EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 071 (2017)
23.02.2017

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing eight judgments on Tuesday 28 February 2017 and 40 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 2 March 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 February 2017

Manoli v. the Republic of Moldova (application no. 56875/11)

The applicant, Radu Manoli, is a Moldovan national who was born in 1984 and lives in Boscana (the Republic of Moldova). At the time of the events Mr Manoli was a police officer. The case concerns his conviction for ill-treating a suspect.

In December 2006, Mr Manoli and another office, V.G., arrested two suspects (both of whom were intoxicated) and took them to the police station. The officers were later charged with ill-treating the suspects, both during the arrest and at the station. According to statements made by the victims to prosecutors, at the police station only officer V.G. had ill-treated one of the suspects, A.C., by kicking him in the chest. The charges against Mr Manoli were therefore dropped – only for them to be re-instated one month later.

During the court proceedings A.C. alleged that V.G. had kicked him in the chest. The other suspect, A.V., made two different contradictory statements about the incident. First he stated that both Mr Manoli and V.G. had kicked him. However, he later said that only V.G. had hit him, using a machine gun. A.V. also said that he did not have a clear memory of what had happened because of the acute state of his intoxication.

In a judgment of May 2009, the Buiucani District Court found that the police officers had used legitimate force during the arrest, and acquitted them in respect of that episode. In relation to the ill-treatment in the police station, the court acquitted Mr Manoli and found V.G. guilty of kicking A.C. in the chest. The Prosecutor's Office appealed.

In January 2010 the Chișinău Court of Appeal upheld the appeal, reversed the judgment at first instance, convicted Mr Manoli as charged and gave him a three-year suspended prison sentence. The court did not question the suspects, victims or witnesses again, but only cited some of the statements they had made before the first-instance court. In particular, the court cited the part of A.V.'s statement where he had accused both police officers of ill-treating him in the police station - but not the rest of his statement.

Mr Manoli lodged an appeal on points of law to the Supreme Court of Justice, alleging that he had received an unfair hearing in the Court of Appeal. The Court dismissed the appeal in February 2011. A further extraordinary appeal to the Supreme Court of Justice was also dismissed, in October 2011.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Manoli complained that the criminal proceedings against him had not been fair, because the Court of Appeal had failed to hear the victims and witnesses before overturning his acquittal.

Bivolaru v. Romania (no. 28796/04)

The applicant, Gregorian Bivolaru, is a Romanian national who was born in 1952 and lives in Romania.

The case concerns the complaints lodged by Mr Bivolaru, leader of the "Movement for Spiritual Integration into the Absolute", relating to the lawfulness of his pre-trial detention, his right to presumption of innocence and respect for his right to private life.

Mr Bivolaru has been the leader of the "Spiritual Yoga Movement" (MISA) since 1990. On 18 March 2004 sixteen buildings occupied by members of the MISA, including M.D., were searched. On 26 March 2004 the public prosecutor brought proceedings against Mr Bivolaru on charges of sexual relations with a minor and sexual perversion allegedly committed on M.D., who had been a minor at the material time. In May 2004 two more similar complaints were added to Mr Bivolaru's criminal file.

On 28 March 2004 Mr Bivolaru was arrested in the customs building at Nădlac, on the Romanian/Hungarian border, and charged with attempting to cross the border illegally. According to Mr Bivolaru, he had gone to the customs building to ascertain whether he was prohibited from leaving Romania before attempting to attend a seminar on yoga in Hungary. On 29 March 2004 Mr Bivolaru was remanded in custody and informed that he was charged with attempting to cross the border illegally, having sexual relations with a minor and sexual perversion. On 30 March 2004 the Bucharest County Court ordered Mr Bivolaru's placement in pre-trial detention. Mr Bivolaru denied the charges and appealed. On 1 April 2004 the Bucharest Court of Appeal ordered his release at a hearing held at twelve noon. The applicant was released at 9.10 p.m. on the same day. The case had attracted extensive coverage by the Romanian media, which quoted the comments of a member of parliament and the Minister for Administration and the Interior on Mr Bivolaru. At the end of the criminal proceedings Mr Bivolaru was sentenced to six years' imprisonment. In the meantime, however, he had moved to Sweden, where he had been granted political asylum. According to the information available to the Court, Mr Bivolaru was arrested in Paris on 26 February 2016 and then extradited to Romania.

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) of the Convention, Mr Bivolaru alleges that he was deprived of his liberty without any plausible reason and detained for 10 hours in a police station despite the judgment of the Bucharest Court of Appeal of 1 April 2004 ordering his release. Relying on Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence), Mr Bivolaru complains about the various public statements made regarding him by State representatives. Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Mr Bivolaru complains of the unlawful house searches conducted on 18 March 2004, the tapping of his telephone, the alleged disclosure to the press by the authorities of audio-visual material produced during the investigation and the information on his private life made public by the media.

Müftüoğlu and Others v. Turkey (nos. 34520/10, 34733/10 and 34745/10)

The applicants, Halil Hilmi Müftüoğlu, Adnan Tınarlıoğlu and Turgut Aksu, are Turkish nationals who were born in 1965, 1966 and 1961 respectively and live in Istanbul (Turkey).

The case concerns allegations of ill-treatment inflicted on the applicants during their arrest and police custody.

On 12 November 1999 the applicants were arrested during a police operation against the *Bilim Araştırma Vakfı* foundation (scientific research foundation). Mr Aksu was released on 17 November 1999. Mr Müftüoğlu and Mr Tınarlıoğlu were released on 18 November 1999. On 11 January 2000 criminal proceedings were brought against them for assisting and participating in a criminal organisation, but the Istanbul Assize Court discontinued the proceedings in May 2008 on grounds of statute limitation. That decision was upheld by the Court of Cassation.

In 2000 the applicants had lodged a complaint of torture against the police officers responsible for their custody. In October 2001 the prosecution decided to discontinue the proceedings, but that decision was set aside by the Assize Court in April 2005. On different dates the prosecution charged several police officers with torture, and the proceedings before the 7th Division of the Istanbul Assize Court led to the acquittal of eight officers. That judgment was, however, quashed by the Court of Cassation in April 2013 and the case should now be pending before the 7th Division of the Istanbul Assize Court. The Court has not been informed of any developments in the case since 5 March 2015.

Relying, in particular, on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain that they suffered ill-treatment during their police custody and had no access to an effective remedy enabling them to identify those responsible and have them convicted.

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.

Auerbach v. Austria (no. 907/13)
Hamberger v. Austria (no. 49664/12)
Cunha Martins da Silva Couto v. Portugal (no. 69062/13)
Timar and Others v. Romania (nos. 26856/06, 26449/08, 61815/09, 30395/10, 50999/10, 58287/10, 63120/10 and 36942/11)
Vonica v. Romania (no. 78344/14)

Thursday 2 March 2017

Debray v. France (no. 52733/13)

The applicant, Dominique Debray, is a French national who was born in 1954 and lives in Paris.

The case concerns the annulment of the entirety of a court summons for defamation and insult, on the ground that it did not meet the requirements of section 53 of the Freedom of the Press Act.

In 2007, a patient being treated by Mr Debray, a doctor specialising in laser depilation, lodged a complaint against him with the medical association. She published the main lines of that complaint on an Internet site, describing Mr Debray and his associates as robbers and accusing him of dishonest commercial practices, misleading advertising and abuse of trust.

In June 2007 Mr Debray sued this person and the Internet site operator before the Paris Regional Court for insult and defamation. However, the pre-trial judge of the Paris Regional Court annulled the summons in its entirety on the grounds that it was too vague on the subject of the requirements of section 53 of the Freedom of the Press Act inasmuch as it classified certain facts as constituting both insult and defamation. That decision was upheld by the Paris Court of Appeal, but the Court of Cassation quashed the judgment delivered. The case was referred back to the Court of Appeal, which, on 15 February 2011, upheld its findings, and on 15 February 2013 the Full Court of Cassation dismissed Mr Debray's appeal on points of law on the grounds that a summons classifying the same fact as both insult and defamation was null and void.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a tribunal) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Debray complains of the annulment of the court summons in its entirety and of a violation of his right to a court.

