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

THIRD SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 49712/20
Artem Vasilyevich SHEVELEV
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 22 October 2020,

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 E. Mezak, living in Saint-Barthélemy-d'Anjou.

The applicant's complaint under Article 11 of the Convention concerning the disproportionate measures against organisers and participants of public assemblies were communicated to the Russian Government ("the Government"). Complaints based on the same facts were also communicated under other provisions of the Convention (see Appendix for details).

THE LAW

The Court notes that the final judgments in the applicant's case were given on 22 and 29 January 2020 (see Appendix). The six-month period for introducing an application therefore started to run on those dates and it was due to expire six calendar months later, on 22 and 29 July 2020, respectively. The applicant however brought his application on 22 October 2020 (see Appendix), that is to say, belatedly. The Court notes in this connection that the applicant cannot benefit from a three-month extension of a six-month period granted by the President of the Court for applications brought during

the outbreak of COVID pandemic because it only concerned applications in which a six-month period ether started to run or, on the contrary, was due to expire at any time between 16 March and 15 June 2020 (see *Saakashvili v. Georgia* (dec.), nos. 6232/20 and 22394/20, § 49, 1 March 2022), unlike in the applicant's case.

In view of the above, the Court finds that the present application was lodged out of time and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 § 1 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 11 of the Convention
(disproportionate measures against organisers and participants of public assemblies)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Name of the public event Location Date	Administrative / criminal offence	Penalty	Final domestic decision Court Name Date	Other complaints
49712/20 22/10/2020	**Artem Vasilyevich SHEVELEV** 1981	Mezak Ernest Aleksandrovich Saint-Barthélemy-d'Anjou	protest against construction of a landfill in Shiyes Mezhyog 27/08/2019	article 20.2.2. § 1 of CAO	20 hours of community work	the Supreme Court Komi Republic, 22/01/2020	Art. 6 (1) - lack of impartiality of the tribunal in view of the absence of a prosecuting party in administrative-offence proceedings; Prot. 7 Art. 4 - right not to be tried or punished twice in criminal proceedings - the applicant complains of a being convicted twice in relation to the same protest / Ust Vymskiy District Court the Republic of Komi / 15/11/2019 and 26/11/2019 (Article 20.2.2. § 1 and Article 19.3 of CAO);
			protest against construction of a landfill in Shiyes Mezhyog 27/08/2019	article 19.3 § 1 of CAO	fine of RUB 500	the Supreme Court Komi Republic 29/01/2020.	Prot. 7 Art. 2 - delayed review of conviction by a higher tribunal - the applicant complains that the Supreme Court of the Republic of Komi, in its rulings, respectively, of 22/01/2020 and 29/01/2020, refused to examine the appeal complaint of the applicant's lawyer L. on the merits, stating that L. had no right to bring an appeal on the applicant's behalf because he had not participated in the first-instance court proceedings.