



Judgments and decisions of 15 February 2024

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 19 judgments¹ and 16 decisions²: three Chamber judgments are summarised below;

separate press releases have been issued for two other Chamber judgments in the cases of *U v. France* (application no. 53254/20) and *Škoberne v. Slovenia* (no. 19920/20);

14 Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been submitted to the Court, and the 16 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

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

[Colombier v. France](#) (application no. 14925/18)*

The applicants, Christian Colombier, David Colombier and Agathe Colombier, are French nationals who were born in 1960, 1964 and 1967 respectively and live in Coye-la-Forêt (France), Tel Aviv (Israel) and Paris (France).

The case concerns the effects of a Constitutional Council decision repealing section 2 of the Law of 14 July 1819 on a succession mechanism known as *droit d'aubaine et de detraction*. Under this statutory provision, individuals entitled to inheritance in France but denied that right in a succession governed by foreign law had been permitted to claim a portion of the estate located in France by way of compensation.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that the domestic courts did not recognise their reserved portion of the estate of their father, composer Michel Colombier, who had disinherited them via a trust.

No violation of Article 8

[Jarre v. France](#) (no. 14157/18)*

The applicants, Jean-Michel Jarre and Stéphanie Jarre, are French nationals who were born in 1948 and 1965 respectively and live in Paris.

The case concerns the effects of a Constitutional Council decision repealing a statutory provision whereby individuals entitled to inheritance in France but denied that right in a succession governed by foreign law had been permitted to claim a portion of the estate located in France by way of compensation.

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.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, the applicants complain that the domestic courts did not recognise their reserved portion of the estate of their father, composer Maurice Jarre, who had disinherited them via a trust.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1
No violation of Article 6 § 1

Shylina v. Ukraine (no. 2412/19)

The applicant, Elvira Danysivna Shylina, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Rivne (Ukraine).

Ms Shylina is an internally displaced person who left Crimea following the Russian occupation of the peninsula. The case concerns a change to a by-law, which required that benefits for internally displaced people could only be paid into accounts opened with a designated State bank, Oshchadbank. Ms Shylina did not bank there and refused to open an account. Payments of her special monthly allowance for internally displaced people were suspended.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), and Article 1 of Protocol No. 12 (general prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, Ms Shylina complains of the suspension of her allowance, arguing that it placed an excessive burden on her, and that the obligations put on her to receive social benefits were discriminatory.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

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

echrpress@echr.coe.int | tel.: +33 3 90 21 42 08

We would encourage journalists to send their enquiries via email.

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.