

## Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing eight judgments on Tuesday 26 May 2026 and 38 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 28 May 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](http://www.echr.coe.int)).

Tuesday 26 May 2026

### [Idris Akhundov v. Azerbaijan \(application no. 22824/21\)](#)

The applicant, Idris Axunbala oglu Akhundov, is an Azerbaijani national who was born in 1967 and now lives in Mainz (Germany). Between June 1993 and May 2016, he worked in various positions in the Khachmaz District Police Office under the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Azerbaijan. Upon reaching retirement age in 2016, he was granted an old-age pension (*yaşa görə əmək pensiyası*) for life.

The case concerns the discontinuance of his old-age pension, as he has allegedly been granted political asylum in Germany.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains that he has been deprived of his possessions on account of the authorities' decision to discontinue his pension payments.

### [J.B. v. Greece \(no. 54796/16\)](#)

The applicant, J.B., is a Syrian national who was born in 1965 and lives in Caen (France). He maintains that he left Syria in April 2015 because he was in danger from the Islamic State due to his being of Armenian origin and a Christian, and also because the country was at war. He reached Türkiye through Lebanon, where he stayed for approximately a year, having been given temporary protection status. In May 2016, he was arrested in Lesbos by the Greek authorities of the Central Port Authority of Mytilene because he had entered the country unlawfully.

The case concerns his potential return from Greece to Türkiye under the EU-Türkiye Statement of 18 March 2016.

Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention, the applicant complains of deficiencies in the removal process and in the examination of his asylum claim by the Greek authorities. He also complains about the risk he might face if returned to Türkiye, including the risk of chain *refoulement*, as well as about the conditions of his detention in Mytilene police station.

### [Samet Kaya v. Türkiye \(no. 42109/22\)](#)

The applicant, Samet Kaya, is a Turkish national who was born in 1993 and lives in Ankara.

The case concerns Mr Kaya's dismissal by the Council of Judges and Prosecutors (*Hâkimler ve Savcılar Kurulu*) on the basis of a medical report by the Forensic Medicine Institute, which concluded that he was not fit on health grounds to carry out the duties of a judge or prosecutor.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention, the applicant complains that he had no access to a court to challenge the decision of the Council of Judges and Prosecutors of 6 April 2022

rejecting his objection against the decision. He also complains under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) that his dismissal was arbitrary as he had already recovered from the health issue in question, further submitting that the loss of employment caused severe financial and moral hardship for him and his family.

#### [Mavrakis and Kasapoğlu v. Türkiye \(nos. 12549/23, 71/24, and 2023/24\)](#)

The applicants, Niko Mavrakis and Corc Kasaoğlu, are two Turkish nationals who were born in 1941 and 1984 respectively and lived in Istanbul, where they served as Greek Orthodox priests.

The case concerns the applicants' removal from the lists of the members of the boards of directors of three religious minority foundations on account of their being members of the clergy, and the ensuing judicial proceedings.

Relying on Articles 9 (right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion) and 11 (freedom of assembly and association), the applicants complain that their removal from the boards of directors of the foundations belonging to the Greek Orthodox community, of which they are members, infringed their right to manifest their religion and their freedom of association. Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), taken alone or in conjunction with Articles 9 and 11, they allege that they were discriminated against on the grounds of their status as Greek Orthodox priests and their belonging to the Greek minority. Lastly, relying on Article 6 § 1 and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), they complain of the lack of a remedy on account of the belated referral of the case to the civil courts.

Thursday 28 May 2026

#### [Tožičková v. the Czech Republic \(no. 21512/23\)](#)

The case concerns the arrest of a journalist during an environmental protest at a coal mine, more specifically, while she was in an area designated as out of bounds.

The applicant is a Czech national who was born in 1977. In September 2020 she attended, in her capacity as a journalist, a demonstration. During the march, some of the participants deviated from the planned route and entered the operating area of a coal mine which was designated as out of bounds. The applicant, who was wearing a visible press badge, followed them.

The police ordered the demonstrators and journalists to leave the mine and, when they refused to do so, began making arrests. The applicant invoked her status as a journalist and her public-watchdog role to justify her refusal to comply. She was nevertheless removed from the mine, arrested, then released around two hours later. She was prohibited from making video-recordings throughout the duration of her arrest.

