

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

THIRD SECTION

CASE OF GAHRAMAN v. AZERBAIJAN

(Applications nos. 14307/17 and 44088/18)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

13 January 2026

This judgment is final but it may be subject to editorial revision.



In the case of Gahraman v. Azerbaijan,

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting as a Committee composed of:

Canòlic Mingorance Cairat*, President*,
Lətif Hüseynov,
Vasilka Sancin*, judges*,
and Olga Chernishova, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to:

the applications against the Republic of Azerbaijan lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ("the Convention") by an Azerbaijani national, Mr Elgiz Jamal oglu Gahraman (*Elgiz Camal oğlu Qəhrəman* – "the applicant"), who was born in 1986 and lives in Baku and who was represented by Mr F. Namazli and Mr N. Karimli, lawyers based in Azerbaijan;

the decision to give notice of the applications to the Azerbaijani Government ("the Government") represented by their Agent, Mr Ç. Əsgərov;

the parties' observations;

Having deliberated in private on 2 December 2025,

Delivers the following judgment, which was adopted on that date:

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

1. At the time of the events, the applicant was a member of the Nida civic movement ("NIDA" – for more information about the movement, see *Ibrahimov and Mammadov v. Azerbaijan*, nos. 63571/16 and 5 others, § 7, 13 February 2020).

2. On 28 July 2016 A.A., a senior official of the ruling party, made a public statement concerning proposed constitutional amendments to be decided in the forthcoming referendum scheduled for September 2016. Among the proposed changes was the removal of the minimum age requirement of 35 years for presidential candidates. In support of this amendment, A.A. cited historical precedents, including the example of Shah Ismail Khatai, who had, in the sixteenth century, ascended to the throne at the age of 14 and died at the age of 36.

3. Certain local media outlets speculated that the proposed amendment was politically motivated, alleging that its true purpose was to enable the President's son to enter the political arena. On the same day as A.A.'s statement, the applicant published a post on his Facebook account stating, "God willing [his] life will be as short as that of Shah Ismail". The applicant later indicated that the authorities had interpreted this remark as a veiled reference to the President's son.

I. APPLICANT'S ARREST AND ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT

4. According to the applicant, on 12 August 2016 he was arrested by five plain-clothed officers and taken to the Organised Crime Unit (OCU), where narcotics allegedly planted en route were "discovered" during a search. According to the Government, police officers – accompanied by attesting witnesses – had approached the applicant on the street that day, presented him with the decision of a police major dated the same day authorising an operational-search measure, and found 3.315 grams of heroin on his person. A formal search and seizure record was drawn up at the station.

5. Criminal proceedings were instituted on the same day, and the applicant was charged under Article 234.4.3 (illegal possession of a large quantity of narcotic substances with intent to sell) of the Criminal Code.

6. By a decision of 13 August 2016, the Narimanov District Court ordered the applicant to be remanded in custody for a period of four months and transferred to a pre-trial detention centre. The decision was upheld by the appellate court.

7. Although the applicant's legal representatives were authorised to meet him on 15 and 16 August 2016, they were not permitted to do so until 18 August 2016. He did not meet lawyers of his own choosing until 21 August 2016.

8. On 19 August 2016 the applicant was transferred to the Baku pre-trial detention facility and on the same day submitted a complaint to the OCU investigator, alleging ill-treatment on 12 and 15 August, as a result of which he had made self-incriminating statements, and retracting those statements. His complaint was forwarded to the prosecuting authorities on 10 September 2016. During his further interrogation, which took place in the presence of lawyer of his own choosing, he claimed that he had been punched in the head by a police officer on 12 August and beaten with a baton for about fifty times and struck on various parts of his body on 15 August.

9. On 29 September 2016 the applicant underwent a forensic medical examination. A report of the examination dated 13 October 2016 concluded that his injuries were likely to have happened a year and a half earlier.

