



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 13 judgments on Tuesday 22 June 2021 and 53 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 24 June 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 22 June 2021

[Hurbain v. Belgium \(application no. 57292/16\)](#)

The applicant, Patrick Hurbain, is a Belgian national who was born in 1959 and lives in Genappe (Belgium). Mr Hurbain is the editor-in-chief of the *Le Soir* newspaper, one of the leading French-language daily newspapers in Belgium.

The case concerns a civil court order issued to Mr Hurbain, as the editor-in-chief of the *Le Soir* daily newspaper, to anonymise, for the purposes of the “right to be forgotten”, the electronic archived version of an article mentioning the full name of a driver who had been responsible for a fatal road accident in 1994.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Hurbain complains about the court order to anonymise the *archived* version of the article in issue on the *Le Soir* website, considering that order as an infringement of his right to freedom of expression, the freedom of the press and the freedom to disseminate information.

[Erkizia Almandoz v. Spain \(no. 5869/17\)](#)

The applicant, Mr Tasio Erkizia Almandoz, is a Spanish national who was born in 1943 and lives in Bilbao, Bizkaia.

The case concerns the participation by the applicant, a Basque separatist politician, in a ceremony paying tribute to a former member of the ETA terrorist organisation, and his conviction for publicly defending terrorism, receiving a twelve-month prison sentence and seven year's ineligibility.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention, the applicant complains of an infringement of his right to freedom of expression on account of his conviction for publicly defending terrorism, whereas, in his view, his speech was aimed solely at launching an exclusively democratic and peaceful procedure for securing the independence of the Basque Country.

[R.B. v. Estonia \(no. 22597/16\)](#)

The applicant, R.B., is an Estonian national who was born in 2007.

The case concerns the failure to conduct an effective criminal investigation into the applicant's allegations of sexual abuse by her father, who was acquitted due to a breach of the procedural rules in the collection of evidence.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, the applicant complains that she had been left without effective legal protection against sexual abuse.

[Adzhigitova and Others v. Russia \(nos. 40165/07 and 2593/08\)](#)

The applicants are 126 Russian nationals who were born between 1930 and 2014.

The applications concern a military operation carried out in the village of Borozdinovskaya by the Vostok Battalion in Chechnya on 4 June 2005.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants allege that soldiers unlawfully searched their houses, arrested, ill-treated and killed local men, set four houses on fire, and abducted eleven local men; they also allege discrimination on account of their being of Avar ethnicity, and claim that the domestic authorities failed to carry out an effective investigation into the events.

[Ballıktaş Bingöllü v. Turkey \(no. 76730/12\)](#)

The applicant, Burcu Ballıktaş Bigöllü, is a Turkish national who was born in 1978 and lives in Istanbul.

The case concerns a specific type of proceedings in the Turkish legal context in which the applicant's request for the removal of statutory restrictions resulting from a past conviction were rejected due to an alleged mistake in the calculation of her conditional release date. As her civil rights had not been restored in time, her application for a post as a research assistant in a public university was rejected.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains that she had been denied access to a court on account of the domestic courts' excessively formalistic examination of her request, which in turn had had significant negative consequences for her private and professional life.

[S.W. v. the United Kingdom \(no. 87/18\)](#)

The applicant, S.W., is a British national who was born in 1968 and lives in St Albans (United Kingdom).

The case concerns accusations of professional misconduct made by a Family Court judge in the course of a fact-finding hearing in which the applicant had given evidence as a professional witness (she was a social worker).

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), and Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicant complains, in particular, that she received no notice of the findings of the Family Court until the oral judgment given at the conclusion of her hearing, and that the national courts were unable to award her damages for the alleged breach of her right to respect for her private life.

Thursday 24 June 2021

[Khachaturov v. Armenia \(no. 59687/17\)](#)

The applicant, Suren Khachaturov, is a Russian national who was born in 1974 and lives in Yerevan. He was first deputy director of one of the State budgetary establishments of the City of Moscow.

The case concerns the Armenian authorities' decision to extradite the applicant to Russia, where he is suspected of corruption offences. The applicant has serious health problems resulting from a stroke.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions of rights), Article 34 (right of individual petition) and Article 38 (adversarial examination of the case), the applicant complains, in particular, that his transfer, if extradited to Russia, would be a risk to his health and thus in breach of the Convention.

[Dodoja v. Croatia \(no. 53587/17\)](#)

The applicant, Siniša Dodoja, is a Croatian national who was born in 1963 and lives in Split.

The case concerns the applicant's trial for narcotic drug abuse, for which he was found guilty and sentenced to eight years' imprisonment.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial), the applicant complains that he had not been given an opportunity to examine a witness against him.

[Imeri v. Croatia \(no. 77668/14\)](#)

The applicant, Ardian Imeri, is a Norwegian national who was born in 1980 and lives in Ski (Norway).

The case concerns administrative-offence proceedings against the applicant in which he was fined 530,000 Norwegian kroner (NOK). He had crossed into Croatia from Slovenia with 43,500 euros and NOK 730,000 without declaring this to customs officials. He was charged under sections 40(1) and 69(1) of the Foreign Currency Act and section 74 of the Prevention of Money Laundering and Financing of Terrorism Act.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention (protection of property), the applicant complains that the decision to confiscate NOK 530,000 from him had been excessive.

