



H/Exec(2020)5 - 10 October 2020

Oleksandr Volkov group v. Ukraine

Cases concerning various violations related to the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, unfair disciplinary proceedings brought against a judge

This document provides a summary of the individual measures taken in this group of cases and some outstanding issues as regards indications as to the progress of general measures taken in the transitional period of the judicial reform in 2016

Memorandum prepared by the Department for the Execution of Judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

The opinions expressed in this document are binding on neither the Committee of Ministers nor the European Court.

This document contains an overview of the information provided by the authorities, or taken from the public Registers of the High Council of Justice and the Registry of judicial decisions of Ukraine and assesses the progress made so far in the individual measures adopted in the cases supervised by the Committee of Ministers in the *Oleksandr Volkov* group against Ukraine.

It also contains information on the dismissal of judges on 29 September 2016 (transitional period of the judicial reform) as a part of indications as to the progress of general measures.

I. Cases concerning various violations related to the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, unfair disciplinary proceedings brought against a judge (individual measures)

1) Just satisfaction

The amounts of just satisfaction awarded have been paid in all cases.

2) Other measures (reinstatement proceedings)

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
1.	Oleksandr Volkov (no. 21722/11) 2705/2013	VOLKOV Oleksandr 21722/11	Resolution of the Parliament of 17/06/2010 quashed by the Parliament on 25/12/2014.	-	Reinstated as of 25/12/2014.
2.	Kulykov and Others (no.5114/09) 19/04/2017	KULYKOV Andriy Volodymyrovych 5114/09	Decisions of the 'former HCJ' ¹ of 04/02/2004 and Resolution of the Parliament of 22/05/2008 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the Supreme Court (SC) on 18/07/2019.	Remitted to the HCJ for reconsideration of the grounds for disciplinary responsibility. Pending before the HCJ.	Not reinstated.
		BABYCH Nina Dmytrivna 11775/12	Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 26/05/2010 and Resolution of the Parliament of 17/06/2010 and of 23/12/2010 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 17/05/2018.	Pending before the HCJ.	Reinstated by the order of the head of a local court; started to work on 12/12/2018.
		BACHUN Oleg Volodymyrovych 9740/11	Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 17/05/2010 and Resolution of the Parliament of 03/06/2010 quashed by the Higher Administrative Court of Ukraine on 07/12/2017.	Remitted to the HCJ for reconsideration of the grounds for disciplinary responsibility. Pending before the HCJ.	Not reinstated.

¹ The abbreviation "HCJ" should be read as follows: before the adoption of constitutional amendments in June 2016, the HCJ denotes the High Council of Justice (Vyshcha rada yustytysii, Вища рада юстиції), 'the former HCJ' is used in this document in respect of this body to avoid confusion; following the adoption of the enacting legislation for these amendments, the HCJ denotes the High Council of Justice (Vyshcha rada pravosuddia, Вища рада правосуддя).

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
		<p><i>VASINA Liliya Anatoliyivna</i></p> <p>75790/11</p>	<p>Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 01/03/2011 and Resolution of the Parliament of 03/11/2011 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 01/03/2018.</p>	<p>Pending before the HCJ.</p>	<p>Reinstated by the order of the head of a local court; started to work on 01/08/2018.</p>
		<p><i>KORMUSHYN Kyrylo Oleksandrovysh</i></p> <p>68443/11</p>	<p>Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 06/12/2010 and Resolution of the Parliament of 23/12/2010 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 02/03/2018.</p>	<p>Dismissed from the post of judge by the decision of the HCJ of 23/04/2020 with the following argumentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the acts of judge Kormushyn that had previously given rise to the 'former HCJ' bringing him to disciplinary liability, taken accumulatively, should be classified, under the legislation currently in force, as a significant disciplinary offence incompatible with the judicial status or office, they also constitute a breach of oath; - thus, the fact of the breach of oath is confirmed and the violations committed are of such nature and graveness that judge Kormushyn should be dismissed; - the 'former HCJ' analysed the omissions of the judge upon a complaint of a person and on its own motion, and not within a framework of disciplinary proceedings, thus, the statutory period is not applicable. <p>On 19/08/2020 the Administrative Court of Cassation quashed the dismissal decision of the HCJ and remitted the case to the HCJ for</p>	<p>1) Not reinstated.</p> <p>2) Dismissed on 23/04/2020.</p>

