



Annexe n°3 : Actions directes des ONG comme représentant des requérants auprès de la CEDH entre 2009 et 2019

Par Delphine Loiseau, janvier 2020.

Nom aff. et date	ONG	Résumé et décision	Juges
<i>Leonidis c. Grèce</i> , n° 43326/05, 8 janvier 2009	Greek Helsinki Monitor représente le requérant.	Le requérant soutenait que son fils avait été tué dans des circonstances où le recours à la force meurtrière n'était pas justifié. Il se plaignait également de ce que les autorités n'avaient pas ouvert d'enquête adéquate, efficace et rapide sur l'incident. Décision : Dit, à l'unanimité, qu'il y a eu violation de l'article 2 de la Convention en raison de carences dans l'opération de police au cours de laquelle le fils du requérant est décédé ; Dit, par 6 voix contre 1, qu'il n'y a pas eu violation de l'article 2 de la Convention en ce qui concerne l'obligation de l'Etat défendeur de mener une enquête effective sur les circonstances de l'événement qui a abouti au décès du fils du requérant ; Dit, par 6 voix contre 1, que le constat de violation constitue en soi une satisfaction équitable suffisante ;	Nina Vajić, Président, Christos Rozakis, Khanlar Hajiyev, Dean Spielmann, Sverre Erik Jebens, Giorgio Malinverni, George Nicolaou.
<i>Lewandowski and Lewandowska c. Pologne</i> ,	Les requérants étaient représentés par M. A. Bodnar de la Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights	Les requérants alléguaient en particulier une violation de l'article 3 de la Convention en raison des mauvais traitements infligés à leur fils lors de son arrestation par la police	Nicolas Bratza, Président, Lech Garlicki, Giovanni Bonello,

n°15562/02, 13 janvier 2009	(Varsovie – Pologne)	Décision : violation de l'article 3 de la Convention pour mauvais traitement du fils des requérants. violation de l'article 3 de la Convention en raison de l'absence d'enquête effective ;	Ljiljana Mijović, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku, Nebojša Vučinić.
<i>Salontaji-Drobnjak c. Serbie</i> , n°36500/05, 13 octobre 2009	Le requérant fut représenté par M. Y. Grozev, un avocat exerçant à Sofia et Mme Lj. Palibrk du Helsinki Committee for Human Rights en Serbie, une ONG basée à Belgrade.	Le requérant alléguait de nombreuses violations des droits garantis par les articles 6 § 1, 8 et 13 de la Convention, le tout dans le contexte de la privation partielle de sa capacité juridique et de ses tentatives ultérieures de le rétablir pleinement. Décision : Violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention en ce qui concerne l'équité de la procédure entraînant la privation partielle de la capacité juridique du requérant. Violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention en ce qui concerne le droit d'accès du requérant à un tribunal pour le rétablissement de sa pleine capacité juridique ; Violation de l'article 8 de la Convention.	Françoise Tulkens, Président, Vladimiro Zagrebelsky, Danutė Jočienė, Dragoljub Popović, András Sajó, Nona Tsotsoria, Kristina Pardalos.
<i>Nowinski c. Pologne</i> , n° 25924/06, 20 octobre 2009	Le requérant fut représenté par M. A. Bodnar du Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights.	Le requérant alléguait que son droit d'accès à un tribunal avait été violé du fait du refus du tribunal d'accepter sa demande. Décision : violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention.	Nicolas Bratza, Président, Lech Garlicki, Giovanni Bonello, Ljiljana Mijović, David Thór Björgvinsson, Ledi Bianku, Mihai Poalelungi.
<i>Kamberi c. "L'ancienne république yougoslave de Macédoine"</i> , n° 39151/04, 22 octobre 2009	Le requérant fut représenté par le " Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia".	Le requérant se plaint de l'incompatibilité de la durée de la procédure avec la condition de « délai raisonnable ». Décision : violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention en ce qui concerne la durée de la procédure.	Peer Lorenzen, Président, Renate Jaeger, Karel Jungwiert, Rait Maruste, Mark Villiger, Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska

<i>Eremeiov c. Roumanie (n°1)</i> , n° 75300/01, 24 novembre 2009	Le requérant fut représenté par M. Dan Mihai, un avocat exerçant à Bucharest et agissant au nom de l'Association for the Defense of Human Rights in Romania – the Helsinki Committee (APADOR).	Le requérant alléguait en particulier que la procédure pénale engagée contre lui pour diffamation avait été injuste et que l'imposition d'une amende et l'obligation de réparer le préjudice moral avaient violé son droit à la liberté d'expression. Décision : violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention ; violation de l'article 10 de la Convention.	Josep Casadevall, Président, Elisabet Fura, Corneliu Bîrsan, Boštjan M. Zupančič, Egbert Myjer, Luis López Guerra, Ann Power.
<i>Ieremeiov c. Roumanie (n°2)</i> , n°4637/02, 24 novembre 2009	Le requérant fut représenté par Mme Monica Macovei et Mme Alexandra Răzvan-Mihalcea, avocats exerçant respectivement à Bucarest et à Timișoara et agissant au nom de l'Association for the Defense of Human Rights in Romania – the Helsinki Committee (APADOR).	Le requérant alléguait en particulier que la procédure pénale pour diffamation engagée contre lui n'avait pas été équitable et que l'imposition d'une amende et l'obligation de réparer le préjudice moral avaient porté atteinte à son droit à la liberté d'expression. Décision : violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention. Violation de l'article 10 de la Convention.	Josep Casadevall, Président, Elisabet Fura, Corneliu Bîrsan, Boštjan M. Zupančič, Egbert Myjer, Luis López Guerra, Ann Power
<i>Omojudi c. Royaume-Uni</i> , n° 1820/08, 24 novembre 2009	Le requérant fut représenté par Mme N. Mole du AIRE Centre , un avocat exerçant à Londres.	Le requérant alléguait que son expulsion vers le Nigéria violait son droit à la vie privée et familiale de l'article 8 de la Convention. Décision : violation de l'article 8 de la Convention	Lech Garlicki, Président, Nicolas Bratza, Giovanni Bonello, Ljiljana Mijović, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku, Nebojša Vučinić
<i>Paduret c. Moldavie</i> , n° 33134/03, 05 janvier 2010	Le requérant était représenté par M. Ș. Uritu, M. A. Briceag et Mme D. Străisteanu, qui travaillaient tous pour le Helsinki Committee for Human Rights en Moldavie.	Le requérant alléguait en particulier qu'il avait été maltraité pendant sa détention et que les autorités n'avaient pas mené d'enquête effective sur ces mauvais traitements dans un délai raisonnable, permettant ainsi aux auteurs de se soustraire à toute responsabilité. Décision: violation de l'art. 3 de la Convention.	Nicolas Bratza, Président, Lech Garlicki, Ljiljana Mijović, David Thór Björgvinsson, Ján Šikuta, Päivi Hirvelä, Mihai Poalelungi

