



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 19 judgments on Tuesday 23 June 2026 and 49 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 25 June 2026.

*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 23 June 2026

[Karchava v. Georgia \(application no. 34790/23\)](#)

The applicant, Zurab Karchava, is a Georgian national who was born in 1983 and lives in Batumi (Georgia).

The case concerns a solo protest planned by Mr Karchava at the end of 2022 to denounce the lack of free lunches in public schools in Georgia during the school year. He intended to set up a tent behind a statue of Memed Abashidze located in a public square in the vicinity of the Constitutional Court of Georgia and the seat of local government and to go on hunger strike.

On the day his protest was to start, police officers tried to persuade him to change his plans as the area had been designated for New Year's Eve celebrations, which included the potential use of pyrotechnics. They encouraged him to relocate to a more appropriate location. At lunchtime, the applicant was arrested for disobeying lawful police orders – an administrative offence under Article 173 § 1 of the Code of Administrative Offences.

Mr Karchava complains that the interruption of his solo demonstration and his subsequent conviction for an administrative offence amounted to a violation of his right to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly protected by Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

[Kiguradze v. Georgia \(no. 25784/23\)](#)

The applicant, Bakur Kiguradze, is a Georgian national who was born in 1955 and lives in Tbilisi. He is an entrepreneur and a published author.

The case concerns the Georgian courts' refusal to rule on the merits of Mr Kiguradze's defamation claim against a Member of Parliament on grounds of parliamentary immunity. Mr Kiguradze brought the proceedings to complain that the MP had referred in an interview he had given in 2020 to his conviction as a Russian spy and subsequent release as a political prisoner, without mentioning that he had later been fully acquitted of the charges. The courts discontinued the proceedings against the MP, ruling that he was exempt from liability because he had made the statements in the context of his political expression and in the exercise of his duties as an MP.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial/access to court), Article 8 (right to private and family life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention, Mr Kiguradze complains that the courts' decision to discontinue the defamation proceedings meant that he could not contest the accusations of espionage against him. He argues that such accusations constituted an attack on his reputation, honour and integrity as a public figure with a reputable academic background.

[Dotani v. Greece \(no. 31077/23\)](#)

The case concerns the national authorities' failure to take a decision on an application for family reunification lodged by an Afghan national who has been granted refugee status in Greece. The applicant submits that he is unable to produce the supporting documents required by Greek legislation.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention, the applicant complains that the Greek authorities asked him, without considering any alternatives, to provide documents certified by the competent consular office in order to benefit from family reunification. Maintaining that the consular office in Islamabad did not certify documents from his family in a timely manner, and now refuses to do so at all, he contends that his right to respect for his family life has been breached, and that he has been discriminated against on the ground of his nationality in the exercise of that right.

Relying on Article 13 of the Convention, he also alleges that there was no effective remedy available to him in respect of his complaint under Articles 8 and 14.

[Marinakakis v. Greece \(nos. 25916/18 and 37429/18\)](#)

The applicant is a Greek shipowner and the majority shareholder of a media group. The case concerns public statements made in his respect by high-ranking State officials while criminal proceedings were pending against him. The proceedings were initiated in 2018 and ended in 2024 with a discharge order.

Relying on Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence), the applicant submits that those statements – including a comment reported across print, television and social media that he was a “drug dealer” – infringed his right to be presumed innocent. He further complains under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) that no effective remedy was available to him in respect of that alleged breach.

[Suji v. Greece \(no. 13250/23\)](#)

The case concerns the national authorities' failure to take a decision on an application for family reunification lodged by a stateless person living in Athens who has been granted refugee status in Greece.

The applicant submits that he is unable to produce the supporting documents required by Greek legislation.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicant complains that the Greek authorities asked him, without considering any alternatives, to provide documents that he could not obtain in order to benefit from family reunification. He contends that this has breached his right to respect for his family life, and that he has been discriminated against on the ground of his statelessness in the exercise of that right.

Relying on Article 13, he also alleges that there was no effective remedy available to him in respect of his complaint under Articles 8 and 14.

[T.N. v. Greece \(no. 41855/23\)](#)

The case concerns the national authorities' failure to take a decision on an application for family reunification lodged by a Burundian national who has been granted refugee status in Greece.

The applicant submits that he is unable to produce the supporting documents required by Greek legislation.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicant complains that the Greek authorities asked him, without considering any alternatives, to provide documents that he could not obtain in order to benefit from family

reunification. He contends that this has breached his right to respect for his family life, and that he has been discriminated against on the ground of the status of his family members (asylum-seekers in another country) in the exercise of that right.

Relying on Article 13, he also alleges that there was no effective remedy available to him in respect of his complaint under Articles 8 and 14.

[Taleski and Others v. North Macedonia \(nos. 34261/23 and 7877/24\)](#)

The applicants, Vladimir Taleski, Mile Janakieski, and Kosta Mitrovski, are three Macedonians/citizens of the Republic of North Macedonia, who were born in 1959, 1978 and 1983 respectively. All had held high-ranking positions within the Government and/or were members of the ruling political party in 2015, when a vast programme of covert recording of thousands of telephone conversations throughout North Macedonia had been revealed by the biggest opposition party at the time, exacerbating an already serious political crisis.