10. On 17 October 2016 the prosecuting authorities refused to open criminal proceedings in connection with the alleged ill-treatment, referring to statements by the police and the forensic medical report. The applicant challenged that decision before the Sabail District Court, arguing that he had been unlawfully detained for six days at the OCU, that no cross-examination with the police officers had been conducted, and that the refusal was based on insufficient reasons. On 5 December 2016 the court upheld the decision of the prosecuting authorities without addressing those points. The Baku Court of Appeal upheld the lower court's decision on 20 December 2016.

II. APPLICANT'S CRIMINAL CONVICTION

11. The applicant, *inter alia*, asked the courts to exclude the search report from the evidence, citing a Plenary decision of the Supreme Court dated 4 March 2011, on judicial practice in criminal cases relating to illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs. It stated that if a personal search occurred before arrest, the admissibility of evidence obtained must be assessed by the courts.

12. On 16 January 2017 the Baku Court of Serious Crimes, referring to the applicant's self-incriminating statements made during the police interrogation, the statements of the police officers involved in the applicant's arrest and those of the attesting witnesses who had allegedly been present during the personal search on the applicant, the search and seizure records, and expert reports, convicted the applicant as charged and sentenced him to five years and six months' imprisonment.

13. On 18 May 2017 the Baku Court of Appeal upheld the applicant's conviction. On 29 November 2017 the Supreme Court reclassified the charge against the applicant to Article 234.1 (illegal acquisition or possession of narcotic substances without intent to sell) of the Criminal Code and reduced the sentence to three years' imprisonment.

14. Relying on Article 3 of the Convention, and Article 13 in conjunction with Article 3, the applicant complained that he had been ill-treated in police custody as a result of which he had made self-incriminating statements, that his complaints about this had not been examined effectively by the authorities. He further alleged that he had been confined in a metal cage in a courtroom during the pre-trial detention hearing. He complained that his arrest and detention had been unlawful under Article 5 of the Convention because he had been arrested and detained in the absence of a reasonable suspicion that he had committed a criminal offence, and that his right to liberty had been violated. Relying on Articles 6 § 1 and 10 of the Convention, he further complained that the criminal proceedings had been unfair. He complained, in particular, that he had been convicted on the basis of planted evidence and that the criminal proceedings against him had been brought to punish him for his publication on Facebook, and that his arrest and conviction pursued purposes not prescribed by the Convention, contrary to Article 18.

THE COURT'S ASSESSMENT

I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

15. Having regard to the similar subject matter of the applications, the Court finds it appropriate to examine them jointly in a single judgment.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 3 OF THE CONVENTION

A. Alleged failure to carry out an effective investigation

16. The applicant maintained his complaints as summarised in paragraph 14 above.

17. The Government submitted, *inter alia*, that the applicant had not been subjected to any ill-treatment.

18. The Court notes that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention or inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

19. The general principles concerning the obligation of States under Article 3 of the Convention not to subject persons under their jurisdiction to inhuman or degrading treatment or torture in the course of encounters with the police have been summarised in *Bouyid v. Belgium* ([GC], no. 23380/09, §§ 81-88, ECHR 2015). The general principles with regard to the procedural obligation under Article 3 of the Convention to investigate acts of ill-treatment by State agents have likewise been set out in detail in *Bouyid* (ibid., §§ 115-23).

20. In the present case, the applicant's complaint made before the domestic authorities contained enough specific information – the identity of the alleged perpetrators, the date, the place and the nature of the ill-treatment – to constitute an "arguable claim" in respect of which those authorities were under an obligation to conduct an effective investigation (compare *Mustafayev and Others v. Azerbaijan* [Committee], nos. 25054/17 and 6 others, § 23, 13 June 2024, and *Ibrahimov and Mammadov*, cited above, § 91).

