

Strasbourg, 28 February 2026

PIL (2026) 1

CASE LAW OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS RELATED TO GENERAL INTERNATIONAL LAW

**prepared by the
Public International Law Division
Directorate of Legal Advice and Public International Law (DLAPIL)**

This document contains press releases of relevant cases
of the European Court of Human Rights related to public international law.

The full texts of the Court's judgments are accessible on its website
(<http://www.hudoc.echr.coe.int>).

CASES FROM 1 SEPTEMBER 2025 TO 28 FEBRUARY 2026

CASE LAW OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS RELATED TO PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW

CASES FROM 1 SEPTEMBER 2025 TO 28 FEBRUARY 2026

M.P. and Others v. Greece, no. 2068/24, Chamber judgment of 9 September 2025 (Article 8, right to respect for private and family life – violation)

The application was lodged by three Greek and United States nationals: a mother (M.P., who was born in 1981) and her two children (E.A.A., born in 2018, and I.R.A., born in 2016). Currently, M.P. lives in Rhodes (Greece) and the two children live in the United States of America. The case concerns the children's return to their father in the United States by order of the Greek courts in the context of international child abduction proceedings. Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention, the applicants submit that their allegation of a grave risk to the children if returned to the United States was not examined in an effective manner by the Greek courts. They further complain that the two children were not heard by the Greek courts in the domestic proceedings.

Sahiti v. Belgium, no. 24421/20, Chamber judgment of 9 October 2025 (Article 3, prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment – no violation; Article 8, right to respect for private and family life – violation)

The applicant, Sabit Sahiti, is a Kosovar national who was born in 1985 and lives in Verviers (Belgium). The case mainly concerns the lack of a final decision by the relevant authorities regarding the application for a residence permit on medical grounds lodged by the applicant in Belgium in 2010. Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), the applicant alleges that his expulsion to Kosovo would give rise to a risk of inhuman and degrading treatment on account of his state of health. Relying on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention, the applicant further complains that he is the victim of a "procedural ping-pong match" between the Aliens Office and the Aliens Appeals Board. Lastly, he submits that he has been waiting for the outcome of the proceedings at issue since 2012 (when his application was first rejected). During most of that time, he asserts, he has been without either a residence permit or social and medical assistance, and has had to bring numerous actions before the employment tribunals.

Storimans-Verhulst and Others v. Russia, no. 26302/10, Chamber judgment of 7 October 2025 (Article 2, right to life/investigation – violation; Article 14, prohibition of discrimination – no violation)

The applicants, Maria Storimans-Verhulst, Tim Storimans, Amber Storimans, Jeroen Akkermans and Tsadok Yecheskeli are four Dutch nationals and an Israeli national, who were born respectively in 1956, 2000, 1998, 1963, and 1956. The first three, a mother and her children, live in Goirle, the Netherlands; Mr Akkermans lives in Berlin; and Mr Yecheskeli lives in Ra'anana, Israel. The case relates to an international armed conflict that occurred between Georgia and the Russian Federation in August 2008, as described in the Court's judgment in the inter-State case of *Georgia v. Russia (II)*. In particular, it concerns the death of Stanislaus Storimans, a photojournalist covering the events - the husband and father of the first three applicants -, and the injury of his colleagues, the other two applicants, on 12 August 2008. All three were carrying out their professional duties in covering the armed conflict. Relying on Articles 2 (right to life/investigation), 13 (right to an effective remedy), and 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the applicants complain of Mr Storimans' death and the injuries inflicted on Mr Akkermans and Mr Yecheskeli, of a lack of effective remedies in respect of their complaints, and of discrimination in the exercise of their rights under the Convention.

B.F. v. Greece, no. 59816/13, Chamber judgment of 14 October 2025 (Article 3, prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment – violation; Article 5 §§ 1 and 4, right to liberty and security – no violation; Article 13, right to effective remedy – violation)

The applicant, Mr B.F., is an Iranian national who was born in 1980. Mr B.F. entered Greece in August 2012. He was arrested immediately on arrival, subsequently released, then arrested again in July 2013 and placed in administrative detention for his irregular status. He applied for asylum first on account of his sexual orientation and then his religious beliefs. He was ultimately released again in September 2013 and granted refugee status. The case concerns his complaints about the unlawfulness and conditions of his detention for just over two and half months in 2013 in Kolonos police station. Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr B.F. complains of overcrowding, lack of hygiene and poor food when he was detained in Kolonos police station, which he alleges was not suitable for prolonged detention. He also alleges under Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 (right to liberty and security) that his detention was arbitrary and that the proceedings for judicial review of the lawfulness of his detention pending the examination of his asylum request were inadequate.

