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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 181 (2017)
09.06.2017

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing a total number of 119 judgments and decisions in the week of 12 June 2017: one on Monday 12 June, 30 on Tuesday 13 June, and 88 on Thursday 15 June 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)*

Monday 12 June 2017

Köksal v. Turkey (no. 70478/16)

The applicant, Gökhan Köksal, is a Turkish national who was born in 1978 and lives in Ankara. He was a teacher at the "1071 Malazgirt" primary school in Erzurum (Turkey).

The case concerns Mr Köksal's dismissal by legislative decree in the context of measures taken after the attempted *coup d'état* in Turkey.

On 25 July 2016 Mr Köksal was suspended from his duties in the context of measures taken after a state of emergency had been declared on 21 July 2016. On 1 September 2016 he was dismissed from his post, pursuant to Legislative Decree no. 672 concerning the dismissal of 50,875 civil servants who were regarded as belonging, affiliated or related to terrorist organisations or to organisations, structures or groups which had been found by the National Security Council to engage in activities harmful to the State. The Legislative Decree provided that those dismissed could never be reinstated as civil servants and their passports were cancelled. On 28 September 2016 Mr Köksal lodged an individual appeal with the Constitutional Court to challenge his dismissal. The appeal is still pending.

Legislative Decree no. 685 on the establishment of the Commission for the review of measures taken in connection with the state of emergency was enacted on 2 January 2017 by the Cabinet and published on 23 January 2017 in the Official Gazette.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1, 2 and 3 (a) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Köksal complains of a violation of his right of access to a court, his right to be presumed innocent and his right to be informed promptly of the accusation against him. Relying on Article 7 (no punishment without law), Mr Köksal complains that he was dismissed on the basis of acts which did not constitute an offence at the time they were committed. Mr Köksal also argues that he sustained breaches of his rights and freedoms under Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 10 (freedom of expression), 11 (freedom of assembly and association), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

Tuesday 13 June 2017

Arnarson v. Iceland (application no. 58781/13)

The applicant, Ólafur Arnarson, is an Icelandic national who was born in 1963 and lives in Garðabær (Iceland). He was a journalist and freelance writer for the web-based media site *Pressan*. The case concerns proceedings brought against him for defamation following the publication of an article accusing the chief executive officer of the Icelandic Federation of Fishing Vessel Owners ("the LIU") of accounting deception and fraud.

Between 2010 and 2011 Mr Arnarson published a series of articles regarding rumours that LIU was paying a website to lobby in its favour, namely by discrediting its detractors. One of the articles pointed out that it was possible that not all LIU's board members were aware that the organisation's funds were being used for that purpose, and insinuated that the payments had been well-disguised in the organisation's financial records by LIU's chief executive officer alone. In November 2012, in proceedings brought by LIU's chief executive officer, the District Court found that this insinuation had been defamatory. The court took into account that the fisheries management system was a matter of great public concern in Iceland, with different views being expressed, but found in essence that Mr Arnarson had not given any proof to show that his allegations were true. He was ordered to pay 300,000 Icelandic *Krónur* (approximately 2,500 euros) in compensation. In February 2013 the Supreme Court refused the applicant´s request for appeal.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Arnarson complains about the judgment against him, submitting in particular that he had published his remarks in good faith as he had based them on an article published a year before in another newspaper and that his statements had been value judgments which had contained several reservations.

Kosteckas v. Lithuania (no. 960/13)

The applicant, Raimondas Kosteckas, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1979 and lives in Šiauliai (Lithuania). Mr Kosteckas complains that a group of men who had attacked him were never brought to justice. In February 2007, Mr Kosteckas and three friends became involved in a dispute with another group of men in a petrol station. Mr Kosteckas was subjected to a physical attack by the other group, whereby he was punched and kicked in the face and head. Criminal proceedings were brought against the alleged perpetrators. They were tried and convicted, but the judgment was overturned on appeal due to breaches of the criminal code of procedure. The alleged perpetrators were tried and convicted again, but once again their convictions were overturned on appeal. When the case came before the courts for a third time, the proceedings were discontinued due to the expiration of the five-year time limit in the statute of limitations. Mr Kosteckas subsequently instituted civil proceedings against the alleged perpetrators and was awarded monetary compensation in respect of pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to fair trial) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Kosteckas complains that the authorities failed to investigate and prosecute the individuals who had assaulted him. The Court chose to communicate the case under these articles, and also Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment).

