



France

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1974

National Judge: André Potocki

[Judges' CVs](#) are available on the Court's website

Previous Judges: René Samuel Cassin (1959-1976), Pierre-Henri Teitgen (1976-1980), Louis-Edmond Pettiti (1980-1998), Jean-Paul Costa (1998-2011)

The Court dealt with 1,188 applications concerning France in 2015, of which 1,156 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 27 judgments (concerning 32 applications), 17 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2013	2014	2015
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	1536	1142	1088
Communicated to the Government	75	89	103
Applications decided:	2426	1297	1188
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	2254	1196	1061
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	109	49	74
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	28	28	21
- Decided by judgment	35	24	32
Interim measures:	115	107	178
- Granted	21	22	35
- Refused (including out of scope)	94	85	143

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

Applications pending before the court on 01/01/2016	
Total pending Applications*	1050
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	382
Single Judge	88
Committee (3 Judges)	18
Chamber (7 Judges)	276
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

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

France 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 France to the Council of Europe's budget (326 million Euros) is **37,597,652 Euros**.

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 **139** are French.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Right to life case (Article 2)

[Lambert and Others v. France](#)

05.06.2015

The applicants are the parents, a half-brother and a sister of Vincent Lambert who sustained a head injury in a road-traffic accident in 2008 as a result of which he is tetraplegic. They complained in particular about the judgment delivered on 24 June 2014 by the French *Conseil d'État* which, relying on, among other things, a medical report drawn up by a panel of three doctors, declared lawful the decision taken on 11 January 2014, by the doctor treating Vincent Lambert, to discontinue his artificial nutrition and hydration. The applicants submitted in particular that withdrawing his artificial hydration and nutrition would be contrary to the State's obligations under Article 2 (right to life) of the Convention.

[No violation of Article 2 \(right to life\) in the event of implementation of the *Conseil d'État* judgment of 24 June 2014.](#)

[Vo v. France](#) (no. 53924/00)

08.07.2004

During a medical examination performed on a pregnant woman by mistake (because she had the same surname as another patient), her amniotic sac was accidentally pierced, entailing a therapeutic abortion. The authorities refused to classify the killing of the foetus as involuntary manslaughter.

[No violation of Article 2](#)

Cases concerning prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment and torture (Article 3)

[Ramirez Sanchez v. France](#)

04.07.2006

Prolonged solitary confinement of the terrorist "Carlos" sentenced to life imprisonment.

[No violation of Article 3](#)

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

[Selmouni v. France](#)

28.07.1999

Torture (physical and mental) of a person in police custody in 1991.

[Violation of Articles 3 \(prohibition of torture\) and 6 § 1 \(right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time\)](#)

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

[Couderc and Hachette Filipacchi Associés v. France](#)

10.11.2015

The case concerned a court ruling against the weekly magazine *Paris Match* for having published information about Prince Albert of Monaco's private life.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

[Morice v. France](#)

23.04.2015

Concerned the conviction of a lawyer, on account of remarks reported in the press, for complicity in defamation of the investigating judges who had been removed from the judicial investigation into the death of Judge Bernard Borrel.

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

[Violation of Article 10](#)

[Lindon, Otchakovsky-Laurens and July v. France](#)

02.10.2007

Conviction for publications found to be defamatory.

[No violation of Article 10](#)

[Fressoz and Roire v. France](#)

21.01.1999

Conviction of the former publication director and a journalist of the weekly satirical newspaper *Le Canard enchaîné* following the publication in 1989 of copies of the tax assessments of the then chairman of Peugeot.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

Cases dealing with discrimination issues (Article 14)

Fabris v. France

07.02.2013¹

The applicant complained that he had been unable to benefit from a law introduced in 2001 (Law of 3 December 2001) granting children "born of adultery" identical inheritance rights to those of legitimate children.

Violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

E. B. v. France (no 43546/02)

22.01.2008

French authorities' refusal to approve an adoption because of the applicant's sexual orientation.

Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Cases dealing with protection of property (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Depalle v. France and Brosset-Triboulet and Others v. France

29.03.2009

Applicants' obligation, under the Coastal Areas Act, to leave their houses and return their properties to their original state, at their own expense and without prior compensation.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1
No need for a separate examination of Article 8 (right to respect for one's home).

Draon v. France and Maurice v. France

06.05.2005

Two children were born with severe congenital disabilities which, owing to medical errors, had not been discovered during prenatal examinations. The parents were unable to obtain compensation for the burdens arising from their children's disability on account of the immediate application of the "anti-Perruche Law", which had come into force while their actions were pending.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

No violation of Articles 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

S.A.S. v. France

01.07.2014

Concerned the complaint of a French national, who is a practising Muslim, that she is no longer allowed to wear the full-face veil in public following the entry into force, on 11 April 2011, of a law prohibiting the concealment of one's face in public places.

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

No violation of Article 9 (right to respect for freedom of thought, conscience and religion)

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) combined with Articles 8 or 9

De Souza Ribeiro v. France

13.12.2012

The case concerned the expulsion of a Brazilian national living in French Guiana (an overseas region and *département* of France) with no possibility for him to challenge the lawfulness of the removal measure before it was enforced.

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Sabel El Leil v. France

29.06.2011

An accountant, fired from an embassy in Paris, could not contest his dismissal.

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a court)

Medvedyev and Others v. France

29.03.2010

Interception on the high seas, then rerouting to France, by the French Navy, of a foreign vessel (used for drug trafficking) and its crew.

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)

No violation of Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security)

¹ As regards the same case, a [judgment](#) on the question of just satisfaction was delivered on 28 June 2013. At the same time, the Court decided to strike the remainder of the case out of its list of cases.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

Conditions of detention cases - Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Isenc v. France

04.02.2016

The case concerned the applicant's son's suicide 12 days after he was admitted to prison.

