



Ukraine

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1997

National Judge: Ganna Yudkivska

[Judges' CVs](#) are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judge: Volodymyr Butkevych (1996-2008)

The Court dealt with 5,792 applications concerning Ukraine in 2015, of which 5,711 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 51 judgments (concerning 81 applications), 50 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2014	2015	2016*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	14179	6007	5335
Communicated to the Government	737	8829	1210
Applications decided:	13805	5792	1782
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	12549	4494	1293
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	167	1212	452
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	16	5	6
- Decided by judgment	1073	81	31
Interim measures:	141	123	25
- Granted	115	64	11
- Refused (including out of scope)	26	59	14

* January to July 2016

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the [ECHR internet site](#).

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2016	
Total pending applications	18447
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	17354
Single Judge	250
Committee (3 Judges)	11634
Chamber (7 Judges)	5465
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	5

*including applications for which completed application forms have not yet been received

Ukraine and ...

Its contribution to the Court's budget

For 2016 the Court's budget amounts to approximately 71 million euros. That budget is financed by contributions from the 47 member States of the Council of Europe in accordance with scales based on population and GDP; the 2016 contribution of Ukraine to the Council of Europe's (EUR 326 million) budget is **EUR 4,404,881**.

The Registry

The task of the Registry is to provide legal and administrative support to the Court in the exercise of its judicial functions. It is composed of lawyers, administrative and technical staff and translators. There are currently **679** Registry staff members of whom **42** are Ukrainian.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

[Bochan v. Ukraine \(No. 2\)](#)

05.02.2015

The case concerned the proceedings relating to Ms Bochan's "appeal in the light of exceptional circumstances" based on the European Court of Human Rights' judgment in her previous case about the unfairness of property proceedings ([judgment](#) of 3 May 2007).

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 \(right to a fair hearing\)](#)

Chamber

Right to life cases (Article 2)

[Yuriy Illarionovich Shchokin v. Ukraine](#)

03.10.2013

The case concerned the death of a prisoner, the applicant's son, following acts of torture inflicted on him by inmates, with the possible involvement of a prison officer, during his imprisonment in a penal colony.

[Violation of Article 2 on account of the death of Mr Shchokin's son during his imprisonment](#)

[Violation of Article 2 as regards the investigation into the circumstances leading to the death of Mr Shchokin's son, as it had been conducted by the authorities without the requisite diligence](#)

[Violation of Article 3 \(prohibition of torture\) on account of the torture to which Mr Shchokin's son had been subjected](#)

[Violation of Article 3 \(lack of effective investigation\) on account of the insufficiency of the State's investigation into those acts of torture](#)

[Mosendz v. Ukraine](#)

17.01.2013

The case concerned the death of the applicant's son (D.M.), while he was on guard duty, during his mandatory military service.

[Two violations of Article 2](#)

[Violation of Article 13 \(right to an effective remedy\)](#)

The Court held that the authorities had not effectively investigated and duly accounted for D.M.'s death, and that they had not adequately protected his life. The Court, having noted widespread concern over the existence of hazing (*didivshchyna*¹) in the Ukrainian army, found in particular that limiting the responsibility for D.M.'s death to wrongdoings of individual officers instead of allocating responsibility to upper hierarchical authority levels was especially worrying.

[Kats and Others v. Ukraine](#)

18.12.2008

[Death resulting from lack of medical treatment in pre-trial detention](#)

[Violation of Article 2](#)

[Gongadze v Ukraine](#)

08.11.2005

[Failure to protect a journalist's life and ineffective investigation into his disappearance and death](#)

[Violation of Article 2](#)

Cases dealing with inhuman and/or degrading treatment or punishment (Article 3)

[Korneykova and Korneykov v. Ukraine](#)

24.03.2016

The case concerned a pregnant detainee, who alleged that she had been shackled in the maternity hospital where she had given birth and that she and her newborn son had subsequently been held in very poor conditions in a pre-trial detention centre, without adequate medical care.

