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

Updated: July 2026

France

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1974

National Judge: Mattias Guyomar (22 juin 2020 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the Court's website

Previous Judges: René Samuel Cassin (1959-1976), Pierre-Henri Teitgen (1976-1980), Louis-Edmond Pettiti (1980-1998), Jean-Paul Costa (1998-2011), André Potocki (2011-2020)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 646 applications concerning France in 2025, of which 619 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 20 judgments (concerning 27 applications), 10 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2024	2025	2026*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	745	863	501
Communicated to the Government	116	69	23
Applications decided:	709	646	518
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	582	545	452
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	51	70	39
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	29	4	8
- Decided by judgment	47	27	19

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2026	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	681
Single Judge	396
Committee (3 Judges)	161
Chamber (7 Judges)	124
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

* 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.

France 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

Right to life case (Article 2)

Lambert and Others v. France

05.06.2015

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

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

Vo v. France (no. 53924/00)

08.07.2004

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

No violation of Article 2

Inadmissible application

Carême v. France (no. 7189/21)

09.04.2024

The case concerned the complaint of the applicant, former resident and mayor of the Grande-Synthe municipality, that France had taken insufficient steps to prevent climate change and that this failure entailed a violation of his right to life and his right to respect for his private and family life and his home.

Application declared inadmissible

For further information, please see these Questions and Answers on the three Grand Chamber cases concerning climate change.

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

Ramirez Sanchez v. France

04.07.2006

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

No violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Selmouni v. France

28.07.1999

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

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

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Sanchez v. France (no. 45581/15)

15.05.2023

The application concerned the criminal conviction of the applicant, at the time a local councillor who was standing for election to Parliament, for the offence of incitement to hatred or violence against a group or an individual on grounds of religion, following his failure to take prompt action to delete comments posted by third parties on the "wall" of his Facebook account. The applicant alleged that his conviction had breached his right to freedom of expression under Article 10 of the Convention.

No violation of Article 10

Couderc and Hachette Filipacchi Associés v. France

10.11.2015

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

Violation of Article 10

Morice v. France

23.04.2015

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

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

Violation of Article 10

Lindon, Otchakovsky-Laurens and July v. France

02.10.2007

Conviction for publications found to be defamatory.

No violation of Article 10

Fressoz and Roire v. France

21.01.1999

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

Violation of Article 10

Cases dealing with discrimination issues (Article 14)

Advisory opinion requested under Protocol No. 16 to the Convention by the French *Conseil d'Etat*
The *Conseil d'Etat* asked the Court about the relevant criteria for assessing the Convention compatibility of a legislative provision limiting the entitlement of landowners' associations to withdraw their land from the territory of an officially approved hunting association (ACCA).

The request was accepted by the Panel of the Grand Chamber on 31 May 2021.

On 13 July 2022, the Grand Chamber delivered the following opinion:

In its request, the *Conseil d'État* asked the Court about the relevant criteria for assessing the compatibility with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the European Convention on Human Rights taken together with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) of a legislative provision excluding the possibility for landowners' associations set up after the creation of an approved municipal hunters' association (*association communale de chasse agréée* – ACCA) to withdraw their land from the ACCA's hunting grounds once they had attained the minimum surface area to be able to do so.

In its advisory opinion, the Court replied that the *Conseil d'Etat* would first have to assess whether the difference in treatment – resulting from Article L. 422-18 of the Environment Code, as worded subsequent to the Law of 24 July 2019 – between associations "having a recognised existence prior to the date of creation of the ACCA" and associations set up after that date could fall within the scope of Article 14 of the Convention in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, and if so, whether that difference concerned persons in analogous or relatively similar situations.

If the reply to each of these two preliminary questions was in the affirmative, the Court specified that in determining whether the difference in treatment at issue was "legitimate and reasonable" and, accordingly, compatible with Article 14 of the Convention in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, the requesting court would be required to ensure: firstly, that in making a distinction between categories of owners of land or hunting rights on the basis of the date on which their association had been set up, the legislature had pursued one or more "legitimate aims"; secondly, that the law provided a legal basis satisfying the requirement of lawfulness enshrined in Article 1 of Protocol No. 1; and, thirdly, that there was a "reasonable relationship of proportionality" between the means employed and the legitimate aim(s) sought to be realised.

In that respect, the requesting court's assessment should be carried out in the light of the criterion "manifestly without reasonable foundation" as regards control of the use of property, within the meaning of the second paragraph of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

In assessing the proportionality of the measure establishing the difference in treatment at issue, the requesting court should take into account, *inter alia*, the nature of the criterion of differentiation introduced by the law and its impact on the national authorities' margin of appreciation; the choice of means employed to achieve the aim(s) pursued; the appropriateness of the means employed in relation to the

aim(s) pursued; and the impact of the means employed.

Fabris v. France

07.02.2013[1]

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

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

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

22.01.2008

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

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

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

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

29.03.2010

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

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

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

Draon v. France and Maurice v. France

06.05.2005

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

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

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

Surrogacy

Request for an advisory opinion under Protocol No. 16 to the Convention

On 16 October 2018 the Court received a request for an advisory opinion on the question of surrogacy from the French Court of Cassation.

The Panel of the Grand Chamber having accepted the request on 3 December 2018, a Grand Chamber was constituted in order to consider it.

On 10 April 2019, the Grand Chamber delivered the following opinion:

In a situation where a child was born abroad through a gestational surrogacy arrangement and was conceived using the gametes of the intended father and a third-party donor, and where the legal parent-child relationship with the intended father has been recognised in domestic law,

1. the child's right to respect for private life within the meaning of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights requires that domestic law provide a possibility of recognition of a legal parent-child relationship with the intended mother, designated in the birth certificate legally established abroad as the "legal mother";

2. the child's right to respect for private life does not require such recognition to take the form of entry in the register of births, marriages and deaths of the details of the birth certificate legally established abroad; another means, such as adoption of the child by the intended mother, may be used.

Cases dealing with repatriation

H.F. and Others v. France

14.09.2022

The case concerned the refusal to grant the applicants' requests for the repatriation by the French authorities of their daughters and grandchildren, who are being held in camps in north-eastern Syria run by the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF). Before the Court they complained that the refusal exposed their family members to inhuman and degrading treatment in breach of Article 3 of the Convention and entailed a violation of their right to enter national territory under Article 3 § 2 of Protocol No. 4.

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

The Court began by finding that the family members in question were not within France's jurisdiction for the purposes of the Article 3 complaint but that in the particular circumstances of the case there was a jurisdictional link between them and France, within the meaning of Article 1 of the Convention, as regards the complaint under Article 3 § 2 of Protocol No. 4.
Violation of Article 3 § 2 of Protocol No. 4 ("no one shall be deprived of the right to enter the territory of the State of which he is a national")

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

S.A.S. v. France (no. 43835/11)
01.07.2014
Concerned the complaint of a French national, who is a practising Muslim, that she is no longer allowed to wear the full-face veil in public following the entry into force, on 11 April 2011, of a law prohibiting the concealment of one's face in public places.
No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)
No violation of Article 9 (right to respect for freedom of thought, conscience and religion)
No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) combined with Articles 8 or 9

De Souza Ribeiro v. France
13.12.2012
The case concerned the expulsion of a Brazilian national living in French Guiana (an overseas region and *département* of France) with no possibility for him to challenge the lawfulness of the removal measure before it was enforced.
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Sabel El Leil v. France
29.06.2011
An accountant, fired from an embassy in Paris, could not contest his dismissal.
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a court)

Medvedyev and Others v. France
29.03.2010
Interception on the high seas, then rerouting to France, by the French Navy, of a foreign vessel (used for drug trafficking) and its crew.
Violation of Article 5 § 1(right to liberty and security)
No violation of Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security)

Noteworthy cases, judgments and decisions delivered

Chamber

Right to life cases (Article 2)

Medmoune v. France (n° 55026/22)
05.02.2026
In this case, the applicants complained of an infringement of the right to life of A.M., their brother and husband, as a result of a medical decision to withdraw his life-sustaining treatment. The particularity of the case was that the patient had drawn up advance directives stating that he wished life-sustaining treatment to be continued even in the event that he permanently lost consciousness and was no longer able to communicate with his relatives.
no violation of Article 2 (right to life)

Fraisse and Others v. France (nos. 22525/21 and 47626/21)
27.02.2025
Rémi Fraisse, a twenty-one-year-old student, died on the night of 25-26 October 2014 as a result of the explosion of a blast-effect dispersal weapon, namely an OF-F1 concussion grenade launched by Staff Sergeant J. in the context of a law-enforcement operation at the Sivens construction site (in the municipality of Lisle-sur-Tarn), during violent clashes between protesters opposed to the construction of a dam and mobile gendarmes forces.
Violation of Article 2 (right to life)
No violation of Article 2 (investigation)

Bouras v. France (no. 31754/18)

19.05.2022

The case concerned a complaint, under the substantive limb of Article 2 of the Convention, about a gendarme's use of armed force resulting in the death of a prisoner who attacked another gendarme in the vehicle that was transferring him from Strasbourg Prison to the Colmar tribunal de grande instance.

No violation of Article 2 (right to life)

Lambert and Others v. France (no. 21675/19)

05.09.2019

The applicants are members of the family of Vincent Lambert, who sustained brain injuries following a road-traffic accident in 2008 and was left tetraplegic. Several collective procedures were initiated with a view to withdrawing Vincent Lambert's treatment; the fourth such procedure was begun in 2017.

On 30 April 2019 the Court decided, in view of the circumstances, to refuse the requests for interim measures submitted by the applicants on 24 April 2019 seeking a stay of execution of the *Conseil d'État* judgment of 24 April 2019 and an order prohibiting Vincent Lambert's removal from France. The Court observed that in its Grand Chamber judgment of 5 June 2015 it had held that there would be no violation of Article 2 of the Convention in the event of implementation of the *Conseil d'État* judgment of 24 June 2014 authorising the withdrawal of Vincent Lambert's artificial nutrition and hydration.