[Violation of Article 2](#)

Sellal v. France

08.10.2015

Suicide in detention of A.S., a prisoner suffering from schizophrenia.

[No violation of Article 2](#)

See also the case [Benmouna and Others v. France](#), declared inadmissible on 08.10.2015.

Helhal v. France

19.02.2015

Concerned the compatibility of a disabled prisoner's state of health with his continuing detention and the arrangements for his care in prison.

[Violation of Article 3](#)

Fakailo dit Safoka and Others v. France

02.10.2014

Concerned the conditions of detention of five French nationals held in police custody in the cells of the police headquarters in Nouméa (New Caledonia).

[Violation of Article 3](#)

Canali v. France

25.04.2013

The case dealt with the conditions of detention in the Charles III Prison in Nancy, which was built in 1857 and shut down in 2009 on account of its extremely dilapidated state.

[Violation of Article 3](#)

Ketreb v. France

19.07.2012

Concerned the suicide in prison, by hanging, of a drug addict convicted of armed assault.

[Violation of Article 2](#)

[Violation of Article 3](#)

G. v. France (no. 27244/09)

23.02.2012

The applicant, who suffers from a chronic schizophrenic-type psychiatric disorder, is currently being held in a Marseilles hospital. He was taken into custody and subsequently sentenced to ten years' imprisonment. He was ultimately found by the Bouches-du-Rhône Assize Court of Appeal to lack criminal responsibility.

[Violation of Article 3](#)

[No violation of Article 6 \(right to a fair trial\)](#)

Popov v. France

19.01.2012

Concerned the administrative detention of a family - baby and young child with their immigrant parents for two weeks - at the Rouen-Oissel in France centre pending their removal to Kazakhstan.

[Violation of Article 3 in respect of the children](#)

[No violation of Article 3 in respect of the parents.](#)

[Violation of Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 \(right to liberty and security\) in respect of the children](#)

[Violation of Article 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\) in respect of the whole family](#)

Cocaign v. France

03.11.2011

The case dealt with the placement of a prisoner with mental disorders in a punishment block and his continued detention.

[No violation of Article 3 on account of the applicant's confinement in a punishment cell, his continued detention and the medical treatment he received](#)

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

[Placement in a punishment block should be subject to appeal with suspensive effect.](#)

Plathey v. France

03.11.2011

Prisoner held in foul smelling cell in disciplinary wing, 23 hours a day for 28 days.

[Violation of Article 3](#)

Alboreo v. France

20.10.2011

The case concerned a high-security prisoner.

Violation of Article 3 concerning ill-treatment inflicted by the special intervention forces

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken together with Article 3 concerning the lack of an effective remedy against security transfer measures

El Shennawy v. France

20.01.2011

Repeated full body searches, recorded on video and conducted by law-enforcement officers wearing balaclavas.

Violation of Articles 3 and 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Payet v. France

20.01.2011

The conditions of detention of a "high-risk prisoner" were inhuman but his repeated transfers were justified.

Violation of Article 3 with regard to the applicant's conditions of detention in the punishment wing

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

No violation of Article 3 with regard to the applicant's transfers

Stasi v. France

20.10.2011

Case concerning measures taken by prison authorities following ill-treatment of an inmate.

No violation of Article 3: Prison authorities had taken all necessary measures to protect inmate

Raffray Taddei v. France

21.12.2010

Failure to provide adequate medical care for anorexic prisoner.

Violation of Articles 3

Khider v. France

09.07.2009

Detention conditions and security measures imposed on a prisoner.

Violation of Articles 3 and 13 (right to an effective remedy)

(see also the [decision](#) of 1 October 2013 in a case registered by the same applicant Khider v. France (no. 56054/12)

Renolde v. France

16.10.2008

Suicide, during pre-trial detention, of a prisoner who had serious mental problems and posing a suicide risk.

Violation of Articles 2 and 3

Frérot v. France

12.06.2007

Full body search of a prisoner with systematic inspection every time he received a visit, for two years.

Violation of Articles 3, 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing)

Expulsion of aliens (Article 3)

A.A. v. France (no. 18039/11) and A.F. v. France (no. 80086/13)

15.01.2015

Both cases dealt with proceedings to deport to Sudan two Sudanese nationals – A.A., from a non- Arab tribe in Darfur, and A.F., from South Darfur and of Tunjur ethnicity – who had arrived in France in 2010.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) if the applicants were deported to Sudan

Rafaa v. France

30.05.2013

The case concerned Mr Rafaa's extradition to Morocco following an international arrest warrant issued against him by the Moroccan authorities for acts of terrorism and the rejection in 2010 of his asylum request by the French authorities.

Violation of Article 3 (in the event of the applicant's expulsion to Morocco)

Interim measure (Rule 39 of the Rules of Court) – not to expel Mr Rafaa – still in force until judgment becomes final or until further order.

Mo.M v. France (no. 18372/10)

18.04.2013

A Chadian national complained that deporting him to his country of origin would expose him to the risk of ill-treatment by the police there to punish him for allegedly siding with the rebels in Darfur.

Violation of Article 3 if Mo.M., who had been denied asylum, were to be sent back to Chad.

I.M. v. France (no. 9152/09)

02.02.2012

Concerned the risks the applicant would face in the event of his deportation to Sudan and the effectiveness of the remedies available to him in France in view

of the fact that his asylum application was dealt with under the fast-track procedure.

[Violation of Article 13 \(right to an effective remedy\) taken together with Article 3 \(prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment\)](#)

The Court rejected the applicant's complaint under Article 3 because he no longer faced deportation to Sudan and was certain to be able to remain in France since he had been granted refugee status.

[H.R. v. France \(no. 64780/09\)](#)

22.09.2011

[The enforcement of the order for the applicant's removal to Algeria would amount to a violation of Article 3 \(prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment\).](#)

[Daoudi v. France](#)

03.12.2009

Risk faced by applicant, convicted in France for terrorist activities, in the event of his return to Algeria.

