



Judgments and decisions of 9 October 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 32 judgments¹ and 73 decisions²: seven Chamber judgments are summarised below;

separate press releases have been issued for two other Chamber judgments in the cases of *Georgios Papadopoulos v. Cyprus* (application no. 21454/21) and *Petruzzo and Others v. Italy* (nos. 1986/09 and 67556/13);

23 Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 73 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

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

Just Satisfaction

[Hrachya Harutyunyan v. Armenia](#) (application no. 15028/16)

The applicant, Hrachya Harutyunyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1953 and lives in Yerevan.

The judgment will concern the just satisfaction to be awarded following the European Court's ruling of 27 August 2024 with regard to proceedings brought against the applicant for defamation and insult after he had reported to the management of his former employer, the Electric Networks of Armenia, corruption on the part of one of his colleagues. In that ruling the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention.

As the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) of the European Convention on Human Rights had not been ready for decision, the Court had reserved it.

In today's judgment, the Court took note of the friendly settlement reached between the parties with respect to the question of pecuniary damage and decided to strike the application out of its list of cases.

[Sahiti v. Belgium](#) (no. 24421/20)*

The applicant, Sabit Sahiti, is a Kosovar national who was born in 1985 and lives in Verviers (Belgium).

The case mainly concerns the lack of a final decision by the relevant authorities regarding the application for a residence permit on medical grounds lodged by the applicant in Belgium in 2010.

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.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), the applicant alleges that his expulsion to Kosovo would give rise to a risk of inhuman and degrading treatment on account of his state of health.

Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention, the applicant further complains that he is the victim of a “procedural ping-pong match” between the Aliens Office and the Aliens Appeals Board. Lastly, he submits that he has been waiting for the outcome of the proceedings at issue since 2012 (when his application was first rejected). During most of that time, he asserts, he has been without either a residence permit or social and medical assistance, and has had to bring numerous actions before the employment tribunals.

Violation of Article 8

Just satisfaction: the Court rejected the applicants’ claim for just satisfaction

X v. Italy (no. 42247/23)*

The applicant, X, is an Italian national who was born in 2018. His biological mother is acting on his behalf.

X was born in Italy to a same-sex couple by means of assisted reproduction abroad. The case concerns the annulment of the registration of the details of his birth certificate in so far as it concerned his intended second mother.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, the applicant complains of a violation of his private and family life on account of the loss, five years after his birth, of the legal parent-child relationship he shared with his intended mother.

No violation of Article 8

Platon v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 74995/17)

The applicant, Veaceslav Platon, is a Moldovan and Ukrainian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Chişinău.

The case concerns the conditions of the applicant’s detention. In 2014 the applicant, a former member of Parliament, was charged with fraud and money laundering and was detained in prison pending trial. During his detention he was held in solitary confinement and was guarded by members of the “Pantera”, a special forces unit. According to the applicant, members of that unit failed to forward his requests for medical treatment, insulted and provoked him. The applicant was unable to receive visits from his relatives as a result of sanctions imposed on him for breaches of the prison rules.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), Article 8 (right to respect for private life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant complains about a lack of medical treatment and of a severe limitation of his right to be visited by his family during his detention.

Violation of Article 3 in respect of the medical assistance in detention

Violation of Article 13 taken in conjunction with Article 3

Violation of Article 8 in respect of the limitation of family visits

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 15,600 euros (EUR)

costs and expenses: EUR 2,000

A.W. v. Poland (no. 1307/21)

The applicant, A.W., is a Polish national who was born in 1975 and lives in J.

The case concerns the applicant's right of access to a court and the length of proceedings concerning the recognition of his paternity of and contact with two children born during an informal relationship with a married woman, a judge. On the basis of the legal presumption of paternity, the mother's husband was indicated as the children's father in the birth register. During domestic proceedings the applicant submitted the results of DNA tests showing that he is the children's biological father.

