



Judgments and decisions of 7 October 2021

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing 12 judgments¹ and 17 decisions²: six Chamber judgments are summarised below;

a separate press release has been issued for a decision in the case of *Djordjević v. France* (no. 15572/17);

six Committee judgments, concerning issues which have already been examined by the Court, and the 16 other decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

The judgment in French below is indicated with an asterisk ().*

Hasanov and Majidli v. Azerbaijan (application no. 9626/14)

The applicants, Ulvi Hasanov and Majid Majidli, are Azerbaijani nationals who were born in 1987 and 1990 respectively and live in Baku.

At the time the applicants were opposition activists who engaged in protests in the early 2010s. The case concerns their arrest in 2013 the day after handing out leaflets at a metro station. They were subsequently detained, tried and convicted for dissemination of anti-government leaflets.

Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that the administrative-offence proceedings had not been fair, and that their arrest and conviction had violated their right to freedom of expression.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Violation of Article 10

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 5,850 euros (EUR) to each applicant

costs and expenses: the Court rejected the applicants' claim for costs and expenses

Zoletic and Others v. Azerbaijan (no. 20116/12)

The applicants are 33 nationals of Bosnia and Herzegovina who were born between 1952 and 1990 and live in various parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The applicants were recruited from Bosnia and Herzegovina as temporary construction workers in Azerbaijan. The case concerns their treatment there by Serbaz Design and Construction LLC and their subsequent treatment by the authorities and the latter's alleged failure to protect them.

¹ Under Articles 43 and 44 of the Convention, Chamber judgments are not final. During the three-month period following a judgment's delivery, any party may request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber of the Court. If such a request is made, a panel of five judges considers whether the case deserves further examination. In that event, the Grand Chamber will hear the case and deliver a final judgment. If the referral request is refused, the Chamber judgment will become final on that day. Under Article 28 of the Convention, judgments delivered by a Committee are final.

Once a judgment becomes final, it is transmitted to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe for supervision of its execution. Further information about the execution process can be found here: www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/execution.

² Inadmissibility and strike-out decisions are final.

Relying on Article 4 § 2 (prohibition of forced labour), Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention, the applicants complain that they had been victims of human trafficking and forced labour.

Violation of Article 4 § 2 (investigation)

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 5,000 to each applicant

costs and expenses: no request for just satisfaction made

Syrianos v. Greece (no. 49529/12)*

The applicant, Rami Syrianos, is a Greek national who was born in 1988 and lives in Larissa (Greece).

The case concerns the disciplinary penalties imposed on the applicant for refusing to undergo strip-searches in Diavata Prison (Thessaloniki) and Nigrita Prison (Serres), where he was held in pre-trial detention.

In 2011 and 2012 four sets of disciplinary proceedings were brought against the applicant. On completion of each of the first three sets of proceedings, the disciplinary board of the prison concerned imposed a penalty on the applicant of ten days' detention in a "special cell" for disobedience. In the fourth set of proceedings the applicant was first placed in a "reception room" in semi-isolation before being transferred to another prison. The appeals which he lodged against these decisions were dismissed by the domestic courts.

Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private life) of the Convention, the applicant complains about the disciplinary penalties imposed on him each time he refused to obey an order by the prison authorities to undress and undergo an anal inspection.

Violation of Article 8 (concerning the fourth set of disciplinary proceedings)

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 2,000

costs and expenses: the Court rejected the applicant's claim for costs and expenses

Bartolo Parnis and Others v. Malta (nos. 49378/18, 49380/18, 49496/18, and 49676/18)

The applicants, Greta Bartolo Parnis, Patricia Anastasi, Anna Maria Saddemi and Josephine Azzopardi, are Maltese nationals who were born in 1965, 1963, 1960 and 1958 respectively and live in Pembroke (Malta).

The case concerns their property being subject to a law introduced in 2007, which they allege is in breach of their property rights given that a forced lease had been imposed on the owners, who were receiving a very low rent, and the remedies in that connection.

They rely on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 4,000 to each applicant

costs and expenses: the applicants did not submit a quantified claim for costs and expenses when invited to do so

Galea v. Malta (no. 28712/19)

The applicant, Maria Pia Galea, is a Maltese national who was born in 1956 and lives in St Julians (Malta).

The case concerns a breach of Article 1 (protection of property) of Protocol No. 1 upheld by the domestic courts in relation to the disproportionate amount of rent received by the applicant for her property, and the effectiveness of the available remedies in this regard.

She relies on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 6 (right to a fair trial).

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Just satisfaction:

pecuniary damage: EUR 110,000

non-pecuniary damage: EUR 10,000

costs and expenses: the Court rejected the applicant's claim for costs and expenses

Łysak v. Poland (no. 1631/16)

The applicant, Wojciech Łysak, is a Polish national who was born in 1984 and lives in Katowice (Poland).

The case concerns the seizure of 582 items of stock following a police search of the applicant's wholesale clothing business in 2013. The search was connected to an investigation into the trade in counterfeit clothes.

Relying on Article 1 (protection of property) of Protocol No. 1, the applicant complains that the seizure of his property had been unjustified and unnecessarily protracted.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Just satisfaction:

The question is not ready for decision and has been set aside.

This press release is a document produced by the Registry. It does not bind the Court. Decisions, judgments and further information about the Court can be found on www.echr.coe.int. To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en or follow us on Twitter [@ECHR_CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

Press contacts

echrpess@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)

Neil Connolly (tel.: + 33 3 90 21 48 05)

Jane Swift (tel.: + 33 3 88 41 29 04)

The European Court of Human Rights was set up in Strasbourg by the Council of Europe Member States in 1959 to deal with alleged violations of the 1950 European Convention on Human Rights.