[Violation of Article 3 \(prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment\) if the deportation measure were to be executed](#)

Cases dealing with inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Violations of Article 3

[Ghedir and Others v. France](#)

16.07.2015

Concerned allegations of ill-treatment during an arrest carried out at a station by security officers of the SNCF (the French national railway company) and police officers.

[Darraj v. France](#)

04.11.2010

Disproportionate force used against youth during identity check at police station.

No violations of Article 3

[Bodein v. France](#)

13.11.2014

Life imprisonment

[Sultani v. France](#)

20.09.2007

Risks faced by an asylum-seeker in the event of his return to Afghanistan.

[V.T. v. France \(no. 37194/02\)](#)

11.09.2007

Applicant alleged that her treatment by the social-security contributions collection agency had forced her to continue in prostitution.

Police custody (Articles 5 and 6)

[Alouache v. France](#)

06.10.2015

Complaint regarding the circumstances in which the notice of appeal lodged by Mr Alouache, the applicant, against his placement in detention was drawn up and sent.

[No violation of Article 5 § 1 \(right to liberty and security\) or Article 5 § 4 \(right to a speedy decision on the lawfulness of detention\)](#)

[Francois v. France](#)

23.04.2015

The case concerned the placing of a lawyer in police custody after he had been assisting at the police station, in his professional capacity, a youth who was being held by the police.

[Violation of Article 5 § 1 \(right to liberty and safety\)](#)

[Ali Samatar and Others v. France](#)

[Hassan and Others v. France](#)

04.12.2014

These two cases dealt with nine Somali nationals, who, having hijacked French-registered vessels off the coast of Somalia were arrested and held by the French army, then transferred to France, where they were taken into police custody and prosecuted for acts of piracy.

[Violation of Article 5 § 1 \(right to liberty and security\) in the case of Hassan and Others, as the French system applicable at the relevant time had not sufficiently guaranteed the applicants' right to their liberty](#)

[Violation of Article 5 § 3 \(right to liberty and security\) in both cases, as the applicants had been taken into custody for 48 hours on their arrival in France instead of being brought "promptly" before a legal authority, when they had already been deprived of their liberty for four days and some twenty hours \(Ali Samatar and Others\) and six days and sixteen hours \(Hassan and Others\)](#)

Vassis and Others v. France

27.06.2013

The case concerned drug-trafficking suspects who were placed in police custody for 48 hours prior to their first appearance before a judicial authority, having already been detained on the high seas for 18 days without any supervision by a judge.

[Violation of Article 5 § 3 \(right to liberty and security\)](#)

Moulin c. France

23.11.2010

The applicant, remanded, has not been "brought promptly" before a "judge or other officer authorised by law to exercise judicial power".

[Violation of Article 5 § 3 \(right to liberty and security\)](#)

Brusco v. France

14.10.2010

Applicant was only allowed, in accordance with the Code of Criminal procedure, the assistance of a lawyer only 20 hours after he had been put in police custody. He had therefore not been informed, before he was questioned, of certain of his rights, such as to remain silent, not to incriminate himself or to have legal assistance when questioned.

[Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 \(right to remain silent and not to incriminate oneself\)](#)

Cases concerning Article 6

Right of access to court

Sfez v. France and Rivière v. France

25.07.2013

Both cases concerned a refusal by the judicial authorities to grant a request for the adjournment of a hearing.

[No violation of Article 6 § 3 \(c\) \(right to be assisted by a lawyer\) in the Sfez case](#)

[Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 \(c\) in the Rivière case](#)

Right to a fair hearing/trial

Vinci Construction and GMT genie civil and services v. France

02.04.2015

The case concerned inspections and seizures carried out by investigators from the Department for Competition, Consumer

Affairs and Fraud Prevention on the premises of two companies.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[Violation of Article 8 \(right to respect for private and family life, for the home and for correspondence\)](#)

Tchokontio Happi v. France

09.04.2015

The case concerned a failure to enforce a final judgment granting the applicant accommodation in the context of the law on the enforceable right to housing (known as the "DALO" Act). **This is the first time that the Court has dealt with an application against France concerning non-enforcement of a decision to grant housing.**

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

Bodein v. France

13.11.2014

The case concerned Mr Bodein's sentence to life imprisonment without any possibility of sentence reduction, and the issue of the reasons provided for Assize Court judgments.

[No violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[No violation of Article 3 \(prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment\)](#)

Agnelet v. France

Legillon v. France

10.01.2013

The applicants complained of a lack of reasoning in the assize court judgments by which they were convicted and sentenced to imprisonment.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 in the Agnelet case](#)
[No violation of Article 6 § 1 in the Legillon case](#)

Lagardère v. France

12.04.2012

The case concerned a court order for Arnaud Lagardère, the son of Jean-Luc Lagardère, the former chairman and managing director of Matra and Hachette, to pay damages on account of his father's criminal guilt, which was not established until after the father's death.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1, on account of the unfairness of proceedings where a civil action against the applicant's father was continued before the criminal court in spite of the father's death;](#)

[Violation of Article 6 § 2 \(presumption of innocence\)](#)

Poirot v. France

15.12.2011

Woman with disabilities who lodged a criminal complaint alleging sexual assault at a residential care home.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1: French courts displayed excessive procedural formalism in depriving the applicant of her right to appeal.](#)

Stojkovic v. France and Belgium

27.10.2011

The case concerned the right of a suspect to be assisted by a lawyer when first questioned by Belgian police officers acting under an international letter of request issued by a French judge, who was present at the interview.

[Application inadmissible in so far as it was lodged against Belgium and admissible in respect of France](#)

[Violation of Article 6 § 3 \(c\) \(right to legal assistance\) taken together with Article 6 § 1](#)

Messier v. France

30.06.2011

Proceedings following which a sanction has been imposed on Jean-Marie Messier by the Financial Market Authority.