[Four violations of Article 3 \(prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment\)](#)

[Lutsenko v. Ukraine \(no. 2\)](#)

11.06.2015

Second application of Mr Lursenko before the Court, which concerned several complaints about the conditions of the pre-trial detention of the former Minister of the Interior, Yuriy Lutsenko, from December 2010 to April 2012 and his treatment during court hearings.

¹ "Didivshchyna", which literally means "grandfatherism", is the name given to the informal system of fresh conscripts being brutalised by more senior soldiers in the military forces of certain former Soviet Republics, in particular, Russia and Ukraine.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) on account of the conditions of Mr Lutsenko's detention from 28 December 2010 to 28 April 2011

Violations of Article 3 on account of the conditions of Mr Lutsenko's detention on days of court hearings and on account of his placement in a metal cage during the trial

No violation of Article 3 on account of the conditions of his detention from 28 April to 10 May 2011, from 23 May 2011 to 6 April 2012 and on 20 April 2012

No violation of Article 3 on account of the medical treatment which Mr Lutsenko received in detention

Lutsenko v. Ukraine

03.07.2012

First application of Mr Lutsenko before the Court (see cases under article 5 of the Convention).

Salakhov and Islyamova v. Ukraine

14.03.2013

The case concerned the lack of appropriate medical care given to a detainee, who died from AIDS two weeks after he was released from detention.

Three violations of Article 3 on account of the inadequate medical care provided to Mr Salakhov both in the detention facilities and in hospital, and on account of his handcuffing in hospital

Two violations of Article 2 (right to life; failure to conduct an adequate investigation)

Kaverzin v. Ukraine

15.05.2012

Serving a life sentence for murder, Mr Kaverzin complained that he had sustained an eye injury when tortured in police custody and then went blind due to inadequate medical care in his subsequent detention.

Four violations of Article 3

No violation of Article 3 as concerned the alleged lack of medical care in detention between September 2001 to December 2008

Under Article 46 (binding force and implementation of judgments) the Court noted that Mr Kaverzin's ill-treatment in police custody reflected a recurring problem in Ukraine. In about 40 of its judgments, the Court had already found that the

Ukrainian authorities had been responsible for ill-treatment of people held in police custody and that no effective investigation had been carried out into their allegations. Currently there are more than 100 other such cases pending. The Court therefore stressed that Ukraine had to urgently put in place specific reforms in its legal system to ensure that the practice of ill-treatment in police custody was eradicated.

Davydov and Others v. Ukraine

01.07.2010

Ill-treatment of prisoners following brutal training exercises by special forces from the State Department for the Enforcement of Sentences.

Four violations of Article 3

Yakovenko v. Ukraine

25.10.2007

Conditions of detention and medical assistance provided to HIV infected person.

Three violations of Article 3

Kucheruk v. Ukraine

06.09.2007

Lack of adequate medical assistance in detention; excessive use of force; handcuffing when in solitary confinement; lack of an effective investigation into the applicant's complaints of ill-treatment

No possibility under Ukrainian law to bring proceedings challenging the lawfulness of compulsory detention in a psychiatric hospital.

Four violations of Article 3

Violations of Article 5 § 4 (right to liberty and security)

Koval v. Ukraine

19.10.2006

Poor conditions of detention and inadequate medical assistance

Violation of Article 3

Dvoynykh v. Ukraine

12.10.2006

Poor conditions of detention

Violation of Article 3

Melnik v. Ukraine

28.03.2006

Overcrowded cells, no adequate medical care and no satisfactory conditions of hygiene and sanitation. No effective domestic remedy to complain about conditions of detention.

Violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Afanasyev v. Ukraine

05.04.2005

Lack of effective investigation into allegations of torture during police custody
Violation of Article 3

Nevmerzhitsky v. Ukraine

05.04.2005

Forced feeding classified as torture
Violation of Article 3
Violation of Articles 3 and 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Poltoratskiy v. Ukraine

29.04.2003

Conditions of detention on death-row
Violation of Article 3

Right to liberty and security cases
(Article 5)

Ms Tymoshenko's first application before the Court, **Tymoshenko v. Ukraine**, concerned complaints related to her detention.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 30 April 2013, the Court held in particular: that Ms Tymoshenko's pre-trial detention had been arbitrary; that the lawfulness of her detention had not been properly reviewed; and, that she had had no possibility to seek compensation for her unlawful deprivation of liberty, in violation of Article 5 (right to liberty and security) of the Convention.