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
		<p>STASOVSKA (SUSHKOVA) Lyudmyla Ivanivna</p> <p>20554/11</p>	<p>Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 26/05/2010 and Resolution of the Parliament of 23/12/2010 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 17/04/2018 and 07/02/2019 respectively; the decision of 07/02/2019 was upheld by the Grand Chamber of the SC on 30/01/2020.</p>	<p>re-consideration.</p> <p>Remitted to the HCJ for reconsideration of the grounds for disciplinary responsibility. Pending before the HCJ.</p>	<p>Reinstated by the order of the head of a local court; started to work on 01/04/2020.</p>
		<p>TOKAR Lidiya Volodymyrivna</p> <p>54135/12</p>	<p>Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 21/02/2017 and Resolution of the Parliament of 05/06/2008 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 22/03/2018</p>	<p>Remitted to the HCJ for reconsideration of the grounds for disciplinary responsibility.</p> <p>Pending before the HCJ</p>	<p>Not reinstated.</p>
		<p>ROZDOBUDKO Oleksandr Mykolayovych</p> <p>21546/12</p>	<p>Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 14/06/2011 and Resolution of the Parliament of 22/09/2011 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 15/03/2018 and 6/09/2018 respectively.</p>	<p>Dismissed from the post of judge by the decision of the HCJ of 16/07/2020 with the following argumentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the HCJ agrees with the findings of the Qualification Commission of Judges of 2010 and with the conclusions that judge Rozdobudko acted in breach of oath and should thus be dismissed; - it was the Qualification Commission of Judges in 2010 who established the facts in evidence of the breach of oath by the judge and brought the judge to the disciplinary liability. Thus, the limitation period is not applicable to the ensuing procedure, the HCJ is implementing the previously 	<p>1) Not reinstated.</p> <p>2) Dismissed 16/07/2020.</p>

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
				<p>made disciplinary liability decision acting within the framework of the personnel management procedure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - actions previously falling under the breach of judicial oath are now covered by the notion of a significant disciplinary offence, which, under the legislation in force, is a ground for dismissal. <p>Pending appeal before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.</p>	
		<p><i>SEREDNYA Nataliya Grygorivna</i> 57154/13</p>	<p>Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 16/10/2012 and Resolution of the Parliament of 23/05/2012 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 28/03/2018 and 12/03/2019 respectively.</p>	<p>The HCJ by its decision of 14/01/2020 decided not to dismiss the applicant, with the following argumentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the applicability of the statutory period is to be decided after the question of whether a judge is proved to have committed a disciplinary offence is decided; - the initial decision of the 'former HCJ' of 2012 was based on the fact that in a certain criminal case judge Serednya issued a sentence which was too lenient (it was further quashed on appeal), acting without diligence and in violation of the legislation; this undermined the authority of the judiciary as it was media covered; her actions raises doubts as to her objectivity and impartiality, thus, there was a breach of oath; - the HCJ has now reconsidered these findings and concluded that 	<p>Reinstated as of 18/09/2019 by the order of the head of a local court.</p>