[A.T. v. Italy \(no. 40910/19\)](#)

The applicant, A.T., is an Italian national who was born in 1969 and lives in Z.B., Italy.

The case concerns the applicant's alleged inability to exercise his right of access to his son and to visit him under the conditions laid down by the courts.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 8 (right to respect for family life), the applicant complains of the negative attitude shown by the child's mother, and alleges that the domestic authorities failed to take swift action to ensure the implementation of his visiting rights. He had been deprived of any opportunity to exercise those rights under the conditions established by the courts, and in his view that had amounted to an interference with his right to respect for family life.

[D.S. v. Italy \(no. 14833/16\)](#)

The applicant, Mr D.S., is an Italian national who was born in 1962 and lives in Rocca di Papa.

The case concerns the tardy enforcement of a domestic decision recognising the applicant's entitlement to compensation for damage sustained from an infection resulting from a blood transfusion.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicant complains of the long delay in enforcing the judgment entitling him to compensation for the damage which he had sustained as the result of a post-transfusion infection.

[Mastroianni and Toscano v. Italy \(no. 12205/16\)](#)

The applicants, Mr Mario Mastroianni and Ms Fernanda Damiana Toscano, are Italian nationals who were born in 1965 and 1969 respectively and live in Alvignano (Caserte).

The case concerns the failure to enforce a domestic decision granting the applicants entitlement to compensation for an infection which had resulted from a blood transfusion administered to Mr Mastroianni.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain of a violation of their right of access to a tribunal, as well as the excessive length of proceedings; they also complain of a violation of their right of property resulting from the failure to enforce the claim arising from the judgment in question; lastly, they also complain of a lack of access to an effective remedy at the domestic level to uphold their complaints.

[Hasáliková v. Slovakia \(no. 39654/15\)](#)

The applicant, Jana Hasáliková, is a Slovak national who was born in 1972 and is currently serving a sentence in Levoča Prison (Slovakia). She suffers from an intellectual disability.

The case concerns mainly the trial and conviction on 11 January 2011 of the applicant on charges of “particularly serious” murder.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (a), (b) and (c) (right to a fair trial), Article 17 (prohibition of abuse of rights), and Article 5 § 2 (everyone who is arrested shall be informed, promptly, in a language he understands, of the reasons for his arrest and of any charge against him), the applicant complains, in particular, of the fairness of the criminal proceedings against her, given her disability and her inability to understand the charges. She also complains of a violation of her rights following her arrest.

[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 22 June 2021

Name	Main application number
Kirakosyan v. Armenia	50609/10
Pagitsch GmbH and Comino Unternehmensberatung Erwachsenenbildung GmbH v. Austria	56387/17
Gechevi v. Bulgaria	54909/14
Zhelezov v. Bulgaria	70560/13
Anghel v. Romania	76328/16
S.C. Gerom Real Estate S.A. v. Romania	41714/13
Maymago and Others v. Russia	56354/07

Thursday 24 June 2021

Name	Main application number
Abbasov and Others v. Azerbaijan	1080/17
Aliyev v. Azerbaijan	59000/19
Ibrahimov v. Azerbaijan	48838/15
Krišto and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	59900/18

Name	Main application number
Jirasek and Rašić v. Croatia	63520/19
Dumenil v. France	63418/13
Stefan and Others v. Greece	26106/20
Berardi and Others v. Italy	54970/15
Filippelli v. Italy	74508/14
Babovski v. North Macedonia	45751/17
Memedov v. North Macedonia	31016/17
Mitrovska and Others v. North Macedonia	55480/16
Stojanovski and Others v. North Macedonia	60633/15
Baban v. the Republic of Moldova	83718/17
Dumitru v. Portugal	53800/17
Gergely v. Portugal	56572/19
Marcolino de Jesus v. Portugal	2388/15
Pereira Lobo and Tavares da Graça v. Portugal	53931/19
Ghiurca v. Romania	4375/16
Ionel v. Romania	41861/19
Petrovici v. Romania	16795/15
Șucnea v. Romania	18802/20
Varga v. Romania	19364/19
Zainea v. Romania	47940/16
Astapenko v. Russia	59064/18
Gnezdilov and Blokhin v. Russia	25729/18
Karetnikov v. Russia	34058/20
Lebedev v. Russia	80697/12
Nevostruyeva v. Russia	51185/11
Vasilyev and Others v. Russia	51329/08
Yegorov v. Russia	34072/16
Zuyev v. Russia	24504/18
Josifović v. Serbia	31185/08
Finhouse, s.r.o. v. Slovakia	53900/20
Doumbe Nnabuchi v. Spain	19420/15
Alsaç v. Turkey	3666/11
Zengin v. Turkey	68426/17
Chystyakov and Vyrovyy v. Ukraine	68636/13
Galamay v. Ukraine	44801/13
Lashch v. Ukraine	44160/19
Palanchuk v. Ukraine	46948/19
Pugachov and Pugachov v. Ukraine	25860/19
Shkirya v. Ukraine	30850/11
Starenkyy and Others v. Ukraine	71848/13
Tanasiychuk and Others Derevyanyy v. Ukraine	25083/20
McGowan v. the United Kingdom	43082/20

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

During the current public-health crisis, journalists can continue to contact the Press Unit via echrpess@echr.coe.int.

Tracey Turner-Tretz

Denis Lambert

Inci Ertekin

Neil Connolly

Jane Swift

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.