The Court also found that, in breach of Article 18 of the Convention (limitation on use of restrictions on rights), her right to liberty had been restricted for reasons other than those permitted under Article 5.

[Ukrainian version press release](#)

The second application, **Tymoshenko v. Ukraine (no. 2)**, concerned the fairness of the criminal proceedings.

Ms Tymoshenko raised several complaints under Article 6 (right to a fair trial), Article 7 (no punishment without law) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy). She also complained, under Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights), that the criminal case against her had been politically motivated and constituted an abuse of the criminal system of justice.

Furthermore, the case raised a number of issues under Articles 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 10 (freedom of expression) taken in conjunction with Article 18 of the Convention and under Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice).

[On 16 December 2014, the Court decided to strike the application out of its list of cases pursuant to Article 39 \(friendly settlements\) of the Convention.](#)

Lutsenko v. Ukraine

03.07.2012

The case concerned the complaint by a well-known opposition politician that his arrest and the decision on his detention were arbitrary and unlawful, and that he was not informed about the reasons for his arrest.

Two violations of Article 5 § 1

Violation of Article 5 § 2 (right to be informed of the reasons for one's arrest)

Two violations of Article 5 § 3 (right to be brought promptly before a judge)

Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to challenge the lawfulness of one's detention)

Violation of Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) in conjunction with Article 5

Molotchko v. Ukraine

26.04.2012

The applicant is a German national born in Belarus. On business in Ukraine in February 2010, he was arrested on the basis of an arrest warrant issued against him in Belarus where he stood accused of organised crime, abuse of power, smuggling and bribery. He was released in May 2011 and left for Germany a few months later. He alleged that, if extradited to Belarus (where he was born), he would be at real risk of torture or inhuman and degrading treatment. He also complained about the unlawfulness, lack of judicial review and conditions of his detention pending extradition.

[Article 3: application struck out from the list of cases in so far as this complaint is concerned](#)

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (f) - as regards Mr Molotchko's detention from 23 February to 23 June 2010 and from 29 July 2010 to 19 May 2011

No violation of Article 5 § 1 (f) - as regards his detention from 23 June to 29 July 2010
Violation of Article 5 § 4 - as regards his detention from 23 February 2010 to 19 May 2011

Ichin and Others v. Ukraine

21.12.2010

Detention of minors in the context of criminal proceedings

Violation of Article 5 § 1

The case concerned the unlawful detention of two minors who stole food and appliances from a school cafeteria.

Soldatenko v. Ukraine

23.10.2008

Lack of legal provisions governing the procedure for detention in Ukraine pending extradition

Violations of Article 5 §§ 1 (f) and 4 (right to liberty and security)

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

The Court further holds that applicant's extradition to Turkmenistan would be in violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment).

Gorshkov v. Ukraine

08.11.2005

No possibility under Ukrainian law to bring proceedings challenging the lawfulness of compulsory detention in a psychiatric hospital.

Violations of Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court)

Salov v. Ukraine

06.09.2005

Applicant not brought promptly before a judge to have his arrest reviewed

Violation of Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security)

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Cases dealing with Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Karpyuk and Others v. Ukraine

06.10.2015

Concerned the trial against seven opposition activists following their

participation in mass protests in Kyiv in March 2001.

Violation of Article 6 in respect of two of the applicants on account of the non-attendance of a number of witnesses during the trial

No violation of Article 6 as regards one applicant's removal from the courtroom and as regards the appointment of a legal aid lawyer for one of the applicants

Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association) in respect of three of the applicants who were involved in organising the protests

No violation of Article 11 in respect of the remaining applicants

Svetlana Naumenko v. Ukraine

09.11.2004

Civil proceedings

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Tregubenko v. Ukraine

02.11.2004

Supervisory (or extraordinary) review proceedings not subject to any time-limit following a final judgment breached the principle of legal certainty and the applicant's right to access to a court.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Right to a fair trial within a reasonable time

Agrokompleks v. Ukraine

06.10.2011

The case concerned the insolvency proceedings initiated by a private company (Agrokompleks) against the biggest oil refinery in Ukraine (LyNOS), in an attempt to recover its outstanding debts. Agrokompleks complained, among other things, about the unfairness of the insolvency proceedings, alleging that the courts were not independent or impartial, given the intense political pressure surrounding the case as the State authorities had a strong interest in its outcome.