In 2010, following the end of the relationship between the applicant and the married woman, and having no standing to institute proceedings himself, the applicant petitioned the public prosecutor to institute proceedings to challenge the husband's paternity of both children. Proceedings were eventually instituted in 2013. The applicant was not permitted to take part in those proceedings, despite his request to do so. Those proceedings are still pending.

In 2011 the applicant applied for a contact order in respect of the children. A final contact order was made in 2014. The children's mother and her husband have been refusing to comply with the order and the applicant has had no contact with the children.

Relying on Article 8 (right to private life), the applicant complains that the domestic authorities failed to provide him with effective access to a court, which could rule, in an expeditious manner, on matters concerning his paternity of the children and his contact with them.

Violation of Article 8

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 20,000

Chaykovskyy v. Ukraine (no. 48879/19)

The applicant, Vitaliy Viktorovych Chaykovskyy, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1967 and is serving a life sentence in a prison in the Ukrainian city of Berdychiv.

In 2005 the applicant, together with several accomplices, was convicted of banditry and several accounts of robbery and murder; the decision was upheld on appeal and on cassation. On 10 November 2016 the European Court found a violation in respect of Mr Chaykovskyy and some of his accomplices (application no. 7183/04 and applications nos. 48016/06 and 7817/07) on account, among other things, of restriction on access to legal advice at the investigation stage and the use of untested witness statements.

The case concerns the alleged unfairness and excessive length of the proceedings before the Supreme Court for the review of his conviction based on the European Court's findings in his case.

The Grand Chamber of the Supreme Court remitted part of the applicant's convictions for fresh examination by the trial court. However, since no violations of Mr Chaykovskyy's rights had been found by the Court in regard of other conviction, the Supreme Court upheld the verdict in that part and maintained the sentence of life imprisonment. Five judges of the Grand Chamber of the Supreme Court wrote a separate dissenting opinion.

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicant complains that the Supreme Court reassessed the facts and evidence itself when it had no jurisdiction to do so. He also complains that the Supreme Court erred in its assessment of the impact that the admission of improperly obtained evidence leading to the conviction of any co-defendant had on other defendants and the case generally, and that the length of the proceedings was excessive. Also, given that the Supreme Court had "unexpectedly" conducted the reassessment of evidence, he had had no adequate knowledge of the charges against him and no opportunity to prepare his defence.

Violation of Article 6 as regards the fairness of the proceedings

No violation of Article 6 as regards the length of the proceedings

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 3,600

costs and expenses: EUR 500

Religious Community of Svyato-Uspenskyk Parish of Rivne Eparchy of Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ptycha Village of Dubenskyk District v. Ukraine
(no. 8906/19)

The applicant is a religious community that belongs to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC) which, when the application was lodged in 2019, was associated with the Moscow Patriarchate and headed by the Metropolitan of Kyiv and All Ukraine, Onufriy.

The community owns and uses a church building in the village of Ptycha in the Rivne Region. The case concerns the applicant community's liturgical use and peaceful possession of its church building in the context of a dispute over that building with another religious group.

In 2014 tensions arose between parishioners who had remained part of the UOC and those who followed the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate. A conflict began over the use of the church building, resulting in clashes. In January 2016, the Rivne Town Court seized the church building and banned its use. When that decision was lifted in April 2018, unidentified individuals tried to occupy the church building, causing damage to the building and injuries to one of its parishioners. The following day, the Rivne Town Court seized the building again to prevent further clashes and banned people from using it. In 2018, the applicant community was granted victim status in the investigation of those events but lost their appeals for the ban to be lifted.

The applicant community alleges that the national authorities failed to comply with their obligations under Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) in respect of those events.

Violation of Article 9

Just satisfaction: The Court dismissed the applicant community's claim for just satisfaction.

The Court decided to strike the part of the application concerning the complaint under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 out of its list of cases.

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/UCR0F0T0T0T0T0T0T0T0T0T0).

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](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/hudoc-main/press-releases)

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.