

New cases communicated from January 2025 until May 2026 organised by themes

Case	Communicated - Lodged	Status	Grounds	Main Themes	Subject Matter	Provisions raised
L.B. v. Czech Republic, Application no. 22390/25, pending (ECtHR).	02/03/2026	Pending	Gender identity and expression	- Hate crimes	The case concerns a trans woman who was inflicted long-term physical and psychological violence both as a child and as an adult at the hands of her father on the basis of her gender identity. complains under Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention that the domestic legal framework and practice did not ensure her effective protection against the domestic violence inflicted by her father, and that the authorities did not conduct an effective investigation into her allegations. She further complains, relying in substance on Article 14 of the Convention, that the authorities had been influenced in their assessment by gender-based stereotypes.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECHR - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+3 - Discrimination - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
Tevdorashvili v. Georgia, Application no. 34267/23, pending (ECtHR).	10/06/2025	Pending	SOGIESC	- Hate crimes - Hate Speech - Expression Rights - Assembly	The applicant alleges that her artistic performance marking the International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia was violently disrupted by a well-known conservative figure, who dismantled her rainbow-coloured installation and verbally and physically assaulted her in a public park. She claims that police present at the scene failed to intervene, and that the subsequent investigation has been ineffective, with no charges brought. She complains under Articles 3, 10 and 11, taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14 of the Convention, of failures to protect her from hate-motivated violence, to investigate effectively, and to safeguard her rights to freedom of expression and assembly.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 11 - Freedom of assembly and association - ECHR - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+3 - Discrimination - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+10 - Discrimination - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+11 - Discrimination - Freedom of assembly and association
ООО Kulturnyye Proyehty v. Russia, Application no. 602/24, 30 April 2026 (ECtHR).	20/11/2025	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights	The applicant company is the organiser of annual Side by Side International LGBT film in Russia. The screening of the film was interrupted after the police received false bomb threat. The Court found that the State has failed to discharge its obligations under Article 10 by securing the safe and uninterrupted conduct of the film festival and a violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 10 in respect of the refusal to include its film festival in the list of approved festival.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14 - Prohibition of discrimination
KaosGL Dernegi v. Türkiye, Application no. 15023/21, pending (ECtHR).	11/09/2025	Pending	SOGIESC	- Hate Speech	The applicant is an LGBTI association complaining under Article 8 about homophobic and transphobic hate speech in a daily newspaper with nationwide circulation, targeting notably the applicant itself. It also maintains that by refusing to bring criminal proceedings against the directors of the newspaper, the judicial authorities discriminated against members of the LGBTI community, in violation of Article 14 of the Convention, but also deprived them of their right to an effective remedy, in violation of Article 13 of the Convention.	ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
Kryštof Stupka v. Czech Republic, Application no. 30276/25, pending (ECtHR).	10/12/2025	Pending	SOGIESC	- Hate Speech - Protection of personal and medical data	The applicant is an LGBT+ activist who applied to join as a civil party criminal proceedings following his complaint for threatening comments published under his posts on his Twitter account, who complains that the authorities collected a large amount of information concerning him and made it accessible to the person charged. He complains under Article 8 about a secondary victimisation and disproportionate interference with his right to respect for private life, which is likely to have a chilling effect on victims of criminal offences who apply for damages.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life
GENDERDOC-M and Others v. Moldova, Application no. 17553/17, pending (ECtHR)	23/01/2026	Pending	SOGIESC	- Hate Speech - Protection of personal and medical data	The applicant is an LGBTI association complaining about the unauthorised use of the image of LGBTI persons accompanying homophobic hate speech by a political party in its electoral campaign.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
Noam Gilbert v. Czech Republic, Application no. 19280/24, 19 February 2026 (ECtHR).	20/10/2025	Struck out or withdrawn ¹⁰	Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Name and gender markers - Medical and diagnosis requirements - Bodily integrity	The applicant complains about the State's refusal to grant legal gender recognition on the grounds that he has not undergone irreversible surgery entailing sterilisation. The case was struck out of the list of cases further to a friendly settlement.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - Substantive - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECHR - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+3 - Discrimination - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life