[No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3](#)

André and Other v. France

24.07.2008

Searches and seizures in a law firm.

[Violation of Articles 6 § 1 and 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\)](#)

Ravon v. France

21.02.2008

No access to an effective remedy in order to challenge searches by the tax authorities.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

Cases dealing with Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Berland v. France

03.09.2015

The case concerned the security measures imposed under a Law of 25 February 2008 on Mr Berland, who had been found to lack criminal responsibility, in connection with a murder committed prior to the entry into force of the Law.

[No violation of Article 7](#)

Soros v. France

06.10.2011

The case concerned George Soros, who was convicted and sentenced by the French courts for insider trading in the 1990s.

[No violation of Article 7](#)

Cases dealing with private and family life (Article 8)

Violations of Article 8

Brunet v. France

18.09.2014

The case concerned a complaint about Mr Brunet's details being recorded in a crime database after the discontinuance of criminal proceedings against him.

Mugenzi v. France, Tanda- Muzinga v. France and Senigo Longue and Others v. France

10.07.2014

Difficulties encountered by applicants - who were either granted refugee status or lawfully residing in France - in obtaining visas for their children so that their families could be reunited.

See also application [Ly v. France](#), declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Winterstein and Others v. France

17.10.2013

The case concerned eviction proceedings brought against a number of traveller families who had been living in the same place for many years.

[The Court reserved in its entirety the question of the application of Article 41 \(just satisfaction\).](#)

M.K. v. France (no. 19522/09)

18.04.2013

A French national complained of the fact that his fingerprints had been retained on a database by the French authorities.

No violations of Article 8

Flamenbaum and Others v. France (nos. 3675/04 and 23264/04)

13.12.2012

The case concerned the extension of the main runway at Deauville Airport and the resulting disturbance affecting the properties of local residents.

[Michaud v. France](#)

06.12.2012

The case concerned the obligation on French lawyers to report their "suspicions" regarding possible money laundering activities by their clients.

[Mallah v. France](#)

01.11.2011

Applicant's criminal conviction with absolute discharge for facilitating the unauthorised residence of his son-in-law.

[B.B. v. France, Gardel v. France, M.B. v. France](#)

17.12.2009

Inclusion of applicants' names in national judicial sex-offenders database.

Cases dealing with children's rights (Article 8)

[Mandet v. France](#)

14.01.2016

The case concerned the quashing of the formal recognition of paternity made by the mother's husband at the request of the child's biological father.

[No violation of Article 8](#)

[Menesson v. France](#) [Labassee v. France](#)

26.06.2014

The cases concerned the refusal to grant legal recognition in France to parent-child relationships that had been legally established in the United States between children born as a result of surrogacy treatment and the couples who had had the treatment.

[No violation of Article 8 concerning the applicants' right to respect for their family life in both cases](#)

[Violation of Article 8 concerning the children's right to respect for their private life in both cases](#)

Cases dealing with parental rights (Article 8)

[No violations of Article 8](#)

[Henrioud v. France](#)

05.11.2015

Applicant's inability to secure the return of his children to Switzerland, who had been taken to France by their mother.

[Zambotto Perrin v. France](#)

26.09.2013

The case concerned a child born out of wedlock, anonymously at the mother's request.

[Harroudj v. France](#)

04.10.2012

The case concerned the refusal of permission for a French national to adopt an Algerian baby girl already in her care under the Islamic-law form of guardianship called "kafala"².

[Kearns v. France](#)

10.01.2008

Inability for a biological mother to secure the return of her child to whom she had given birth anonymously, as the statutory time-limit for such a request had passed.

[Mauousseau and Washington v. France](#)

06.12.2007

Young girl's return to her father in the USA, her place of habitual residence, pursuant to a French court's order, the mother having retained her daughter in France after a holiday there.

Adoption by same-sex couples cases (Articles 14 and 8)

[Gas and Dubois v. France](#)

15.03.2012

The applicants were two cohabiting women. The case concerned the refusal of the first applicant's request for simple adoption of the second applicant's child.

[No violation of Articles 14 \(prohibition of discrimination\) and 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\)](#)

[E.B. v. France \(no. 43546/02\)](#)

22.01.2008 (Grand Chamber)

(see p. 3)

[Fretté v. France](#)

26.02.2002

The applicant, a homosexual man, complained that the decision dismissing his request for authorisation to adopt a child

² Islamic law prohibits adoption, creating family relationships that are comparable or similar to those resulting from biological descent. However it allows for 'kafala' or 'legal fostership'. In Muslim States except for Turkey, Indonesia and Tunisia, 'kafala' is defined as the voluntary commitment to take charge of the upkeep, education and protection of a minor.

amounted to arbitrary interference with his private and family life because it was based exclusively on unfavourable prejudice about his sexual orientation. He further complained that he had not been summoned to the hearing on his case held by the *Conseil d'Etat*.

[No violation of Article 14 \(prohibition of discrimination\) in conjunction with Article 8 \(right to respect for private life\)](#)

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

Cases dealing with freedom of religion (Article 9)

[Ebrahimian v. France](#)

26.11.2015

The case concerned the decision not to renew the contract of employment of a hospital social worker because of her refusal to stop wearing the Muslim veil.

[No violation of Article 9](#)

[Association Les Témoins de Jéhovah v. France](#)

30.06.2011³

Gifts received by "Association of Jehovah's Witnesses" were taxed under a law that was too imprecise.

[Violation of Article 9](#)

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

[Violations of Article 10](#)

[de Carolis and France Televisions v. France](#)

21.01.2016

The case concerned an accusation of defamation brought by Saudi Prince Turki Al Faisal on account of a documentary on the France 3 television channel concerning complaints lodged by families of the victims of the 11 September 2001 attacks.

