Last updated: September 2026

Ukraine

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1997

National Judge: Mykola Gnatovskyy (27 June 2022 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judge: Volodymyr Butkevych (1996-2008), Ganna Yudkivska (2010-2022)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 5,997 applications concerning Ukraine in 2025, of which 5,429 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 164 judgments (concerning 568 applications), 160 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	2830	2297	1406
Communicated to the Government	738	766	485
Applications decided:	2885	5997	2034
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	2126	5255	1715
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	198	162	64
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	5	12	11
- Decided by judgment	556	568	244

* January to July 2026
For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the ECHR internet site.
Statistics on interim measures can be found here.

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2026	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	3341
Single Judge	240
Committee (3 Judges)	2865
Chamber (7 Judges)	236
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

Ukraine 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

Advisory opinion (P16-2026-001)

29.09.2026

Ukraine's Supreme Court requested an opinion on how to apply the Convention in the context of a company's challenge to a tax fine equivalent to triple the value of its assets. It asked for guidance on the criteria to be considered when undertaking their proportionality assessment in the case pending before it. It also asked whether a national court could decide not to impose a statutory sanction for failing to comply with tax-law requirements if disproportionate and instead apply a lower level of sanction not provided for by law.

Advisory opinion (P16-2025-001)

05.03.2026

The request concerned a dispute pending before Ukraine's Supreme Court between a monastery of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and a former nun over her right to live in a convent owned by the monastery. She left the convent in 2017 in a context of conflict within the religious community.

Ukraine and the Netherlands v. Russia (nos. 8019/16, 43800/14, 28525/20 and 11055/22)

09.07.2025

The case (applications nos. 8019/16, 43800/14 and 11055/22) concerned the conflict that began in eastern Ukraine in 2014 following the arrival in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions of pro-Russian armed groups, and escalated after Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine beginning on 24 February 2022.

The Court held that there had been patterns of violations of multiple Articles of the European Convention.

The case (application no. 28525/20) also concerned the shooting down of flight MH17 over eastern Ukraine on 17 July 2014, killing all those on board, many of whom were Dutch nationals.

Violation of Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment) and 13 (right to an effective remedy)

See here for the press release and FAQ in Ukrainian.

***

Regarding the question of Article 41 (just satisfaction), the Court held that it was not yet ready for decision and adjourned it, disjoining application no. 28525/20 (the downing of flight MH17) from the other three applications to allow for the examination of the just satisfaction claims separately.

Denisov v. Ukraine

25.09.2018

The case concerned the applicant's removal from the post of president of the Kyiv Administrative Court of Appeal.

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

The Court declared inadmissible a complaint under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

Burmych and Others v. Ukraine

12.10.2017

These five applications concerned the prolonged non-enforcement of final judicial decisions, and raised issues similar to those assessed in the *Ivanov* pilot judgment, which noted the existence of a structural problem which amounted to a breach of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention.

The Court declared these five applications admissible and joined these five applications and the other 12,143 pending applications.

It held that the five applications and the 12,143 pending applications joined should be dealt with in compliance with the obligation set out in the pilot judgment delivered on 15 October 2009 in the case of *Ivanov v. Ukraine.*

The Court further decided to strike all these applications out of the list of cases pursuant to Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention and to transmit them to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in order to be dealt with in the framework of the general enforcement measures set out in the *Ivanov* pilot judgment

See press release in Ukrainian

Bochan v. Ukraine (No. 2)

05.02.2015

The case concerned the proceedings relating to Ms Bochan's "appeal in the light of exceptional circumstances" based on the European Court of Human Rights' judgment in her previous case about the unfairness of property proceedings (judgment of 3 May 2007).

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

Chamber

Right to life cases (Article 2)

Vyacheslavova and Others v. Ukraine

13.03.2025

The case concerned the violent clashes between Maidan supporters and opponents and the fire in the Trade Union Building in Odesa on 2 May 2014, which resulted in heavy casualties.

Violations of Article 2 on account of the relevant authorities' failure to do everything that could reasonably be expected of them to prevent the violence in Odesa on 2 May 2014, to stop that violence after its outbreak, to ensure timely rescue measures for people trapped in the fire, and to institute and conduct an effective investigation into the events

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) in respect of one applicant (application no. 39553/16) concerning the delay in handing over her father's body for burial

Mikhno v. Ukraine and Svitlana Atamanyuk and Others v. Ukraine

01.09.2016

Both cases concerned a military aircraft crash during an aerobatics display at an air show on 27 July 2002 at the Sknyliv aerodrome in Lviv. The cases were brought by relatives of persons killed when the aircraft crashed into spectators at the show and exploded (referred to as the "Sknyliv accident"). As a result of the crash, 77 people died and over 290 sustained injuries.

