



Judgments of 29 March 2022

The European Court of Human Rights has today given notification in writing of 16 judgments¹:

three Chamber judgments are summarised below;

a separate press release has been issued for another Chamber judgment in the case of *Nuh Uzun and Others v. Turkey* (application no. 49341/18 and 13 other applications);

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

The judgments summarised below are available only in English.

Vool and Toomik v. Estonia (applications nos. 7613/18 and 12222/18)

The applicants, Tarko Vool and Janek Toomik, are Estonian nationals who were born in 1988 and 1971 and live in the towns of Võru and Jõgeva (Estonia) respectively.

The case concerns the statutory ban on remand prisoners from having long-term family visits, despite such visits being generally authorised for convicted prisoners. Mr Vool was remanded in custody in April 2014 on suspicion of extortion and of being a member of a criminal organisation, while Mr Toomik was remanded in custody in December 2011 suspected of handling a large quantity of narcotic drugs. During their time on remand, they were not allowed long-term – unsupervised visits of 24-72 hours – with their families.

Relying on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that they had no right to long-term visits during their detention on remand whereas convicted persons serving their prison terms did.

Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8

Just satisfaction:

non-pecuniary damage: 5,000 euros (EUR) to the first applicant and EUR 3,000 to the second applicant

costs and expenses: EUR 4,125 to the first and EUR 6,004.20 to the second applicant

Laniauskas v. Lithuania (no. 48309/19)

The applicant, Remigijus Laniauskas, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1972 and is currently detained at the Prison Hospital in Pravieniškės (Lithuania). He sustained injuries to his eyes during an explosion in 1993 and his vision continued to deteriorate afterwards, particularly from 2009. He is now nearly blind.

¹ Under Articles 43 and 44 of the Convention, Chamber judgments are not final. During the three-month period following a Chamber 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

In 2013 and 2015 Mr Laniauskas was convicted on several counts of unlawful possession and smuggling of firearms, explosive materials and narcotic or psychotropic substances, committed between 2006 and 2008 as part of an organised criminal group. He began serving his sentence in the Kybartai Correctional Facility in March 2015 and is set to be released in March 2023.

The applicant complains that, in view of his visual impairment, his detention is incompatible with Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention.

No violation of Article 3

Starkevič v. Lithuania (no. 7512/18)

The applicant, Edvin Starkevič, is a Lithuanian national who was born in 1986 and lives in Vilnius. He is a former police officer.

The case concerns a criminal investigation into Mr Starkevič for suspected abuse of office, and the use of information thus obtained in subsequent disciplinary proceedings to prove that he had committed a disciplinary offence. As a result, he was dismissed from the police.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, the applicant complains that he did not have a fair hearing in connection with the court proceedings. He also complains that the use of the pre-trial investigation material to investigate the question of his disciplinary violation was in breach of his right to respect for his private life under Article 8 of the Convention.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

No violation of Article 8

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

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

We would encourage journalists to send their enquiries via email.

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.