



Judgments and decisions of 30 April 2026

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 28 judgments¹ and 15 decisions²: three Chamber judgments are summarised below;

a separate press release has been issued for a Chamber judgment in the case of *Benladghem v. Belgium* (application no. 5414/22);

a separate press release has also been issued for a Chamber judgment and a decision in the cases of *Mlinarević v. Croatia* (no. 24406/21) and *Sanader v. Croatia* (no. 27577/21);

23 Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 14 other decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

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

[Nikolaou and Others v. Cyprus](#) (application no. 37068/18)

The case concerns the authorities' refusal to return to the original owners, or their heirs, land which had been expropriated, but allegedly remained unused.

The applicants are ten Cypriot nationals who previously owned (or whose ancestors owned) a 7,024-square-metre plot of land in the Agios Athanasios sector of Limassol which was expropriated in 1976 by the authorities for the development of an industrial area.

Part of the expropriated property was used for road development. In the following years various construction projects were negotiated in respect of the remaining 3,974 square metres of the land, which never materialised. In 2008, the applicants requested that the disputed land be returned to them as, under the relevant law, they had the right to restitution if the expropriated land had not been used as intended. Their request was rejected. The Cypriot authorities informed them that the land was destined to remain "open space", while also accepting that plans to construct on the industrial area had not yet been abandoned.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants allege that 32 years had gone by without the expropriated land being used as intended and that the authorities were therefore obliged to return the property to them.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Just satisfaction: The Court held that the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) was not ready for decision in so far as pecuniary damage was concerned and reserved it for examination at a later date. The Court further held that the Respondent State was to pay 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.

applicants jointly 12,000 euros (EUR) in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 5,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

[Mastey v. France](#) (no. 30049/23)*

The applicant, Max-Junior Mastey, is a French national who was born in 1996 and is currently detained in Rennes Prison.

The case concerns the applicant's inability to attend his trial on account of his having been removed from the courtroom during the hearing before the court of appeal, and also the failure of the Court of Cassation to reply to his argument that the proceedings had been unfair.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, the applicant complains that the president of the court of appeal removed him from the courtroom without ascertaining whether, in view of his psychiatric disorder, he had validly waived his right to attend the trial in order to present his defence. He also complains that the Court of Cassation breached the requirement to give reasons, in that it rejected his appeal on points of law solely on the basis of Article 405 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, without ruling on his complaint concerning a violation of the Convention.

No violation of Article 6

Just Satisfaction

[Theo National Construct S.R.L. v. the Republic of Moldova](#) (no. 72783/11)

The applicant, Theo National Construct S.R.L., is a road construction company incorporated in Romania.

The case concerns the question of just satisfaction with regard to the hostile takeover ("raider attack") of the applicant company, that is the alleged seizure of its goods, with the assistance of presumed corrupt courts and law-enforcement agencies.

In its [principal judgment](#) of 11 October 2022 the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention.

The Court further held that the question of just satisfaction was not ready for decision and reserved it for examination at a later date.

Today's judgment concerned the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction).

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 6,000

costs and expenses: EUR 8,000

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/UCR01111111111111111111).

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](#)

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.