



Armenia

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 2002

National Judge: Armen Harutyunyan

Previous judge: Alvina Gyulumyan (2003-2014)

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

The Court dealt with 149 applications concerning Armenia in 2016, of which 133 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 15 judgments (concerning 16 applications), 13 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2014	2015	2016
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	156	122	753
Communicated to the Government	16	25	41
Applications decided:	60	187	149
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	53	178	127
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	3	0	6
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	0	0	0
- Decided by judgment	4	9	16
Interim measures:	2	5	553
- Granted	0	0	0
- Refused (including out of scope)	2	5	553

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

Applications pending before the Court on 01/01/2017	
Total pending applications*	1596
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	1581
Single Judge	28
Committee (3 Judges)	25
Chamber (7 Judges)	1527
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	1

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

Armenia and ...

Its contribution to the Court's budget

For 2017 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 2017 contribution of Armenia to the Council of Europe's (EUR 328 million) budget is **EUR 483,598**.

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 **672** Registry staff members of whom **8** are Armenian.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

[Chiragov and Others v. Armenia](#)

16.06.2015

The case concerned the complaints by six Azerbaijani refugees that they were unable to return to their homes and property in the district of Lachin, in Azerbaijan, from where they had been forced to flee in 1992 during the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh.

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

[Continuing violation of Article 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\)](#)

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

In the applicants' case, the Court confirmed that Armenia exercised effective control over Nagorno-Karabakh and the surrounding territories and thus had jurisdiction over the district of Lachin.

[There are currently more than one thousand individual applications pending before the Court which were lodged by persons displaced during the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.](#)

[Bayatyan v. Armenia](#)

07.07.2011

The case concerned the conviction of the applicant, a Jehovah's Witness, for his refusal to serve in the army on conscientious grounds.

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

Chamber

Right to life cases (Article 2)

[Muradyan v. Armenia](#)

24.11.2016

Death of a military conscript, Suren Muradyan, based in the (unrecognised) Nagorno Karabakh Republic. His father, the applicant in the case, alleged that he had died following ill-treatment by his superiors.

[Violation of Article 2 \(right to life\) as concerned both the death of Suren Muradyan as well as the related investigation](#)

Case dealing with prohibition of torture (Article 3)

[Zalyan and Others v. Armenia](#)

17.03.2016

The case concerned the complaint by three former servicemen that they had been subjected to torture while performing their military service, being suspected of having murdered two other servicemen. One of the applicants also complained that he had been unlawfully deprived of his liberty.

[No violation of Article 3 \(prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment\) as regards the applicants' alleged torture](#)

[Violation of Article 3 on account of the lack of an effective investigation into their complaints of having been subjected to torture](#)

[Violation of Article 5 §§ 1, 2 and 3 \(right to liberty and security\) in respect of one of the applicants, Mr Zalyan](#)

[Virabyan v. Armenia \(no. 40094/05\)](#)

02.10.2012

The case concerned the torture of an opposition activist in police custody in April 2004. He had in particular been repeatedly kicked and punched in the groin during his custody and, as a result, his left testicle had to be removed.

[Two violations of Article 3 \(prohibition of torture and lack of an effective investigation\)](#)

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

[No violation of Article 14 \(prohibition of discrimination\) in conjunction with Article 3](#)

[Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 3](#)

[This is the first case in which the Court found a violation by Armenia of Article 3 on account of an applicant having been tortured. The Court also criticised the Armenian authorities for failing to conduct an effective investigation into Mr Virabyan's allegations that his ill-treatment had been politically motivated.](#)

Cases dealing with Article 6

Right to a fair hearing

[Galstyan v. Armenia](#)

15.11.2007

The case concerned the conduct of administrative proceedings and the imposition of administrative penalties (usually detention) for participation in demonstrations or other minor offences.

[Violation of Article 6 § 3 \(b\)](#)

[Violation of Article 11 \(freedom of assembly and association\)](#)

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

[Harutyunyan v. Armenia](#)

28.06.2007

The domestic courts convicted the applicant relying on his and other witnesses' testimony obtained under torture.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

Right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses

[Chap Ltd v. Armenia](#)

04.05.2017

The case concerned tax evasion proceedings brought against a regional television broadcasting company. The company notably alleged that they had not been able to examine witnesses whose evidence had been used against it in the proceedings. The witnesses were the head of the National Television and Radio Commission and a number of businessmen.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 read in conjunction with Article 6 § 3 \(d\)](#)

Presumption of innocence

[Virabyan v. Armenia \(no. 40094/05\)](#)

02.10.2012

See case dealing with Article 3

Freedom of expression case (Article 10)

[Karapetyan and Others v. Armenia](#)

17.11.2016

The case concerned the dismissal of four high-ranking civil servants in the Armenian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, after they had issued a public statement criticising the Government in the aftermath of the Armenian presidential election of February 2008.

[Meltex Ltd and Mesrop Movsesyan v. Armenia](#)

17.06.2008

The independent broadcasting company Meltex Ltd was repeatedly refused broadcasting licences by the National Television and Radio Commission, without reasons.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

Noteworthy pending case

[Saghatelyan v. Armenia \(no. 23086/08\)](#)

[Communicated](#) in November 2010

The case concerns the events that followed the disputed presidential election of 19 February 2008 which resulted in clashes between the demonstrators and the police and in subsequent arrests and criminal charges against the demonstrators.

Mr Saghatelyan alleges violations of Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 §§ 1 (c) and 3 (right to liberty and security), 6 §§1, 3 (b) and (d) (right to a fair trial), 10 (freedom of expression), 11 (freedom of assembly and association), and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

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