[Bono v. France](#)

15.12.2015

The case concerned a disciplinary sanction imposed on Mr Bono, as lawyer acting for a suspected terrorist, S.A., for remarks made in his pleadings before the Court of Appeal. He claimed that the French investigating judges had been complicit in the torture of S.A. by the Syrian secret services and thus

sought the exclusion of statements obtained through the use of torture.

[Eon v. France](#)

14.03.2013

The case concerned the applicant's conviction for insulting the President of France. During a visit by the President to the department of Mayenne, the applicant had waved a placard reading "Casse toi pov'con" ("Get lost, you sad prick"), a phrase uttered by the President himself several months previously.

[The Court held that criminal penalties for conduct such as that displayed by the applicant were likely to have a chilling effect on satirical contributions to discussion of matters of public interest, such discussion being fundamental to a democratic society.](#)

[Ressiot and Others v. France](#)

28.06.2012

The case concerned investigations carried out at the premises of *Equipe* and *Le Point* newspapers and at the homes of journalists accused of breaching the confidentiality of a judicial investigation.

[The Court found that the Government had not shown that a fair balance had been struck between the various interests involved.](#)

[Martin and Others v. France \(no. 30002/08\)](#)

12.04.2012

The case concerned a search of the premises of the *Midi Libre* daily newspaper ordered by an investigating judge to determine in what circumstances and conditions journalists had obtained a copy of a confidential draft report of the Regional Audit Office concerning the management of the Languedoc-Roussillon region.

[Mor v. France](#)

15.12.2011

The case concerned the conviction of a lawyer for a breach of professional confidence following an interview with the press on the subject of an expert report submitted to an investigating judge concerning deaths following vaccination against hepatitis B.

[Vellutini and Michel v. France](#)

06.10.2011

Conviction of the President and General Secretary of the municipal police officers'

³ In the same case, a [judgment](#) on the question of just satisfaction was delivered on 5 July 2012.

union (USPPM) for public defamation of a mayor, on the basis of statements made in their capacity as union officials.

[Dumas v. France](#)

15.07.2010

[Fleury v. France](#)

11.05.2010

[Haguenauer v. France](#)

22.04.2010

[Renaud v. France](#)

25.02.2010

[Orban and Others v. France](#)

15.01.2009

[Chalabi v. France](#)

18.09.2008

[July and SARL Libération v. France](#)

14.02.2008

[Mamère v. France](#)

07.11.2006

No violations of Article 10

[Société de Conception de Presse et d'Édition v. France](#)

25.02.2016

The case concerned the unauthorised publication by the magazine *Choc* of a photograph of a young man, I.H., taken by his torturers while he was in captivity.

The Court found in particular that the publication of the photograph, which had not been intended for public viewing, constituted serious interference with the private life of I.H.'s relatives.

[Prompt v. France](#)

03.12.2015

The case concerned the judgment given in civil proceedings for libel against Mr Prompt, the lawyer representing Bernard Laroche, one of the protagonists in the "Grégory case", on account of a book he had published on the case. The circumstances of four-year-old Grégory Villemin's murder have still not been established.

[Bidart v. France](#)

12.11.2015

The case concerned the obligation imposed on Philippe Bidart, in the context of his release on licence, to refrain from disseminating any work or audiovisual production authored or co-authored by him

concerning the offences of which he had been convicted, and from speaking publicly about those offences.

[Leroy v. France](#)

02.10.2008

[Editions Plon v. France](#)

18.05.2004

Ban imposed on the distribution of a book, *Le Grand Secret*, by the private doctor of the late President Mitterrand, in which he spoke about the difficulty of having to conceal the President's illness.

No violation of Article 10 for the interim injunction; violation of Article 10 for subsequent ban.

Cases dealing with the right to freedom of assembly and association (Article 11)

[ADEFDROMIL v. France](#)

[Matelly v. France](#)

02.10.2014

The cases concerned the prohibition on trade unions within the French armed forces.

Violation of Article 11 in both cases

In the judgment *Matelly*, the Court concluded that, while the exercise by military personnel of freedom of association could be subject to legitimate restrictions, a blanket ban on forming or joining a trade union encroached on the very essence of this freedom, and was as such prohibited by the Convention.

Cases dealing with the right to an effective remedy (Article 13)

[Yengo v. France](#)

21.05.2015

Concerned the conditions of detention of a prisoner, Mr Yengo, in Nouméa prison, New Caledonia. Mr Yengo complained about those conditions and also about the lack of an effective remedy by which to complain about them to the domestic authorities.

The Court held that Mr Yengo could no longer claim to be a victim of Article 3 of the Convention prohibiting inhuman and degrading treatment, since the domestic court had awarded him some compensation for the harm sustained as a result of the detention conditions.

The Court further held that there had been a violation of Article 13.

[Gebremedhin v. France](#)

26.04.2007

Eritrean asylum-seeker held in the waiting zone of Roissy-Charles de Gaulle airport had no remedy with automatic suspensive effect against decisions denying him leave to enter and ordering his removal.

[Violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 3 \(prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment\)](#)

[No violation of Article 5 § 1 \(f\) \(right to liberty and security\)](#)

Cases dealing with protection of property (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Violations of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

[Milhau v. France](#)

10.07.2014

The case concerned the arrangements by which a judge, in the context of a divorce, could choose to order the compulsory transfer of an individually-owned asset in payment of a compensatory financial provision.

[Grifhorst v. France](#)

26.02.2009

Confiscation of a sum of money that the applicant had failed to declare at the France-Andorra border, combined with a fine amounting to one half of that sum.

[Mazurek v. France](#)

01.02.2000

Reduction in applicant's share of his mother's estate in relation to that of a legitimate child on account of his status as an adulterine child.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

[Couturon v. France](#)

25.06.2015

Mr Couturon complained about the failure to award compensation for the fall in the value of his property arising from the construction of the A89 motorway nearby.

