



Judgments and decisions of 10 July 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 32 judgments¹ and 62 decisions²: three Chamber judgments are summarised below;

separate press releases have been issued for four other Chamber judgments in the cases of *Gullotti v. Italy* (application no. 64753/14), *Rodina and Borisova v. Latvia* (nos. 2623/16 and 2299/16), *Korniyets and Others v. Ukraine* (nos. 2599/16, 6904/16, and 12704/16), and *Tomenko v. Ukraine* (no. 79340/16);

the 25 Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 62 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

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

[Wulffaert and Wulffaert Beheer NV v. Belgium](#) (application no. 76634/16)*

The applicants are two Belgian nationals and a Belgian public limited company, Wulffaert Beheer. The case concerns their criminal conviction for carrying out building work without planning permission.

The applicants – who were each ordered to pay a criminal fine of 11,000 euros – submit that the Flemish Government decree which was in force at the time of their conviction exempted certain types of work from planning permission.

They rely in this respect on the principle of the retrospective application of the more lenient criminal law, as guaranteed by Article 7 (no punishment without law) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Violation of Article 7

Just satisfaction: the Court rejected the applicants' claim for pecuniary damage and held that the respondent State was to pay them jointly 5,000 euros (EUR) for costs and expenses.

[Sakkou v. Cyprus](#) (no. 4429/23)

The applicant, Charalambos Sakkou, is a Cypriot national who was born in 1979 and is serving a prison sentence in Nicosia.

In 2020 Mr Sakkou was convicted of multiple drug offences and sentenced to six years' imprisonment. The conviction was based on the testimony of one of his accomplices, R., evidence given by two police officers and telecommunications data. R. was himself also convicted of various drug offences. The case concerns Mr Sakkou's allegation that his conviction was not fair because it had been based, to a decisive extent, on the testimony of R., his accomplice.

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 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, Mr Sakkou argues in particular that the admission of R. into a witness protection programme, the suspension of his prison sentence and his subsequent removal from Cyprus under a new identity – albeit subsequent to the applicant’s conviction – showed that R.’s testimony as a prosecution witness had been unreliable.

No violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the reliance on accomplice testimony

[Bednarek and Others v. Poland](#) (no. 58207/14)

The applicants are, Stanisław Bednarek and Dawid Durejko, two Polish nationals who were born in 1991; and Vyacheslav Melnyk, a Ukrainian national who was born in 1992. They all live in Warsaw.

The case concerns the applicants’ complaint about the authorities’ inadequate response to a homophobic attack against them.

On 1 January 2013 at about 3 a.m. they were assaulted and beaten by two brothers and another person while walking in one of Warsaw’s main streets. The first and the third applicants, who were a couple at the time, had been holding hands. They complained to the police and the three aggressors were subsequently indicted and convicted of battery. All three were given a one-year suspended prison sentence and fined 100 Polish zlotys (approximately 25 euros).

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention, the applicants complain that the authorities had not taken into account the homophobic motivation of their attackers, and, instead, had investigated, prosecuted and tried them for ordinary criminal offences. They also complain of a lack of adequate legislative and other measures in Poland to prosecute and combat hate crimes motivated by victims’ sexual orientation.

Violation of Article 3 taken in conjunction with Article 14

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 7,000 to each applicant

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) and Bluesky [@echr.coe.int](https://bsky.app/profile/echr.coe.int).

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)

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.