



Judgments and decisions of 13 June 2024

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 19 judgments¹ and 14 decisions²: four Chamber judgments are summarised below;

a separate press release has been issued for a Chamber judgment in the case of *Daniel Karsai v. Hungary* (application no. 32312/23);

14 Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 14 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

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

[RFE/RL Inc. and Others v. Azerbaijan](#) (applications nos. 56138/18, 48735/19, 51207/19, and 58694/19)

The case concerns the authorities' decisions to completely block access to four online media outlets since 2017-18. The online media outlets are [azadliq.org](#), [anaxeber.az](#), [az24saat.org](#) and [xural.com](#).

More specifically, the applicants are RFE/RL Inc. (Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty) which, apart from radio broadcasting, operates the website [azadliq.org](#); Azer Mammad oglu Talibov, an Azerbaijani national who is the founder and editor of the online news portal [anaxeber.az](#); 24Saat.org, a mass media company which operates the online news portal [az24saat.org](#), and its founder Vugar Alakbarov; and Khural, a newspaper published in Baku which operates the website, [xural.com](#), and its founder and editor-in-chief, Avaz Zeynalov.

The courts decided to block access to the websites on the grounds that certain articles published on them had featured allegedly unlawful content under Azerbaijan's media laws. In particular [azadliq.org](#) was found to have published "information promoting violence and religious extremism and calling for, among other things, mass riots", while the other four websites were found to have published "false, misleading and libellous information".

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants allege that the decisions to block access to their entire websites, instead of to specific articles, were extreme. They argue in particular that the blocking orders were because they were critical of the Government and exposed abuse of power and corruption. They also rely on Article 6 (right to a fair trial), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) of the European Convention.

Violation of Article 10

Just satisfaction: For the details of the amounts awarded to the applicants for non-pecuniary damage, as well as for costs and expenses, please see the operative part the judgment.

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.

Just satisfaction

[SCI Le Château du Francport v. France](#) (no. 3269/18)*

The applicant, Société Civile Immobilière (SCI) Le Château du Francport, is a legal person constituted under French law.

The case concerned a château belonging to the applicant company, which had been seized as part of a judicial investigation into suspected offences before being returned to the applicant company four years later in a state of disrepair, and the applicant company's claim for compensation, which had been rejected for failure to prove that the damage sustained had been the consequence of gross negligence on the part of the State.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, the applicant company complained that its claim for compensation had been rejected for failure to prove damage directly attributable to the State, whereas the domestic authorities responsible for the upkeep and preservation of the château had taken no effective measures to protect and preserve it throughout the time it had remained seized.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 7 July 2022 the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property). As the question of the application of Article 41 was not ready for decision, the Court reserved it.

Today's judgment concerned the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) of the Convention.

Just satisfaction:

pecuniary damage: 2,000,000 euros (EUR)

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 10,000

[Bluks Savickis v. Latvia](#) (no. 44570/19)

The applicant, Jurijs Bluks Savickis, is a Latvian national who was born in 1962. At the time the application was lodged, he was detained in Riga.

The case concerns his pre-trial detention after being arrested in November 2017 on suspicion of drug-related offences.

Relying on Article 5 §§ 1 (right to liberty and security) and 3 (entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial), he complains about his continued pre-trial detention.

Violation of Article 5 § 3 (on account of the failure to provide relevant and sufficient reasons for the applicant's continued detention)

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 2,600

[Cviková v. Slovakia](#) (nos. 615/21, 9427/21, and 36765/21)

The applicant, Denisa Cviková, is a Slovak national who was born in 1970 and lives in Bratislava.

The case originates in a large-scale investigation in 2019 into alleged organised corruption in the judiciary in the Bratislava region. Ms Cviková, a lawyer and judge of the Bratislava I District Court, was a target of the investigation, which led to her and 17 others being charged with various offences, including corruption, abuse of official power and interfering with the judiciary. She was suspected in particular of having accepted a bribe in exchange for assisting another judge to unlawfully rule in a case concerning a promissory note. As part of the investigation, her home was searched and she was detained pending trial from 11 March to 8 October 2020.

Relying on Article 5 §§ 1 (c), 3 and 4 (right to liberty and security), Ms Cviková complains about her detention, which she argues was unjustified and arbitrary, and the proceedings to review the lawfulness of her detention in relation to her request for release. Lastly, she complains that the search of her home breached Article 8 (right to respect for home) because it was unnecessarily invasive and the authorities seized information unrelated to the criminal proceedings.

No violation of Article 5 §§ 1 (c) and 3 - as regards the period until the dismissal of the applicant's request for release (decision of 24 August 2020)

Violation of Article 5 §§ 1 (c) and 3 - as regards the period upon the dismissal of the applicant's request for release (decision of 24 August 2020)

Violation of Article 5 § 4

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 19,500

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. To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en or follow us on Twitter [@ECHR CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

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.