



Judgments and decisions of 2 July 2026

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 11 judgments¹ and seven decisions²: four Chamber judgments are summarised below;

a separate press release has been issued for a Chamber judgment in the case of *Ubeda and Others v. Italy* (application no. 9993/24);

a separate press release has also been issued for a Chamber judgment and a decision in the cases of *A.P. and R.P. v. Poland* (no. 1298/19) and *A.D.-K. and Others v. Poland* (no. 30806/15);

five Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the seven other decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

The judgments in French below are indicated with an asterisk ().*

[Dragoni and Others v. Italy](#) (application no. 12654/22)

The case concerns a girl, H., who was taken into public care right after her birth in 2017 and put up for adoption in 2019.

The applicants in the case are her parents, Dora Dragoni, an Italian national, and Fatih Divrak, a Turkish national; and, her maternal grandparents, Italo Dragoni and Lilia Ida Guerrini, both Italian nationals. They all live in Bagnacavallo (Italy).

After giving birth to H., Ms Dragoni was hospitalised for two weeks with a psychotic disorder. H. was placed in the care of the social services after parental responsibility of Ms Dragoni and Mr Divrak was suspended and the Youth Court initiated proceedings to put her up for adoption. Regular visits were organised between all four applicants and the child. Ultimately, however, in 2019 the courts found that both the parents and the grandparents lacked the necessary parenting abilities and that they were not capable of improving within a time frame that was compatible with the child's needs.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain about the decision to declare that H. had been abandoned brackets ("*stato di abbandono*") and that she was available for adoption. They allege in particular that the adoption decision had been based on an outdated assessment of their parenting abilities and that the authorities had failed to put in place a programme to help them improve. They further complain about the interruption of their contact with the child, without sufficient reasons, while the proceedings were still pending, and that the length of the proceedings on their request for a stay of execution of that decision had been excessive.

Violation of Article 8

Just satisfaction:

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.

non-pecuniary damage: 35,000 euros (EUR) to the first and the second applicants jointly and EUR 27,000 to the third and fourth applicants jointly
costs and expenses: EUR 20,000 to the first and second applicants jointly, EUR 20,000 to the third and fourth applicants jointly and EUR 9,000 to all applicants jointly

[Fanesi v. Italy](#) (no. 25063/20)*

The applicant, Gianluca Fanesi, is an Italian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Monteprandone.

The case concerns the alleged ill-treatment of the applicant by police officers and the alleged lack of an effective investigation into that treatment.

On 5 November 2017, following a football match, the applicant was involved in a fight between supporters of the two opposing teams. He submits that he was hit on the head by police officers present at the scene, which caused him serious physical injuries resulting in permanent neurological damage.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) of the European Convention, the applicant complains that the force used against him by the police was not strictly necessary. He further submits that the investigation into his allegations was not effective as there were a number of shortcomings and, among other things, those responsible for his injuries were never identified.

Violation of Article 3 (investigation)

Violation of Article 3 (ill-treatment)

Just satisfaction:

pecuniary damage: EUR 100 000

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 30 000

costs and expenses: EUR 20 000

[Căldărari v. the Republic of Moldova](#) (no. 55294/17)

The applicants, Virgilia Căldărari and Lilian Căldărari, mother and son, are Moldovan nationals who were born in 1982 and 2005 respectively. They used to live in Chişinău.

The case essentially concerns the State's response to alleged medical negligence. In November 2011 a dentist recommended that Mr Căldărari, who was 8 years' old at the time, undergo dental treatment under a general anaesthesia. Following the administration of an anaesthetic agent (halothane), Mr Căldărari's pulse rate dropped, and he went into cardiac arrest. Although he was resuscitated, he remained in a cerebral coma for several months, which left him with severe neurological damage and complete paralysis. In April 2012 he was discharged from hospital to continue his recovery at home. Mr Căldărari died on 3 July 2022 as a consequence of his long-term afflictions. A criminal investigation, initiated at Ms Căldărari's request, was discontinued and reopened on several occasions. On 17 July 2017 the prosecutor closed the investigation and that decision became final.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 8 (right to private and family life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, the applicants complain that Mr Căldărari was a victim of medical negligence relating to the improper use of halothane as an anaesthetic agent and that the investigation had been ineffective.

No violation of Article 2 (right to life)

Violation of Article 2 (investigation)

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 20,000

costs and expenses: EUR 2,520

[Ivanyushchenko v. Switzerland](#) (no. 54708/20)*

The applicant, Yuriy Ivanyushchenko, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1959. Following the removal from office of the then Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich in February 2014, the Swiss Federal Council issued an order on 26 February 2014 freezing assets held in Switzerland by the removed President and his entourage, including those of the applicant, a former member of the Ukrainian Parliament.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life), the applicant alleges, in particular, that the inclusion of his name on the list annexed to the order imposing sanctions on the former leaders of Ukraine (the government of Viktor Yanukovich), and the freeze on all his assets and other financial interests in Switzerland from 28 February 2014 onwards, has seriously undermined respect for his reputation, a component of the right to respect for private life.

No violation of Article 8

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](#), [LinkedIn](#), and [YouTube](#).

Contact [ECHRPress](#) to subscribe to the press-release mailing list.

Where can the Court's press releases be found? [HUDOC - Press collection](#)

Press contacts

echrpess@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.