



## Judgments and decisions of 16 December 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 12 judgments<sup>1</sup> and one decision<sup>2</sup>: three Chamber judgments are summarised below;

a separate press release has been issued for a Chamber judgment in the case of *Anti-Corruption Foundation (FBK) and Others v. Russia* (application no. 13505/20 and 138 other applications);

a separate press release has been issued for a Chamber judgment and a decision in the cases of *Gondert v. Germany* (no. 34701/21) and *De Simone v. Germany* (no. 21853/23);

a separate press release has also been issued for three Committee judgments in the cases of *Bozyokuş and Others v. Türkiye* (no. 39586/20 and 131 other applications), *Karslı and Others v. Türkiye* (no. 18693/20 and 1,435 other applications), and *Seyhan and Others v. Türkiye* (no. 57837/19 and 851 other applications).

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

*The judgments summarised below are available only in English.*

### [Z and Others v. Finland](#) (application no. 42758/23)

The applicants, Mr Z and his two minor sons, X and Y, are Russian nationals who were born in 1983, 2011 and 2013 respectively.

In September 2022 Mr Z took X and Y from Russia to Finland without their mother's consent. The case concerns the Finnish courts' decision to order the return of X and Y, who have been granted asylum in Finland, to Russia under the Hague Child Abduction Convention.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that the Supreme Court's order for the return of the children was in breach of their right to respect for their family life. They also complain under Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) that, if returned to Russia, X and Y would be subjected to ill-treatment.

#### **No violation of Article 8**

**Interim measure (Rule 39 of the Rules of Court):** still in force as regards the second and third applicants until the present judgment becomes final or until further notice

### [Vekua v. Georgia](#) (no. 43537/22)

The applicant, Nana Vekua, is a Georgian national who was born in 1957 and lives in Poti (Georgia).

<sup>1</sup> 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](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/execution)

<sup>2</sup> Inadmissibility and strike-out decisions are final.

In 2017 criminal proceedings brought against Ms Vekua on suspicion of fraudulently obtaining a plot of land in Poti were discontinued as time-barred. The case concerns the subsequent administrative proceedings brought by the Property Agency requesting, among things, that the applicant's title to the property be annulled and that damages be awarded. The courts ultimately concluded that the administrative act registering the title to the disputed plot in the name of the applicant's company had been unlawful because it had been based on a forged document.

Relying on Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence) of the European Convention, Ms Vekua complains that the administrative proceedings were unfair and breached her right to be presumed innocent because the courts relied on the prosecutor's decision of 2017 to conclude that she had committed fraud, even though her criminal prosecution had been discontinued. She also relies on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to complain of an unlawful interference with her right to the peaceful enjoyment of her possessions.

#### **No violation of Article 6 § 2**

#### **Emre v. Türkiye (no. 2412/21)**

The applicant, Rafet Emre, is a Turkish national who was born in 1966 and lives in Edirne (Türkiye).

The case concerns the rejection in 2018 of Mr Emre's request for a prison transfer, to be closer to his family in Edirne. At the time he was serving a prison term in Kırşehir E-Type Penitentiary Institution, over 850 kilometres away, following his conviction of membership of an organisation referred to by the Turkish authorities as the "Fetullahist Terror Organisation / Parallel State Structure" ("the FETÖ/PDY"). The prison authorities rejected his request on the grounds that the prisons located nearer to his family were at full capacity and, in any event, were not suitable given the type of offence for which he had been convicted. The courts upheld this decision, ultimately in a Constitutional Court ruling in 2020.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for family life) of the Convention, Mr Emre complains that the long journey between Edirne and Kırşehir had had a negative impact on his family life. In particular it had meant hardship for his wife and children whom he had only been able to see four or five times since he had been placed in detention in 2016.

#### **Violation of Article 8**

**Just satisfaction:** No request for just satisfaction made.

---

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](http://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/UCk1jW13333333333333333333).

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)

#### **Press contacts**

[echrp@echr.coe.int](mailto: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)

Claire Windsor (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 24 01)

**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.