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
				<p>the applicant had acted in accordance with her interpretation of the facts of the case and the applicable legislation, her decisions, even if wrong and further quashed on appeal, were well-reasoned;</p> <p>- under the European standards, a judge cannot be brought to liability for the exercise of the judicial functions, except for deliberate offences; the personal guilt of a judge in each case should be proved and not mere quashing of the judgment on appeal.</p>	
		<p><i>KOVZEL Petro Olegovich</i> 35336/11</p>	<p>Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 07/06/2010 and Decree of the President of Ukraine of 18/06/2010 quashed by the Supreme Court of Ukraine on 11/09/2017.</p>		<p>Reinstated as of 18/06/2010 by the decision of the Supreme Court of Ukraine of 11/09/2017.</p>
		<p><i>KORZACHENKO Volodymyr Mykolayovich</i> 4588/11</p>	<p>Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 07/06/2010 and Decree of the President of Ukraine of 06/07/2010 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 29/03/2018.</p>	<p>SC [GC] by its judgment of 29/03/2018 transferred the applicant's proceedings to the HCJ for reconsideration of the grounds for disciplinary responsibility.</p> <p>Dismissed from the post of judge by the decision of the HCJ of 18/06/2020 with the following argumentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the HCJ agrees with the findings of the 'former HCJ' of 2010; - the acts committed by the judge Korzachenko which were 	<p>1) Not reinstated.</p> <p>2) Dismissed by the HCJ on 18/06/2020.</p>

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
				<p>classified as a breach of oath, can be recognised under the legislation in force as a significant disciplinary offence, grave or systemic negligence in the judge's duties incompatible with the judicial status or office which, according to the legislation in force, is a ground for dismissal;</p> <p>- prevailing public interest still requires that a person who has committed violations of such graveness do not serve as a judge.</p> <p>The HCJ did not mention the statutory period issue.</p> <p>Pending appeal before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.</p>	
		<p><i>BARANENKO Igor Ivanovych</i></p> <p>78241/11</p>	<p>Resolution of the Parliament of 21/04/2011 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 19/02/2018.</p>	<p>The HCJ by its decision of 16/04/2019 decided not to dismiss the applicant.</p>	<p>Reinstated.</p> <p>From 5/03/2020 - on retirement.</p>
		<p><i>BONDARENKO Igor Anatoliyovych</i></p> <p>5678/12</p>	<p>Resolution of the Parliament of 23/12/2010 quashed by the Higher Administrative Court of Ukraine on 13/11/2017.</p>	<p>Dismissed from the post of judge by the decision of the HCJ of 23/06/2020 with the following argumentation:</p> <p>- while the decision of the Parliament to dismiss judge Bondarenko was quashed, the 'former HCJ's' dismissal motion of 2010 remains valid;</p> <p>- the HCJ agrees with the findings of the 'former HCJ' of 2010 and with the conclusions that judge Bondarenko acted in breach of</p>	<p>1) Reinstated as of 04/05/2018 by the Order of the head of the court.</p> <p>2) Dismissed by the HCJ on 23/06/2020.</p>

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
				<p>oath and should thus be dismissed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it was the 'former HCJ' in 2010 who established the facts in evidence of the breach of oath by the judge and brought him to disciplinary liability. Thus, the statutory period is not applicable to the ensuing procedure, the HCJ is implementing the previously made disciplinary liability decision acting within the framework of the personnel management procedure; - actions previously falling under the breach of oath are now covered by the notion of a significant disciplinary offence, grave or systemic negligence in the judge's duties incompatible with the judicial status or office, which, under the legislation in force, is a ground for dismissal. <p>Pending appeal before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.</p>	
		<p><i>VOLVENKO Aleksandr Ivanovich</i> 65207/12</p>	<p>Resolution of the Parliament of 12/04/2012 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 06/03/2018</p>	<p>Dismissed from the post of judge by the decision of the HCJ of 14/07/2020 with the following argumentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the 'former HCJ's' decision of 2012, which established the facts leading to the dismissal motion, remains valid and is not subject to review by the HCJ; - the HCJ analysed the motion for dismissal and established that 	<p>1) Not reinstated.</p> <p>2) Dismissed by the HCJ on 14/07/2020</p>

