

Judgments of 8 July 2025

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 16 judgments¹:

five Chamber judgments are summarised below;

two separate press releases have been issued for two other Chamber judgments in the cases of *Google LLC and Others v. Russia* (application no. 37027/22) and *Selahattin Demirtaş v. Türkiye (No. 4)*;

nine 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 ()*.

[Ismailaj and Others v. Albania](#) (application no. 28873/22)

The applicants, Kastriot Ismailaj, Lutfije Ismailaj and Adriatic Development Corporation Ltd SHPK, are, respectively, two Albanian nationals who were born in 1963 and 1941 respectively and live in Tirana; and a company based in Albania.

Confiscation of certain assets belonging to the applicants was ordered in March 2016 in connection with money laundering under the Anti-Mafia Act (Law no. 10192 of 3 December 2009, as amended, “On preventing and combatting organised crime and trafficking through measures against assets”). The case concerns the applicants’ cassation appeal before the Supreme Court.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that the participation of Judge K.K. in the cassation proceedings had rendered the court partial.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Just satisfaction:

to the applicants jointly

non-pecuniary damage: 3,500 euros (EUR)

costs and expenses: EUR 5,000

[Rafiyev v. Azerbaijan](#) (no. 81028/17)

The applicant, Vugar Karim oglu Rafiyev, is an Azerbaijani national who was born in 1980 and lives in Sumgayit (Azerbaijan). He is a follower of the Nurism teachings of Islam.

The case concerns the arrest and subsequent conviction of the applicant for holding an unauthorised religious meeting in a private house in March 2017. He was convicted of an administrative offence and fined for violating the rules on organising and holding religious meetings set out in law.

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

Relying on Article 5 (right to liberty and security), Article 6 (right to a fair trial), Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion), of the European Convention the applicant complains, in particular, that his arrest and detention were unlawful, that his trial was unfair as the national courts did not examine his arguments, and that the interference with his freedom of worship was unlawful.

Violation of Article 5 § 1

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Violation of Article 9

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 3,000

costs and expenses: EUR 1,000

[Levon v. Lithuania \(no. 27121/23\)](#)

The applicant, Anton Levon, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Vilnius.

On the morning of 25 December 2020 Mr Levon's father, who had a history of heart disease, began to feel unwell. He was taken to the hospital that evening and died there the following day. The cause of death was put down as unspecified chronic cardiovascular disease. Mr Levon instituted civil proceedings, alleging that his father had not been provided with proper medical treatment, but the courts dismissed his complaints. He also attempted to have a criminal investigation opened against the hospital for wrongful death and falsification of documents, but it was discontinued at the pre-trial stage.

Relying on Articles 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, Mr Levon alleges that the investigation into the treatment given to his father was ineffective.

No violation of Article 2

[B.R. v. Switzerland \(no. 2933/23\)*](#)

The applicant, B.R., is a Swiss national who was born in 1988 and lives in Switzerland.

The case concerns a health insurer's refusal to cover the cost of a particular treatment for the applicant's rare illness (spinal muscular atrophy, type 2). The applicant submits that the drug Spinraza, which is very expensive, is the only treatment that is likely to be effective.

She relies on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

No violation of Article 8

[Cangi and Others v. Türkiye \(no. 2\)](#) (no. 65087/19)

The applicants are seven Turkish nationals.

The case concerns an environmental dispute over a nickel mine situated in the Turgutlu district in the city of Manisa (Türkiye). Three of the applicants live in Turgutlu, about 10 to 14 kms from the mine, while the others live 85 km away in İzmir. They unsuccessfully brought proceedings in the national courts to contest the official approval of extraction from the mine.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicants complain that the decisions given by the national courts, including the Constitutional Court, were not adequately reasoned because their objections to the assessment made by the court-appointed experts in respect of depletion and pollution of groundwater and the risk of sulphuric acid mist from the mine's activities had not been taken into account.

Violation of Article 6 § 1 in respect of the lack of a reasoning of domestic courts, including the Constitutional Court

Just satisfaction: the Court rejected the applicants' 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 <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 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)

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.