



Judgments and decisions of 29 April 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing eight judgments¹ and one decision²: five Chamber judgments are summarised below;

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

The judgments summarised below are available only in English.

[Jaupi v. Albania](#) (application no. 23369/16)

The applicant, Kastriot Jaupi, is an Albanian national who was born in 1975. He is currently serving a prison sentence.

The case concerns Mr Jaupi's trial in absentia, for which he received a life sentence. He was convicted of the attempted murder of the chief of the criminal police of Berat, I.N., and his driver, and the murder of I.N. in a bar in Vlora in 2000. As Mr Jaupi was in detention in Spain at the time, the trial was held without him present.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) and (d) (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Jaupi complains, in particular of not being allowed a retrial after being convicted in absentia, of not being able to cross-examine key prosecution witnesses, and of the Supreme Court's reasoning being inadequate.

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) as regards the applicant's right to take part in the criminal proceedings against him

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) as regards the applicant's right to question prosecution witnesses in respect of his conviction for murder

Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) as regards the applicant's right to question the prosecution witnesses R.B. and B.H. in respect of his conviction for attempted murder

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 1,200 euros (EUR) for costs and expenses.

[Avagyan v. Russia](#) (no. 36911/20)

The applicant, Mariya Anatolyevna Avagyan, is a Russian national who was born in 1985 and lives in Krasnodar (Russia).

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.

The case concerns Ms Avagyan's conviction in 2020 for wilful dissemination of untrue information. She had posted on a social-media platform questioning the presence of the covid-19 virus in Krasnodar and the Government's reasons for reporting deaths as being a result of the disease. She was fined 30,000 Russian roubles (approximately 390 euros at the time).

Relying on Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention, Ms Avagyan complains, in particular, of her conviction for dissemination of "untrue information", and that there had not been a prosecuting party present at her trial.

Violation of Article 10

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Just satisfaction:

pecuniary damage: EUR 350

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 10,000

costs and expenses: EUR 2,008

Derrek and Others v. Russia (no. 31712/21)

The applicants are six Russian nationals who live in Moscow, St Petersburg and Yaroslavl (all Russia).

The case concerns a police raid on a venue hosting an LGBT workshop on human rights and LGBT activism in 2020, which the applicants were attending. They were searched and allegedly abused in different ways before being taken to a hospital to be tested for drugs.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 (right to liberty and security), 11 (freedom of assembly and association), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention, the applicants complain, in particular, that their treatment by the police caused them feelings of fear, anguish and humiliation, that there was no effective investigation into the alleged police misconduct, and that their deprivation of liberty was in contravention of the Convention.

Violation of Article 3 (investigation and ill-treatment) taken in conjunction with Article 14

Violation of Article 5 § 1

Violation of Article 11

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 20,000 to Ms Yerokh and EUR 16,000 to each of the other applicants

Kavečanský v. Slovakia (no. 49617/22)

The applicant, Vojtech Kavečanský, is a Slovak national who was born in 1979 and lives in Košice (Slovakia). He is a notary.

The case concerns an inspection of Mr Kavečanský's notary's office in 2021 by the Chamber of Notaries of Slovakia carried out while he was on sick leave following his alleged kidnapping for a ransom of 4 million euros. The police also searched unoccupied residential premises belonging to Mr Kavečanský. Both of these searches, and a later search of his home, concerned alleged embezzlement.

Mr Kavečanský has since been charged with aggravated embezzlement and the proceedings are ongoing.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Kavečanský complains, in particular, of the search of his notary's office and residential premises and the seizure of his electronic devices.

Violation of Article 8**Just satisfaction:**

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 5,000

costs and expenses: EUR 7,580.90

Tergek v. Türkiye (no. 39631/20)

The applicant, Abdül Samed Tergek, is a Turkish national who was born in 1989 and is currently serving a prison sentence in Kocaeli T-Type Prison (Türkiye) following a conviction for membership of an armed terrorist organisation described by the Turkish authorities as the “Fetullahist Terror Organisation/Parallel State Structure”.

The case concerns the withholding of correspondence to Mr Tergek from his sister and his wife by the prison authorities. The correspondence consisted of letters, notes, pictures and printed material from internet websites. The letters were ultimately given to Mr Tergek, but the printouts were not passed on to him.

Mr Tergek relies on Article 8 (right to respect for correspondence).

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 <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 contactsechrpess@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.