

## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 16 judgments on Tuesday 22 October 2024 and 80 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 24 October 2024.

*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](http://www.echr.coe.int)).*

### Tuesday 22 October 2024

#### [J.B. and Others v. Malta \(application no. 1766/23\)](#)

The applicants are six Bangladeshi nationals who arrived in Malta in November 2022 after being rescued at sea. They allege that they were minors – between 16 and 17 years old – at the time.

The case concerns the applicants' detention in Hal Far Initial Reception Centre (China House) for almost two months after their arrival, then for at least another four months in Safi Detention Centre. Five of the applicants were released in May 2023 and accommodated in an open centre for minors, while the remaining applicant left Malta in August 2023 after being issued with a removal order.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain about their conditions of detention, alleging among other things that they were threatened and harassed by detention officials and other detainees. Also relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), they allege that their detention was unlawful and/or arbitrary. Lastly, they complain that they did not have an effective procedure to complain of the conditions and the lawfulness of their detention, in breach of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided by a court), respectively.

#### [Tasoncom S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 59627/15\)](#)

The applicant company, Tasoncom S.R.L., is a limited liability company with its registered office in Orhei.

The case concerns two sets of proceedings, tax and criminal, against the applicant company in respect of the same acts. In the tax proceedings, sanctions were imposed on the applicant company, but in the criminal proceedings it was eventually acquitted. Following that acquittal, the applicant company sought the review of the decision in the tax proceedings, but its request was rejected.

Before the Court, the applicant company alleges that the decision to impose tax penalties on it was solely based on its conviction in the criminal proceedings and that after it had been finally acquitted in those proceedings, that decision lacked basis. In that connection, it relies on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention, arguing that the refusal to reopen the tax proceedings was not duly reasoned, which in its view infringed the principle of legal certainty. The applicant company also relies on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

#### [Kobaliya and Others v. Russia \(no. 39446/16 and 106 other applications\)](#)

The applicants are 107 non-governmental organisations (NGOs), media organisations and individuals. Among them are prominent members of Russian civil society, including International Memorial and Memorial Human Rights Centre, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, journalists, human-rights defenders, environmental activists and election monitors.

The case concerns “foreign agent” legislation introduced in Russia between 2012 and 2022. The applicant organisations and individuals complain that this legislation has forced them to register as “foreign agents”, which has led to their being subjected to numerous inspections and fines, excessive accounting, reporting and labelling obligations, as well as restrictions on their professional activities.

Relying on Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of association) of the Convention, complain about the restrictions on their rights after being designated as a “foreign agent”. They allege that the legislation was stigmatising and imposed a significant financial and administrative burden, with certain NGOs International Memorial and Memorial Human Rights Centre – even being dissolved. In the applicants’ view, this was part of a systematic campaign against human-rights and media organisations who were critical of the authorities.

The applicant individuals also complain that the legislation has obliged them to have their personal details published on the Ministry of Justice’s website, to disclose personal financial information, to reveal their political views in all publications, including social media, and has barred them from certain employment or professional activities, in breach of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

#### [Y and Others v. Switzerland \(no. 9577/21\)](#)

The applicants are seven Albanian nationals, who currently live in Switzerland. They are a family.

On 26 November 2019 the applicants applied for asylum in Switzerland, owing to the alleged risk to their lives as a result of threats connected to the first applicant’s work related to study and denunciation of the crimes committed by the communist regime. The case concerns the rejection of their applications and potential deportation to Albania.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) and Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) the applicants complain, in particular, that their removal to Albania would breach their Convention rights under those Articles. They also rely on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).

#### [Yüksek v. Türkiye \(no. 4/18\)](#)

The applicant, Kamuran Yüksek, is a Turkish national who was born in 1980. He was detained in Diyarbakır at the time of lodging his application.

The case concerns Mr Yüksek’s pre-trial detention for four months before his conviction in 2017 for membership of a terrorist organisation. At the time he was co-chair of the Democratic Regions Party (*Demokratik Bölgeler Partisi*), a left-wing pro-Kurdish political party, and had made statements at public meetings and to the media calling for people to struggle against the government’s policies. He had also referred to some actions of the public authorities as “political genocide” and the killing of three members of his party as a “war crime”.

Relying on Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 (right to liberty and security), Mr Yüksek alleges in particular that there was no evidence to prove that he had committed the offence of which he had stood accused and that his being placed in pre-trial detention was on account of his political opinions. Also relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), he alleges that the decisions ordering his initial and continued pre-trial detention infringed his freedom to express his opinion as an opposition-party politician. He submits that his speeches had not contained terrorist propaganda or incitement to violence, but had instead been a call for a peaceful and democratic solution to the Kurdish issue.

Thursday 24 October 2024

#### [Eckert v. France \(no. 56270/21\)](#)

The applicant, Myriam Eckert, is a French national who was born in 1972 and lives in Bordeaux.

The case concerns the applicant's criminal conviction for taking part in a "yellow vests" ("*gilets jaunes*") demonstration on Saturday 11 May 2019 which was banned by the prefect of Gironde.

Relying on Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of assembly and association), the applicant submits that her criminal conviction for participating in a banned demonstration infringed her rights to freedom of expression and to freedom of peaceful assembly.

#### [B.B. v. Slovakia \(no. 48587/21\)](#)

The applicant, Ms B.B., is a Slovak national who was born in 1990 and lives in Banská Bystrica (Slovakia). She is of Roma ethnicity and was brought up in State care.

