

Judgments and decisions of 2 April 2026

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 11 judgments¹ and 30 decisions²: two Chamber judgments are summarised below; nine Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 30 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

The judgments summarised below are available only in English.

[Word of Life Church of Christians of Evangelical Faith in Armenia and Simonyan v. Armenia](#) (application 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) of the European Convention on Human Rights, 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.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 3,600 euros (EUR)
costs and expenses: EUR 1,000

[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

¹ Under Articles 43 and 44 of the Convention, Chamber judgments are not final. During the three-month period following a Chamber judgment's delivery, any party may request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber of the Court. If such a request is made, a panel of five judges considers whether the case deserves further examination. In that event, the Grand Chamber will hear the case and deliver a final judgment. If the referral request is refused, the Chamber judgment will become final on that day. Under Article 28 of the Convention, judgments delivered by a Committee are final.

Once a judgment becomes final, it is transmitted to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe for supervision of its execution. Further information about the execution process can be found here: www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/execution

² Inadmissibility and strike-out decisions are final.

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) of the European Convention, 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) of the Convention.

Violation of Article 34 in respect of applicants nos. 1-40

No violation of Article 34 in respect of applicants nos. 41-42

Violation of Articles 3 and 13 concerning the inadequate conditions of detention during the periods indicated in the table appended to the judgment and the lack of any effective remedy in domestic law

Just satisfaction: Details of the amounts awarded to the applicants for non-pecuniary damage, as well as costs and expenses, are appended to the judgment.

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/UCR01111111111111111111).

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.