



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing one judgment on Tuesday 30 June 2026 and 18 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 2 July 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 30 June 2026

[Eikenaar v. the Netherlands \(application no. 52053/18\)](#)

The applicant, Elisabeth Gertrude Eikenaar, is a Dutch national who was born in 1960 and lives in Hellevoetsluis (the Netherlands).

The case concerns the use of force by a police officer against her late partner, E.C.U. On 23 November 2016 the Rotterdam police received reports of a man, E.C.U., behaving in a confused and aggressive manner. Police officers attended the scene and during the events that followed, one of the officers, Officer X, punched him in the back of the head. E.C.U. was arrested and taken to a nearby police station where he died. The subsequent autopsy concluded that E.C.U. had died of a "cocaine-related death". In July 2017 the Chief Public Prosecutor closed the criminal investigation, finding that the use of force had been necessary and proportionate and that there was no indication that the force inflicted on E.C.U. had caused or contributed to his death. Ms Eikenaar lodged a complaint against the decision not to prosecute Officer X which was dismissed. The Court of Appeal acknowledged that Officer X should have refrained from administering the punch to the head but held that no criminal offence requiring prosecution had been committed.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Ms Eikenaar complains about the use of force during her partner's arrest.

Thursday 2 July 2026

[Dragoni and Others v. Italy \(no. 12654/22\)](#)

The case concerns a girl, H., who was taken into public care right after her birth in 2017 and put up for adoption in 2019.

The applicants in the case are her parents, Dora Dragoni, an Italian national, and Fatih Divrak, a Turkish national; and, her maternal grandparents, Italo Dragoni and Lilia Ida Guerrini, both Italian nationals. They all live in Bagnacavallo (Italy).

After giving birth to H., Ms Dragoni was hospitalised for two weeks with a psychotic disorder. H. was placed in the care of the social services after parental responsibility of Ms Dragoni and Mr Divrak was suspended and the Youth Court initiated proceedings to put her up for adoption. Regular visits were organised between all four applicants and the child. Ultimately, however, in 2019 the courts found that both the parents and the grandparents lacked the necessary parenting abilities and that they were not capable of improving within a time frame that was compatible with the child's needs.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention, the applicants complain about the decision to declare that H. had been abandoned brackets ("*stato di abbandono*") and that she was available for adoption. They allege in particular that the adoption

decision had been based on an outdated assessment of their parenting abilities and that the authorities had failed to put in place a programme to help them improve. They further complain about the interruption of their contact with the child, without sufficient reasons, while the proceedings were still pending, and that the length of the proceedings on their request for a stay of execution of that decision had been excessive.

[Fanesi v. Italy \(no. 25063/20\)](#)

The applicant, Gianluca Fanesi, is an Italian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Monteprandone.

The case concerns the alleged ill-treatment of the applicant by police officers and the alleged lack of an effective investigation into that treatment.

On 5 November 2017, following a football match, the applicant was involved in a fight between supporters of the two opposing teams. He submits that he was hit on the head by police officers present at the scene, which caused him serious physical injuries resulting in permanent neurological damage.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), the applicant complains that the force used against him by the police was not strictly necessary. He further submits that the investigation into his allegations was not effective as there were a number of shortcomings and, among other things, those responsible for his injuries were never identified.

[Ubeda and Others v. Italy \(no. 9993/24\)](#)

The applicants, Audrey Carmen Manuela Ubeda, A.P. and M.P., are French nationals who were born in 1983, 2011 and 2014 respectively and live in Italy. A.P. and M.P. are Ms Ubeda's minor children.

The case concerns the alleged failure of the Italian authorities to duly address and assess Ms Ubeda's allegations of domestic and sexual violence perpetrated against her and the two children. In April 2021 Ms Ubeda lodged a complaint with the police against the father of her children and former cohabitant, G.P., an Italian national, alleging that he had been violent towards her and her children during their relationship, both physically and psychologically. In May 2021 at Ms Ubeda's request, she and her children were placed in a shelter. After an initial request for dismissal by the prosecution, which Ms. Ubeda alleges was based on sexist stereotypes, in 2024 G.P. was committed for trial. However, no hearing had been held prior to the lodging of the application before the Court. In parallel, in May 2021 Ms Ubeda brought an action seeking sole custody of the children, the removal of G.P.'s parental responsibility and authorisation to leave Italy. In May 2024 the Juvenile Court deprived G.P. of his parental responsibility. No ruling on Ms Ubeda's request to be authorised to leave the shelter and to settle in France was expressly taken. The applicants left the shelter in July 2024.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to private and family life), the applicants complain that the national courts —both in the criminal proceedings and in the civil proceedings relating to child custody— failed to properly assess their allegations of domestic violence or to adopt adequate protective measures. They also complain that the authorities kept them in the shelter for over three years without considering the restrictions thus imposed on their liberty.

[Căldărari v. the Republic of Moldova \(no. 55294/17\)](#)

The applicants, Virgilia Căldărari and Lilian Căldărari, mother and son, are Moldovan nationals who were born in 1982 and 2005 respectively. They used to live in Chişinău.

The case essentially concerns the State's response to alleged medical negligence. In November 2011 a dentist recommended that Mr Căldărari, who was 8 years' old at the time, undergo dental

treatment under a general anaesthesia. Following the administration of an anaesthetic agent (halothane), Mr Căldărari's pulse rate dropped, and he went into cardiac arrest. Although he was resuscitated, he remained in a cerebral coma for several months, which left him with severe neurological damage and complete paralysis. In April 2012 he was discharged from hospital to continue his recovery at home. Mr Căldărari died on 3 July 2022 as a consequence of his long-term afflictions. A criminal investigation, initiated at Ms Căldărari's request, was discontinued and reopened on several occasions. On 17 July 2017 the prosecutor closed the investigation and that decision became final.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 8 (right to private and family life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain that Mr Căldărari was a victim of medical negligence relating to the improper use of halothane as an anaesthetic agent and that the investigation had been ineffective.

[A.D.-K. and Others v. Poland \(no. 30806/15\)](#)

[A.P. and R.P. v. Poland \(no. 1298/19\)](#)

The applicants in the first case are Ms A.D.-K., a Polish national who was born in 1976, Ms S.D.-K., a British national who was born in 1976 and L. D.-K., a British national who was born in 2011. Ms A.D.-K. and Ms S. D.-K. are two women living together in a registered civil partnership in the United Kingdom. Ms. S.D.-K. is L. D-K's biological mother. The three applicants live in Essex (the United Kingdom).

The applicants in the second case are Ms. A.P., and R.P., Polish nationals who were born in 1978 and 2014 respectively and who live in Northampton (the United Kingdom). Ms A.P. is R.P.'s biological mother. Ms A.P. is in a same-sex relationship with E.K., also a Polish national.

Both cases concern the refusal of the Polish authorities to register the birth certificates, of L.D.K. in the first case and of R.P in the second, in Poland.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicants complain that they were unable to register the birth certificates in Poland and allege that they have suffered discriminatory treatment.

[Ivanyushchenko v. Switzerland \(no. 54708/20\)](#)

The applicant, Yuriy Ivanyushchenko, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1959. Following the removal from office of the then Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich in February 2014, the Swiss Federal Council issued an order on 26 February 2014 freezing assets held in Switzerland by the removed President and his entourage, including those of the applicant, a former member of the Ukrainian Parliament.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life), the applicant alleges, in particular, that the inclusion of his name on the list annexed to the order imposing sanctions on the former leaders of Ukraine (the government of Viktor Yanukovich), and the freeze on all his assets and other financial interests in Switzerland from 28 February 2014 onwards, has seriously undermined respect for his reputation, a component of the right to respect for private life.

Thursday 2 July 2026

Name	Main application number
Commissions Import Export v. France	33168/18
Société Autoroutes du Sud de la France (ASF) v. France	2905/24
Miliūtė and Danauskienė v. Lithuania	27313/23
Babii v. the Republic of Moldova	19726/14

Name	Main application number
Baştovoi v. the Republic of Moldova	22126/15
Cucerov v. the Republic of Moldova	44393/15
Russu v. the Republic of Moldova	2697/15
S.C. Divado-Lux S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	45585/15
Aydın and Sarı v. Türkiye	6571/17
Yaramuş v. Türkiye	41852/23
Zayets v. Ukraine	37590/18

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.

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/UCk1j8LW8v8v8v8v8v8v8v8v8).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrpress@echr.coe.int) to subscribe to the press-release mailing list.

Where can the Court's press releases be found? [HUDOC - Press collection](#)

Press contacts

echrpress@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.