



Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing five judgments on Tuesday 31 May 2022 and 35 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 2 June 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 31 May 2022

[X and Others v. Albania \(applications nos. 73548/17 and 45521/19\)](#)

The applicants are 18 Albanian nationals of Roma and Egyptian ethnicity who together make up six households. They live in Korça (Albania).

The applicants allege that Roma or Egyptian ethnic pupils account for 89-100% of pupils in Naim Frashëri primary school – which their children attend – in an average year, despite being a minority of the town's population. The case concerns the applicants' complaints to the authorities concerning that situation, and the Commissioner for the Protection from Discrimination's subsequent order that the Ministry of Education and Sport take "immediate measures to improve the situation and change the ratio" between Roma/Egyptian and other pupils attending the school". They allege that the situation has not been resolved.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 12 (general prohibition of discrimination) to the European Convention on Human Rights the applicants complain of discrimination and segregation in their children's education owing to the over-representation of Egyptian and Roma pupils in Naim Frashëri school.

[Arnar Helgi Lárusson v. Iceland \(no. 23077/19\)](#)

The applicant, Arnar Helgi Lárusson, is an Icelandic national who was born in 1976 and lives in Reykjanesbær (Iceland).

The case concerns Mr Lárusson's access to municipal buildings which house cultural and social institutions in Reykjanesbær as a wheelchair user.

The applicant complains of a violation of his rights under Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private life). He submits that the lack of accessibility to the two buildings hindered his personal development and right to establish and develop relationships with his community.

[Galeano Peñas v. Spain \(no. 48784/20\)](#)

The applicant, Ruben Galeano Peñas, is a Spanish national who was born in 1987 and lives in Griñón (Spain).

In 2011 Mr Galeano Peñas, who was a *Guardia Civil* officer, had a traffic dispute while off duty. Following a criminal complaint, he was subsequently convicted in 2013 of forgery of facts in a public record committed by a civil servant, receiving a three-year prison sentence, a fine and disqualification from public posts for two years. The penalty in his case was suspended while he was awaiting the resolution of a pardon request. The sentence was executed only over five years after it had become final. The case concerns the application of modified provisions of the Criminal Code

(which only came into force after his conviction and after his sentence had already been suspended) concerning the statutory period applicable in his case, and whether that was in fact a retroactive application of a prejudicial criminal law.

Relying on Article 7 (no punishment without law) and Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) of the Convention, the applicant complains that he was imprisoned after the statutory period had expired, and that he was punished by virtue of retroactive application of the law.

[Taner Kılıç v. Turkey \(no. 2\) \(no. 208/18\)](#)

The applicant, Taner Kılıç, is a Turkish national who was born in 1969. When he lodged his application, in December 2017, he was detained in İzmir (Turkey).

The case concerns the initial and continued pre-trial detention of Mr Kılıç, who, at the relevant time, was the Chair of the Turkish branch of the NGO Amnesty International.

Mr Kılıç was arrested in June 2017 on suspicion of belonging to the organisation described by the Turkish authorities as “Gülenist Terror Organisation/Parallel State Structure” (FETÖ/PDY). He was released in August 2018. The authorities criticised him, in particular, for having allegedly downloaded and used the ByLock messaging service on his telephone; for subscriptions to certain publications, such as the Zaman newspaper (allegedly linked to FETÖ/PDY); for the facts that his sister was married to the editor of the Zaman newspaper, and that his children were schooled in institutions which were allegedly run by FETÖ/PDY and had been closed by legislative decrees after the attempted coup of 15 July 2016; and for holding bank accounts with Bank Asya, a financial institution which was allegedly linked to FETÖ/PDY.

Relying on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), Mr Kılıç complains about his initial placement in pre-trial detention and its continuation for 14 and a half months; he considers that there were no reasonable grounds for suspecting him of having committed a criminal offence.

Relying on Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of assembly and of association), he considers that his initial and continued pre-trial detention breached his rights as guaranteed by those provisions.

Mr Kılıç also relies on Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights).

Thursday 2 June 2022

[H.M. and Others v. Hungary \(no. 38967/17\)](#)

The applicants are an Iraqi couple, born in 1978 and 1980, and four of their children who were born between 2001 and 2013. They live in Aachen, Germany.

The case concerns the family’s confinement in a transit zone at the border between Hungary and Serbia after fleeing Iraq.

Relying mainly on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 5 §§ 1 (right to liberty and security) and 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court), the applicants complain about the conditions and unlawfulness of their confinement and the way they were treated in the transit zone.

[Straume v. Latvia \(no. 59402/14\)](#)

The applicant, Aušra Straume, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1978 and lives in Riga.

The case concerns her treatment by her employer and ultimately her firing for statements made regarding employment conditions potentially affecting flight safety in a letter to State officials on behalf of the trade union of which she was the chair. She worked as an air-traffic controller.

Relying on Articles 11 (freedom of assembly and association) read in the light of Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicant complains of the negative consequences she suffered owing to the letter she wrote to the State officials overseeing her State-owned employer on behalf of her trade union. Under Article 6 (right to a fair trial) she complains about all hearings on the merits being closed to the public and that the judgments were not delivered publicly.

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 31 May 2022

Name	Main application number
Melnik and Others v. Russia	66619/10

Thursday 2 June 2022

Name	Main application number
Agonset SH.P.K. v. Albania	33104/15
Babayev and Others v. Azerbaijan	71750/13
Čolak v. Croatia	60123/16
Croatia Bus d.o.o. v. Croatia	12261/15
Krasić v. Croatia	31619/16
Roić Erceg v. Croatia	26327/16
Štefek v. Croatia	65173/17
Colomer v. France	597/19
BACHT AE v. Greece	49215/18
Church of Greece v. Greece	25207/13
Mastrogiannis v. Greece	34151/13
Radio Athina Monoprosopi Etairia Periorismenis Efthynis v. Greece	77504/13
Zoidaki-Georgantopoulou v. Greece	44038/13
Friðjón Björgvin Gunnarsson v. Iceland	48281/18
Haukur Sigurbjörn Magnússon v. Iceland	6696/19
Antonucci v. Italy	31650/15
Galli and Others v. Italy	1772/18
Zwierz v. Poland	69950/14
Mierlă and Others v. Romania	25801/17
Akulova v. Russia	72109/14
Khalizov and Others v. Russia	41266/17
Knyshov v. Russia	21754/19
Nurmagomedov and Others v. Russia	55341/17
OOO Ozon Media v. Russia	75388/14
Osankin and Mazurina v. Russia	20506/07
Rudik and Others v. Russia	31118/15
Sultanov v. Russia	56738/19

Name	Main application number
Zaripov and Others v. Russia	71767/17
Adamčo v. Slovakia (no. 2)	20877/19
M.H. and Others v. Slovakia	14099/18
Kodrič v. Slovenia	16472/20
Totopa v. Spain	74048/17
Barseghyan v. Sweden	21238/18

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. 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

echrpess@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.