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

THIRD SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 28054/20
Aleksey Markovich VYSOKOVSKIY against Russia
and 5 other applications
(see appended table)

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting on 19 June 2025 as a Committee composed of:

Diana Kovatcheva*, President*,
Canòlic Mingorance Cairat,
Vasilka Sancin*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above applications lodged on the various dates indicated in the appended table,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The list of applicants is set out in the appended table.

The applicants' complaints 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"). In some of the applications, complaints based on the same facts were also communicated under other provisions of the Convention.

THE LAW

A. Joinder of the applications

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

B. Complaints under Articles 5, 6 and 11 of the Convention

The Court notes from the outset that, in the present case, the applications were lodged more than six months after the final decisions in respect of the applicants' grievances under Articles 5, 6 and 11 of the Convention were taken (see the appended table). It must therefore ascertain whether the applicants complied with the six-month rule set out in Article 35 § 1 of the Convention.

The Court further notes that, as regards applications introduced in 2020, the method of calculation of the six-month rule has been adjusted in order to handle the difficulties to which the global pandemic and widespread lockdown gave rise and to preserve the essence of the right of individual petition under Article 34 of the Convention. In particular, the six-month rule was exceptionally considered to have been suspended for three calendar months in total, whenever a calendar six-month period either 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, §§ 46-59, 1 March 2022).

Turning to the circumstances of the present case, the Court observes that neither the dates of the introduction of the applications nor the dates of the expiration of the six-month time-limit fall within the above-mentioned period (16 March to 15 June 2020). The exceptional measure are therefore not applicable in the present case (compare *Kitanovska and Barbulovski v. North Macedonia*, no. 53030/19, § 39-40, 9 May 2023; and *Masse v. France* (dec.), no. 47506/20, 25 March 2025). It follows that the applications were 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,

Decides to join the applications;

Declares the applications inadmissible.

Done in English and notified in writing on 10 July 2025.

Viktoriya Maradudina Acting Deputy Registrar	Diana Kovatcheva President

APPENDIX

List of applications raising complaints under Article 11 of the Convention (disproportionate measures against organisers and participants of public assemblies)

No.	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
1.	28054/20 26/06/2020	**Aleksey Markovich VYSOKOVSKIY** 1980	Memorial Human Rights Centre Moscow	Manifestation for fair elections to Mosgorduma Moscow 27/07/2019	article 20.2 § 5 of CAO	fine of RUB 17,000	Moscow City Court 20/12/2019	Art. 6 (1) - lack of impartiality of the tribunal in view of the absence of a prosecuting party in administrative-offence proceedings, Art. 6 (1) - and Art. 6 (3) (d) - unfair trial in view of restrictions on the right to examine witnesses - The applicant complains about his inability to cross-examine in open court police officers on whose written statements the applicant's conviction was based, Art. 5 (1) - unlawful deprivation of liberty, including unrecorded detention and detention without a judicial order and any other legal basis - arrest and detention on 27/07/2019 in excess of 3 hours for the sole purpose of drawing a record of administrative offence
2.	32036/20 23/07/2020	**Ivan Yuryevich CHISTYAKOV** 1998	Memorial Human Rights Centre Moscow	Manifestation for fair elections to Mosgorduma Moscow 27/07/2019	article 20.2 § 5 of CAO	fine of RUB 10,000	Moscow City Court 18/12/2019	Art. 6 (1) - and Art. 6 (3) (d) - unfair trial in view of restrictions on the right to examine witnesses - inability to cross-examine in open court police officer on whose written statements the applicant's conviction was based, Art. 6 (1) - lack of impartiality of the tribunal in view of the absence of a prosecuting party in administrative-offence proceedings, Art. 5 (1) - unlawful deprivation of liberty, including unrecorded detention and detention without a judicial order and any other legal basis - arrest and detention on 27/07/2019 in excess of 3 hours for the sole purpose of drawing a record of administrative offence,

No.	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
3.	32065/20 23/07/2020	**Darya Nikolayevna KORNILOVA** 1976	Memorial Human Rights Centre Moscow	Manifestation for fair elections to Mosgorduma Moscow 27/07/2019	article 20.2 § 5 of CAO	fine of RUB 15,000	Moscow City Court 22/01/2020	Art. 6 (1) - and Art. 6 (3) (d) - unfair trial in view of restrictions on the right to examine witnesses - inability to cross-examine in open court police officer on whose written statements the applicant's conviction was based, Art. 6 (1) - lack of impartiality of the tribunal in view of the absence of a prosecuting party in administrative-offence proceedings, Art. 5 (1) - unlawful deprivation of liberty, including unrecorded detention and detention without a judicial order and any other legal basis - arrest and detention on 27/07/2019 in excess of 3 hours for the sole purpose of drawing a record of administrative offence
4.	32098/20 23/07/2020	**Andrey Vasilyevich SAYAPIN** 1986	Memorial Human Rights Centre Moscow	Manifestation for fair elections to Mosgorduma Moscow 27/07/2019	article 20.2 § 5 of CAO	fine of RUB 10,000	Moscow City Court 22/01/2020	Art. 6 (1) - lack of impartiality of tribunal - lack of a prosecuting party in the administrative proceedings (Karelin v. Russia, no. 926/08, 20 September 2016), Art. 6 (1) - and Art. 6 (3) (d) - unfair trial in view of restrictions on the right to examine witnesses - inability to cross-examine in open court police officer on whose written statements the applicant's conviction was based, Art. 5 (1) - unlawful deprivation of liberty, including unrecorded detention and detention without a judicial order and any other legal basis - Unlawful detention on 27/07/2019, detention in excess of 3 hours
5.	44299/20 16/09/2020	**Artem Sergeyevich PRIVALENKO** 1996 **Dmitriy Yuryevich RYANNEL** 1997	Mezak Ernest Aleksandrovich Saint-Barthélemy-d'Anjou	Manifestation for fair elections to Mosgorduma (events related to the first applicant) Moscow 27/07/2019	article 20.2 § 6.1 of CAO	fine of RUB 15,000	Moscow City Court 18/12/2019	Art. 6 (1) - lack of impartiality of tribunal - both applicants complain of absence of a prosecuting party in the administrative proceedings (Karelin v. Russia, no. 926/08, 20 September 2016), Art. 6 (1) - and Art. 6 (3) (d) - unfair trial in view of restrictions on the right to examine witnesses - both applicants complain of inability to cross-examine two police officers Mr M. and Mr P. on whose written statements the applicants' convictions were based.

No.	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
				Manifestation for fair elections to Mosgorduma (events related to the second applicant) Moscow 27/07/2019	article 20.2 § 6.1 of CAO	fine of RUB 10,000	Moscow City Court 16/12/2019	
6.	44477/20 16/09/2020	**Sergey Dmitriyevich MISHUNIN** 1992 **Vyacheslav Viktorovich MOSKVICHEV** 1970	Mezak Ernest Aleksandrovich Saint-Barthélemy-d'Anjou	Manifestation for fair elections to Mosgorduma Moscow 27/07/2019	article 20.2 § 6.1 of CAO	fine of RUB 10,000 (each applicant)	Moscow City Court 16/12/2019	Art. 6 (1) - lack of impartiality of tribunal - absence of a prosecuting party in all sets of the administrative proceedings concerning both applicants, Art. 6 (1) - and Art. 6 (3) (d) - unfair trial in view of restrictions on the right to examine witnesses - inability to cross-examine in open court police officer on whose written statements the applicants' convictions were based in all sets of the administrative proceedings.