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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 030 (2017)
25.01.2017

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing seven judgments on Tuesday 31 January 2017 and 49 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 2 February 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 31 January 2017

Kalnėnienė v. Belgium (application no. 40233/07)

The applicant, Aušra Kalnėnienė, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1963 and lives in Brussels.The case concerns a search carried out at Ms Kalnėnienė's home and the use of evidence thus obtained in the criminal trial which resulted in her conviction.

In June 2005 the investigating judge at the Brussels Court of First Instance issued a search warrant for a house located in Molenbeek-Saint-Jean, home to a certain J.R. The latter was suspected of belonging to a criminal organisation and of involvement in trafficking of human beings.

The police officers checked the identity of Ms Kalnėnienė, who lived in a flat on the second floor of the same building as J.R.; noting that the applicant's name was listed in a criminal case, they decided of their own motion to search her flat. On the same day she was taken into custody and the investigating judge charged her with involvement in a criminal organisation and with having used deception to have a foreign national brought into and settled in the country.

In December 2005 Ms Kalnėnienė alleged before the Committals Division that all the procedural acts in her case up to that date were void, referring to the unlawfulness of the search, which had been conducted without a warrant, but her request was dismissed. That decision was upheld by the Indictments Division of the Brussels Court of Appeal, but the Court of Cassation quashed the appeal judgment. In May 2006 the Indictments Division of the Brussels Court of Appeal found that the search had been unlawful; however, it considered that this unlawfulness did not render the proceedings null and void under the law and that it did not compromise the reliability of the evidence thus obtained.

In June 2008 Ms Kalnėnienė was found guilty of the charges and sentenced to five years' imprisonment; she was also ordered to pay 10,000 euros. The Brussels Criminal Court also held that it was not necessary to exclude the evidence obtained during the search, and indicated that she could bring an action for damages against the State under Article 1382 of the Civil Code. This judgment was upheld on appeal, and an appeal on points of law by Ms Kalnėnienė was dismissed.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), separately and taken together with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Ms Kalnėnienė complains about the search of her home, the use of evidence obtained in that search to convict her, and the lack of an effective remedy in respect of her complaint under Article 8 of the Convention.

Boljević v. Croatia (no. 43492/11)

The applicant, Isat Boljević, is a Montenegrin national who was born in 1967 and lives in Bar (Montenegro). The case concerns his complaint that the Croatian authorities confiscated 180,000 euros (EUR) from him.

In February and March 2009 Mr Boljević entered Croatia from Montenegro and deposited on each occasion EUR 90,000. In June 2009 administrative offence proceedings were instituted against him under the Foreign Currency Act and section 74 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act for failing to declare the sum of EUR 180,000 while entering Croatia. A number of hearings were held at which, in his defence, Mr Boljević explained that the money was to pay for a flat in Podgorica (Montenegro) from a Croatian national who had insisted that the money be paid to him from a Croatian bank account. In a decision of October 2009 the Administrative offences Council found him guilty of the administrative offence of failing to declare EUR 180,000 in cash to customs, notably because he had not proved the legitimate destination of the money he had carried across the border. In particular the preliminary agreement submitted concerning the purchase of the flat in Podgorica had been concluded two weeks after the commission of the offence and the sale price did not correspond to the amount he had brought into Croatia. He was fined 10,000 Croatian kunas and the EUR 180,000 was confiscated from him as a protective measure. This decision was subsequently upheld on appeal before the High Court for Administrative Offences and his constitutional complaint was declared inadmissible in December 2010.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention, Mr Boljević complains that the decision to confiscate EUR 180,00O from him for failing to declare that sum to customs was excessive.

Abubakarova and Midalishova v. Russia (nos. 47222/07 and 47223/07)

The applicants, Zekiyat Abubakarova and Yakhita Midalishova, were born in 1966 and 1957 respectively and live in Komsomolskoye in the Chechen Republic (Russia). The case concerns the deaths of their husbands in a traffic incident involving military servicemen and the subsequent investigation.

On 30 September 2002, the applicants' husbands, Shamkhan Abubakarov and Badrudi Abubakarov, who were brothers, were travelling with their nephew in a Volga vehicle on the road leading from the Staraya Sunzha settlement to the village of Berkat-Yurt in Chechnya. At about 5pm, they pulled in to the side of the road to allow a convoy of three IFVs carrying military servicemen to pass. One of the IFVs suddenly turned and drove over the Volga, killing all three of its occupants. The IFV then drove off in the direction of Staraya Sunzha. Several eyewitnesses immediately drove to the police station to report the incident. The police questioned a number of witnesses and examined the Volga, which had been left at the scene. Traces of blood and brain matter were found inside the vehicle; no evidence was collected.

In October 2002, the Grozny district prosecutor's office opened an investigation into the incident. They questioned a number of witnesses and ordered a post-mortem examination, which later concluded that the applicants' relatives had died as a result of the accident. The investigators also requested information from the military on the IFV which had been seen driving over the Volga, but no such information was provided. The investigation was suspended in December 2002 on the grounds that the perpetrators had not been identified. Ms Abubakarova and Ms Midalishova were not informed. The investigation was subsequently resumed in 2006, then suspended and resumed again, with orders given to the investigators to take certain steps, including identifying the owners of the IFVs. The investigation was, however, suspended again in November 2006.

In July 2007, the Grozny District Court allowed Ms Abubakarova and Ms Midalishova's complaint against the decision to suspend the investigation. The court held that the investigators had failed to

take necessary steps to identify the perpetrators and had limited themselves to sending requests for information from the military authorities, even though it was clear that the IFVs had entered the Khankala military base after the incident. On the court's instruction, the investigation was resumed in July 2007, only to be suspended again in August 2007. In 2011, the case was transferred to the Chechnya Investigations Committee and the proceedings are still pending.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life), Ms Abubakarova and Ms Midalishova complain that their husbands were killed by military servicemen and that the authorities failed to investigate the matter effectively.

Rozhkov v. Russia (no. 2) (no. 38898/04)

The applicant, Yevgeniy Rozhkov, is a Russian national who was born in 1966 and lives in Belgorod (Russia). He works as a legal consultant, in particular for Vityaz Arbitration Bureau based in Belgorod. The case concerns his complaint about being unlawfully arrested on two occasions in 2006 and about a search of his office.

In June 2005 criminal proceedings were brought against Mr Rozhkov on suspicion of forgery in administrative-offence proceedings against a private company for whom he was providing legal services. He was interviewed by an investigator a few months later, but after that the authorities experienced difficulties to summon him for further interview. In October 2005 the investigating authorities thus issued a decision ordering that measures be taken to locate Mr Rozhkov. On 25 January 2006 the police, having obtained information from Mr Rozhkov's mother, went to his office address and informed him that, if did not follow them to the police station, they would have to employ force. He alleges that he was not shown any official authorisation by the police for such an order and was held at the police station for a few hours before being let go on the undertaking that he would appear before the investigator on a date fixed a few weeks later. The investigation was subsequently suspended and resumed with further summons for interviews issued. On 25 December 2006 the police arrived at his office again and, on the basis of an order that he had failed on several occasions to attend interviews without a valid excuse, was once more escorted to the police station. He was allowed to leave later on in the day on having explained that he had not been able to attend previously scheduled interviews due to illness and that he had informed the investigating authorities accordingly.

In the meantime, in October 2006 a search was carried out of the Vityaz Arbitration Bureau office on the basis of a warrant issued by the investigator in charge of the criminal case against Mr Rozhkov. The investigator indicated in particular that it was necessary to seize samples of Mr Rozhkov's handwriting.

Mr Rozhkov brought proceedings to complain of having been deprived of his liberty on 25 January and 25 December 2006. Both claims were rejected, essentially on the grounds that he had not been arrested or detained but taken to the police station for no more than a few hours to clarify some aspects of the investigation in his criminal case. He also sought judicial review of the search-and-seizure order and the manner in which it was implemented, without success.

The criminal case against Mr Rozhkov was ultimately discontinued for lack of evidence in November 2010.

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security / right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court), Mr Rozhkov alleges that the two instances of his being escorted by the police to appear before an investigator were unlawful and arbitrary. He also alleges under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and the correspondence) that the search of his office was unlawful and unnecessary as the authorities had already obtained samples of his handwriting during the interviews he had given.

Vakhitov and Others v. Russia (nos. 18232/11, 42945/11, and 31596/14)

The applicants, Florid Vakhitov, Maksim Bogdashkin, and Karnik Aslanyan, are Russian nationals who were born in 1986, 1986, and 1973 respectively. Mr Vakhitov is detained in Sterlitamak, Perm region, Mr Bogdashkin lives in Krasnokamensk, Krasnoyarsk region, and Mr Karnik Mkrdychevich Aslanyan was detained in Krasnodar (all in Russia). All the applicants were considered by the authorities as having gone into hiding, their names were placed on a wanted list and detention orders were issued against them *in absentia*. The case concerns the applicants' complaint about their ensuing arrests and detention, and notably that they were not brought promptly before a judge.

