



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 28 judgments on Tuesday 28 November 2017 and 66 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 30 November 2017.

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 November 2017

Valentin Baştovoi v. the Republic of Moldova (application no. 40614/14)

The applicant, Valentin Baştovoi, is a Moldovan national who was born in 1987 and is currently detained in Chişinău.

The case concerns the conditions of Mr Baştovoi's detention in Chişinău Prison no. 13.

In 2013 Mr Baştovoi was admitted to Chişinău Prison no. 13 after being sentenced to eight years' imprisonment for aggravated embezzlement. He alleges that he was detained in a cold, overcrowded cell with no natural light or ventilation, where the prisoners had to take it in turns to sleep because there were not enough beds, and where the toilets were not separated from the rest of the cell. He also maintains that the food served was insufficient and unfit for consumption and that he was allowed only one shower a week and one hour's daily exercise. Lastly, he complains that he was not given medical treatment for various diseases he contracted while in detention.

Relying on Article 3 of the Convention (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 3, Mr Baştovoi complains of the conditions of his detention and the lack of medical treatment, and submits that he has no effective remedy by which to assert his rights.

Antović and Mirković v. Montenegro (no. 70838/13)

The case concerns an invasion of privacy complaint by two professors at the University of Montenegro's School of Mathematics after video surveillance was installed in areas where they taught. The applicants, Nevenka Antović and Jovan Mirković, are Montenegrin nationals.

In February 2011 the dean of the School announced that he had decided to install surveillance cameras in several areas, including the auditoriums where classes were held. Ms Antović and Mr Mirković complained to the Personal Data Protection Agency in March, saying the video surveillance and consequent collection of data on them was taking place without their consent. The Agency initially backed the School but after an objection by the applicants the Agency's Council ordered the removal of the cameras from the auditoriums. It found that the video surveillance was not in accordance with data protection laws and the cameras were later removed.

In January 2012 Ms Antović and Mr Mirković brought a court compensation claim, citing Article 8 of the Convention (right to respect for private and family life) and domestic law. However, the domestic courts rejected their claim. They considered that the question of private life was not at issue as the auditoriums where Ms Antović and Mr Mirković taught were public areas. The data collected by the video surveillance was also thus not personal data.

Relying on Article 8 before the European Court, Ms Antović and Mr Mirković complain that the alleged unlawful installation and use of video surveillance equipment in the university auditoriums where they held classes violated their right to respect for their private life.

[Gaspar v. Portugal \(no. 3155/15\)](#)

The applicant, Florbela Gaspar, is a Portuguese national who was born in 1972. She is currently detained in São Domingos de Rana Prison.

The case concerns Ms Gaspar's placement in police custody followed by pre-trial detention for approximately three years and three months in the course of criminal proceedings for money laundering, tax evasion, offering bribes and forgery.

On 26 March 2014 Ms Gaspar was arrested and taken into police custody before being charged together with seven other individuals in a case concerning a criminal conspiracy to buy and sell precious metals. From 27 to 29 March she was questioned as part of the judicial investigation led by the investigating judge at the Almada District Court. During this period, she remained in police custody. After the questioning had been completed, she was taken into pre-trial detention, on the grounds that there were risks of her absconding, obstructing the course of justice, engaging in further criminal activity and disturbing public order, given the media interest in the case.

On 14 April 2014 Ms Gaspar appealed to the Lisbon Court of Appeal against the decision to place her in pre-trial detention and asked for a less restrictive measure to be applied. Her appeal was rejected on 25 June. She made a similar application on 16 July to the investigating judge, who decided to continue and then extend her detention in October 2014 and March 2015 respectively. Ms Gaspar again applied to the Almada District Court to have the measure of pre-trial detention replaced by house arrest. Her application was unsuccessful at first instance and on appeal, as was a subsequent habeas corpus application to the Supreme Court. She made yet another application to the Almada District Court for a review of her pre-trial detention, which was then extended on three further occasions. Ms Gaspar was eventually convicted in a judgment of 20 September 2016 and sentenced to seven years and six months' imprisonment.

Relying on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), Ms Gaspar submits that her right to be brought before a judge within 48 hours following her arrest was infringed. She also complains that her pre-trial detention was excessively lengthy and that no consideration was ever given to imposing a less restrictive measure on her.