F.M. and Others v. Greece, no. 17622/21, Chamber judgment of 14 October 2025 (Article 2, right to life/investigation – violation)

The case concerns the sinking of a boat which occurred, according to the applicants, on 16 March 2018 off the coast of the island of Agathonisi (Greece). The applicants are two Afghan and two Iraqi nationals. They all complain of the death of their relatives in that boat accident. Three of the applicants, who were on the boat and survived, submit that their lives were put in danger owing to the acts and/or omissions of the authorities, particularly the coastguards. All of the applicants also allege that the investigations into the accident in question were ineffective. They rely on Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention.

Georgia v. Russia (IV), no. 39611/18, Chamber judgment of 14 October 2025 (Article 41, just satisfaction)

The parties in this case are two States, Georgia and Russia. The case concerns the just satisfaction to be awarded following the European Court's ruling of 9 April 2024 with regard to the human-rights toll caused by the hardening of boundary lines after the 2008 conflict between the two States. In particular the armed conflict had led to a process, which started in 2009 and is known as "borderisation", blocking people from crossing the administrative boundary lines freely between Georgian-controlled territory and the Russian-backed breakaway Georgian regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. In the 2024 judgment the Court found multiple violations of the Convention by Russia, including excessive use of force, ill-treatment, unlawful restrictions on access to homes, land and families, denial of the right to education in Georgian and unlawful restrictions on day-to-day movement across the administrative boundary line. As the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) of the Convention was not ready for decision, the Court reserved it. It will rule on this question in its judgment of 14 October 2025.

Basyuk and Others v. Ukraine, no. 55156/19 and ten other applications, Chamber judgment of 16 October 2025 (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, protection of property – no violation)

The applicants are 11 Ukrainian nationals, former employees of the State enterprise "Donetsk Railways" (later – of "Ukrzaliznytsya"). As of May 2014, the government of Ukraine lost control over the Donetsk and Luhansk regions where the applicants were employed (see the 2022 decision in *Ukraine and the Netherlands v. Russia*). The applicants were ultimately dismissed from their jobs in 2017. Civil proceedings instituted by them seeking, among other things,

unpaid wages and compensation for their untimely payment were in part unsuccessful. The key issue before the courts was related to the fact that the labour law, as it stood at the time, did not provide any specific rules in the event an employer was unable to ensure timely payment of wages and arrears on account of objective impediments, such as military activity. The applicants' claims for compensation were eventually dismissed on the grounds of *force majeure*. Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicants complain about the refusal of the courts to grant their claims for salary and various dismissal-related payments, in particular on the grounds of *force majeure*, and that the courts relied on improper evidence to confirm *force majeure*.

M.S.L., TOV v. Ukraine, no. 18049/18, Chamber judgment of 16 October 2025 (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, protection of property – no violation; Article 13, right to an effective remedy – violation)

The applicant, M.S.L., TOV, is a limited liability company based in Ukraine. It is a major operator of State lotteries in Ukraine. Since 2014 Ukraine has faced unprecedented threats to its national security and territorial integrity. Notably, in the spring of 2014 Russia's armed forces occupied and assumed effective control over Crimea (see judgment *Ukraine v. Russia* (re Crimea) of 2024), and in parallel a conflict began in eastern Ukraine with the arrival in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions of pro-Russian armed groups (see *Ukraine and the Netherlands v. Russia* of 2025). Against this background, the *Verkhovna Rada* (Parliament) adopted the Sanctions Act which was specifically designed to address urgent security needs. The case concerns the economic sanctions imposed on the applicant company between 2015 and 2018 under this legislation and its unsuccessful attempts to challenge them. Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), the applicant company complains that the sanctions, in particular the freezing of its assets, were unlawful and disproportionate, and that the decisions to impose them lacked proper judicial review. In particular, it complains that the grounds for imposing the sanctions, alleged money laundering, tax evasion, illegal gambling and affiliation with the Russian Federation, were speculative and never established in any judicial proceedings. It also relies on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) to complain that the proceedings in two of the sets of administrative proceedings in its case were too long and that there was no effective remedy at national level to complain about the breach of its property rights.