Daskiyev and others v. Russia, Application no. 25500/20 and 12 others, pending (ECtHR).	03/07/2025	Pending	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights	The applications - made by 13 individuals - concern complaints raised under Article 10 of the Convention relating to various restrictions on the right to freedom of expression which are the subject of well-established case law of the Court.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
Vladimirovich Fedorov v. Russia, Application no. 9746/25, pending (ECtHR).	03/07/2025	Pending	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights	The applicant is an LGBT rights activist and gender psychologist who was designated as "foreign agent" and whose challenge to this designation was unsuccessful. The complaints are the subject of well-established case law of the Court.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
Irma Vasilyevna Veller v. Russia, Application no. 11408/20, pending (ECtHR).	18/09/2025	Pending	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights	The applicant is a solo demonstrator in support of LGBT rights who complains about disproportionate measures against solo demonstrators. The complaints are the subject of well-established case law of the Court.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression
Lira, Case C-638/25, pending (CJEU)	30/09/2025	Pending	SOGIESC	Expression Rights - Other goods and services	The applicant is a bookstore in Budapest that was fined for selling the "Heartstopper" books in the section for publications classified as children's literature without wrapping them in a sealed packaging, allegedly in breach of Decree No 210/2009 regulating the conditions for the exercise of commercial activities amended further to Hungary's anti-LGBTI law of 2021 which is the subject of the Commission's infringement procedure against Hungary (Case C-769/22). According to the new provision, products intended for minors "that portray or promote homosexuality" may be marketed (offered for sale) only in sealed packaging (and) separately from other products. The referring court asks the CJEU if this provision infringes Articles 16 and 19 of the Services Directive and Article 56 TFEU as well as Articles 1, 7, 11 and 21 of the Charter.	CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 1 - Human dignity CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 3 - Integrity of the person CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 7 - Private and family life CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 8 - Protection of personal data CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 9 - Right to marry and right to found a family CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 11 - Freedom of expression and information CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 20 - Equality before the law CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 21 - Non-discrimination CJEU - T - Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) - Art. 56 - Services CJEU - D - Services - Directive 2006/123/EC - Art. 16 CJEU - D - Services - Directive 2006/123/EC - Art. 19
M.S. v. Malta, Application no. 30737/24, pending (ECtHR).	19/03/2025	Pending	SOGIESC	- Risk of persecution	The applicant is a Bangladeshi trans woman who made an unsuccessful claim for asylum in Malta. She complains that she would be at risk of ill-treatment, contrary to Article 3 of the Convention, if she were to be returned to Bangladesh on account of her sexual orientation and gender identity. She notes that the domestic authorities have failed to conduct a rigorous risk assessment, contrary to Articles 3, 5 and 13.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy
G.S. v. Türkiye, Application no. 47612/21, pending (ECtHR).	17/12/2025	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Risk of persecution	The applicant is an Iranian national who applied for asylum in Türkiye and complains of the failure of the domestic authorities to adequately assess the risk of the applicant being killed or ill-treated upon removal in view of a risk of persecution due to his sexual orientation.	ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 2 - Right to life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment
Y.M. v. Sweden, Application no. 34687/25, pending (ECtHR).	13/01/2026	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Risk of persecution	The applicant is an Afghan national who requested asylum in Sweden. The Swedish authorities refused his requests and ordered his deportation. He complains that if he were to be deported, he would face a real risk of being subjected to ill-treatment owing to his Hazara ethnicity, his sexual orientation, his religious views as an atheist, his political views, and his so-called "westernisation".	ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 2 - Right to life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy
Y.F.N.N. and D.S.N.K. v. Switzerland, Applications nos. 12055/25 and 25281/25, pending (ECtHR).	09/02/2026	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Risk of persecution	The applicants are nationals from Cameroons who requested asylum in Switzerland. The authorities refused their requests and ordered their deportation. They complain about the risks of persecution in view of their sexual orientation in case of deportation, which would force them to hide their sexual orientation there.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life