No violation of Article 2

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time) and of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) on account of the length of the proceedings concerning Ms Mikhno's claims for damages and the lack of an effective remedy with which to accelerate her claim

Yuriy Illarionovich Shchokin v. Ukraine

03.10.2013

The case concerned the death of a prisoner, the applicant's son, following acts of torture inflicted on him by inmates, with the possible involvement of a prison officer, during his imprisonment in a penal colony.

Violation of Article 2 on account of the death of Mr Shchokin's son during his imprisonment

Violation of Article 2 as regards the investigation into the circumstances leading to the death of Mr Shchokin's son, as it had been conducted by the authorities without the requisite diligence

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture) on account of the torture to which Mr Shchokin's son had been subjected

Violation of Article 3 (lack of effective investigation) on account of the insufficiency of the State's investigation into those acts of torture

Mosendz v. Ukraine

17.01.2013

The case concerned the death of the applicant's son (D.M.), while he was on guard duty, during his mandatory military service.

Two violations of Article 2

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

The Court held that the authorities had not effectively investigated and duly accounted for D.M.'s death, and that they had not adequately protected his life. The Court, having noted widespread concern over the existence of hazing (*didivshchyna*[1]) in the Ukrainian army, found in particular that limiting the responsibility for D.M.'s death to wrongdoings of individual officers instead of allocating responsibility to upper hierarchical authority levels was especially worrying.

[1] "Didivshchyna", which literally means "grandfatherism", is the name given to the informal system of fresh conscripts being brutalised by more senior soldiers in the military forces of certain former Soviet Republics, in particular, Russia and Ukraine.

Kats and Others v. Ukraine

18.12.2008

Death resulting from lack of medical treatment in pre-trial detention

Violation of Article 2

Gongadze v Ukraine

08.11.2005

Failure to protect a journalist's life and ineffective investigation into his disappearance and death

Violation of Article 2

Cases concerning inhuman and/or degrading treatment or punishment (Article 3)

Cases concerning events around the Maidan protests

Shmorgunov and Others v. Ukraine, Lutsenko and Verbytskyy v. Ukraine, Kadura and Smaliy v. Ukraine, Dubovtsev and Others v. Ukraine and Vorontsov and Others v. Ukraine

21.01.2021

The cases concerned events around the Maidan protests in Kyiv and other cities in Ukraine, including dispersal of the protestors, their detention, the kidnapping of activists and their ill-treatment, and the related proceedings. The applicants had all had encounters with the police or non-State agents under police control (*titushky*). They alleged, among other things, police brutality, a denial of their right to protest, unjustified detention, and even in one case death.

Multiple violations of Article 3

Multiple violations of Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 (right to liberty and security)

Multiple violations of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association)

Violation of Article 2 (right to life)

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

Strashunskyy v. Ukraine

17.09.2026

The case concerned a complaint by the applicant, a vulnerable individual diagnosed with schizophrenia, about injuries he had sustained in 2016 when being transferred from a Staterun boarding house to a psychiatric hospital.

Two violations of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment/investigation)

Press release in Ukrainian

Benyukh v. Ukraine

26.06.2025

The case concerned Mr Benyukh's dental treatment in detention, in particular a 19-month delay in providing him with dentures despite duty-of-care legislative provisions making them available free of charge to prisoners with an established need for them but no means to pay.

Violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Spivak v. Ukraine

05.06.2025

The case concerned Mr Spivak's compulsory psychiatric treatment at the National High Security Psychiatric Hospital in Dnipro as ordered by a criminal court in October 2012.

Violation of Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 (right to liberty and security)

Violation of Article 3 on account of both Mr Spivak's treatment and the conditions in which he was held in a psychiatric hospital

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

K.K. v. Ukraine (no. 79412/17)

07.11.2024

The case concerned in particular Ms K.K.'s confinement in a psychiatric hospital and her allegations of ill-treatment there.

Violation of Article 3

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

Yakovlyev v. Ukraine

08.12.2022

The case concerned the applicant's force-feeding whilst in prison for robbery, after going on hunger strike in protest against his conditions of detention and the attitude of the prison officials.

Violation of Article 3

Razvozzhayev v. Russia and Ukraine

19.11.2019

The case concerned the conviction of a man for organising "mass disorder" for his part in May 2012 opposition protests and resultant disturbances in central Moscow, an incident which has been at the centre of

several earlier cases dealt with by the European Court of Human Rights.
Violation of the applicant's rights under Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman and degrading treatment) and Article 5 (right to liberty and security) over a failure by both Russia and Ukraine to carry out an effective investigation of arguable allegations that he had been abducted by State agents of Russia while in Ukraine and returned to Russia

Chernega and Others v. Ukraine

18.06.2019

The case concerned complaints of violations of the rights of people who had protested against the felling of trees in a public park to make way for a road.
No violation of the substantive aspect of Article 3 (prohibition of torture) in respect of the seventh and ninth applicants
Violation of the procedural aspect of Article 3 in respect of those applicants
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) in respect of the first and second applicants
Violation of Article 11 (right to peaceful assembly) in respect of the first, second, seventh and ninth applicants
No violation of Article 11 in respect of the third, fourth, fifth and sixth applicants

Petukhov v. Ukraine (No. 2)

12.03.2019

The case mainly concerned a prisoner's complaint that Ukrainian law did not provide for release on parole for life prisoners. Mr Petukhov, the applicant, has been serving a life sentence since 2004.
Violation of Article 3 because Mr Petukhov had no prospect of release from or possibility of review of his life sentence

Korneykova and Korneykov v. Ukraine

24.03.2016

The case concerned a pregnant detainee, who alleged that she had been shackled in the maternity hospital where she had given birth and that she and her newborn son had subsequently been held in very poor conditions in a pre-trial detention centre, without adequate medical care.
Four violations of Article 3

Lutsenko v. Ukraine (no. 2)

11.06.2015

Second application of Mr Lursenko before the Court, which concerned several complaints about the conditions of the pre-trial detention of the former Minister of the Interior, Yuriy Lutsenko, from December 2010 to April 2012 and his treatment during court hearings.
Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) on account of the conditions of Mr Lutsenko's detention from 28 December 2010 to 28 April 2011
Violations of Article 3 on account of the conditions of Mr Lutsenko's detention on days of court hearings and on account of his placement in a metal cage during the trial
No violation of Article 3 on account of the conditions of his detention from 28 April to 10 May 2011, from 23 May 2011 to 6 April 2012 and on 20 April 2012
No violation of Article 3 on account of the medical treatment which Mr Lutsenko received in detention

Lutsenko v. Ukraine

03.07.2012

First application of Mr Lutsenko before the Court (see cases under article 5 of the Convetion).

Salakhov and Islyamova v. Ukraine

14.03.2013

The case concerned the lack of appropriate medical care given to a detainee, who died from AIDS two weeks after he was released from detention.
Three violations of Article 3 on account of the inadequate medical care provided to Mr Salakhov both in the detention facilities and in hospital, and on account of his handcuffing in hospital
Two violations of Article 2 (right to life; failure to conduct an adequate investigation)

Kaverzin v. Ukraine

15.05.2012

Serving a life sentence for murder, Mr Kaverzin complained that he had sustained an eye injury when tortured in police custody and then went blind due to inadequate medical care in his subsequent detention.
Four violations of Article 3
No violation of Article 3 as concerned the alleged lack of medical care in detention between September 2001 to December 2008

Under Article 46 (binding force and implementation of judgments) the Court noted that Mr Kaverzin's ill-treatment in police custody reflected a recurring problem in Ukraine. In about 40 of its judgments, the Court had already found that the Ukrainian authorities had been responsible for ill-treatment of people held in police custody and that no effective investigation had been carried out into their allegations. Currently there are more than 100 other such cases pending. The Court therefore stressed that Ukraine had to urgently put in place specific reforms in its legal system to ensure that the practice of ill-treatment in police custody was eradicated.

Davydov and Others v. Ukraine

01.07.2010

Ill-treatment of prisoners following brutal training exercises by special forces from the State Department for the Enforcement of Sentences.

Four violations of Article 3

Yakovenko v. Ukraine

25.10.2007

Conditions of detention and medical assistance provided to HIV infected person.

Three violations of Article 3

Kucheruk v. Ukraine

06.09.2007

Lack of adequate medical assistance in detention; excessive use of force; handcuffing when in solitary confinement; lack of an effective investigation into the applicant's complaints of ill-treatment

No possibility under Ukrainian law to bring proceedings challenging the lawfulness of compulsory detention in a psychiatric hospital.

Four violations of Article 3

Violations of Article 5 § 4 (right to liberty and security)

Koval v. Ukraine

19.10.2006

Poor conditions of detention and inadequate medical assistance

Violation of Article 3

Dvoynykh v. Ukraine

12.10.2006

Poor conditions of detention

Violation of Article 3

Melnik v. Ukraine

28.03.2006

Overcrowded cells, no adequate medical care and no satisfactory conditions of hygiene and sanitation. No effective domestic remedy to complain about conditions of detention.

Violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Afanasyev v. Ukraine

05.04.2005

Lack of effective investigation into allegations of torture during police custody

Violation of Article 3

Nevmerzhitsky v. Ukraine

05.04.2005

Forced feeding classified as torture

Violation of Article 3

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

Poltoratskiy v. Ukraine

29.04.2003

Conditions of detention on death-row

Violation of Article 3

Right to liberty and security cases (Article 5)

Kaganovskyy v. Ukraine (no. 2)

05.03.2026

The case concerned the stay of a man, with a long history of psychiatric conditions and who had been found to lack capacity, in a State-run social care home.

Violation of Article 5 § 1

violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court), and a violation of Article 5 § 5 (enforceable right to compensation in case of contravention of above provisions)

Spivak v. Ukraine

05.06.2025

The case concerned Mr Spivak's compulsory psychiatric treatment at the National High Security Psychiatric Hospital in Dnipro as ordered by a criminal court in October 2012.