Abdulaal Naser and Others v. Denmark, no. 46571/22, Chamber judgment of 21 October 2025 (Article 3, prohibition of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment – inadmissible; Article 6, right to a fair trial – no violation)

The case of *Abdulaal Naser and Others v. Denmark* (application no. 46571/22) concerned a military search and arrest operation on 25 November 2004 in Az Zubayr, outside Basra (Iraq). Danish Military forces had participated in the operation at the request of the Iraqi authorities. Investigations in Denmark into subsequent allegations of ill-treatment by Danish soldiers in connection with that operation were discontinued on the basis that no criminal offence had been committed. Civil proceedings for compensation instituted by the applicants, 21 Iraqi nationals, were ultimately unsuccessful, the Supreme Court finding that Denmark had no jurisdiction in respect of their complaints. The Chamber judgment in the case, the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that the applicants' complaints under Article 3 (prohibition of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment) were inadmissible because the applicants had not been within Denmark's jurisdiction. The Court also found that there had been no violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights. The applicants had been given access to a court at two levels of jurisdiction and those proceedings had been fair.

Greenpeace Nordic and Others v. Norway, no. 34068/21, Chamber judgment of 28 October 2025 (Article 8, right to respect for private and family life – no violation; Article

13, right to an effective remedy – inadmissible; Article 14, prohibition of discrimination – inadmissible)

The case concerned the procedural aspect of the obligation to effectively protect individuals from the serious adverse effects of climate change on their life, health, well-being and quality of life in the context of petroleum exploration preceding extraction. On 10 June 2016 the Norwegian Ministry of Petroleum and Energy awarded ten exploration licences to 13 private companies for petroleum gas production. A judicial review requested by the applicant organisations, Greenpeace Nordic and Young Friends of the Earth Norway, of the validity of that decision was unsuccessful. In today's Chamber judgment in the case, the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been no violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights in respect of the complaints introduced by the applicant organisations. The Court held, in particular, that when making a decision in the context of the environment and climate change, the State had to carry out an adequate, timely and comprehensive environmental impact assessment in good faith, and based on the best available science. While the processes leading to the 2016 decision had not been fully comprehensive and, in particular, the assessment of the activity's climate impacts had been deferred, there was no indication that deferring such an assessment had been inherently insufficient to support the State's guarantees of respect for private and family life within the meaning of the Convention. The Court also found the complaints introduced by the individual applicants under Article 8 and by all the applicants under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 8 were inadmissible.

Manukyan v. Armenia, no. 5778/17, Chamber judgment of 13 November 2025 (Article 8, right to private and family life – violation; Article 13, right to an effective remedy – no violation)

The applicant, Hrayr Manukyan, is an Armenian national who was born in 1987 and lives in Amsterdam (the Netherlands). In 2014 the applicant, who was a newly elected member of the standing governing body of an opposition party at the time, was approached by an agent of the National Security Service of Armenia and asked to cooperate with that service. In June 2014 the applicant met the agent in a café and secretly recorded their conversation. During the meeting the applicant refused to cooperate. The agent claimed to know things about the applicant and made a series of statements concerning the potential consequences of his refusal to cooperate. In July 2014 the applicant submitted a crime report to the Prosecutor General along with the audio recording of the conversation. No criminal proceedings were brought against the agent and appeals by the applicant against decisions in that connection were ultimately unsuccessful. The applicant was granted asylum in the Netherlands in April 2016. Relying on Article 8 (right to private and family life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention on Human Rights the applicant alleges that his personal information had been collected by the security services and complains of an unjustified interference with his private and family life and of a lack of an effective investigation in that regard.

Stanev and the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee v. Bulgaria, no. 50756/17, Chamber judgment of 18 November 2025 (Article 6, right to a fair hearing – inadmissible; Article 10, freedom of speech – violation)

The applicants are Kaloyan Georgiev Stanev, a Bulgarian national who was born in 1987 and lives in Sofia, and a non-governmental organisation, the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee, which is based in Sofia as well. The case concerns the denial of access to information of public interest held by the public prosecutor's office and alleged breaches of due process guarantees. Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that the authorities denied them access to information

they were seeking from the Chief Public Prosecutor's Office in order to ascertain whether criminal investigations had been opened following press reports of migrant deaths in Bulgaria. Relying on Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention, the applicants submit that the involvement of a member of the public prosecutor's office at the Supreme Administrative Court in their proceedings against the Chief Public Prosecutor's Office was in breach of the principle of equality of arms.