On 20 May 2019 the applicants again applied to the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, requesting it to indicate to the French Government that they should immediately implement the interim measures called for by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on 3 May 2019. The UN Committee had requested the French Government to suspend the decision to stop Vincent Lambert's treatment while it examined the complaint brought before it by the applicants. The Court observed that it had decided on 30 April 2019, in view of the circumstances, to refuse the requests for interim measures submitted to it, and pointed out that the applicants had presented no new evidence that might prompt it to change its position.

See press releases of 30 April 2019 and 20 May 2019.

In September 2019, at the request of the applicants, the Court struck the application out of the Court's list of cases.

Chebab v. France

23.05.2019

The case concerned the circumstances in which the applicant was shot by a police officer while being arrested.

Violation of Article 2 in its procedural aspects

Semache v. France

21.06.2018

The case concerned the death of the applicant's father, Mr Ziri, following his arrest by the police and his detention in Argenteuil police station.

Violation of Article 2 in its substantive aspect

No violation of Article 2 in its procedural aspect

Toubache v. France

07.06.2018

The case concerned the necessity and proportionality of the use of force by the law-enforcement agencies in the context of the death of the applicants' son, who was shot and killed by a gendarme while travelling in the rear of a fleeing vehicle.

Violation of Article 2

Inadmissible applications

Le Mailloux v. France

03.12.2020

The case concerned the applicant's objections to the handling by the French State of the Covid-19 health crisis.

Application declared inadmissible.

Mendy v. France

27.09.2018

The case concerned the death of a man who was armed with a knife and had failed to heed police warnings while dangerously pursuing another before being shot by the police.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Atallah v. France

30.08.2011

A Lebanese lawyer who was lethally wounded in Beirut by a soldier from the

French contingent of UNIFIL or the Multinational Security Force.
Application declared inadmissible.

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

Sekour v. France
(no.52496/19)
12.03.2026
The case concerned solitary-confinement measures applied to a prisoner and the successive decisions to prolong them. The Court found, first, that an application to set aside an administrative decision together with an urgent application for a stay of execution (référé-suspension) under Article L. 521-1 of the Administrative Courts Code, and an urgent application for protection of a fundamental freedom (référé-liberté) under Article L. 521-2 of the same Code, were in principle effective domestic remedies that had to be exhausted in the case of complaints under Article 3 of the Convention concerning the placement of prisoners in solitary confinement.
no violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)
no violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

N.B. and Others v. France
(no. 49775/20)
31.03.2022
The case concerned the placement in administrative detention for fourteen days of a Georgian couple and their then eight-year-old child, who had entered France unlawfully and whose asylum requests had been rejected.
Violation of Article 3 in respect of K.G., who had been an under-age child at the material time
No violation of Article 3 in respect of the parents, N.B. and N.G.;
Violation of Article 34 (right of individual petition).

J.M.B. and Others v. France
(no. 9671/15 and 31 others)
30.01.2020
The 32 cases concerned the poor conditions of detention in the following prisons: Ducos (Martinique), Faa'a Nuutania (French Polynesia), Baie-Mahault (Guadeloupe), Nîmes, Nice and Fresnes, as well as the issue of overcrowding in prisons and the effectiveness of the preventive remedies available to the prisoners concerned.
Violation of Article 3

J.M. v. France (no. 71670/14)
05.12.2019
The case concerned the applicant's complaints of inhuman and degrading treatment and disproportionate use of force by prison staff while he was in detention, and his allegation that the subsequent investigation had been ineffective and lacked independence.
Violation of the substantive and procedural aspects of Article 3

Boukrourou and Others v. France
16.11.2017
The case concerned the death of an individual suffering from psychiatric disorders (M.B.) during a police operation. The applicants were the deceased's brothers, sister, widow, father and mother.
No violation of Article 2 (right to life)
Violation of Article 3

Isenc v. France
04.02.2016
The case concerned the applicant's son's suicide 12 days after he was admitted to prison.
Violation of Article 2

Sellal v. France
08.10.2015
Suicide in detention of A.S., a prisoner suffering from schizophrenia.
No violation of Article 2
See also the case Benmouna and Others v. France, declared inadmissible on 08.10.2015.

Helhal v. France
19.02.2015
Concerned the compatibility of a disabled prisoner's state of health with his continuing detention and the arrangements for his care in prison.
Violation of Article 3

Fakailo dit Safoka and Others v. France
02.10.2014
Concerned the conditions of detention of five French nationals held in police custody in the cells of the police headquarters in Nouméa (New Caledonia).

Violation of Article 3

Canali v. France

25.04.2013

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

Violation of Article 3

Ketreb v. France

19.07.2012

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

Violation of Article 2

Violation of Article 3

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

23.02.2012

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

Violation of Article 3

No violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Popov v. France

19.01.2012

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

Violation of Article 3 in respect of the children

No violation of Article 3 in respect of the parents.

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

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

Cocaign v. France

03.11.2011

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

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

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Placement in a punishment block should be subject to appeal with suspensive effect.

Plathey v. France

03.11.2011

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

Violation of Article 3

Alboreo v. France

20.10.2011

The case concerned a high-security prisoner.

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

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

El Shennawy v. France

20.01.2011

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

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

Payet v. France

20.01.2011

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

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

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

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

Stasi v. France

20.10.2011

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

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

Raffray Taddei v. France

21.12.2010

Failure to provide adequate medical care for anorexic prisoner.

Violation of Articles 3

Khider v. France

09.07.2009

Detention conditions and security measures imposed on a prisoner.

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

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

Renolde v. France

16.10.2008

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

Violation of Articles 2 and 3

Frérot v. France

12.06.2007

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

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

Inadmissible applications

Astruc v. France

14.05.2020

The case concerned the applicant's complaint that he was kept in solitary confinement, while imprisoned on remand, after hospital treatment.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

Khider v. France

25.10.2013

The applicant, a convicted prisoner who had made several escapes and attempted escapes, was classified by the authorities as a "high-risk prisoner". He alleged that his conditions of detention were particularly strict, including frequent changes of establishment, prolonged periods in solitary confinement, and strip-searches.

Application declared inadmissible.

Robineau v. France

26.09.2013

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

Application declared inadmissible.

Expulsion of aliens (Article 3)

R v. France (no. 49857/20) and W v. France (no. 1348/21)

30.08.2022

The case of **R v. France** concerned the deportation to Russia of a Russian national of Chechen origin after his refugee status had been revoked.

Having noted that the applicant had remained a refugee, even though his status had been revoked pursuant to Article L. 711-6 of the Immigration and Asylum Code (CESEDA), the Court referred to its case-law according to which the fact of being a refugee was a factor to which the authorities should have particular regard when determining the reality of the alleged risk in the event of an individual's expulsion.

Violation of Article 3

The case of **W v. France** concerned an order to deport the applicant, a Russian national of Chechen origin whose refugee status had been revoked under Article L. 711-4 of the Immigration and Asylum Code, to Russia. The applicant had argued before the Court that his deportation would expose him to risks because the prefecture had provided the consulate of the Russian Federation with details on his personal situation along with the request for readmission.

The Court held that there would be a violation of Article 3 if the decision to deport the applicant to the Russian Federation were to be implemented

E.H. v. France

22.07.2021

The case concerned the return to Morocco of an applicant who claimed to be at risk of treatment contrary to Article 3 on account of his Sahrawi origins and his activism in support of the Sahrawi cause.

No violation of Article 3

No violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken in conjunction with Article 3

K.I. v. France

15.04.2021

The case concerned a Russian national of Chechen origin who arrived in France when he was still a minor and obtained refugee status. After being convicted for a terrorism offence and on the grounds that his presence in France represented a serious threat to French society, the French Office for Refugees and Stateless Persons (OFPRA) revoked his status in July 2020 under Article L. 711-6 of the Immigration and Asylum Code and his deportation to Russia was ordered.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) under its procedural aspect if, having had his refugee status withdrawn, the applicant were to be returned to his country of origin without any prior assessment by the French authorities of the actual and current risk that he claimed to be facing in the event of his deportation.

A.M. v. France (no. 12148/18)

29.04.2019

The case concerned the applicant's planned deportation to Algeria after he was convicted in France in 2015 for participating in acts of terrorism and was permanently banned from French territory.

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) if the decision to deport the applicant to Algeria is enforced

A.S. v. France (no. 46240/15)

19.04.2018

The case concerned the expulsion to Morocco of a Moroccan national who had been convicted in France of conspiracy to carry out terrorist acts, and who had previously been deprived of his French nationality for the same reason.

No violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 34 (right of individual application)

The Court noted in particular that Morocco had adopted general measures to prevent risks of treatment contrary to Article 3.

M.A. v. France (no. 9373/15)

01.02.2018

The case concerned the expulsion to Algeria of an Algerian national convicted in France of involvement in a terrorist organisation.

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

Violation of Article 34 (right of individual application)

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

15.01.2015

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

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

Rafaa v. France

30.05.2013

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

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

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

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

18.04.2013

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

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

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

02.02.2012

Concerned the risks the applicant would face in the event of his deportation to Sudan and the effectiveness of the remedies available to him in France in view of the fact that his asylum application was dealt with under the fast-track procedure.

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

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

H.R. v. France (no. 64780/09)
22.09.2011
The enforcement of the order for the applicant's removal to Algeria would amount to a violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment).

Daoudi v. France
03.12.2009
Risk faced by applicant, convicted in France for terrorist activities, in the event of his return to Algeria.
Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) if the deportation measure were to be executed

Inadmissible application

Beghal v. France
06.09.2011
Complaints concerning the prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment and the right to respect for private and family life.
Application declared inadmissible.

