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

Press Release
issued by the Registrar of the Court

ECHR 024 (2020)
23.01.2020

Forthcoming judgments and decisions

The European Court of Human Rights will be notifying in writing 14 judgments on Tuesday 28 January 2020 and 18 judgments and / or decisions on Thursday 30 January 2020.

*Press releases and texts of the judgments and decisions will be available at **10 a.m.** (local time) on the Court's Internet site (www.echr.coe.int)*

Tuesday 28 January 2020

Nicolaou v. Cyprus (application no. 29068/10)

The applicants, Andriana Nicolaou, Charalambos Nicolaou, Nicos Nicolaou, Andreas Nicolaou, and Parthenope-Ariadne Nicolaou, are five Cypriot nationals who were born in 1948, 1943, 1972, 1980, and 1982 and live in Limassol (Cyprus).

The case concerns the death of Athanasios Nicolaou, the first two applicants' son and the other applicants' brother.

In 2005 Mr Nicolaou, 26, was performing his six months of compulsory military service. After an overnight leave in September, he was due to return to camp, however, the family were alerted that he had not returned. His body was subsequently found under a bridge, not far from his parked car. His family alleged that he had been killed by other soldiers.

The initial police investigation concluded in June 2006 that he had fallen from the bridge and died. It excluded any criminal act.

The authorities also carried out a military investigation, two inquests, an investigation on behalf of the Council of Ministers, and a second police investigation, which ended in June 2018. The Attorney General concluded in September 2018 that it was not possible to secure evidence to show that his death had been the result of a criminal act.

The applicants complain that the investigation into Mr Nicolaou's death was inadequate. The Court will deal with the complaint under the investigation obligation of Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Lobarev and Others v. Russia (nos. 10355/09, 14358/11, 12934/12, 76458/12, 25684/13, and 49429/14)

The applicants, Pavel Lobarev, Dmitriy Dumler, Stanislav Shkarin, Roman Kazakovskiy, Valeriy Kosov, and Vadim Novgorodov, are six Russian nationals who were born in 1979, 1965, 1980, 1985, 1979, and 1970 respectively and live in various regions of Russia.

The case concerns the applicants' complaint that they were not able to examine at their trials prosecution witnesses who had been evading justice.

They were convicted between 2008 and 2014 on the basis, among other things, of pre-trial statements of the prosecution witnesses who did not appear at court because they were either in hiding and/or on wanted lists.

They appealed, arguing that the domestic courts did not make sufficient efforts to ensure the presence of the witnesses at trial and read out their pre-trial statements. The trial court judgments were, however, upheld.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses) of the European Convention, the applicants complain that the criminal proceedings against them were unfair because the domestic courts read out the prosecution witnesses' pre-trial statements without good reason, thus restricting their right to have those witnesses examined at trial.

Zinatullin v. Russia (no. 10551/10)

The applicant, Ramazan Zinatullin, is a Russian national who was born in 1993 and lives in Tolyatti (Samara region, Russia).

The case concerns an accident on a construction site near the applicant's school which left him disabled at the age of 14.

Mr Zinatullin was seriously injured in 2008 when he fell through a hole in the floor of an unfinished building near his school. The building, owned by the Tolyatti mayor's office, was freely accessible from the school. Construction work on it had been on hold for years for lack of funding.

Criminal proceedings against officials from the mayor's office were never instituted as the investigating authorities found the accident had happened because of the applicant's own lack of care.

In civil proceedings brought by the applicant the courts established that the mayor's office, as owner of the unfinished building, had primary responsibility for the accident for failing to close off the unfinished building and awarded the applicant 600 euros (EUR) in compensation.

Relying on Article 2 (right to life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Zinatullin complains about the authorities' refusal to institute criminal proceedings against the officials from the mayor's office who were responsible for taking safety measures at the construction site. He also complains that the compensation awarded to him in the civil proceedings was inadequate.

A.P. v. Slovakia (no. 10465/17)

The applicant, Mr A.P., is a Slovak national who was born in 1999, lives in Rudňany (Slovakia). He is of Roma origin.

The case concerns his allegation of police brutality and the lack of an adequate investigation.

