

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing three judgments on Tuesday 21 October 2025 and 77 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 23 October 2025.

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 October 2025

[Abdulaal Naser and Others v. Denmark \(application no. 46571/22\)](#)

The applicants are 21 Iraqi nationals who were born between 1952 and 1981.

Investigations by the Danish Military Prosecution Services into allegations of ill-treatment of detainees during that operation were discontinued in 2014 and 2016, as it did not appear that any criminal offences had been committed. In subsequent proceedings instituted by the applicants in Denmark, the Supreme Court, among other things, upheld findings of fact by the High Court that Danish forces had not had command of the Iraqi military or police forces and had not participated in the detention of the applicants.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture) of the European Convention on Human Rights, in particular, the applicants complain that they were subjected to ill-treatment by Danish soldiers during the operation of 25 November 2004 and that the Danish State was liable because they fell within the extraterritorial jurisdiction of Denmark.

[Mortensen v. Denmark \(no. 16756/24\)](#)

The applicant, Mathias Friis Mortensen, is a Danish national who was born in 1989 and lives in Kolind (Denmark).

The case concerns Mr Mortensen's conviction for writing a post in 2021 on (the at the time named) Twitter, calling into question the fact that a controversial leader of a political party, R.P., was "allowed to be a Nazi... [whereas another person was convicted for calling a police officer an idiot.]". R.P., the founder and leader of the right-wing and anti-Islam political party Stram Kurs, brought defamation proceedings against Mr Mortensen. The courts found him guilty in 2023, ruling that the term "Nazi" had been unfounded. He was given fines and ordered to pay compensation to R.P., sanctions which amounted cumulatively to approximately 5,400 euros.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention, Mr Mortensen alleges that his freedom to express an opinion on a matter of public interest, namely the administration of justice in Denmark, was breached and that the criminal sanction was particularly severe.

Just Satisfaction

[Naskov and Others v. North Macedonia \(nos. 31620/15, 34859/15, and 14659/16\)](#)

The applicants are 10 Macedonians/citizens of the Republic of North Macedonia, who were born between 1937 and 1952 and live in Skopje.

The case concerns the just satisfaction to be awarded following the European Court's [judgment of 12 December 2023](#) concerning the quashing of a final restitution order conferring on the applicants title to a plot of land.

In the 2023 judgment the Court found that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention.

As the question of pecuniary damage under Article 41 (just satisfaction) was not ready for decision, the Court reserved it. It will deliver its judgment on this question on 21 October 2025.

Thursday 23 October 2025

[Fillon and Others v. France \(no. 24326/24\)](#)

The applicants, François Fillon, Penelope Fillon (his wife) and Marc Joulaud (Mr Fillon's deputy in the National Assembly from 2002 to 2007), are French nationals who were born in 1954, 1955 and 1967 respectively and live in Solesmes and Sablé-sur-Sarthe. Penelope Fillon is also a British national.

The application concerns the fairness of the trial of Mr Fillon, his wife and Mr Joulaud in the so-called "fake jobs" case.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (right to a fair trial), the applicants submit that they did not have access to an independent and impartial tribunal, on account of the "pressure" exerted by the Principal Public Prosecutor in the pre-trial stage of the proceedings against them. They also submit that both the manner in which the prosecutors were appointed and the feedback required by the Principal Public Prosecutor demonstrated a lack of independence on the part of the prosecutors who applied for proceedings to be initiated against them.

Relying on the same provision, the second and third applicants complain that the Court of Cassation, on the basis of a subsequent decision delivered by the Constitutional Council on a request for a preliminary ruling on constitutionality (*question prioritaire de constitutionnalité*) lodged by the first applicant, chose not to rule on their application to have the judgment of 9 May 2022 of the Paris Court of Appeal set aside.

Relying on Article 7 (no punishment without law), the first applicant also submits that the offence of embezzlement of public funds provided for by Article 432-15 of the Criminal Code is not applicable to persons holding elected office when exercising their legislative power.

[Ayala Flores v. Italy \(no. 16803/21\)](#)

The applicant, Elisabeth Ayala Flores, is a Peruvian national who was born in 1957 and lives on the island of Procida in the Bay of Naples (Italy).

