



Judgments and decisions of 3 April 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 18 judgments¹ and 53 decisions²: three Chamber judgments are summarised below;

separate press releases have been issued for two Chamber judgments in the cases of *Hayk Grigoryan v. Armenia* (application no. 9796/17) and *Kulák v. Slovakia* (no. 57748/21);

13 Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 53 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

The judgment in French below is indicated with an asterisk ().*

[Federici v. France](#) (application no. 52302/19)*

The applicant, Jean-François Federici, is a French national who was born in 1957. He is currently detained in Venzolasca Prison in Corsica.

The case concerns the applicant's placement in a glass booth during proceedings before an assize court of appeal, and that court's refusal to grant the applicant's request to be questioned in the witness stand instead.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (right to a fair trial/right to have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of one's defence) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains that he was subjected to an unnecessary and disproportionate restriction on his right to appear freely at trial and his right to participate effectively in the proceedings. He also complains that the fact of being questioned while in the glass booth infringed his right to be presumed innocent as guaranteed by Article 6 § 2 of the Convention.

No violation of Article 6 § 2

[Kulák v. Slovakia](#) (no. 57748/21)

The applicant, Tomáš Kulák, is a Slovak national who was born in 1980 and lives in Bratislava. He is a lawyer.

The case concerns the search of Mr Kulák's law firm on 28 October 2020 by the authorities, during which computers and other items were seized. The action had been taken with a prosecutor's consent given over the telephone, rather than a warrant, as there was an alleged urgent need to act to prevent the deletion of files as Mr Kulák had accidentally been made aware that the search was imminent.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Mr Kulák complains that the search of his law firm and the seizure of his work computer had violated his legal-professional privilege.

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.

Violation of Article 8

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 10,000 euros (EUR)

costs and expenses: EUR 3,125

[Bogay and Others v. Ukraine](#) (no. 38283/18)

The applicants are 12 Ukrainian nationals. They were born between 1989 and 2001 and live in Ukraine.

The applicants were involved in January 2018 in a protest in Lviv against the use of animals in circus acts, which was opposed by people allegedly belonging to far-right groups at the site. The case concerns police actions at the protest, which allegedly disrupted the demonstration. Some of the applicants were searched and allegedly detained.

The applicants rely, in particular, on Articles 5 (right to liberty and security), 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of assembly and association). They also rely on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).

Violation of Article 5 § 1 in respect of all the applicants

No violation of Article 11 read in the light of Article 10 in respect of the inspection of the applicants' belongings by the police

Violation of Article 11 read in the light of Article 10 regarding all the applicants in respect of their arrest and detention

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 1,200 to each applicant

costs and expenses: EUR 6,350 to eight of the 12 applicants (see the list 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 <https://www.echr.coe.int/home>. To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en or follow us on X (Twitter) [@ECHR_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH) and Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int).

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)

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.