

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing five judgments on Tuesday 31 March 2026 and 41 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 2 April 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 31 March 2026

[Makki v. Denmark \(application no. 10297/23\)](#)

The applicant, Abdeelhadi Abbas Makki, is a Danish national who was born in 1995 and lives in Slagelse (Denmark).

Mr Makki suffers from paranoid schizophrenia. On 3 June 2016 he was involuntarily admitted to a psychiatric hospital. The same day he stabbed a nurse in the back of his head and upper back nine times with a fork and, as a result, was strapped to a restraint bed. He remained strapped to the bed from 1.30 p.m. that day until 8.18 p.m. on 16 June 2016. During that period, he was released for 30 minutes once a day, with the assistance of the police, to shower and to go outside to smoke. On 16 June 2016 he was transferred to a more secure psychiatric hospital and then, subsequently, on 28 February 2019 to the High-Security Psychiatric Unit, a unit where extraordinarily dangerous persons are treated under the Mental Health Act. In March 2019 Mr Makki complained to the Psychiatric' Complaints Board about the use of restraint on him from 3 to 16 June 2016. In May 2019 the Board upheld his complaint in part, finding that the use of physical restraints from 1.30 p.m. on 3 June until 9.30 a.m. on 5 June had been lawful but that the period thereafter had been unlawful. In subsequent proceedings brought by Mr Makki under the Mental Health Act, he complained only about the period from 9.30 a.m. on 5 June onwards.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Makki complains about his restraint from 9.30 a.m. on 5 June 2016 to 8.18 p.m. on 16 June 2016, arguing that that he was physically restrained for longer than had been absolutely necessary and that the authorities failed to establish that there had been an imminent risk of harm to others requiring his continued physical restraint.

[X v. Georgia \(no. 35640/22\)](#)

The applicant, X, was born in 2005 and lives in Georgia.

The case concerns allegations made by X that she had been sexually abused by her stepfather, starting when she was 13 years old. X confided in a relative who formally reported the alleged abuse to the police on 7 May 2021 and a criminal investigation was opened. A number of investigative steps were taken. In May and June 2021, the prosecution authority issued decisions refusing to grant X victim status and an appeal by her lawyers against those decisions was dismissed as unfounded, the court finding that there was insufficient evidence that a criminal offence had been committed.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention, X complains that the criminal proceedings failed to provide adequate legal protection against sexual abuse. She argues that the national legislative framework for combatting sexual violence against children was inadequate, that the criminal investigation into her allegations had been ineffective and that the investigators' incompetent

conduct, such as subjecting her to gynaecological examinations and interrogation techniques, had exposed her to further victimisation.

[Yuriy Dmitriyev v. Russia \(no. 47934/17\)](#)

The applicant, Yuriy Dmitriyev, is a Russian national who was born in 1956 and, at the relevant time, lived in Petrozavodsk (Russia). He is a historian and human-rights activist.

The case concerns two sets of criminal proceedings brought against Mr Dmitriyev, his arrest and his pre-trial detention. Mr Dmitriyev alleges that the criminal proceedings brought against him, which resulted in a conviction for sexual assault against a minor, his adopted daughter, were politically motivated.

Relying on Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 (right to liberty and security) of the Convention, Mr Dmitriyev complains that his arrest and pre-trial detention were not based on a “reasonable suspicion” that he had committed criminal offences and that the domestic courts failed to provide “relevant and sufficient” reasons for the duration of his pre-trial detention. Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial/right to legal assistance of own choosing), Mr Dmitriyev complains about the overall fairness of the second set of criminal proceedings, in particular, he alleges that he was unable to participate effectively in the appeal hearing, which had been conducted by video link or to challenge the evidence presented, and that he was deprived of effective legal assistance of his own choosing during that hearing. Relying on Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) taken in conjunction with Articles 5 and 6, Mr Dmitriyev also alleges that his pre-trial detention and prosecution were politically motivated and pursued the ulterior purpose of punishing him for his work.

Thursday 2 April 2026

[Word of Life Church of Christians of Evangelical Faith in Armenia and Simonyan v. Armenia \(no. 30817/13\)](#)

The applicants are a religious organisation and its senior pastor and leader, Artur Simonyan. He is an Armenian national, who was born in 1966 and lives in Verin Ptghni (Armenia).

The case concerns a weekly newspaper’s (*Iravunk Hetaqnnutyun* – “Law Investigation”) publication of articles referring to the applicant organisation as a “sect” and its followers “sectarians”. The focus of the articles was a scandal about a famous actress, amid speculation that she was a follower of the applicants’ faith. The applicants’ claims against the newspaper for defamation and insult were ultimately unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 6 (right of access to court), the applicants complain that the Court of Cassation refused to admit the applicants’ appeal on points of law in their case because of a purely technical error. They also rely on Article 9 (freedom of religion) to complain that certain findings by the Armenian courts breached the duty of neutrality and impartiality in religious matters, in particular their justifying the use of the words “sect” and “sectarian”, by the fact that the applicant organisation’s beliefs deviated from the dominant Armenian Apostolic Church.

[Ukrayinskyy and Others v. Ukraine \(no. 48751/19 and 41 others\)](#)

The applicants are 42 Ukrainian nationals who were detained in Zhovti Vody Correctional Colony no. 26 in the Dnipropetrovsk Region (Ukraine) until 2020 when they were transferred elsewhere because the Ministry of Justice decided to close the prison. Contact has been lost with 37 of the applicants.

The case concerns their complaints about inadequate conditions of detention in the Zhovti Vody prison. They had lodged their complaints with the authorities after a monitoring visit by the non-governmental organisation, Kharkiv Human Rights Protection Group. The NGO also subsequently

published a report alleging that the conditions in the prison were causing serious harm to prisoners' health.

Relying in particular on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain of damp, mouldy and dirty cells infested with rodents and insects; no hot water and limited access to cold water; a lack of access to drinking water, electricity, toiletries and clothing; sanitary facilities in a state of disrepair, with toilets not ensuring privacy; insufficient laundry facilities; and poor-quality food served in unsanitary conditions.

Lastly, they allege that the prison authorities had tried to pressure them into withdrawing their complaints, in breach of Article 34 (right of individual petition).

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 March 2026

Name	Main application number
Lepuri and Others v. Albania	17829/23
Z.G. v. Hungary	12013/21

Thursday 2 April 2026

Name	Main application number
Artsruni v. Armenia	8363/19
Hakobyan v. Armenia	21350/19
Shkhrdumyan and Ghukasyan v. Armenia	5760/17
Ibrahimov v. Azerbaijan	2865/24
Tahmazov and Gahramanli v. Azerbaijan	3755/24
Ćorić v. Croatia	21543/24
Seges d.o.o. v. Croatia	12948/25
Badi and Boulaksil v. France	19741/23
C8 (Canal 8) v. France	33272/24
Cathédrale d'Images v. France	2876/24
Vartanov and Others v. Georgia and Russia	60335/11
S.G. and S.R. v. Greece	6923/21
Kovács v. Hungary	57646/22
Rácz and Others v. Hungary	15821/25
Rácz and Others v. Hungary	20509/25
Bílabúð Benna ehf. v. Iceland	44000/22
Exstro S.r.l. v. Italy	56139/19
Malena v. Italy	34873/24
Stropus v. Lithuania	27950/23
Cub S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	31625/14
M-Paradis Plus S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova	71151/13
Arhip v. the Republic of Moldova	27514/13

