EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Press Unit
Unité de la Presse

Press country profile
Fiche pays pour la presse

Last updated: July 2026

Georgia

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1999

National Judge: Lado Chanturia (8 January 2018 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Mindia Ugrekhelidze (1999-2008), Nona Tsotsoria (2008-2017)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 159 applications concerning Georgia in 2025, of which 143 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 10 judgments (concerning 16 applications), of which 8 found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2024	2025	2026*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	151	194	172
Communicated to the Government	38	50	22
Applications decided:	148	159	72
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	93	130	53
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	28	8	11
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	0	5	1
- Decided by judgment	27	16	7

* January to July 2026

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the ECHR internet site.
Statistics on interim measures can be found here.

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2026	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	325
Single Judge	60
Committee (3 Judges)	165
Chamber (7 Judges)	100
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

Georgia and ...

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 **673** Registry staff members.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Tsaava and Others v. Georgia (applications nos. 13186/20, 16757/20, 20129/21, 20175/21, and 39382/21)

11.12.2025

The case concerned the dispersal by the police of a major anti-Government protest on the night of 20-21 June 2019 from the front of the Parliament building in Tbilisi. The approximately 12,000-strong protest, policed by about 5,000 officers, had been sparked by a prominent member of the Russian Duma sitting in the Speaker's chair in the Georgian Parliament and delivering a speech in Russian as part of a session of the Interparliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy (an interparliamentary institution based in Athens, set up to foster relations between Christian Orthodox lawmakers).

Violation of both aspects of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment/lack of effective investigation)
Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)
Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association)
No violation of Article 38 (obligation to furnish all necessary facilities during the examination of the case).

Merabishvili v. Georgia

28.11.2017

The case concerned the arrest and pre-trial detention of a former Prime Minister of Georgia, Ivane Merabishvili, and his complaint that there had been ulterior purposes behind these measures.

No violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) with regard to Mr Merabishvili's arrest or his pre-trial detention
No violation of Article 5 § 3 (entitlement of a detainee to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial) with regard to his initial placement in pre-trial detention
Violation of Article 5 § 3 in that, at least from 25 September 2013 onwards, his pre-trial detention had ceased to be based on sufficient grounds; and
Violation of Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) taken in conjunction with Article 5 § 1

Assanidze v. Georgia

08.04.2004

The case concerned the continued detention of Tengiz Assanidze, former mayor of Batumi, in a short-term remand prison in the Adjarian Autonomous Republic, despite his acquittal by the Supreme Court of Georgia.

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing)

Interstate cases

Georgia v. Russia (IV)

09.04.2024 (merits)

The case concerned the human-rights toll caused by the hardening of the administrative boundary lines (known as "borderisation") after the armed conflict between Georgia and Russia in August 2008.

Multiple violations of:
Article 2 (right to life)
Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)
Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)
Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)
Articles 1 (protection of property) and 2 (right to education) of Protocol No. 1
Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement)

The Court ruled on the question of just satisfaction in a judgment delivered on 14 October 2025.
It held that Russia had to pay Georgia over 253 million euros for breaches of human rights caused by the hardening of boundary lines after the 2008 conflict. It made that award to more than 29,000 victims of a pattern or system of violations, including excessive use of force; ill-treatment; unlawful detention; unlawful restrictions on day-to-day movement across the administrative boundary line and on access

to homes, land and families; and, denial of the right to education in Georgian.

Georgia v. Russia (II)

21.01.2021

The case concerned allegations by the Georgian Government of administrative practices on the part of the Russian Federation entailing various breaches of the Convention, in connection with the armed conflict between Georgia and the Russian Federation in August 2008.

See press release published in January 2021

Georgia v. Russia (I)

03.07.2014

The case concerned the alleged existence of an administrative practice involving the arrest, detention and collective expulsion of Georgian nationals from the Russian Federation in the autumn of 2006.

Violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens)
Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)
Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to judicial review of detention)
Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)
Violations of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 5 § 1 and with Article 3
Violation of Article 38 (obligation to furnish all necessary facilities for the effective conduct of an investigation)
The Court also found no violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), no violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 7 (procedural safeguards relating to expulsion of aliens) and no violation of Articles 1 and 2 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property and right to education).
On 31 January 2019, the Court decided on the question of just satisfaction.
It held that Russia had to pay Georgia 10,000,000 euros (EUR) in respect of non-pecuniary damage suffered by a group of at least 1,500 Georgian nationals; that that amount was to be distributed to the individual victims by paying EUR 2,000 to the Georgian nationals who had been victims only of a violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (collective expulsion), and EUR 10,000 to EUR 15,000 to those among them who had also been victims of a violation of Article 5 § 1 (unlawful deprivation of liberty) and Article 3 (inhuman and degrading conditions of detention), taking into account the length of their respective periods of detention.

Georgia initially filed four inter-State applications against Russia but withdrew no. 3, leading to its strike-out on 16 March 2010.

Chamber

Cases concerning the right to life (Article 2)

Machalikashvili and Others v. Georgia (no. 32245/19)

19.01.2023

The case concerned an anti-terrorism operation carried out in Georgia by the State Security Service. Following one of the arrests, the applicants' relative, T.M., who was suspected of providing material support to a group associated with the so-called "Islamic State", died in hospital, having been shot while allegedly trying to detonate a grenade during his arrest. The applicants alleged that they themselves were subjected to physical and verbal abuse.

Violation of Article 2 (investigation)
No violation of Article 2 (right to life)

A and B v. Georgia

10.02.2022

The case concerned the failure to prevent gender-based violence by a police officer and to investigate the law-enforcement authorities' passive response.

Violation of Article 2 in both its procedural and substantive aspects
Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Tkhelidze v. Georgia

08.07.2021

The case concerned the Georgian authorities' failure to protect the applicant's daughter from domestic violence and to conduct an effective investigation into the matter.

Violation of Article 2 (right to life/investigation) taken in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Kukhalashvili and Others v. Georgia

02.04.2020

The case concerned the death of the applicants' relatives during a police operation to quell a riot in a prison where they were being held.

Violation of Article 2 in both its procedural and substantive aspects

Vazagashvili and Shanava v. Georgia (no. 50375/07)

18.07.19

The case concerned the shooting of the applicants' son in a police operation and their complaint of the lack of an effective investigation.

Violation of Article 2 in both its procedural and substantive aspects

Sarishvili-Bolkvadze v. Georgia

19.07.2018

The case concerned the applicant's complaint about the authorities' duty to protect her son's life from medical negligence and the adequacy of their response to his death.

Violation of Article 2 because of the authorities' failure to provide an effectively functioning regulatory framework

Violation of Article 2 because of shortcomings in the civil proceedings for compensation

Makharadze and Sikharoulidze v. Georgia

22.11.2011

Georgian authorities' inability to provide effective treatment to a prisoner suffering from multi-drug resistant tuberculosis.

Violation of Article 2

Violation of Article 34 (individual applications)

Enukidze and Girgvliani v. Georgia

26.04.2011

The case concerned the death of a young man, allegedly at the hands of representatives of the Ministry of the Interior, and the complaint that no effective investigation was carried out into it.

Violation of Article 2 (lack of effective investigation into the death of the applicants' son)

Violation of Article 38 (obligation to co-operate with the Court)

Cases concerning inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

X v. Georgia (no. 35640/22)

30.03.2026

The case concerned allegations of sexual abuse of a child and the alleged ineffectiveness of the subsequent criminal investigation. In May 2021 a criminal investigation was opened into allegations of sexual abuse made by X against her stepfather. X gave a detailed statement to the police, who gathered evidence supporting her allegations. According to the information available in the case file, no action has been taken to further the investigation since July 2021.