Cases dealing with inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Violations of Article 3

L. and Others v. France (nos. 46949/21, 24989/22, and 39759/22)
24.04.2025
In each of the three applications, the applicants complained that French law and practice did not provide effective protection against rape and that their status as minors and the vulnerable situations in which they had been at the time of the events complained of had not adequately been taken into account. The applications mainly concerned the respondent State's compliance with its duty ("positive obligations") under Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention, in their substantive and procedural aspects.
Violation of Article 3
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)
Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Articles 3 and 8 in respect of application no. 46949/21

M.D. and A.D. v. France
22.07.2021
The case concerned the administrative detention of a mother and her four-month-old daughter in the Mesnil-Amelot no. 2 administrative detention centre pending their transfer to Italy, the country responsible for examining their application for asylum.
Violation of Article 3
Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)
Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to a speedy review of the lawfulness of detention)

Bivolaru and Moldovan v. France (nos. 40324/16 and 12623/17)
25.03.2021
The case concerned the applicants' surrender by France to the Romanian authorities under European arrest warrants (EAWs) for the purpose of execution of their prison sentences. The case prompted the Court to clarify the conditions for application of the presumption of equivalent protection in such circumstances.
Violation of Article 3 in application no. 12623/17, lodged by Mr Moldovan
No violation of Article 3 in application no. 40324/16, lodged by Mr Bivolaru

N.H. and Others v. France (nos. 28820/13, 75547/13 and 13114/15)
02.07.2020
The applications concerned five asylum-seekers, single men, living in France. They complained that they had been unable to receive the material and financial support to which they were entitled under French law and had thus been forced to sleep rough in inhuman and degrading conditions for several months.
Violation of Article 3 in respect of the applicants N.H. (no. 28820/13), K.T. (no. 75547/13) and A.J. (no. 13114/15)
No violation of Article 3 in respect of the applicant S.G. (no. 75547/13)

Moustahi v. France
25.06.2020
The case concerned the conditions in which two children, apprehended when they unlawfully entered French territory in Mayotte, were placed in administrative detention together with adults, arbitrarily associated with one of them for administrative purposes, and expeditiously returned to the Comoros without a careful

and individual examination of their situation.
Violation of Article 3 in respect of the second and third applicants on account of the conditions of their removal to the Comoros
Violation of Article 3, in respect of the second and third applicants on account of the conditions of their removal to the Comoros
No violation in respect of the first applicant

Association Innocence en Danger and Association Enfance et Partage v. France
04.06.2020
The case concerned the death in 2009 of an eight-year-old girl (M.) as a result of abuse by her parents. The applications were lodged by two French child protection associations.

Castellani v. France
30.04.2020
The case concerned a complaint by the applicant that he was the victim of acts of violence during his arrest at his home by the GIPN, a special armed police unit, in the presence of his wife and daughter.

Khan v. France
28.02.2019
The case concerned the failure by the French authorities to provide an unaccompanied foreign minor with care before and after the dismantling of the makeshift camps set up in the southern section of the "lande de Calais" ("Calais heath"). Large numbers of people hoping to seek asylum in the United Kingdom had for many years been living there in tents or huts, in overcrowded conditions without even the most basic sanitation.

Ghedir and Others v. France
16.07.2015
Concerned allegations of ill-treatment during an arrest carried out at a station by security officers of the SNCF (the French national railway company) and police officers.

Darraj v. France
04.11.2010
Disproportionate force used against youth during identity check at police station.

No violations of Article 3

U v. France (no. 53254/20)
15.02.2024
The case concerned the procedure to remove the applicant, a Russian national of Chechen origin, to Russia. The applicant's refugee status had been revoked on account of the serious threat his presence in France posed to State security.

P.M. and F.F. v. France
18.02.2021
The case concerned injuries sustained by the two applicants during their arrest in Paris on 1 January 2007, in a state of inebriation, for the offence of damaging private property, and during their police custody.

B.G. and Others v. France
10.09.2020
The case concerned the accommodation of asylum-seekers for several months in a tent camp set up on a carpark in Metz and the question whether they had received the material and financial support provided for by domestic law.

Hirtu and Others v. France
14.05.2020
The case concerned the clearance of an unauthorised encampment where the applicants, who are of Roma origin, had been living for six months.

M.D. v. France (no. 50376/13)
10.10.2019
The case concerned M.D., a migrant who identified himself as an unaccompanied minor and who complained of being left in a precarious material situation by the French authorities.

N.T.P. and Others v. France (no. 68862/13)
24.05.2018
The case concerned the accommodation arrangements for a family – comprising a mother and her three young children – while they were waiting to submit their asylum application.

Bodein v. France
13.11.2014
Life imprisonment

Sultani v. France
20.09.2007
Risks faced by an asylum-seeker in the event of his return to Afghanistan.

V.T. v. France (no. 37194/02)

11.09.2007

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

Inadmissible applications

M.M. v. France (no. 13303/21)

23.05.2024

The case concerned the French courts' refusal to open an investigation into a criminal complaint (with an application for civil-party status) which had been lodged by the applicant, an Egyptian national, against the Egyptian President, Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, for alleged torture and acts of barbarity, while President Sisi had been on an official visit to France in 2014. The applicant claimed to have been seriously injured when a projectile fired by an officer in the Egyptian army had hit him in the eye, during a crackdown in Cairo on protests against the coup d'état of 3 July 2013. The application before the Court concerned the decision not to investigate the allegations in the applicant's criminal complaint owing to the public-international-law principle of immunity of heads of State.

Application declared inadmissible

Tenenbaum v. France

16.12.2021

The case concerned a complaint by the applicant that he had been subjected to acts of violence during his arrest by gendarmes, together with allegations of bias and other defects in the ensuing investigation.

Application declared inadmissible.

Zambrano v. France

07.10.2021

The case concerned a university lecturer, Guillaume Zambrano, who complained about the "health pass" introduced in France in 2021 and who created a movement to protest against it.

Application declared inadmissible.

B.L. and Others v. France

09.01.2020

The case concerned asylum-seekers housed in a tent camp in Metz, who complained about the poor conditions in which they were accommodated.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Cases dealing with Article 4 (prohibition of slavery or forced labour)

Siliadin v. France

26.07.2005

Insufficient protection of the applicant, a domestic slave.

Violation of Article 4

Police custody (Articles 5 and 6)

Alouache v. France

06.10.2015

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

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

François v. France

23.04.2015

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

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

Ali Samatar and Others v. France
Hassan and Others v. France

04.12.2014

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

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

Violation of Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security) in both cases, as the applicants had been taken into custody for 48 hours on their arrival in France instead

of being brought "promptly" before a legal authority, when they had already been deprived of their liberty for four days and some twenty hours (*Ali Samatar and Others*) and six days and sixteen hours (*Hassan and Others*)

Vassis and Others v. France

27.06.2013

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

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

Moulin v. France

23.11.2010

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

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

Brusco v. France

14.10.2010

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

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

Cases dealing with the right to liberty and security (Article 5)

Jarrand v. France

09.12.2021

The case concerned a police raid on the home of Mr Jarrand after he had failed to return his elderly, dependent and highly vulnerable mother to her care home, in breach of a placement order, in addition to his arrest and questioning at the police station without being formally taken into police custody.

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

Violation of Article 5 § 5 (right to compensation for unlawful detention) No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for one's home)

Moustahi v. France

25.06.2020

The case concerned the conditions in which two children, apprehended when they unlawfully entered French territory in Mayotte, were placed in administrative detention together with adults, arbitrarily associated with one of them for administrative purposes, and expeditiously returned to the Comoros without a careful and individual examination of their situation.

Violation of Article 5 § 1 in respect of the second and third applicants

Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to a speedy decision on the lawfulness of detention), in respect of the second and third applicants

Kiril Zlatkov Nikolov v. France

10.11.2016

The case concerned a person suspected of having committed an offence related to organised crime who had to wait almost four days before being brought before an investigating judge, and the failure to record his interrogations.

No violation of Article 5 § 3

A.B. and Others v. France (no. 11593/12)

12.07.2016

The case primarily concerned the administrative detention of an underage child for eighteen days in the context of a deportation procedure against his parents.

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

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) in respect of the applicants' child

Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to speedy review of the lawfulness of detention) in respect of the applicant's child

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) in respect of all the applicants (the child and his parents)

The Court delivered four other judgments on the same day in similar cases (R.M. and M.M. v. France, no. 33201/11, A.M. v. France, no. 24587/12, R.K. v. France, no. 68264/14 and R.C. v. France, no. 76491/14), all essentially concerning the fact of placing underage children in administrative detention in the context of deportation procedures.

A.M. v. France (no. 56324/13)
12.07.2016
The case concerned a complaint about the lack of an effective remedy, for the purposes of Article 5 § 4, to contest the lawfulness of a detention order against an alien in France which had led to his deportation from French territory.
Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to a speedy decision on the lawfulness of detention)

Corbet and Others v. France
19.03.2015
Concerned the applicants' prosecution and conviction for misappropriating assets from the airline Air Liberté before it was put into compulsory liquidation.
Violation of Article 5 § 1 on account of Mr Corbet's detention on 24 July 2003
At the same time, the Court declared inadmissible the applicants 'complaint under Article 6 §§ 1 and 2 (right to a fair trial / right to be presumed innocent)

Cases concerning Article 6

Right of access to court

B.G. v. France (no. 70945/17)
19.03.2026
The applicant, aged 16 at the time, had reported a 17-year-old man, L.A., to the police for rape. Following the discontinuance of the investigation into that complaint, L.A.'s mother reported the applicant to the police for making a false accusation. Although the applicant stood by the details of her initial complaint, she was issued with a caution and was consequently included in the criminal history database for a five-year period.
violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Tamazount and Others v. France (nos. 17131/19, 19242/19, 55810/20, 28794/21, and 28830/21)
04.04.2024
The applicants in this case are five French nationals who are descendants of "Harkis" (auxiliary forces of Algerian origin who fought alongside the French army during the Algerian War of Independence) and who claimed that the State was liable for negligence on account of a failure to protect the Harkis and their families in Algeria and to repatriate them systematically to France.
No violation of Article 6 § 1
Violation of Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private life and correspondence) of the Convention and of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention in respect of four of the applicants.