Three violations of Article 6 § 1: courts deciding the case lacked independence; reopening of finally settled court decision on amount owed by LyNOS breached legal certainty; and proceedings lasted too long; Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

Cases dealing with private and family life (Article 8)

Putistin v. Ukraine

21.11.2013

The case concerned an article written about the legendary "Death Match" between Ukrainian footballers and members of the German Luftwaffe in 1942 in Kyiv. The applicant alleged that the article discredited his father, who had played in the game, as it suggested that he had been a collaborator. He claimed that, by rejecting his requests for the article to be rectified, the Ukrainian courts had failed to protect his and his family's reputation.

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

Garnaga v. Ukraine

16.05.2013

The case concerned the Ukrainian authorities' refusal to allow the applicant to change her patronymic – the middle name derived from the father's forename.

Violation of Article 8

Oleksandr Volkov v. Ukraine

09.01.2013

The case concerned the dismissal of a Supreme Court Judge.

Four violations of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Violation of Article 8

Under Articles 41 (just satisfaction) and 46 (binding force and execution of judgments), the Court, in view of the serious systemic problems concerning the functioning of the Ukrainian judiciary disclosed in Mr Volkov's case, recommended Ukraine to urgently reform its system of judicial discipline. It further held that, given the very exceptional circumstances of the case, Ukraine was to reinstate Mr Volkov in the post of Supreme Court judge at the earliest possible date.

Trosin v. Ukraine

23.02.2012

The case concerned a detainee's complaint about the restrictions imposed on his family visits and about the prison authorities monitoring his correspondence with the European Court of Human Rights.

Violation of Article 8

The Court further held that Ukraine had failed to comply with its obligations under Article 34 (right of individual petition).

Dubetska and Others v. Ukraine

10.02.2011

Prolonged exposure of the applicants to environmental pollution from a State-owned coal mine and coal-processing factory

Violation of Article 8

Saviny v. Ukraine

18.12.2008

Placement of children in public care

Violation of Article 8

Volokhy v. Ukraine

02.11.2006

Secret surveillance of correspondence: Ukrainian law not compatible with the Convention as no clear scope and conditions for it and no sufficient safeguards against abuse of that surveillance system

Violation of Article 8

Freedom of expression and information
(Article 10)

Shvydka v. Ukraine

30.10.2014

The case concerned the detention for ten days of a member of a Ukrainian opposition party for tearing a ribbon from a wreath which had been laid by the then President of Ukraine, V. Yanukovich, during a ceremony.

Violation of Article 10

Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 7 (right of appeal in criminal matters)

Editorial Board of Pravoye Delo and Shtekel v. Ukraine

05.05.2011

The case mainly concerned the lack of adequate safeguards in Ukrainian law for journalists' use of information obtained from the Internet.

Two violations of Article 10

Ukrainian Media Group v. Ukraine

29.03.2005

Media fined for statements found to be defamatory.

Violation of Article 10

Freedom of assembly and association
(Article 11)

[Vyerentsov v. Ukraine](#)

11.04.2013

The case concerned a human rights activist who complained in particular that he had been sentenced to three days of administrative detention for holding a demonstration without permission, even though such permission was not required by domestic law.

[Violation of Article 11](#)

[Violation of Article 7 \(no punishment without law\)](#)

[Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 \(right to a fair trial\)](#)

The Court considered that the case disclosed a structural problem, namely a legislative lacuna concerning freedom of assembly which has remained in Ukraine since the end of the Soviet Union.