21. The applicant's allegations of ill-treatment at the OCU were brought to the attention of the authorities on 19 August 2016. However, the complaint was not transmitted to the prosecuting authorities until 10 September 2016, and the applicant's medical examination was only conducted on 29 September 2016 – more than forty days after his alleged ill-treatment. The Court considers that this delay significantly compromised the effectiveness of the investigation, particularly in terms of securing timely and reliable medical evidence to substantiate the applicant's claims. The Court cannot therefore accept the forensic expert report of 13 October 2016 (see paragraph 9 above) as evidence that refuted the ill-treatment allegations.

22. Moreover, neither the prosecuting authorities nor the domestic courts provided any explanation with respect to the applicant's continued detention at the OCU from 13 to 19 August 2016, even after the Narimanov District Court's decision of 13 August 2016 (see paragraph 6 above) to place him in pre-trial detention (compare *Abishov v. Azerbaijan* [Committee], no. 46419/16, § 20, 23 March 2023). The domestic authorities failed to conduct a face-to-face confrontation despite a clear contradiction between the

applicant's statements and those of the police officers who denied the applicant's ill-treatment allegations. Nor did the authorities question other witnesses, such as the applicant's cellmates.

23. The Court also notes that the domestic authorities, having refused to institute a criminal case, did not provide any relevant explanation as to why the applicant's statements were considered less credible than those of the police officers who had allegedly ill-treated him (see *Mustafa Hajili v. Azerbaijan*, no. 42119/12, § 52, 24 November 2016).

24. The foregoing considerations are sufficient to enable the Court to conclude that the investigation into the applicant's claim of ill-treatment was ineffective.

25. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention under its procedural limb.

B. Alleged ill-treatment of the applicant

26. The Court reiterates that allegations of ill-treatment must be supported by appropriate evidence. In assessing evidence, the Court adopts the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt". Such proof may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar unrebutted presumptions of fact (see *Avşar v. Turkey*, no. 25657/94, § 282, ECHR 2001-VII (extracts)).

27. In the present case, the applicant presented a detailed description of his allegation of ill-treatment by the police, which were such as to oblige the authorities to launch an official investigation. The Court can further accept that ill-treatment such as punching once in the head, which allegedly happened on 12 August 2016, may not always lead to visible consequences (compare *Satullayev v. Azerbaijan* [Committee], no. 22004/11, § 35, 19 March 2020), but being hit with a baton for about fifty times as the applicant alleged, was more likely to leave traces. Given the absence of any evidence provided by the applicant, such as photographs of the alleged injuries, medical report, extracts from the medical examination log of the Baku pre-trial detention facility, any statements from witnesses, such as cellmates or the lawyers who met the applicant on 21 August 2016, the Court cannot conclude "beyond reasonable doubt" that the applicant was subjected to the alleged ill-treatment (compare *Mehdiyev v. Azerbaijan*, no. 59075/09, §§ 73-74, 18 June 2015; *Bagirov and Ibishbeyli* [Committee], nos. 29896/17 and 43608/17, §§ 26-27, 15 July 2025; *Mustafayev and Others v. Azerbaijan* [Committee], nos. 25054/17 and 6 others, §§ 29-31, 13 June 2024; and *Gurbanov and Mammadov v. Azerbaijan* [Committee], no. 20605/13, § 28, 12 October 2023).

28. The Court would, however, like to underline that its inability to reach any conclusions as to whether there has been, in substance, treatment prohibited by Article 3 of the Convention derives, at least in part, from the

failure of the domestic authorities to react effectively to the applicant's complaints at the relevant time (see *Jannatov v. Azerbaijan*, no. 32132/07, § 61, 31 July 2014).

29. Accordingly, the Court cannot establish a substantive violation of Article 3 of the Convention in respect of the applicant's alleged ill-treatment by the police.

