



Judgments and decisions of 4 June 2026

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

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

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

[Albertani v. Italy](#) (application no. 15994/20)*

The applicant is an Italian national who was born in 1983 and suffers from psychiatric disorders. The case concerns her detention in prison following a reform which led to the closure of forensic psychiatric hospitals.

In 2011 the applicant was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment for several offences, including the murder of her sister and the attempted murder of her mother. After psychiatric assessments found that she was dangerous and partly incapable of understanding and controlling her actions, the courts ordered her placement in a forensic psychiatric hospital for an initial three-year period as a security measure. At the end of the three years, the courts decided that her state of health required her to remain in a forensic psychiatric hospital, on the basis of Article 148 of the Criminal Code. In the meantime, a reform was passed providing for the closure of forensic psychiatric hospitals and their replacement by residential centres for the enforcement of security measures (*residenze per l'esecuzione delle misure di sicurezza*) by 31 March 2015 at the latest. As those centres were not intended for prisoners detained under Article 148 of the Criminal Code, the applicant was transferred to prison.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention, the applicant complains about her detention in prison, where she allegedly does not receive appropriate treatment for her disorders.

Relying on Article 5 (right to liberty and security) of the European Convention on Human Rights, she submits that she is being unlawfully detained in a manner incompatible with her health needs. Under Articles 5 and 13 (right to an effective remedy), she further alleges that there is no effective remedy by which to complain of the unlawfulness of her detention and the ill-treatment she has received.

Violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 5 § 1

Violation of Article 5 § 4 and Article 13 in conjunction with Article 3

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: 15,000 euros (EUR)
costs and expenses: EUR 10,000

[Andrea Ciotta v. Italy](#) (no. 368/21)*

The applicant is an Italian national who was born in 1984 and suffers from psychiatric disorders. The case concerns his continued detention in prison, despite a domestic court decision ordering his placement in a residential centre for the enforcement of security measures (*residenza per l'esecuzione delle misure di sicurezza*).

In April 2020 the applicant was placed in pre-trial detention on charges of harassing his former partner. In prison a psychiatric team diagnosed him with a delusional disorder. In July 2020 the Rome District Court granted his request to replace his pre-trial detention with a pre-trial security measure in the form of placement in a residential centre for the enforcement of security measures. As there were no free places, he remained in prison until 2 March 2021, when he was transferred to a therapeutic community in Latina province, where he currently resides.

In the meantime, at the applicant's request, the European Court had indicated an interim measure under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court in January 2021, asking the Government to transfer the applicant to a more suitable facility.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 5 (right to liberty and security) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention, the applicant submits that his continued detention in prison was unlawful; that it was incompatible with his psychiatric illness and prevented him from receiving appropriate therapeutic care for his mental health; and that there was no effective remedy available to him. Under Article 34 (right of individual application), he also complains about the delay in implementing the interim measure indicated by the European Court.

Violation of Article 3

No violation of Article 5 § 1 concerning the detention period from 26 April to 9 July 2020

Violation of Article 5 § 1 concerning the detention period from 10 July 2020 to 25 February 2021

Violation of Article 5 § 5

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Violation of Article 34

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 30,000
costs and expenses: EUR 15,000

Just Satisfaction

[Seksimp Group SRL v. the Republic of Moldova](#) (no. 30085/13)

The applicant company, Seksimp Group SRL, was incorporated in Moldova in 2002 by a Slovenian national, who is its sole associate.

The case concerns a private dispute over the alleged failure to fulfil the contractual obligations of a tenancy agreement, following which the domestic courts ordered the applicant company to pay an allegedly disproportionate amount of compensation without providing sufficient reasoning; the enforcement of that court order resulted in the sale of the applicant company's property, all without its knowledge.

In its [principal judgment](#) delivered on 15 May 2025, the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention in relation to the lack of adequate reasoning in the domestic courts' judgments and that the State had failed to set up a proper forum allowing the

applicant company to assert its rights effectively, in breach of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention.

The Court further held that the question of just satisfaction was not ready for decision and reserved it for examination at a later date.

Today's judgment concerned the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) in respect of the pecuniary damage sustained by the applicant company.

Just satisfaction:

pecuniary damage: EUR 560,000

[Brun v. Switzerland](#) (no. 50885/16)

The applicant, Fabian Brun, is a Swiss national who was born in 1980 and lives in Merenschwand (Canton of Aargau, Switzerland).

The case concerns the applicant's obligation to pay a military-service exemption tax under the Swiss Constitution; he had completed a total of 104 days of military service when he was declared unfit on medical grounds.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 4 §§ 2 and 3 (prohibition of slavery and forced labour), the applicant complains that, as a man of Swiss nationality who was required to perform compulsory military service, he had been exposed to discriminatory treatment on account of his sex and nationality by being made to pay the military-service exemption tax following the declaration that he was unfit, whereas women of Swiss nationality and foreign nationals residing in Switzerland were not obliged to pay the tax in question.

No violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 4

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.