[Koretsky and Others v. Ukraine](#)

03.04.2008

Registration of associations: domestic legislation allowed an unfettered discretion to the executive and did not meet the Convention standard of clarity and foreseeability.

[Violation of Article 11](#)

First pilot judgment concerning non-execution of final domestic court decisions

[Yuriy Nikolayevich Ivanov v. Ukraine](#)²

15.10.2009

Under Article 46, the Court noted that the case concerned two recurring problems which lay behind the most frequent violations of the Convention found by the Court since 2004 in over 300 cases in respect of Ukraine - the prolonged non-enforcement of final domestic decisions and the lack of an effective domestic remedy to deal with it. In view of the approximately 1400 applications against Ukraine currently pending before the Court and concerning the same questions, the Court concluded that an incompatible with the Convention practice existed in Ukraine and held unanimously that Ukraine had to:

² This recurring problem concerns more than half of the almost 3,500 cases in respect of Ukraine pending before a Committee or a Chamber.

In January 2011, the Government was given a six-month extension of the time fixed in the pilot judgment to settle the pending cases and to adopt the necessary general measures at the national level so as to avoid new similar violations.

- introduce in its legal system, within one year from the date on which the judgment becomes final, an effective remedy which secured adequate and sufficient redress for non-enforcement of domestic judgments;

- grant such redress, within one year from the date on which the judgment becomes final, to all applicants in such cases who had applied to the Court before the delivery of the present judgment, and whose applications had been communicated to the Ukrainian authorities.

In the event that no redress was granted, the Court would resume its examination of all similar pending applications with a view to adopting a judgment on them. Pending the adoption of the above measures, the Court adjourned, for one year from the date on which the judgment becomes final, the proceedings in all new Ukrainian cases concerning solely the non-enforcement or delayed enforcement of domestic judgments.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 \(right to a fair trial\)](#)

[Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

[Violation of Article 13 \(right to an effective remedy\)](#)

On 21 February 2012, the Court examined the state of the implementation of the above-mentioned pilot judgment, noted that Ukraine has not adopted the required general measures to tackle the issues of non-enforcement at the domestic level, and - in accordance with the pilot judgment (§ 100) - decided to resume the examination of applications raising similar issues.

[Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered](#)

[Ruban v. Ukraine](#)

12.07.2016

The case concerned entitlement to a more favourable sentence due to a gap in legislation. Mr Ruban – serving a life sentence for aggravated murder – alleged that, had he been sentenced during the three-month gap between the time when the death penalty had been abolished in Ukraine and life imprisonment had not yet been introduced, the courts would have had

no choice but to sentence him to a maximum of 15 years' imprisonment.

[No violation of Article 7 \(no punishment without law\)](#)

[Naydyon v. Ukraine](#)

14.10.2010

No possibility for the applicant, a prisoner without a lawyer, to obtain copies of the documents from his domestic case-files necessary for his application before the European Court of Human Rights.

[Violation of Article 34 \(right of individual petition\)](#)

[Svyato-Mykhaylivska Parafiya v. Ukraine](#)

14.06.2007

Registration of religious associations: lack of coherence and foreseeability of domestic legislation and no safeguards against arbitrariness.

[Violation of Article 9 \(freedom of thought, conscience and religion\)](#)

[Gurepka v. Ukraine](#)

06.09.2005

No right to appeal in an administrative arrest case because the available extraordinary review proceedings could only be initiated by a prosecutor or the president of the higher court.

[Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 7 \(right of appeal in criminal matters\)](#)

[Melnychenko v. Ukraine](#)

19.10.2004

Arbitrary denial of registration as a parliamentary candidate

[Violation of Article 3 of Protocol No 1 \(right to free elections\)](#)

[Merit v. Ukraine](#)

30.03.2004

Delayed enforcement of judgments against the State or State-controlled entities.

[Violations of Article 13 \(right to an effective remedy\)](#)

[Sovtransavto Holding v. Ukraine](#)

25.07.2002

Failure of the authorities to secure the effective enjoyment of the applicant company's right to property

[Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

Noteworthy pending cases

Grand Chamber

Burmych and Others v. Ukraine (nos. 46852/13, 47786/13, 54125/13, 56605/13, and 3653/14)

The case concerns the non-enforcement of domestic judgments in Ukraine.