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
				<p>actions that have previously been classified as breach of oath, constitute, under the legislation in force, a significant disciplinary offence, grave or systemic negligence in the judge's duties incompatible with the judicial status or office, which leads to the judge's dismissal;</p> <p>- the statutory period is not applicable, as the HCJ is not bringing judge Volvenko to disciplinary liability but simply implementing the previously made decision, based on the previously lodged motion.</p> <p>Pending appeal before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.</p>	
		<p><i>KONYAKIN Sergiy Mykhaylovych</i></p> <p>12812/11</p>	<p>Resolution of the Parliament of 03/06/2010 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 03/04/2018</p>	<p>Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC by its decision of 3/04/2018 transferred the applicant's proceedings to the HCJ for reconsideration of the grounds for disciplinary responsibility.</p> <p>Dismissed from the post of judge by the decision of the HCJ of 16/06/2020 with the following argumentation:</p> <p>- the facts established by the 'former HCJ' in 2009 are confirmed, the decision that established the facts remains valid;</p> <p>- while previously the acts of judge Konyakin were classified as a</p>	<p>1) Not reinstated (no vacant position of a judge)</p> <p>2) Dismissed by the HCJ on 16/06/2020</p>

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
				<p>breach of oath, they should now be classified as a significant disciplinary offence, grave or systemic negligence in the judge's duties incompatible with the judicial status or office, which is also punishable by dismissal;</p> <p>- the 'former HCJ's' decision to lodge before the Parliament a dismissal motion was taken upon a consideration of proposals made by the 'former HCJ' members following an examination they had undertaken on their own motion, and not within a framework of disciplinary proceedings. Thus, the statutory period is not applicable.</p> <p>Pending appeal before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.</p>	
		<p><i>NEMYNUSHCHIY Gennadiy Leonidovych</i></p> <p>15073/13</p>	<p>Resolution of the Parliament of 05/07/2012 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 01/02/2018</p>	<p>Dismissed from the post of judge by the decision of the HCJ of 14/03/2019 with the following argumentation:</p> <p>- the 'former HCJ's' decision of 2012, which established the facts leading to the dismissal motion, remains valid and is not subject to review by the HCJ;</p> <p>- the 'former HCJ' has rightly classified the acts of judge Nemyrushchyi as breach of oath, moreover, these findings were confirmed on appeal by the Higher Administrative Court; the HCJ cannot re-assess the facts</p>	<p>Dismissed by the HCJ on 14/03/2019</p> <p>The SC [GC] upheld the decision</p>

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
				<p>assessed by a valid court's decision;</p> <p>- the judge's actions constitute, under the legislation in force, a significant disciplinary offence, grave or systemic negligence in the judge's duties incompatible with the judicial status or office, which leads to the judge's dismissal;</p> <p>The HCJ did not address the question of the statutory period.</p> <p>The HCJ's decision was quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 28/11/2019; on 14/05/2020 the Grand Chamber of the SC quashed the decision of the Administrative Court of Cassation, thus upholding the HCJ's decision.</p>	
		<p><i>SHKINDER Oleksandr Anatoliyovych</i></p> <p>65207/12</p>	<p>Resolution of the Parliament of 12/04/2012 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 13/02/2018.</p>	<p>Decision of the HCJ on the applicant's dismissal of 17/01/2019 (argumentation: the 'former HCJ's' decision remains valid and cannot be reviewed by the HCJ; his actions that were classified as a breach of oath are to be classified, under the legislation in force, as a significant disciplinary offence, grave or systemic negligence in the judge's duties incompatible with the judicial status or office, which leads to the judge's dismissal) was quashed by the</p>	<p>1) Reinstated as of 1/11/2018 by the decision of the president of a local court, which was further quashed by the court of appeal on 18/12/2018.</p> <p>2) Dismissed by the HCJ on 17/01/2019. Decision upheld by the SC [GC].</p>

No.	Main case title (Application No.) Date of final judgment	The applicant (Application No.)	Domestic decision in the reopened proceedings on the applicant's dismissal for the breach of oath	Subsequent re-examination of the applicant's case	Decision on reinstatement
		<p data-bbox="555 746 904 842"><i>STREBKOV Yuriy Oleksiyovych</i> 242/13</p>	<p data-bbox="943 746 1308 858">Resolution of the Parliament of 12/04/2012 quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 19/03/2018.</p>	<p data-bbox="1339 331 1697 737">Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 18/12/2019, with the following argumentation: - the HCJ considered the case with a violation as it had not duly received the case file of the 'former HCJ' from the Parliament; - the HCJ failed to address the issue of statutory period. On 25/06/2020 the Grand Chamber of the SC quashed the decision of the Administrative Court of Cassation, thus upholding the HCJ's decision.</p> <p data-bbox="1339 746 1697 1024">Dismissed from the post of judge by the decision of the HCJ of 08/07/2020, for a significant disciplinary offence, grave or systemic negligence in the judge's duties incompatible with the judicial status or office. Pending appeal before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.</p>	<p data-bbox="1736 746 2042 865">1) Not reinstated. 2) Dismissed by the HCJ on 08/07/2020.</p>
3.	<p data-bbox="280 1040 443 1104">Denisov (no. 76639/11)</p> <p data-bbox="280 1145 407 1168">25/09/2018</p>	<p data-bbox="555 1040 904 1136">DENISOV Anatoliy Oleksiyovych 76639/11</p>	<p data-bbox="943 1040 1308 1200">Decisions of the 'former HCJ' of 14/06/2011 on the dismissal of the applicant from the position of the head of the court quashed by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 13/06/2019.</p>		<p data-bbox="1736 1040 1886 1066">Retired judge.</p>

II. Dismissal of judges by the Parliament on 29 September 2016 (transitional period)², as examined within the general measures

No.	Name of the judge	Proceedings on quashing of the Resolution of the Parliament of 29/09/2016 on judges' dismissal for "breach of oath"	Subsequent proceedings before the HCJ
1.	Bartashchuk Liudmyla Viktorivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 12/12/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	
2.	Bets Oleksandr Vadymovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 11/11/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	Pending before the HCJ.
3.	Volkova Svitlana Yakivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 03/10/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	Reinstated by the order of the Pechersky District Court of Kyiv on 11 November 2019.
4.	Hamanko Oleksandr Ivanovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on judge's dismissal left in force. The SC [GC] by its final decision of 05/02/2019 found no violation of the internal procedures by the Parliament.	-
5.	Demydovska Alla Ihorivna	Pending examination.	
6.	Domaratska Alla Viktorivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 07/06/2017 by the Higher Administrative Court of Ukraine.	Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 16/08/2018 with the following argumentation: - the decision of the Parliament to dismiss judge Domaratska was quashed, but the 'former HCJ's' decision of 2015 on the breach of oath remains in force; - a judge with regard to whom a motion on dismissal for breach of oath had been lodged with the Parliament prior to the entry into force of the constitutional amendments, shall be dismissed for the significant disciplinary offence, grave or systemic negligence, incompatible with the judicial status or office. The HCJ's decision was challenged to the SC , it was upheld by the Grand Chamber on 12/03/2020 with the following argumentation: - the GC agrees that the 'former HCJ's' decision remains in force; - the HCJ has not brought the applicant to liability for the second time, as

² In accordance with the procedure in force before 30 September 2016, Verkhovna Rada was competent to dismiss a judge appointed for life