Mr Vakhitov failed to appear in court on 4 March 2010 at a hearing in a criminal case against him for drug trafficking. At another hearing on 19 March 2010 the trial court ordered his detention *in absentia*. Mr Vakhitov was subsequently arrested in Tuymazy and transferred to Ufa. He appealed against the detention order of 19 March, arguing that he and his lawyer had never received notification of either hearing, but was unsuccessful. In April 2010, in Mr Vakhitov's absence, the judge decided that he should remain in detention. Mr Vakhitov was released one month later in return for an undertaking not to leave his place of residence. In March 2011, the trial court ultimately found Mr Vakhitov guilty of drug trafficking and sentenced him to four years and six months' imprisonment.

On 28 September 2010, Mr Bogdashkin, accused of attempted murder, did not attend a court hearing on his case, without explanation. As a result, the examination of his case was postponed until 11 October 2010. On 11 October, the proceedings were suspended and a search for Mr Bogdashkin was ordered. In March 2011, he was arrested and placed in a temporary detention centre in Kuraginsky district. He complained to the prosecutor of the Krasnoyarsk region that his detention was unlawful and that the police had failed to inform him about the reasons for his arrest. In April 2011, the trial court ultimately convicted Mr Bogdashkin of attempted murder and sentenced him to one year and nine months' imprisonment.

Mr Aslanyan was indicted for murder in April 2013 and fled from his place of residence. In May 2013, his name was placed on an international search list and the Oktyabrskiy District Court of Krasnodar ordered his detention *in absentia.* He was arrested on 11 July 2013. The district court extended Mr Aslanyan's detention at a hearing on 4 September 2013, holding that the evidence confirmed his guilt. On an unspecified date, Mr Aslanyan challenged the detention order of 4 September, arguing that the authorities had failed to bring him promptly before a judge after his arrest in July. The Krasnodar Regional Court upheld the aforementioned detention order.

Relying on Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security / entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial), all the applicants complain that they were not brought promptly before a judge after their respective arrests. Mr Bogdashkin also complains, among other things, that the authorities failed to inform him of the reasons for his arrest, in breach of Article 5 § 2 (right to be informed of the reasons for arrest). Lastly, Mr Aslanyan also complains under Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence) that the wording used by the Oktyabrskiy District Court in its detention order of September 2013 declared him guilty before this had been proved according to law, and that the regional court had failed to rectify this on appeal.

Vorontsov and Others v. Russia (nos. 59655/14, 5771/15, and 7238/15)

The applicants, Ruslan Vladimiovich Vorontsov, Aleksandr Nikolayevich Susarin and Yevgeniy Vladimirovich Belyayev, were born in 1977, 1972 and 1987 respectively and lived before their convictions in Krasnoyarsk, Cheboksary and Vologda Region (all in Russia). The case concerns the applicants' confinement in metal cages during criminal proceedings against them.

Mr Vorontsov was convicted of robbery and sentenced to three years and six months' imprisonment in April 2014. During the hearings before the Oktyabrskiy District Court of Krasnoyarsk, Mr Vorontsov was held in a metal cage.

Mr Susarin was convicted of fraud and firearms-related offences in 2011, 2013, and 2014. During proceedings before the Leninskiy District Court of Cheboksary and the Supreme Court of the Chuvash Republic, he was confined in a metal cage.

Mr Belyayev was remanded in custody following his arrest in September 2014. His detention was extended by the Cherepovets Town Court of the Vologda Region in November 2014 and in December 2014 that court convicted him of grievous bodily harm and sentenced him to three years' imprisonment. Mr Belyayev was confined in a metal cage when the custodial measure was applied to him, when it was subsequently extended, and during the trial.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Vorontsov, Mr Susarin and Mr Belyayev complain that their confinement in metal cages in courtrooms during the criminal proceedings against them was degrading.

Hasan Tunç and Others v. Turkey (no. 19074/05)

The applicants, Hasan Tunç, Memiş Tunç and Mehmet Tunç, are Turkish nationals who were born in 1935, 1946 and 1948 respectively and live in Ankara. The case concerns proceedings brought by the Tunç brothers to challenge the validity of a sale which had taken place before the death of their mother, between her and their half brothers.