C. Alleged confinement in a metal cage in a courtroom

30. The Court notes that in *Natig Jafarov v. Azerbaijan* (no. 64581/16, §§ 37-41, 7 November 2019) and *Sardar Babayev v. Azerbaijan* (nos. 34015/17 and 26896/18, §§ 42-43, 1 February 2024), having examined an identical complaint based on similar facts, it found that the applicants' confinement in a metal cage during a pre-trial detention hearing had amounted to degrading treatment. The Court sees no reason to deviate from that finding.

31. There has therefore been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 5 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION

32. The Court notes that the applicant's complaint summarised in paragraph 14 above is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention or inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

33. The Court observes that, as in *Ibrahimov and Mammadov v. Azerbaijan* (nos. 63571/16 and 5 others, 13 February 2020), in the present case the applicant was a member of NIDA. The applicant had no criminal history of being involved in drug trafficking or any other crimes whatsoever prior to the events in question and neither the police reports nor any decisions taken subsequently contained any specifics in respect of the collection and receipt of the operational information in question. In particular, it remains unknown how that information was allegedly received by the police, the source of the information and how that source became aware of the information (ibid., §§ 119-20).

34. The applicant was searched without a prior judicial warrant, and the investigating authorities failed to justify this by explaining the circumstances which made it necessary, merely citing domestic law provisions. Nor does the case file show any retrospective judicial review of the actions of the investigating authorities, or any evidence that the relevant decisions were sent to the supervising court or the prosecuting authorities within 48 hours, as required by law (see *Savalanli and Others v. Azerbaijan*, nos. 54151/11 and 3 others, § 90, 15 November 2022).

35. Moreover, the investigation was mainly confined to conducting searches, with no further steps being taken to clarify the applicant's alleged

involvement in drug trafficking. The case file contains no indication that the authorities sought any additional evidence – such as cash, supplier or buyer information, or drug paraphernalia such as scales or packaging – at any stage of the investigation. Additionally, throughout the applicant's detention, the investigating authorities failed to identify or document the source from which the applicant had allegedly obtained the drugs in question (ibid., § 92).

36. The Court further notes that the domestic courts failed to assess the quality of the evidence obtained during the search and did not address the absence of any other material linking the applicant to the alleged drug-related offence (ibid., § 93).

37. Having regard to the above considerations, the Court finds that the material put before it does not meet the minimum standard set by Article 5 § 1 (c) of the Convention for the reasonableness of the suspicion required for an individual's arrest and continued detention. It has not been demonstrated in a satisfactory manner that during the period under the Court's consideration in the present case the applicant was deprived of his liberty on "reasonable suspicion" of having committed a criminal offence.

38. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention.

IV. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION

39. The applicant maintained his complaint that the proceedings had been unfair and that he had been convicted on the basis of planted evidence.

40. The Government denied the allegations.

41. The Court notes that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention or inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

42. The general principles, which are equally pertinent to the present case, have been summarised in *Layijov v. Azerbaijan* (no. 22062/07, §§ 62-65, 10 April 2014) and were later reiterated in *Sakit Zahidov v. Azerbaijan* (no. 51164/07, §§ 46-49, 12 November 2015).

43. In the present case, the applicant's conviction was based, to a decisive degree, on physical evidence, namely the heroin found on his person during a search.

44. In these circumstances, the Court will examine firstly the quality of the physical evidence, including whether the circumstances in which it was obtained casts doubt on its reliability or accuracy, and secondly whether the applicant was given the opportunity to challenge its authenticity and oppose its use in the domestic proceedings (see *Sakit Zahidov,* cited above, § 52).