[Dorneanu v. Romania \(no. 55089/13\)](#)

The applicant, Florin Liviu Dorneanu, was a Romanian national who was born in 1965. At the time of his application he was serving a prison sentence for economic offences.

The case concerns Mr Dorneanu's living conditions and the care he received after being detained in order to serve his sentence despite suffering from terminal metastatic prostate cancer. He died after eight months in detention.

In February 2013 Mr Dorneanu was sentenced by the High Court of Cassation and Justice to three years and four months' imprisonment for criminal conspiracy. Although he had been diagnosed with prostate cancer in November 2012 and the seriousness of his condition had been confirmed by oncologists, he was admitted to Bacău Prison on 4 March 2013 to begin his sentence.

On the same day, Mr Dorneanu applied to the Bacău County Court to suspend the execution of his sentence on health grounds, arguing that his life was at risk because he would be unable to receive the necessary treatment in prison. After seeking the opinion of a panel from the National Institute of Forensic Medicine, which concluded that Mr Dorneanu's survival was dependent on the medical attention he was receiving, the court ordered the suspension of his sentence on 25 June 2013 for a three-month period. The public prosecutor's office appealed, and on 29 August 2013 the Bacău

Court of Appeal rejected Mr Dorneanu's application. He was sent back to Bacău Prison. Mr Dorneanu was repeatedly admitted to hospital and his condition deteriorated, with the result that he could no longer undergo chemotherapy and received palliative care instead. He died in Bacău Hospital on 24 December 2013.

Relying in particular on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), Mr Dorneanu complained that his immobilisation in his hospital bed had amounted to inhuman treatment, and that his state of health was incompatible with detention.

[N. v. Romania \(no. 59152/08\)](#)

The applicant, N., is a Romanian national who was born in 1959. He is currently detained in Săpoca Psychiatric Hospital (Romania).

The case concerns N.'s psychiatric detention since 2001 on account of his paranoid schizophrenia.

In January 2001 the criminal investigation department instituted criminal proceedings against N. on suspicion of incest and corruption of his two minor daughters: he was accused of having had sexual intercourse with his elder daughter and having forced both his daughters to be present while he was having sex with his wife. In April 2001 the public prosecutor's office ordered his provisional detention on the grounds that he constituted a particularly serious danger to society and was likely to commit antisocial acts. N. was admitted to Bucharest Psychiatric Hospital. In the meantime, a preliminary investigation had been opened into his alleged rape of his wife.

In February 2002 the public prosecutor's office ordered the closure of the criminal proceedings concerning the accusations of incest, as N.'s elder daughter had not confirmed that she had had sexual intercourse with her father. It also concluded that N. had forced his daughters to be present while he was having sex with his wife, but it decided to discontinue the investigation into corruption of minors, finding that N. was suffering from a lack of insight. Lastly, it ruled that there was no case to answer in respect of the rape allegation as his wife had not lodged a complaint.

In April 2002 the Bucharest District Court upheld the order for N.'s detention. N. did not attend the hearing and was not represented. In October 2008 N. lodged an appeal, which was rejected as being out of time. His subsequent appeals were likewise unsuccessful. After 2007, changes to the Code of Criminal Procedure introduced automatic periodic review of detention orders. Between 2007 and 2017 N.'s detention was reviewed by the courts on several occasions, resulting in its continuation. On each occasion, psychiatric assessments were carried out, concluding in particular that N. was suffering from paranoid schizophrenia. In February 2017 the District Court directed that N.'s detention was to be replaced by compulsory treatment until his recovery, but efforts to secure his release were to no avail. As a result, he was transferred to the wing for patients with chronic diseases in the hospital where he was already being detained.

Relying in particular on Articles 5 (right to liberty and security), 6 (right to a fair hearing) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life), N. complains that he has been detained for more than 16 years, that no procedural safeguards are in place as regards the review of the lawfulness of his detention and that it is impossible for him to be awarded compensation for the damage caused by his unlawful deprivation of liberty.

Relying on Article 46 (binding force and execution of judgments), N. also asks the Court to order the respondent State to release him and, in view of the length of his detention, to prepare him for the transition from institutional to community life.

[Aleksandr Konovalov v. Russia \(no. 39708/07\)](#)

The applicant, Aleksandr Viktorovich Konovalov, is a Russian national who was born in 1971 and is serving a 12-year prison sentence for aggravated murder in Valuyki, the Belgorod region (Russia).

The case concerns his allegation of ill-treatment in police custody in order to make him confess to the murder.

Mr Konovalov was taken for police questioning about the disappearance of a university student on the morning of 17 June 2006. He was released, but taken back into custody the same evening for swearing at passers-by near the police station. According to the police record, Mr Konovalov had no injuries at this point in his detention. He was found guilty of petty hooliganism and placed in administrative detention until the morning of 19 June.

He was then taken to another police station where he was questioned for the next 14 hours. During this questioning he confessed to strangling the student and disclosed the location of her body. He then reiterated his confession statements twice over the following days.

He was formally arrested as a suspect on 20 June just after midnight and a medical examination of him was ordered. The ensuing report recorded multiple bruises and abrasions all over his body. Mr Konovalov alleged that he had sustained the injuries following ill-treatment by the police, including being punched, beaten with a rubber baton and given electric shocks.

Mr Konovalov's allegations of ill-treatment were dismissed by the domestic investigating authorities in decisions of 21 and 29 September for lack of evidence. In the first decision the investigator notably considered that Mr Konovalov could have been injured by a third party outside the police department.

In October 2006 the domestic courts, relying on Mr Konovalov's confession during the preliminary investigation, convicted him of aggravated murder. During his trial Mr Konovalov had pleaded innocent, submitting that he had made self-incriminating statements under duress which should be declared inadmissible. However, the courts dismissed these arguments, noting that the allegations of ill-treatment had already been examined and dismissed during the preliminary investigation.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Konovalov complains that he was subjected to ill-treatment in police custody and that the ensuing investigation was ineffective. Also relying on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), he alleges that his detention from the time of his actual arrest – on the morning of 17 June – and until his formal arrest as a suspect – in the early hours of 20 June – was unlawful. Lastly, he complains under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and right to legal assistance of own choosing) that his conviction was based on a confession he had made after having been ill-treated and without a lawyer of his choice to assist him.

[Kavkazskiy v. Russia \(no. 19327/13\)](#)

The applicant, Nikolay Kavkazskiy, is a Russian national who was born in 1986 and lives in Moscow. The case concerns his complaint about various aspects of his detention following his arrest on suspicion of participating in mass disorder during the Bolotnaya Square protest in May 2012. The demonstration had taken place in order to protest against the allegedly rigged presidential elections and degenerated into clashes between the police and protestors.

Mr Kavkazskiy, a human rights activist and NGO lawyer, was arrested a few months later, in July, for kicking a police officer during the dispersal of the protest. He was placed in pre-trial detention primarily on account of the seriousness of the charges against him and the risk of him absconding or obstructing the course of justice. The same grounds were cited for extending his detention over the next year. The detention orders were however quashed in August 2013, the courts taking into account Mr Kavkazskiy's worsening health, and he was placed under house arrest. The house arrest was lifted five months later when he was amnestied.

When being taken into custody Mr Kavkazskiy informed the prison authorities that he had a number of chronic illnesses, including gastritis, which required regular medical supervision and a special diet. During the first eight months of his detention he was examined by a general practitioner about once

a month and was also seen by a neurologist, who prescribed treatment. At a later stage, in April 2013, he was referred for comprehensive inpatient examination in a prison medical wing because of rapid weight-gain as well as recurrent headaches and back pain. He underwent a series of medical examinations before being discharged back to the remand prison one month later with recommendations for a magnetic resonance imaging procedure, physiotherapy and a special diet. None of these recommendations were carried out before his release under house arrest.

Mr Kavkazskiy makes a number of complaints under Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) about: the lack of medical care during his pre-trial detention; the conditions of his transfer to and from court on his case; and his confinement in glass cabins during court hearings on his case. He also alleges under Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security / entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial) that his arrest and pre-trial detention were not sufficiently justified.

[MAC TV s.r.o. v. Slovakia \(no. 13466/12\)](#)

The applicant company, MAC TV s.r.o., operates two private television channels. It was established in 1991 and is based in Bratislava. The case concerns a television programme it broadcast in April 2010 after the plane crash killing the President of Poland, Lech Kaczynski. The reporter's commentary during the broadcast was critical of the former Polish President's political views, noting in particular that a political era had ended with his death.

The Broadcasting Council, of its own motion, subsequently brought administrative proceedings against the applicant company for the broadcast, taking particular issue with the last two sentences of the reporter's commentary "I am sorry, but I do not pity the Poles. I envy them". The Broadcasting Council, acknowledging that the commentary had been sarcastic and ironic, found however that it had constituted a serious attack on the honour and reputation of the former Polish President as a politician and a human being. The applicant company was fined 5,000 euros. This decision was upheld by the Supreme Court in March 2011.

The applicant company's constitutional complaint was later rejected. The Constitutional Court found in particular that the commentary had expressed a positive attitude towards the late President's death and that this had undermined his human dignity.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicant company complains about being sanctioned for expressing its political opinion on the late Polish President's alleged extreme conservatism.

[Rastoder v. Slovenia \(no. 50142/13\)](#)

The applicant, Smako Rastoder, is a Slovenian national who was born in 1950 and is currently detained in Dob pri Mirni (Slovenia). The case concerns his inability to cross-examine two prosecution witnesses who gave evidence during the pre-trial stage of the criminal proceedings against him.

In March 2006, Mr Rastoder and his two sons were arrested on suspicion of attempted murder. Mr Rastoder was suspected of having attacked and injured three people with a knife in a fight. Following the questioning of a number of witnesses, Mr Rastoder and his sons were charged, in May 2006, with the attempted murder of three people. At a hearing in May 2009 the trial court decided that the statements of two of the witnesses which they had made before the investigating judge at the pre-trial stage of the proceedings should be read out, as those two witnesses no longer resided in Slovenia and had informed the trial court that they were unable to attend the hearing. On 19 June 2009 Mr Rastoder was convicted as charged and sentenced to five years and ten months' imprisonment. He appealed, complaining that his defence rights had been violated as the court had relied on the record of two of the witnesses' statements given only at the investigation stage. His appeal was dismissed. The higher court notably considered that Mr Rastoder had had an opportunity

to question those witnesses during the investigation. His appeal on points of law and his constitutional complaint were equally dismissed, the latter in December 2012.

Mr Rastoder complains that his inability to question the two witnesses at the hearing was in breach of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses).

[Boudraa v. Turkey \(no. 1009/16\)](#)

The applicant, Rida (Reda) Boudraa, is an Algerian national who was born in 1974 and lives in Yalova (Turkey). The case concerns his allegation that he was held for 66 days in an ordinary police station used as a foreigners' detention centre in inhuman and degrading conditions.

Mr Boudraa, who had been deported to Algeria from Turkey in 2003, returned to live with his wife and children in Yalova in 2013. He was however taken into custody on 3 November 2013 for not having a passport and placed in a detention room in Yalova police headquarters.

In December 2013 he lodged an application with the Constitutional Court describing the conditions in the police headquarters as inhuman and degrading. He alleged in particular that he was being kept in a facility where arrestees were generally held for just one day, without a proper bed to sleep on, only a mattress on the floor. He also complained that he was only exceptionally allowed into other parts of the detention facility and was never taken outside for fresh air. The Constitutional Court declared his complaint inadmissible, finding that the treatment during his detention had not been inhuman and degrading as he had been provided with medical care on falling ill.

He was eventually released on 7 January 2014.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Boudraa alleges that his detention at Yalova police headquarters had amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment as the facility was not designed to hold foreign nationals in an immigration context for such long periods of time.

[Özmurat İnşaat Elektrik Nakliyat Temizlik San. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti. v. Turkey \(no. 48657/06\)](#)

The applicant, Özmurat İnşaat Elektrik Nakliyat Temizlik San. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti, is a construction company based in Mersin (Turkey). The case concerns a fine against the applicant company for mining outside of the area for which it had a license. It failed to pay the fine and the plot of land on which it had carried out its mining activities ended up being seized in 2008.