Šimkus v. Lithuania (no. 41788/11)

The applicant, Raimundas Šimkus, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1975 and lives in Tauragė (Lithuania). Relying on Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice), Mr Šimkus complains that two different sets of proceedings were brought against him relating to the same offence. In July 2006, a phone call was received by an officer of the State Border Guard Service, in which the caller threatened to "find and shoot" an officer who had shot a man suspected of smuggling earlier that night. A forensic examination identified the caller as Mr Šimkus. Later the same night, Mr Šimkus had arrived at the hospital where the wounded man was being treated and used various swearwords against the officers, demanded that they release the wounded man, and said that he would beat the officers up or kill them.

In administrative proceedings, Mr Šimkus, was found to have committed the offence of minor hooliganism for using swearwords in the hospital. However, criminal proceedings were also brought him, in relation to both the phone call and his conduct in the hospital. The criminal proceedings were ultimately terminated for being time-barred. Mr Šimkus complains that the criminal proceedings related to the same offence for which he had been given an administrative penalty.

Cheltsova v. Russia (no. 44294/06)

The applicant, Inna Cheltsova, is a Russian national who was born in 1947 and lives in Fryazino, the Moscow Region. She is retired, but is also editor-in-chief of a local independent newspaper, *Fryazinets*. The case concerns a series of defamation proceedings brought against her for articles published in her newspaper.

Between 2005 and 2006 she was held liable under civil law in three sets of defamation proceedings for articles which were critical of a local civil servant, a manager of a local branch of a State unitary enterprise and a local entrepreneur who was also running for mayor of Fryazino. The articles published had made a number of allegations against these individuals, including combining the official function of civil servant with other gainful employment, alleged unlawful registration of real estate rights and dubious business activities. In the proceedings that these three individuals brought against her, the domestic courts essentially found against Ms Cheltsova because she had presented no evidence to prove that the information she had published had been true or verified. They ordered her to publish retractions and to pay between 10,000 and 15,000 Russian roubles in damages.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), Ms Cheltsova complains that the courts did not give enough consideration to the fact that her articles had been about a legitimate matter of public interest, namely corruption. She also complains in particular that the sanctions imposed on her, which had amounted to between four to six times her monthly retirement pension, had been excessive.

Koshevoy v. Russia (no. 70440/10)

The applicant, Aleksandr Koshevoy, was born in 1946 in Kazakhstan and has been living in Moscow since 2001. The case concerns his detention pending extradition for nearly six months.

Mr Koshevoy was arrested in Moscow in September 2010 and placed in detention pending extradition on the basis of an international arrest warrant issued by the Kazakh authorities for abuse of office when he had worked in local government in Kazakhstan. His detention was extended in November and December 2010 and then in February 2011; it was chiefly justified by the fact that proceedings were pending concerning his Russian nationality and that a decision had to be taken by the General Prosecutor's Office as to his extradition. He was released in early March 2011.

Mr Koshevoy suffers from serious heart and vascular illness and spent the major part of his detention in civilian and prison medical facilities. On 10 December 2010 the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) granted a request for an interim measure (Rule 39 of the Rules of Court), indicating to the Russian Government that he should be examined immediately by an independent medical practitioner and, if necessary, transferred to an appropriate civilian or prison hospital. He was admitted four days later to a prison medical unit and then two weeks later to a civilian hospital. He underwent a thorough examination by various doctors at these establishments, but both considered that his treatment in detention was adequate. Mr Koshevoy also lodged a claim following his release against the detention authorities for inadequate medical care, which was in the main dismissed.

Relying in particular on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), Mr Koshevoy alleges that his detention pending extradition was unlawful and that the related proceedings had not been carried out diligently. Also relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 34 (right of individual petition), he complains about inadequate medical care during his detention and the authorities' failure to comply with the ECtHR interim measure as the doctors who had examined him at the prison hospital had not been independent.

