



Judgments and decisions of 18 June 2026

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing seven judgments¹ and 17 decisions²: two Chamber judgments are summarised below;

five Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 17 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

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

V.T. and Others v. Azerbaijan (application no. 20075/16)

The case concerns an Armenian family's allegation that their son and brother, H.T., a soldier, was tortured and decapitated during military clashes in April 2016 between Azerbaijan and Armenia over territories which formed at the time the unrecognised "Nagorno-Karabakh Republic" (the "NKR"). A ceasefire was reached after four days, on 5 April 2016, and the bodies of dead soldiers on either side of the conflict were recovered; some were reportedly returned mutilated, with missing heads, hands and earlobes. 21 other applications with similar allegations are currently pending (see [K.S. and N.A. v. Azerbaijan and 21 other applications](#)).

The applicants in this case, V.T., L.V. and A.G., are the parents and sister of H.T, who was a major in the "NKR" army. His body was found close to the line of contact between Azerbaijan and the "NKR", near the village of Talish. According to the "NKR" authorities' investigation and a forensic report by an Armenian expert, H.T. was seriously injured after his military truck had been ambushed and had had his hands, then head cut off while he was still alive.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants allege that H.T. was already defenceless and *hors de combat* when captured by the Azerbaijani forces and that his subsequent mutilation and killing were unjustified and unlawful. Also relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), they allege that H.T. was tortured before he was killed, that they were unable to recover his missing body parts and carry out a proper burial, and that, as a consequence, they have suffered extreme mental distress and anguish. They also rely on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

Violation of Article 2

Violation of Article 3 on account of H.T. 's Torture

Violation of Article 3 on account of the applicants' personal suffering

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 60,000 euros (EUR) jointly to the two first applicants and EUR 30,000 to the third applicant

costs and expenses: EUR 14,210

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.

Société d'Exploitation d'un Service d'Information - CNews v. France (no. 41355/23)*

The applicant is a company incorporated under French law with its registered office in Issy-les-Moulineaux. It operates the television channel, CNews.

The case concerns the notice served on the applicant company by the Audiovisual and Digital Communications Regulatory Authority (ARCOM), following statements made on 21 November 2021 by an infectious disease specialist during the “Les Points sur les i” programme. The notice required the applicant company to comply with its obligations, to ensure honesty and accuracy in the presentation and treatment of information, to guarantee that differing viewpoints on controversial issues were expressed, and, in all circumstances, to retain control over its broadcasting output.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention, the applicant company complains about the formal notice served on it by ARCOM.

No violation of Article 10

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.

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/UCk1jW0u0p0p0p0p0p0p0p0p0).

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://www.echr.coe.int/eng/press-releases)

Press contacts

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.