

## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing three judgments on Tuesday 26 April 2022 and 24 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 28 April 2022.

*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 26 April 2022

### [Mediengruppe Österreich GmbH v. Austria \(application no. 37713/18\)](#)

The applicant, Mediengruppe Österreich GmbH, is a company based Vienna. It is the publisher of the daily newspaper *Österreich*.

The case concerns a court order for *Österreich* not to publish particular information about an individual indirectly connected to the campaign of the Freedom Party of Austria candidate in the run-up to the 2016 presidential election. The newspaper published a photo of the brother of the candidate's office manager in a "right-wing scene" and revealed that he was a "convicted neo-Nazi". The conviction dated from 20 years before and was spent.

Court proceedings ensued. In a final decision the Supreme Court prohibited the applicant company from "publishing pictures of [the office manager's brother] without his consent, if at the same time he [was] called a convicted neo-Nazi in the accompanying report ...".

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant company complains about the domestic-court decisions.

### [Vod Baur Impex S.R.L. v. Romania \(no. 17060/15\)](#)

The applicant, Vod Baur Impex S.R.L., is a Romanian company based in Bucharest.

In 2006 the applicant company bought from the City of Bucharest commercial premises which included the ground floor and the basement of a multi-storey building. Following civil proceedings brought by the association of landlords representing the owners of the private apartments in the building, the courts annulled the contract of sale in respect of the basement, finding that it had always belonged to the association of landlords, not the City of Bucharest. The case concerns the ensuing proceedings brought by the applicant company against the City of Bucharest for compensation.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant company complains that it was deprived of its property, which it had acquired in good faith, without compensation.

### [M.A.M. v. Switzerland \(no. 29836/20\)](#)

The application concerns a Pakistani national whose asylum request was rejected by the Swiss authorities. He submits to the European Court that he converted to Christianity from Islam in Switzerland, where he had arrived in 2015. In his view, his return to Pakistan would present him with a real risk of ill-treatment or death. He also maintains that his freedom of religion would be severely curtailed in that country.

He relies on Article 2 (right to life), Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 9 (right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion) of the Convention.

Thursday 28 April 2022

### [Bursać and Others v. Croatia \(no. 78836/16\)](#)

The applicants, Bosiljka Bursać, Đuka Damjanović, Nena Damjanović, Danica Dubajić and Milica Vasiljević, are Croatian nationals who were born between 1940 and 1953 and live in Apatin, Gračac, Srb and Zagreb.

The applicants' father was an ethnic Serb who was allegedly killed in 1995 by Croatian soldiers during the battle to regain control over Krajina in the war following the dissolution of Yugoslavia. They later sued the State for compensation in 2005. The case concerns the investigation into his death. It also concerns the applicants having to pay the State's costs in the civil proceedings.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) and Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain, in particular, that the investigation was inadequate and that the excessive costs breached their peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

### [Dubois v. France \(no. 52833/19\)](#)

The applicant, Mr Joël Dubois, is a French national who was born in 1949 and lives in Joué-les-Tours. In 2018 he was convicted of unlawfully exercising the profession of dental surgeon.

The case concerns a voluntary police interview during which the applicant was not informed of his right to remain silent and was not afforded legal assistance.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial/right to legal assistance), the applicant complains of a breach of the Convention inasmuch as his conviction was based on statements given during his voluntary police interview, during which he had not been informed of his right to remain silent and had had no legal assistance.

### [Wang v. France \(no. 83700/17\)](#)

The applicant is a Chinese national who was born in 1972 and lives in Saint Priest Ligoure (France).

The case concerns a voluntary police interview during which the applicant, who was being prosecuted on charges of unlawfully exercising the profession of medical doctor, was not explicitly informed of her right to remain silent and was not assisted by an interpreter.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (right to a fair trial/right to legal assistance), the applicant complains of a breach of the Convention inasmuch as her conviction was based on statements given during her voluntary police interview, during which she had not been informed of her right to remain silent and had had no legal assistance.

### [Verrascina and Others v. Italy \(no. 15566/13 and five other applications\)](#)

The applicants are 16 Italian nationals. Their applications concern the length of proceedings before the Italian courts and the 2012 reform of section 4 of Law no. 89 of 8 March 2001 (the so-called "Pinto Law", which made claims for just satisfaction for damage caused by the excessive length of proceedings subject to the date on which the final decision in the proceedings in question became *res judicata*).

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain of the length of domestic proceedings and the ineffectiveness of the compensatory remedy, pointing out that at the time of lodging of their applications with the European Court, those domestic proceedings were still live and the Constitutional Court had still not determined the constitutionality of section 4 of the Pinto Law (judgment no. 88 of 2018).

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 28 April 2022

Name	Main application number
Hasanov v. Azerbaijan	59202/12
Čalušić and Others v. Croatia	1190/16
Milas v. Croatia	19922/16
Split Ferry Port JSC v. Croatia	23472/15
Tončić v. Croatia	73553/16
Zečić v. Croatia	3425/18
Podlipní v. the Czech Republic	9128/13
Kvirikashvili v. Georgia	34720/16
Soutzos v. Greece	31628/14
Császy and Tátrai v. Hungary	5692/13
Fiagbe v. Italy	18549/20
Imeri v. Italy	24984/20
Liepiņš v. Latvia	24827/16
Gera de Petri Testaferrata v. Malta	19465/20
Said v. Malta	34562/20
Spiteri v. Malta	43693/20
Krupowicz and Rynkiewicz v. Poland	13248/13
Łęcka v. Poland	44343/14
Toledo Polo v. Spain	39691/18
Buttet v. the United Kingdom	12917/19

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 Twitter [@ECHR\\_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

#### Press contacts

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

**We would encourage journalists to send their enquiries via email.**

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.