Atutxa Mendiola and Others v. Spain (no. 41427/14)

The applicants are Spanish nationals. Juan Maria Atutxa Mendiola (born in 1941) is the former President of the Parliament of the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country. Gorka Knorr Borras (born 1950) and Maria Concepción Bilbao Cuevas (born 1958) were respectively the Vice-President and clerk of the Parliament at the time when Mr Atutxa Mendiola was its President. They live in Lemoa, Barcelona and Zurbano (Spain) respectively.

The case concerns their conviction by the Supreme Court for failing to comply with a decision ordering the dissolution of the parliamentary groups in the different institutions of the autonomous communities of the Basque Country and of Navarre which bore the name *Batasuna*.

The union *Manos Limpias* and the public prosecutor filed a complaint against the applicants for the offence of non-compliance with a court order. In November 2005 and December 2006 the applicants were acquitted twice by the Superior Court of Justice. The union appealed on points of law. In a judgment of 8 April 2008, delivered after a public hearing attended by the applicants' representatives but during which they were not heard, the court found the applicants guilty of the offence of non-compliance and sentenced them to disqualification from public office for a period of between 12 and 18 months, together with the payment of a fine and costs. On the basis of the same facts, regarded as established by the judgment of the Superior Court of Justice, the Supreme Court found that the applicants had deliberately and openly refused to comply with the decision ordering the dissolution of the parliamentary groups in question.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (right to a fair hearing) of the Convention, the applicants complain that they were convicted without having been heard in a public hearing. They allege that the Supreme Court did not confine itself to purely legal questions but carried out a review of the facts and reconsidered evidence such as witness statements, which, in their view, were of crucial importance for the assessment of the facts.

Daşlık v. Turkey (no. 38305/07)

The applicant, Remziye Daşlık, is a Turkish national who was born in 1980 and lives in Diyarbakır (Turkey). The case concerns allegations of ill-treatment sustained by her while in police custody.

On 28 February 2002 Ms Daşlık was questioned by two police officers in the context of an investigation into the activities of the PKK (Kurdistan Workers' Party, an illegal armed organisation) and a political party, HADEP (*Halkın Demokrasi Partisi* – People's Democractic Party) on the premises of the anti-terrorist division of the Diyarbakır police headquarters. While she was in police custody, which lasted for one day, Ms Daşlık suffered vaginal bleeding and was taken to hospital.

On 4 March 2002 Ms Daşlık filed a complaint for abuse of power against the officers who questioned her, arguing that she had been tortured during her police custody. On 10 March 2003 criminal proceedings were brought against two officers before the Diyarbakır Assize Court, which acquitted them in October 2004 for lack of sufficient evidence, particularly on the basis of medical reports, drawn up at the beginning and end of the police custody, which did not show any injury on the complainant's body. The Court of Cassation upheld that judgment in September 2006. Moreover, the criminal proceedings against Ms Daşlık for propaganda in favour of the illegal organisation resulted in her acquittal in September 2002.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment), Ms Daşlık complains that she was ill-treated while in police custody and that the authorities did not conduct an effective investigation following her complaint.

R.M. v. Turkey (no. 81681/12)

The applicant, R.M., is an Uzbek and Turkish national who was born in 1988 and lives in Istanbul (Turkey). The case essentially concerns his detention pending extradition for 32 months.

Wanted by the Uzbek prosecuting authorities for establishing a criminal organisation and causing bodily harm, R.M. was arrested in Turkey in September 2009 on the basis of an international arrest warrant. A month later a first-instance court ordered his detention pending extradition. Six months later, that decision was quashed by the Court of Cassation because it was considered manifestly inappropriate and the case was transferred to the Assize Court. The proceedings then lasted another year before this court, with the trial being adjourned six times pending receipt of information from the Uzbek authorities, and ended in June 2011 with a judgment again ordering R.M.'s detention. The Court of Cassation upheld this judgment in March 2012. R.M. was however ultimately released in May 2012 because he had, in the meantime, been granted subsidiary protection status by the Ministry of the Interior and a temporary residence permit. He has since also acquired Turkish nationality.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), R.M. alleges that, if extradited to Uzbekistan, he would be at real risk of ill-treatment. Also relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), he complains that his detention pending extradition was unlawful and excessively long. He makes a number of other complaints under Article 5 §§ 1, 4 and 5 about his detention in a foreigners' removal centre for one day just after being released and about the alleged lack of judicial remedies to challenge the unlawfulness of his detention and request compensation.

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.

Đuković v. Montenegro (no. 38419/08)
Svorcan v. Montenegro (no. 1253/08)
Tomašević v. Montenegro (no. 7096/08)
Chayka v. Russia (no. 37042/14)
Drobyshevskiy and Vitt v. Russia (nos. 52637/09 and 21973/10)
Fomin and Sivayeva v. Russia (nos. 3141/08 and 41640/08)
Kravchenko v. Russia (no. 23137/04)
Lunina and Mukhamedova v. Russia (nos. 7359/14 and 69173/14)
Natalya Volkova v. Russia (no. 56360/07)
Sergeyeva and Proletarskaya v. Russia (no. 59705/12)
Shorokhova and Others v. Russia (nos. 42968/06, 49272/06, 2319/07, and 51217/07)
Stadnik v. Russia (no. 41509/06)
Tsarev and Others v. Russia (nos. 39979/08, 43101/08, and 47759/08)
Akgül v. Turkey (no. 53803/11)
Güllü v. Turkey (no. 57218/10)
Ali Gürbüz v. Turkey (no. 14742/10)
Bayar v. Turkey (nos. 55060/07 and 55061/07)
Bulut v. Turkey (no. 56982/10)
Çolak and Kasımoğulları v. Turkey (nos. 29969/07 and 47462/07)
Tunç v. Turkey (no. 53802/11)
Yavuz Nal and Others v. Turkey (nos. 11736/09, 592/11, 47028/11, and 49731/11)
Urfani Yildiz v. Turkey (no. 59173/08)

Thursday 15 June 2017

Metodiev and Others v. Bulgaria (no. 58088/08)

The applicants are 31 Bulgarian nationals, who are Ahmadi Muslims, a religious movement aligned with the Sunni tradition. The case concerns the refusal by the authorities to register a new religious association called the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community as a denomination.

In February 2007 ten individuals, including nine of the applicants, decided to set up a new religious association called the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, to be based in the town of Sandanski. The 22 other applicants subsequently became members of the community. On 26 February 2007 Mr Metodiev, the first applicant, filed with the district court of Sofia an application for the registration of the new religious association in accordance with the Religions Act. The court sought the opinion of the government department for religious affairs. On 31 May 2007 the court denied the application for registration, basing its decision on the report it received from the department, on the grounds that the Ahmadis were to be distinguished from the Muslim religion, were known for their religious intolerance, refusal of modernity and polygamy, and were regarded as a sect by Muslims. The court noted that the constitution of the religious association did not specify its beliefs but merely copied aims and activities referred to in the law on non-profit legal entities. Lastly, it expressed the view that the registration of this association could provoke a schism within the Muslim community in Bulgaria.

Mr Metodiev appealed against this judgment on behalf of the association, complaining about a breach of its right to freedom of religion. The Sofia Court of Appeal upheld the judgment. The Supreme Court of Cassation dismissed the association's appeal. It pointed out that the Religions Act – requiring a precise statement of the beliefs and rites of religious associations – sought to distinguish clearly between the different religions and to avoid confrontations between religious communities.

Relying on Articles 9 (freedom of religion) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicants allege that the courts' refusal to register their association under the Religions Act breached their right to freedom of religion. They also relied on their right to a fair hearing under Article 6 of the Convention.

Shalyavski and Others v. Bulgaria (no. 67608/11)

The applicants are a Bulgarian family: Ventsislav Shalyavski and Silvia Kotseva, and their son and daughter, Martin Kotsev and Yoana Shalyavska. They were born in 1966, 1967, 1988 and 2003 respectively and live in Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria). The case concerns the alleged ill-treatment of Ventsislav Shalyavski, who is heavily disabled, when he was made to wait for ten hours outside a police station in his car in order to have charges brought against him for usury.

