



Judgments and decisions of 6 November 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 14 judgments¹ and 16 decisions²: five Chamber judgments are summarised below;

separate press releases have been issued for two other Chamber judgments in the cases of *B.M. v. Spain* (application no. 25893/23) and *Sanchez i Picanyol and Others v. Spain* (nos. 25608/20, 27250/20, and 46481/20);

seven Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 16 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

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

[Kyrian v. the Czech Republic](#) (application no. 15956/23)

The applicant, David Kyrian, is a Czech national who was born in 1982 and lives in Dublovice (the Czech Republic).

The case concerns the Czech courts' denying Mr Kyrian contact rights with and information about his son, born in 2013 from an extramarital relationship. The mother's then husband became the child's legal father. The courts ruled that it was not in the child's best interests to grant contact rights and provide information about the child to Mr Kyrian, given his complex and conflictual relationship with the legal parents.

The legal parents of the child have since divorced and the legal father has custody of the child.

In his case before the Court, Mr Kyrian complains that the courts failed to strike a fair balance between the interests of all those involved. He submits that he had been able to see his son up until February 2016 and develop a relationship of trust with him; the situation had changed on account of a change of attitude by the mother. He stresses that conflict could not be the only reason to deny him his rights and that the courts could have at least granted him a separate right to information about his child. The Court will examine the complaints under Article 8 (right to private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

No violation of Article 8

[M.A. v. Latvia](#) (no. 55234/21)

The applicant, Ms M.A., is a Latvian national who was born in 1967.

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.

The applicant has had mental health problems since 2005. The case concerns her detention in an ordinary prison environment, despite the fact that a court ordered her medical treatment in a psychiatric hospital.

She had been involved in two sets of criminal proceedings. She was first convicted in 2018 of fraud, tax evasion and forgery and sentenced to four years' imprisonment. While serving her sentence, another set of proceedings for fraud were instituted against her. It was during those proceedings, in 2021, that the courts ordered her placement in a psychiatric hospital. However, the decision could not be enforced until the procedure for her release from serving the sentence in the first set of proceedings was completed, that is in February 2022.

The applicant alleges that her detention in ordinary prison facilities from July 2021 to February 2022 without specialised psychiatric treatment was in breach of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention.

Violation of Article 5 § 1

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 9,000 euros (EUR)

Baena Salamanca v. Spain (no. 23236/22)

The applicant, Maria del Carmen Baena Salamanca, is a Spanish national who was born in 1962 and lives in Madrid.

The case concerns an article published by a national newspaper in September 2012 suggesting that the applicant, who, at the time, was a forensic medical doctor, had not complied with a judicial order to examine in person a convicted terrorist before issuing a report about him. The applicant maintains that she never received the order and was unaware of its existence or contents until the newspaper article appeared.

A claim against the newspaper and the journalist, brought by the applicant, asking for a retraction was unsuccessful. In 2013 the applicant lodged a criminal complaint against the journalist and a lawyer alleging that the order and its cover letter, which had been produced as evidence in the retraction proceedings, had been tampered with. The investigating court declared that the cover letter had been tampered with, but the proceedings were discontinued as it could not be established that either the journalist or the lawyer had altered the document, or that they had been aware of the modification.

A further civil claim brought by the applicant against the newspaper for defamation was also unsuccessful.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, the applicant complains that by rejecting her civil claim against the newspaper in the defamation proceedings, the domestic courts failed to protect her right to reputation.

No violation of Article 8

A.V. v. Switzerland (no. 37639/19)*

The applicant, A.V., is an Italian national who was born in 1955 and is imprisoned in Lonay.

On 29 June 2017 the applicant was placed in pre-trial detention for, *inter alia*, attempted murder. She was suspected of having fired several bullets at her daughter and of having seriously injured her.

The case concerns the prison authorities' inspection of the applicant's correspondence, except for her correspondence with her lawyer and a number of public institutions.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for one's private and family life, one's home and one's correspondence), the applicant complains that all her mail, except for her correspondence with her lawyer, was systematically inspected by the authorities of the prison where she was in pre-trial detention counting towards a possible custodial sentence.

No violation of Article 8

[Guyvan v. Ukraine](#) (no. 46704/16)

The applicant, Petro Dmytrovych Guyan, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1958 and lives in Poltava (Ukraine).

The case concerns the processing of data from his work mobile telephone by his employer. In 2015, in the context of an internal investigation, his employer asked the mobile phone operator, with which the employer had a contract, for detailed information about certain calls from the applicant's mobile telephone. The operator provided that information. A claim lodged by the applicant against his employer was unsuccessful, the Supreme Court finding that the information in question did not constitute the applicant's personal data.

Relying on Article 8, the applicant complains that the courts failed to protect his right to privacy in relation to his employer having processed his personal data.

Violation of Article 8

Just satisfaction: The applicant did not submit a claim for just satisfaction.

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/UCR11111111111111111111).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrp@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

echrp@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)

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.