Labaca Larrea and Others v. France (nos. 56710/13, 56727/13, and 57412/13)

The case concerns the imprisonment in France of three members of the ETA in a remand prison located far away from their homes and families.

The applicants, Urko Labaca Larrea, Ione Lozano Miranda and Alejandro Zobaran Arriola, are Spanish nationals who were born in 1986 and 1981.

In March 2011 they were arrested in French territory and sentenced to six, five and nine years' imprisonment respectively for various offences. Having initially been held in remand prisons in the Paris area, they were later transferred to the Lyon-Corbas remand prison.

Considering that the latter remand prison was situated too far from the residences of their families, forcing the latter to travel a great distance to visit them, the three applicants sent a letter to the investigating judge asking him, pursuant to Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, to take the requisite action to put an end to that situation, which in their view infringed their right to lead a normal family life. In the absence of a reply from the investigating judge, the applicants repeated the contents of their letter in the form of a request for a procedural act. On 15 February 2013 the investigating judge issued an order rejecting the request for a procedural act. On 6 March 2013 he sent the applicants a letter explaining the reasons for their imprisonment in the Lyon-Corbas remand prison. The three applicants appealed against the order of 15 February 2013. On 26 March 2013 the President of the Investigation Chamber of the Paris Court of Appeal ruled that there was no need to refer to the Investigation Chamber the appeal lodged against the order.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants complained of their transfer to the Lyon-Corbas remand prison, far from their homes and families. Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complained of the lack of an effective remedy to contest their transfer to Lyon-Corbas.

Paroutsas and Others v. Greece (no. 34639/09)

The applicants, Athanasios Paroutsas, Aspasia Paroutsa, Efthymia Paroutsa and Dimitra Paroutsa, are Greek nationals who were born in 1932, 1973, 1974 and 1981 respectively and live in Athens, apart from Ms Aspasia Paroutsa, who lives in Washington DC (USA).

The case concerns a problem with the service of two administrative decisions concerning the demolition of a building which was deemed dangerous.

On 8 May 2002 the Urban Planning Department of Athens Municipality ordered the demolition of the first floor of a building belonging to the applicants, on the grounds that it was empty, rundown and unsuitable for habitation. The Urban Planning Department further requested the consolidation of the ground floor, notifying a 30-day deadline for commencing the works, under the supervision of an architect. According to the Government, the applicants initiated the works without calling on the services of an architect and with the intention of demolishing the whole building.

On 31 May 2002 a number of employees of the Urban Planning Department visited the site and drew up a progress report on the works, noting, firstly, that total demolition of the building was against the law because the structure was a listed "neoclassical" building and was under a conservation order, and secondly, that the works had begun. The Urban Planning Department ordered the owners to halt the demolition work and imposed a fine of 4,200 euros (EUR) on them. The report was served on the applicants by means of bills posted on the building under demolition on 21 June 2002, thus initiating the 30-day deadline in order to apply for reconsideration. The applicants submit that that decision was only brought to their attention one year later, on 19 June 2003, when Mr Athanasios Paroutsas was requested to pay the fine imposed.

On 4 September 2003 Mr Athanasios Paroutsas submitted an application for reconsideration to the Urban Planning Department's Appeals Board, which declared it inadmissible as having been lodged out of time. He subsequently applied to the Athens Administrative Court to set the decision aside, submitting that on the date on which the report had been served the building had been almost completely demolished and that there had no longer been any walls standing on which to post the decision. That application was dismissed by the Administrative Court of Appeal by judgment of 28 December 2004, upheld by the Council of State on 31 December 2008.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a tribunal and right to a fair trial within a reasonable time), the applicants complained of their lack of access to a court in order to assert their rights and of the length of proceedings.

Talpis v. Italy (no. 41237/14)

The applicant, Elisaveta Talpis, is a Romanian and Moldovan national who was born in 1965 and lives in Remanzaccio (Italy).

The case concerns the conjugal violence suffered by Ms Talpis, which resulted in the murder of her son and the attempted murder of Ms Talpis.