[Arnaud and Others v. France](#)

15.01.2015

The case concerned new legislation which made French nationals who had settled in the Principality of Monaco liable, from 2005, to pay the solidarity tax on wealth on the same basis as if they were domiciled or resident in France.

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

[Corbet and Others v. France](#)

19.03.2015

Concerned the applicants' prosecution and conviction for misappropriating assets from the airline Air Liberté before it was put into compulsory liquidation.

[Violation of Article 5 § 1 \(right to liberty and security\) on account of Mr Corbet's detention on 24 July 2003](#)

At the same time, the Court declared inadmissible the applicants' complaint under Article 6 §§ 1 and 2 (right to a fair trial / right to be presumed innocent)

[Siliadin v. France](#)

26.07.2005

Insufficient protection of the applicant, a domestic slave.

[Violation of Article 4 \(prohibition of slavery and forced labour\)](#)

[Koua Poirrez v. France](#)

30.09.2003

French authorities' refusal to award a disabled adult's allowance to a national of Côte d'Ivoire, resident in France.

[Violation of Article 14 \(prohibition of discrimination\) in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

[No violation of Article 6 § 1 \(right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time\)](#)

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

[Ursulet v. France](#)

31.03.2016

The case concerned the arrest of Mr Ursulet, a lawyer, on account of a number of road traffic offences, and the fact that he had been held in a police station.

[Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.](#)

[M'Bala M'Bala v. France](#)

10.11.2015

Conviction of Dieudonné M'Bala M'Bala, a comedian with political activities, for public insults directed at a person or group of persons on account of their origin or of belonging to a given ethnic community,

nation, race or religion, specifically in this case persons of Jewish origin or faith.

Application dismissed as being incompatible with the provisions of the Convention, in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 (admissibility criteria).

Matis v. France

29.10.2015

The case concerned the reasons given for a conviction by an Assize Court of Appeal, with particular reference to the content of the "statement of reasons form" appended to the judgement, an issue on which the Court decided for the first time.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Benmouna and Others v. France

08.10.2015

Suicide by hanging of M.B., who had been taken into police custody in connection with an offence of attempted aggravated extortion.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Okitaloshima Okonda Osungu v. France and Selpa Lokongo v. France

01.10.2015

Concerned the authorities' refusal to award the applicants family benefits for their children who had joined them in France without complying with the family reunification procedure.

Applications declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

M.K. v. France (no. 76100/13)

01.09.2015

The case concerned the applicant's deportation to Algeria, where he alleges that he would risk being subjected to treatment contrary to Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Renard v. France and three other applications

25.08.2015

Issue whether the Court of Cassation's refusal to refer questions to the Constitutional Council for a preliminary ruling on constitutionality was compatible with the right of access to a court under Article 6 § 1 of Convention. The applicants

also complained under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

Applications declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies as concerns Article 6 § 1 and as being manifestly ill-founded in respect of Article 13.

Canonne v. France

02.06.2015

Mr Canonne complained about the fact that the domestic courts had inferred his paternity from his refusal to submit to the genetic tests ordered by them.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Barras v. France

17.03.2015

Applicant's inability to recover property belonging to him which has been occupied under an open-ended rent-free loan for over 50 years.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

NML Capital Ltd v. France

13.01.2015

Attempts by a creditor of the Republic of Argentina, a State which defaulted on its debt in 2001, to obtain repayment of its loan by having assets belonging to Argentina seized in France. In application of the diplomatic immunity in relation to enforcement, the French ordinary courts refused to grant the applicant company's request, and it then applied to the European Court of Human Rights.

The Court has declared the application inadmissible, holding that the applicant company still had available to it an effective domestic remedy, namely before the French administrative courts.

Ly v. France

10.07.2014

Difficulties encountered by Mr Ly, who was legally residing in France, in obtaining visa for his daughter.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Khider v. France

25.10.2013

The applicant, a convicted prisoner who had made several escapes and attempted escapes, was classified by the authorities as a "high-risk prisoner". He alleged that his conditions of detention were particularly

strict, including frequent changes of establishment, prolonged periods in solitary confinement, and strip-searches.
[Application declared inadmissible.](#)

Robineau v. France

26.09.2013

In this case a suspect died after throwing himself out of a window of the courthouse to which he had been taken.

[Application declared inadmissible.](#)

Marc-Antoine v. France

04.06.2013

In connection with a hearing before the *Conseil d'État* the applicant complained that, unlike the "public rapporteur" (rapporteur public) at the *Conseil d'État*, he was not given a copy of the draft decision of the reporting judge.

[Application declared inadmissible.](#)

Mandil v. France, Barreau and Others v. France, Deceuninck v. France

13.12.2011

Breach of a duty of confidentiality in negotiations on a friendly settlement between the French State and members of the organisation "Les faucheurs volontaires" who had lodged a complaint against France with the European Court of Human Rights. That stage of negotiations with a view to reaching a friendly settlement between the parties, expressly provided for by the Convention and which may take place at any time, must remain strictly confidential, a point of which the parties had been informed.

[The Court declared the applications inadmissible for failure to respect duty of confidentiality in friendly settlement negotiations.](#)

Atallah v. France

30.08.2011

A Lebanese lawyer who was lethally wounded in Beirut by a soldier from the French contingent of UNIFIL or the Multinational Security Force.

[Application declared inadmissible.](#)

Beghal v. France

06.09.2011

Complaints concerning the prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment and the right to respect for private and family life.

[Application declared inadmissible.](#)

Rinck v. France

17.11.2010

Appeal against a road traffic penalty.

[Application declared inadmissible \(no significant disadvantage – new admissibility criterion introduced by Protocol no. 14\)](#)

Cases concerning the wearing of conspicuous religious symbols

30.06.2009

[Applications declared inadmissible.](#)

Hakkar v. France

07.04.2009

The applicant submitted a number of complaints concerning criminal proceedings against him which had been reopened after a judgment finding a violation of the Convention.