<i>Atanasovski c. "L'ancienne république yougoslave de Macédoine",</i> n° 36815/03, 14 janvier 2010	Le requérant était représenté par le " Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia"	Un ressortissant macédonien a notamment allégué que la décision de la Cour suprême n'avait pas motivé sa décision de s'écarter de sa jurisprudence antérieure et que la durée de la procédure avait été excessive. Décision : Dit, à l'unanimité, qu'il y a eu violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention en ce qui concerne la durée d'une procédure ; Dit, par six voix contre une, qu'il y a eu violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention pour manque de motivation dans la décision de la Cour suprême.	Peer Lorenzen, Président, Renate Jaeger, Karel Jungwiert, Rait Maruste, Mark Villiger, Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska. Opinion dissidente du juge Maruste.
<i>Galotskin c. Grèce,</i> n° 2945/07, 14 janvier 2010	Le requérant était représenté par le Greek Helsinki Monitor, member de l'International Helsinki Federation	Le requérant, ressortissant grec, alléguait notamment avoir été victime d'actes de brutalité policière et que les autorités n'avaient pas ouvert d'enquête suffisante sur le cas, en violation des articles 3, 6 § 1 et 13 de la Convention. Décision : Violation de l'article 3 de la Convention en ce qui concerne le traitement subi par le requérant de la part de la police ; Violation de l'article 3 de la Convention en ce que les autorités n'ont pas mené d'enquête administrative ni judiciaire efficace sur l'incident ; Il n'y a pas besoin d'examiner séparément la requête concernant l'article 13 de la Convention ; Violation de l'article 6§1 de la Convention en raison de la durée de la procédure pénale et de la procédure administrative ; Il n'y a pas besoin d'examiner séparément les griefs tirés de l'article 6§1 concernant le prétendu procès inéquitable et l'absence de motivation suffisante dans l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de Salonika.	Nina Vajić, Président, Christos Rozakis, Anatoly Kovler, Elisabeth Steiner, Khanlar Hajiyev, Dean Spielmann, Sverre Erik Jebens.
<i>A.D. et O.D. c.</i>	Les requérants étaient représentés par	Les requérants se plaignent que la décision de confier la	Lech Garlicki, Président,

<i>Royaume-Uni</i> , n° 28680/06, 16 mars 2010	Mme N. Mole du AIRE Centre , un avocat exerçant à Londres.	deuxième requérante aux autorités locales a porté atteinte aux droits qui leur sont reconnus par l'article 8 de la Convention. La première requérante se plaint également que la décision a violé ses droits au titre de l'article 3 de la Convention. Enfin, les deux requérants se plaignaient d'une violation de l'article 13, alléguant qu'ils n'avaient pas accès à un recours interne effectif. Décision : violation de l'article 8 de la Convention. Violation de l'article 13 de la Convention lu conjointement avec l'article 8 de la Convention à l'égard du premier requérant ; Non-violation de l'article 13 de la Convention en ce qui concerne le second requérant.	Nicolas Bratza, Giovanni Bonello, Ljiljana Mijović, Ján Šikuta, Mihai Poalelungi, Nebojša Vučinić.
<i>M.A.K. et R.K. c.</i> <i>Royaume-Uni</i> , n° 45901/05 et 40146/06, 23 mars 2010	Les requérants ont été représentés par J. Sykes de Levi Solicitors LLP and Mme N. Mole du AIRE Centre .	Retard dans le renvoi de la victime présumée d'abus d'enfants à un spécialiste afin de déterminer la cause de ses blessures. Décision : Violation du droit à la vie familiale de l'article 8. Examen médical d'une victime présumée d'abus d'enfant sans consentement parental ou ordonnance de la cour. Décision : Violation du droit à la vie privée de l'article 8.	Lech Garlicki, Président, Nicolas Bratza, Giovanni Bonello, Ljiljana Mijović, Ján Šikuta, Mihai Poalelungi, Nebojša Vučinić.
<i>Frodl c. Autriche</i> , n° 20201/04, 08 avril 2010	Les requérants étaient représentés par Mme N. Mole du AIRE Centre , une ONG de Londres.	Le requérant alléguait que sa privation du droit de vote résultant de sa peine d'emprisonnement de plus d'un an constituait une violation des droits que lui reconnaît l'article 3 du Protocole n° 1. Décision : Dit, par six voix contre une, qu'il y a eu violation de l'article 3 du Protocole no. 1 à la Convention.	Christos Rozakis, President, Anatoly Kovler, Elisabeth Steiner, Dean Spielmann, Sverre Erik Jebens, Giorgio Malinverni, George Nicolaou.
<i>Laska et Lika c.</i> <i>Albanie</i> , n° 12315/04 et 17605/04, 20 avril 2010	Les requérants étaient représentés par M A. Dobrushki du European Roma Rights Centre et plus tard co- représentés par l'Albanian Helsinki Committee.	En vertu de l'article 3 de la Convention, les requérants se plaignent d'avoir subi des mauvais traitements lors de leur interrogatoire de police afin de les forcer à avouer les faits reprochés. Ils invoquaient également une violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention pour se plaindre de l'iniquité de la procédure.	Nicolas Bratza, President, Lech Garlicki, Giovanni Bonello, Ljiljana Mijović, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku,

		Décision : violation de l'article 6 § 1 de la Convention, déclare le grief des requérants fondé sur l'article 3 de la Convention irrecevable.	Nebojša Vučinić.
<i>Stefanou v. Greece</i> , n° 2954/07, 22 avril 2010	The applicant was represented by Greek Helsinki Monitor, a non-governmental organisation registered in Greece	The applicant alleged, in particular, violations of Articles 3 (substantial and procedural violation), 6 § 1 (length of proceedings, access to court and alleged failure of the Appeal Court to give reasons for its decision), and 14 (discrimination on the ground of ethnic origin) of the Convention. The applicant is a Greek national of Roma origin, who was born in 1985 and lives in Athens. He was sixteen years old at the time of the events. Decision : a violation of Article 3 of the Convention in its substantive part; no need to examine separately the procedural complaint under Article 3 of the Convention; no need to examine separately the complaint under Article 13 of the Convention; violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention;	Nina Vajić, President, Christos Rozakis, Khanlar Hajiyev, Dean Spielmann, Sverre Erik Jebens, Giorgio Malinverni, George Nicolaou, judges,
<i>Kennedy v. The United Kingdom</i> , n° 26839/05, 18 mai 2010	The applicant was represented by N. Mole of the AIRE Centre , a non-governmental organisation based in London	The applicant complained about an alleged interception of his communications, claiming a violation of Article 8. He further alleged that the hearing before the Investigatory Powers Tribunal was not attended by adequate safeguards as required under Article 6 and, under Article 13, that he had as a result been denied an effective remedy. Decision : no violation of Article 8 of the Convention and dismisses in consequence the Government's above-mentioned objection; no violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention; no violation of Article 13 of the Convention.	Lech Garlicki, President, Nicolas Bratza, Giovanni Bonello, Ljiljana Mijović, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku, Nebojša Vučinić, judges,
<i>Spasovski v. "the</i>	The applicant was represented by	A Macedonian national alleged that the proceedings had been	Peer Lorenzen, President,

<i>former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i> ", n° 45150/05, 10 juin 2010	Mrs K. Jandrijeska Jovanova, on behalf of the “ Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia”	unfair and, in particular, that contradictory rulings of the domestic courts had denied his right of access to a court. Decision : violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention	Karel Jungwiert, Rait Maruste, Mark Villiger, Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, judges,
<i>Vasilkoski And Others V. "The Former Yugoslav Republic Of Macedonia"</i> , n° 28169/08, 28 octobre 2010	The applicants were represented by the “ Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia”, represented by Mr S. Dukoski	The applicants, 38 Macedonian nationals, alleged, in particular, that their continued detention was not justified by concrete and sufficient reasons. Decision : violation of Article 5 § 3 of the Convention	Peer Lorenzen, President, Renate Jaeger, Karel Jungwiert, Mark Villiger, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Ganna Yudkivska, judges,
<i>O'Donoghue and others v. The United Kingdom</i> , n° 34848/07, 14 décembre 2010	The applicants, who have been granted legal aid, were represented by the AIRE Centre .	Requirement of certificate of approval for immigrants wishing to marry other than in the Church of England Decision : a violation of Article 12 of the Convention; violation of Article 14 of the Convention read together with Article 12; violation of Article 14 of the Convention read together with Article 9;	Lech Garlicki, President, Nicolas Bratza, Ljiljana Mijović, David Thór Björgvinsson, Ján Šikuta, Päivi Hirvelä, Mihai Poalelungi, judges,
<i>Osman v. Denmark</i> , n° 38058/09, 14 juin 2011	The applicant was represented by the AIRE Centre , an NGO situated in London	The applicant alleged, in particular, that the Danish authorities’ refusal to reinstate her residence permit in Denmark was in breach of Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention. Decision : violation of Article 8 of the Convention	Nina Vajić, President, Anatoly Kovler, Peer Lorenzen, Elisabeth Steiner, George Nicolaou, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Julia Laffranque, judges,
<i>Sufi and Elmi v. The</i>	The applicants, who had been granted	The applicants alleged that if returned to Somalia they would be	Lech Garlicki, President,