In 1946 the mother of the Tunç brothers, who died in 1994, sold two properties to one of her sons from her first marriage. That son, a few years later, transferred half of those properties to his brother, also a child from the mother's first marriage.

In 1996 and 1997 the Tunç brothers brought two sets of proceedings before the District Court to have the relevant property conveyances declared null and void, accusing their mother of a falsified sale to prevent them from inheriting the property in question. The court ordered an expert assessment, which was completed in 1998, evaluating the property at 5,450,625,000 Turkish liras (TRL). The Tunç brothers thus had to pay an additional sum of TRL 49,056,000 to supplement the court costs in proportion to the value of the property.

In 2003 the District Court dismissed the Tunç brothers' claim, finding in particular that they had not proved their allegation of a falsified sale. In 2004 the Court of Cassation upheld that judgment, also dismissing the Tunç brothers' request for a hearing on the ground that the property value did not reach the statutory threshold. They sought the revision of that decision, but the Court of Cassation dismissed their appeal again on the ground that the value of the property did not reach the statutory threshold of TRL 150,000,000 for such an appeal.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time), the Tunç brothers complain about the dismissal by the Court of Cassation of their application for revision, alleging that the court was mistaken in its assessment when it found the property value to fall below the statutory threshold. Under the same Article they also complain about the length of the proceedings, about the lack of public hearings before the Court of Cassation and about the assessment of evidence by the first-instance court, which accepted defence evidence the after the allotted time-limit.

Under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the Tunç brothers complain that they have been prevented from inheriting their mother's property, alleging that the transfer of the property to their half-brothers was in reality a falsified sale for the purpose of excluding them from their inheritance.

Thursday 2 February 2017

Ait Abbou v. France (no. 44921/13)

The applicant, Abdelmajid Ait Abbou, is a Moroccan national who was born in 1982 and lives in Villepinte. He complains that he has not had a fair trial, having been unable to complain about the lawfulness of proceedings brought against him in his absence.

In October 2007, while investigating a theft and the handling of stolen goods, the gendarmes by chance discovered in a garage 300 kg of cannabis and a car with a false number plate. Mr Ait Abbou was charged in 2009, his DNA having been identified on a pair of gloves found on the car roof. The police tried to trace him in vain. They went a number of times to his only known address, that of his parents, where they did not find him but spoke to two of his brothers and his father, who all said that they did not know his whereabouts.

In August 2010 Mr Ait Abbou was committed to stand trial with two other defendants for importing, trafficking in, acquiring and possessing drugs, and for his participation in a criminal conspiracy to commit an offence punishable by ten years' imprisonment. The hearing in the Paris Criminal Court was held on 23 September 2010 in his absence and judgment was given on the same day. Mr Ait Abbou was found guilty on the charges and sentenced to five years' imprisonment. A warrant was issued for his arrest. After being arrested on 14 February 2011, Mr Ait Abbou challenged his conviction. On 17 February 2010 he was remanded in custody.

In a judgment of 8 July 2011 on Mr Ait Abbou's appeal, the court found that he could not have been unaware that he was a wanted man and that he had therefore deliberately absconded. On the merits, the court noted that according to the evidence in the file his DNA had been found on a glove on the roof of a car, but there was no indication of time or place in that connection. The court acquitted him of transporting, possessing and acquiring drugs, and of drug trafficking, and found him guilty of criminal conspiracy. The applicant and public prosecutor appealed.

The Court of Appeal took the view that Mr Ait Abbou, who had absconded during the pre-trial investigation, was precluded from claiming the nullity of that investigation procedure. On the merits, the Court of Appeal found that the case against him had been made out. The fact that the gloves with his DNA inside had been found on the roof of a stolen car kept in a garage where over 300 kg of cannabis resin had been seized was sufficient evidence that he had used the gloves, that he was not unconnected with the discovery of the drugs in the vicinity of the stolen car and that he had taken part in the drug trafficking. Reversing the first-instance judgment, the Court of Appeal found Mr Ait Abbou guilty of transporting, possessing and acquiring drugs and participating in a criminal conspiracy. It sentenced him to five year's imprisonment, to take effect immediately.

The applicant's appeal on points of law was dismissed by the Court of Cassation.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), Mr Ait Abbou complains that he did not have a fair trial.

Ilnseher v. Germany (nos. 10211/12 and 27505/14)

The applicant, Daniel Ilnseher, is a German national who was born in 1978 and is currently detained in a centre for persons in preventive detention on the premises of Straubing Prison (Germany). The case concerns Mr Ilnseher's provisional preventive detention and retrospective preventive detention.

In 1999, Mr Ilnseher was convicted of murder in the Regensburg Regional Court and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment under the criminal law applicable to young offenders. The court found that in June 1997, Mr Ilnseher, then aged 19, had strangled a woman, partly undressed her, and then masturbated. It also found that he had acted with full criminal responsibility.

From July 2008 onwards, after he had served his full prison sentence, Mr Ilnseher was remanded in provisional preventive detention. In June 2009, the Regensburg Regional Court ordered his retrospective preventive detention. The court, having regard to reports by a criminological expert and a psychiatric expert, found that Mr Ilnseher was still harbouring violent sexual fantasies and that there was a high risk that he would again commit serious violent and sexual offences if released, including murder for sexual gratification.

From March 2010 until December 2013, Mr Ilnseher engaged in proceedings before the German courts challenging the lawfulness of his preventive detention. In May 2011, he successfully appealed to the Federal Constitutional Court, which quashed the order for his preventive detention and remitted his case to the Regional Court. On 6 May 2011, the Regional Court, however, once again ordered Mr Ilnseher's provisional preventive detention. After a series of appeals, the courts ultimately found that his preventive detention had been necessary, as a comprehensive assessment of Mr Ilnseher, his offence, and his development during the enforcement of his sentence revealed that there was a high risk that he could commit serious crimes of a violent and sexual nature, similar to the one he had been found guilty of, if released. It was further noted that he still suffered from a sexual preference disorder (sexual sadism) which had caused and been manifested in his offence and that the therapy he had undergone until 2007 had not been successful. Since 20 June 2013, Mr Ilnseher has been detained in a newly-built preventive detention centre at Straubing Prison. He has refused all offers of therapy at that centre.

In the new main proceedings on his retrospective preventive detention before the Regensburg Regional Court, Mr Ilnseher also lodged a motion for bias against one of the judges of that court, who had ordered his retrospective preventive detention in June 2009. The case was dismissed and was also dismissed on appeal to the Federal Court of Justice and the Federal Constitutional Court.

Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) and Article 7 § 1 (no punishment without law), Mr Ilnseher complains that his retrospective preventive detention violated his right to liberty, the prohibition on retrospective punishment, and his right not to have a heavier penalty imposed than the one applicable at the time of his offence. Lastly, he complains under Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court) about the duration of the proceedings for review of his provisional preventive detention and under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) about the lack of impartiality of one of the judges who had ordered his retrospective preventive detention.

Navalnyy v. Russia (nos. 29580/12, 36847/12, 11252/13, 12317/13, and 43746/14)

The applicant, Aleksey Navalnyy, is a Russian national who was born in 1976 and lives in Moscow. He is a political activist, opposition leader, anti-corruption campaigner and popular blogger. The case concerns his arrest on seven occasions at different public gatherings, and his subsequent prosecution for administrative offences.

The details of the arrests are as follows. On the evening of 5 March 2012, Mr Navalnyy was arrested during a meeting held in Moscow's Pushkinskaya Square involving around 500 people, which was devoted to the allegedly rigged Russian presidential elections. During an overnight "walkabout" in Moscow on 8 May 2012, where activists met to discuss the inauguration of President Putin the previous day, Mr Navalnyy was arrested without warning on two occasions: firstly in the early hours of the morning whilst walking down Lubyanskiy Proyezd accompanied by about 170 people; and secondly between 11p.m. and midnight, whilst walking down Bolshaya Nikitskaya Street in a group of around 50 people. At 6 a.m. on 9 May 2012 Mr Navalnyy was arrested in Kudrinskaya Square in Moscow whilst in a gathering of 50 to 100 people discussing current affairs. On 27 October 2012 Mr Navalnyy had picketed the Russian Investigation Committee to protest against "repressions and torture" in co-ordination with around 30 others, and was arrested - according to him, whilst walking away from the event. Finally, Mr Navalnyy was arrested twice on 24 February 2014: first when attending Zamoskvoretskiy District Court for the delivery of the judgment in a case concerning

Bolotnaya Square protestors; and second when attending a public gathering of around 150 participants in Tverkaya Street later that evening.