[Application declared inadmissible.](#)

Ould Dah v. France

17.03.2009

Conviction in France for offences committed in Mauritania on the basis of France's "universal jurisdiction". Complaint under Article 7 (no punishment without law).

[Application declared inadmissible.](#)

Garretta v. France and Karchen v. France

04.03.2008

"Contaminated blood" case. Complaints concerned the right not to be tried or punished twice and the right to life.

[Applications declared inadmissible.](#)

Noteworthy pending cases

Detention conditions

J.M.B. v. France (no. 9671/15) and 9 other applications

Communicated to the parties in February 2016

The case concerns the ten applicants' conditions of detention in the Ducos Prison in Martinique. Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private life) of the Convention, the applicants complain about the physical conditions of their detention. They explain that they are locked up for most of the day in overcrowded cells, which are infested with insects and rodents and are poorly lit. They complain of a climate of violence in the prison, difficulty in obtaining access to medical services and, occasionally,

exposure to second-hand smoking. They also rely on Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, considering that they have no remedy available that would enable them to have their conditions of detention brought to a speedy end.

[F.R. v. France \(no. 12792/15\) and 3 other applications](#)

Communicated to the parties in February 2016
The case concerns the four applicants' conditions of detention in the Nîmes Prison in the *département* of Gard.
Relying on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private life) of the Convention, the applicants complain about the physical conditions of their detention. They explain that they suffer from a lack of personal space and privacy, and allege that they are locked up in dilapidated and noisy cells. They complain of poor hygiene conditions and a climate of violence within the prison. They allege that they are sometimes subjected to second-hand smoking. They also rely on Article 13 of the Convention (right to an effective remedy), considering that they have no remedy available that would enable them to have their conditions of detention brought to a speedy end.

Family life of prisoners

[Labaca Larrea v. France \(no. 56710/13\), Lozano Miranda v. France \(no. 56727/13\) and Zobaran Arriola v. France \(no. 57412/13\)](#)

Communicated to the parties in September 2015
Relying on Article 8 of the Convention, the applicants complain that their transfer to the Lyon-Corbas Prison, more than 800 kilometres from their family homes, was in breach of their right to lead an appropriate family life. Under Article 13, the applicants consider that they did not have an effective remedy before the domestic courts in order to raise their complaints about the transfer decision.

Dissolution of football fans' associations

[Les Authentiks v. France and Supras Auteuil 91 v. France \(nos. 4696/11 and 4703/11\)](#)

Communicated to the parties in October 2013
This case concerns the dissolution, ordered by Prime Ministerial decree, of two associations of fans of the Paris Saint Germain (PSG) football team following clashes between a number of their members and those of another association of supporters which resulted in a fan's death.
The associations allege, in particular, that their dissolution amounts to an interference with the exercise of their right to freedom of association which does not have an adequate factual basis and is not necessary in a democratic society.
The applicants rely on Articles 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and 11 (freedom of association) of the Convention.

Expulsions or removal of foreigners and the right to asylum

Placement of families, including minors, in an administrative detention centre pending their expulsion.

[A.M. v. France \(no. 24587/12\)](#)

Communicated to the parties in April 2012

[R.M. and M.M v. France \(no. 33201/11\)](#)

Communicated to the parties in May 2011

Aliens placed in a waiting zone, the applicants complain, in particular, about the ineffectiveness of the appeals lodged by them in order to avoid expulsion.

[M. F. v. France \(no. 13437/13\)](#)

Communicated to the French Government in April 2014

[Balta v. France \(no. 19462/12\)](#)

Communicated to the parties in November 2015
This case concerns the procedure to evict the applicant, a Rom of Romanian nationality, from the cul-de-sac which he occupied with several other persons on the territory of the Courneuve municipality in the Paris region. The applicant alleges, in particular, that the legislative framework for evicting travellers is contrary to the principle of non-discrimination, in that it

restricts, on an ethnic basis, freedom of movement.

Mr Balta relies on Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement) to the Convention.

Hirtu and Others v. France
(no. 24720/13)

Communicated to the French Government in April 2014

Forced evacuation of an unauthorised encampment of Romanian Roma in the Paris region.

Complaints under Articles 3 (inhuman or degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

Gjutaj and Others v. France
(no. 63141/13)

Communicated to the French Government in October 2013

The applicants, families made up of couples accompanied by children aged between one and eleven years, allege in particular that the emergency accommodation in tents currently made available to them does not meet the requirements of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention, having regard in particular to their status as asylum seekers and the presence of a large number of minor children.

Freedom of expression

Oran-Martz v. France (no. 24466/12)

Communicated to the parties in May 2014

The applicant, a French national of Turkish origin, was the Green Party candidate on the Socialist/Green ballot list for the 2008 elections in Villeurbanne. She alleges that she was subjected to various forms of pressure, particularly from the incumbent mayor, on account of her position, considered ambiguous, on the Armenian genocide, which led her to withdraw her candidacy. She brought proceedings against the mayor before the Criminal Division of the Lyon *Tribunal de Grande Instance* by means of a direct summons, for interference with the normal exercise of an economic activity (in her submission, access to elected office in this instance) on account of real or supposed origin or membership of an ethnic group or nationality. Her claim was dismissed, and she was convicted of bringing an improper civil-party application, having regard in

particular to the fact that, in the context of those proceedings, she had alleged that the mayor was "electorally beholden to Armenian extremists" and that his statements "about Turkey, the Turks and French citizens could only incite racial hatred".

Ms Oran-Martz relies on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the Convention.