<i>United Kingdom</i> , n° 8319/07, 11449/07, 28 juin 2011	legal aid, were represented by Ms N. Mole of the AIRE Centre ,	at real risk of ill-treatment contrary to Article 3 and/or a violation of Article 2 of the Convention. They also complained that their removal would disproportionately interfere with their rights under Article 8 of the Convention. Decision : Holds that the applicants' removal to Somalia would violate Article 3 of the Convention	Nicolas Bratza, Ljiljana Mijović, Sverre Erik Jebens, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku, Vincent A. De Gaetano, judges,
<i>A.A. v. The United Kingdom</i> , n° 8000/08, 20 septembre 2011	The applicant was represented before the Court by the AIRE Centre , a non-governmental organisation based in London	The applicant alleged, in particular, that his deportation to Nigeria would violate his right to respect for his family and private life and would deprive him of the right to education by terminating his university studies in the United Kingdom. Décision : violation of Article 8 of the Convention in the event of the applicant's deportation;	Lech Garlicki, President, Nicolas Bratza, Ljiljana Mijović, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Nebojša Vučinić, judges,
<i>The United Macedonian Organisation Ilinden and others v. Bulgaria</i> (No. 2), n° 34960/04, 18 octobre 2011 + 37586/04	The applicants were represented by the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee	The United Macedonian Organisation Ilinden and thirteen Bulgarian nationals are the applicants. They alleged, in particular, that the refusal to register Ilinden was unlawful and unwarranted, that the registration proceedings were unfair, and that those matters were a result of their asserted Macedonian ethnicity which the Bulgarian State was refusing to recognise. Decision : violation of Article 11 of the Convention	Nicolas Bratza, President, Lech Garlicki, Ljiljana Mijović, Päivi Hirvelä, George Nicolaou, Ledi Bianku, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, judges,
<i>J.H. v. The United Kingdom</i> , n° 48839/09, 20 décembre 2011	The applicant was represented by Ms N. Mole, a lawyer practising in London with the AIRE Centre .	The applicant, an Afghan national, alleged that, if expelled from the United Kingdom to Afghanistan, he would face a real risk of ill-treatment contrary to Article 3 and/or a violation of Article 2 of the Convention. Decision : no violation of Article 3 of the Convention in the event of the applicant's removal to Afghanistan; and Decides to continue to indicate to the Government under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court that it is desirable in the interests of the	Lech Garlicki, President, David Thór Björgvinsson, Nicolas Bratza, Päivi Hirvelä, George Nicolaou, Nebojša Vučinić, Vincent A. De Gaetano, judges,

		proper conduct of the proceedings not to remove the applicant until such time as the present judgment becomes final or further order.	
<i>Gqsiior v. Poland</i> , n° 34472/07, 21 février 2012	The applicant was represented by Mr A. Bodnar from the Helsinki Foundation of Human Rights	The applicant alleged that her right to freedom of expression under Article 10 of the Convention was infringed. Decision : six votes to one that there has been no violation of Article 10 of the Convention	David Thór Björgvinsson, President, Lech Garlicki, Päivi Hirvelä, George Nicolaou, Ledi Bianku, Nebojša Vučinić, Vincent A. De Gaetano, judges, Dissenting opinion of judge David Thór Björgvinsson
<i>Arseniev v. Moldova</i> , n° 10614/06, 10620/06, 20 mars 2012	The applicant was represented by Mr Ș. Urîtu and Mr Ș. Burlaca from the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Moldova	The applicant alleged, in particular, that he had been detained in inhuman conditions of detention, as a result of which his health had been affected. He made a number of additional complaints under Articles 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14 and 17 of the Convention. Decision : violation of Article 3 of the Convention;	Josep Casadevall, President, Corneliu Bîrsan, Egbert Myjer, Ján Šikuta, Ineta Ziemele, Mihai Poalelungi, Kristina Pardalos, judges,
<i>Ograzden Ad and others v. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"</i> , n° 35630/04, 42580/09, 53442/07, 29 mai 2012	The second applicant was represented by the " Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia"	3 applicants (Ograzden A.D. ("the first applicant"), Ms Cvetanka Milčevska ("the second applicant") and Ms Elena Davidovska ("the third applicant") alleged that the excessive length of proceedings has breached art. 6§1. Decision : violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention in respect of the length of the proceedings; violation of Article 13 of the Convention;	Nina Vajić, President, Peer Lorenzen, Khanlar Hajiyeu, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Julia Laffranque, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Erik Møse, judges,
<i>Raducanu v. Romania</i> , n° 17187/05, 12 juin 2012	The applicant was represented by Ms Nicoleta Tatiana Popescu, a lawyer practising in Bucharest and by APADOR-CH (the Association for the Defence of Human Rights in Romania – the Helsinki Committee),	The applicant alleged, in particular, that the material conditions of detention in Ploiești Prison and the lack of adequate medical care for the venous thromboses in his legs had breached his rights guaranteed by Article 3 of the Convention. Decision : violation of Article 3 of the Convention	Josep Casadevall, President, Alvina Gyulumyan, Egbert Myjer, Ineta Ziemele, Luis López Guerra, Nona Tsotsoria, Kristina Pardalos, judges,

	an association based in Bucharest		
<i>Makjasevy v. Russia</i> n° 20546/07, 31 juillet 2012	The applicants were represented by lawyers of Open Society Justice Initiative ,	Ill-treatment of the applicants and subsequent events. Declares the complaints under Articles 3, 13 and 14 of the Convention admissible and the remainder of the application inadmissible; 3. Holds that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention taken together with Article 14 of the Convention in respect of the failure to conduct an effective investigation into the applicants' ill-treatment at the hands of the police and the failure to investigate possible discriminatory motives behind the incident; 4. Holds that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention taken together with Article 14 of the Convention due to the applicants' ill-treatment based on discrimination at the hands of the police; 5. Holds that there is no need to examine separately the complaint under Article 13 of the Convention;	Nina Vajić, President, Anatoly Kovler, Peer Lorenzen, Khanlar Hajiyeu, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Erik Møse, judges,
<i>Lewandowska-Malec v. Poland</i> , n° 39660/07, 18 septembre 2012	The applicant was represented by Ms D. Bychawska-Siniarska, a lawyer with the Helsinki Foundation of Human Rights	The applicant alleged, in particular, that her conviction and punishment for defamation had been in breach of her right to freedom of expression. Decision : violation of Article 10 of the Convention	David Thór Björgvinsson, President, Lech Garlicki, Päivi Hirvelä, George Nicolaou, Ledi Bianku, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Nebojša Vučinić, judges,
<i>Kędzior v. Poland</i> , n° 45026/07, 16 octobre 2012	The applicant was represented by Mr A. Bodnar and Mrs M. Zima, lawyers from the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights	The applicant complained, in particular, about his placement in a social care home and his inability to obtain release from the home, in breach of Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention. Decision : violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention; violation of Article 5 § 4 of the Convention; violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention;	David Thór Björgvinsson, President, Lech Garlicki, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Nebojša Vučinić, Vincent A. De Gaetano, judges,
<i>Lenev v. Bulgaria</i> ,	The applicant was represented by Ms	The applicant alleged, in particular, that he had been tortured by	Ineta Ziemele, President,