No.	Name of the judge	Proceedings on quashing of the Resolution of the Parliament of 29/09/2016 on judges' dismissal for "breach of oath"	Subsequent proceedings before the HCJ
			she had been brought to liability by the 'former HCJ's' decision of 2015. The HCJ was simply implementing this decision. Thus, the HCJ's dismissal decision is not a disciplinary liability decision but a personnel management one, the statutory period is not applicable.
7.	Yefimova Olha Ivanivna	Pending examination.	
8.	Koval Svitlana Mykolaivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 23/10/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	
9.	Levchenko Anatolii Volodymyrovych	Pending examination.	
10.	Lysenko Volodymyr Vasylyovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 14/11/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	Pending before the HCJ.
11.	Makukha Andrii Anatoliiiovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 02/10/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	
12.	Martsynkevych Vitalii Anatoliiiovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 20/02/2020 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	
13.	Merkulova Tetiana Volodymyrivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 10/05/2018 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 11/07/2019.
14.	Myroshnychenko Stanislav Volodymyrovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 07/05/2018 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 27/06/2019. The HCJ's decision was challenged to the SC but to no avail.
15.	Poida Serhii Mykolaiovych	Decision of the 'former HCJ' of 17/12/2015 quashed on 24/06/2020 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC. Proceedings with regard to the resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal are pending.	
16.	Pryndyuk Mariia Vasyliivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 18/11/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	
17.	Proshutia Iryna Dmytrivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 20/11/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	

No.	Name of the judge	Proceedings on quashing of the Resolution of the Parliament of 29/09/2016 on judges' dismissal for "breach of oath"	Subsequent proceedings before the HCJ
18.	Reva Serhii Viktorovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 11/05/2018 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC	Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 05/02/2019. Appeal proceedings are pending before the SC[GC].
19.	Riepina Lidiia Oleksandrivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on judge's dismissal left in force. The SC [GC] by its final decision of 19/03/2019 found that the Verkhovna Rada used all possible means to inform the judge about the parliamentary dismissal proceedings in order to guarantee her obligatory participation, but to no avail as the judge hadn't showed up for work for more than two years and obtained a citizenship of other state.	
20.	Siromashenko Nataliia Volodymyrivna	Decision of the 'former HCJ' of 14/01/2016 and the resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 12/12/2019 by the Grand Chamber of the SC and on 16/03/2020 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC respectively.	Pending before the HCJ.
21.	Stepanenko Viktor Viktorovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 19/02/2018 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 03/09/2019. Appeal proceedings are pending before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.
22.	Tataurova Iryna Mykolaivna	Decision of the 'former HCJ' of 18/11/2015 and the resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed by the Higher Administrative Court of Ukraine on 13/09/2017 and by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC on 13/07/2020 respectively.	
23.	Tatkov Viktor Ivanovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 30/11/2018 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 03/09/2019. Appeal proceedings are pending before the SC[GC].
24.	Khomenko Valentyna Hryhorivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 26/06/2017 by the Higher Administrative Court of Ukraine.	Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 18/07/2019.
25.	Tsybra Nelia Valentynivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 19/02/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 28/11/2019 with the following argumentation: - the 'former HCJ's' dismissal motion of 2015 remains valid;

No.	Name of the judge	Proceedings on quashing of the Resolution of the Parliament of 29/09/2016 on judges' dismissal for "breach of oath"	Subsequent proceedings before the HCJ
			<p>- a judge with regard to whom a motion on dismissal for breach of oath had been lodged with the Parliament prior to the entry into force of the constitutional amendments, shall be dismissed for the significant disciplinary offence, grave or systemic negligence, incompatible with the judicial status or office.</p> <p>Appeal proceedings are pending before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.</p>
26.	Chala Alla Petrivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 27/03/2017 by the Higher Administrative Court of Ukraine.	<p>Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 09/07/2019.</p> <p>Appeal proceedings are pending before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.</p>
27.	Chornobuk Valerii Ivanovych	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 28/11/2018 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	<p>Dismissed by the decision of the HCJ of 19/09/2019.</p> <p>Appeal proceedings are pending before the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.</p>
28.	Shvets Valerii Anatoliiovych	The Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada has not been challenged.	-
29.	Kalinichenko Olena Borysivna	Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada on dismissal quashed on 22/04/2019 by the Administrative Court of Cassation of the SC.	Pending before the HCJ.