

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 16 judgments on Tuesday 29 March 2022 and 70 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 31 March 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)

Tuesday 29 March 2022

[Vool and Toomik v. Estonia \(applications nos. 7613/18 and 12222/18\)](#)

The applicants, Tarko Vool and Janek Toomik, are Estonian nationals who were born in 1988 and 1971 and live in the towns of Võru and Jõgeva (Estonia) respectively.

The case concerns the statutory ban on remand prisoners from having long-term family visits, despite such visits being generally authorised for convicted prisoners. Mr Vool was remanded in custody in April 2014 on suspicion of extortion and of being a member of a criminal organisation, while Mr Toomik was remanded in custody in December 2011 suspected of handling a large quantity of narcotic drugs. During their time on remand, they were not allowed long-term – unsupervised visits of 24-72 hours – with their families.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that they had no right to long-term visits during their detention on remand whereas convicted persons serving their prison terms did.

[Laniauskas v. Lithuania \(no. 48309/19\)](#)

The applicant, Remigijus Laniauskas, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1972 and is currently detained at the Prison Hospital in Pravieniškės (Lithuania). He sustained injuries to his eyes during an explosion in 1993 and his vision continued to deteriorate afterwards, particularly from 2009. He is now nearly blind.

In 2013 and 2015 Mr Laniauskas was convicted on several counts of unlawful possession and smuggling of firearms, explosive materials and narcotic or psychotropic substances, committed between 2006 and 2008 as part of an organised criminal group. He began serving his sentence in the Kybartai Correctional Facility in March 2015 and is set to be released in March 2023.

The applicant complains that, in view of his visual impairment, his detention is incompatible with Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention.

[Starkevič v. Lithuania \(no. 7512/18\)](#)

The applicant, Edvin Starkevič, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1986 and lives in Vilnius. He is a former police officer.

The case concerns a criminal investigation into Mr Starkevič for suspected abuse of office, and the use of information thus obtained in subsequent disciplinary proceedings to prove that he had committed a disciplinary offence. As a result, he was dismissed from the police.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, the applicant complains that he did not have a fair hearing in connection with the court proceedings. He also complains that the use of the pre-trial

investigation material to investigate the question of his disciplinary violation was in breach of his right to respect for his private life under Article 8 of the Convention.

[Nuh Uzun and Others v. Turkey \(nos. 49341/18 and 13 other applications\)](#)

The applications concern the uploading of the applicants' correspondence, while they were in detention, onto the National Judicial Network Server (*Ulusal Yargı Ağı Bilişim Sistemi* – "UYAP"). Some of the applications also relate to the non-disclosure of the public prosecutor's opinion during the proceedings before the domestic authorities (enforcement judge and/or assize court). At the time of the events the applicants (fourteen Turkish nationals) were detained in various Turkish prisons in connection with alleged membership of a terrorist organisation, following the attempted military coup of 15 July 2016. Some of them were subsequently released while others are still in detention.

The applicants rely on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life/right to respect for correspondence). Some of them also rely on Article 6 (right to a fair trial).

Thursday 31 March 2022

[Mayrapetyan v. Armenia \(no. 43/19\)](#)

The applicant, Samvel Mayrapetyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1959 and lives in Yerevan. He is a well-known businessman and the owner and chief executive of a television channel in Armenia.

The case concerns the deterioration of Mr Mayrapetyan's health while in detention and the manner in which the authorities handled the situation.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) and Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), Mr Mayrapetyan complains of the healthcare and diet provided during his detention while ill, and of the authorities' refusal to allow him to travel abroad for urgent medical treatment.

[N.B. and Others v. France \(no. 49775/20\)](#)

The applicants, N.B. and N.G. and their son K.G., are Georgian nationals who were born in 1988, 1984 and 2012 respectively. They entered France unlawfully in 2019 and their applications for asylum were rejected. In the context of their forcible removal, the Ardennes prefecture booked a flight to Georgia for 7 November 2020. On 6 November 2020 the prefect of the *département* issued orders for the placement of N.B. and N.G. in administrative detention.

The case concerns the 14-day administrative detention of the couple and their child, who was aged eight at the time.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), the applicants allege that their placement in administrative detention amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment. Under Article 34 (right of individual application), they complain of the fact that the French authorities did not release them following the Court's decision granting their request for interim measures under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court aimed at putting an end to their detention.

[Faulkner and McDonagh v. Ireland \(nos. 30391/18 and 30416/18\)](#)

The applicants, Christina Faulkner and Bridget McDonagh, were born in 1965 and 1962 respectively. They are Irish nationals, members of the Traveller community (a recognised ethnic group in Ireland), and live in Limerick (Ireland). They are sisters.

The case concerns the applicants' removal from a roadside site they were living on illegally.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants complain that the orders to vacate the site were an interference with their rights, and that the authorities did not examine the proportionality of the orders. The applicants further complain that the domestic proceedings breached Article 6 (right to a fair trial) as they were conducted in undue haste and they were not legally represented.

Maslák v. Slovakia (no. 2) (nos. 38321/17 and 8 other applications)

The applicant, Miroslav Maslák, is a Slovak national who was born in 1979 and resides in Pružina (Slovakia).

Mr Maslák has lodged around 40 applications with the Court. This current set of applications concerns his time serving a prison sentence for extortion in the high-security units of three separate Slovak prisons in Leopoldov, Ilava and Banská Bystrica-Kráľ'ová. It also concerns the legal framework governing that security regime and the prison authorities' decisions and the court proceedings following his complaints.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), Article 8 (right to respect for private life), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), and Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), Mr Maslák complains, in particular, that his placement in the high-security unit and other prison restrictions were unlawful and arbitrary, that that prison regime amounted to inhuman treatment, and that he did not have an that he did not have an effective remedy and a fair hearing before the Constitutional Court.

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 29 March 2022

Name	Main application number
Ghukasyan and Others v. Armenia	32986/10
Hakobyan v. Armenia	11222/12
Andi Marius Ionescu v. Romania	24481/15
Manole v. Romania	54241/15
Nistor v. Romania	19115/15
A.J. and Others v. Russia	12120/20
Aksenov v. Russia	13706/08
Buriyev v. Russia	42874/18
Chirikov and Nekrasov v. Russia	47942/17
N.K. v. Russia	45761/18
Rakhmonov v. Russia	296/18
Sherstobitova v. Russia	14697/18

Thursday 31 March 2022

Name	Main application number
Kalia v. Albania	62986/09
Balasanyan v. Armenia	76124/14

Name	Main application number
Skizb Media Kentron Ltd v. Armenia	32251/12
Jafarov v. Azerbaijan	53213/18
Kesteley v. Belgium	45873/16
Đozo and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina	50577/21
Marinova v. Bulgaria	59932/15
Yordan Ivanov v. Bulgaria	36946/12
Perša v. Croatia	50014/15
Carrobours v. France	66205/17
Dolidze v. Georgia	37662/11
Diamantopoulos v. Greece	68144/13
N.A. and Others v. Greece	11216/20
R.A. v. Greece	24427/20
Bander and Others v. Hungary	21980/21
Bartus and Others v. Hungary	10214/21
Duka v. Hungary	9298/21
Fábi and Others v. Hungary	15589/21
Móricz v. Hungary	47157/21
D.S. and Others v. Hungary	41602/17
Borghetti v. Italy	5019/18
Burlotti Spedizioni S.p.A. v. Italy	32323/07
Fasano v. Italy	61126/08
Pepoli v. Italy	16955/21
Traina Berto and Others v. Italy	75505/12
M.D. v. North Macedonia	46504/18
Jaroszczak v. Poland	16602/21
Krotofil and Others v. Poland	51044/19
Obremski and Others v. Poland	52386/19
Szlezinger v. Poland	37370/17
Touahri v. Poland	46971/20
Ferreira Estevam v. Portugal	24779/20
Horst Krenz and Figueira Almeida v. Portugal	40892/20
Băltăţoiu and Others v. Romania	28375/16
Cilibeanu and Others v. Romania	41688/16
Coşeru and Others v. Romania	49772/16
Dăniciuc and Others v. Romania	52969/16
Fotache v. Romania	35631/16
Grecu v. Romania	47434/20
Kerekes v. Romania	53601/16
Părăuşanu v. Romania	24032/18
Roba and Others v. Romania	34533/16
Toma and Others v. Romania	30351/16
Ashikov v. Russia	63458/19
Karimbayev v. Russia	26627/05
Kulikov v. Russia	12889/18
Leonov v. Russia	12864/17

Name	Main application number
Makarov v. Russia	69310/17
Osechkin and Others v. Russia	14813/10
Taran v. Russia	11327/10
Vavilin v. Russia	35249/19
Yudin v. Russia	45508/13
Denić and Others v. Serbia	33698/21
Janković and Others v. Serbia	47529/20
Jeremić and Others v. Serbia	33740/21
Josimović and Others v. Serbia	29303/21
Stamenković and Others v. Serbia	34432/21
Stevanović and Others v. Serbia	45269/20
Tatović v. Serbia	13717/21
Vojinović and Others v. Serbia	34822/21
Brychta v. Slovakia	38811/21
Junas v. Slovakia	8790/19
Kľačanová v. Slovakia	8116/19
İlimoğlu v. Turkey	60138/15
Ball v. the United Kingdom	65463/16
Human Rights Watch v. the United Kingdom	64230/16

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 [@ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

Press contacts

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.