

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

FIFTH SECTION

CASE OF PAVLYUCHENKO v. UKRAINE

(Applications nos. 23462/22 and 16921/23)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

14 November 2024

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

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

In the case of Pavlyuchenko v. Ukraine,

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

Kateřina Šimáčková*, President*,
Mykola Gnatovskyy,
Artūrs Kučs*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having deliberated in private on 17 October 2024,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in applications against Ukraine lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ("the Convention") on the various dates indicated in the appended table.

2. The applicant was represented by Mr Sergiy Mykolayovych Rybiy, a lawyer practising in Dnipro.

3. The Ukrainian Government ("the Government") were given notice of the applications.

THE FACTS

4. The applicant's details and information relevant to the applications are set out in the appended table.

5. The applicant complained of the inadequate conditions of his detention and of the lack of any effective remedy in domestic law. He also raised other complaints under the provisions of the Convention.

THE LAW

I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

6. 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 ARTICLES 3 AND 13 OF THE CONVENTION

7. The applicant complained principally of the inadequate conditions of his detention and that he had no effective remedy in this connection. He relied on Articles 3 and 13 of the Convention.

8. The Court notes that the applicant was kept in detention in poor conditions. The details of the applicant's detention are indicated in the

appended table. The Court refers to the principles established in its case-law regarding inadequate conditions of detention (see, for instance, *Muršić v. Croatia* [GC], no. 7334/13, §§ 96-101, ECHR 2016). It reiterates in particular that a serious lack of space in a prison cell weighs heavily as a factor to be taken into account for the purpose of establishing whether the detention conditions described are "degrading" from the point of view of Article 3 and may disclose a violation, both alone or taken together with other shortcomings (see *Muršić*, cited above, §§ 122-41, and *Ananyev and Others v. Russia*, nos. 42525/07 and 60800/08, §§ 149-59, 10 January 2012).

9. In the leading cases of *Melnik v. Ukraine* (no. 72286/01, 28 March 2006) and *Sukachov v. Ukraine* (no. 14057/17, 30 January 2020), the Court already found a violation in respect of issues similar to those in the present case.

10. The Court further observes in the present case that, in reply to a *prima facie* complaint of inadequate conditions of detention, no primary evidence showing cell floor plans and the actual number of inmates during the entire period of the applicant's detention have been provided by the Government (see *Ananyev and Others*, cited above, § 123, and, *Sparysh and Kutsmand v. Ukraine* [Committee], nos. 49709/18 and 49870/18, 12 September 2024).

11. Having examined all the material submitted to it, the Court has not found any fact or argument capable of persuading it to reach a different conclusion on the admissibility and merits of these complaints. Having regard to its case-law on the subject, the Court considers that in the instant case the applicant's conditions of detention were inadequate.

12. The Court further notes that the applicant did not have at his disposal an effective remedy in respect of these complaints.

13. These complaints are therefore admissible and disclose a breach of Articles 3 and 13 of the Convention.

III. OTHER ALLEGED VIOLATIONS UNDER WELL-ESTABLISHED CASE-LAW

14. The applicant submitted other complaints which also raised issues under the Convention, given the relevant well-established case-law of the Court (see appended table). These complaints are not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention, nor are they inadmissible on any other ground. Accordingly, they must be declared admissible. Having examined all the material before it, the Court concludes that they also disclose violations of the Convention in the light of its findings in the case set out in the appended table.

IV. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

15. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Sukachov,* cited above, §§ 165 and 167), the Court considers it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;

2. *Declares* the applications admissible;

3. *Holds* that there has been a breach of Articles 3 and 13 of the Convention concerning the inadequate conditions of detention and the lack of any effective remedy in domestic law;

4. *Holds* that there has been a violation of the Convention as regards the other complaints raised under the well-established case-law of the Court (see appended table);

5. *Holds*
   (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicant, within three months, the amounts indicated in the appended table, to be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable at the date of settlement;
   (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.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 14 November 2024, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Viktoriya Maradudina	Kateřina Šimáčková
Acting Deputy Registrar	President

APPENDIX

List of applications raising complaints under Articles 3 and 13 of the Convention (inadequate conditions of detention and lack of any effective remedy in domestic law)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Facility Start and end date Duration	Sq. m per inmate	Specific grievances	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage (in euros)[1]	Amount awarded for costs and expenses (in euros)[2]
23462/22 17/04/2022 AND 16921/23 29/03/2023	**Danylo Dmytrovych PAVLYUCHENKO** 1994	Rybiy Sergiy Mykolayovych Dnipro	Dnipro Penitentiary Facility no. 4 27/08/2019 pending More than 4 year(s) and 5 month(s) and 13 day(s)	3.6 m²	lack of fresh air, passive smoking, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, mouldy or dirty cell, overcrowding, lack of privacy for toilet, no or restricted access to warm water, lack of toiletries, lack of or poor quality of bedding and bed linen, poor quality of food, no or restricted access to potable water, no or restricted access to shower	Art. 5 (3) - excessive length of pre-trial detention – 23/08/2019 – 23/01/2023, failure to examine the possibility of applying other measures of restraint, fragility and repetitiveness of the reasoning employed by the courts as the case progressed, failure to examine the possibility, as the case progressed, of applying other measures to secure attendance at the trial, failure to conduct the proceedings with due diligence during the period of detention (see *Kharchenko v. Ukraine*, no. 40107/02, §§ 77-81, 10 February 2011, *Ignatov v. Ukraine*, 40583/15, §§ 38-42, 15 December 2016), Art. 5 (5) - lack of, or inadequate compensation, for the violation of Article 5 § 3 of the Convention - (see *Tymoshenko v. Ukraine*, no. 49872/11, §§ 286-87, 30 April 2013 and *Kotiy v. Ukraine*, no. 28718/09, § 55, 5 March 2015)	9,800	250

[1] Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant.
[2] Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant.