



Judgments and decisions of 7 January 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing seven judgments¹ and one decision²:

three Chamber judgments are summarised below;

separate press releases have been issued for the four other Chamber judgments in the cases of *A.R.E. v. Greece* (application no. 15783/21), *F.D. and H.C. v. Portugal* (no. 18737/18), *Pătrașcu v. Romania* (no. 1847/21), and *Văleanu and Others v. Romania* (no. 59012/17 and 27 other applications);

a separate press release has also been issued for the decision in *G.R.J. v. Greece* (no. 15067/21);

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

[Minasyan and Others v. Armenia](#) (application no. 59180/15)

The applicants are 14 Armenian nationals, who live in Armenia. They are all activists, members of NGOs, journalists and researchers involved in the sphere of human rights, including LGBT and women's rights.

The case concerns the publication in 2014 of an article on the website of the *Iravunk* ("Law") newspaper, entitled "They Serve the Interests of the International Homosexual (*Լուսմուկամուկ*) Lobby: the Blacklist of Enemies of the Nation and the State". The article attacked "Homosexual rights lobbyists", "the disgusting phenomenon called Eurovision", and the Eurovision winner, Conchita Wurst, who it described "human waste", among other targets. It included links to the Facebook profiles of the applicants. Other articles followed.

The applicants were unable to get satisfaction before the Armenian courts.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), Article 6 (right to a fair trial), and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain, in particular, that the article and subsequent articles had amounted to harassment and hate speech.

Violation of Article 8 taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 2,000 euros (EUR) to each applicant

costs and expenses: EUR 1,067 to the applicants jointly

¹ Under Articles 43 and 44 of the Convention, Chamber judgments are not final. During the three-month period following a 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.

[Yoncheva v. Bulgaria](#) (no. 39127/19)*

The applicant, Elena Nikolova Yoncheva, is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1964 and lives in Sofia.

The case concerns the publication of a press release by the Bulgarian public prosecutor's office on 23 January 2019 which the applicant – a well-known journalist and member of parliament (MP) – regards as having undermined her right to be presumed innocent.

Relying on Articles 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, and on Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) in conjunction with Article 6 § 2, the applicant complains that her right to be presumed innocent was undermined and that no domestic remedy was available to her in respect of that complaint. She submits that the aim of the prosecuting authorities' actions was to punish her for her activities as a journalist and an opposition MP by damaging her credibility and professional reputation.

Violation of Article 6 § 2

Violation of Article 13 in conjunction with 6 § 2

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 4,700

costs and expenses: EUR 3,000

[UAB Profarma and UAB Bona Diagnosis v. Lithuania](#) (nos. 46264/22 and 50184/22)

The applicants, UAB Profarma and UAB Bona Diagnosis, are two companies based in Lithuania.

The case concerns the annulment by the State of several contracts with the applicant companies for the provision of Covid-19 rapid tests, negotiated during the global Covid pandemic. The Prosecutor General had sought the annulment as the State had allegedly overpaid for the tests.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant companies complain, in particular, of being ordered by the civil courts to return part of the money they had received in the public procurement procedure.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 in respect of both applicant companies

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).

Press contacts

echrpres@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.