



## Judgments and decisions of 24 April 2025

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

separate press releases have been issued for two other Chamber judgments in the cases of *L. and Others v. France* (applications nos. 46949/21, 24989/22, and 39759/22) and *Sytnyk v. Ukraine* (no. 16497/20);

five Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 12 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

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

### [Bogdan Shevchuk v. Ukraine](#) (application no. 55737/16)

The applicant, Bogdan Grygorovych Shevchuk, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1979 and lives in Zatoka (Odesa Region, Ukraine).

In January 2016 a criminal investigation was opened into him for abuse of power and, as a result, he was arrested and detained in May 2016. His detention ordered by the Kyivskiy District Court of Odesa was subsequently extended twice until 20 October 2016, the second extension being given by Judge F. and not amenable to appeal. The applicant lodged numerous complaints with the courts in which he argued that his continued detention was unlawful, but to no avail.

Relying on Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 (right to liberty and security/right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains that his detention was not lawful as it was authorised by an incompetent court and that there was no effective procedure for him to challenge its lawfulness. He furthermore alleges that the authorities exerted pressure on him to withdraw his application to the Court, after notice of the application had been given to the Ukrainian Government, in breach of Article 34 (right of individual petition) of the European Convention.

**Violation of Article 5 § 1** regarding the unlawfulness of the applicant's detention from 28 August to 18 October 2016

**Violation of Article 34**

**Just satisfaction:**

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 10,000

<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.

## [Ivan Karpenko v. Ukraine \(no. 2\)](#) (no. 41036/16)

The applicant, Ivan Ivanovych Karpenko, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1973 and is detained in Perekhrestivka (Sumy Region, Ukraine). He has been serving a life sentence since 2004.

The case concerns alleged monitoring of his correspondence in detention and the fact that he was not allowed to participate in hearings in a subsequent case he brought before the courts.

Relying mainly on Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, the applicant complains that the prison authorities unlawfully monitored his correspondence and that, when he lodged a complaint with the courts in that connection, they failed to ensure that he could participate via videolink in the hearings of his case. He also complains that the subsequent decisions were not adequately reasoned.

### Violation of Article 6 § 1

### Violation of Article 8

**Just satisfaction:** The Court held that the finding of a violation constituted in itself sufficient just satisfaction for any non-pecuniary damage sustained by the applicant and that the respondent State was to pay him EUR 800 for costs and expenses.

---

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](http://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

[echrpress@echr.coe.int](mailto:echrpress@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.