In October 2020 she challenged those measures – namely, the order to vacate the premises; her removal from the mine followed by her arrest; and the ban on making video-recordings for the duration of her arrest – before the domestic courts. Those courts found that the first and third measures amounted to unlawful interference, but considered that, given the applicant's refusal to leave the site of the demonstration, the police had been authorised to arrest her and that arrest had been in accordance with the law, since she had been in an area to which access was prohibited. Her appeal to the Constitutional Court was dismissed as ill-founded.

Before the Court, she complains that her arrest by the police, following an order that the domestic courts subsequently found to be unlawful and which prevented her from continuing to report on a demonstration, amounted to an interference with the exercise of her freedom of expression as guaranteed by Article 10 of the Convention.

### [Petrignani and Others v. Italy \(nos. 26187/14, 24511/21, and 31161/22\)](#)

The applicants are three Italian nationals, Riccardo Petrignani, Vincenzo Carbone and Ruggiero Massimo Curci who were born in 1972, 1951 and 1968 respectively. They were accused of various criminal offences and confiscation orders were made against them. The value of the confiscation orders was equivalent to the overall proceeds of the offences committed jointly by the applicants and other co-offenders, on the basis of joint liability.

Relying on Article 7 (no punishment without law), the applicants complain that the confiscation of an amount equivalent to the overall proceeds of the offences was in breach of that Article. Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No.1 (protection of property), they complain that the confiscation of an amount of their assets equivalent to the overall proceeds of the offence did not have a sufficiently foreseeable legal basis and was disproportionate.

### [Kovalenko v. Ukraine \(no. 21425/18\)](#)

The applicant, Viktor Sergiyovych Kovalenko, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1985 and lives in Bucha (Ukraine).

The case concerns allegations made by Mr Kovalenko that, in February 2008, he was assaulted by two off-duty police officers and sustained serious injuries as a result.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment/lack of effective investigation), Mr Kovalenko alleges that he was assaulted by off-duty police officers and that the authorities have failed to carry out an effective investigation into his complaints.

[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 26 May 2026

Name	Main application number
Abilov v. Azerbaijan	43237/15
Kapelko Belousova and Others v. Azerbaijan	50342/15
Schönberger v. Hungary	40805/21
Topuz v. Türkiye	44240/18

## Thursday 28 May 2026

Name	Main application number
Mkrtumyan v. Armenia	47577/17
Hajili v. Azerbaijan	39963/20
Sadigov v. Azerbaijan	26915/18
Ilveskoski and Others v. Finland	56153/22
Marti v. France	5634/22
Béres and Others v. Hungary	9588/25
Fekete and Others v. Hungary	21827/25
Kardos and Others v. Hungary	759/25
Vámos and Others v. Hungary	23691/25

Name	Main application number
Goldoni and Others v. Italy	27207/24
Tonolo v. Italy	7952/17
Stankevičius v. Lithuania	2229/24
Žukauskas v. Lithuania	35321/21
Memishoski v. North Macedonia	24570/22
Petrushevski and Others v. North Macedonia	1345/24
Tasino Cheshmiche Branko Dooel Skopje v. North Macedonia	55137/20
Zendelska v. North Macedonia	18364/21
Bacza and Others v. Poland	8487/23
Jakubowska v. Poland	27324/24
Lipski v. Poland	16458/21
Bado v. Slovakia	23445/21
DENIM retail s.r.o. and Others v. Slovakia	21846/21
Krátky v. Slovakia	42029/22
Spišáková and Schweizer v. Slovakia	21151/23
Trnka v. Slovakia	2091/22
J.H. v. Slovenia	10359/25
Kaya v. Türkiye	54624/20
Yılmaz v. Türkiye	30957/19
Avramych v. Ukraine	51682/17
Buzyna v. Ukraine	59562/17
Fomichov and Aland Group, TOV v. Ukraine	57804/17
Kryuk and Others v. Ukraine	23549/20
Kukovynets v. Ukraine	8283/20
Letucha v. Ukraine	8973/25
Mikheyev v. Ukraine	12744/23

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).

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/UC8v1U11111111111111111111).

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://www.echr.coe.int/hudoc)

#### Press contacts

[echrp@echr.coe.int](mailto: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.