In June 2012 Ms Talpis complained to the police that her husband (A.T.), who was an alcoholic, had beaten her and her daughter. On arriving at the scene, the police officers found A.T. in the street in a drunken state and recorded the injuries sustained by Ms Talpis and her daughter in their incident report. Ms Talpis did not lodge a formal complaint and decided to hide in the cellar.

In August 2012 Ms Talpis was once again attacked by her husband with a knife, forcing her to accompany him in order to have sexual relations with his friends. She asked a police patrol in the street for help; the officers fined A.T. for carrying a prohibited weapon and invited Ms Talpis to go home. She then went to the hospital accident and emergency unit, where doctors noted a head injury and multiple lesions to her body, and told her that the injuries would probably heal up within a week. She was then taken in by a welfare association for female victims of violence for three months, after which she had to leave for lack of available places and adequate resources. According to Ms Talpis, she subsequently slept in the street, was accommodated for a time by a friend, and finally found a job as a care assistant and was able to rent a flat. A.T. continued to exert psychological pressure on her.

In September 2012 Ms Talpis lodged a complaint for bodily harm, ill-treatment and threats of violence, urging the authorities to take prompt action to protect her and her children. On 4 April 2013 she was questioned for the first time by the police and she modified her statements, mitigating the allegations. In August 2013 the complaint concerning the allegations of ill-treatment of the family and threats of violence was dropped. In October 2015, however, A.T. was fined 2,000 euros (EUR) for the offence of actual bodily harm.

In November 2013 Ms Talpis once again called the police concerning an argument with her husband, who was taken to hospital in a state of intoxication. After his discharge from hospital, armed with a kitchen knife, A.T. entered the family apartment and attacked Ms Talpis. He stabbed his son, who had tried to separate his parents and who died of his injuries. A.T. also stabbed Ms Talpis in the chest several times as she was attempting to escape. In January 2015 A.T. was sentenced to life imprisonment for the murder of his son and the attempted murder of his wife, for carrying a prohibited weapon and for the ill-treatment of Ms Talpis and her daughter. He was also ordered to pay Ms Talpis damages.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Ms Talpis complained of the failure of the Italian authorities in their obligation to provide protection against the domestic violence which she had suffered and which had led to the death of her son and her own attempted murder.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Articles 2 and 3, Ms Talpis also complained that she had suffered discrimination as a woman on account of the inaction of the authorities. She also complained of the inadequacy of the Italian legislation on domestic violence.

Moroz v. Ukraine (no. 5187/07)

The applicant, Oleg Moroz, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1967 and is currently serving his prison sentence. The case concerns his prosecution for murder, in addition to the conditions and treatment he was subjected to whilst in pre-trial detention.

On the morning of 1 June 2005 O., the president of the Ukrainian Dental Association, was shot in his office. Mr Moroz had been present at the time, and called an ambulance. When the police arrived, Mr Moroz explained that it had been an accident: that he and O. had both been interested in hunting; that he had brought the gun as a present for O.; and that the gun had accidentally gone off when O. had tried to pull it to himself.

Mr Moroz was arrested by police, and questioned later that night in the presence of his lawyer. The lawyer indicated to the police that Mr Moroz had to be provided with the opportunity to talk with him in private before the questioning. However, the investigator rejected the request. Mr Moroz was later charged with murder, and then also with the illegal production, possession and storage of firearms. Starting in July 2005, he was detained at Kyiv pre-trial detention centre no.13 (“the SIZO”).

In May 2006 the Kyiv City Court of Appeal found Mr Moroz guilty as charged and sentenced him to 15 years’ imprisonment. The Court held that Mr Moroz had deliberately shot O. twice in the head, as revenge for O.’s role in preventing him from becoming the acting executive director of the Ukrainian Dental Association. The court’s conclusion was based on witness testimony (including that of three people who had entered the room after the incident, and found Mr Moroz smiling), as well as a forensic examination (which included a ballistic examination that contradicted Mr Moroz’s version of events). Mr Moroz appealed, but the Supreme Court upheld the decision in November 2006.