The applicant company was inspected in January 2006 and the ensuing report ordered the company to pay a fine of 132,250 Turkish liras (at the time 82,000 euros) for quarrying substantial amounts of sand outside of the area for which it had a mining license. It subsequently filed an objection with the Tarsus Magistrates' Court, requesting that the fine be stayed and drawing the court's attention to criminal proceedings for extortion which were pending against certain officials who had been involved in drawing up the inspection report. The company further requested the court to hold an oral hearing, to carry out an on-site examination of the mine and to hear its witnesses in order to better evaluate the credibility of the inspection report used to order the fine. However, relying on the inspection report, the court rejected the company's objection. It also rejected its request for a hearing without specifying any particular reason. The company objected to this decision, also without success.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant company complains about the unfairness of the proceedings in its case. It complains in particular that the domestic court rejected its objection to the administrative fine without holding an oral hearing or directly assessing evidence from the parties and witnesses.

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.

Chanturidze v. Russia (no. 55080/12)
Ibragimov v. Russia (no. 26586/08)
Kolesin v. Russia (no. 72885/10)
Shmeleva v. Russia (no. 43664/16)
Sokolov v. Russia (no. 63392/09)
Syarkevich v. Russia (no. 10216/06)
Timishev v. Russia (no. 47598/08)
Mercan and Others v. Switzerland (no. 18411/11)
Bilgiç v. Turkey (no. 54135/07)
Çalar v. Turkey (no. 9626/12)
Güneş v. Turkey (no. 47079/06)
Gürakın v. Turkey (no. 1313/08)
İnan v. Turkey (no. 40757/10)
Kök v. Turkey (no. 42289/11)
Özsoy and Yıldırım v. Turkey (nos. 30953/09 and 53174/10)
Üçel v. Turkey (no. 58661/09)
Yaşar and Others v. Turkey (no. 1236/09)

Thursday 30 November 2017

[X v. Germany](#) (no. 54646/17)

The case concerns the expulsion from Germany to Russia of a man suspected of being willing to participate in terrorist attacks. The applicant is a Russian national who was born in 1999 in Dagestan in the Northern Caucasus (Russia), and grew up in Germany.

In March 2017, the applicant's deportation to Russia was ordered by the German authorities, as he was suspected of being willing to participate in or carry out a terrorist attack in Germany and was therefore considered to constitute a threat to national security. He was placed in detention pending deportation.

In July 2017 the domestic courts rejected the applicant's requests to suspend his removal. In particular, in interim proceedings the Federal Administrative Court came to the conclusion that, even if there was a risk of torture and ill-treatment in the region of Dagestan, where the applicant was born, there was no such risk in other parts of Russia and he could therefore be deported there. It based this finding on information provided by a local Russian NGO, "Committee against Torture", according to which the applicant would probably be questioned and monitored by security agencies in Russia, but it was highly unlikely that he would be tortured. It found that other publicly available reports concerning those who were either directly connected to the conflicts in the Northern Caucasus or their relatives were not applicable to the applicant, who had left Dagestan when he was three years old. This assessment was confirmed soon after by the Federal Constitutional Court. The main proceedings before the Federal Administrative Court are still pending.

Also in July 2017, the European Court of Human Rights applied an interim measure following a request by the applicant, indicating to the German Government that he should not be removed pending the receipt of further information. This interim measure was lifted in August 2017.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), the applicant complains, in particular, that his removal to Russia would expose him to the risk of being tortured, placed under surveillance, detained or subjected to a forced disappearance. Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), he also complains that he would be torn from his family and the country in which he has lived for the past 15 years. Lastly, he alleges under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) that the domestic courts did not sufficiently assess the situation in which he would find himself if he were deported to Russia.

[Strand Lobben and Others v. Norway \(no. 37283/13\)](#)

The case concerns the removal of a mother's parental authority and the adoption of her eldest son.

The applicants are T. Strand Lobben, born in 1986, her children X and Y, and her parents, S. Graff Lobben and L. Lobben. They are Norwegian.