Right to a fair trial

Ramda v. France (no. 78477/11)

Communicated to the parties in September 2014

The case concerns the applicant's conviction for his involvement in planning attacks in Paris in 1995. The applicant was convicted both by a criminal court for his participation in an association or a conspiracy established with a view to the substantiated preparation of acts of terrorism, and by an assize court for the actual commission of the attacks.

The application concerns, on the one hand, the absence of reasons in the judgment of a specially constituted assize court (that is, made up solely of professional judges) and, on the other, the existence of two prosecutions and convictions for the same offences - Articles 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) of the Convention and Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice) to the Convention.

Thiam v. France (no. 80018/12)

Communicated to the parties in August 2015

The case concerns the applicant's conviction for concerted fraud. The fraud consisted in purchasing mobile telephones under false identities, and obtaining telephone subscriptions using illegally obtained data about bank cards and payment cards. One of the fraudulently debited bank accounts belonged to Nicolas Sarkozy, President of the Republic.

Relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to question witnesses) of the Convention, the applicant complains that the President of the Republic's application to join the proceedings as a civil party had been declared admissible. Also under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) of the Convention, the applicant alleges that the functions of the President of the Republic, which enabled him to appoint judges and prosecutors, cast legitimate doubt on the independence and impartiality of the judges and magistrates called upon to adjudicate

in cases in which the President was a party and ran counter to the principle of equality of arms between the parties.

Colonna v. France (no. 4213/13)

Communicated to the parties in January 2015
The case concerns Mr Colonna's conviction for the assassination in 1998 of the Prefect Claude Erignac.
Relying on Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence) of the Convention, the applicant complains that the statements made by various public authorities in the executive, legislative and judicial branches, naming him as the assassin of Prefect Erignac before his trial, had breached his right to be presumed innocent.

Injury during arrest

Chebab v. France (no. 542/13)

Communicated to the parties in February 2015
The case concerns the circumstances in which Mr Chebab was shot by a police officer, and also the follow-up given to his injuries and to his complaint and application to join the proceedings as a civil party.
The applicant complains that his life was endangered by the use of force against him and considers that the national authorities did not fulfil their obligation to conduct an effective investigation, and did not justify their failure to meet the obligation to protect his right to life. Mr Chebab relies on Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention.

Private and/or family life

Access by the authorities to personal data and use of these data

Dagregorio and Mosconi v. France (no. 65714/11)

Aycaquer v. France (no. 8806/12)

Communicated to the parties in March 2014
The applicants complain, in particular, that they were convicted for refusing to provide a biological sample for the purpose of identifying their DNA; the data were then to have been entered in the national genetic database (FNAEG).

In both these cases, the applicants rely primarily on Article 8 (right to respect for private life) of the Convention.

Ben Faiza v. France (no. 31446/12)

Communicated to the parties in February 2015
The applicant in this case complains in particular of an interference in his private life on account of the installation of equipment for recording geographical data on his vehicle, as part of an investigation into drug trafficking, for the purpose of monitoring the car's movements.
The applicant relies on Article 8 (right to respect for private life and correspondence) of the Convention.

Children born as a result of gestational surrogacy and the legal parent-child relationship

Laborie and Others v. France (no. 44024/13)

Communicated to the French Government in January 2015
Impossibility for a French couple to obtain recognition in France of a legal parent-child relationship between them and children born in Ukraine from a gestational surrogacy arrangement.
The applicants rely on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention.

Foulon v. France (no. 9063/14) and Bouvet v. France (no. 10410/14)

Communicated to the French Government in January 2015
Impossibility for the applicants to obtain recognition in France of a legal parent-child relationship between them and, respectively, one child and two children born in India from gestation surrogacy arrangements.
The applicants rely on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention.

Status of transgender persons

A.P. v. France (no. 79885/12), Garçon v. France (no. 52471/13) and Nicot v. France (no. 52596/13)

Communicated to the parties in March 2015
The applicants in these cases complain, among other points, about the fact that persons who, like them, are transgender, can only have their civil status changed if they submit proof of a transgender syndrome and of having undergone an irreversible sex change.

The provisions relied on: Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and, in the case of A.P., Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention.

Hallier and Lucas v. France
(no. 46386/10)

Communicated to the French Government in April 2011

The applicants – two women who had been living as a couple for about eight years and who entered into a *Pacte civil de solidarité* (French civil partnership, PACS) in 2004 – complain about the refusal to grant the paternity leave request submitted by the second applicant on the occasion of the birth of her partner's son.

The applicants rely on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), taken in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention.

Chapin and Charpentier v. France
(no. 40183/07)

Communicated to the French Government in April 2009

Case concerning a same-sex marriage celebrated at the Bègles town hall and annulled by the French courts on account of sexual identity. The applicants rely on Articles 8 and 12 (right to marry), taken in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention.

**Testing of athletes and the fight
against doping**

National Federation of Sports Unions
(FNASS) and Others v. France
(no. 48151/11)

Communicated to the parties in June 2013

The applicants in this case are the National Federation of Sports Unions (the FNASS),

several legal entities carrying out activities connected with ball sports and 99 professional handball, football, rugby and basketball players.

The individual applicants complain, in particular, as professional sportsmen and women, of having to justify their time schedule at all times and of being subjected to drug testing during their periods of leave and in their daily lives. They complain of an unconditional and geographically and temporally unlimited control system that is not proportionate to the aim pursued, especially as the statistics show an extremely low percentage of tests found to be positive.

The following are relied upon: Articles 34 (individual applications), 35 (admissibility criteria) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, and also Article 2 (freedom of movement) of Protocol No. 4 to the Convention.

Longo and Ciprelli v. France
(no. 77769/13)

Communicated to the French Government in June 2014

The applicants are an internationally renowned racing cyclist and her husband and trainer. The first applicant complains about the whereabouts obligation imposed on her, as she is part of a "target group", for random anti-doping tests. In her view, this obligation amounts to an unjustified intrusion in her private and family life.

The applicants rely on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention.