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

THIRD SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 63741/19
Tatyana Yuryevna KRUPINA
against Russia

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting on 5 February 2026 as a Committee composed of:

Úna Ní Raifeartaigh*, President*,
Mateja Đurović,
Vasilka Sancin*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 29 November 2019,

Having regard to the observations by the applicant,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant's details are set out in the appended table.

The applicant was represented by Mr K. Terekhov, a lawyer practising in Moscow.

The applicant's complaints under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) of the Convention concerning the unfair trial in view of: restrictions on the right to examine witnesses, the courts' refusal to admit expert reports commissioned by the defence, and the appellate court's failure to state reasons and to reply to the applicant's specific arguments were communicated to the Russian Government ("the Government").

THE LAW

In the present application, having examined all the material before it, the Court considers that the applicant's complaints concerning her right to examine expert witness Yu. in the course of the criminal proceedings against her, the courts' refusal to admit reports prepared by Z. and S. commissioned by the defence (while Z. and S. were heard by the trial court and their statements reproduced in the first instance court's judgment in detail and

analysed by the court), as well as appellate court's alleged failure to reply to the applicant's argument pertaining to the above grievances, are inadmissible.

In particular, in the light of the principles established in the case-law under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) of the Convention (see *Al- Khawaja and Tahery v. the United Kingdom* [GC], nos. 26766/05 and 22228/06, §§ 118-47, ECHR 2011, *Schatschaschwili v. Germany* [GC], no. 9154/10, §§ 100-31, ECHR 2015 and *Murtazaliyeva v. Russia* [GC], no. 36658/05, §§ 117-27, 18 December 2018, as regards the right to examine witnesses; *Matytsina v. Russia*, no. 58428/10, §§ 176-81 and 185-92, 27 March 2014, *Khodorkovskiy and Lebedev v. Russia (no. 2)*, nos. 51111/07 and 42757/07, §§ 486-99, 14 January 2020, and *Pichugin v. Russia* [Committee], no. 38958/07, §§ 35-38, 6 June 2017 as regards an adequate opportunity for the applicant to effectively contest the crucial pieces of evidence commissioned and obtained unilaterally by the prosecution; and *Moreira Ferreira v. Portugal* (no. 2) [GC], no. 19867/12, §§ 84-85, 11 July 2017 as regards the courts' obligation to adequately state reasons and give a specific and explicit reply to the arguments which are decisive for the outcome of those proceedings), the Court notes that the applicant's criminal trial had complied with overall fairness requirement.

In view of the above, the Court finds that these complaints are manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 and 4 of the Convention.

For these reasons, the Court, unanimously,

Declares the application inadmissible.

Done in English and notified in writing on 26 February 2026.

Viktoriya Maradudina
Acting Deputy Registrar

Úna Ní Raifeartaigh
President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) of the Convention (unfair trial in view of restrictions on the right to examine witnesses)

Application no. **Date of introduction**	**Applicant's name** **Year of birth**	**Representative's name and location**	**Final domestic decision** **Convicted of**	**Witness (indicated by initials)** **Absent and/or anonymous** **Evidence type**	**Reasons for absence and/or anonymity**	**Counterbalancing factors** **Overall fairness**
63741/19 29/11/2019	**Tatyana Yuryevna KRUPINA** 1963	Terekhov Konstantin Ilyich Moscow	Nizhniy Novgorod Regional Court 28/08/2019 embezzlement	Yu. (expert) significant weight	court's refusal to call a witness	No breach of the overall fairness due to the strength of the other prosecution evidence