



Judgments of 16 September 2025

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

two Chamber judgments are summarised below;

two 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 judgments summarised below are available only in English.

[Seppern v. Estonia](#) (application no. 31722/22)

The applicant, Alar Seppern, is an Estonian national who was born in 1986 and lives in Jõhvi.

The case concerns the use of unlawfully obtained evidence in criminal proceedings. The applicant had been suspected of several criminal offences and during the related criminal investigation his telephone was wiretapped and various conversations were recorded. That evidence was subsequently declared inadmissible. Several excerpts from the transcripts of those conversations were, nonetheless, disclosed at trial, following a request by the prosecutor, and used to assess the applicant's credibility during his cross-examination. The applicant's trial statements were excluded as unreliable and on 19 April 2021 he was convicted of various offences, including tax evasion and fraud.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complains that his trial was unfair as the domestic courts had used unlawfully obtained evidence to find that his statements, made during the trial, were unreliable.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

[Cantemir v. Romania](#) (no. 9915/19)

The applicant, Tiberiu Cantemir, is a Romanian national who was born in 1964 and lives in Bucharest.

The case concerns the effectiveness of a criminal investigation into ill-treatment and injury sustained by participants in anti-government demonstrations in Romania in December 1989. The main investigation in that connection, which included consideration of the ill-treatment sustained by the applicant, was opened in 1990. Most recently, in 2019, the investigation was discontinued in respect of 627 injured persons, including the applicant.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) of the European Convention, the applicant complains that the criminal investigation into his ill-treatment was not effective.

Violation of Article 3 (investigation)

Just satisfaction:

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

