



Judgments of 7 June 2022

The European Court of Human Rights has today given notification in writing of 23 judgments¹:

three Chamber judgments are summarised below;

separate press releases have been issued for five other Chamber judgments in the cases of *I.G.D. v. Bulgaria* (application no. 70139/14), *Kutsarovi v. Bulgaria* (no. 47711/19), *Teliatnikov v. Lithuania* (no. 51914/19), *Patrício Monteiro Telo de Abreu v. Portugal* (no. 42713/15), and *Taganrog LRO and Others v. Russia* (no. 32401/10 and 19 other applications);

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

The judgments below are available only in English.

Boboc and Others v. the Republic of Moldova (application no. 44592/16)

The applicants are three Moldovan nationals, Ala Boboc, Victor Boboc and Natalia Romanciuc who were born in 1963, 1959 and 1987 respectively. They live in Bubuieci and Chişinău.

The case concerns the beating to death of the applicants' 24-year-old son/husband by the police during mass protests in the centre of Chişinău in April 2009, as well as the manner in which his ill-treatment and death were subsequently investigated.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that he was killed by the police, and that the investigation into his death was inefficient.

Violation Article 2 (right to life and investigation)

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 50,000 euros (EUR) to the applicants jointly

costs and expenses: EUR 7,000 to the applicants jointly

Kohen and Others v. Türkiye (no. 66616/10 and three other applications)

The applicants, Erol Maks Kohen, Nail Tahsildaroğlu, Ezra Ören and Hüseyin Özçalı are four Turkish nationals who were born in 1959, 1948, 1961 and 1944 respectively, and live in Istanbul.

The case concerns the alleged unfairness of criminal proceedings against them for running a fictitious and fraudulent export scheme.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, the applicants complain that they had no access to a lawyer during the preliminary investigation stage, and that the statements made by them and certain other co-defendants in the absence of a lawyer were used by the trial

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

court. They also complain that there was a breach of the principle of equality of arms in relation to the collection and examination of certain expert reports at the trial stage, and that the court failed to specify the documents on the basis of which it asked the defendants to make additional submissions.

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c)

Yeğen v. Türkiye (no. 4099/12)

The applicant, İhya Tamer Yeğen, is a Turkish national who was born in 1958 and lives in Istanbul.

The case concerns the alleged unfairness of the criminal proceedings against the applicant for issuing an uncovered cheque.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) of the Convention, the applicant complains that he was tried and convicted without having been able to exercise his right to be present and to defend himself in person. In the same vein, he complains that he was unable to lodge an appeal against his conviction owing to his trial and conviction *in absentia*. Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), he complains of the alleged unlawfulness of his resulting detention.

Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the applicant's trial and conviction *in absentia* and his inability to obtain a fresh determination of the case in respect of both law and fact

Violation of Article 5 § 1

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 12,000

costs and expenses: EUR 1,020

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. To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en or follow us on Twitter [@ECHR_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

Press contacts

echrpess@echr.coe.int | tel.: +33 3 90 21 42 08

We would encourage journalists to send their enquiries via email.

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.