45. Unlike the cases cited above, in the present case the parties are in dispute over where the personal search of the applicant was carried out. Whereas the Government argued that the search had been conducted immediately after the applicant was stopped on the street, the applicant

contended that he had been arrested by plain-clothed officers, taken to the OCU, and that drugs had been planted in the pocket of his shorts en route, later being "found" during a search at the OCU. He further submitted that he had been subjected to ill-treatment while in police custody, which had compelled him to admit to the charge and make self-incriminating statements and sign them. In support of their argument, the Government referred to the decision of the police major (see paragraph 4 above) authorising the operational-search measure, and the search and seizure report. However, in the light of the Court's finding of a violation of Article 3 of the Convention on account of the lack of an effective investigation into the applicant's allegations of police ill-treatment, and given that no video-recording of the search was submitted to the Court, it is not in a position to determine, on the basis of the evidence available, where the search was actually conducted. However, the Court finds it sufficient to conclude that the applicant's arguable claim of ill-treatment casts serious doubt on the reliability and credibility of the search record, which constituted the decisive piece of evidence referred to by the domestic courts in support of the applicant's conviction (see paragraph 12 above, *mutatis mutandis, Bokhonko v. Georgia*, no. 6739/11, § 96, 22 October 2020).

46. The Court also cannot overlook the fact that the applicant's arrest was not documented promptly by the police. In this context, Article 246 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Azerbaijan permits a personal search without a judicial warrant, *inter alia*, when a suspect is arrested or brought before an investigating authority. In the present case, even assuming the Government's assertion that the applicant was stopped and searched at approximately 2.30 p.m. on 12 August 2016, the official record of arrest was not drawn up until 5 p.m. on the same day. This delay in documentation undermines the procedural safeguards required under domestic law and leads the Court to conclude that the search of the applicant was not conducted in accordance with the applicable legal framework.

47. Having regard to the above, the Court considers that the quality of the physical evidence on which the domestic courts' guilty verdict was based is questionable because the manner in which it was obtained casts doubt on its reliability (see *Sakit Zahidov,* cited above, § 55).

48. The applicant raised the authenticity of the physical evidence and its use against him before all instances of the domestic courts, including by reference to the Supreme Court Plenum decision (see paragraph 11 above). However, it was never properly considered.

49. In the same vein, the applicant's request to exclude the search report from the evidence was not addressed by the domestic courts, whose judgments were silent on the matter. As for his claim that his self-incriminating statements resulted from ill-treatment, the courts dismissed the allegation as groundless, referring to prior decisions (see paragraph 10 above). However, they failed to examine the applicant's specific complaints

or provide any reasoning, merely stating that his assertion that the evidence had been planted was defensive in nature and unsubstantiated. The Court therefore concludes that the applicant's complaints were not adequately examined by the domestic courts.

50. In the light of the fact that the physical evidence found on the applicant's person formed the basis of his conviction, the Court considers that the manner in which it was obtained – combined with the domestic courts' failure to address the applicant's objections and justified concerns regarding its authenticity and use – rendered the proceedings as a whole unfair. (see *Layijov*, cited above, § 76).

51. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

V. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 18 IN CONJUCTION WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION

52. The applicant maintained his complaint that his arrest pursued purposes not prescribed by the Convention, contrary to Article 18, as he was arrested and convicted because of his post on a social media network, in breach of his freedom of expression.

53. The Government denied the allegation.

54. The Court notes that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention or inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

55. The Court considers that this complaint falls to be examined under Article 18 in conjunction with Article 5.

56. The general principles have been summarised in *Merabishvili v. Georgia* ([GC], no. 72508/13, §§ 287-317, 28 November 2017), and *Navalnyy v. Russia* ([GC], nos. 29580/12 and 4 others, §§ 164-65, 15 November 2018).

57. The Court, in light of its findings above in respect of complaint under Article 5 § 1 and its assessment in *Ibrahimov and Mammadov* (cited above, §§ 149-57), which concerned a situation and context significantly similar to the present case, finds that the restriction of the applicant's liberty was imposed for purposes other than those prescribed by Articles 5 § 1 (c) of the Convention and the actual purpose of the impugned measures was to punish the applicant for his active social and political engagement and his activities in NIDA (see *Rashad Hasanov and Others v. Azerbaijan*, nos. 48653/13 and 3 others, § 125, 7 June 2018).

58. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 18 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 5.