n° 41452/07, 04 décembre 2012	D. Fartunova, a lawyer practising in Sofia, and the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee	the police and had not obtained effective redress, and that he could have been subjected to secret surveillance and had no effective remedies in that connection. Decision : violation of Article 3 of the Convention in that the applicant was subjected to torture during his detention; violation of Article 3 of the Convention on account of the lack of an effective investigation into that; violation of Article 13 of the Convention on account of the lack of an effective remedy in that respect; violation of Article 8 of the Convention in relation to the potential placing of the applicant under secret surveillance; violation of Article 13 of the Convention in relation to the lack of effective remedies in respect of secret surveillance;	David Thór Björgvinsson, Päivi Hirvelä, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Vincent A. De Gaetano, Paul Mahoney, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, judges,
<i>Sampani et autres c. Grèce</i> , n°59608/09, 11 décembre 2012	Les requérants ont été représentés par le Greek Helsinki Monitor, une organisation non gouvernementale ayant son siège à Glyka Nera	Les requérants, cent quarante ressortissants, alléguaient en particulier une violation de l'article 14 de la Convention, combiné avec l'article 2 du Protocole no 1, et de l'article 13 de la Convention. Concerne la scolarisation d'enfants roms. Décision : violation de l'article 14 de la Convention, combiné avec l'article 2 du Protocole no 1 ; Dit qu'il n'y a pas lieu d'examiner séparément le grief tiré de l'article 13 de la Convention	Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, présidente, Anatoly Kovler, Khanlar Hajiyev, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Julia Laffranque, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Erik Møse, juges, Opinion concordante du juge kovler
<i>El-Masri c. l'ex-république yougoslave de Macédoine</i> , n° 39630/09, 13 décembre 2012 [1]	Open Society Justice Initiative : Le requérant a été représenté par M. J. A. Goldston, M. D. Pavli et M. R. Skilbeck, de l'organisation Open Society Justice Initiative, bureau de New York, et par Me F. Medarski, avocat macédonien Tierce intervention : Amnesty International §227-228 Interights	Le requérant alléguait en particulier avoir fait l'objet d'une opération de remise secrète, dans le cadre de laquelle il aurait été arrêté, détenu au secret, interrogé et maltraité par des agents de l'Etat défendeur, avant d'être remis par ceux-ci à l'aéroport de Skopje à des agents de la CIA (Central Intelligence Agency, agence centrale de renseignement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique) qui l'auraient ensuite emmené, sur un vol spécial affrété par la CIA, dans un établissement de détention secret en Afghanistan, où il aurait subi des mauvais traitements pendant plus de quatre mois. Cette épreuve aurait duré du 31 décembre 2003 au 29 mai 2004, date du retour du requérant en Allemagne.	Nicolas Bratza, président, Françoise Tulkens, Josep Casadevall, Dean Spielmann, Nina Vajić, Peer Lorenzen, Karel Jungwiert, Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, Khanlar Hajiyev, Luis López Guerra, Ledi Bianku, Işıl Karakaş, Vincent A. De Gaetano, Julia Laffranque, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Erik

ECLJ, Annexe n°3 : Actions directes des ONG comme représentant des requérants auprès de la CEDH entre 2009 et 2019

	International commission of jurists Redress	Violation de l'article 3, 5 et 8 de la CESDH à l'unanimité.	Møse, Helen Keller, juges,
<i>Austrianu v. Romania</i> , n°16117/02, 12 février 2013	The applicant, who had been granted legal aid, was represented by Mrs D. O. Hatneanu[1] and Mrs R. Stănescu-Cojocaru, lawyers practising in Bucharest. He was also assisted by APADOR-CH (the Association for the Defence of Human Rights in Romania – the Helsinki Committee), a non-governmental organisation based in Bucharest.	The applicant alleged that he had been subjected to ill-treatment in violation of Article 3 of the Convention and that the authorities had not carried out a prompt and effective investigation of that incident. Relying on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention he claimed that three final decisions rendered by domestic courts had not been enforced. Under Article 8 he claimed that the prison authorities opened two letters addressed to him by the Court. He alleged that the confiscation of his religious audio tapes and cassette tape player by the prison authorities had infringed his freedom of religion guaranteed by Article 9 of the Convention. Relying on Article 14 in conjunction with Article 9 of the Convention he contended that he had been treated as a member of the Orthodox faith even though he had informed the prison authorities that he was a Baptist. Decision : violation of Article 3 of the Convention under its substantive limb concerning the incident of 9 December 1998; a violation of Article 3 of the Convention under its procedural limb concerning the incident of 9 December 1998; no violation of Article 3 of the Convention concerning the alleged lack of adequate medical treatment;	Josep Casadevall, President, Alvina Gyulumyan, Ján Šikuta, Luis López Guerra, Nona Tsotsoria, Kristina Pardalos, Johannes Silvis, judges,
<i>Maskhadova and others v. Russia</i> , n° 18071/05, 06 juin 2013	Interights , an NGO specialising in the legal protection of human rights based in London represented the applicants.	Referring to Article 2 of the Convention, the applicants (3 Russian nationals) alleged, in particular, that the respondent Government had been directly responsible for the death of Aslan Maskhadov and had failed to investigate the incident. The refusal of the authorities to return the body of Aslan Maskhadov to his family was unlawful and disproportionate, in breach of Articles 8 and 9, taken alone and in conjunction with Articles 13 and 14 of the Convention. Décision : pas de violation de l'article 2, violation des articles 8	Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, President, Elisabeth Steiner, Khanlar Hajiyeu, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Erik Møse, Ksenija Turković, Dmitry Dedov, judges, the joint dissenting opinion of Judges Hajiyeu and Dedov

		et 13, pas de violation de l'article 14 combiné avec l'article 8.	
<i>Vallianatos et autres c. Grèce</i> [GC], n° 29381/09 et 32684/09, 7 novembre 2013 cf. tableau tierce intervention	Les requérants ont été représentés par le Moniteur grec Helsinki • tierce intervention : International commission of jurists, International LGBTI §69	Les requérants alléguaient en particulier sous l'angle des articles 8 et 14 combinés que le fait que le « pacte de vie commune » instauré par la loi no 3719/2008 fût destiné uniquement aux couples formés de personnes majeures de sexe opposé portait atteinte à leur droit à la vie privée et familiale et opérait une discrimination injustifiée entre les couples hétérosexuels et les couples homosexuels, au détriment de ces derniers. Décision : par seize voix contre une, qu'il y a eu violation de l'article 14 de la Convention combiné avec l'article 8	Dean Spielmann, président, Josep Casadevall, Guido Raimondi, Ineta Ziemele, Mark Villiger, Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, Peer Lorenzen, Danutė Jočienė, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Ledi Bianku, Angelika Nußberger, Julia Laffranque, Paulo Pinto de Albuquerque, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Erik Møse, André Potocki, Aleš Pejchal, juges, opinion concordante commune aux juges Casadevall, Ziemele, Jočienė et Sicilianos ; – opinion en partie concordante, en partie dissidente du juge Pinto de Albuquerque.
<i>Khadzhiev v. Bulgaria</i> , n° 44330/07, 03 juin 2014	The applicant was represented by Mrs M. Ilieva, a lawyer practising in Sofia, and the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee	The applicant alleged, in particular, that his second detention pending extradition was unlawful and arbitrary. In 2003 he became a co-founder and an executive member of the Turkmen Helsinki Foundation, an organisation which was founded in Varna and was engaged in human rights protection in	Ineta Ziemele, President, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku, Nona Tsotsoria, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Paul Mahoney, Faris Vehabović, judges,