A.G. v. Sweden, Application no. 3872/25, pending (ECtHR).	08/04/2026	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Risk of persecution	The applicant is an Afghan national who requested asylum in Sweden. The Swedish authorities refused his requests and ordered his deportation. He complains that if he were to be deported, he would face a real risk of being subjected to ill-treatment owing to his Hazara ethnicity, his sexual orientation, his religious views as an atheist, his political views, and his so-called "westernisation".	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 2 - Right to life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment

L.B. v. France, Application no. 11013/24, pending (ECtHR).	02/04/2025	Pending	Sex characteristics	- Risk of persecution - Access to Healthcare	The application concerns an intersex person of Moroccan nationality who transitioned medically in France. He was expelled to Morocco following a decision of the national authorities. Relying on Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention, the applicant complains, firstly, of the risks he faces in Morocco as an intersex person who could be perceived by society and the authorities to be gay. Secondly, he complains of the interruption, due to his expulsion, of his medical treatment and care received in France, and of the consequences of such a suspension, particularly on account of his intersex status. Finally, he complains that the domestic authorities did not take sufficient account of his refugee status. The case was originally communicated under application no. 67839/17 and led to an inadmissibility decision on 28 September 2023.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life
Z.A. v. Türkiye, Application no. 26454/18, pending (ECtHR).	25/09/2025	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Employment	The applicant was a teacher who was dismissed following disciplinary proceedings based on allegations that he proposed a same-sex relationship to a school officer and engaged in similar conduct with other persons in his town. He complains that the refusal to reinstate him was based solely on his sexual orientation and amounted to discriminatory treatment and a violation of his right to respect for private life. He also complains that the length of the proceedings before the Constitutional Court was incompatible with the requirement of a hearing within a reasonable time.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14 - Prohibition of discrimination
I.N.I. v. Bulgaria and 1 other application, Application no. 35066/23 and 27890/24, pending (ECtHR).	02/07/2025	Pending	Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Name and gender markers	The applicants complain about the impossibility of obtaining legal gender recognition in Bulgaria. One of the two applicants had brought a successful case to the European Court of Human Rights (P.H. v. Bulgaria), which resulted in a finding of a violation of Article 8 of the Convention. But in the time since the judgment was issued, she has been unable to amend her data in the electronic register. The applicants allege that the authorities' persistent refusals highlight a continuing failure to comply with the Convention, contrary to Articles 8 and 13.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy
Rakos , Case C-129/26, (CJEU).	25/02/2026	Struck out or withdrawn	Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Name and gender markers	The case was referred to the CJEU by a judge in the course of a judicial procedure initiated by a trans applicant seeking legal gender recognition. The judge challenges the independence and impartiality of the Supreme Court at the time it rendered a resolution on 4 March 2025 deciding that trans persons should not have to sue their parents anymore to request legal gender recognition in Poland as the Supreme Court was composed of "neo-judges" when it rendered that decision. The case also raises the lack of a specific procedure for legal gender recognition in Poland. The case was withdrawn.	- CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 7 - Private and family life - CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 47 - Right to an effective remedy and to a fair trial - CJEU - T - Treaty on European Union - Art. 19
L.K. and others v. Hungary, Application no. 30821/23, pending (ECtHR).	04/08/2025	Pending	Gender identity and expression	- Name and gender markers	The applicants complain about the impossibility of obtaining legal gender recognition in Hungary as a result of the 2020 law banning legal gender recognition.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life
S.I. v. Bulgaria , Application no. 18529/24, pending (ECtHR).	06/11/2025	Pending	Gender identity and expression	- Name and gender markers	The applicant complains about the impossibility of obtaining legal gender recognition in Bulgaria.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life
N.G. v. Bulgaria, Application no. 21353/24, pending (ECtHR).	05/01/2026	Pending	Gender identity and expression	- Name and gender markers	The applicant complains about the impossibility of obtaining legal gender recognition in Bulgaria.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy
Y and Z v. Serbia, Application no. 26671/24, pending (ECtHR).	10/01/2025	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships	The applicants are a same-sex couple who have been living together for five years. In 2019 their marriage application was rejected. The authorities held that the Family Act expressly prohibits same-sex marriages. No other form of legal recognition for same-sex couples exists in Serbia. In April 2024 the Constitutional Court confirmed the decision that a marriage can only be formed by two persons of the opposite sex. Relying on Article 8 taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14 of the Convention, the applicants complain about their inability to have their relationship legally recognised. See also M and S v. Serbia.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life