In their applications to the Court, the applicants complain about the non-enforcement of these domestic judgments in their favour. The applicants rely on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

[The chamber relinquished jurisdiction in favor of the Grand Chamber on 8 December 2015](#)

Chamber

Inter-State applications concerning the events in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine

There are currently three inter-State applications lodged by Ukraine against Russia pending before the Court. **Ukraine v. Russia (no. 20958/14)**, lodged on 13 March 2014, concerns the events leading up to and following the assumption of control by the Russian Federation over the Crimean peninsula from March 2014 and subsequent developments in Eastern Ukraine up to the beginning of September 2014. **Ukraine v. Russia (II) (no. 43800/14)**, lodged on 13 June 2014, concerns the alleged abduction of three groups of children in Eastern Ukraine and their temporary transfer to Russia on three occasions between June and August 2014.

A further inter-State application was lodged by the Government of Ukraine on 27 August 2015: **Ukraine v. Russia (IV) (application no. 42410/15)** concerns the events in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine mainly as from September 2014. [See press release](#)

Another inter-State application, **Ukraine v. Russia (III) (no. 49537/14)**, was struck out of the Court's list of cases in September 2015, after the Government of Ukraine had informed the Court that they did not wish to pursue the application, given that an individual application (no. 49522/14) concerning the same subject matter was pending before the Court. The case

concerned the deprivation of liberty and the alleged ill-treatment of a Ukrainian national belonging to the Crimean Tatars ethnic group, in the context of criminal proceedings conducted against him by the Russian authorities.

In addition to three inter-State applications, approximately **3,000 individual cases** related to the events in Crimea or the hostilities in Eastern Ukraine are currently pending before the Court.

One individual application, **Savchenko v. Russia (no. 50171/14)**, has been lodged by a servicewoman of the Ukrainian Air Force who was captured in June 2014 by armed formations operating near Luhansk in Eastern Ukraine and subsequently detained by the Russian authorities on suspicion of murder and illegal crossing of the Russian border.

Three individual applications, **Lisnyy and Others v. Ukraine and Russia** (nos. 5355/15, 44913/15 and 50853/15), essentially concerning three Ukrainian nationals' complaints about the shelling of their homes during the hostilities in Eastern Ukraine from the beginning of April 2014 onwards, were declared inadmissible in July 2016. [See press release](#)

Cases concerning protests in Kyiv in 2013 and 2014

[Derevyanko v. Ukraine \(no. 7684/14\)](#)

Communicated to the Ukrainian Government in February 2014

Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 11 (freedom of assembly and association) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention.

Press release in [Ukrainian](#)

[Sirenko v. Ukraine \(no. 9078/14\)](#)

Communicated to the Ukrainian Government in January 2014

Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 5 (right to

liberty and security), Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

Press release in [Ukrainian](#)

Cases involving alleged persecutions of political figures by the authorities

[Ivashchenko v. Ukraine \(n° 41303/11\)](#)

Communicated to the Ukrainian Government on 15.04.2012

[Korniychuk v. Ukraine \(no 10042/11\)](#)

Communicated to the Ukrainian Government on 29.06.2011

[Mararenko v. Ukraine \(n° 622/11\)](#)

Communicated to the Ukrainian Government on 07.06.2011

Other communicated cases

[Mushynskyy v. Ukraine \(no. 3547/06\)](#)

Communicated to the Ukrainian Government in November 2009 and March 2010

Limitations on family visits during post-conviction detention.

Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 34 (right of individual petition) of the Convention.

[Industrial Financial Consortium Investment Metallurgical Union v. Ukraine \(no. 10640/05\)](#)

Communicated to the Ukrainian Government in December 2008

The case concerns allegations of a violation of the principle of legal certainty on the grounds that the same matter involving the same parties has been dealt with by the courts of general jurisdiction and the commercial courts in the course of two "parallel" judicial procedures.

Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention.

**ECHR Press Unit Contact:
+33 (0)3 90 21 42 08**