Violation of Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 (right to liberty and security)

Violation of Article 3 on account of both Mr Spivak's treatment and the conditions in which he was held in a psychiatric hospital

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Cases concerning events around the Maidan protests

Shmorgunov and Others v. Ukraine, Lutsenko and Verbytskyy v. Ukraine, Kadura and Smaliy v. Ukraine, Dubovtsev and Others v. Ukraine and Vorontsov and Others v. Ukraine

21.01.2021

The cases concerned events around the Maidan protests in Kyiv and other cities in Ukraine, including dispersal of the protestors, their detention, the kidnapping of activists and their ill-treatment, and the related proceedings. The applicants had all had encounters with the police or non-State agents under police control (*titushky*). They alleged, among other things, police brutality, a denial of their right to protest, unjustified detention, and even in one case death.

Multiple violations of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman and degrading treatment)

Multiple violations of Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 (right to liberty and security)

Multiple violations of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association)

Violation of Article 2 (right to life)

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

Grubnyk v. Ukraine

17.09.2020

The case concerned the applicant's arrest and detention in connection with various terrorism offences in Odessa in 2015.

No violation of Article 5 §§ 2 and 3 (right to liberty and security) concerning the applicant's complaints about not being informed promptly of the reasons for his arrest and about bail not being available to him by law because he was accused of terrorism offences;

Two violations of Article 5 § 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights because the applicant's arrest had been carried out without a prior court decision and had not actually been recorded until the next day;

A violation of Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence) because the initial pre-trial detention order against him had stated that he was guilty of a particularly "grave offence" while, at the time, he had merely been suspected and not convicted of any terrorism offence.

Sinkova v. Ukraine

37.02.2018

The case concerned Ms Sinkova's arrest and detention for three months for frying eggs on the flame of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Kyiv in 2010. At the time, she belonged to an artistic group known for its provocative public performances. She later posted a video of the scene on the Internet, with the explanation that she had been protesting against the waste of precious natural gas.

No violation of Article 5 § 1 concerning Ms Sinkova's arrest, which had been based on a judicial order and had aimed to ensure her attendance at a hearing on her case as, despite the police's efforts, they had not been able to find her until March 2011

Violation of Article 5 §§ 1, 3 and 5 because Ms Sinkova's detention from 29 May to 17 June 2011 had not been covered by any judicial decision, the entirety of her detention from 29 March to 30 June 2011 had not been justified, and Ukrainian law had not provided an enforceable right to compensation for that unlawfulness of her detention

No violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Ignatov v. Ukraine

15.12.2016

The case concerned criminal proceedings against Mr Ignatov, who complained that the domestic courts had failed to uphold the appropriate standards when ordering his pre-trial detention and extending it on multiple occasions.

Violations of Articles 5 §§ 1, 3 and 4

Press release in Ukrainian.

Ms Tymoshenko's first application before the Court, **Tymoshenko v. Ukraine**, concerned complaints related to her detention.

In its Chamber judgment of 30 April 2013, the Court held in particular: that Ms Tymoshenko's pre-trial detention had been arbitrary; that the lawfulness of her detention had not been properly reviewed; and, that she had had no possibility to seek compensation for her unlawful deprivation of liberty, in violation of Article 5 of the Convention.

The Court also found that, in breach of Article 18 of the Convention (limitation on use of restrictions on rights), her right to liberty had been restricted for reasons other than those permitted under Article 5.
Ukrainian version press release

The second application, **Tymoshenko v. Ukraine (no. 2)**, concerned the fairness of the criminal proceedings.
Ms Tymoshenko raised several complaints under Article 6 (right to a fair trial), Article 7 (no punishment without law) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy). She also complained, under Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights), that the criminal case against her had been politically motivated and constituted an abuse of the criminal system of justice.
Furthermore, the case raised a number of issues under Articles 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 10 (freedom of expression) taken in conjunction with Article 18 of the Convention and under Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice).
On 16 December 2014, the Court decided to strike the application out of its list of cases pursuant to Article 39 (friendly settlements) of the Convention.

Lutsenko v. Ukraine

03.07.2012
The case concerned the complaint by a well-known opposition politician that his arrest and the decision on his detention were arbitrary and unlawful, and that he was not informed about the reasons for his arrest.
Two violations of Article 5 § 1
Violation of Article 5 § 2 (right to be informed of the reasons for one's arrest)
Two violations of Article 5 § 3 (right to be brought promptly before a judge)
Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to challenge the lawfulness of one's detention)
Violation of Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions on rights) in conjunction with Article 5