		Turkmenistan. Decision : violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention	
<i>M.P.E.V. and others v. Switzerland</i> , n° 3910/13, 08 juillet 2014	The applicants were represented by Mr B. Wijkstroem and Ms M.-C. Kunz, lawyers at the Protestant Social Centre in Geneva, and by Mr A. Weiss, a lawyer at the AIRE Centre in London	The applicants alleged, in particular, that the first applicant's expulsion to Ecuador would violate their right to respect for their family life. Decision : violation of Article 8 of the Convention in the case of the first applicant's expulsion;	Guido Raimondi, President, András Sajó, Nebojša Vučinić, Helen Keller, Paul Lemmens, Egidijus Kūris, Jon Fridrik Kjølbro, judges,
<i>Hämäläinen c. Finlande</i> , [GC] n° 37359/09, 16 juillet 2014	Avocats représentant le requérant sont à Interights . Tierce intervention : Amnesty International (+Transgender Europe)	Sur des questions liés à la reconnaissance juridique des changements de sexe. La requérante se plaignait en particulier, sous l'angle des articles 8 et 14 de la Convention, de ne pouvoir obtenir la pleine reconnaissance de son nouveau sexe sans transformer son mariage en un partenariat enregistré. Elle y voyait une violation de son droit à la vie privée et familiale. Décision : Dit, par quatorze voix contre trois, pas de violation de l'article 8 ; pas lieu d'examiner l'affaire sous l'angle de l'article 12 ; pas de violation de l'article 14 combiné aux art. 8 et 12 de la Convention.	Dean Spielmann, président, Josep Casadevall, Guido Raimondi, Ineta Ziemele, Mark Villiger, Isabelle Berro, Khanlar Hajiyev, Danutė Jočienė, Päivi Hirvelä, András Sajó, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Erik Møse, Helen Keller, André Potocki, Paul Lemmens, Valeriu Grițco, Faris Vehabović, juges, Opinion concordante de la juge Ziemele ; opinion dissidente commune aux juges Sajó, Keller et Lemmens.

<i>Husayn (Abu Zubaydah) v. Poland</i>, n° 7511/13, 24 juillet 2014	The applicant was represented before the Court by Mr P. Hughes, a lawyer in the non-governmental organisation Interights, Ms H. Duffy, Senior Counsel in Interights, Ms V. Vandova, the Litigation Director of Interights, Tierces interventions: the International commission of jurists and Amnesty International : §387-390 + rapports AI et HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH	A stateless Palestinian alleged, in particular: (i) a breach of Articles 3, 5 and 8 on account of the fact that Poland had enabled the CIA to detain him secretly on its territory, thereby allowing the CIA to subject him to treatment that amounted to torture, incommunicado detention, various forms of mental and physical abuse and deprivation of any access to, or contact with, his family or the outside world; (ii) a breach of Articles 3, 5 and 6 § 1 on account of the fact that Poland enabled the CIA to transfer him from its territory, thereby exposing him to years of further torture, ill-treatment, secret and arbitrary detention and denial of justice in the hands of the US authorities; (iii) a breach of Article 13 taken separately and in conjunction with Articles 3, 5 and 8 on account of Poland's failure to conduct an effective investigation into his allegations of serious violations of the Convention. Decision unanimously: a violation art. 3 (in its procedural aspect and in its substantive aspect), a violation of Article 5 of the Convention, a violation of Article 8 of the Convention, a violation of Article 13 of the Convention and a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.	Ineta Ziemele, President, Päivi Hirvelä, George Nicolaou, Ledi Bianku, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Vincent A. De Gaetano, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, judges,
<i>Al Nashiri c. Pologne</i>, n° 28761/11, 24 juillet 2014	The applicant was represented before the Court by Mr J.A. Goldston, attorney, member of the New York Bar and Executive Director of the Open Society Justice Initiative ("the OSJI"), Mr R. Skilbeck, barrister, member of the England and Wales Bar and Litigation Director of the OSJI, Ms A. Singh, attorney, member of the New York Bar and Senior Legal Officer at the OSJI, and also by Ms N. Hollander, attorney,	Torture et séquestration / détention par la CIA Décision : violation art. 3 (en son aspect procédural et substantiel), violation art. 5, violation art. 8, violation art. 13, violation art. 6§1, violation art.2 et 3 pris ensemble avec l'article 1 protocole n°6	Ineta Ziemele, President, Päivi Hirvelä, George Nicolaou, Ledi Bianku, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Vincent A. De Gaetano, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, judges,

	member of the New Mexico Bar.		
<i>K.C. v. Poland</i> , n° 31199/12, 25 novembre 2014	The applicant was represented by Mr A. Bodnar, a lawyer from the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights	The applicant (a Polish national, Ms K.C.) complained, in particular, about her enforced placement in a social care home and her inability to obtain release from the home, in breach of Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention. Decision : a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention; no violation of Article 5 § 4 of the Convention;	Ineta Ziemele, President, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku, Nona Tsotsoria, Paul Mahoney, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, Faris Vehabović, judges,
<i>Marian Maciejewski v. Poland</i> , n° 34447/05, 13 janvier 2015	The applicant was initially represented by Mr A. Rzepliński, and subsequently by Mr A. Bodnar and Ms D. Bychawska-Siniarska, lawyers with the Helsinki Foundation of Human Rights	A Polish national alleged a breach of Article 10 of the Convention on account of his conviction for defamation. Decision : violation of Article 10 of the Convention	Ineta Ziemele, President, Päivi Hirvelä, George Nicolaou, Ledi Bianku, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, Faris Vehabović, judges,
<i>Neshkov and others v. Bulgaria</i> , n° 36925/10, 21487/12, 72893/12..., 27 janvier 2015	Mr Yordanov (one of applicants) was represented by Ms D. Fartunova, a lawyer practising in Sofia and working with the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee. third-party submissions : Bulgarian Helsinki Committee §219-224	six applications : the applicants alleged, <i>inter alia</i> , that the conditions of their detention in various correctional facilities in Bulgaria had been or were inhuman and degrading. Mr Neshkov in addition alleged that he had not had effective domestic remedies in that respect. Decision : Holds that there has been a violation of Article 13 of the Convention and dismisses the Government's objection of non-exhaustion of domestic remedies; Holds that there have been violations of Article 3 of the Convention with respect to: (a) the conditions in which Mr Neshkov was kept in Varna Prison and Stara Zagora Prison; (b) the conditions in which Mr Yordanov was kept in Sofia Prison, Pleven Prison, Lovech Prison and Atlant Prison Hostel; and (c) the conditions in which Mr Tsekov and Mr Zlatev were kept	Ineta Ziemele, President, Päivi Hirvelä, George Nicolaou, Nona Tsotsoria, Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, Faris Vehabović, judges,

		in Burgas Prison;	
<i>Association for the defence of human rights in Romania – Helsinki committee on behalf of Ionel Garcea v. Romania</i> , n° 2959/11, 24 mars 2015	the Association for the Defence of Human Rights in Romania – Helsinki Committee (the APADOR-CH)	the complaints concerning the alleged lack of proper medical treatment in prison resulting in Mr Garcea’s death, the quality of the ensuing investigation and the absence of an effective remedy to complain about the alleged violations were communicated to the Government under Articles 2, 3 and 13 of the Convention and the remainder of the application was declared inadmissible. Decision : a violation of Article 2 of the Convention in its procedural limb; no violation of Article 2 of the Convention in its substantive limb; no need to examine the admissibility and merits of the complaints under Articles 3, 6 and 13 of the Convention;	Josep Casadevall, President, Luis López Guerra, Dragoljub Popović, Kristina Pardalos, Johannes Silvis, Valeriu Grițco, Iulia Antoanella Motoc, judges,
Helsinki Committee of Armenia v. Armenia, n° 59109/08, 31 mars 2015	Helsinki Committee of Armenia	The applicant organisation is a non-governmental human rights organisation based in Yerevan. On 12 May 2007 a third person, L.G., who was apparently a witness in a murder investigation, died while at a police station. According to the official version, L.G. died in an attempt to escape by jumping out of a second-floor window of the police station. It appears that this event provoked an outcry among Armenian human rights groups and civil society. Decision: violation art. 11 & 13	Josep Casadevall, President, Luis López Guerra, Ján Šikuta, Dragoljub Popović, Kristina Pardalos, Johannes Silvis, Iulia Antoanella Motoc, judges,
<i>Rutkowski and others v. Poland</i> , n° 72287/10, 07 juillet 2015	The first applicant was represented by Mr A. Bodnar and Ms I. Pacho, lawyers working for the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights	The applicants, 3 polish nationals, alleged a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention on account of the unreasonable length of proceedings in their cases and a violation of Article 13 of the Convention on account of the defective operation of a domestic remedy for the excessive length of judicial proceedings. Decision : violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention on account of the unreasonable length of proceedings in the applicants’ cases; violation of Article 13 of the Convention on account of the deficient operation of the complaint under the 2004 Act in that it did not provide the applicants with	Guido Raimondi, President, Päivi Hirvelä, Ledi Bianku, Nona Tsotsoria, Paul Mahoney, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, Faris Vehabović, judges,

