

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing four judgments on Tuesday 28 April 2026 and 44 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 30 April 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 28 April 2026

[Kanev and Bulgarian Helsinki Committee v. Bulgaria \(application no. 45864/22\)](#)

The case concerns the processing of data by Bulgaria's national security agency.

The applicants are the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee, an association founded in 1992 and based in Sofia, and its chair, Krasimir Ivanov Kanev, a Bulgarian national, who was born in 1958 and lives in Sofia.

In 2021 Mr Kanev asked Bulgaria's State Agency for National Security whether it had gathered intelligence about him or the association. The Agency refused to disclose that information, and proceedings brought by Mr Kanev to challenge that refusal were unsuccessful.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Kanev and the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee complain about an absence of clear rules on the circumstances in which the Agency could process data and the absence of effective safeguards in that regard.

[Antonov v. Estonia \(no. 48721/22\)](#)

The case concerns the rules governing the eligibility for early release of prisoners serving life sentences following a new conviction in Estonia.

The applicant, Andrei Antonov, is an Estonian national who was born in 1972 and is detained in Viru Prison (Estonia).

He has been in prison since 1994 and was sentenced to life imprisonment in 1996. While serving his life sentence he has been convicted of other criminal offences. Most recently, in 2021, he was convicted of causing damage to the health of another prisoner and sentenced to one year and three months' imprisonment. He was given an aggregate life sentence, with the starting date set at 9 July 2021, meaning that the 25-year minimum period that he had to spend in prison before he could be considered for early release was reset. He appealed, arguing that the starting date of his new sentence should be the date on which he had initially started his life sentence, without success.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) of the European Convention, Mr Antonov complains that the approach taken in his case and his age meant that he might never have the possibility of being released on parole.

Thursday 30 April 2026

[Benladghem v. Belgium \(no. 5414/22\)](#)

The applicant is a French national who lives in Nancy (France).

The case concerns the death of the applicant's brother, who was shot by members of special units of the Belgian federal police during his arrest.

The applicant's brother, whom the Belgian authorities considered to be particularly dangerous, was the subject of two investigations, one for participation in a terrorist group and the other for armed robbery. On 26 March 2013 an investigating judge ordered his apprehension and arrest. According to the report drawn up the same day, two police vehicles blocked his car on the motorway as he was travelling towards Brussels. The officers then got into position in order to intercept him, but he pointed a gun in their direction. Shots were subsequently fired, causing his death. An investigation was opened, which ended in a decision to discontinue the proceedings. That decision was upheld by the Belgian courts, which found that the officers had acted in self-defence.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) of the Convention, the applicant disputes the facts as established by the domestic authorities, complaining of the lack of preparation for the operation of 26 March 2013 and of the disproportionate use of lethal force by the police.

[Mlinarević v. Croatia \(no. 24406/21\)](#)

[Sanader v. Croatia \(no. 27577/21\)](#)

These two cases concern the impartiality of the Croatian Constitutional Court in high-profile proceedings for corruption.

The applicants, Mladen Mlinarević and Ivo Sanader, former Prime Minister of Croatia, are Croatian nationals who were born in 1954 and 1953, respectively. They both live in Zagreb.

In 2012 they were indicted on corruption charges linked to the sale of property located on Planinska Street in Zagreb. The proceedings were widely referred to as the "Planinska" affair. They were both found guilty in 2019.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicants allege that the judge who presided over their cases before the Constitutional Court was biased.

[Nikolaou and Others v. Cyprus \(no. 37068/18\)](#)

The case concerns the authorities' refusal to return to the original owners, or their heirs, land which had been expropriated, but allegedly remained unused.

The applicants are ten Cypriot nationals who previously owned (or whose ancestors owned) a 7,024-square-metre plot of land in the Agios Athanasios sector of Limassol which was expropriated in 1976 by the authorities for the development of an industrial area.

Part of the expropriated property was used for road development. In the following years various construction projects were negotiated in respect of the remaining 3,974 square metres of the land, which never materialised. In 2008, the applicants requested that the disputed land be returned to them as, under the relevant law, they had the right to restitution if the expropriated land had not been used as intended. Their request was rejected. The Cypriot authorities informed them that the land was destined to remain "open space", while also accepting that plans to construct on the industrial area had not yet been abandoned.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants allege that 32 years had gone by without the expropriated land being used as intended and that the authorities were therefore obliged to return the property to them.

[Mastey v. France \(no. 30049/23\)](#)

The applicant, Max-Junior Mastey, is a French national who was born in 1996 and is currently detained in Rennes Prison.

The case concerns the applicant's inability to attend his trial on account of his having been removed from the courtroom during the hearing before the court of appeal, and also the failure of the Court of Cassation to reply to his argument that the proceedings had been unfair.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicant complains that the president of the court of appeal removed him from the courtroom without ascertaining whether, in view of his psychiatric disorder, he had validly waived his right to attend the trial in order to present his defence. He also complains that the Court of Cassation breached the requirement to give reasons, in that it rejected his appeal on points of law solely on the basis of Article 405 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, without ruling on his complaint concerning a violation of the Convention.

Just Satisfaction

[Theo National Construct S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 72783/11\)](#)

The applicant, Theo National Construct S.R.L., is a road construction company incorporated in Romania.

The case concerns the question of just satisfaction with regard to the hostile takeover ("raider attack") of the applicant company, that is the alleged seizure of its goods, with the assistance of presumably corrupt courts and law-enforcement agencies.

In its [principal judgment](#) of 11 October 2022 the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention.

The Court further held that the question of just satisfaction was not ready for decision and reserved it for examination at a later date.

The Court will deal with this question in its judgment of 30 April 2026.

[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 28 April 2026

Name	Main application number
Molnár-Fulmer and Pincehelyi v. Hungary	21715/22
Zhunko v. Russia	15381/17

Thursday 30 April 2026

Name	Main application number
Abrahamyan v. Armenia	31326/17
Gaspari v. Armenia	54338/17
Gaspari v. Armenia	1606/16
Khachatryan v. Armenia	18635/16
Kiviryan v. Armenia	1593/16
Manucharyan v. Armenia	9970/19
Minasyan and Geravetyan v. Armenia	4892/16
Samvelyan v. Armenia	30374/17
Francišković v. Croatia	1313/20

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.