Molotchko v. Ukraine

26.04.2012
The applicant is a German national born in Belarus. On business in Ukraine in February 2010, he was arrested on the basis of an arrest warrant issued against him in Belarus where he stood accused of organised crime, abuse of power, smuggling and bribery. He was released in May 2011 and left for Germany a few months later. He alleged that, if extradited to Belarus (where he was born), he would be at real risk of torture or inhuman and degrading treatment. He also complained about the unlawfulness, lack of judicial review and conditions of his detention pending extradition.
Article 3: application struck out from the list of cases in so far as this complaint is concerned
Violation of Article 5 § 1 (f) - as regards Mr Molotchko's detention from 23 February to 23 June 2010 and from 29 July 2010 to 19 May 2011
No violation of Article 5 § 1 (f) - as regards his detention from 23 June to 29 July 2010
Violation of Article 5 § 4 - as regards his detention from 23 February 2010 to 19 May 2011

Ichin and Others v. Ukraine

21.12.2010
Detention of minors in the context of criminal proceedings
Violation of Article 5 § 1
The case concerned the unlawful detention of two minors who stole food and appliances from a school cafeteria.

Soldatenko v. Ukraine

23.10.2008
Lack of legal provisions governing the procedure for detention in Ukraine pending extradition
Violations of Article 5 §§ 1 (f) and 4
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)
The Court further holds that applicant's extradition to Turkmenistan would be in violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment).

Gorshkov v. Ukraine

08.11.2005
No possibility under Ukrainian law to bring proceedings challenging the lawfulness of compulsory detention in a psychiatric hospital.
Violations of Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court)

Salov v. Ukraine

06.09.2005

Applicant not brought promptly before a judge to have his arrest reviewed

Violation of Article 5 § 3

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

Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Cases dealing with Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Sytnyk v. Ukraine

24.04.2025

The case concerned proceedings brought against a high-level public official in the field of anticorruption for accepting gifts – specifically holidays – in breach of the Code of Administrative Offences. He was found guilty in 2019 and his name was included, indefinitely, in a public register of corrupt officials.

Violations of Article 6 § 1, Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), and Article 18 (limitation on use of restriction of rights)

Polyakh and Others v. Ukraine

17.10.2019

The case concerned the dismissal of five civil servants under the Government Cleansing (Lustration) Act of 2014 ("the GCA").

Violation of Article 6 § 1 owing to the length of the proceedings in the first three applicants' domestic cases

Press release in Ukrainian

Zhang v. Ukraine

13.11.2018

The case concerned the applicant's conviction for murder.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Karpyuk and Others v. Ukraine

06.10.2015

Concerned the trial against seven opposition activists following their participation in mass protests in Kyiv in March 2001.

Violation of Article 6 in respect of two of the applicants on account of the non-attendance of a number of witnesses during the trial

No violation of Article 6 as regards one applicant's removal from the courtroom and as regards the appointment of a legal aid lawyer for one of the applicants

Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association) in respect of three of the applicants who were involved in organising the protests

No violation of Article 11 in respect of the remaining applicants

Svetlana Naumenko v. Ukraine

09.11.2004

Civil proceedings

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Tregubenko v. Ukraine

02.11.2004

Supervisory (or extraordinary) review proceedings not subject to any time-limit following a final judgment breached the principle of legal certainty and the applicant's right to access to a court.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Inadmissible application

Makovetskyy v. Ukraine

15.09.2022

The case concerned administrative-offence proceedings against Mr Makovetskyy for refusal to wear a mask in a supermarket, although doing so had been compulsory as part of measures to restrict the spread of the disease Covid-19.

Application declared inadmissible as being manifestly ill-founded.

Right of access to court

Gumenyuk and others v. Ukraine

22.07.2021

The case concerned judges of the former Supreme Court of Ukraine who were prevented from exercising their functions, without having ever been formally dismissed, because of judicial reform and legislative amendments that took place in 2016.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

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

Tsezar and Others v. Ukraine

13.02.2018

The case concerned a complaint by seven residents of Donetsk that they had not been able to bring cases challenging a suspension of pension payments and other

social benefits ("social benefits") before a court in the city where they lived.
No violation of Article 6 § 1

Right to a fair trial within a reasonable time

Khlebik v. Ukraine

25.07.2017

The case concerned the complaint by a man who had been convicted of several offences by a court in the Luhansk Region in 2013 that the domestic courts were unable to examine his appeal against his conviction, because his case file was blocked in an area that was no longer under the Ukrainian Government's control.
No violation of Article 6 § 1

Agrokompleks v. Ukraine

06.10.2011

The case concerned the insolvency proceedings initiated by a private company (Agrokompleks) against the biggest oil refinery in Ukraine (LyNOS), in an attempt to recover its outstanding debts. Agrokompleks complained, among other things, about the unfairness of the insolvency proceedings, alleging that the courts were not independent or impartial, given the intense political pressure surrounding the case as the State authorities had a strong interest in its outcome.
Three violations of Article 6 § 1: courts deciding the case lacked independence; reopening of finally settled court decision on amount owed by LyNOS breached legal certainty; and proceedings lasted too long; Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

Right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses

Famulyak v. Ukraine

02.05.2019

The case concerned the applicant's allegation that proceedings against him for aggravated robbery were unfair. He alleged in particular that his case had been remitted for retrial to a different judge, without the possibility to re-examine the witnesses against him.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

Cases dealing with Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Ruban v. Ukraine

12.07.2016

The case concerned entitlement to a more favourable sentence due to a gap in legislation. Mr Ruban – serving a life sentence for aggravated murder – alleged that, had he been sentenced during the three-month gap between the time when the death penalty had been abolished in Ukraine and life imprisonment had not yet been introduced, the courts would have had no choice but to sentence him to a maximum of 15 years' imprisonment.
No violation of Article 7

Cases dealing with private and family life (Article 8)

Korniyets and Others v. Ukraine

10.07.2025

The case concerned police searches of the applicants' homes carried out in 2015 without a prior court order.
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family) in respect of all applicants
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)
Violations of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) in respect of one of the applicants, Ms Zhabo

Denysyuk and Others v. Ukraine

13.02.2025

The first three applicants had been accused of large-scale corruption in related criminal cases instituted in 2016-17. They had been subsequently informed that either there had been covert audio and video monitoring in their cases or that their telephones had been tapped. The last applicant had been involved as the lawyer to two of the other applicants.
Violation of Article 8
Violation of Article 38 (obligation to furnish necessary facilities for the examination of a case)

Mayboroda v. Ukraine

13.04.2023

The case concerned the applicant's allegation that her kidney had been removed without her consent or even knowledge during emergency surgery for internal bleeding in March 2000.

Violation of Article 8 as regards the failure to protect Ms Mayboroda's right to informed consent

Polyakh and Others v. Ukraine

17.10.2019

The case concerned the dismissal of five civil servants under the Government Cleansing (Lustration) Act of 2014 ("the GCA").

Violation of Article 8 in respect of all five applicants

Press release in Ukrainian

Burlya and Others v. Ukraine

06.11.2018

The case concerned allegations made against the Government of Ukraine by a group of Roma following an anti-Roma attack in a Ukrainian village in 2002. They argued in particular that the State was responsible for the invasion and ransacking of their homes, since the local authorities had at worst been complicit in the attack and at best done nothing to prevent it.

Violation of Article 8 in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Two violations of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment/lack of effective investigation), taken in conjunction with Article 14, with respect to the applicants who had been at home as the events unfolded

Putistin v. Ukraine

21.11.2013

The case concerned an article written about the legendary "Death Match" between Ukrainian footballers and members of the German Luftwaffe in 1942 in Kyiv. The applicant alleged that the article discredited his father, who had played in the game, as it suggested that he had been a collaborator. He claimed that, by rejecting his requests for the article to be rectified, the Ukrainian courts had failed to protect his and his family's reputation.

No violation of Article 8

Garnaga v. Ukraine

16.05.2013

The case concerned the Ukrainian authorities' refusal to allow the applicant to change her patronymic – the middle name derived from the father's forename.

Violation of Article 8

Oleksandr Volkov v. Ukraine

09.01.2013

The case concerned the dismissal of a Supreme Court Judge.

Four violations of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Violation of Article 8

Under Articles 41 (just satisfaction) and 46 (binding force and execution of judgments), the Court, in view of the serious systemic problems concerning the functioning of the Ukrainian judiciary disclosed in Mr Volkov's case, recommended Ukraine to urgently reform its system of judicial discipline. It further held that, given the very exceptional circumstances of the case, Ukraine was to reinstate Mr Volkov in the post of Supreme Court judge at the earliest possible date.

Trosin v. Ukraine

23.02.2012

The case concerned a detainee's complaint about the restrictions imposed on his family visits and about the prison authorities monitoring his correspondence with the European Court of Human Rights.

Violation of Article 8

The Court further held that Ukraine had failed to comply with its obligations under Article 34 (right of individual petition).

Dubetska and Others v. Ukraine

10.02.2011

Prolonged exposure of the applicants to environmental pollution from a State-owned coal mine and coal-processing factory

Violation of Article 8

Volokhy v. Ukraine

02.11.2006

Secret surveillance of correspondence: Ukrainian law not compatible with the Convention as no clear scope and conditions for it and no sufficient safeguards against abuse of that surveillance system

Violation of Article 8

Parental rights (Article 8)

Saviny v. Ukraine

18.12.2008

Placement of children in public care

Violation of Article 8

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

Svyato-Mykhaylivska Parafiya v. Ukraine

14.06.2007

Registration of religious associations: lack of coherence and foreseeability of domestic legislation and no safeguards against arbitrariness.

Violation of Article 9

Freedom of expression and information (Article 10)

Udovychenko c. Ukraine

23.03.2023

The case concerned the consequences for an eyewitness to a road accident of telling a journalist that she had seen the son of B., a former member of parliament, getting out of the driver's side of the car.