Renouard v. France, no. 46911/21, Chamber judgment of 27 November 2025 (Article 6 § 1, right of access to a court – no violation)

The applicant, Pascal Renouard, is a French national who was born in 1961 and lives in Paris. The case concerns the application of State immunity from jurisdiction in the context of a dispute between Mr Renouard and the United Arab Emirates concerning the payment of the fees due in remuneration for his role as intermediary in the project to create the Sorbonne Abu Dhabi University. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a court) of the Convention, Mr Renouard complains about the application of State immunity to the United Arab Emirates in the context of his dispute with authorities of that State.

Fernandez Iradi v. France, no. 23421/21, Chamber judgment of 4 December 2025 (Article 3, prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment – violation)

The applicant, Juan Fernandez Iradi, is a Spanish national who was born in 1971 and is currently detained in San Sebastián, Spain. He was initially placed in detention in France in December 2003. Between 2008 and 2009 the Special Assize Court of the Paris Court of Appeal sentenced him to three prison terms of 30, 15 and 30 years and to a permanent exclusion from France, for terrorist acts. In 2012 his sentences were reduced to the statutory maximum of 30 years' imprisonment and the minimum term was limited to 20 years. The case concerns whether, under Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) of the Convention, the continued detention of the applicant, who has multiple sclerosis, is compatible with his state of health. Relying on Article 3, the applicant complains about the arrangements for his escorted leave and hospital consultations, and more specifically those for his first medical consultation at Toulouse University Hospital in October 2012. He further complains about his continued detention despite his state of health.

Khaghaghutyan Yerkkhosutyun v. Armenia, no. 5497/17, Chamber judgment of 4 December 2025 (Article 10, freedom of expression – violation)

The applicant is an Armenian non-governmental organisation, Khaghaghutyan Yerkkhosutyun («*հաղադիման երկխոսություն*» հասարակական կազմակերպություն; which translates as "Peace Dialogue"). The applicant NGO was founded in 2009. It was set up to support the peaceful resolution of conflicts in the South Caucasus and to help victims. The case concerns the authorities' refusal to provide the applicant NGO with information concerning non-combat deaths in the Armenian armed forces between 1994 and 2014. It had made a request for such information in 2014 in the context of a project it was running called "Safe soldier for a safe Armenia". The project involved an online database with information about fatalities and crimes in the armed forces. Faced with refusals to respond to its request, the applicant NGO brought claims in the administrative courts, which were ultimately dismissed with the courts refusing to allow the applicant NGO access to the information sought on grounds of national security. Relying on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant NGO complains about the refusal to allow it access to information on non-combat deaths, an issue of great concern to the public.

Fliegenschnee and Others v. Austria, no. 40054/23, Fourth Section decision of 11 December 2025 (Article 8, right to respect for private and family life – inadmissible; Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, protection of property – inadmissible)

In its decision in the case of *Fliegenschnee and Others v. Austria* (application no. 40054/23) the European Court of Human Rights has, unanimously, declared the application inadmissible. The decision is final. The case concerned the Austrian Federal Minister for Economic and Digital Affairs' refusal to ban the sale of fossil fuels to mitigate the impact of climate change as she was not competent in that regard. The Court found that the three individual applicants who had brought the case had not provided evidence to show that they had been personally affected by climate change, either because of their age or health issues or owing to crop shortfalls caused by drought. They could not therefore claim to be victims of a violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) or Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights and those complaints were inadmissible. As concerned the remaining applicant, *Umweltschutzorganisation Global 2000*, the Court considered that it was not necessary to decide whether it had standing to bring its complaints under Article 8 of the European Convention because they were inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded. In particular Article 8 did not guarantee the right to a specific measure, namely a ban on the sale of fossil fuels under the Austrian Trade Act. The Court noted the general principles for complaints under the Convention concerning climate change set out in the 2024 Grand Chamber judgment *Verein KlimaSeniorinnen Schweiz and Others v. Switzerland*.

***Z and Others v. Finland*, no. 42758/23, Chamber judgment of 16 December 2025 (Article 3, prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment – inadmissible; Article 8, right to respect for private and family life – no violation)**

The applicants, Mr Z and his two minor sons, X and Y, are Russian nationals who were born in 1983, 2011 and 2013 respectively. In September 2022 Mr Z took X and Y from Russia to Finland without their mother's consent. The case concerns the Finnish courts' decision to order the return of X and Y, who have been granted asylum in Finland, to Russia under the Hague Child Abduction Convention. Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicants complain that the Supreme Court's order for the return of the children was in breach of their right to respect for their family life. They also complain under Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) that, if returned to Russia, X and Y would be subjected to ill-treatment.

