



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing five judgments on Tuesday 25 March 2025 and 15 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 27 March 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 25 March 2025

[Almukhlas and Al-Maliki v. Greece \(application no. 22776/18\)](#)

The applicants, Mohammed Hussein Hasan Almukhlas and Huda Hadi Kareem Al-Maliki, are two Iraqi nationals who were born in 1967 and 1977 respectively and live in Basra (Iraq).

The case concerns the death of the applicants' minor son on 29 August 2015, near the island of Symi, from a shot fired by a coastguard during an operation to intercept a boat that was illegally transporting persons to Greece.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants submit that the domestic authorities did not take appropriate steps to plan and conduct the interception operation as effectively as possible, with a view, above all, to protecting the persons being transported. Furthermore, they consider that the administrative and judicial investigations to establish the liability of those responsible for the incident were inadequate.

[Ali v. Serbia \(no. 4662/22\)](#)

The applicant, Ahmet Jaafar Mohamed Ali, is a Bahraini national who was born in 1973. He is currently in prison in Bahrain.

The case concerns the applicant's extradition from Serbia to Bahrain. He was wanted in Bahrain following his conviction *in absentia* for terrorism offences and was arrested in Serbia in November 2021 under an international arrest warrant issued by Interpol. During the ensuing extradition proceedings he argued that, as a Shiite and political activist, he would be at risk of persecution, torture or even death in Bahrain. The courts upheld, however, the decision to extradite him, finding that his presence in Serbia was illegal.

He was ultimately extradited on 24 January 2022 after the Serbian Minister of Justice obtained diplomatic assurances that the applicant would have a retrial with him being allowed to present his case in person.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention, the applicant alleges that at the time of his extradition he faced a real risk of being subjected to torture or inhuman or degrading treatment; that his extradition exposed him to a sentence of life imprisonment with no prospect of release; and, that the Serbian authorities had not taken any of these issues into consideration in their decisions. He also argues under Article 34 (right to individual application) that he was extradited to Bahrain in spite of an interim measure issued on 21 January 2022 by the European Court under Rule 39 of its Rules of Court.

[Demirer v. Türkiye \(no. 45779/18\)](#)

The applicant, Serferaz Demirer, is a Turkish national who was born in 1994 and lives in Bayburt (Türkiye).

The case concerns Ms Demirer's conviction in May 2016 of, among other things, membership of an armed terrorist organisation after she had been arrested trying to cross the Turkish border illegally from Syria with another woman who had confessed to having joined the YPG (the Kurdish People's Defence Units movement), the Syrian branch of the PKK (Workers' Party of Kurdistan) and received political and military training there. Both initially falsely identified themselves as Syrian citizens. After Ms Demirer's true identity was discovered, she accused the interpreter, B.S., of "treason". She was sentenced to nine years' imprisonment. The courts found unconvincing her argument that she had gone to Syria to attend a wedding.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention, Ms Demirer alleges that the courts failed to adequately investigate the allegations against her, to provide grounds for her conviction and to assess her defence submissions.

[Onat and Others v. Türkiye \(no. 61590/19 and six other applications\)](#)

The applicants are seven Turkish nationals who live variously in Van, Şırnak, Diyarbakır and Batman (all Türkiye).

They were all labourers employed by different private companies subcontracted by municipal authorities in south-east Türkiye. The case notably concerns their dismissal from their jobs on various dates in 2016 and 2017, against the background of an escalation in fighting between the Turkish security forces and armed terrorist groups and the declaration of a state of emergency after the 2016 attempted *coup d'état*.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 2 (right to a fair trial/presumption of innocence), the applicants complain that the judicial review of their dismissals was ineffective. They argue in particular that, to justify their dismissal, the labour courts had referred to criminal proceedings or investigations which had taken place prior to the attempted *coup d'état* and which had ended with final decisions to acquit or not to prosecute. All but one of the applicants also complain under Article 8 (right to respect for private life) that the dismissals have stigmatised them and caused irreversible harm to their reputations and private lives.

[N.S. v. the United Kingdom \(no. 38134/20\)](#)

The applicant, N.S., is a British national who was born in 1969 and lives in Wolverhampton.

The case concerns the applicant's complaint about the decision authorising the adoption of her son, Y, (born in 2011), against her wishes. Y and his older brother, X (born in 2002), had been placed in foster care in 2013 after she had been detained on mental-health grounds. They were returned to her in 2014, but taken into care again a year later when she had a relapse. In 2016 X was returned to her, but the Family Court ordered that Y be placed for adoption. In November 2019, the Family Court made an adoption order, dispensing with the applicant's consent.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains about the decision to sever family ties between her and Y. She argues in particular that the courts rejected her request to make a special guardianship order, which would have allowed the prospective adopter to look after Y while preserving his legal ties with his birth family.

Thursday 27 March 2025

[Laterza and D’Errico v. Italy \(no. 30336/22\)](#)

The applicants are two Italian nationals who were born in 1976 and 1956 respectively. They are the son and wife of the late G.L.

The case concerns the decision to discontinue the criminal proceedings brought by the applicants in respect of the death of their relative (G.L.) from a pulmonary tumour in July 2010.

G.L., who had been employed between 1980 and 2004 by Ilva (a company specialising in the production and processing of steel), died of a pulmonary tumour in July 2010. In 2015 the applicants lodged a criminal complaint with the public prosecutor’s office against a person or persons unknown for involuntary manslaughter, arguing that their relative’s death had been caused by prolonged exposure in the workplace to toxic substances used in steel production. In 2019 the public prosecutor requested that the case be discontinued, holding that the evidence gathered did not prove that the illness which had led to G.L.’s death had been occupational in nature. The applicants appealed unsuccessfully against that decision.

Relying on the procedural aspect of Article 2 (right to life), the applicants complain about the domestic authorities’ refusal to pursue the investigation. In particular, they criticise the authorities’ decision to discontinue the proceedings without taking into account the expert report demonstrating the correlation between G.L.’s illness and his exposure to harmful substances in the workplace. They also submit that by discontinuing the investigation, the authorities chose not to examine the evidence which, in their view, would have made it possible to identify those responsible for implementing safety measures in the factory.

[Niort v. Italy \(no. 4217/23\)](#)

The applicant, Simone Niort, is an Italian national who was born in 1997 and is currently detained in Sassari Prison. He suffers from personality disorders, including borderline and antisocial personality disorder, for which he has received treatment from the mental health services since childhood. He is certified as 100% disabled and receives a disability allowance. He is also a drug addict.

The case concerns the medical treatment and continued imprisonment, despite his psychiatric disorders, of the applicant, who was convicted of serious offences and is considered to be a danger to society.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), the applicant complains that his continued imprisonment prevents him from receiving appropriate treatment for his psychiatric problems. Relying on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), he complains of unlawful and unjustified imprisonment, and about the lack of compensation in that regard. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), he complains that two orders for his transfer to a prison with appropriate facilities for treatment of his psychiatric disorder were not executed. Lastly, relying on Article 8 (right to private life), he complains about the absence of an educational programme and rehabilitation pathway in the prison.

[Bilyavska v. Ukraine \(no. 84568/17\)](#)

The applicant, Mariya Vasylivna Bilyavska, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1948 and lives in Kyiv.

In 2004 Ms Bilyavska allowed her adult son and daughter along with their partners and minor children to move temporarily into her house in Bucha (Ukraine). She was not permanently residing in the house at the time and alleges that her family made it difficult for her to move back in. In particular, they allocated her only a 9 sq. m room and restricted her movements in the house and

use of the kitchen and toilet. She was forced to retreat to another dwelling but continued to try accessing her property. Unpaid bills accumulated in her name.

She initiated eviction proceedings against her children and their families in March 2016, but was unsuccessful. The Ukrainian courts, relying on the Soviet-era Housing Code, held that she had failed to prove the existence of “systematic” breach of the rules of socialist living together or that any preventive measures had been applied and had been ineffective.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Mr Bilyavska alleges that the State failed in its obligation to ensure she could enjoy her property, and that she is unable to enjoy her home.

[Golovchuk v. Ukraine \(nos. 16111/19 and 4737/21\)](#)

The applicant, Svitlana Volodymyrivna Golovchuk, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1961 and lives in Kyiv. At the time of the events in question, she was a judge at the High Administrative Court.

The case concerns the 2016 changes to the Ukrainian court system which made the Supreme Court – rather than the three existing cassation courts – responsible for cassation review and therefore the highest ordinary court in Ukraine. As a result of this the three cassation courts, including the High Administrative Court, were wound down.

Having been unsuccessful in two competitions for the Supreme Court, Ms Golovchuk was prevented from exercising her judicial functions because she did not obtain a new judicial assignment in another court. She ultimately chose to resign from the judiciary in February 2024.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Ms Golovchuk complains, in particular, that her inability to sit as a judge violated the principle of security of tenure of judges, and that she had no remedy in that connection.

[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 27 March 2025

Name	Main application number
Číž and Lindovská v. the Czech Republic	1557/22
Štěrbová v. the Czech Republic	16517/20
Schwarz v. Germany	10100/16
Giudice and Others v. Greece	29017/18
Florini v. Italy	5343/15
Polisciano v. Italy	60707/11
Tosi v. Italy	8238/18
Meszkes v. Poland	11560/19
Babkinis v. Ukraine	8753/16
Reva and Others v. Ukraine	68519/12
Varitek, TOV v. Ukraine	7622/18

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 X (Twitter) [@ECHR_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH) and Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int).

Press contacts

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.