Violation of Article 10

Shvydka v. Ukraine

30.10.2014

The case concerned the detention for ten days of a member of a Ukrainian opposition party for tearing a ribbon from a wreath which had been laid by the then President of Ukraine, V. Yanukovych, during a ceremony.

Violation of Article 10

Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 7 (right of appeal in criminal matters)

Editorial Board of Pravoye Delo and Shtekel v. Ukraine

05.05.2011

The case mainly concerned the lack of adequate safeguards in Ukrainian law for journalists' use of information obtained from the Internet.

Two violations of Article 10

Ukrainian Media Group v. Ukraine

29.03.2005

Media fined for statements found to be defamatory.

Violation of Article 10

Inadmissible application

Borzykh v. Ukraine

12.12.2024

The case concerned the prohibition on wearing the St George ribbon (a war commemoration symbol) in public.

Application declared inadmissible

Freedom of assembly and association (Article 11)

Cases concerning events around the Maidan protests

Shmorgunov and Others v. Ukraine, Lutsenko and Verbytskyy v. Ukraine, Kadura and Smaliy v. Ukraine, Dubovtsev and Others v. Ukraine and Vorontsov and Others v. Ukraine

21.01.2021

The cases concerned events around the Maidan protests in Kyiv and other cities in Ukraine, including dispersal of the protestors, their detention, the kidnapping of activists and their ill-treatment, and the related proceedings. The applicants had all had encounters with the police or non-State agents under police control (*titushky*). They alleged, among other things, police brutality, a denial of their right to protest, unjustified detention, and even in one case death.

Multiple violations of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman and degrading treatment)

Multiple violations of Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 (right to liberty and security)

Multiple violations of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association)

Violation of Article 2 (right to life)

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

Razvozzhayev v. Russia and Ukraine

19.11.2019

The case concerned the conviction of a man for organising "mass disorder" for his part in May 2012 opposition protests and resultant disturbances in central Moscow, an incident which has been at the centre of several earlier cases dealt with by the European Court of Human Rights.

The Court rejected the complaint by the applicant under this provision, finding that

his actions did not fall within the notion of "peaceful assembly".

Vyerentsov v. Ukraine

11.04.2013

The case concerned a human rights activist who complained in particular that he had been sentenced to three days of administrative detention for holding a demonstration without permission, even though such permission was not required by domestic law.

Violation of Article 11

Violation of Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (right to a fair trial)

The Court considered that the case disclosed a structural problem, namely a legislative lacuna concerning freedom of assembly which has remained in Ukraine since the end of the Soviet Union.

Koretskyy and Others v. Ukraine

03.04.2008

Registration of associations: domestic legislation allowed an unfettered discretion to the executive and did not meet the Convention standard of clarity and foreseeability.

Violation of Article 11

Cases concerning effective remedy (Article 13)

Abuhmaid v. Ukraine

12.01.2017

The case concerned Mr Abuhmaid's right to reside in Ukraine.

No violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Kebe and Others v. Ukraine

12.01.2017

The case concerned the applicants' attempts to obtain asylum in Ukraine.

Violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 3

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of ill-treatment)

Merit v. Ukraine

30.03.2004

Delayed enforcement of judgments against the State or State-controlled entities.

Violations of Article 13

Cases concerning prohibition of discrimination (Article 14)

Maymulakhin and Markiv v. Ukraine

01.06.2023

The case concerned legal recognition and protection of same-sex couples in Ukraine.

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

Pilot judgments

Sukachov v. Ukraine

31.01.2020

The case concerned a recurrent structural problem of poor conditions of pre-trial detention in Ukraine.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) because of the cumulative effect of overcrowding, poor lighting, ventilation and sanitary conditions of the cells in which Mr Sukachov had been held, with only one hour's exercise per day, between 2012 and 2017

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) because of the lack of effective remedies available for him to complain about his detention conditions

Yuriy Nikolayevich Ivanov v. Ukraine

15.10.2009

Under Article 46, the Court noted that the case concerned two recurring problems which lay behind the most frequent violations of the Convention found by the Court since 2004 in over 300 cases in respect of Ukraine - the prolonged non-enforcement of final domestic decisions and the lack of an effective domestic remedy to deal with it. In view of the approximately 1400 applications against Ukraine, which concerned the same questions and were at the time pending, the Court concluded that an incompatible with the Convention practice existed in Ukraine and held unanimously that Ukraine had to:

- introduce in its legal system, within one year from the date on which the judgment becomes final, an effective remedy which secured adequate and sufficient redress for non-enforcement of domestic judgments;
- grant such redress, within one year from the date on which the judgment

becomes final, to all applicants in such cases who had applied to the Court before the delivery of the present judgment, and whose applications had been communicated to the Ukrainian authorities.
In the event that no redress was granted, the Court would resume its examination of all similar pending applications with a view to adopting a judgment on them. Pending the adoption of the above measures, the Court adjourned, for one year from the date on which the judgment becomes final, the proceedings in all new Ukrainian cases concerning solely the non-enforcement or delayed enforcement of domestic judgments.
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)
On 21 February 2012, the Court examined the state of the implementation of the above-mentioned pilot judgment and noted that Ukraine has not adopted the required general measures to tackle the issues of non-enforcement at the domestic level, and - in accordance with the pilot judgment (§ 100) - decided to resume the examination of applications raising similar issues.