Xavier Lucas v. France (no. 15567/20)
09.06.2022
The case concerned a requirement to issue proceedings in the Court of Appeal electronically using the e-barreau platform. The Court of Appeal had held that the applicant's paper application to set aside an arbitral award could be entertained on the ground that the online form did not allow users to enter that type of application or the capacity in which the parties were named. However, the Court of Cassation took the opposite view, holding that the application should have been filed electronically.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Association BURESTOP 55 and Others v. France
01.07.2021
The case concerned environmental protection associations which were opposed to the planned industrial geological storage centre known as *Cigéoon* the Bure site along the boundaries of the *départements* of Meuse, Haute-Marne and Vosges, in the Grand Est administrative region. The centre was designed for the storage in deep geological repositories of high-level and long-life radioactive waste. Those associations had sued the National Agency for the management of radioactive waste (ANDRA), seeking compensation for damage caused by the failure to provide mandatory public information under Article L. 542-12 7° of the Environmental Code. Their actions were dismissed, one for the association's lack of *locus standi* and the five others on the merits.
Violation of Article 6 § 1 in respect of the *MIRABEL-LNE* Association
No violation of Article 10 (right of access to information) in respect of the associations Burestop 55, ASODEDRA, Fédération Réseau Sortir du Nucléaire, Les Habitants vigilants du Canton de Gondrecourt and the CEDRA 52 collective.

Allègre v. France
12.07.2018
The case concerns the applicant's complaint that she was unable to bring a private

prosecution in the criminal courts as the proceedings had already been discontinued.
No violation of Article 6 § 1

Reichman v. France

12.07.2016

The case concerned an allegation of disproportionate interference with the right of access to the Court of Cassation and with the right to freedom of expression.
Violation of Article 6 § 1
Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Sfez v. France and Rivière v. France

25.07.2013

Both cases concerned a refusal by the judicial authorities to grant a request for the adjournment of a hearing.
No violation of Article 6 § 3 (c) (right to be assisted by a lawyer) in the Sfez case
Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) in the Rivière case

Right to a fair trial

Syndicat National des Journalistes and Others v. France (no. 41236/18)

14.12.2023

The case concerned an alleged violation of the right to a fair hearing by an impartial court, as a result of the involvement of three Court of Cassation judges – who, in the applicants' submission, had ties with the opposing party – in the examination of their appeal on points of law.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Sassi and Benchellali v. France

25.11.2021

The case concerned the fairness of the criminal proceedings in France against the applicants, who had been held at the Guantánamo Bay US naval base before being repatriated. They alleged that statements they had made during that period of detention had subsequently been used for the purposes of the criminal proceedings against them in France and relied upon by the courts in convicting them.
No violation of Article 6 § 1

Sanofi Pasteur v. France

13.02.2020

The case concerned the liability of the Sanofi Pasteur company to an individual, a trainee nurse who was vaccinated against hepatitis B and subsequently contracted various illnesses, and the court order against the applicant company to pay damages.
No violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the method for calculating the starting point for the limitation period in respect of the compensation proceedings brought against the applicant company
Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the failure to provide reasons for the decision to refuse the applicant company's request that questions be referred to the Court of Justice of the European Union for a preliminary ruling.

Hôpital local Saint-Pierre d'Oléron and Others v. France

08.11.2018

The case concerned a refusal by the social security contributions collection agency ("the URSSAF") to reimburse the employer's share of the contributions paid in respect of the employees of residential care facilities for the elderly ("EHPADs"). The applicants had claimed that they were entitled to an exemption under the Social Security Code.
No violation of Article 6 § 1 regarding the legislature's intervention during the proceedings
No violation of Article 6 § 1 regarding the alleged lack of reasoning of the Court of Cassation's judgments

Thiam v. France

18.10.2018

The case concerned criminal proceedings brought against the applicant, in the course of which the former President of the French Republic, Nicolas Sarkozy, applied to join the proceedings as a civil party.

Ramda v. France

19.12.2017

The case concerned the reasoning of the judgment convicting the applicant delivered by an Assize Court composed exclusively of professional judges and compliance with the *ne bis in idem* principle in the case of a final conviction by the ordinary criminal courts followed by a criminal conviction by the Assize Court.
No violation of Article 6 § 1
No violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice)

Ait Abbou v. France

02.02.2017

The applicant complained that he had not had a fair trial, having been unable to challenge the lawfulness of pre-trial proceedings against him in his absence.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

Les Authentiks and Supras Auteuil 91 v. France

27.10.2016

The case concerned the dissolution of two Paris-Saint-Germain supporters' associations, following scuffles in which some of their members were involved on 28 February 2010, leading to the death of one supporter.

No violation of Article 6 and 11 (freedom of assembly and association)

Beausoleil v. France

06.10.2016

The case concerned a Court of Audit judgment which, according to the applicant, was biased.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Duceau v. France

30.06.2016

The case concerned the dismissal of an appeal on account of the appointment of a new lawyer without complying with a procedural rule (Article 115 of the Code of Criminal Procedure).

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Tchokontio Happi v. France

09.04.2015

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

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Vinci Construction and GMT genie civil and services v. France

02.04.2015

The case concerned inspections and seizures carried out by investigators from the Department for Competition, Consumer Affairs and Fraud Prevention on the premises of two companies.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

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

Bodein v. France

13.11.2014

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

No violation of Article 6 § 1

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Agnelet v. France
Legillon v. France

10.01.2013

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

Violation of Article 6 § 1 in the Agnelet case

No violation of Article 6 § 1 in the Legillon case

Lagardère v. France

12.04.2012

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

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

Violation of Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence)

Poirot v. France

15.12.2011

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

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

Messier v. France

30.06.2011

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

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3

André and Other v. France

24.07.2008

Searches and seizures in a law firm.

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

Ravon v. France

21.02.2008

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

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Inadmissible applications

Fillon and Others v. France (no. 24326/24)

23.10.2025

The application essentially concerned the fairness, under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 of the Convention, of the trial of the three applicants - Mr Fillon, a former Prime Minister, his wife Ms Fillon, and Mr Joulaud (who had been Mr Fillon's substitute in the National Assembly) – who had all been convicted of embezzlement of public funds, handling of those funds or complicity in the offence.

Application declared inadmissible

Amar v. France (no. 4028/23)

23.05.2024

The case concerned disciplinary proceedings against the applicant, who at the relevant time had been Deputy Prosecutor at the National Public Prosecutor's Office for Financial Offences ("PNF"). In that capacity, he had worked on several cases concerning former French President Nicolas Sarkozy, including on a charge of bribing a member of the Court of Cassation. On 26 March and 21 April 2021 the Prime Minister lodged a disciplinary complaint against the applicant with the Judicial Service Commission (Conseil supérieur de la magistrature, "CSM"), alleging that he had breached his ethical obligations.

Application declared inadmissible

El Kodwa Arafat v. France

01.07.2021

The applicants had complained of a breach of their right to a fair hearing, under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, in proceedings, to which they were joined as civil parties, initiated by their criminal complaint against persons unknown alleging the premeditated murder of Yasser Arafat.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Carrefour France v. France

24.10.2019

The case concerned a judgment against the company Carrefour France finding it liable and ordering it to pay a fine for acts committed by the company Carrefour hypermarchés France in breach of the Commercial Code.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Robert v. France

26.09.2019

The case concerned a request for the replacement of the sentence handed down by the Moroccan courts on a French national in the framework of a procedure for transferring him to France to serve the sentence.

Application declared inadmissible as Articles 6 and 7 (no punishment without law) of the Convention did not apply to sentence execution.

NML Capital Ltd v. France

13.01.2015

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

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

Marc-Antoine v. France

04.06.2013

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

Application declared inadmissible.

Right to legal assistance

Wang v. France and Dubois v. France

28.04.2022

Both cases concerned individuals prosecuted and convicted for unlawfully practising medicine. They complained of the conditions in which their voluntary police interviews had been conducted.

Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 in the case of Wang v. France (application no. 83700/17)

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) in the case of Dubois v. France (application no. 52833/19)

Olivieri v. France and Bloise v. France

11.07.2019

Both cases concerned periods spent in police custody prior to the legislative reform of 14 April 2011.

They related to the failure to notify the applicants of their right to remain silent while in police custody, and to the lack of assistance by a lawyer during that time. The law in force at the relevant time made no provision for persons in police custody to be notified of their right to remain silent or for them to be assisted by a lawyer during questioning.

Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 (right to a fair trial) and 3 (c) in the case of Olivieri v. France

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 (right to a fair trial) and 3 (c) in the case of Bloise v. France (no. 30828/13)

Stojkovic v. France and Belgium

27.10.2011

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

Application inadmissible in so far as it was lodged against Belgium and admissible in respect of France

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

Inadmissible applications

Bouhamla v. France

18.07.2019

The case concerned the enforcement of a final judicial decision granting housing to the applicant under the law on the enforceable right to housing. The applicant was ultimately rehoused but he failed to apply to the administrative courts for compensation in respect of the period of one year and 11 months in which the judgment in his favour had remained unenforced.

Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies

Bonnemaison v. France

11.04.2019

The case concerned the Medical Association's decision to strike Mr Bonnemaison off the medical register following several sudden patient deaths at the short-stay unit (UHCD) of the Côte Basque Hospital in Bayonne, where he worked as an accident and emergency doctor.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Cases dealing with Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Baldassi and Others v. France

11.06.2020

The cases concerned a complaint by activists in the Palestinian cause about their criminal conviction for incitement to economic discrimination, on account of their participation in actions aimed at boycotting products imported from Israel as part of the campaign "BDS : Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions".

No violation of Article 7

X and Y v. France (no. 48158/11)

01.09.2016

The case concerned two complaints lodged by stock market professionals following the imposition of disciplinary sanctions on them by the Enforcement Committee of the *Autorité des marchés financiers* (*AMF* – stock market authority) for failing to comply with the rules on and the period of cover for the short selling of stocks under a capital-raising programme for the Euro Disney company.

Complaint under Article 6 §1 (right to a fair trial) declared inadmissible

No violation of Article 7

Berland v. France

03.09.2015

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

murder committed prior to the entry into force of the Law.
No violation of Article 7

Soros v. France

06.10.2011
The case concerned George Soros, who was convicted and sentenced by the French courts for insider trading in the 1990s.
No violation of Article 7

Inadmissible applications

Robert v. France

26.09.2019
The case concerned a request for the replacement of the sentence handed down by the Moroccan courts on a French national in the framework of a procedure for transferring him to France to serve the sentence.
Application declared inadmissible as Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 7 of the Convention did not apply to sentence execution.

Hakkar v. France

07.04.2009
The applicant submitted a number of complaints concerning criminal proceedings against him which had been reopened after a judgment finding a violation of the Convention.
Application declared inadmissible.

Ould Dah v. France

17.03.2009
Conviction in France for offences committed in Mauritania on the basis of France's "universal jurisdiction". Complaint under Article 7 (no punishment without law).
Application declared inadmissible.

Cases dealing with private and family life (Article 8)

Violations of Article 8

H.W. v. France (no. 13805/21)

23.01.2025
The case concerned a fault-based divorce in which blame was attributed solely to the applicant, on the grounds that she had ceased to have sexual relations with her husband. The applicant did not complain about the divorce itself, which she had also sought, but rather about the grounds on which it had been granted. The Court noted that the concept of "marital duties", as provided for in the domestic legal order and reaffirmed in the present case, took no account whatsoever of consent to sexual relations. Failure to fulfil marital duties could, in the conditions set out in Article 242 of the Civil Code, be considered a fault which justified the granting of a divorce. It could also entail pecuniary consequences and, in certain circumstances, serve as a basis for a claim for damages.

A.C. v. France (no. 15457/20)

16.01.2025
The case concerned a Guinean national who claimed to have been an unaccompanied minor when he arrived in France. He submitted that he had not received the care provided for under French child-protection laws, because the domestic authorities had contested that he was a minor.

Drelon v. France

08.09.2022
The applications concerned, first, the collection and retention, by the French blood donation service (EFS) of personal data reflecting the applicant's presumed sexual orientation – together with the rejection of his criminal complaint for discrimination – and, second, the refusal of his offers to donate blood, together with the dismissal by the Conseil d'Etat of his judicial review application challenging an order of 5 April 2016 which amended the selection criteria for blood donors.

Moustahi v. France

25.06.2020
The case concerned the conditions in which two children, apprehended when they unlawfully entered French territory in Mayotte, were placed in administrative detention together with adults, arbitrarily associated with one of them for administrative purposes, and expeditiously returned to the Comoros without a careful and individual examination of their situation.

Hirtu and Others v. France

14.05.2020
The case concerned the clearance of an unauthorised encampment where the applicants, who are of Roma origin, had been living for six months.

Halabi v. France

16.05.2019

The case concerned the compatibility of a home visit under the Planning Code with the right to respect for the home as secured under Article 8 of the Convention.

Laurent v. France

24.05.2018

The case concerned the interception by a police officer of papers that a lawyer (Mr Laurent) had handed over to his clients, who were under police escort, in the lobby of a court building.

Ben Faiza v. France

08.02.2018

The case concerns surveillance measures taken against Mohamed Ben Faiza in connection with a criminal investigation into drug trafficking. This part of the judgment concerns the real-time geolocation of Mr. Ben Faiza's vehicle by means of a GPS device.

Aycaguer v. France

22.06.2017

The case concerned the applicant's refusal to undergo biological testing, the result of which was to be included in the national computerised DNA database (FNAEG).
See also press release regarding the application Dagregorio and Mosconi v. France.

A.P., Garçon and Nicot v. France

06.04.2017

The case concerned three transgender persons of French nationality who wished to change the entries concerning their sex and their forenames on their birth certificates, and who were not allowed to so do by the courts in the respondent State. The applicants submitted, among other points, that the authorities had infringed their right to respect for their private life by making recognition of sexual identity conditional on undergoing an operation involving a high probability of sterility.

Brunet v. France

18.09.2014

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

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

10.07.2014

Difficulties encountered by applicants - who were either granted refugee status or lawfully residing in France – in obtaining visas for their children so that their families could be reunited.
See also application Ly v. France, declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Winterstein and Others v. France

17.10.2013

The case concerned eviction proceedings brought against a number of traveller families who had been living in the same place for many years.
The Court reserved in its entirety the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction).

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

18.04.2013

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

No violations of Article 8

M.A. and Others v. France (nos. 63664/19, 64450/19, 24387/20, 24391/20 and 24393/20)

25.07.2024

The case concerned the creation, under French criminal law, of the offence of purchasing sexual relations, which, in the applicants' allegation, seriously endangered the physical and mental integrity and health of individuals engaged in prostitution, and radically infringed on their right to respect for private life, in so far as this included the right to personal autonomy and sexual freedom.

Ghoumid and Others v. France

25.06.2020

The case concerned five individuals, formerly having dual nationality, who were convicted of participation in a criminal conspiracy to commit an act of terrorism. After serving their sentences they were released in 2009 and 2010, then stripped of their French nationality in October 2015.

Guimon v. France

11.04.2019

The case concerned the refusal to allow the applicant, who was imprisoned in Rennes

for terrorist offences, to travel to a funeral parlour in Bayonne to pay her last respects to her deceased father.

Libert v. France

22.02.2018

The case concerned the dismissal of an SNCF (French national railway company) employee after the seizure of his work computer had revealed the storage of pornographic files and forged certificates drawn up for third persons.

Ben Faiza v. France

08.02.2018

The case concerns surveillance measures taken against Mohamed Ben Faiza in connection with a criminal investigation into his involvement in drug-trafficking offences. This part of the judgment deals with the court order issued to a mobile telephone operator to obtain the list of cell towers pinged by Mr Ben Faiza's phone for subsequent tracking of his movements.

Fédération Nationale des Syndicats Sportifs (FNASS) and Others v. France

18.01.2018

The case concerned the requirement for a targeted group of sports professionals to notify their whereabouts for the purposes of unannounced anti-doping tests.

Terrazzoni v. France

29.06.2017

The case concerned the use, in the context of disciplinary proceedings against a judge, of the transcript of a telephone conversation that had been intercepted by chance in criminal proceedings in which the judge had not been involved.

Versini-Campinchi and Crasnianski v. France

16.06.2016

The case concerned the interception, transcription and use in disciplinary proceedings against her of conversations which the applicant, who is a lawyer, had had with one of her clients.

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

13.12.2012

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

Michaud v. France

06.12.2012

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

Mallah v. France

01.11.2011

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

B.B. v. France, Gardel v. France, M.B. v. France

17.12.2009

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

Inadmissible applications

Association confraternelle de la Presse Judiciaire and Others v. France (no. 49526/15 and 13 others)

16.01.2025

The applicants alleged that the French legislation on intelligence-gathering techniques infringed the right to respect for private life, the right to freedom of expression and the right to an effective remedy and to a fair hearing.

The applicants alleged violations of Articles 8 (right to respect for private life), 10 (freedom of expression), and 13 (right to an effective remedy).

Application declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies regarding Articles 8 and 10 and as being manifestly ill-founded regarding Articles 6 and 13.

A.L. and E.J. v. France (nos. 44715/20 and 47930/21)

17.10.2024

Both applications concerned the remote retrieval of user data from the encrypted telecommunications tool EncroChat and their sharing with the United Kingdom law-enforcement authorities. EncroChat was an encrypted mobile-phone telecommunications tool, for which more than 66,000 handsets had been distributed covertly in 122 countries from 2016 to 2020.

The applicants alleged violations of Articles 8 (right to respect for private life), 6 (right to a fair trial), and 13 (right to an effective remedy).

Application declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies.

Thevenon v. France (no. 46061/21)

06.10.2022

The case concerned a firefighter's refusal to comply with the COVID 19 vaccination requirement imposed on workers in certain occupations by the Public Health Emergency Act (Law no. 2021 1040 of 5 August 2021). When the applicant refused vaccination without claiming a medical exemption under the statute, he was suspended from both his professional and volunteer duties. He applied directly to the Court, alleging violations of Articles 8 (right to respect for private life) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

Application declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies.

Melouli v. France

25.11.2021

The case concerned a refusal to grant the applicant a permit to reside in France, together with an order to leave the country.

Application declared inadmissible

Ngumbu Kikoso v. France

25.11.2021

The case concerned an order for the applicant's deportation and exclusion from France, imposed in addition to the applicant's six-month prison sentence for possession and use of falsified administrative documents.

Application declared inadmissible

Agamemnon v. France

08.11.2018

The application concerned a request by the applicant to be transferred to a prison close to his family.

Application declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies.

Tuheiava v. France

20.09.2018

The application concerned a lawyer who complained about a visit by the Chair of the Bar Council to his professional premises during his absence.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

The Court reiterated that, while lawyers must have particular protection in discharging their professional duties, it was legitimate for standards of conduct to be required of them, under the monitoring and supervisory powers vested in Bar councils.

Cases dealing with children's rights (Article 8)

Cherrier v. France (no. 18843/20)

30.01.2024

The case concerned the refusal by the National Council for Access to Information about Personal Origins (*Conseil national pour l'accès aux origines personnelles* – "the CNAOP") to inform the applicant, who was born to anonymous parents, of the identity of her biological mother. The applicant had applied for information about her origins to be disclosed, but the mother had reasserted her choice not to reveal her identity.

No violation of Article 8

Gauvin-Fournis and Silliau v. France (nos. 21424/16 and 45728/17)

07.09.2023

The case concerned the inability, alleged by the applicants, who were born in the 1980s by means of medically assisted procreation (MAP) using third-party donors, to access information concerning the respective donors. This situation had lasted until 1 September 2022, when a new legal system for obtaining access to one's origins entered into force. It introduced a system of access to information about one's origins for individuals who had been born prior to its entry into force; however, this was subject to the donors giving their consent.

No violation of Article 8

D v. France (no. 11288/18)

16.07.2020

The case concerned the refusal to record in the French register of births, marriages and deaths the details of the birth certificate of a child born abroad through a gestational surrogacy arrangement in so far as the certificate designated the intended mother, who was also the child's genetic mother, as the mother.

No violation of Article 8

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) read in conjunction with Article 8

Foulon v. France and Bouvet v. France

21.07.2016

The case concerns children born from surrogacy agreements abroad and the

French authorities' refusal to transcribe their birth certificates issued in India to the French civil-status registers.
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) in respect of children's right to respect for their private life
No violation of Article 8 in respect of the applicants' (intended parents and children involved together) to respect for family life

Mandet v. France

14.01.2016
The case concerned the quashing of the formal recognition of paternity made by the mother's husband at the request of the child's biological father.
No violation of Article 8

Mennesson v. France
Labassee v. France

26.06.2014
The cases concerned the refusal to grant legal recognition in France to parent-child relationships that had been legally established in the United States between children born as a result of surrogacy treatment and the couples who had had the treatment.
No violation of Article 8 concerning the applicants' right to respect for their family life in both cases
Violation of Article 8 concerning the children's right to respect for their private life in both cases

Cases dealing with parental rights (Article 8)

A. L. v. France (no. 13344/20)

07.04.2022
The case concerned the compatibility with the right to respect for private life (Article 8 of the Convention) of the domestic courts' refusal to legally establish the applicant's paternity vis-à-vis his biological son – who had been born in the framework of a gestational surrogacy contract in France – after the surrogate mother had entrusted the child to a third couple.
Violation of Article 8

Callamand v. France (no. 2338/20)

07.04.2022
The case concerned the rejection of the applicant's request for contact rights with her former spouse's child, who had been conceived by medically assisted procreation.
Violation of Article 8

No violations of Article 8

C.E. and Others v. France
(nos. 29775/18 and 29693/19)

24.03.2022
The judgment concerned two cases. The first related to the rejection by the domestic courts of an application for full adoption of a child, made by the biological mother's former partner. The second concerned the domestic courts' refusal to issue a document attesting to a matter of common knowledge (acte de notoriété) recognising a legal parent-child relationship, on the basis of de facto enjoyment of status (possession d'état), between a child and the biological mother's former partner.
No violation of Article 8

G.M. v. France (no. 25075/18)

09.12.2021
The case concerned the taking into care of the applicant's child, then an infant, by the Child Welfare Authority, and the limitation of the applicant's contact rights.
No violation of Article 8

Honner v. France

12.11.2020
The case concerned the refusal to award contact rights to the applicant in respect of the child which had been born to her former partner in Belgium using assisted reproductive techniques while the two women were a couple, despite the fact that the applicant had raised the child during his early years.

Lacombe v. France

10.10.2019
The case concerned proceedings for the return of a child to his mother in the United States under the Hague Convention.

Henrioud v. France

05.11.2015
Applicant's inability to secure the return of his children to Switzerland, who had been taken to France by their mother.

Zambotto Perrin v. France

26.09.2013
The case concerned a child born out of wedlock, anonymously at the mother's request.

Harroudj v. France
04.10.2012
The case concerned the refusal of permission for a French national to adopt an Algerian baby girl already in her care under the Islamic-law form of guardianship called "kafala[2]".

Kearns v. France
10.01.2008
Inability for a biological mother to secure the return of her child to whom she had given birth anonymously, as the statutory time-limit for such a request had passed.

Maumousseau and Washington v. France
06.12.2007
Young girl's return to her father in the USA, her place of habitual residence, pursuant to a French court's order, the mother having retained her daughter in France after a holiday there.

Inadmissible applications

Alami v. France
16.12.2021
The case concerned a Moroccan applicant who is subject to a deportation order from France. He had submitted that his removal would interfere excessively with his right to respect for his private and family life; he emphasised, in particular, his ties with his children, who are resident in France.

C and E v. France (nos. 1462/18 and 17348/18)
12.12.2019
The case concerned the French authorities' refusal to enter in the French register of births, marriages and deaths the full details of the birth certificates of children born abroad through a gestational surrogacy arrangement and conceived using the gametes of the intended father and a third-party donor, in so far as the birth certificates designated the intended mother as the legal mother.
Case declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Petithory Lanzmann v. France
05.12.2019
The case concerned the applicant's request to have her deceased son's sperm transferred to an establishment capable of arranging medically assisted reproduction or gestational surrogacy.
Application declared inadmissible

O.L.G. v. France (no. 47022/16)
28.06.2018
The case concerned the rejection of a visa application by the applicant to bring a child born on 6 October 2014 whom he had adopted in Côte d'Ivoire to France.
Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

Same sex marriages (Articles 12 and 8)

Chapin and Charpentier v. France
09.06.2016
The case concerned the right to same-sex marriage.
No violation of Article 12 (right to marry) taken together with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)
No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) taken together with Article 14

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

Gas and Dubois v. France
15.03.2012
The applicants were two cohabiting women. The case concerned the refusal of the first applicant's request for simple adoption of the second applicant's child.
No violation of Articles 14 (prohibition of discrimination) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

E.B. v. France (no. 43546/02)
22.01.2008 (Grand Chamber)
(see p. 3)

Fretté v. France
26.02.2002
The applicant, a homosexual man, complained that the decision dismissing his request for authorisation to adopt a child amounted to arbitrary interference with his private and family life because it was based exclusively on unfavourable prejudice about his sexual orientation. He further

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

complained that he had not been summoned to the hearing on his case held by the *Conseil d'Etat*.
No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private life)
Violation of Article 6 (right to a fair hearing)

Inadmissible application

Bonnaud and Lecoq v. France
01.03.2018
The case concerned an application for joint exercise of parental responsibility made by two women living as a couple, each of whom had a child born as a result of medically assisted reproduction.
Application declared inadmissible.

Cases dealing with freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 9)

Ebrahimian v. France
26.11.2015
The case concerned the decision not to renew the contract of employment of a hospital social worker because of her refusal to stop wearing the Muslim veil.
No violation of Article 9

Association Les Témoins de Jéhovah v. France
30.06.2011[3]
Gifts received by "Association of Jehovah's Witnesses" were taxed under a law that was too imprecise.
Violation of Article 9

Inadmissible applications

Aktas v. France
Bayrak v. France
Gamaleddyn v. France
Ghazal v. France
J. Singh v. France
R. Singh v. France
17.07.2009
The applications concerned the expulsion of pupils from school for wearing conspicuous symbols of religious affiliation.
Applications declared inadmissible.

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Violations of Article 10

Allée v. France (no. 20725/20)
18.01.2024
The case concerned the applicant's criminal conviction for public defamation following her allegations of harassment and sexual assault against a senior executive of the non-profit association where she worked. The claims had been sent by email to six people from both inside and outside the association.

Bouton v. France (no. 22636/19)
13.10.2022
The case concerned the criminal conviction of the applicant, a feminist activist who at the time was a member of Femen, for acts of "sexual exposure" (*exhibition sexuelle*) committed in a church (La Madeleine) in Paris during a "performance" by way of protest against the Catholic Church's position on abortion. She received a suspended prison sentence.

Rouillan v. France (no. 28000/19)
23.06.2022
The case concerned the sentencing of Jean-Marc Rouillan, formerly a member of the terrorist group *Action directe*, to a term of 18 months' imprisonment including a suspended portion of 10 months with probation, upon his conviction as an accessory to the offence of publicly defending acts of terrorism for remarks he had made on a radio show in 2016 and which had subsequently been published on a media website.
Violation of Article 10 on account of the severity of the criminal penalty imposed

Baldassi and Others v. France
11.06.2020
The cases concerned a complaint by activists in the Palestinian cause about their criminal conviction for incitement to economic discrimination, on account of their participation in actions aimed at boycotting products imported from Israel as part of the campaign "BDS : Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions".

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

Tête v. France
26.03.2020
In this case the applicant complained about his conviction for malicious falsehood on account of an open letter which he had written to the President of the French Financial Markets Authority (AMF), in which he accused the Olympique Lyonnais Group ("the OL Group") and its CEO of providing false and misleading information during the company's stock-market flotation. The flotation had been aimed at allowing the construction of a new football stadium known as "OL Land" in a suburb of Lyons.

Ottan v. France
19.04.2018
The case concerned a disciplinary sanction imposed on Mr Ottan, who is a lawyer, on the grounds of his statements to the press immediately after an acquittal.

de Carolis and France Televisions v. France
21.01.2016
The case concerned an accusation of defamation brought by Saudi Prince Turki Al Faisal on account of a documentary on the France 3 television channel concerning complaints lodged by families of the victims of the 11 September 2001 attacks.

Bono v. France
15.12.2015
The case concerned a disciplinary sanction imposed on Mr Bono, as lawyer acting for a suspected terrorist, S.A., for remarks made in his pleadings before the Court of Appeal. He claimed that the French investigating judges had been complicit in the torture of S.A. by the Syrian secret services and thus sought the exclusion of statements obtained through the use of torture.

Eon v. France
14.03.2013
The case concerned the applicant's conviction for insulting the President of France. During a visit by the President to the department of Mayenne, the applicant had waved a placard reading "Casse toi pov'con" ("Get lost, you sad prick"), a phrase uttered by the President himself several months previously.
The Court held that criminal penalties for conduct such as that displayed by the applicant were likely to have a chilling effect on satirical contributions to discussion of matters of public interest, such discussion being fundamental to a democratic society.

Ressiot and Others v. France
28.06.2012
The case concerned investigations carried out at the premises of *Equipe* and *Le Point* newspapers and at the homes of journalists accused of breaching the confidentiality of a judicial investigation.
The Court found that the Government had not shown that a fair balance had been struck between the various interests involved.

Martin and Others v. France (no. 30002/08)
12.04.2012
The case concerned a search of the premises of the *Midi Libre* daily newspaper ordered by an investigating judge to determine in what circumstances and conditions journalists had obtained a copy of a confidential draft report of the Regional Audit Office concerning the management of the Languedoc-Roussillon region.

Mor v. France
15.12.2011
The case concerned the conviction of a lawyer for a breach of professional confidence following an interview with the press on the subject of an expert report submitted to an investigating judge concerning deaths following vaccination against hepatitis B.

Vellutini and Michel v. France
06.10.2011
Conviction of the President and General Secretary of the municipal police officers' union (USPPM) for public defamation of a mayor, on the basis of statements made in their capacity as union officials.

Dumas v. France
15.07.2010

Fleury v. France
11.05.2010

Haguenauer v. France
22.04.2010

Renaud v. France
25.02.2010

Orban and Others v. France
15.01.2009

Chalabi v. France

18.09.2008

July and SARL Libération v. France

14.02.2008

Mamère v. France

07.11.2006

No violations of Article 10

Ludes and Others v. France (nos. 40899/22, 41621/22, and 42956/22)

03.07.2025

The case concerned the criminal conviction of the applicants, environmental activists, and their sentencing to suspended fines, for theft committed as a joint enterprise, after they had taken down the official portrait of the French President in several town halls and refused to return it. They had been seeking to draw attention to the State's inaction with regard to its COP21 climate-summit commitments and the fight against climate change more generally.

Z.B. v. France

02.09.2021

The case concerned the conviction of Z.B. for glorification of wilful killing on account of slogans ("I am a bomb" and "Jihad, born on 11 September") on a T-shirt he had given his nephew as a present for his third birthday. The boy had then worn the T-shirt to nursery school. Before the domestic courts and the European Court the applicant had claimed that the slogans were supposed to be humorous in tone.

Société Editrice de Mediapart and Others v. France

14.01.2021

The two cases concerned an order issued against Mediapart, a news website, its publishing editor and a journalist to remove from the news company's website audio extracts and transcripts of illegal recordings made at the home of Ms Bettencourt, principal shareholder of the L'Oréal group.

Sellami v. France

17.12.2020

The case concerned the conviction of a journalist for using information obtained in breach of professional secrecy, following the publication of a composite image produced by the police in connection with an ongoing investigation.

Giesbert and Others v. France

01.06.2017

Société de Conception de Presse et d'Édition v. France

25.02.2016

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

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

Prompt v. France

03.12.2015

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

Bidart v. France

12.11.2015

The case concerned the obligation imposed on Philippe Bidart, in the context of his release on licence, to refrain from disseminating any work or audiovisual production authored or co-authored by him concerning the offences of which he had been convicted, and from speaking publicly about those offences.

Leroy v. France

02.10.2008

Editions Plon v. France

18.05.2004

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

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

Inadmissible applications

Ramadan v. France (no. 23443/23)

01.02.2024

The case concerned the applicant's conviction for having disseminated information about the identity of the presumed victim of a rape for which he was facing trial.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Graner v. France

28.05.2020

The case concerned a refusal to allow the applicant to consult certain documents in the archives of the French President's office concerning Rwanda for the period between 1990 and 1995.

Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

Campion v. France

14.03.2019

The case concerned comments made by Marcel Campion to the weekly magazine *VSD* on account of which he was found guilty of defaming Dominique Strauss-Kahn.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Meslot v. France

01.02.2018

The case concerned the applicant's conviction for contempt of court on the grounds of comments which he had made about a judge at a meeting during an election campaign.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

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

Ayoub and Others v. France (nos. 77400/14, 34532/15, and 34550/15)

08.10.2020

The cases concerned the administrative dissolution of three extreme right-wing entities: a de facto group (the Troisième Voie association and its security squad) and two associations (L'Oeuvre française and Jeunesses nationalistes).

Application no. 77400/14 declared admissible and the remaining applications inadmissible on account of an abuse of rights (Article 17 of the Convention).

No violation of Article 11, read in the light of Article 10 (freedom of expression), in relation to application no. 77400/14.

ADEFDROMIL v. France
Matelly v. France

02.10.2014

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

Violation of Article 11 in both cases

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

Right to marriage (Article 12)

Delecolle v. France

25.10.2018

The case concerned the right of a person placed under enhanced curatorship to marry without the authorisation of his or her curator or of the guardianship judge.

No violation of Article 12

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

Barbotin v. France

19.11.2020

The case concerned the compensation awarded to the applicant by the domestic courts in respect of his conditions of detention in Caen remand prison. The applicant complained of the ineffectiveness of the compensatory remedy of which he had availed himself, in view of the low amount awarded and the fact that he had had to pay the expert's fees incurred to inspect the cells in which he had been held.

Violation of Article 13 read in conjunction with Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Moustahi v. France

25.06.2020

The case concerned the conditions in which two children, apprehended when they unlawfully entered French territory in Mayotte, were placed in administrative

detention together with adults, arbitrarily associated with one of them for administrative purposes, and expeditiously returned to the Comoros without a careful and individual examination of their situation.
No violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 3 as regards the complaint of a lack of effective remedies against the conditions of removal of the second and third applicants
Violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 8, and of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 4 of Protocol No. 4, as regards the complaint of a lack of effective remedies against the removal of the second and third applicants

Yengo v. France

21.05.2015
Concerned the conditions of detention of a prisoner, Mr Yengo, in Nouméa prison, New Caledonia. Mr Yengo complained about those conditions and also about the lack of an effective remedy by which to complain about them to the domestic authorities.
The Court held that Mr Yengo could no longer claim to be a victim of Article 3 of the Convention prohibiting inhuman and degrading treatment, since the domestic court had awarded him some compensation for the harm sustained as a result of the detention conditions.
The Court further held that there had been a violation of Article 13.

Gebremedhin v. France

26.04.2007
Eritrean asylum-seeker held in the waiting zone of Roissy-Charles de Gaulle airport had no remedy with automatic suspensive effect against decisions denying him leave to enter and ordering his removal.
Violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)
No violation of Article 5 § 1 (f) (right to liberty and security)

Cases related to discrimination (Article 14)

Zeggai v. France (no. 12456/19)

13.10.2022
The case concerned the rejection of the applicant's request for a certificate of French nationality. He was born in France, before Algerian independence, to parents who at the time were still French nationals. He has lived continuously in France and his brothers and sisters, who were born after Algerian independence, have acquired French nationality. He had previously held a French identity card and voter card, issued to him in error by the French authorities. He complained before the Court that he had been subjected to discrimination prohibited by Article 14.
No violation of Article 14 taken together with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Saumier v. France

12.01.2017
The case concerned an individual who had become ill as a result of her employer's negligence and been unable to obtain full compensation for the damage she suffered.
No violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 1 (protection of property) of Protocol No. 1

Koua Poirrez v. France

30.09.2003
French authorities' refusal to award a disabled adult's allowance to a national of Côte d'Ivoire, resident in France.
Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)
No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time)

Inadmissible application

Balta v. France

08.02.2018
The case concerned the decision by the Prefect of Seine-Saint-Denis to serve formal notice on the applicant and other caravan occupiers illegally parked in La Courneuve to leave the area.
Application declared inadmissible.

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

Violations of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

SCI Le Chateau du Francport v. France (no. 3269/18)

07.07.2022
The case concerned a château belonging to the applicant company (SCI Le Château du Francport), which had been seized as part

of a judicial investigation into suspected offences before being returned to the applicant four years later in a state of disrepair, and the applicant's claim for compensation, which had been rejected for failure to prove that the damage sustained had been the consequence of gross negligence on the part of the State.

N.M. and Others v. France (no. 66328/14)

03.02.2022

The case concerned the dismissal, by the administrative courts, of the arguments submitted by the parents in their claim for compensation for the special costs arising from their child's disability. This disability had not been detected at the time of the prenatal diagnosis.

Milhau v. France

10.07.2014

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

Grifhorst v. France

26.02.2009

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

Mazurek v. France

01.02.2000

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

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Malfatto and Mieille v. France

06.10.2016

The case concerned some land around Anthénor cove (*calanque*) on the Mediterranean coast in the *département* of Bouches-du-Rhône. It was designated as building land and in 1964 a permit was issued for its subdivision into plots. Under the terms of a national planning directive of 25 August 1979 and the Coastal Areas Act of 3 January 1986, the land was made subject to an absolute prohibition on construction, owing to the fact that it was located within 100 meters of the shoreline.

Couturon v. France

25.06.2015

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

Arnaud and Others v. France

15.01.2015

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

Inadmissible application

Alves de Oliveira v. France

16.12.2021

The case concerned the combination of criminal sanctions and tax penalties applicable under domestic law for the offence of assisting or benefiting from prostitution, together with laundering of the proceeds from that offence, and the proportionality of these different sanctions and measures.

Djordjević v. France

07.10.2021

The case concerned the confiscation of a building belonging to the applicant, who had been convicted of a repeat offence of criminal conspiracy, in application of an additional penalty allowing property to be confiscated in blanket fashion.
Application declared inadmissible

Right to education cases (Article 2 of Protocol No. 1)

Dupin v. France

24.01.2019

The case concerned the right to education of autistic children, and more specifically the right to attend a mainstream school.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Freedom of movement (Article 2 of Protocol No. 4)

Domenjoud v. France (nos. 34749/16 and 79607/17)

16.05.2024

The case concerned home-curfew orders issued against two French nationals, Cédric and Joël Domenjoud, on the basis of state-

of-emergency legislation. The measures were taken in the context of the 21st Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change ("COP21").
No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 in respect of Cédric Domenjoud
Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 in respect of Joël Domenjoud

Auray and Others v. France (no. 1162/22)
08.02.2024
The case concerned the applicants' containment for several hours on Place Bellecour in Lyons on 21 October 2010, during a demonstration against a pension reform bill.
Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4
Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association) read in the light of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Fanouni v. France (no. 31185/18)
15.06.2023
The case concerned a home curfew imposed on the applicant in the context of a state of emergency, prohibiting him from leaving the municipality of Champagne-sur-Oise.
No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4

Pagerie v. France (no. 24203/16)
19.01.2023
The case concerned a curfew order confining the applicant to the municipality of Angers, made by the Minister of the Interior acting under the state of emergency declared following the wave of terrorist attacks committed in France in November 2015. For more than 13 months the applicant had been placed under strict requirements to, among other things, report to a police station three times a day and remain at home between the hours of 8 p.m. and 6 a.m.
No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4

Cases dealing with Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice)

Nodet v. France
06.06.2019
The case concerned the right not to be tried or punished twice (*ne bis in idem*). The applicant, a financial analyst, was fined by the financial markets regulator, the AMF, for manipulation of a share price, and subsequently by criminal courts for the offence of obstructing the proper operation of the stock market by the same action. He complained that he had been punished twice for the same offence.
Violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7

Inadmissible application

Faller v. France and Steinmetz v. France
22.10.2020
The case concerned two doctors who complained that they had been convicted by a criminal court for fraud on account of acts for which they had already been punished.

Krombach v. France
29.03.2018
The case concerned Mr Krombach's criminal conviction in France for events in respect of which he submitted that he had previously been acquitted in Germany. The facts concerned the circumstances surrounding the death of Kalinka Bamberski in 1982 at Mr Krombach's home in Germany.
The Court had consistently held that Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 only concerned "courts in the same State" and therefore did not prevent an individual from being prosecuted or punished by the courts of a State Party to the Convention on the grounds of an offence of which he or she had been acquitted or convicted by a final judgment in another State Party.
Application declared inadmissible because the complaint was incompatible with the provisions of the Convention.

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Association des familles des victimes du JOOLA v. France (no. 21119/19)
24.02.2022
In this case, the applicant association complained before the Court that they had been deprived of their right of access to a court on account of the jurisdictional immunity which led to the discontinuance of the proceedings initiated by their criminal complaints in France.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Bonnet v. France (no. 35364/19)
24.02.2022
The case concerned the criminal conviction of the applicant Alain Bonnet, known as Alain Soral, by the French courts for the offence of proffering a public insult of a racial nature against an individual or group on account of their origin or of belonging to a given ethnicity, nation, race or religion, and for the offence of questioning the existence of crimes against humanity.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Charron and Merle-Montet v. France
08.02.2018
The application concerned a female married couple who had applied for medically assisted reproduction by means of artificial insemination. The application was rejected by Toulouse Hospital on the grounds that "the Bioethics Law currently in force in France did not authorise such medical provision for same-sex couples".
Application declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies.

Afiri and Biddarri v. France
25.01.2018
The case concerned the decision to withdraw the life-sustaining treatment being administered to a 14-year-old girl in a vegetative state following acute cardio-respiratory failure.
Application declared inadmissible.

Szpiner v. France
25.01.2018
In a press article published just after the trial in the "gang of barbarians" case, the applicant, who was the lawyer of the victim's family, referred to the fact that the father of the principal prosecutor B. had been a Nazi collaborator, and described B. as "genetically a traitor". Disciplinary proceedings were brought against the applicant on that account.
Application declared inadmissible.

Hallier and Others v. France
18.01.2018
The case concerned the inability of a lesbian (Ms Lucas) to obtain paternity leave following the birth of her partner's child. Ms Hallier and Ms Lucas have lived as a couple for many years and are in a civil partnership.
Application declared inadmissible.

Boudelal v. France
06.07.2017
The application concerned the authorities' refusal to reinstate the applicant as a French national.
Application declared inadmissible.

Dagregorio and Mosconi v. France
22.06.2017
The applicants are two trade unionists who took part in the occupation and immobilisation of the SNCM ferry "Pascal Paoli" during the company takeover by a financial operator. The case concerned their refusal to undergo biological testing, the results of which were to be included in the national computerised DNA database (FNAEG). The applicants, having been convicted at first instance and on appeal, did not lodge an appeal on points of law.
Application declared inadmissible.

de Mortemart v. France
15.06.2017
The case concerned a request to declassify part of a protected site, corresponding to the applicant's private property.
Application declared inadmissible.

Janssen Cilag S.A.S. v. France
13.04.2017
The case concerned search and seizure operations carried out at the applicant company's premises.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Poulain v. France
13.04.2017
The case concerned the allegedly excessive length of a set of liquidation proceedings.
Application declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies.

Gouri v. France
23.03.2017
The case concerned the applicant's request for the payment by France of a supplementary disability allowance, which was denied because she was living in Algeria.
Application declared inadmissible

Labaca Larrea v. France and two other applications

02.03.2017

The case concerned the detention in France of three ETA members in a prison located at a great distance from the residences of their families.

Applications declared inadmissible.

UBS AG v. France (no. 29778/15)

12.01.2017

The case concerned a sum of 1.1 billion euros required by way of security in the context of the court supervision of a bank that was placed under formal investigation for illegal direct selling of banking products and aggravated laundering of the proceeds of tax fraud.

Application declared inadmissible.

Colonna v. France

08.12.2016

The case concerns the assassination of the Prefect for the French Region of Corsica, Claude Erignac, in 1998.

Application declared inadmissible.

Oran-Martz v. France

02.06.2016

The case concerned a conviction for a vexatious civil-party claim.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Dupré v. France

26.05.2016

The case concerned the election, in 2011, of two additional French members to the European Parliament, an election in which the applicant, Mr Dupré, could neither stand for election nor vote.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Ursulet v. France

31.03.2016

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

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

M'Bala M'Bala v. France

10.11.2015

Conviction of Dieudonné M'Bala M'Bala, a comedian with political activities, for public insults directed at a person or group of persons on account of their origin or of belonging to a given ethnic community, nation, race or religion, specifically in this case persons of Jewish origin or faith.

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

Matis v. France

29.10.2015

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

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Benmouna and Others v. France

08.10.2015

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

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

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

01.10.2015

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

Applications declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

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

01.09.2015

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

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Renard v. France and three other applications

25.08.2015

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

also complained under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.
Applications declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies as concerns Article 6 § 1 and as being manifestly ill-founded in respect of Article 13.

Canonne v. France

02.06.2015
Mr Canonne complained about the fact that the domestic courts had inferred his paternity from his refusal to submit to the genetic tests ordered by them.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Barras v. France

17.03.2015
Applicant's inability to recover property belonging to him which has been occupied under an open-ended rent-free loan for over 50 years.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Ly v. France

10.07.2014
Difficulties encountered by Mr Ly, who was legally residing in France, in obtaining visa for his daughter.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

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

13.12.2011
Breach of a duty of confidentiality in negotiations on a friendly settlement between the French State and members of the organisation "Les faucheurs volontaires" who had lodged a complaint against France with the European Court of Human Rights. That stage of negotiations with a view to reaching a friendly settlement between the parties, expressly provided for by the Convention and which may take place at any time, must remain strictly confidential, a point of which the parties had been informed.
The Court declared the applications inadmissible for failure to respect duty of confidentiality in friendly settlement negotiations.

Rinck v. France

17.11.2010
Appeal against a road traffic penalty.
Application declared inadmissible (no significant disadvantage – new admissibility criterion introduced by Protocol no. 14)

Garretta v. France and Karchen v. France

04.03.2008
"Contaminated blood" case. Complaints concerned the right not to be tried or punished twice and the right to life.
Applications declared inadmissible.

Noteworthy pending cases

Sarkozy v. France (no. 9143/25)

Communicated to the Government in June 2026
The case concerns the use of transcripts from conversations between the applicant and his lawyer, recorded while their telephones were being tapped in the so-called "affaire des écoutes" ("telephone-tapping case").

Mouzin v. France (no. 15353/19)

Communicated to the Government in February 2021
The application concerns the effectiveness of the investigation into the 9 January 2003 disappearance of the applicant's 9-year-old daughter, Estelle.
Relying on Article 2 of the Convention, the applicant alleges that the judicial investigation into the circumstances of his daughter's disappearance and death was ineffective. He complains of inaction during the investigation, particularly by the investigation unit, which allegedly did not take all the necessary steps to ensure its proper conduct.

Théron v. France (no. 16147/23)

Communicated to the Government in November 2023
The application concerns an injury sustained by the applicant after a grenade was thrown during a 15 September 2016 protest against the so-called "Labour" Act. As a result, he permanently lost the use of his right eye. The applicant alleges a breach of Article 3 of the Convention.

Alsace nature and Others v. France (no. 11833/24)

Communicated to the Government in June 2025
The application concerns the indefinite extension of a permit issued to the

company Mines de Potasse d'Alsace (formerly Stocamine) for the underground storage of hazardous, non-radioactive waste in a deep geological repository in Wittelsheim.
Relying on Articles 2 and 8 of the Convention, the applicants submit that any pollution of Europe's largest groundwater aquifer would damage the environment and impair the conditions necessary for human life along with people's well-being, normal living conditions and peaceful enjoyment of their homes, thereby adversely affecting their private and family lives. They also rely on Articles 6 and 13 of the Convention.

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