Violation of Articles 3 and 8

Mamasakhlisi and Others v. Georgia and Russia (nos. 29999/04 and 41424/04)

07.03.2023

The case concerned events prior to the armed conflict in 2008 between Georgia and Russia and, in particular, Mr Mamasakhlisi's and Mr Nanava's arrests in 2001 and 2003 respectively, and their alleged ill-treatment, conviction and continued detention by the *de facto* Abkhaz authorities.

No violation by Georgia

Women's Initiatives Supporting Group and Others v. Georgia

16.12.2021

The case concerned an attack by a mob on LGBT demonstrators on 17 May 2013 – the International Day Against Homophobia – in central Tbilisi.

Violation of Article 3 in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Violation of Article 11 (freedom of association) taken in conjunction with Article 14.

Aghdgomelashvili and Japaridze v. Georgia

08.10.2020

The case concerned a police raid on the office of a lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender organisation in Tbilisi. The applicants, who worked at the organisation, complained that the police had insulted and threatened them, and put them through humiliating strip-searches.

Violations of Article 3 taken in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) as concerned the police abuse during the raid and the related investigation.

Identoba and Others v. Georgia

12.05.2015

The case concerned a peaceful demonstration in Tbilisi in May 2012 to mark the International Day against Homophobia, which was violently disrupted by counter-demonstrators outnumbering the marchers.

Violation of Article 3 taken in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association) in conjunction with Article 14

Begheluri and Others v. Georgia

07.10.2014

The case concerned the severe harassment of a large number of Jehovah's Witnesses in Georgia in the years 2000-2001.

Violation of Article 3, taken separately and in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) with regard to 32 of the applicants, on account of the inhuman and degrading treatment to which they were subjected – and no violation, in that respect, of Article 3 taken separately or in conjunction with Article 14 with regard to the remaining applicants

Violation of Article 3, taken separately and in conjunction with Article 14 with regard to 46 of the applicants on account of the authorities' failure to conduct an effective investigation into their complaints – and no violation, in that respect, of Article 3 taken separately or in conjunction with Article 14 with regard to the remaining applicants

Violation of Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience, and religion), taken separately and in conjunction with Article 14 with regard to 88 applicants

Ghavtadze v. Georgia

03.03.2009

The case concerned the failure of the Georgian authorities to comply with their obligation to protect the applicant's health during his detention and to provide him with appropriate treatment for his viral hepatitis C and tuberculous pleurisy.

Violation of Article 3

Poghosyan v. Georgia

24.02.2009

The case concerned the failure to provide the applicant, who suffered from viral hepatitis C, with proper medical care in prison.

Violation of Article 3

The Court, under Article 46 (binding force and execution of judgments), invited Georgia to take legislative and administrative steps to prevent the transmission of viral hepatitis C in prisons, to introduce screening arrangements for this disease and to ensure its timely and effective treatment.

Ramishvili and Kokhreidze v. Georgia

27.01.2009

The case concerned the imprisonment on suspicion of extortion of Shalva Ramishvili and Davit Kokhreidze, who were co-founders of and shareholders in a private media company which owned "TV 202", a broadcasting television channel in Tbilisi.

Violation of Article 3) on account of the inhuman and degrading conditions in which the first applicant was detained in the punishment cell at Tbilisi No. 5

Violation of Article 3 on account of the second applicant's detention in an overcrowded cell at Tbilisi No. 5 Prison

Violation of Article 3 on account of the applicants' placement in a metal cage during a court hearing

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (c) (right to liberty and security) on account of the absence of a valid court order authorising the applicants' detention between 27 November 2005 and 13 January 2006

No violation of Article 5 § 4 on account of the applicants' inability to have prompt access to a video recording used as evidence against them

Violation of Article 5 § 4 on account of the manner in which the judicial review of 2 September 2005 was conducted and the absence of a speedy reply to the applicants' complaint of 6 December 2005

97 Members of the Gldani Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses & 4 Others v. Georgia

03.05.2007

The case concerned an October 1999 attack on a Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses by a group of extremist Orthodox believers,

led by Basil Mkalavishvili (known as "Father Basil") and the lack of an appropriate response by the Georgian authorities.
Violation of Article 3
Violation of Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion)
Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Shamayev and 12 Others v. Georgia and Russia

12.04.2005
The case concerned the extradition of alleged Chechen terrorists from Georgia to Russia.
See the Court's findings in the press release

Cases concerning the right to liberty and security (Article 5)

O.J. and J.O. v. Georgia and Russia (nos. 42126/15 and 42127/15)

19.12.2023
The case concerned the arrest, detention and sentencing of two men on spying charges in the Autonomous Republic of Abkhazia -- the region in Georgia which is currently outside the *de facto* control of the Georgian Government.
No violation by Georgia.
Violation of Article 5 § 1(a)(c) by the Russian Federation
Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3(c) (right to a fair trial) by the Russian Federation

Melia v. Georgia (no. 13668/21)

07.09.2023
The applicant is an opposition politician who, at the time of the events, was a member of Parliament and one of the leaders of the United National Movement (UNM). He was fitted with an electronic tag in 2019 when released on bail while awaiting trial for his alleged role in organising and participating in an attempted violent storming of the Parliament building on 20-21 June 2019.
No violation of Article 5 § 1
No violation of Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights)

Ugulava v. Georgia (no. 5432/15)

09.02.2023
The case concerned the arrest of Mr Ugulava on 3 July 2014 and his pre-trial detention until 17 September 2015. He was wanted in connection with money laundering and other crimes, with several criminal proceedings taking place in parallel.
No violation of Article 5 § 1 on account of the arrest and remand during the period between 3 July 2014 and 2 April 2015
Violation of Article 5 § 1 on account of the remand between 2 April and 17 September 2015
No violation of Article 5 § 1 on account of the lack of a fixed period of detention in the orders of 4 July 2014 and 15 March 2015
Violation of Article 5 § 3
No violation of Article 18 (limitation on restriction of rights) in conjunction with Article 5

Tchankotadze v. Georgia

21.06.2016
The case concerned the pre-trial detention of the former the chairperson of the Civil Aviation Agency (CAA) of Georgia and his criminal conviction of abuse of power.
Violation of Article 5 § 1
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Kakabadze and Others v. Georgia

02.10.2012
The case concerned the applicants' arrest and punishment by detention, imposed as an administrative sanction by a court on the day of their arrest, for their participation in a demonstration.
Violation of Article 5 § 1
Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial)
Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association)
Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 7 (right of appeal in criminal matters)

Giorgi Nikolaishvili v. Georgia

13.01.2009
The case concerned the unlawful detention on remand of the applicant who had been called to serve as a witness in a murder case in which his brother was a suspect.
Violation of Article 5

Cases concerning Article 6

Kezerashvili v. Georgia (no. 11027/22)

05.12.2024
The case concerned a set of proceedings in which Mr Kezerashvili, a former Minister of Defence, was tried, acquitted, and

ultimately convicted, in absentia, of embezzlement.
Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of a lack of objective impartiality of the Supreme Court;
No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 on account of the Supreme Court's reversal of the applicant's acquittal by the lower courts.

Tsulukidze and Rusulashvili v. Georgia (nos. 44681/21 and 17256/22)

29.08.2024

The case concerned the alleged lack of impartiality of a Supreme Court judge who was a member of three-judge panels which rejected claims brought by the applicants and whose judicial assistant was the daughter of the lawyer of the respondent party, the Telasi electricity distribution company, in those proceedings.
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Saakashvili v. Georgia (nos. 6232/20 and 22394/20)

23.05.2024

The case concerned two separate sets of criminal proceedings brought against Mikheil Saakashvili, former President of Georgia. The first set of proceedings concerned an attack in 2005 on a member of parliament, while the second set concerned his granting a pardon in 2008 to four former high-ranking officers of the Ministry of the Interior who had been convicted of murder. Both sets of proceedings took place after the newly-formed government in 2012 officially declared that investigating the wrongdoings of the past would be a key priority.
No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial / right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses) as concerned either the way in which the national courts had dealt with the evidence against Mr Saakashvili or the alleged lack of independence or impartiality of the judge who had examined the second criminal case against him;
No violation of Article 7 (no punishment without law) - Mr Saakashvili could reasonably have foreseen, in the particular circumstances of the case, that using his power of clemency to pervert the course of justice in a murder case would render him criminally liable under Georgian law;
Complaints under Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) - rejected as inadmissible.

Mamaladze v. Georgia (no. 9487/19)

03.11.2022

The case concerned the proceedings against a priest and director of a medical clinic for plotting to kill the personal secretary of the Georgian Orthodox Church's Patriarch while in Berlin. She was part of a delegation accompanying the Patriarch to that city for medical treatment. Mr Mamaladze was ultimately found guilty of "preparation of murder".
No violation of Article 6 § 1 concerning the manner in which the key evidence had been obtained and used against the applicant;
Violation of Article 6 § 1 regarding the closing of his criminal trial to the public
Violation of Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence)

Rusishvili v. Georgia (no. 15269/13)

30.06.2022

The case concerned the alleged unfairness of criminal proceedings conducted against the applicant for murder.
No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) on account of the alleged restrictions on the applicant's right of access to a lawyer of his own choosing
No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) on account of the allegedly arbitrary refusal to admit the defence evidence
No violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the absence of reasons in the jury verdict
Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the unreasoned decision to declare inadmissible the applicant's appeal on points of law

Rustavi 2 Broadcasting Company Ltd and Others v. Georgia

18.07.2019

The case concerned an ownership row over a privately owned television channel, Rustavi 2, the first applicant in the case. The dispute led to a ruling in March 2017 by the Supreme Court of Georgia finding that a former owner of Rustavi 2 had been coerced into giving up the television channel and that the current owners, the second to fourth applicants in the case, were not therefore *bona fide* third-party acquirers. Pending those proceedings, Rustavi 2's corporate assets and all of the

owners' shares in the company were frozen.
In the case before the European Court of Human Rights, the current owners of Rustavi 2 alleged in particular that the judges examining the ownership row had lacked independence and impartiality.
No violation of Article 6 § 1 as concerned the judge deciding the case at first-instance
No violation of Article 6 § 1 as concerned the court deciding the case on appeal
No violation of Article 6 § 1 as concerned the composition of the bench deciding the case during the cassation proceedings before the Supreme Court
The Court also rejected as inadmissible the remaining complaints brought by Rustavi 2's owners (the second to fourth applicants) as well as all those brought by Rustavi 2 (the first applicant) itself, including in particular their allegations that the proceedings had been a State-led campaign to silence the television channel.
Given those inadmissibility findings, the Court decided to lift the interim measure under Rule 39 of its Rules of Court indicating to the Georgian Government that it should among other things suspend enforcement of the decision of March 2017.

Tchokhonelidze v. Georgia

28.06.2018
The case concerned the alleged police entrapment of a senior regional Government official. Following an undercover police operation, he was convicted of requesting a bribe in exchange for his help in obtaining a building permit. In the criminal proceedings against him he unsuccessfully alleged that he had been incited into committing the offence.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Natsvlishvili and Togonidze v. Georgia

29.04.2014
The case essentially concerns the compatibility of the plea-bargain procedure, introduced into the Georgian judicial system in 2004, with the right to a fair trial.
No violation of Article 6 § 1
No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 7 (right of appeal in criminal matters)
No violation of Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence)
No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)
The Court further held that Georgia had not failed to comply with its obligations under Article 34 (right of individual petition).
The Court also noted that in Mr Natsvlishvili's case, the plea bargain had been accompanied by sufficient safeguards against abuse. Mr Natsvlishvili had entered into the plea bargain voluntarily, having understood its contents and consequences.

Khoniakina v. Georgia

19.06.2012
The case concerned the retirement pension of a former Supreme Court judge, which had been modified under a retroactive legislative amendment.
No violation of Article 6 § 1
No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)
The Court found in particular that the adjustment requirement of Ms. Khoniakina's initial pension entitlement had been preserved, as well as the idea of a more generous welfare scheme for retired Supreme Court judges. The modification to Ms. Khoniakina's retirement pension was similarly applied to 850 persons affected by the general reform of retired civil servants' pensions.

Gogoladze v. Georgia

11.12.2007
The case concerned the applicant's complaint that there had been no hearing before the Supreme Court in her case.
No violation of Article 6 § 1

Apostol v. Georgia

28.11.2006
The case concerned the authorities' refusal to enforce the judgment in the applicant's favour.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses

Kartvelishvili v. Georgia

07.06.2018
The case concerned a penknife found during a search of Mr Kartvelishvili's cell while he was serving a nine-year sentence for murder. He was convicted of infringing prison regulations and sentenced to a further three years in prison essentially on the basis of statements by prison officers who had carried out the search. The courts refused Mr Kartvelishvili's requests to have

his cellmates, who were present during the search, called as witnesses in the proceedings.
Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d)

Cases dealing with private and family life (Article 8)

Ramishvili v. Georgia (no. 4100/24)
03.02.2026
The case concerned civil defamation proceedings brought by the applicant, a well-known defence lawyer, against a prominent clergyman of the Georgian Orthodox Church, for statements he had made during a televised interview accusing him of being a "snitch" and feeding information to the secret services.
Violation of Article 8

A.D. and Others v. Georgia (no. 57864/17)
01.12.2022
The applicants are transgender men (assigned female at birth). The case concerned their complaints that they had been unable to obtain legal recognition of their gender because they had not undergone sex reassignment surgery.
Violation of Article 8

Jishkariani v. Georgia
20.09.2018
The case concerned defamation proceedings brought in 2005 by a psychiatrist, who is also a civil society activist, against the Minister of Justice at the time. The Minister had accused her on live television and in a newspaper of issuing medical reports to prisoners in exchange for money.
Violation of Article 8

N.Ts. v. Georgia (no. 71776/12)
02.02.2016
The case concerned proceedings for the return of three young boys – who had been living with their maternal family since their mother's death – to their father.
Violation of Article 8

Freedom of expression (Article 10)

Miladze v. Georgia (no. 41585/23)
19.05.2026
The case concerned Mr Miladze's administrative conviction for a video he had posted on TikTok in 2022 criticising the new transport policies in Tbilisi and alleging misconduct by public officials. The video had gone viral.
No violation of Article 10

Amaghlobeli and Others v. Georgia
20.05.2021
The case concerned the scope of journalistic freedom to engage in news-gathering activities in the customs-control zone of a border checkpoint. Two of the applicants had entered such a zone, had interviewed travellers and taken photographs, and had refused to leave when requested to do so by customs officials.
No violation of Article 10

Studio Monitori and Others v. Georgia
30.01.2020
The case concerned complaints about being denied access to information of public interest.
No violation of Article 10

Freedom of assembly and association (Article 11)

Chkhartishvili v. Georgia (no. 31349/20)
11.05.2023
The case concerned the applicant's arrest in 2019 at a demonstration for disobeying police orders to move off the road and throwing beans at the police, shouting that beans used to be "gruel for slaves". The demonstration in Tbilisi was part of a series of protests about Parliament's failure to approve electoral reform. Mr Chkhartishvili was brought before a judge and found guilty of insulting and disobeying lawful police orders. He was sentenced to eight days' administrative detention.
violation of Article 11 read in the light of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Peradze and Others v. Georgia (no. 5631/16)

15.12.2022

The case concerned the applicants' arrest and conviction for brandishing a banner likening Panorama Tbilisi, an urban development project, to a human penis during a public demonstration. The project aimed to build four new city areas on Sololaki Hill overlooking Tbilisi Old Town.

Violation of Article 11 read in the light of Article 10.

Protection of property cases (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Taganova and Others v. Georgia and Russia

17.12.2024

The case concerned complaints related to property that the applicants had been forced to leave behind or could not access in Abkhazia, Georgia, following the outbreak of hostilities in 1992. Most of the applicants fled Abkhazia to other parts of Georgia and were unable to return. They all claimed ownership of homes in Abkhazia that they had been unable to use or visit.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property);

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

Due to Russia's control over the territory and its failure to protect property rights, particularly for Georgian citizens, the Court held Russia solely responsible for the ongoing property-related violations in this case, excluding Georgia from liability.

Khizanishvili and Kandelaki v. Georgia

17.12.2019

The case concerned the applicants' complaint that they had not received sufficient compensation for the demolition of a building in central Tbilisi in which they had shares.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Gogitidze and Others v. Georgia

12.05.2015

The case concerned the court-imposed measure of confiscation of property belonging – in particular – to the former Ajarian Deputy Minister of the Interior.

No violation of Article 1 (protection of property) of Protocol No. 1

Ashlarba v. Georgia

15.07.2014

The case concerned the precision and foreseeability of a law which punishes individuals for their membership of a criminal syndicate and which was introduced in Georgia in 2005 as part of a legislative package aiming to fight against the criminal underworld.

No violation of Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Kudukhova and Kudukhova v. Georgia and Naniyeva and Bagayev v. Georgia

13.12.2018

The cases concerned complaints by the applicants that their lives were put in danger by the actions of Georgian forces in South Ossetia in August 2008 and that their property had been damaged or destroyed.

Cases declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

X. and Y. v. Georgia (no. 5358/14)

02.10.2014

The case concerned the criminal proceedings instituted against 16 public officials, including the head and deputy head of the Georgian prison department, after video footage of ill-treatment in prisons had been broadcasted on national television. One of the videos included scenes of X., the second applicant, being verbally and physically abused by prison officers.

Application declared inadmissible as it was lodged with the European Court of Human rights outside the six-month time-limit.

Inter-state application Georgia v. Russia (III) (no. 61186/09)
This application was lodged on 16 November 2009 in connection with the detention of four Georgian minors by the *de facto* authorities of South Ossetia. Following a visit to South Ossetia by the Human Rights Commissioner of the Council of Europe, the four minors and a further one who had been previously detained were released from detention. On 29 January 2010 the Georgian Government informed the Court that they no longer wished to maintain the case. Therefore, on 16 March 2010 a Chamber decided to strike the application out of its list of cases (Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention).

Noteworthy pending cases

Chamber

Georgian Young Lawyers' Association and Others v. Georgia (no. 31069/24)
Case communicated to the Government in March 2025
The applicants are 120 civil society organisations and 16 media outlets as well as four individual applicants.
The case concerns the recently enacted Law on Transparency of Foreign Influence ("the TFI Act"). The Act introduced an obligation for privately established organisations (non-commercial organisations, public broadcasters and owners of print or online media) to register as "organisations pursuing a foreign entity's interests" where more than 20% of their total annual income derives from abroad.
The applicants allege that, despite none of the TFI Act's requirements having yet been enforced against them, the law's enactment itself constitutes an interference with their rights under the Convention.
They rely on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 10 (freedom of expression), and 11 (freedom of assembly and association) considered alone and in conjunction with Articles 13 (right to an effective remedy), 14 (prohibition of discrimination) and 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights).

Amaghlobeli v. Georgia (no. 13661/25)
Case communicated to the Government in June 2025
The case concerns the arrest and subsequent pre-trial detention of the applicant, a well-known journalist in Georgia, on charges of assaulting a police officer in the performance of his duties (a criminal offence under Article 353 § 1 of the Criminal Code).
The applicant complains that she was detained in the absence of any reasonable suspicion that she had committed a criminal offence; that there were no relevant and sufficient reasons justifying her initial and/or continued pre-trial detention; that the domestic courts failed to conduct a proper reassessment of the lawfulness of her continued detention; and that her Article 5 rights were restricted for purposes other than those prescribed in the Convention.
She relies on Article 5 (right to liberty and security) taken alone and in conjunction with Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights), and on Articles 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence, 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 10 (freedom of expression) and 13 (right to an effective remedy).

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