In the early 1990s the applicant and her husband built a 30 sq. m house on a plot of land he owned on Procida and set up home there. In August 1996 the municipality ascertained that it had been built without a building permit or authorisation, which had been required given that it was located in a highly seismic zone and was subject to landscape constraints (*vincoli paesaggistici*) due to it being in an area of outstanding natural beauty. In May 2002 the applicant was found guilty of the offence of unauthorised construction. Consequently, a demolition order of the construction was issued by the criminal court. In March 2016 the Public Prosecutor served the applicant with a notice to comply with the demolition order.

The case concerns the proportionality of the enforcement of the demolition order with the conviction and the possibility of having it reviewed within the national legal framework in respect of its impact on the right to a home. It seems that the building has not yet been demolished.

Ms Ayala Flores complains that the enforcement of the demolition order would disproportionately affect her, and that the domestic courts had failed to carry out a proportionality assessment, in breach of her rights under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

[Tartamella and Others v. Italy \(nos. 26338/19, 1823/21, and 12868/22\)](#)

The applicants, Francesca Tartamella, Barbara Tartamella, Szilvia Koka, and Silvia Santorelli, were born in 1982, 1980, 1974 and 1985, respectively. Francesca Tartamella and Barbara Tartamella are Italian nationals; Ms Koka is Hungarian; and Ms Santorelli is Romanian. They live in Perigua (Italy), London, Costa (Corsica, France) and Savignano (Italy) respectively.

The case concerns the seizure and confiscation of assets belonging to them, the value of which was deemed to be equivalent to the proceeds from offences committed by their family members. The measures were based on the finding that, even though the applicants were the formal owners of the assets, those assets were at the disposal of the offenders.

Relying on Articles 7 (no punishment without law) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain that, by seizing and confiscating their assets, the domestic courts had punished them for an offence committed by others and that the seizure and confiscation had been disproportionate and not sufficiently foreseeable. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), Ms Koka also complains that she did not have access to an effective remedy by which to contest the confiscation of her assets.

[A.J. and L.E. v. Spain \(nos. 40312/23 and 40388/23\)](#)

The applicants, Ms A.J. and Ms L.E., are Spanish nationals.

The case concerns the alleged failure of the Spanish authorities to conduct an effective investigation into the applicants' complaints that they had been drugged and sexually assaulted (by chemical submission), as well as into the subsequent loss and manipulation of crucial evidence that was in police custody. The applicants allege that they were rendered unconscious through the administration of substances in a bar and subjected to non-consensual sexual acts in December 2016.

The applicants complain that the numerous deficiencies in the investigation, including the loss and manipulation of evidence by the police and the excessive length of the proceedings, violated their rights under Articles 3 (lack of effective investigation) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

[Otegi Mondragon and Others v. Spain \(no. 14186/24\)](#)

The applicants are five Spanish nationals who were born between 1956 and 1981. In September 2011, they were convicted by the *Audiencia Nacional* (National High Court) for being members of the terrorist organisation ETA. In May 2012 the Supreme Court partially upheld their subsequent appeals and their sentences were reduced.

The case concerns the review proceedings following the European Court's subsequent 2018 judgment [Otegi Mondragón and Others v. Spain](#), in which the Court found a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention on the grounds that the applicants had not been tried by an impartial tribunal. By the time the Court had published its judgment, the applicants had fully served their sentences, except for one of the applicants, who remained disqualified from holding public office until 28 February 2021.

Instead of reviewing the May 2012 judgment and declaring the judgment of 16 September 2011 of the *Audiencia Nacional* null and void and cancelling their criminal records, as requested by the applicants, the Supreme Court ordered the reopening of the appeal proceedings and delivered a judgment on 15 December 2020, setting aside the first-instance judgment and remitting the case for retrial by a newly composed court. Following an *amparo* appeal, that judgment was declared null and void by the Constitutional Court in January 2024 and the effect of the Supreme Court's May 2012 judgment maintained, as the applicants had refused a retrial.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) read in the light of Article 46 (binding force and execution of judgments), the applicants complain that, in spite of the European Court's finding that they had been convicted in violation of their right to an impartial tribunal, their guilt and convictions were maintained.

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.

Thursday 23 October 2025

Name	Main application number
Safaryan v. Armenia	5567/16
Ayvazova v. Azerbaijan	11431/15
Ismayilov v. Azerbaijan	21786/20
Virjina Kichik Muassisasi v. Azerbaijan	36354/15
I.C. v. Belgium	8575/20
Dimitrov v. Bulgaria	26489/22
Neshkov and Others v. Bulgaria	62531/19
Nikiforov v. Bulgaria	16379/22
Rangelov and Others v. Bulgaria	49395/21
Sakaliev and Others v. Bulgaria	16355/22
Vukev and Others v. Bulgaria	35275/21
Crites and Rabinovitz v. the Czech Republic	30632/23
Hlaváček v. the Czech Republic	21873/21
Adjadj and Others v. France	41503/18
Aubry v. France	31130/20
Société Générale des Textiles Balsan v. France	24267/23
Ahmed and Mia v. Greece	17504/22
Dervisis and Others v. Greece	55398/20
Ethiki Enosi Plioktiton Epaggelmaton Alieon I Mesogios and Fatouros v. Greece	11009/23
Frantzeskaki and Others v. Greece	60806/17
M.J. v. Greece	51975/17
Megagiannis v. Greece	1868/18
Mitsou and Others v. Greece	10798/23
Panopoulou and Others v. Greece	28983/20
Qadeer and Others v. Greece	52176/20
Sakellaris and Others v. Greece	43594/16
Vernardakis v. Greece	53097/20
BK1 and Others v. Hungary	35610/22
Calvache and Others v. Hungary	4018/25
Rácz and Others v. Hungary	3037/25
Rádai and Others v. Hungary	9551/25
Sahara Bank S.A. v. Hungary	4191/21
Barbieri and Others v. Italy	76462/12

Name	Main application number
Ciucci and Piccioni v. Italy	17259/17
Tripputi and Others v. Italy	24604/16
Vallesinella S.a.s v. Italy	35333/10
Andronesi v. the Republic of Moldova	26806/15
Business-Investiții pentru Toți S.A. v. the Republic of Moldova	48998/10
Ceachir v. the Republic of Moldova	13730/15
Cedron-G.I.S. SRL v. the Republic of Moldova	75193/16
Cojocari v. the Republic of Moldova	6576/18
Colbasiuc v. the Republic of Moldova	57074/13
Orbu v. the Republic of Moldova	10698/19
Tețcu v. the Republic of Moldova	25218/20
Țurcan v. the Republic of Moldova	25244/20
Urusbiev and Others v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia	33519/15
Bărbieru v. Romania	32334/21
Danci and Others v. Romania	3870/21
Jovičić and Kostić v. Serbia	21710/23
A.B. and Others v. Slovakia	34349/24
Khúebachová and Khúebach v. Slovakia	8481/24
Lacková and Lacko v. Slovakia	32769/22
Lovše v. Slovenia	25439/23
SIP Nepremičnine d.o.o. v. Slovenia	26267/22
R.G. v. Switzerland	30036/22
N.R. v. Türkiye	5137/19
Bilko and Others v. Ukraine	35442/13
Boyko and Others v. Ukraine	25475/23
Bregey v. Ukraine	40066/18
Garkusha v. Ukraine	31064/16
Genger and Others v. Ukraine	54891/22
Kostyuk and Others v. Ukraine	31762/19
Lutsyshyn v. Ukraine	28232/24
Markush v. Ukraine	37358/21
Naydyonov and Vedutenko v. Ukraine	56181/15
Odarenko v. Ukraine	23906/15
Oliynyk and Others v. Ukraine	37327/21
Petedzhyev and Bondar v. Ukraine	60318/21
Popov v. Ukraine	20817/24
Rogatyuk v. Ukraine	30062/24
Samar v. Ukraine	22434/14
Yermolenko v. Ukraine	26256/21

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.