On 7 April 2011, Mr Shalyavski, who has muscular dystrophy and can only move his head and hands, was left immobilised in a car in front of a police station while the investigation authorities searched his home and other premises as well as carried out the necessary formalities for bringing charges against him. During this time his personal needs had to be attended to in public by his partner, the second applicant. His care assistant, who had been driving him in his car when he was stopped by the police at about 11 a.m. was arrested and taken into detention, but brought out under guard on two occasions during the day in order to move him to another car and eventually at 9.30 p.m. to help him attend a hearing at which his house arrest was ordered. He was kept under house arrest until 21 June 2011, with the police frequently – sometimes up to four or five times a day – checking whether he was at home or not. Mr Shalyavski has apparently since been indicted – in 2016 – and is currently standing trial.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home, and the correspondence), Mr Shalyavski alleges that his

treatment on 7 April 2011 had caused him physical pain and public humiliation. All the applicants also further complain under these same articles about the police visits to their home during Mr Shalyavski's house arrest, which – in their view – had been meant purely to harass them. Lastly, they allege under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) that they had no effective remedies in domestic law for their complaints under Articles 3 and 8.

De Mortemart v. France (no. 67386/13)

The applicant, Mr Antoine de Mortemart, is a French national who was born in 1976 and lives in Paris.

He is the owner of the Parc de Saint-Vrain, which was run as a zoo and leisure park until 1998, situated in the Juine Valley. On 18 July 2003 a ministerial decree listed the valley as a protected site. Mr de Mortemart applied to the Minister for Ecology and Sustainable Development to declassify the part of the valley corresponding to his property, but his request was denied.

In May 2009 M. de Mortemart appealed to the Versailles Administrative Court, seeking the annulment of the decision to deny his request and of the decree of 18 July 2003. He explained in particular that the decree had been adopted in breach of the principles of public participation and access to information and that he had not been able himself to submit observations. He subsequently sought the referral of the matter for a preliminary ruling on the constitutionality of a number of provisions in the Environment Code concerning listed sites. In November 2012 the Constitutional Council declared that most of the provisions included in the referral request were compliant with the Constitution but found in favour of Mr de Mortemart concerning the breach of the principle of public participation in the elaboration of public decisions having an impact on the environment.

The Constitutional Council thus found Articles L. 341-3 and L. 341-13 of the Environment Code to be contrary to the Constitution. It decided that those provisions were to be declared unconstitutional from 1 September 2013 and that decisions taken before that date could not be challenged on that basis. The *Conseil d'État* (Supreme Administrative Court) thus rejected Mr de Mortemart's appeal.

In July 2013 Mr de Mortemart applied to the Minister for the partial repeal of the decree of 18 July 2003 in so far as it included the Parc de Saint-Vrain among the listed sites in the Essonne *département*. The Minister denied the application on the ground that the listing of the Juine Valley had taken place before the date decided by the Constitutional Council for the repeal of the provisions that were declared unconstitutional. In December 2013 Mr de Mortemart appealed to the *Conseil d'État* seeking the annulment of that decision and the partial repeal of the decree of 18 July 2003. The *Conseil d'État* struck the case out of its list on 9 July 2015.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a court), the applicant complains about his inability to challenge the inclusion of his property within the listed site of the Juine Valley. He refers to the case of De Geouffre de la Pradelle v. France.

Independent Newspapers (Ireland) Limited v. Ireland (no. 28199/15)

The applicant company is the publisher of an Irish daily newspaper, the *Herald*, which was known as the *Evening Herald* at the time of the relevant events. The company complains of a violation of its rights under Article 10 (freedom of expression), arising from an allegedly disproportionate award of damages against it in defamation proceedings.

In November and December 2004, the *Evening Herald* published a total of eleven articles concerning the awarding of Government contracts to a public relations consultant, Ms L.. The articles referred to rumours of an intimate relationship between Ms L. (who was married with two children) and a Government minister, Mr C., and suggested that the awarding of the lucrative public contracts to Ms L. had been improper. The case became the subject of widespread media coverage.

Ms L. sued the applicant company for defamation. The jury hearing the case found that the newspaper had indeed defamed Ms L. by alleging the existence of an extra-marital affair between her and Mr C.. Ms L. was awarded 1,872,000 euros (EUR) in damages by the jury, plus costs. Following an appeal, the Supreme Court lowered the amount of damages to EUR 1,250,000.