***Gondert v. Germany*, no. 34701/21, Fourth Section judgment of 16 December 2025 (Article 6(1), right to a fair hearing – violation)**

***De Simone v. Germany*, no. 21853/23, Fourth Section decision of 2 December 2025 (Article 6(1), right to a fair hearing – inadmissible)**

The cases of *Gondert v. Germany* (application no. 34701/21) and *De Simone v. Germany* (application no. 21853/23) concerned sets of proceedings in which the national courts did not make a referral to the Court of Justice of the European Union ("the CJEU") for a preliminary ruling. The European Court of Human Rights found in both cases that where a party to proceedings had explicitly requested a referral to the CJEU for a preliminary ruling and it had been refused by a domestic court against whose decisions there was no further right of appeal, that court was required to give reasons for the refusal. It therefore held, unanimously, in today's Chamber judgment in Mr Gondert's case that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention on Human Rights. The national courts had not given reasons for the refusal to refer questions to the CJEU for a preliminary ruling, despite Mr Gondert's precise request and detailed submissions in that regard. Mr De Simone, on the other hand, had not made an explicit request for a referral to the CJEU, and in its decision in his case the Court, unanimously, declared the application inadmissible. The decision is final.

[Anti-Corruption Foundation \(FBK\) and Others v. Russia](#), no. 13505/20 and 138 others, Chamber judgment of 16 December 2025 (Article 8, right to respect for private and family, life, the home and correspondence – violation; Article 10, freedom of expression – violation; Article 11, freedom of association – violation; Article 18, limitation on use of restrictions on right – violation; Article 1 Protocol No. 1, protection of property – violation)

The case covers 139 applications brought by organisations affiliated with Aleksey Navalnyy, his own family members, his associates and, in some cases, their families. Aleksey Navalnyy was a political activist and opposition leader in Russia; he died on 16 February 2024 while serving a 19-year sentence in a high-security penal colony in the Russian Arctic. The applicant organisations include the Anti-Corruption Foundation (“FBK”), the Foundation for the Protection of Civil Rights (“Shtab”), the Navalnyy Headquarters network, the Foundation for the Defence of Civil Rights (“the FZPG”) and OOO “Strana Prilivov”. They formed an integrated structure that underpinned Mr Navalnyy’s campaign against corruption and his advocacy of democratic reform in Russia. The case concerns various measures taken against the applicant organisations and individuals, which they allege were to suppress their political activities and persecute them for their fight against corruption. Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and correspondence), Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), the applicants complain about mass searches of their offices and homes, the seizure and retention of money, personal belongings and documents during the searches and the freezing of their bank accounts. Also relying on Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of association), FBK, Shtab, the FZPG and the Navalnyy Headquarters complain about restrictions on their rights after being designated as a “foreign agent” and/or as “extremist” organisations under legislation enacted in Russia in 2002 and subsequently amended. They further complain that their designation as “extremist” had led to their disbandment and to the inability of some of the individual applicants to stand for election, in breach of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections). Lastly, the applicants argue that the measures formed part of an abusive pattern which aimed to obstruct their work, intimidate them and their supporters and eliminate political opposition centred around Aleksey Navalnyy, in breach of Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights).

[Navalnyy v. Russia \(no. 4\)](#), nos. 4743/21 and 37083/21, Chamber judgment of 3 February 2026 (Article 2, right to life – violation; Article 5 § 1, right to liberty and security – violation; Article 3, prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment – violation)

The case *Navalnyy v. Russia (no. 4)* (applications nos. 4743/21 and 37083/21) concerned Aleksey Navalnyy’s arrest and detention in January 2021 when he returned to Russia following his alleged poisoning in August 2020 and medical treatment abroad, followed by proceedings which culminated in the activation of a suspended prison sentence previously imposed on him in 2014 and his subsequent imprisonment on the basis of that sentence. In today’s Chamber judgment¹ the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been: a violation of Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention on Human Rights; violations of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) on account of Mr Navalnyy’s detention pending the outcome of the proceedings concerning the activation of his suspended sentence and of his subsequent imprisonment from 2 February 2021 onwards once the suspended sentence had been activated; and a violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) on account of the overall conditions of his detention. The Court found that Mr Navalnyy’s 2014 conviction had been based on an unforeseeable application of Russian criminal law and had been the result of proceedings that amounted to a “flagrant denial of justice” (it relied in this connection on the findings made in the judgment of 17 October 2017); therefore his imprisonment after 2 February 2021 had not been “lawful”. Moreover, his detention during the proceedings had been based on legal provisions that were not applicable to his situation, which the Court found to be contrary to the principles of foreseeability and legal certainty. In addition, despite the near-fatal poisoning of Mr Navalnyy in August 2020, the national courts,

