

Judgments and decisions of 12 June 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 13 judgments¹ and 38 decisions²: two Chamber judgments are summarised below;

one separate press release has been issued for the decision in the case of *S.S. and Others v. Italy* (application no. 21660/18).

The 11 Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 37 other decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

The judgments summarised below are available only in English.

[Krpelík v. the Czech Republic](#) (application no. 23963/21)

The applicant, Oldřich Krpelík, is a Czech national who was born in 1984 and lives in Frýdek-Místek (the Czech Republic).

The case concerns the fair-trial rights of Mr Krpelík, who has a slight intellectual disability. He was arrested and questioned in May 2016 on suspicion of burglary. He was subsequently convicted on the basis of the confession he had made at the pre-trial stage and sentenced to two years in prison.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and to legal assistance of own choosing) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Krpelík alleges that his conviction was not fair because he had not had legal assistance either during the initial police interviews or during a site visit to the location of the burglaries. He submits that he should have been assisted by a lawyer at this stage, and all the more so given that he was in a vulnerable position because of his intellectual disability.

Violation of Article 6 § 3 (c) taken in conjunction with Article 6 § 1

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 3,000 euros (EUR)

costs and expenses: EUR 800

[T.H. v. the Czech Republic](#) (no. 33037/22)

The applicant, T.H., is a Czech national who was born in 1977 and lives in Prague.

The applicant identifies as having a non-binary gender identity. From an early age he struggled considerably with the male identity assigned to him at birth, but due to concerns about potential medical complications, he refused to undergo irreversible male-to-female sex reassignment surgery.

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.

In the autumn of 2012, he changed his first name and was issued a new identity card, mentioning his male sex and a male form of his personal identity number (“personal numerical code”).

The case concerns the authorities’ refusal to grant the applicant’s request to change his personal numerical code denoting gender on the ground that he had not undergone the irreversible surgery required by domestic law for gender reassignment.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention, the applicant complains about the refusal to grant his requests, saying that the sterilisation requirement made him face an “impossible dilemma”. The applicant also complains that he was forced to repeatedly and involuntarily disclose his gender identity every time he had to present his identity documents, in breach of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8.

Violation of Article 8

Just satisfaction: The Court held that the finding of a violation constituted in itself sufficient just satisfaction for any non-pecuniary damage sustained by the applicant and that the respondent State was to pay him EUR 2,000 for costs and expenses.

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

echrpess@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.