		appropriate and sufficient compensation for a breach of Article 6 § 1; Holds that the above violations of Articles 6 § 1 and 13 originated in a practice that was incompatible with the Convention, consisting in the unreasonable length of civil and criminal proceedings in Poland and in the Polish courts' non-compliance with the Court's case-law on the assessment of the reasonableness of the length of proceedings and "appropriate and sufficient redress" for a violation of the right to a hearing within a reasonable time;	
<i>Nabil and others v. Hungary</i> , n° 62116/12, 22 septembre 2015	The applicants were represented by Ms B. Pohárnok, a lawyer practising in Budapest and acting on behalf of the Hungarian Helsinki Committee.	Three Somali nationals alleged that their detention had been unjustified, a situation not remedied by adequate judicial supervision. They relied on Articles 5 §§ 1 (f) and 4 of the Convention. Decision : violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention concerning the period from 8 November 2011 to 3 March 2012;	Işıl Karakaş, President, András Sajó, Nebojša Vučinić, Paul Lemmens, Egidijus Kūris, Robert Spano, Jon Fridrik Kjølbro, judges,
<i>Neškoska v. "The Former Yugoslav Republic Of Macedonia"</i> , n° 60333/13, 21 janvier 2016	The applicant was represented by Mr S. Dukoski, on behalf of the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Skopje	The applicant alleged under Articles 2 and 13 of the Convention that the investigation into her son's death had not been effective and that she had no remedy in this respect. Decision : no violation of Article 2 of the Convention;	Päivi Hirvelä, President, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Ledi Bianku, Paul Mahoney, Aleš Pejchal, Robert Spano, Armen Harutyunyan, judges,
<i>D.L. v. Bulgaria</i> , n° 7472/14, 19 mai 2016	The applicant was represented by Ms D.N. Fartunova, a lawyer and member of the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee	The applicant alleged that her placement in a correctional boarding school (възпитателно училище – интернат) had been in breach of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention and that she had been unable to have it reviewed by a court at regular intervals in accordance with Article 5 § 4 of the Convention. She also complained, under Article 8, of the automatic monitoring of her correspondence and telephone calls at the correctional boarding	Angelika Nußberger, President, Ganna Yudkivska, Khanlar Hajiyevev, André Potocki, Yonko Grozev, Síofra O'Leary,

		school in which she had been placed. Decision : Holds, by six votes to one, that there has been no violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention; Holds, unanimously, that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 4 of the Convention; Holds, unanimously, that there has been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention;	Mārtiņš Mits, judges,
<i>Kulinski and Sabev v. Bulgaria</i> , n°63849/09, 21 juillet 2016	The applicants were represented by Mr K. Kanev, from the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee	The applicants, 2 Bulgarian nationals, alleged that they were prevented from voting while serving prison sentences of different lengths. Decision : Holds that there has been a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention; Holds that there has been no violation of Article 13 of the Convention;	Angelika Nußberger, President, Khanlar Hajiyevev, Erik Møse, André Potocki, Siofra O'Leary, Carlo Ranzoni, judges, Pavlina Panova, ad hoc judge,
<i>Shahanov and Palfreeman v. Bulgaria</i> , n° 35365/12 69125/12, 21 juillet 2016	Mr Palfreeman was represented by Mr K. Kanev, chairman of the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee, a non-governmental organisation based in Sofia.	A Bulgarian national, Mr Nikolay Ivanov Shahanov, and an Australian national, Mr Jock Palfreeman alleged, in particular, that disciplinary punishments imposed on them by the prison authorities in response to complaints that they had made in relation to prison officers had unjustifiably interfered with the exercise of their right to freedom of expression. Mr Shahanov also alleged that the prison authorities routinely opened and read his correspondence. Decision : a violation of Article 10 of the Convention in relation to both applicants	Angelika Nußberger, President, Ganna Yudkivska, Erik Møse, Faris Vehabović, Siofra O'Leary, Mārtiņš Mits, judges, Pavlina Panova, ad hoc judge,
<i>Magyar Helsinki Bizottság c. Hongrie</i> [GC], n° 18030/11, 08 novembre 2016	Comité Helsinki hongrois est la partie requérante. Parties tierces : Media Legal Defence Initiative, Campaign for Freedom of Information, ARTICLE 19, Access to	Invoquant l'article 10 de la Convention, la requérante alléguait que le refus des tribunaux hongrois d'ordonner la divulgation des informations auxquelles elle aurait demandé l'accès avait emporté violation de son droit à la liberté d'expression. Dit, par quinze voix contre deux, qu'il y a eu violation de l'article 10 de la Convention	Guido Raimondi, président, András Sajó, Işıl Karakaş, Luis López Guerra, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Angelika Nußberger, Boštjan M. Zupančič, Nebojša

	Information Programme et l'Union hongroise pour les libertés civiles, agissant conjointement, et Fair Trials (§114-116).		Vučinić, Kristina Pardalos, Ganna Yudkivska, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Helen Keller, André Potocki, Aleš Pejchal, Ksenija Turković, Robert Spano, Jon Fridrik Kjølbro, juges. opinion concordante commune aux juges Nussberger et Keller ; opinion concordante du juge Sicilianos, à laquelle se rallie le juge Raimondi ; – opinion dissidente du juge Spano, à laquelle se rallie le juge Kjølbro.
<i>J. and others v. Austria</i> , n° 58216/12, 17 janvier 2017	The applicants were represented by Mr Adam Weiss, Legal Director of the AIRE Centre , a non-governmental organisation (NGO) with its registered office in London.	The applicants complained that the Austrian authorities had failed to undertake effective and exhaustive investigations into their allegations that they had been the victims of human trafficking. Decision : Holds that there has been no violation of Article 4 of the Convention; Holds that there has been no violation of Article 3 of the Convention.	András Sajó, President, Vincent A. De Gaetano, Nona Tsotsoria, Paulo Pinto de Albuquerque, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, Gabriele Kucsko-Stadlmayer, Marko Bošnjak, judges, concurring opinion of judge pinto de Albuquerque, joined by judge Tsotsoria
<i>Chowdury et autres c. Grèce</i> , n° 21884/15, 30 mars 2017	Les requérants ont été représentés par Mes V. Kerasiotis (membre du Conseil grec pour les réfugiés), M. Karavias et M. Papamina, avocats à Athènes, et MM. J. Goldston et S. Cox, respectivement directeur et avocat de la Open Society Justice	The facts relate to 42 Bangladeshi nationals with undocumented status who worked in a strawberry farm in Manolada in Greece. The employers of the farm promised the workers' wages of 22 euros for seven hours labour and 3 euros for each overtime hour, less 3 euros for food. They worked in plastic greenhouses picking strawberries every day from 7 a.m. till 7 p.m. under the supervision of armed guards. They lived in makeshift tents of	Kristina Pardalos, présidente, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Aleš Pejchal, Robert Spano, Armen Harutyunyan, Tim Eicke, Jovan Ilievski, juges,

