



Judgments of 7 July 2026

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 11 judgments¹:

four Chamber judgments are summarised below;

two separate press releases have been issued for the Chamber judgments in the cases of *Al Nashiri v. Lithuania* (application no. 31908/22) and *De Carvalho Marques and Others v. Portugal* (nos. 29703/19, 29978/19, 34185/19, 37235/19, 47902/20, and 3708/22);

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

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

[Günana v. Bulgaria](#) (application no. 54549/22)*

The applicant, Remzi Günana, is a Turkish national who was born in 1977 and lives in Gözeler, Bingöl (Türkiye).

The case concerns the applicant's allegations that he was ill-treated during his detention at Haskovo police station in Bulgaria and that there was no effective investigation into the matter.

On 18 August 2019, during a border check at the Turkish-Bulgarian border, Bulgarian customs officers found 38 packages of heroin hidden in the car of a German national, W.R. Criminal proceedings for drug trafficking were instituted against W.R., who was arrested and taken to Haskovo. When questioned by investigators, W.R. named the applicant as his accomplice. W.R. then phoned the applicant on the investigators' initiative and, pretending that he had a sudden health problem, asked him to come and pick up his vehicle in Haskovo.

On 24 August 2019, at around 2 p.m., the taxi carrying the applicant was stopped at the entrance to Haskovo by a police patrol. The applicant was arrested and taken to Haskovo police station, where he was detained by the police for 24 hours, starting at 2 p.m.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention of Human Rights, the applicant alleges that he was beaten at Haskovo police station and that the Bulgarian authorities failed to conduct an effective investigation into these allegations.

Violation of Article 3 (investigation)

Violation of Article (ill-treatment)

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 7,500 euros (EUR)

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

Allabed v. Denmark (no. 14983/25)

The applicant, Abdulsattar Abdulbaset Allabed, is a Syrian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Aarhus (Denmark).

Mr Allabed entered Denmark in 2013 and was granted residence as a refugee. By a final Supreme Court judgment of 29 January 2025 he was convicted of, among other offences, money laundering and sentenced to two years and six months' imprisonment. His expulsion from Denmark was ordered with a six-year re-entry ban.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention, Mr Allabed complains about the Supreme Court's decision ordering his expulsion. In particular, he argues that the six-year re-entry ban amounts to a *de facto* permanent ban as he has no prospect, as a Syrian national, of re-entering Denmark.

No violation of Article 8**Rainbow Mission Foundation and Others v. Hungary** (nos. 32272/21, 50723/21, 28709/22, 28707/22, and 30238/22)

The applicants are Rainbow Mission Foundation, a non-governmental organisation promoting equality for LGBTIQ persons, and four Hungarian nationals, Sándor Jámbor, Ákos Ányos Hadházy, Bernadett Szél and Gergely István Gazda who were born in 1967, 1974, 1977 and 1977 respectively and who live in various towns and cities in Hungary.

The case concerns their right to demonstrate during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and 2021.

Relying on Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association) of the Convention, the applicant organisation and Mr Jámbor, a retired police officer, complain about the general prohibition of gatherings and decisions prohibiting their planned demonstrations.

Relying on Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of assembly and association), Mr Hadházy and Ms Szél, opposition party politicians, and Mr Gazda complain about their convictions for minor offences of abuse of the right of assembly because they had failed to notify the police of the events that the domestic authorities said they had organised (Mr Hadházy and Ms Szél) and for a violation of traffic rules because they had sounded their car horns at a public gathering (Ms Szél and Mr Gazda).

Violation of Article 11 in respect of the applicant association and the first applicant

No violation of Article 11 in the light of Article 10 in respect of the second, third and fourth applicants in relation to the administrative-offence proceedings against them

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 3,000 each to the applicant association and the first applicant

costs and expenses: EUR 5,520 to the applicant association and EUR 4,680 to the first applicant

Kunstelj v. Slovenia (no. 5257/22)

The applicant, Mitja Kunstelj, is a Slovenian national who was born in 1970 and lives in Ljubljana.

The case concerns criminal proceedings against Mr Kunstelj for insult and slander following offensive posts on his personal blog about two journalists. He was found guilty and sentenced to six months' imprisonment. The national courts held that this was the only appropriate sentence given the prolonged and serious insults against the journalists, his refusal to pay fines imposed in civil proceedings and his lack of remorse.

Mr Kunstelj alleges that the imposition of the prison sentence violated his right to freedom of expression under Article 10 of the Convention.

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 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/european-court-of-human-rights), and [YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCk1j8LW8k1j8LW8k1j8LW8k).

Contact [ECHRPress](mailto:echrpess@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

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)

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.