



Judgments and decisions of 22 May 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing five judgments¹ and 11 decisions²: three Chamber judgments are summarised below;

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

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

[Gevorgyan v. Armenia](#) (application no. 231/16)

The applicant, Ani Gevorgyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1988 and lives in Yerevan. She was a journalist at the time of the events in this case.

The case concerns Ms Gevorgyan's covering a group who were handing out Armenian National Congress flyers on Mashtots Avenue in Yerevan in February 2014. They were confronted by supporters of the rival Republican Party. The police intervened. In the events that followed, they allegedly attempted to take Ms Gevorgyan's camera from her, and arrested her on suspicion of hooliganism.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Ms Gevorgyan alleges police violence and that no effective investigation was conducted into that complaint by the Armenian authorities, and that the police action, including allegedly stealing and destroying her memory cards at the police station, was to prevent her taking footage of the incident and making it public.

Violation of Article 10

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 4,500 euros (EUR)

costs and expenses: EUR 1,000

[de Galbert Defforey and Others v. France](#) (nos. 45443/21, 45483/21, and 8701/23)*

The applicants, Albertine de Galbert Defforey, Marc Simoncini and Philippe Jaubert, are French nationals who were born in 1980, 1963 and 1956 respectively.

The applications concern an allegation of "reverse discrimination" (*discrimination à rebours*) in tax matters.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, the applicants complain of the

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.

method used to calculate their income tax. They allege “reverse discrimination”, arguing that they would have received more favourable tax treatment if the capital gains on which they were taxed had been generated in respect of transactions falling within the scope of European Directive 2009/133/EC of 19 October 2009.

No violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Jordan v. the Republic of Moldova (no. 10870/15)

The applicant, Iurie Jordan, is a Moldovan national who lives in Chişinău. He was a judge at the Chişinău Court of Appeal at the time of events in this case.

The case concerns B., a journalist, filming Mr Jordan in the carpark of the court in 2013, where he was handed an envelope by a woman. B published that video online, asking in his commentary whether he had witnessed an act of corruption. Mr Jordan complained to the prosecution service, alleging slander. B. was found guilty and fined. However the fine was quashed during a retrial of the case by the Moldovan courts.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Mr Jordan complains of the Moldovan courts’ refusal to punish B.

No violation of Article 8

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.