The case concerns a legislative intervention that affected criminal proceedings against the applicants (for abuse of official position and authority and various electoral offences) which permitted the annulment of the presidential pardons that had been granted to them in early 2016 and which, at the time, had been final and irrevocable, and had conferred upon them the right not to be prosecuted. The case also concerns the fairness of those proceedings.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing/trial), the applicants complain that the criminal proceedings against them after they had been pardoned were contrary to the principles of legal certainty and the rule of law. They also complain that their right to an independent and impartial tribunal was violated since one of the judges in the Supreme Court panel had previously made public statements relating to their cases. Two of the applicants complain that the criminal proceedings against them were unfair, as they had not been served with a copy of the higher prosecutor's submissions in the proceedings before the Court of Appeal.

[Malachini and Others v. Russia \(nos. 9184/09 and 22580/10\)](#)

The applicants are 12 Georgian nationals, who were born between 1959 and 2009, nine of whom live in Tbilisi and the others in Gori, Kareli or Batumi.

The case relates to the international armed conflict that occurred between Georgia and the Russian Federation in August 2008, the chronology of which was described in the Court's judgment in the inter-State case of [Georgia v. Russia \(II\)](#). In particular, it primarily concerns the applicants' complaints in relation to the alleged torture and killing of three Georgian prisoners of war between 9 and 11 August 2008, and the alleged torture of other surviving prisoners of war between 9 and 19 August 2008.

The applicants rely mainly on Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of torture).

Thursday 25 June 2026

[Shevchuk v. Ukraine \(no. 474/21\)](#)

The applicant, Stanislav Volodymyrovych Shevchuk, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1969 and lives in Kyiv.

The case concerns Mr Shevchuk's dismissal from his position as a judge of the Constitutional Court of Ukraine and the refusal of the administrative court to hear his claim for reinstatement.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair hearing/access to court), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 10 (freedom of expression), Mr Shevchuk complains that the Constitutional Court had not been impartial, had breached procedural rules, and had denied him the right to defend himself; he

had been denied access to the administrative court; and the dismissal had affected a wide range of his personal and professional relationships, his reputation, and his material well-being and that of his family. He also complains that his dismissal based on a statement he had made was in breach of his right to freedom of expression.

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 23 June 2026

Name	Main application number
Elezi v. Albania	17141/21
Kadana v. Albania	50295/20
Osmani v. Albania	7780/20
Acar v. Türkiye	20039/22
Çalı and Others v. Türkiye	21763/20
Çetin v. Türkiye	35454/19
Dönmez and Others v. Türkiye	24039/21
İpek v. Türkiye	71299/16
Karasu and Others v. Türkiye	12589/18
Kılıç and Others v. Türkiye	356/18
Kılıçarslan and Others v. Türkiye	16234/18

Thursday 25 June 2026

Name	Main application number
AZEKO Azerbaijani American Joint Enterprise v. Azerbaijan	8797/18
Dimitrov v. Bulgaria	44635/21
Tita 04 EOOD v. Bulgaria	51897/21
Barba v. Croatia	6354/23
Rath v. the Czech Republic	34695/22
K.N. v. France	19697/23
Habash v. Greece	46255/17
M.H. v. Greece	38555/19
Megalokonomou v. Greece	33510/25
Danyi and Others v. Hungary	28445/25
Molnár and Others v. Hungary	30081/25
Pisch and Others v. Hungary	24676/25
A.B.F. v. Italy	3132/24
Artemis S.r.l. v. Italy	54187/20
Dellaoui v. Italy	38743/23
Vuković v. Montenegro	5522/25
Cywiński and Rączkiewicz v. Poland	41028/23
Grocka-Leśniak v. Poland	3097/25

Name	Main application number
Lenart v. Poland	29899/24
Miklikowski v. Poland	22411/24
Piela v. Poland	2155/24
Roszkowski and Others v. Poland	40831/23
Youssefi v. Poland	12730/21
Baicea and Others v. Romania	42636/21
Dută and Others v. Romania	52560/22
Hoca and Roman v. Romania	5651/24
Macaveiu and Others v. Romania	35792/16
Mavrodin and Others v. Romania	40347/22
Moise and Others v. Romania	61328/19
Moldovan and Others v. Romania	41993/22
Puşcaş and Others v. Romania	18293/13
Zodilă-Cristic and Others v. Romania	36321/22
Botyanszká and Others v. Slovakia	56444/22
Križan v. Slovakia	31270/25
Alkan v. Türkiye	23709/21
Aybek and Others v. Türkiye	32365/20
D.D. v. Türkiye	57965/19
Güler v. Türkiye	1830/21
Kara v. Türkiye	29988/20
Bulakh v. Ukraine	1380/25
Greta, PAT v. Ukraine	1368/25
Kyselyov and Others v. Ukraine	8625/24
Lisovyy and Yemelyanova v. Ukraine	46460/19
Marchuk and Others v. Ukraine	11834/17
Mishin and Others v. Ukraine	29381/16
M.G. v. the United Kingdom	13063/23
Pham v. the United Kingdom	37478/20
Y and X v. the United Kingdom	23202/21

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.

Follow the Court on Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int), X [ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH), [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/company/echr), and [YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCk1jW1W1W1W1W1W1W1W1W1W).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrp@echr.coe.int) to subscribe to the press-release mailing list.

Where can the Court's press releases be found? [HUDOC - Press collection](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int)

Press contacts

echrp@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)

Jane Swift (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 29 04)

Claire Windsor (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 24 01)

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.