On 1 July 2007 Mr Moroz was transferred to prison no.72 to serve his sentence.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Moroz complains that he suffered poor conditions whilst detained in the SIZO (including overcrowding, poor hygiene, and the claim that he was exposed to Hepatitis B); that he was denied access to adequate medical attention there; and that he was also exposed to poor conditions in both the police station and the temporary detention centre. Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), he complains that the proceedings against him had been unfair. In particular, Mr Moroz complains that he was not allowed to have a private discussion with his lawyer in the police station before his police interview there; and that he was also denied a lawyer when first questioned about the shooting at the scene. Relying on Article 8 (right to family life and the correspondence), Mr Moroz complains that whilst in pre-trial detention, he was not allowed to see his family or send correspondence to them. He also relies on Article 9 (freedom of religion) to complain that during his pre-trial detention he had not been allowed to meet with a priest or visit the SIZO chapel, and that his religious literature and other religious items were seized by SIZO staff. Mr Moroz also claims that there had been no grounds for his arrest or criminal prosecution, relying on Article 5 (right to liberty) and Article 7 (no punishment without law). He also invokes Articles 1 (obligation to respect human rights) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) in relation to his case.

Palchik v. Ukraine (no. 16980/06)

The applicant, Aleksandr Palchik, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1954 and lives in Kostyantynivka. The case concerns his allegation that criminal proceedings brought against him for smuggling and related offences were unfair.

In 2002 criminal proceedings were instituted against Mr Palchik, the managing director of a private company, on suspicion of having concluded fictitious contracts for ferromanganese with four Ukrainian private companies in order to obtain export value added tax refunds. Mr Palchik denied the allegations, stating that he had legally bought ferromanganese from the four companies, exported it to Russia and then received tax refunds. During the pre-trial investigation managers of the four companies admitted that the contracts had either been forged or fictitious and that no actual shipments of the goods had taken place; some of the managers also repeated these statements during confrontations with Mr Palchik.

The police tried on at least five occasions between 2003 and 2004 to bring these and other witnesses to court hearings on the case, without success. The pre-trial statements of these witnesses were therefore read out at a court hearing on the case in August 2004.

In December 2004 Mr Palchik was found guilty of exporting ferromanganese based on forged documents, receipt of tax refunds on the basis of fictitious and forged documents, abuse of office and forgery of documents. His final sentence was seven years and six months' imprisonment with a ban on holding managerial positions for two years. In convicting Mr Palchik, the first-instance court relied in particular on the statements of a number of witnesses given during the pre-trial investigation as well as inconsistencies between the official records of Mr Palchik's company and the shadow accounting discovered by the authorities. These findings and the sentence were upheld on appeal in March 2005. Mr Palchik's and his lawyer's appeals on points of law were dismissed by the Supreme Court in September 2005, on the ground that the lower courts' findings had been based on a substantial amount of evidence, in particular the statements made by the managers of companies at the investigation stage.

Mr Palchik was released from detention following a presidential pardon in May 2009.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair hearing/right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses), Mr Palchik makes a number of complaints about the fairness of the proceedings against him. In particular, he complains that the Supreme Court failed to summon him and his lawyer to the hearing on his appeal on points of law, and thus only heard the case in the presence of the prosecutor, in breach of the principle of equality of arms. Furthermore, he complains that the witnesses whose statements had been used to convict him had not been examined at trial and that five other witnesses had not been called at all. Lastly, he also complains that he had not been able to obtain a copy of the appeal court's decision of March 2005 for a considerable amount of time during the proceedings, in breach of Article 34 (right of individual petition).

Ahmed v. the United Kingdom (no. 59727/13)

The applicant, Liban Mohamud Ahmed, is a Somali national who was born in 1977 and lives in London. The case concerns his detention after the Secretary of State decided to make a deportation order against him.

In 1999 the applicant made a claim for asylum in the UK. This was unsuccessful, but he was granted exceptional leave to remain in the UK until 2004.

Following ten criminal convictions between November 2001 and August 2005, Mr Ahmed was convicted again in December 2007, of a public order offence and of failing to surrender, and was sentenced to four and a half months' imprisonment. In January 2008 Mr Ahmed was served with a notice that the Secretary State intended to make a deportation order against him. His appeal against that decision was dismissed.

On 8 February 2008 Mr Ahmed was detained pending his deportation. Removal directions were cancelled on 16 June 2009, after Mr Ahmed made an application to the European Court of Human Rights, which granted an interim measure under Rule 39.

His detention was reviewed monthly with reasons for maintaining his detention being recorded in the review forms. Some of the review forms issued after the grant of the interim measure under Rule 39 noted, in what the domestic courts described to be passages which were "not very happily expressed" [§22], that his continuing detention was a direct result of his appeals, that Rule 39 "is a barrier to removal" and that he could reduce the length of his detention by withdrawing voluntarily.

The courts repeatedly refused to grant Mr Ahmed bail and his further representations against his removal were also refused by the Secretary of State.

On 13 July 2011, two weeks after the Court ruled on the issue of removals to Somalia in the case of Sufi and Elmi v. the United Kingdom[1], Mr Ahmed was released on bail.

In November 2011 the Administrative Court dismissed Mr Ahmed's judicial review claim, finding that his detention had not been unlawful. In particular, the Court noted that Mr Ahmed had plainly presented a substantial absconsion risk, The Court of Appeal dismissed his appeal in October 2012. The Supreme Court refused leave to appeal on 26 March 2013.

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (f) (right to liberty and security), Mr Ahmed complains that the domestic law governing administrative detention of immigrants prior to expulsion had not been sufficiently precise, accessible and foreseeable for it to meet the standard of lawfulness under the Convention. He also argued that his detention between 8 February 2008 and 13 July 2011 had not been for the purpose of deportation and had been in violation of his right to liberty. Furthermore, Mr Ahmed relies on Article 34 (right of individual petition) to complain that the authorities had hindered his right to apply to the Court, by justifying the decision to keep him detained with the fact that he had obtained a measure under Rule 39 (interim measures) of the Rules of Court from the Court, and by making repeated offers to him to join a "Facilitated Returns Scheme" which would voluntarily return him to Somalia.

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.

GH Immobilienmakler GmbH v. Austria (no. 36871/11)
Saarepu v. Estonia (no. 24316/13)
Nurbegian v. Georgia (no. 9593/09)
Mociu v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 66094/12)
Karp v. Poland (no. 23887/15)
Osinski v. Poland (no. 52224/15)
Alistar and Others v. Romania (nos. 68125/13, 49311/15, 39723/14, 44588/14, 6785/15, 22051/15, 30749/15, 39398/15, 53341/15, 9202/16 and 29134/16)
Catalan v. Romania (nos. 43826/05 and 837/06)
Vișteanu and Others v. Romania (nos. 40313/15, 52842/15 and 19105/16)
De Mateis and Others v. Slovenia (no. 56928/08)
Saver v. Slovenia (no. 18105/13)
A.S.R. v. Turkey (no. 60079/14)
Aggoz v. Turkey (no. 12061/09)
Atik v. Turkey (no. 31572/04)
Canpolat v. Turkey (no. 32030/14)
Cingöz v. Turkey (no. 64677/12)
Demir v. Turkey (no. 42781/07)
Engin v. Turkey (no. 13246/13)
Etgü v. Turkey (no. 37588/12)

Menkü v. Turkey (no. 51279/12)
Özçakmak v. Turkey (no. 24573/08)
Özdemir v. Turkey (no. 26424/11)
Sarcan and Others v. Turkey (nos. 17594/08, 34446/08, 34447/08, 34454/08, 34457/08 and 34471/08)
Soytoprak v. Turkey (no. 58186/12)
Süzer and Others v. Turkey (nos. 5426/09, 17856/09 and 33302/09)
Arkhipov v. Ukraine (no. 77741/14)
Baydak and Nychaya v. Ukraine (nos. 39809/08 and 4157/10)
Blashchuk and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 81643/12, 11001/16, 12003/16 and 12005/16)
Khatsko and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 50564/08, 20476/16, 34045/16 and 44365/16)
Mindrova v. Ukraine (no. 32454/06)
Sitnik and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 20100/07, 35763/08, 36663/10, 4697/13, 65330/13 and 9451/14)
Volchkova and Zheleznova v. Ukraine (no. 2293/09)
Yantsev and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 47247/09, 4764/13 and 73560/14)

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)
George Stafford (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 71)