



## Judgments of 7 October 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 13 judgments<sup>1</sup>:

seven Chamber judgments are summarised below;

one separate press release has been issued for another Chamber judgment in the case of *Misiūnas v. Lithuania* (application no. 38687/22);

five Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by 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 (\*).*

### [Imanov v. Azerbaijan](#) (application no. 62/20)

The applicant, Yalchin Jamil oglu Imanov, is an Azerbaijani national who was born in 1973 and lives in Sumgayit (Azerbaijan). He was a human rights lawyer and member of the Azerbaijani Bar Association.

The case concerns his disbarment on account of statements that he made to the press about the alleged ill-treatment of one of his clients in Gobustan prison in 2017.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private life), 10 (freedom of expression) and 18 (limitation on the use of restrictions on rights) of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention, the applicant complains that being disbarred for such a reason infringed his Convention rights.

#### Violation of Article 10

#### Violation of Article 8

#### Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 10,000 euros (EUR)

costs and expenses: EUR 2,000

### [Helme v. Estonia](#) (no. 3023/22)

The applicant, Peeter Helme, is an Estonian national who was born in 1978 and lives in Tallinn.

The case concerns the applicant's alleged online entrapment by an undercover police officer who, while using a pseudonym and the fictional identity of a 12-year-old girl, engaged in conversations with the applicant in an online chatroom. The applicant was subsequently convicted of attempted sexual enticement of a minor.

<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)

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, the applicant complains that evidence resulting from that police operation was used in criminal proceedings against him, in breach of his right to a fair trial.

#### **No violation of Article 6 § 1**

#### **Storimans-Verhulst and Others v. Russia (no. 26302/10)**

The applicants, Maria Storimans-Verhulst, Tim Storimans, Amber Storimans, Jeroen Akkermans and Tsadok Yecheskeli are four Dutch nationals and an Israeli national, who were born respectively in 1956, 2000, 1998, 1963, and 1956. The first three, a mother and her children, live in Goirle, the Netherlands; Mr Akkermans lives in Berlin; and Mr Yecheskeli lives in Ra'anana, Israel.

The case relates to an international armed conflict that occurred between Georgia and the Russian Federation in August 2008, as described in the Court's judgment in the inter-State case of [Georgia v. Russia \(II\)](#). In particular, it concerns the death of Stanislaus Storimans, a photojournalist covering the events – the husband and father of the first three applicants –, and the injury of his colleagues, the other two applicants, on 12 August 2008. All three were carrying out their professional duties in covering the armed conflict.

Relying on Articles 2 (right to life/investigation), 13 (right to an effective remedy), and 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicants complain of Mr Storimans' death and the injuries inflicted on Mr Akkermans and Mr Yecheskeli, of a lack of effective remedies in respect of their complaints, and of discrimination in the exercise of their rights under the Convention.

#### **Violation of Article 2** (investigation)

##### **Just satisfaction:**

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 10,000 to the first three applicants jointly and EUR 10,000 each to Mr Akkermans and Mr Yecheskeli

#### **Đorđević v. Serbia (no. 11212/23)**

The applicant, Zorka Đorđević, is a Serbian national who was born in 1940 and lives in Belgrade.

The case concerns the construction of a building in such close proximity to the applicant's flat that it blocks natural light, ventilation and direct sunlight.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private life) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant complains that her living conditions have deteriorated to the point of being incompatible with her right to respect for her home and private life and that the construction of the building has significantly reduced the flat's market value.

#### **Violation of Article 8**

#### **Violation 1 of Protocol No. 1**

##### **Just satisfaction:**

pecuniary damage: EUR 7,000

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 6,000

costs and expenses: EUR 5,685

#### **Prenča v. Serbia (no. 48725/12)**

The applicant, Rifat Prenča, is a Serbian national who was born in 1953 and lives in Novi Pazar.

The case concerns the confiscation of a large amount of cash that the applicant had attempted to carry across the State border in breach of the relevant regulations. The customs authorities initially

temporarily seized the undeclared cash and the administrative authorities subsequently imposed, as a sanction, the permanent confiscation of the cash in excess of the statutory export threshold (EUR 10,000) in respect of residents.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant complains that the imposition of a fine and the confiscation of the cash constituted an unlawful and a grossly disproportionate measure.

#### **Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1**

**Just satisfaction:** The Court held that the finding of a violation constituted in itself sufficient just satisfaction for the non-pecuniary damage sustained by the applicant. It further held that the respondent State was to pay him EUR 39,500 for pecuniary damage and EUR 1,930 for costs and expenses.

#### **Šabanović and Others v. Serbia (no. 39819/16 and four other applications)**

The applicants, Safet Šabanović, Dragan Boričić, Zoran Tešić, Tijana Majstorović and Zoran Pifar are Serbian nationals and police officers.

The case concerns domestic case-law in respect of claims for the payment of salary supplements for overtime, night work and work on public holidays performed by police officers employed by the Ministry of the Interior.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) the applicants complain, in particular, that inconsistent rulings have created legal uncertainty. Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No 1, two applicants also complain that they have been deprived of their property because the courts dismissed their claims.

#### **No violation of Article 6 § 1**

#### **Hastaoğlu v. Türkiye (no. 29061/21)\***

The applicant, Yurdagül Hastaoğlu, is a Turkish national who was born in 1941 and lives in Sakarya (Türkiye).

The case concerns restrictions on her right of property after several plots of land she owned were classified as being in a coastal zone, and her inability to obtain compensation.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), she complains of a breach of her entitlement to the peaceful enjoyment of her possessions.

#### **Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1**

**Just satisfaction:** The applicant did not submit a claim for just satisfaction.

---

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](http://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:echrpress@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**

[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)

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.