VI. OTHER COMPLAINTS

59. The applicant also raised complaints under Articles 5 § 4, 6 § 3 (c), 10 and 13 of the Convention. Having regard to the conclusions reached above under Articles 3, 5 § 1, 6 § 1 and 18 of the Convention, the facts of the case, the submissions of the parties and the arguments relied on by both parties, the Court considers that there is no need to examine the admissibility and merits of the remaining complaints (compare *Haziyev v. Azerbaijan*, no. 19842/15, § 44, 6 December 2018; *Ayyubzade v. Azerbaijan*, no. 6180/15, § 60, 2 March 2023; *Emin Huseynov v. Azerbaijan (no. 2)*, no. 1/16, § 68, 13 July 2023; and *Afgan Mammadov v. Azerbaijan*, no. 43327/14, § 88, 14 November 2024).

APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

60. The applicant claimed 2,500 euros (EUR) in respect of pecuniary damage. He further claimed EUR 50,000, and 20,000 Azerbaijani manats (AZN – approximately EUR 10,900 on 7 March 2024, when the claim was submitted) in respect of non-pecuniary damage. Lastly, he claimed EUR 5,000, AZN 10,000 (approximately EUR 5,450 on 7 March 2024) and EUR 54.81 in respect of costs and expenses incurred before the domestic courts and the Court. The applicant asked the Court to pay the award of legal costs directly to his representative.

61. The Government submitted that the claims were unsubstantiated and excessive. In respect of costs and expenses, the Government submitted that AZN 1,500 and EUR 1,000 would be a sufficient award.

62. The Court does not discern any causal link between the violations found and the pecuniary damage alleged by the applicant. It therefore rejects this part of the claim.

63. The Court considers that the applicant has suffered non-pecuniary damage which cannot be compensated for solely by the finding of a violation. Making its assessment on an equitable basis, as required by Article 41 of the Convention, the Court awards the applicant the sum of EUR 10,000 under this head, plus any tax that may be chargeable on this amount.

64. Regard being had to the documents in its possession, the Court considers it reasonable to award the sum of EUR 2,054.81 in respect of costs and expenses in the domestic proceedings and before the Court, plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant, to be paid directly to his representative Mr F. Namazli. The Court dismisses the remainder of the claims.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;

2. *Declares* the complaints under Articles 3, 5 § 1, 6 § 1 and 18 admissible;

3. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention under its procedural limb as regards the lack of an effective investigation into the applicant's complaint about ill-treatment;

4. *Holds* that there has been no violation of Article 3 of the Convention under its substantive limb concerning the applicant's complaint of ill-treatment;

5. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention as regards the applicant's confinement in a metal cage;

6. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention;

7. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention;

8. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 18 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 5 of the Convention;

9. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the admissibility and merits of the remaining complaints;

10. *Holds*
    (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicant, within three months, the following amounts, to be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable at the date of settlement:
        (i) EUR 10,000 (ten thousand euros), plus any tax that may be chargeable, in respect of non-pecuniary damage;
        (ii) EUR 2,054.81 (two thousand and fifty-four euros and eighty-one cents), plus any tax that may be chargeable, in respect of costs and expenses, to paid directly to the bank account of Mr F. Namazli;
    (b) that from the expiry of the above-mentioned three months until settlement simple interest shall be payable on the above amounts at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points;

11. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicant's claim for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 13 January 2026, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Olga Chernishova Deputy Registrar	Canòlic Mingorance Cairat President

APPENDIX

List of cases:

No.	Application no.	Case name	Date lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by
1.	14307/17	Gahraman v. Azerbaijan	16/02/2017	**Elgiz Jamal oglu GAHRAMAN** 1986 Baku Azerbaijani	Nemat Aga oglu KARIMLI
2.	44088/18	Gahraman v. Azerbaijan	30/08/2018		Fariz Mubariz oglu NAMAZLI