



Judgments of 9 June 2026

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 12 judgments¹ :

four Chamber judgments are summarised below;

eight 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 ().*

Velev and Others v. Bulgaria (application no. 56007/21)*

The applicants are two individuals (a Bulgarian national and a Polish national, both of whom are Jehovah's Witnesses in Bulgaria) and a legal entity (The Religious Denomination of Jehovah's Witnesses in Bulgaria).

In this case, the applicants allege that a ban on door-to-door "religious propaganda" imposed in the municipality of Shumen in 2016 infringed their right to freedom of religion.

They rely in this connection on Articles 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) and 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention of Human Rights.

Violation of Article 9

Just satisfaction: The Court held that the finding of a violation constituted in itself sufficient just satisfaction for any non-pecuniary damage sustained by the applicants and that the respondent State was to pay 1,000 euros (EUR) to each applicant for costs and expenses.

Jiitee Työt Oy v. Finland (no. 2895/25)

The applicant company, Jiitee Työt Oy, has its registered office in Vantaa (Finland).

Jiitee Työt Oy and another limited liability company, M., entered contracts between them for repair work to rail tunnels. The contracts stipulated that certain disputes would be resolved through arbitration by the Arbitration Institute of the Finland Chamber of Commerce. In May 2022 M. lodged a request for arbitration and the two parties agreed that the Rules for Expediated Arbitration would be applied to their dispute. Those rules do not require that arbitration awards be reasoned. An arbitral award was issued in December 2022, ordering Jiitee Työt Oy to pay an award to M. No reasons were given.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention, Jiitee Työt Oy complains about the lack of any reasoning in the arbitral award.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

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

Anićić v. Serbia (no. 36639/22)

The applicant, Aleksandar Anićić, is a Serbian national who was born in 1990 and lives in Nepričava (Serbia).

In January 2018 a lorry Mr Anićić was driving collided with a car driven by M. In October 2019 a minor-offences court found Mr Anićić guilty of having caused the accident and ordered him to pay a fine. An appeal by Mr Anićić was unsuccessful. In March 2022 the Constitutional Court reviewed Mr Anićić's case and discerned no violation as regards his rights to a fair hearing or to defend himself in the minor-offence proceedings.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention, Mr Anićić complains that the minor-offence proceedings against him were unfair. In particular, he argues that the courts refused to admit expert evidence.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

Erçin v. Türkiye (no. 44621/19)

The applicant, Hikmet Erçin, is a Turkish national who was born in 1992 and lives in Şanlıurfa (Türkiye). He suffers from epilepsy.

In 2011 Mr Erçin went through a medical check as part of his pre-enlistment examination for compulsory military service. On 26 August 2012 he started military service. On 27 August 2012 he underwent the standard initial medical examination following conscription. The doctor diagnosed his epilepsy and requested his transfer to a neurology clinic. According to Mr Erçin, he requested medication for his epilepsy, but this was refused. On 2 September 2012 he suffered an epileptic fit during which he lost consciousness and fell. He was admitted to hospital and underwent various surgical procedures. On 1 July 2013 a medical report was issued by a medical board at the GATA Military Hospital which stated that he was unfit for military service. He was subsequently discharged from the army. Mr Erçin brought compensation proceedings before the Supreme Military Administrative Court. In September 2014 that court allowed his claim in part, finding a failure of the State authorities in the pre-enlistment examination. It awarded him 3,000 Turkish liras (approximately 1,000 euros) for non-pecuniary damage. However, it also imposed legal fees which exceeded the amount of compensation ordered.

Relying, in particular, on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Erçin complains that the negligence of State authorities before and following his conscription caused serious harm to his health. Relying on Article 6 (access to court), he complains about the legal fees imposed on him by the Military Administrative Court and the independence and impartiality of that court.

No violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 6 § 1 access to court

Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the lack of independence and impartiality of the Supreme Military Administrative Court

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 2,000

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/european-court-of-human-rights), and [YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCk1jW1W1W1W1W1W1W1W1W1W).
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.