The applicant company complains of a violation of its right to freedom of expression, claiming that the award of damages was disproportionately high, reflecting the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of domestic safeguards designed to prevent unreasonable awards for defamation.

Frolovs v. Latvia (no. 13289/06)

The applicant, Vladimirs Frolovs, is a permanently resident non-citizen of the Republic of Latvia who was born in 1963 and is detained in Riga. Mr Frolovs complains that criminal proceedings brought against him were unfair. In July 2003 he was convicted of organising, inciting and aiding various crimes against persons and property, and sentenced to six years' imprisonment. The conviction was made in Mr Frolovs' absence and he was not detained to serve his sentence until November 2009. In the meantime, a lawyer claiming to act on his behalf had lodged appeals against the conviction. However, the senior courts had refused to consider the appeals, on the grounds that Mr Frolovs had not been present to attend the hearings and could not confirm that he wished to pursue an appeal.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture), Mr Frolovs complains that, in reaching its judgment, the first-instance court had relied on evidence from his co-accused which had been obtained through the use of torture. Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and right to legal assistance of own choosing), he complains that the refusal of the appellate courts to examine his appeal in his absence had violated his right to have his case considered by a court.

Centre for Development of Analytical Psychology Ltd v. 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' (nos. 29545/10 and 32961/10)

The applicant company is a limited liability company which is owned and managed by Dr Marija Arsovska, a psychiatrist, whose name at the time was Dr Marija Karanfilova. The case concerns two sets of civil proceedings for claims brought against the State Health Insurance Fund ("the Fund").

In 2004 Dr Marija Karanfilova's Independent Psychiatric Practice ("the Practice") signed a contract with the Fund on the funding of the treatment it provided to health insurance beneficiaries. In 2006 the Practice was obliged by the health authorities to re-register under new statutory provisions: its name had thus been changed and it had been given a new individual tax number ("the new Practice"). In 2007 the new Practice was transformed into the applicant company.

In the meantime two sets of proceedings were initiated against the Fund for non-adherence to the terms of the contract of 2004. The domestic courts dismissed those claims for lack of standing on the side of the claimant, finding that the contract had been signed by the Fund and Dr Marija Karanfilova's Independent Psychiatric Practice and that the applicant company could not be considered as the Practice's legal successor as they had different individual tax numbers. Both sets of proceedings ended before the second-instance courts since the value of the claims fell below the statutory threshold for lodging an appeal on points of law with the Supreme Court.

A separate set of civil proceedings between the applicant company and the Fund (concerning the same contract of 2004) reached the Supreme Court which found that, in the particular circumstances of the case, the lower courts had incorrectly established that the applicant company had no standing in the proceedings.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 the applicant company complains of a lack of access to a court concerning its claims related to the contract with the Fund. It also complains under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

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.

Dngikyan v. Armenia (no. 66328/12)
Seidl v. Austria (no. 65013/11)
Budišćak v. Croatia (no. 10640/16)
Dagostin v. Croatia (no. 67644/12)
Gulin v. Croatia (no. 29520/15)
Marušić v. Croatia (no. 79821/12)
Zaňko v. the Czech Republic (no. 16782/15)
de Mortemart v. France (no. 67386/13)
Lauzeral v. France (no. 31269/15)
Nogues v. France (no. 29790/15)
Rodrigues Tavares v. France (no. 62019/14)
Sabadie v. France (no. 7115/15)
Boro-Baro v. Greece (no. 43877/16)
Dimitras v. Greece (no. 26108/11)
Koltsidas and Others v. Greece (no. 41784/11)
Lambakis v. Greece (no. 43862/16)
Benczúr v. Hungary (no. 61764/13)
Besenyi v. Hungary (no. 59442/13)
Billing v. Hungary (no. 65061/13)
László v. Hungary (no. 31739/13)
Padlás v. Hungary (no. 52640/10)
Politikatörténeti Intézet Közhasznú Nonprofit Kft and Magyar Szakszervezetek Országos Szövetsége v. Hungary (no. 53996/12)
Carotenuto v. Italy (no. 11368/07)
De Antoniis and Others v. Italy (nos. 29329/07, 28805/09, and 80128/12)
Glavacka v. Latvia (no. 17842/16)
Oderovs v. Latvia (no. 21979/08)
Human Rights Monitoring Institute v. Lithuania (no. 56814/13)
Vilėniškis v. Lithuania (no. 27468/10)
Anton Camilleri v. Malta (no. 43717/16)
Joseph Camilleri v. Malta (no. 71562/16)
Rotaru v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 2111/13)
Bulatović v. Montenegro (no. 32557/11)
Minić v. Montenegro (no. 23644/12)
Pavlović v. Montenegro (no. 58861/11)
Rakočević and Minić v. Montenegro (nos. 68938/12 and 31745/13)
Karczyński v. Poland (no. 18460/15)
Moroz v. Poland (no. 19958/12)
Trębicki v. Poland (no. 36499/11)
Wrona v. Poland (no. 74568/11)
Dragan v. Portugal (no. 56503/15)
Conțac v. Romania (nos. 9781/13 and 17137/13)
Druta v. Romania (no. 15572/09)
Fieroiu and Others v. Romania (no. 65175/10)
Iordachescu v. Romania (no. 32889/09)
Luca v. Romania (no. 42605/07)