Following each of the arrests, Mr Navalnyy was taken to a police station for several hours, while an offence report was drawn up. He was then charged with an administrative offence, of either breaching the established procedure for conducting public events (under Article 20.2 of the Code of Administrative Offences); or disobeying a lawful order of the police (under Article 19.3 of the Code). On two of the occasions, after being arrested and charged he was kept in pre-trial detention (for a number of hours on 9 May 2012; and overnight on the evening of 24 February 2014). All of the charges led to a hearing, in which Mr Navalnyy was duly convicted of an offence. On six occasions he was sentenced to a fine, ranging from 1,000 to 30,000 Russian roubles; and on one occasion he was sentenced to seven days' administrative detention. All of Mr Navalnyy's appeals against the judgments were dismissed.

Relying on Article 11 (right to freedom of assembly), Mr Navalnyy complains that the authorities repeatedly interrupted peaceful, non-violent gatherings, by arresting, prosecuting and eventually convicting him. Relying on Article 5 (right to liberty), he complains that the seven arrests (and two instances of pre-trial detention) were unlawful and arbitrary deprivations of his liberty. Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), he complains that the subsequent proceedings against him were all unfair. Finally, Mr Navalny relies on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), as well as Article 18 (limitation on the restriction of rights) taken in conjunction with Articles 5 and 11, to complain that the authorities' actions were politically motivated.

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.

Janssens v. Belgium (no. 52464/09)
Stevancevic v. Bosnia and Herzegovina (no. 67618/09)
Vidovic v. Bosnia and Herzegovina (no. 40139/16)
Petrov v. Bulgaria (no. 37776/15)
Petrovi v. Bulgaria (no. 26759/12)
Rashkova and Simeonska v. Bulgaria (no. 41090/12)
Folnegovic v. Croatia (no. 13946/15)
Caldarașan and Others v. the Republic of Moldova (nos. 22894/13, 32502/13, 36584/13, and 10501/15)
Butnărică v. Romania (no. 65621/13)
Cavaliere and Sicu v. Romania (nos. 2595/11 and 60952/13)
Cristian and Others v. Romania (nos. 50506/15, 62538/15, 62872/15, 2861/16, 5596/16, 9515/16, 16166/16, and 18067/16)
Culiță Olaru and Others v. Romania (nos. 22541/15, 46360/15, 47201/15, 50319/15, 50578/15, 1222/16, and 10692/16)
Diaconu and Others v. Romania (nos. 76749/14, 49087/15, and 8791/16)
Împunge Rouă and Grozea v. Romania (nos. 62210/13 and 62481/13)
Matei v. Romania (no. 69145/13)
Muti and Others v. Romania (nos. 15661/16, 16465/16, 28735/16, and 31357/16)
Pașcalău v. Romania (no. 59291/14)
Sentonoi v. Romania (no. 41196/13)
Stănică and Others v. Romania (nos. 76762/13, 39373/14, 5031/15, 7485/15, 10923/15, 14425/15, and 47886/15)
Ștețco v. Romania (no. 38969/15)

Toșa v. Romania (no. 62168/14)
Varvaroi v. Romania (no. 71178/14)
Dzhabarov and Others v. Russia (nos. 51182/10, 62814/10, 34313/11, 10342/12, 32166/14, and 59613/14)
Gamov and Others v. Russia (nos. 16103/06, 13498/07, 14113/07, 48171/08, 46811/09, and 824/15)
Kochekov and Others v. Russia (nos. 28740/07, 48047/07, 34657/08, 69109/10, and 16323/11)
Korolev and Kherman v. Russia (nos. 40052/05 and 55036/08)
Tretyakov v. Russia (no. 62553/15)
Demir v. Turkey (no. 58402/09)
Eren v. Turkey (no. 21692/09)
Ergezer v. Turkey (no. 24271/07)
Gundogan v. Turkey (no. 57994/10)
Guzelgul v. Turkey (no. 65321/12)
Petrol Hizmetleri A.S. v. Turkey (no. 19958/06)
S.H.H. v. Turkey (no. 22930/08)
Tikiz v. Turkey (no. 42744/09)
Turkes and Kaplan v. Turkey (no. 23700/12)
Yesil v. Turkey (no. 45064/10)
Fortunskiy v. Ukraine (no. 14729/06)
Gavrilyak v. Ukraine (no. 32425/08)
Kalashnykova v. Ukraine (no. 38930/14)
Kulik v. Ukraine (no. 34515/04)
Litvinenko v. Ukraine (no. 34059/06)
Lopushanskyy v. Ukraine (no. 27793/08)
Paryzkyy and Others v. Ukraine (nos 35534/10, 11779/12, 31048/13, and 58058/13)
Trotsenko and Burov v. Ukraine (nos. 33466/08 and 4840/09)
Austin v. the United Kingdom (no. 40/14)

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)