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

Bazhenov and Others v. Russia and Ukraine

16.07.2026

The case concerned the Russian authorities' cancellation of the applicants' titles to plots of land in Sevastopol, Crimea between 2015-2017. The plots had originally been transferred into private ownership by the Ukrainian authorities. The Russian authorities reclaimed them as public property on the basis that they were forest lands and as such should have never been privatised.
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 by the Russian Federation in relation to three of the five applicants (Mr Bazhenov, Mr Bornyakov and Mr Agafonov) on account of their being deprived of their land, and in relation to one of the applicants (Ms Sklyarenko) on account of her being deprived of the proceeds from the sale of her land
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) by the Russian Federation in relation to four of the applicants (Mr Bazhenov, Ms Melnik, Ms Sklyarenko and Mr Agafonov

Sadocha v. Ukraine

11.07.2019

The case concerned the applicant's complaint about Ukrainian customs officials seizing 31,000 euros in cash from him at Kyiv Zhuliany Airport.
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Svitlana Ilchenko v. Ukraine

04.07.2019

The case concerned the applicant's garage being demolished to make way for a new commercial housing development.
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Batkivska Turbota Foundation v. Ukraine

09.10.2018

The case concerned the applicant organisation being deprived of its ownership of parts of a sanatorium which it had bought from the property arm of Ukraine's Federation of Trade Unions in 2002. The Federation itself had gained control of the premises through a process which had begun in the Soviet era and its ownership of the assets had been confirmed in a 1997 court ruling.
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Zelenchuk and Tsytsyura v. Ukraine

22.05.2018

The case concerned a complaint by two people about a State ban on the sale of agricultural land, which they said had violated their property rights as the owners of such plots.
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Sovtransavto Holding v. Ukraine

25.07.2002

Failure of the authorities to secure the effective enjoyment of the applicant company's right to property
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Cases on elections
(Article 3 of Protocol No. 1)

Tomenko v. Ukraine
10.07.2025
The case concerned the early ending of Mr Tomenko's term as a member of parliament (MP) in 2016 for having left the political faction in which he had been elected.
Violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

Melnychenko v. Ukraine
19.10.2004
Arbitrary denial of registration as a parliamentary candidate
Violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

Cases on freedom of movement
(Article 2 of Protocol No. 4)

Stetsov v. Ukraine
11.05.2021
The case concerned a ban on leaving the country imposed on Mr Stetsov on account of a failure to reimburse a debt established by a judgment. According to domestic law at the material time, that prohibition could not be lifted until the full amount of the debt had been reimbursed. The ban had thus lasted for at least four years.
Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4

Other noteworthy cases, judgments and decisions delivered

Naydyon v. Ukraine
14.10.2010
No possibility for the applicant, a prisoner without a lawyer, to obtain copies of the documents from his domestic case-files necessary for his application before the European Court of Human Rights.
Violation of Article 34 (right of individual petition)

Gurepka v. Ukraine
06.09.2005
No right to appeal in an administrative arrest case because the available extraordinary review proceedings could only be initiated by a prosecutor or the president of the higher court.
Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 7 (right of appeal in criminal matters)

Inadmissible application

Saakashvili v. Ukraine
29.06.2023
The case concerned former President of Georgia, Mikheil Saakashvili, who became a naturalised Ukrainian in 2015 and was actively involved in Ukrainian politics.
For all but one of his complaints, the Court found that Mr Saakashvili had not used all the legal avenues available to him at national level, and that the remaining complaint – under Article 13 – was manifestly ill-founded.

Noteworthy pending cases

Grand Chamber

Inter-state cases

There are currently four inter-State applications lodged by Ukraine against Russia, two of which concern the question of just satisfaction .

There are also over 9,500 individual applications pending before the Court which appear to be related to the events in Crimea, eastern Ukraine and the Sea of Azov and Russia's military operations on the territory of Ukraine since 24 February 2022.

For more information, see the Q and A on inter-State cases.

Request for advisory opinion (P16 - 2025-001
7 January 2026
The request concerns a dispute pending before Ukraine's Supreme Court over proportionality of tax penalty calculated at flat rate set by law.

Chamber

Borovyk v. Ukraine (no. 2091/19)
Case notified on 30 October 2023
The case concerns suspension of payment of pension to persons residing in the

eastern regions of Ukraine where armed hostilities started in 2014

Shevchuk v. Ukraine (no. 474/21)

Case notified on 22 November 2021

The case concerns dismissal of the applicant from the posts of Judge and President of the Constitutional Court of Ukraine in the context of disciplinary proceedings.

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