Lupaş and Others v. Romania (no. 14254/10)
Preda v. Romania (no. 13090/12)
Abelmas and Others v. Russia (nos. 16418/10, 17050/10, 17685/10, 18594/10, 18770/10, 19026/10, 19906/10, and 20132/10)
Dvoynov v. Russia (no. 10633/07)
Kokurkhayev and Kokurkhayev v. Russia (nos. 8647/09 and 8653/09)
Polovinkina v. Russia (no. 74828/11)
Zakharov v. Russia (no. 13114/05)
Zayrivov and Others v. Russia (nos. 1485/14, 1643/14, and 3337/14))
Priklerová v. Slovakia (no. 25887/16)
W.K. and M.F. v. Sweden (no. 36802/15)
M.M. v. Switzerland and Italy (no. 70311/14)
Dejanovik v. 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' (no. 48320/09)
Eminov v. 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' (no. 31268/14)
Nevzat Ziberi v. 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' (nos. 52874/10, 52882/10, 55881/10, 55925/10, 55932/10, and 56401/10)
Toleski v. 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' (no. 17800/10)
Akay v. Turkey (no. 16849/12)
Akkaş Çetinkaya and Sönmez Aytekin v. Turkey (no. 41609/10)
Arslan and Others v. Turkey (no. 75051/12)
Ashirovi v. Turkey (no. 81436/12)
Baydemir and Others v. Turkey (no. 52428/08)
Bayram and Others v. Turkey (nos. 37221/05, 43222/09, 60112/10, and 17816/11) - **Rectification**
Çolak and Kasımoğulları v. Turkey (no. 75484/12)
Demir and Others v. Turkey (nos. 60267/09, 64012/09, 64143/09, 64168/09, 64182/09, 64198/09, 64324/09, 64337/09, 64352/09, 64361/09, 64511/09, 64518/09, 64596/09, 64607/09, 64611/09, 64621/09, 64637/09, 64647/09, 64654/09, 64665/09, 64726/09, 64727/09, 64732/09, 64740/09, 64745/09, 64751/09, and 64755/09)
Gökşen and Others v. Turkey (no. 31818/10)
Gürkan v. Turkey (no. 20514/10)
Kayaalp and Others v. Turkey (no. 53086/11)
Kılıç v. Turkey (no. 20502/10)
Kutlay v. Turkey (no. 21421/11)
N. K. Ö. v. Turkey (no. 64486/10)
Olcaşöz v. Turkey (no. 16353/10)
Tanasa v. Turkey (no. 37920/11)
Taş v. Turkey (no. 51483/08)
Viskhadziev v. Turkey (no. 34112/12)
Yay v. Turkey (no. 24592/09)
Yurdakul Engin v. Turkey (no. 22079/13)
Nak Naftogaz Ukrainy v. the United Kingdom (no. 62976/12)
Negassi v. the United Kingdom (no. 64337/14)

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)

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.