debate on a matter of public interest, namely the functioning of a public burial company.

Kerem Çiftçi v. Turkey (no. 35205/09)

The applicant, Kerem Çiftçi, is a Turkish national who was born in 1970 and lives in Batman (Turkey).

The case concerns an arrest warrant against the applicant and his police custody for, among other things, being a member of a terrorist organisation (the PKK – Workers' Party of Kurdistan, an illegal armed organisation), attacking security forces using stones, sticks and Molotov cocktails and causing damage to public and private property. He was detained for approximately an hour and half in January 2007.

Relying on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), he alleges that his detention was unlawful as the arrest warrant had already been withdrawn one month earlier. He also alleges under Article 5 § 5 (enforceable right to compensation) that the domestic courts dismissed his compensation claim for unlawful detention.

Thursday 23 September 2021

[Anagnostakis and Others v. Greece \(no. 46075/16\)](#)

The applicants, Mr Nikolaos Anagnostakis, Ms Ioanna Anagnostaki Pouloupoulou and Mr Andreas Anagnostakis, are three Greek nationals who were born in 1983, 1949 and 1940 respectively and live in Ilioupoli. They are, respectively, the father and grandparents of a child who was two years old when the application was lodged.

The case concerns the access rights granted to the applicants, and the length of proceedings in which the opposing party was the child's mother.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair hearing) and 8 (right to respect for family life), the applicants complain, firstly, of delays in the proceedings and, secondly, about the once-weekly three-hour right of access granted by the domestic courts on a provisional basis pending a hearing scheduled for 4 June 2018.

[Dyluś v. Poland \(no. 12210/14\)](#)

The applicant, Paweł Dyluś, is a Polish national who was born in 1957 and lives in Poznań (Poland). He is a lawyer.

The case concerns disciplinary proceedings, at the close of which the Bar Council imposed a reprimand and ordered Mr Dyluś to pay the costs of the proceedings, which amounted to about 500 euros (EUR). Through his lawyer, the applicant lodged an appeal on points of law before the Supreme Court, challenging this decision.

Relying on Article 6 (right of access to a court), Mr Dyluś complains about the fact that the Supreme Court dismissed his appeal on points of law on the grounds that it had been drafted by Mr Dyluś himself, rather than by his lawyer.

[Ringier Axel Springer Slovakia, a.s. v. Slovakia \(no. 4\) \(no. 26826/16\)](#)

The applicant, Ringier Axel Springer Slovakia, a.s., (now known as News and Media Holding, a.s.), is a Slovak company which was established in 1990 and is based in Bratislava.

The case concerns a television programme in which a famous singer allegedly expressed support for marijuana legalisation and the journalist allegedly appeared to agree with him resulting in the applicant company being fined.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicant company argues that it merely presented the singer's opinions to inform the public about a matter of public interest.

[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 21 September 2021

Name	Main application number
Hissel v. Belgium	8638/12
Pissens and Eurometaal N.V. v. Belgium	66107/12

Thursday 23 September 2021

Name	Main application number
Vavan Ltd v. Armenia	50939/10
Gazanfar Mammadov v. Azerbaijan	4867/10
Guliyeva v. Azerbaijan	51424/08
Devriendt v. Belgium	35567/19
Nedić and Džojić v. Croatia	26813/15
Vidak v. Croatia	67141/14
Thouy and Others v. France	33136/20
Tkheldze v. Georgia	72475/10
Skoczylas and Scotchstone Capital Fund Ltd v. Ireland	43209/19
Iannini v. Italy	55951/16
Varano and Others v. Italy	62319/10
Siništaj v. Montenegro	31529/15
Ansion and Walczak v. Poland	71320/14
B.Ż. v. Poland	6386/17
Chojnowski and Others v. Poland	65146/11
Łabędź v. Poland	10949/15
Mroczek and Others v. Poland	25202/11
Nowak v. Poland	2290/14
Przywieczerski v. Poland	45153/19
S v. Poland	65200/12
Sadlik v. Poland	44180/17
Gerber v. Slovakia	14661/17
Kortik v. Turkey	58628/16

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

Press contacts

echrpess@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)

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.