	Initiative Des observations : de la faculté de droit de l'université de Lund en Suède, la Confédération syndicale internationale, l'organisation Anti-Slavery International, le AIRE Centre (Advice for Individual Rights in Europe) et la PICUM (Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants)	cardboard boxes and nylon without running water and toilets. They were warned by their employers that they would only receive their salaries if they kept on working for them The Court found a violation of Article 4§2.	
<i>Aneva and others v. Bulgaria</i> , n° 66997/13 77760/14 50240/15, 06 avril 2017	The applicants in the second and third applications were represented before the Court by Ms A. Kachaunova, from the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee.	The first, third and fourth applicants alleged that they had been unable to have contact with their children, and the second applicant with his mother, for a prolonged period, despite final domestic Judgments awarding the first, third and fourth applicants custody or visiting rights. Decision : violation of Article 8 of the Convention in respect of the first, second and third applicants; no violation of Article 8 of the Convention in respect of the fourth applicant; no need to examine the complaint under Article 13 of the Convention;	Angelika Nußberger, President, Erik Møse, Faris Vehabović, Yonko Grozev, Síofra O'Leary, Mārtiņš Mits, Lətif Hüseynov, judges,
<i>Karajanov v. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"</i> , n° 2229/15, 06 avril 2017	The applicant was represented by Mr S. Dukovski, on behalf of the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Skopje	The applicant alleged that the domestic authorities' decisions in lustration proceedings against him had been unfair and had violated the principle of the presumption of innocence. He also complained that the proceedings had violated his right to respect for his private life. Decision : violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention on account of the overall unfairness of the lustration proceedings; violation of Article 8 of the Convention; no need to examine the complaint under Article 13 of the Convention;	Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, President, Kristina Pardalos, Aleš Pejchal, Robert Spano, Armen Harutyunyan, Tim Eicke, Jovan Ilievski, judges,
<i>Dimcho Dimov v. Bulgaria</i> (No. 2), n° 77248/12, 29 juin	The applicant was represented by Ms M. Ilieva, a lawyer practising in Sofia and legal director of the Bulgarian	The applicant, who is serving a sentence of imprisonment, alleged that the prison authorities had not done enough to protect him against a violent attack perpetrated by another inmate, even	Angelika Nußberger, President, Erik Møse,

2017	Helsinki Committee (“BHC”)	though they knew he was at risk. He also claimed that they had not provided him with adequate medical care for the injury he had suffered as a result of that attack. Decision : no violation of Article 3 of the Convention	André Potocki, Síofra O’Leary, Mārtiņš Mits, Lātif Hüseynov, judges, Pavlina Panova, judge ad hoc,
<i>Orthodox ohrid Archdiocese (Greek-orthodox ohrid Archdiocese of the Peć Patriarchy)" v. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia",</i> n° 3532/07, 16 novembre 2017	The applicant association was represented by the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Skopje.	The applicant association alleged, in particular, that the refusal of the respondent State to register it violated its rights to freedom of religion and association and breached the principle of prohibition on discrimination. Decision : a violation of Article 11 of the Convention, interpreted in the light of Article 9;	Linós-Alexandre Sicilianos, President, Kristina Pardalos, Aleš Pejchal, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, Armen Harutyunyan, Tim Eicke, Jovan Ilievski, judges,
<i>Kiril Ivanov v. Bulgaria,</i> n° 17599/07, 11 janvier 2018	The applicant was represented by Mr K. Kanev, chairman of the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee, a non-governmental organisation based in Sofia, and by Mr S. Ovcharov, a lawyer working with the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee and practising in Sofia.	In his original application, the applicant alleged that a rally planned for 30 September 2006 in whose organisation he had taken part had been banned by the authorities, and that he had not had an effective domestic remedy in respect of that. This, he alleged, had been due to the Macedonian ethnic consciousness of the people who had intended to take part in it. In follow-up submissions filed with the Court on 28 November 2007, the applicant alleged that another rally, planned for 12 September 2007, which he had also helped organise, had been banned by the authorities for the same reasons. Decision : violation of Article 11 of the Convention; violation of Article 13 of the Convention;	Angelika Nußberger, President, Erik Møse, André Potocki, Síofra O’Leary, Gabriele Kucsko-Stadlmayer, Lātif Hüseynov, judges, Maiia Rousseva, ad hoc judge,
<i>The United Macedonian Organisation Ilinden and others v.</i>	The applicants were represented by Mr K. Kanev, chairman of the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee, a non-governmental organisation based	The applicants alleged that the Bulgarian courts’ refusal to register Ilinden had been in breach of their right to freedom of association. They also alleged that the refusal, which had in their view been based on the Bulgarian State’s policy to deny the	Angelika Nußberger, President, Erik Møse, André Potocki,

<i>Bulgaria</i> (No. 3), n° 29496/16, 11 janvier 2018	in Sofia.	existence of a Macedonian minority in Bulgaria, had been discriminatory. Decision : violation of Article 11 of the Convention;	Síofra O’Leary, Gabriele Kucsko-Stadlmayer, Lätif Hüseyinov, judges, Maiia Rousseva, ad hoc judge,
<i>Yordan Ivanov and others v. Bulgaria</i> , n° 70502/13, 11 janvier 2018	The applicants were represented by Mr K. Kanev, chairman of the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee, a non-governmental organisation based in Sofia	The applicants alleged that the Bulgarian courts’ refusal to register the United Macedonian Organisation Ilinden (“Ilinden”), an organisation based in south-west Bulgaria, in an area known as the Pirin region or the geographic region of Pirin Macedonia, of whose board they were members, had been in breach of their right to freedom of association. They also alleged that the refusal, which had in their view been based on the Bulgarian State’s policy to deny the existence of a Macedonian minority in Bulgaria, had been discriminatory. Decision : violation of Article 11 of the Convention	Angelika Nußberger, President, Erik Møse, André Potocki, Síofra O’Leary, Gabriele Kucsko-Stadlmayer, Lätif Hüseyinov, judges, Maiia Rousseva, ad hoc judge,
<i>Hadzhieva v. Bulgaria</i> , n° 45285/12, 01 février 2018	The applicant was represented by Mr K. Kanev, head of the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee	The applicant alleged, in particular, a breach of Articles 8 and 13 as a result of the failure by the authorities to provide her with assistance following her parents’ arrest in December 2002, and the absence of an effective remedy in this connection. Decision : Holds, by four votes to three, that there has been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention as regards the period before 6 December 2002; Holds, unanimously, that there has been no violation as regards the period after that date; Holds, unanimously, that there is no need to examine the complaint under Article 13 of the Convention;	Angelika Nußberger, President, Erik Møse, Nona Tsotsoria, Síofra O’Leary, Mărtiņš Mits, Gabriele Kucsko-Stadlmayer, judges, Maiia Rousseva, ad hoc judge, the joint dissenting opinion of Judges Møse, O’Leary and Rousseva
<i>Bistieva et autres c. Pologne</i> , n° 75157/14, 10 avril	Le requérant est représenté par Mr J. Białas (avocat de la team of the Strategic Litigation Programme de la	Concerne la détention de migrant en Pologne dont d’enfants. Décision : violation de l’article 8 de la Convention.	Vincent A. De Gaetano, President, András Sajó, Paulo Pinto de