In February 2015 two municipal police officers went to his school after an allegation that he had been involved in an attack on another youth. He alleged that he was beaten by one of the officers and obtained medical reports the same day that showed an injury to his nose and a swollen top lip.

He lodged a criminal complaint against the police officers with the district police but in March 2015 an investigator dismissed the case, accepting the police officers' account that the applicant had been aggressive and that one of them had put him in an elbow lock and slapped him. Further investigations all essentially found that the police officers had acted in accordance with the law.

The applicant complains that he was subjected to treatment banned by Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), that the investigation into his allegations failed to comply with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), and that his Roma origin had been a decisive factor in his ill treatment, which had never been taken properly into consideration during the investigation, in breach of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

Ali Riza and Others v. Turkey (nos. 30226/10, 17880/11, 17887/11, 17891/11, and 5506/16)

The case concerns football disputes in Turkey.

The applicants are Ömer Kerim Ali Rıza, a dual British and Turkish national, and Fatih Arslan, Şaban Serin, Mehmet Erhan Berber, and Serkan Akal, Turkish nationals, who were born in 1979, 1974,

1980, 1981, and 1977 respectively. They live in Broxbourne (the UK), Muğla, Kocaeli and Zonguldak (Turkey).

Mr Rıza was a football player for Trabzonspor Kulübü Derneği, a club in the top Turkish professional league. He returned to England, his home country, in 2008 and the club brought proceedings against him with the Turkish Football Federation ("the TFF") for breach of contract. In his defence he submitted that the club owed him salary arrears and match appearance fees. The TFF Arbitration Committee ultimately found in 2009 that he had wrongfully terminated his contract and fined him approximately 61,596 euros (EUR). He applied against this decision to the Swiss-based Court of Arbitration for Sport, but his application was declared inadmissible for lack of jurisdiction. An appeal to the Swiss Federal Court was dismissed in 2011 and he has since brought an application (no. 74989/11) against Switzerland with the European Court, which is ongoing.

The second to fourth applicants are amateur football players. Proceedings were brought against them with the TFF when they were accused in 2010 of match-fixing during an important end of season match for their team, İçmeler Belediyespor Kulübü. In a first-instance decision by the TFF, it was found that the applicants had committed the disciplinary offence of "influencing the match result" and were banned from any football-related activities for a year. This decision was then unanimously upheld by the Arbitration Committee.

Mr Akal, the fifth applicant, is a football referee. He lodged an objection with the TFF Arbitration Committee in 2015 about the Federation's decision to downgrade him from top-level assistant referee to "provincial referee". The committee dismissed his objection, finding that his downgrading had been in accordance with the law and procedure.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing and access to court), all five applicants allege that the proceedings before the Arbitration Committee lacked independence and impartiality. They allege in particular that the members of the Committee who decided on their cases were biased towards football clubs because they were appointed by the TFF's Board of Directors, which was predominately composed of former members or executives of football clubs. They all, except for Mr Rıza, also make several other complaints under Article 6 § 1 about procedural shortcomings in the proceedings, and the lack of judicial review of the decisions against them. The second to fourth applicants complain under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), that banning them for a year from football had deprived them of their income.

Just Satisfaction

Cıngıllı Holding A.Ş. and Cıngıllıoğu v. Turkey (nos. 31833/06 and 37538/06)

The case concerns the transfer in 2000 and the sale of Demirbank, the fifth biggest private bank in Turkey at the time.

The applicants are Cıngıllı Holding A.Ş, a Turkish company based in Istanbul, and Sema Cıngıllıoğlu, a Turkish national who was born in 1951 and lives in Istanbul. Ms Cıngıllıoğlu is one of the main shareholders in Cıngıllı Holding. The applicants were the main shareholders in Demirbank. In the second case, the applicant, Michael Reisner, is a German national who was born in 1961 and lives in Schrobenhausen (Germany). He was a shareholder in Demirbank.

The applicants complain that the prolonged failure of the Turkish authorities to comply with the binding judgments annulling the transfer of Demirbank to the Savings Deposit Insurance Fund and the sale of the bank had amounted to a violation of their rights as secured under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

In its judgment delivered on 27 July 2015, the Court found, in the cases of Cingilli Holding A.Ş. v. Turkey and Cıngıllıoğlu v. Turkey, a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a tribunal) and a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1. Observing that the question of the application of Article 41

(just satisfaction) of the Convention was not ready for decision, the Court reserved it for a subsequent date. The Court will give its decision by judgment to be delivered on Tuesday 28 January 2020.

Mehmet Zeki Çelebi v. Turkey (no. 27582/07)

The applicant, Mehmet Zeki Çelebi, is a Turkish national who was born in 1973 and lives in Van (Turkey).

The case concerns his complaint that criminal proceedings against him for membership of a terrorist organisation, the PKK (Workers' Party of Kurdistan), for extortion and murder were unfair owing to the systemic restriction imposed on his right to a lawyer.

Throughout the criminal proceedings against him he changed his position on the accusations against him.

When he was first arrested in 1999 and questioned by the police, he said that he had committed extortion for the PKK on six occasions and had acted as a lookout during a murder. Before the public prosecutor and investigating judge he admitted to three incidents of extortion and denied being involved in the murder. Under a statutory ban in force he was not represented by a lawyer at this stage.

During the trial itself, he was represented by a lawyer and retracted all his earlier statements. However, in 2004 he decided to confirm them, asking to benefit from Law. 4959, which provided for a reduction in his sentence if he gave information about his activities and other accused.

He then maintained for the next five years, up until his conviction in 2009, that he had been involved in two extortion incidents and as lookout for the murder, but denied any criminal responsibility for the latter. His conviction was based on his statements, those of his co-accused and the victims, as well as reports from an identification parade. He was sentenced to life imprisonment.

On appeal, his lawyer unsuccessfully contested the use of his statements taken without a lawyer present. In 2010 the Court of Cassation upheld the judgment of the first-instance court.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and right to legal assistance of own choosing), Mr Zeki Çelebi complains about the restriction on his right to a lawyer while in police custody and the subsequent use by the trial court of his statements taken without a lawyer present to convict him.

Timurlenk v. Turkey (no. 37758/08)

The applicant, Ayşe Timurlenk, is a Turkish national who was born in 1948 and lives in Ankara.

The case concerns her complaint about statutory interest on a medical negligence award failing to compensate for inflation.

Ms Timurlenk had had to have a leg amputated in August 1996 after complications from an earlier gynaecological procedure. She sought compensation for medical negligence and eventually in 2008 she was awarded 50,000 new Turkish liras (TRY) for both pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage (about 25,000 euros (EUR) at the time) with default statutory interest from the date of the incident.

In December 2008 the Ministry of Defence paid her TRY 330,373. After a further court ruling changing the start date for statutory interest she repaid TRY 28,620 to the Ministry in 2011.

Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), Ms Timurlenk complains that the default interest did not keep pace with Turkey's very high rate of inflation.

Thursday 30 January 2020

Ahmadov v. Azerbaijan (no. 32538/10)

The applicant, Eldar Ziyadkhan oglu Ahmadov was born in 1973 in Georgia and lives in Baku. He is of Azerbaijani ethnicity.

The case concerns the authorities' refusal to issue him an identity card.

Mr Ahmadov was born in Georgia but moved to Baku in 1991 to begin studies at the Azerbaijan Oil and Chemistry Institute. In 1998 the Azerbaijan police put a stamp in his Soviet-issue passport that he was a "citizen of the Republic of Azerbaijan".

In 2008 he applied for an identity card, but was refused pursuant to Article 5 of the 1998 Law on Citizenship, which stated that only people who had permanent registration in Azerbaijan before the Law entered into force were considered citizens. However, the applicant had only had temporary registration as a student and thus did not qualify.

The applicant appealed against the administrative decision and won at first instance. However, on appeal by the authorities the refusal to issue the identity card was confirmed, a ruling upheld in December 2009 by the Supreme Court. The courts rejected his argument that his participation in elections, being designated as an Azerbaijani citizen on his son's birth certificate, issued in Georgia, and his registration as a reserve military officer in Azerbaijan were proof of citizenship, although they failed to address his argument about the stamp in his passport.

The applicant complains under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and the correspondence) about the refusal to issue him an ID card.

Babayeva v. Azerbaijan (no. 57724/11)

The applicant, Laman Feruz gizi Babayeva, is an Azerbaijani national who was born in 1981 and lives in Ganja (Azerbaijan).

The case concerns the courts giving custody of her children to her ex-husband after finding she had allegedly had an extramarital affair.

Ms Babayeva applied for a divorce from her husband in 2010. The court dealing with the case ultimately awarded custody of the couple's two children to the husband, basing its decision mainly on the fact that the applicant had previously had an affair and concluding that her actions were "incompatible with moral standards".

The applicant appealed, arguing among other things that the court had unlawfully disregarded the first opinion submitted by a Custody and Guardianship Commission, which had not objected to her having custody, and had failed properly to assess two subsequent Commission opinions. The appeal was rejected in October 2010, a decision which was upheld by the Supreme Court in March 2011.

Relying in particular on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Ms Babayeva complains about the court child custody order in favour of the father.

Namazov v. Azerbaijan (no. 74354/13)

The applicant, Elchin Yusif oglu Namazov, is an Azerbaijani national who was born in 1978 and lives in Baku.

The case concerns his disbarment as a lawyer after a verbal altercation with a judge.

In 2011 the applicant was the defence lawyer for a man accused of a breach of the peace after taking part in an opposition demonstration. In four hearings during August of that year the applicant had verbal altercations with the judge, who eventually took a formal decision to inform the Azerbaijani Bar Association of a breach of ethics by the applicant.

According to the judge's decision, the applicant, when examining a prosecution witness, had uttered various phrases which had to be considered as a breach of lawyer ethics. The applicant was not provided with a copy of the judge's decision or the official transcripts of the hearings where he had had altercations with the judge.

The Bar Association subsequently found that he had breached the Law on Advocates and Advocacy Activity and applied to a court to have him disbarred.

In December 2011 the first-instance court ordered the applicant's disbarment. He appealed, arguing among other things that he had not insulted the judge but had tried to defend his client, and that he had not been duly examined by the Bar Association, which had wanted to punish him for his independence and activism. The appeal and a subsequent cassation appeal were rejected in 2012.

Relying in substance on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complains that his disbarment was unlawful and did not pursue a legitimate aim.

Saribekyan and Balyan v. Azerbaijan (no. 35746/11)

The applicants, Mamikon Saribekyan and Siranush Balyan, are Armenian nationals.

The case concerns their son's death while in military police custody in neighbouring Azerbaijan.

Their son, Manvel Saribekyan, born in 1990, was arrested in Azerbaijan in September 2010. His family state that he inadvertently crossed the border in the fog in a forest while looking for wood and stray cattle, however, the Azerbaijani authorities accused him of being part of a plan to blow up a school in a nearby Azerbaijani village.

He was taken to the Military Police Department of the Ministry of Defence in Baku and placed in a cell, where he was found dead in October 2010, with the Azerbaijani authorities subsequently finding that he had hanged himself.

The body was returned to Armenia in November 2010 and the authorities there opened a criminal investigation. A forensic report found injuries on his neck, head and body.

The Armenian Prosecutor General asked for legal assistance from Azerbaijan but as no reply was received the Armenian pre-trial investigation was suspended in December 2011. An investigation in Azerbaijan found in January 2011 that Mr Saribekyan had committed suicide, that he had been held in proper conditions and that he had not been assaulted while in custody.

The applicants complain under Article 2 (right to life), Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Articles 2 and 3 that their son was tortured and killed in detention; that the Azerbaijani authorities did not carry out an effective investigation; that they had no effective legal remedy; and that the alleged violations occurred because of discrimination based on ethnic origin.

J.M.B. and Others v. France (no. 9671/15 and 31 other applications)

The 32 applicants in this case are 29 French nationals, one Cape Verde national, one Polish national and one Moroccan national, who were born between 1945 and 1995. The case concerns their conditions of detention in prisons in Martinique, French Polynesia and Guadeloupe, as well as in the Nîmes, Nice and Fresnes remand prisons.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), Article 8 (right to private and family life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), they allege that their conditions of detention are or were inhuman and degrading and that they had no effective remedy at their disposal to complain of those conditions.

Studio Monitori and Others v. Georgia (nos. 44920/09 and 8942/10)

The applicants in application 44920/09 are Studio Monitori, which carries out investigative journalism, and a Georgian national, Nino Zuriashvili, born in 1968, who is an investigative journalist. The applicant in application 8942/10 is Georgian national Mamuka Nozadze, born in 1974.

The case concerns their complaint about being denied access to information of public interest.

Ms Zuriashvili is a journalist and a founding member of Studio Monitori. In 2007 she asked Khashuri District Court registry for access to a file on a criminal case, giving no reasons for her request. The registry rejected it, citing provisions on classified investigative information and the need for consent by the man who had been convicted in the case to release his personal information.

Ms Zuriashvili went to court over the registry's refusal, relying on her right of access to information of public interest. She lost the case at three levels of jurisdiction, the final rejection coming from the Supreme Court in June 2008.

Mr Nozadze was a practising lawyer who was convicted of fraud in March 2006 for stealing a client's money that had been given to him for a bail payment in criminal proceedings. While in prison he asked the registry of Tbilisi City Court in October 2007 to send him a copy of all the court orders concerning the imposition of pre-trial preventive measures in six criminal cases. He did not specify why he was interested in that particular information.

After the registry provided him only with the operative parts of the decisions in the six cases, he went to court to obtain the orders in full, relying on the right to unfettered access to public information. The courts rejected his claim, the Supreme Court handing down the final judgment on an appeal on points of law in July 2009.

Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression), the applicants complain that the domestic judicial authorities denied them access to information of general public interest.

Breyer v. Germany (no. 50001/12)

The applicants, Patrick Breyer and Jonas Breyer, are German nationals who were born in 1977 and 1982 respectively and live in Wald-Michelbach (Germany).

The case concerns the storage of pre-paid SIM card users' data by telecommunications companies.

In accordance with 2004 amendments to the Telecommunications Act, companies had to collect and store the personal details of users of pre-paid SIM cards, which had not previously been required. The applicants, civil liberties activists and critics of State surveillance, were users of such cards and therefore had to register their personal details, such as their telephone numbers, date of birth, and their name and address, with their service providers.

In 2005 they lodged a constitutional complaint against various sections of the Act, including sections 111, 112 and 113. These provisions covered respectively the obligation to collect the data and for the authorities to access it, both automatically and on demand.

In January 2012 the Federal Constitutional Court found that the provisions in question were compatible with the Basic Law as being proportionate and justified.

The applicants complain about the storage of their personal data as users of pre-paid SIM cards, relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home, and the correspondence) and Article 10 (freedom of expression).

Franz v. Germany (no. 29295/16)

The applicant, Friedrich-Carl Franz, is a German national who was born in 1955 and lives in Lüneburg (Germany).

The case concerns his complaints of bias against judges of the Celle Court of Appeal who decided on his removal from the office of notary and who had therefore to examine a decision of the president of that court.

The applicant became a notary in 1997 but in 2013 he was removed definitively from that office by the President of the Celle Court of Appeal.

The applicant appealed and the case was assigned to the notary senate of the Celle Court of Appeal. He also subsequently lodged complaints of bias against the judges of the notary senate, but those complaints were rejected as inadmissible in November 2013.

The Court of Appeal rejected his challenge to the decision to remove him from the office of notary in March 2014. It cited legal provisions which stated that a notary had to be removed from office if his economic circumstances, the manner of his business administration or his conduct regarding deposits jeopardised the interests of users of legal services.

In November 2014 the Federal Court of Justice rejected an application by the applicant for leave to appeal as ill-founded. He lodged a constitutional complaint with the Federal Constitutional Court, relying on his constitutional right to a lawful judge. In November 2015 the Federal Constitutional Court refused to adjudicate on the complaint.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicant complains that he did not have an independent and impartial tribunal.

Cicero and Others v. Italy (nos. 29483/11, 33534/11, 69172/11, 13376/12, and 14186/12)

The applicants are 20 Italian nationals who were born between 1941 and 1966 and live in Messina, Florence, Scandicci, Orta di Atella, Sant'Arpino, Rome, Palestrina and Colleferro (Italy).

The case concerns judicial proceedings on the calculation of their length of service as employees in Italian State schools.

The applicants were all employed by local government until 2000 when they were transferred under a new law to the Ministry of Education, Universities and Research.

They subsequently lodged proceedings to complain that, upon their transfer, they had not obtained full recognition of their length of service with the local government authorities.

Pending the completion of those proceedings a new law on the 2006 budget was enacted. This law did not provide for the recognition of the applicants' full length of service, and their claims were dismissed.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain about the retrospective application of the new budget law to their pending proceedings, alleging that this amounted to legislative interference. They also rely on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) to complain that they were discriminated against as compared to other employees who were either already employed by the Ministry at the time of their transfer or who had already been given a final judgment in their favour before the enactment of the new law.

Vinks and Ribicka v. Latvia (no. 28926/10)

The applicants, Vladimirs Vinks and Jeļena Ribicka, are Latvian nationals who were born in 1975 and 1972 and lived together in Ķekava parish (Latvia) at the time in question.

The case concerns a police search of their home during an investigation into serious financial crimes.

In June 2009 the Finance Police Department of the State Revenue Service (VID FPP) began a criminal investigation into tax evasion and money laundering allegedly carried out by 25 people, including the first applicant and involving more than 200 fictitious companies.

That month the police also searched the applicants' house, which in particular involved the participation of at least four armed members of the Omega anti-terrorism unit, followed by five VID FPP officers. The VID FPP case against the first applicant is still at the pre-trial investigation stage.

The applicants made various complaints to the authorities, including about the lawfulness of the search warrant; the VID FPP's actions; and the need for armed police. All the complaints were dismissed by judges, prosecutors or investigators.

The first applicant also complained to the authorities that the VID FPP allegations of tax evasion and money laundering and the house search had been motivated by revenge after he had testified against two of the service's officers in a separate case.

The applicants complain about the search of their house and the way it was carried out under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and the correspondence). They also raise a complaint under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in relation to their Article 8 complaint.

Sukachov v. Ukraine (no. 14057/17)

The case concerns pre-trial detention conditions in Ukraine.

The applicant, Viktor Sukachov, is a Ukrainian national who was born in 1978.

Since his arrest in 2012 on terrorism charges he has been held in detention in Dnipropetrovsk (now Dnipro) Pre-trial Detention Facility No. 3, which in March 2016 was re-categorised as a prison. He was convicted as charged in 2018 and sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment.

During his time in the Dnipro prison Mr Sukachov complained about the sanitary and hygiene conditions of his detention, lodging a petition with a member of parliament in 2016 and complaining directly to the Prosecutor General in 2017. His first complaint resulted in an inspection by the regional prosecutor who found that his allegations had not been confirmed. His second complaint led to a similar finding by the relevant prosecutor.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Mr Sukachov complains in particular of inadequate conditions of detention at the Dnipro prison and of the lack of effective remedies for his complaints. He notably alleges that the cells in which he was detained were overcrowded, damp, poorly lit and ventilated and did not have proper separation between the toilet and the rest of the cell. In addition, he submits that this situation was aggravated by the fact that he was confined to his cell for most of the day, except for a one-hour daily walk in a small exercise yard, and could only take a shower once per week.

The Court will give its rulings in writing on the following cases, some of which concern issues which have already been submitted to the Court, including excessive length of proceedings.

These rulings can be consulted from the day of their delivery on the Court's online database HUDOC.

They will not appear in the press release issued on that day.

Tuesday 28 January 2020

Name	Main application number
Atayev v. Russia	39070/08
Yunusova v. Russia	5489/10
Lazareva v. Russia	22298/11
Andreyevy v. Russia	83399/17
Kustova and Bibanin v. Russia	44309/06

Name	Main application number
framipek s.r.o. and AGRORACIO Senica, a.s. v. Slovakia	51894/14

Thursday 30 January 2020

Name	Main application number
Bibin and Others v. Azerbaijan	81518/12
Religious Community of Jehovah's Witnesses and Hansen v. Azerbaijan	52682/07
Yagublu and Ahadov v. Azerbaijan	67374/11
Morawski and Morawska v. Poland	3508/12
Dorofeyev v. Russia	1004/09
Nasibullin v. Russia	64774/09
Dost Ali v. Sweden	8158/18

Press contacts
echrpress@echr.coe.int | tel: +33 3 90 21 42 08

Tracey Turner-Tretz (tel: + 33 3 88 41 35 30)
Denis Lambert (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 09)
Inci Ertekin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 55 30)
Patrick Lannin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 44 18)