



Judgments of 18 November 2025

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

two Chamber judgments are summarised below;

four 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 ().*

[Stanev and the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee v. Bulgaria](#) (application no. 50756/17)*

The applicants are Kaloyan Georgiev Stanev, a Bulgarian national who was born in 1987 and lives in Sofia, and a non-governmental organisation, the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee, which is based in Sofia as well.

The case concerns the denial of access to information of public interest held by the public prosecutor's office and alleged breaches of due process guarantees.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that the authorities denied them access to information they were seeking from the Chief Public Prosecutor's Office in order to ascertain whether criminal investigations had been opened following press reports of migrant deaths in Bulgaria.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention, the applicants submit that the involvement of a member of the public prosecutor's office at the Supreme Administrative Court in their proceedings against the Chief Public Prosecutor's Office was in breach of the principle of equality of arms.

Violation of Article 10

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 1,000 euros (EUR)

costs and expenses: EUR 2,000

[Iskra DOO Beograd v. Serbia](#) (no. 53002/21)

The applicant, Iskra DOO Beograd, is a limited liability company based in Belgrade.

On 8 May 2015, in the context of the Belgrade Waterfront project (*Beograd na vodi*), a fence erected by the applicant company in 1964 was demolished without prior notice. The land on which the fence had been erected had been used by the applicant company on a continuous basis since before 1964.

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

On 8 June 2015 the applicant lodged a civil claim for protection of possession against two limited liability companies that had been involved in the demolition. On 24 June 2015 employees from one of those companies occupied part of the land used by the applicant company and began construction of their own temporary fence. The national courts established that there had been an interference with the applicant company's right to the peaceful enjoyment of its possessions. However, on 10 April 2019 the Appellate Commercial Court found that returning the land to the applicant company would contradict the Belgrade Waterfront Spatial Planning Decree, in which the land had been designated for public use. Since restoring the property to its previous state would be against the established public interest and did not depend solely on the will of the respondent companies, restoration was legally impossible.

On 3 December 2020 the Constitutional Court dismissed an appeal by the applicant company, finding that the guarantees of a fair trial had been respected and that there had been no violation of the applicant company's property rights.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No 1 (protection of property), the applicant company complains about the destruction of the fence and the taking from its possession the land which it had been using, and the subsequent civil proceedings.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 3,000

costs and expenses: EUR 3,000

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/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 | 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.