2018	Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights - Pologne) ¹		Albuquerque, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, Iulia Motoc, Gabriele Kucsko-Stadlmayer, Marko Bošnjak, judges,
<i>Dimitras v. Greece</i> , n° 11946/11, 19 avril 2018	The applicant was represented by Greek Helsinki Monitor, a non-governmental organisation based in Glyka Nera, Athens	The applicant complained under Article 6 that his right of access to a court and his right to have his case heard within a reasonable time had been violated. He also complained that he had not had at his disposal an effective remedy for his complaint concerning the reasonable-time requirement. He is the executive director of the non-governmental organisation “Greek Helsinki Monitor”. Decision : no violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention on account of the applicant’s right of access to a court; violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention on account of the length of the proceedings; violation of Article 13 of the Convention;	Kristina Pardalos, President, Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, Aleš Pejchal, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, Armen Harutyunyan, Tim Eicke, Jovan Ilievski, judges,
<i>Al Nashiri v. Romania</i> , n° 33234/12, 31 mai 2018	The applicant was represented by Mr J.A. Goldston, attorney, member of the New York Bar and Executive Director of the Open Society Justice Initiative (“the OSJI”), Mr R. Skilbeck, barrister, member of the England and Wales Bar and Litigation Director of the OSJI, Ms A. Singh, attorney, member of the New York Bar and Senior Legal Officer at the OSJI ONG tierces interventions : third-party comments were received from Amnesty International , (hereinafter	Abd al-Rahim Husseyn Muhammad al-Nashiri is a Saudi national who is the victim of a joint U.S.-Romanian rendition and secret detention operation. In October 2002 al-Nashiri was captured in Dubai, UAE, and secretly transferred to CIA custody. He was taken to a secret CIA prison in Afghanistan known as the “Salt Pit,” and then to another “black site” prison in Bangkok, Thailand, where he was waterboarded. On or about December 5, 2002, the CIA “rendered” al-Nashiri to yet another secret prison in Poland where he was subjected to mock executions among other torture tactics. Sometime after 6 June 2003, Romania assisted the CIA in landing a secret flight that brought al-Nashiri to Bucharest. Romania permitted the CIA to hold him incommunicado in a secret prison codenamed “Bright Light”, reportedly located in the basement of a Bucharest government building used as the National Registry Office for	Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, President, Kristina Pardalos, Robert Spano, Aleš Pejchal, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Paul Mahoney, judges, Florin Streteanu, ad hoc judge,

¹ Cette affaire est considérée comme une affaire Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights car elle est mentionnée dans le rapport de cette ONG au titre des affaires dans lesquelles elle agit. <https://www.hfhr.pl/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/raport-roczny-PSP-2018-EN.pdf>

	also referred to as “AI”) and the International commission of jurists (hereinafter also referred to as “ICJ”), the Association for the Defence of Human Rights in Romania – the Helsinki Committee (“APADOR-CH”), the twelve media organisations (“Media Groups”), represented by Howard Kennedy Fsi LLP, and the United Nations (UN) Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism (“the UN Special Rapporteur”). • rapports International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights +Amnesty International Report +Human Rights Watch	Classified Information (ORNISS). At the Bright Light facility, detainees were reportedly subjected to mistreatment including sleep deprivation, water dousing, slapping or forced to stand in painful positions. Sometime before 6 September 2006, Romania assisted the CIA in transferring al-Nashiri out of the country on another secret flight. The Court found a violation of Articles 2, 3, 6§1, 8, 13, 1 Protocol No 6.	
<i>Big Brother Watch et autres c. Royaume-Uni</i>, n^{os} 58170/13, 62322/14 et 24960/15, 13 septembre 2018 Renvoi devant la Grande Chambre 04/02/2019 (aff. aussi dans le tableau tierce intervention)	Requérants : 58170/13 Open Rights Group 24960/15 Amnesty International Limited (ONG Tierces Aff 1 : Human Rights Watch, Fondation Helsinki pour les droits de l’homme, International	3 requêtes (nos 58170/13, 62322/14 et 24960/15) dirigées contre le Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d’Irlande du Nord et dont les personnes physiques ou morales énumérées en annexe (« les requérantes ») ont saisi la Cour. Ils se plaignent de la portée et de l’ampleur des programmes de surveillance électronique mis en œuvre par le gouvernement britannique. Protection insuffisante de matériaux journalistiques visés par des systèmes de surveillance électronique : violations art. 10-1 Dit, par cinq voix contre deux, qu’il y a eu violation de l’article 8 de la Convention à raison du régime découlant de l’article 8 § 4 de la RIPa ; Dit, par six voix contre une, qu’il y a eu violation de l’article 8	Linós-Alexandre Sicilianos, président, Kristina Pardalos, Aleš Pejchal, Ksenija Turković, Armen Harutyunyan, Pauline Koskela, Tim Eicke, juges,

	commission of jurists, Open Society Justice Initiative. Dans la seconde affaire, l'autorisation de se porter tiers intervenant a été accordée aux organismes suivants :, Fondation Helsinki pour les droits de l'homme, International commission of jurists.)	de la Convention à raison du régime découlant du chapitre II de la RIPA, Dit, par cinq voix contre deux, qu'il n'y a pas eu violation de l'article 8 de la Convention à raison du régime d'échange de renseignements ; Dit, par six voix contre une, que, dans la mesure où cette disposition était invoquée par les requérantes de la deuxième affaire, il y a eu violation de l'article 10 de la Convention à raison du régime découlant de l'article 8 § 4 de la RIPA et du régime découlant du chapitre II de cette loi ;	
<i>Solska et Rybicka v. Poland</i> , n° 30491/17, 31083/17, 20 septembre 2018	The applicants were represented by Mr P. Kłodoczny, a lawyer working with the Helsinki Foundation of Human Rights	The applicants alleged, in particular, that the exhumation of their husbands' remains had violated Article 8 of the Convention. contexte : crash d'avion. Decision : violation of Article 8 of the Convention	Linós-Alexandre Sicilianos, President, Aleš Pejchal, Krzysztof Wojtyczek, Ksenija Turković, Pauline Koskelo, Tim Eicke, Jovan Ilievski, judges,
<i>Prizreni v. Albania</i> , n° 29309/16, 11 juin 2019	The applicant was represented by Ms E. Skendaj, of the Albanian Helsinki Committee	The applicant complained of the lack of an effective investigation into the death of his brother while he was serving a prison sentence, contrary to Article 2 of the Convention. He also complained of the inhuman and degrading treatment of his brother as a result of the lack of medical treatment and of the fact that his brother had been handcuffed while in hospital, contrary to Article 3 of the Convention. Decision : a violation of Article 2 of the Convention, in its procedural limb; no violation of Article 3 of the Convention, in its substantive limb; violation of Article 3 of the Convention, in its procedural limb;	Robert Spano, President, Marko Bošnjak, Işıl Karakaş, Julia Laffranque, Valeriu Griţco, Arnfinn Bårdsen, Darian Pavli, judges,
<i>Magnitskiy and others v. Russia</i> , n° 32631/09 53799/12, 27 août	Mr Magnitskiy and his widow were initially represented by Mr D. Kharitonov and Ms E. Oreshnikova, lawyers practising in Moscow. The	Le premier requérant, un expert fiscal et comptable dont le cabinet se trouvait à Moscou, avait conduit pour le compte d'un client des investigations en rapport avec des allégations de fraude fiscale. Il fut ultérieurement arrêté, soupçonné de	Vincent A. De Gaetano, President, Georgios A. Serghides, Helen Keller, Dmitry Dedov, María

2019	second applicant was then represented by lawyers from the Open Society Justice Initiative, including its executive director, Mr J. Goldston. They also represented the third applicant.	complicité de fraude fiscale. Alors qu'il était incarcéré, on diagnostiqua chez lui une pancréatite et il décéda en détention provisoire le 16 novembre 2009. Il fit l'objet d'une condamnation posthume. Avant son décès, le premier requérant avait saisi la Cour européenne, s'étant plaint en particulier de ses conditions de détention ainsi que de la justification et de la durée de sa détention provisoire. Son épouse et sa mère (la deuxième requérante et la troisième requérante, respectivement) ont introduit d'autres requêtes à la suite de son décès. Violation art. 2-1, art. 6§1 et art. 3 pour le premier requérant.	Elósegui, Gilberto Felici, Erik Wennerström, judges
------	--	--	---