when ordering his detention and imprisonment, had made no attempt to consider the fears he expressed for his health and life, and had done nothing to undertake any kind of risk-assessment or consider preventive options, including non-custodial or enhanced protective arrangements. The authorities had also completely disregarded the Court's judgment in respect of his 2014 conviction, had failed to take into account the interim measure indicated by the Court and a decision and resolutions of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers urging for his release. Moreover, Mr Navalnyy had been simultaneously subjected to a combination of several forms of ill-treatment during his detention which, taken together, reflected a pattern of disregard for his health, well-being and dignity, and amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment.

O.H. and Others v. Serbia, no. 57185/17, Chamber judgment of 3 February 2026 (Article 4 of Protocol 4, prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens – violation; Article 3, prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment – violation; Article 5 § 1, right to liberty and security – violation; Article 5 § 2 – no violation; Article 5 § 4 – violation; Article 13, right to an effective remedy – inadmissible)

The applicants are 17 Afghan nationals who were born between 1962 and 2015. The case concerns the removal of the applicants to Bulgaria after they had expressed their intention of seeking asylum in Serbia. At approximately 12.15 a.m. on 3 February 2017, the Serbian authorities arrested the applicants on suspicion of having crossed the border illegally and placed them in detention. At 10.30 p.m. that day, misdemeanour proceedings against the applicants were discontinued and the police subsequently transported them to the Bulgarian border and forced them to cross. Relying on Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens), the applicants allege that the Serbian authorities had compelled them to leave the country without having conducted an individual assessment of their personal circumstances. They also make complaints under Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 5 (right to liberty and security) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).

Koffi v. Bulgaria, no. 95/24, Chamber judgment of 17 February 2026 (Article 3, prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment – no violation; Article 3 (investigation) – violation; Article 14, prohibition of discrimination – violation)

The applicant, Leon François d'Assises Koffi, is a British national who was born in 1970 and lives in Sheffield. On 29 September 2018 teams from the two biggest football clubs in Bulgaria played a match at the National Stadium in Sofia. The case concerns an assault on Mr Koffi which occurred following the end of the football match when fans were leaving the stadium, and which he alleges was prompted by racist motives. Relying, in particular, on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention, the applicant complains, firstly, that the authorities had failed to put in place adequate regulations and operational measures with a view to preventing the assault on him and, secondly, that the authorities had not effectively investigated the assault.

Đaković v. Serbia, no. 30749/22, Chamber judgment of 17 February 2026 (Article 2, right to life (investigation) – violation)

The applicant, Vilko Đaković, is a Croatian national who was born in 1957 and lives in Lovas, Croatia. On 10 October 1991, in the context of war that followed the dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Yugoslav People's Army, together with a certain number of locally recruited "territorial defence" forces, local police and volunteer forces, shelled and subsequently captured the Croatian village of Lovas. The case concerns the death of Mr Đaković's father, who was shot and killed during the assault. Relying on Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention the applicant complains that the Serbian authorities have failed to carry out an effective investigation into the killing of his father.

V.N. and Others v. Sweden, no. 42101/23, Chamber judgment of 19 February 2026 (Rule 39 – lifted; Article 8, right to private and family life – no violation)

The applicants are a family of four Azerbaijani nationals: Mr V.N., his wife, now deceased, and their daughter and son. They were born in 1973, 1975, 2006 and 1999, respectively. The family arrived in Sweden in May 2013 and requested asylum, which was refused. The case concerns the authorities' subsequent refusal to grant Mr V.N. a residence permit because they considered him a threat to public order and security. Several deportation orders were also issued against him, which have never been enforced. His deportation to Azerbaijan was stayed by the European Court in December 2023 under Rule 39 (interim measures) of its Rules of Court. Mr V.N.'s wife and children were, on the other hand, granted temporary residence permits in December 2021, after the mother was diagnosed with cervical cancer. She died in June 2024. Mr V.N. and his two children all apparently still live in Sweden. Relying on Article 8 (right to private and family life), the applicant family complain about the migration authorities' decisions in 2023 refusing to grant Mr V.N. a residence permit or to suspend his deportation, while his wife was seriously ill. The Court held that there had been no violation of Article 8 of the Convention in respect of the first, second and third applicants and decided to lift the interim measure indicated under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court. It declared the application inadmissible in respect of the fourth applicant.