T. Strand Lobben's first son was born in September 2008. Having experienced difficulties when she was pregnant, she had turned to the child welfare authorities for guidance and accepted to stay at a family centre for evaluation during the first months after the child was born. However, a month after the birth she decided to leave the centre. The authorities decided to take the baby into immediate compulsory care and place him in a foster home on an emergency basis as the centre's staff had concerns about whether the baby had been receiving enough food to survive. The baby remained in foster care for the next three years until the social welfare authorities authorised the foster parents to adopt him in December 2011.

As concerned the foster care, the domestic authorities decided that it would not be in the baby's best interests to discontinue public care given his special care needs and the fundamental limitations in the mother's parenting skills.

As concerned the subsequent decision to remove the mother's parental authority and to authorise the adoption, the case was first decided in 2011 by the County Social Welfare board, comprised of a jurist, a psychologist and a layperson who heard 21 witnesses over three days. The mother was present and represented by counsel. The Board concluded that adoption would be in the baby's best interest.

The mother appealed this decision before the courts in 2012. She was again present and represented during three days of witnesses being heard by a professional judge, psychologist and lay person. However, while the courts found that her situation had improved in some areas – she had married and had another child in 2011 – she had not shown improvement in empathising with or understanding her son who was psychologically vulnerable and, as found in a psychiatric report, was in need of a lot of quiet, security and support. The courts notably took account of the contact sessions over three years during which the child had not bonded psychologically with his biological mother and had even been “inconsolable” afterwards, and the security that his foster parents, whom he regarded as his parents, could provide in the years ahead.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants complain about the domestic authorities' decision to let the foster parents adopt X. They allege in particular that severing family ties should only be ordered in exceptional circumstances, such as a particularly unfit family, and that it was not enough to show that a child would have a more beneficial environment if brought up elsewhere.

[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.

Bitanji v. Albania (no. 41984/08)
Kociu and Berballa v. Albania (nos. 44673/07 and 47495/07)
Asgarov v. Azerbaijan (no. 47692/15)
KLAAS-2006 OOD v. Bulgaria (no. 50583/13)
Gobejishvili v. Georgia (no. 51158/08)
Javakhishvili and Others v. Georgia (no. 57437/12)
Kavkasioni Ltd v. Georgia (no. 60249/09)
Mikeladze v. Georgia (no. 70753/10)
Ronly Holdings Ltd. v. Georgia (no. 41444/05)
Shanidze v. Georgia (no. 60867/08)
Defilippis and Others v. Italy (nos. 14828/15, 14853/15, 16938/15, 16944/15, 16948/15, 16951/15, 16957/15, 16960/15, 16962/15, 16970/15, 16972/15, 16976/15, 15298/16, and 20359/16)
Di Cresci Ventrella and Others v. Italy (no. 71443/14 and 65 other applications)
Napolitano and Santoro v. Italy (nos. 9097/16, 9218/16, and 15458/16)
Magyar v. Montenegro (no. 45372/13)
Aştileanu and Axente v. Romania (no. 43258/07)
Oltean v. Romania (no. 8398/16)
A.L. v. Russia (no. 57426/16)
Afanasyeva and Others v. Russia (nos. 12825/10, 59450/11, 19731/16, 27597/16, 32892/16, 36557/16, and 43551/16)
Atakishiyeva and Others v. Russia (nos. 37923/12, 12478/14, 14144/14, 28396/14, 36493/14, 46777/14, 55238/14, and 67033/14)
Blinova and Samagin v. Russia (nos. 17690/06 and 49730/06)
Gorbunov and Others v. Russia (nos. 6511/08, 5048/09, 9571/09, 16662/09, 21338/09, 34119/09, 1121/10, and 11481/10)
Grebenkin v. Russia (no. 3823/11)
Istomin v. Russia (no. 10125/04)
Karyy and Ramishvili v. Russia (nos. 20888/14 and 60277/14)
Kasheshov and Others v. Russia (nos. 6671/14, 38840/14, and 52289/14)
Kazachkova and Others v. Russia (nos. 33064/07, 13600/10, 40437/10, 78491/12, 20600/13, 49569/13, 63406/13, 68839/13, and 76570/13)
Khalilov v. Russia (no. 2373/05)
Klimov and Others v. Russia (nos. 22625/07, 14218/08, 12509/09, 3154/11, 21968/12, 16340/13, 30203/13, 69862/13, and 28992/14)
Kovalev and Others v. Russia (nos. 38777/04, 68855/12, 73964/12, 20988/13, 47875/13, and 53937/13)
Kurushina and Others v. Russia (nos. 19388/07, 46656/09, 47394/10, 59298/11, 64943/11, 44953/12, 72964/12, and 40790/14)
Ladyuk and Others v. Russia (nos. 636/10, 32116/12, 17581/13, 28826/13, 32029/13, 37126/13, 45064/13, and 54123/13)
Lazarev and Others v. Russia (nos. 24000/06, 71804/12, 13420/13, 16031/13, 26703/13, 40773/13, 48292/13, 79581/16, and 3405/17)
Legler and Maryin v. Russia (nos. 724/06 and 38416/09)
Litvinova and Others v. Russia (nos. 1850/10, 7300/12, 18261/13, 50086/13, 16778/14, 58166/14, 39327/16, 62111/16, and 5751/17)
Merzlyak and Others v. Russia (nos. 58812/16, 65619/16, 78152/16, 78506/16, 18999/17, 19013/17, and 20467/17)
Mikryukov and Others v. Russia (nos. 11930/11, 21081/11, 43178/11, 73971/11, 9159/12, 21641/12, 23796/12, and 24614/12)
Nikolayev and Others v. Russia (nos. 43893/16, 61743/16, 64468/16, 64794/16, 64930/16, 76907/16, and 76965/16)

Ogureyev and Makhanova v. Russia (nos. 6983/06 and 32489/06)
Poltoratskiy and Others v. Russia (nos. 4622/09, 9361/10, 55219/12, 328/17, 2803/17, 3031/17, 3132/17, 17911/17, 22861/17, and 23928/17)
Ponomarev and Sosina v. Russia (nos. 35018/12 and 14316/14)
Portnoy v. Russia (no. 73316/10)
Prokhorov and Others v. Russia (nos. 59558/13, 60134/13, 60139/13, 63246/13, 64120/13, 64805/13, and 74853/13)
Pulyayev and Others v. Russia (nos. 48316/08, 58969/12, 58582/13, 69047/13, 26564/14, 52775/16, and 53578/16)
Resin and Others v. Russia (nos. 30428/14, 33972/16, 65613/16, 76412/16, 2605/17, 3496/17, 3534/17, 5168/17, and 5171/17)
S.K. v. Russia (no. 58221/10)
Sadriyev and Demin v. Russia (nos. 46427/16 and 25584/17)
Sashkov and Others v. Russia (nos. 31606/13, 53568/16, 60287/16, 62184/16, 62978/16, 63742/16, 65010/16, 79179/16, 14964/17, and 15672/17)
Sidorova and Others v. Russia (nos. 51210/11, 59336/11, 5530/12, and 21969/12)
Skrytnik v. Russia (no. 25393/07)
Vakhonin v. Russia (no. 70519/12)
Vilkov and Others v. Russia (nos. 29567/10, 25402/15, and 30831/15)
Aksu and Others v. Turkey (nos. 2715/06, 14936/06, 29653/06, 29661/06, 29673/06, 29681/06, 44042/07, 52060/07, and 53315/08)
Akyal v. Turkey (no. 34127/06)
Buderath v. Turkey (no. 34080/10)
Dindar v. Turkey (no. 13077/13)
Erdem and Egin-Erdem v. Turkey (no. 28431/06)
Gülşen v. Turkey (no. 21311/12)
Kızıltepe and Others v. Turkey (no. 23063/08)
Saygi v. Turkey (no. 55559/07)
Yurtsever and Others v. Turkey (no. 37363/05)
Z.K. and Others v. Turkey (no. 60831/15)
Kondrakhin and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 2887/05, 48927/11, 5722/12, 68256/12, 57300/16, 61243/16, 64904/16, 66389/16, and 70406/16)
Prigarin and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 8660/09, 76687/11, 74522/12, 27173/13, 42811/13, 51238/13, and 8390/14)
Yerokhin and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 4043/08, 65291/14, 62164/16, and 2635/17)

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 Twitter [@ECHRpress](https://twitter.com/ECHRpress).

Press contacts

echrpress@echr.coe.int | tel: +33 3 90 21 42 08

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)

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.