



Judgments and decisions of 4 September 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing two judgments¹ and seven decisions²:

one Chamber judgment is summarised below;

one Committee judgment, 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 judgment summarised below is available only in French.

[E.A. and Association européenne contre les violences faites aux femmes au travail v. France](#) (application no. 30556/22)

The applicant, E.A., is a French national who was born in 1983. The Association européenne contre les violences faites aux femmes au travail (“European Association against Violence against Women at Work” – AVFT) is a non-governmental association (NGO) that was created in 1985 and is headquartered in Paris. Its stated aims include defending the victims of sexist and sexual violence in the workplace.

At the relevant time, Dr K.B., who was born in 1967, was the head of the pharmacy department at a hospital. E.A. had joined his department as an assistant pharmacist in March 2010; she had been recruited on the basis of a temporary contract, with a view to training for managerial duties, and worked under the direct supervision of a senior medical officer, Ms A.K.

On 12 June 2013 E.A. was placed on medical leave. That leave was extended indefinitely and she was ultimately admitted to the psychiatric department. E.A. confided to A.K. that she was in a sexual relationship with K.B. and that K.B. was harassing her. She mentioned the sado-masochistic nature of their relationship.

On 30 July 2013 the deputy director of the hospital reported the facts to the district prosecutor with territorial jurisdiction, specifically stating that E.A. had complained of a situation of “controlling behaviour” (“*emprise*”) and “forced sexual relations”. Moreover, K.B. was suspended from his duties on 5 August 2013 and was later struck off the register of hospital practitioners.

The applicants submit that the criminal statutes in force in France do not afford sufficient protection against non-consensual sexual acts. They further claim that the domestic authorities failed in their duty to conduct an effective investigation into the acts complained of by E.A. and to punish the perpetrator, and that they exposed E.A. to secondary victimisation. Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private life) of the European

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.