The case concerns proceedings in Slovakia in response to an allegation of Ms B.B.'s being trafficked in 2010 to the United Kingdom where she worked as a prostitute for at least a year. In these proceedings, an individual was convicted of pimping.

Ms B.B. complains that the authorities' failure to treat the offence as one of human trafficking, rather than pimping, was incompatible with their obligation to carry out an effective investigation into a credible suspicion that she had been subjected to human trafficking, in violation of her rights protected under Article 4 (prohibition of slavery and forced labour) of the Convention.

#### [Drozdyk and Mikula v. Ukraine \(no. 27849/15\)](#)

The applicants, Mariya Petrivna Drozdyk and Olga Pavlivna Mikula, are Ukrainian nationals who were born in 1946 and 1949 respectively. They live, respectively, in Chudei (Chernivtsi Region) and Bryukhovychi (Lviv Region) (both Ukraine).

The case concerns the annulment of the applicants' titles to plots of land, which they had used and owned for decades, on the basis that the lands fell within railway exclusion zones and thus should never have been transferred into private ownership.

They rely on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No.1 (protection of property).

[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 October 2024

Name	Main application number
Ćehić v. Croatia	14043/19
Šatvar v. Croatia	20497/19
Zdjelar v. Croatia	58566/19
Hesselink v. the Netherlands	24008/20
Dimitrov v. North Macedonia	24030/19
Shapkaroski and Kanevche v. North Macedonia	42520/17
Furdui v. the Republic of Moldova	4859/12
Kaplan and Others v. Türkiye	49484/17
Kavak and Others v. Türkiye	5507/13
Kocaman v. Türkiye	24484/15

Name	Main application number
Şişman and Others v. Türkiye	52107/14

Thursday 24 October 2024

Name	Main application number
Dobrozi v. Albania	41592/14
Shkjezi v. Albania	82151/17
Sovjani v. Albania	42684/15
Boyajyan v. Armenia	40599/17
Movsisyan v. Armenia	19133/20
Voskanyan and Others v. Armenia	54225/22
Heuberer and Hoza v. Austria	47234/22
Agayev & Zulfugarzadeh Company v. Azerbaijan	31222/14
Azimov and Others v. Azerbaijan	38244/12
Babali and Others v. Azerbaijan	43164/10
Haziye v. Azerbaijan	65893/16
Safarov and Others v. Azerbaijan	12507/21
Vladov v. Bulgaria	35060/17
Andrijanić and Others v. Croatia	12947/22
Husić v. Croatia	596/21
Quasimi v. Denmark	38589/23
Fédération Sud Santé Sociaux v. France	31034/23
SAM TM Transports v. France	33851/23
Union des Mutuelles d'Assurances Monceau v. France	20224/18
A.S. and W.S. v. Greece	39339/20
Bognár and Others v. Hungary	24131/23
Burján and Others v. Hungary	10094/24
Kajdi and Others v. Hungary	3828/24
Kompanik and Others v. Hungary	6557/24
Kőrös and Others v. Hungary	6211/24
Mezei and Others v. Hungary	24863/21
Alfonsi and Others v. Italy	63624/19
Bollante v. Italy	77214/17
Coletti v. Italy	25048/21
Maybud v. Italy	77436/17
Püschel v. Italy	52611/19
Rinelli v. Italy	41772/21
Ivanovs v. Latvia	20786/14

Name	Main application number
N.B. v. Latvia	67101/17
Rutule v. Latvia	58195/16
Siņicins v. Latvia	48987/16
Sprūds andt Others v. Latvia	66499/17
Timofejevs v. Latvia	15062/21
Ažukas v. Lithuania	12192/22
Mirotić v. Montenegro	12246/23
Trpkovski v. North Macedonia	24705/21
Ludwisiak and Others v. Poland	54461/21
Neto Conceição v. Portugal	10558/21
Vicol v. the Republic of Moldova	40650/14
Anton and Others v. Romania	29563/20
Apostolescu and Others v. Romania	2188/21
Bolentiş v. Romania	51307/21
Bucşa and Others v. Romania	14180/20
Butnaru v. Romania	82237/17
Gheocalescu v. Romania	17601/21
Iarna and Others v. Romania	29453/20
Mihăiescu and Others v. Romania	7011/20
Mocanu and Others v. Romania	33383/21
Stărbu and Others v. Romania	44867/20
Stoica and Others v. Romania	7037/20
Bojković v. Serbia	26522/17
Copechim Trading Ag v. Serbia	39219/22
Dimović v. Serbia	9842/23
Đorđević and Others v. Serbia	25712/23
Mitić v. Serbia	59711/21
Preković and Others v. Serbia	16659/23
Strainović and Others v. Serbia	27216/23
X v. Serbia	40801/22
Agusti Julia v. Spain	60860/21
Quintero Mendez v. Spain	26838/22
Tosun v. Türkiye	67568/17
Tütmez v. Türkiye	80858/12
Aleksyutin and Others v. Ukraine	36641/05
Bezyazykov and Others v. Ukraine	44245/17
Gayevskyy v. Ukraine	31705/16
Kalimov and Others v. Ukraine	26875/23

Name	Main application number
Kudla and Others v. Ukraine	64510/12
Podolych and Others v. Ukraine	12994/23
Rista and Others v. Ukraine	6116/23
Shaykov and Others v. Ukraine	56961/22
Shemet v. Ukraine	17019/15
N.S.K. v. the United Kingdom	28774/22

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

#### Press contacts

[echrpess@echr.coe.int](mailto:echrpess@echr.coe.int) | tel.: +33 3 90 21 42 08

**We are happy to receive journalists' enquiries via either email or telephone.**

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.