M and S v. Serbia, Application no. 9072/25, pending (ECtHR).	09/07/2025	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships	The applicants are a same-sex couple who have been living together for five years. In 2019 their marriage application was rejected. The authorities held that the Family Act expressly prohibits same-sex marriages. No other form of legal recognition for same-sex couples exists in Serbia. In October 2024 the Constitutional Court confirmed the decision that a marriage can only be formed by two persons of the opposite sex. Relying on Article 8 taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14 of the Convention, the applicants complain about their inability to have their relationship legally recognised. See also Y and Z v. Serbia.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
Norbutas and Šamatulskis v. Lithuania, Application no. 11330/24, pending (ECtHR).	07/01/2026	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships	The applicants are a same-sex couple who requested the civil registry office to register their same-sex marriage, which was refused on the basis that marriage can be concluded only between persons of different sex.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
D.S. and R.Š. V. Lithuania, Application no. 11326/24, pending (ECtHR).	07/01/2026	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships	The applicants are a same-sex couple who requested the civil registry office to register their same-sex civil partnership, which was refused on the basis that civil partnerships are not available under Lithuanian law.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
PMLP, Case C-237/26, pending (CJEU).	24/03/2026	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships - Cross-border recognition of relationships	This is a preliminary ruling reference brought by the Latvian Supreme Court in a case concerning a same-sex couple of two Latvian citizens, one with Latvian-Swedish dual citizenship who married in Sweden, challenging Latvia's refusal to recognise their marriage, based on EU law provisions on free movement read in light with Articles 7 and 21 of the Charter.	- CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 7 - Private and family life - CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 21 - Non-discrimination - CJEU - T - Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) - Art. 20 - Citizens rights and duties - CJEU - T - Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) - Art. 21 - Freedom of movement - CJEU - T - Treaty Establishing the European Community (TEC) - Art. 18 - Freedom of movement
Mitov v. Bulgaria, Application no. 58469/21, pending (ECtHR).	27/06/2025	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Cross-border recognition of relationships	The application concerns the refusal of the Bulgarian authorities to change the applicant's surname to that of his partner, whom he married abroad, in particular due to the lack of legal recognition of same-sex couples in Bulgaria. He complains that the domestic authorities refusal disproportionately interferes with his right to respect for private and family life and his right to marry on an equal and non-discriminatory basis, relying on Article 14 in conjunction with Articles 12 and 8 of the Convention.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+12 - Discrimination - Right to marry
Angel Ivanov Mikhlashevsky v. Bulgaria, Application no. 49188/22, pending (ECtHR).	28/08/2025	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Cross-border recognition of relationships	The applicant complains that his application to have his same-sex marriage concluded in Germany registered in Bulgaria was refused, as well as his change of last name.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+12 - Discrimination - Right to marry
Jean-Charles Gardetto and Robert Samson v. Monaco, Application no. 19906/24, pending (ECtHR).	10/09/2025	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Cross-border recognition of relationships	The applicants are a same-sex couple whose application to have their marriage concluded in the US recognised in the civil registry in Monaco was refused notably based on the fact that they could conclude a civil union in Monaco.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
J.F. and I.W. v. Hungary, Application no. 6593/23, pending (ECtHR).	01/12/2025	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Cross-border recognition of relationships	The applicants are a same-sex couple whose application to register their marriage concluded in Germany as a registered partnership in Hungary was rejected.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life
Serviciul pentru Imigrări al județului Bihor, Case C-449/25, pending (CJEU).	08/07/2025	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Cross-border recognition of relationships - Residency rights	The applicant is a British national residing in Australia. In 2024, the applicant entered into a same-sex civil partnership in Italy with a Romanian citizen residing in Romania. At the time, the applicant was residing in Australia. Neither of the applicants had Italian resident status. After moving to Romania to live with her partner, the applicant applied for temporary residence for the purpose of family reunification. However, this was rejected. They argue that Romania is obliged to recognise family ties lawfully entered into in another EU Member State by persons of the same sex. They complain that the return decision violates the right to free movement and family life contrary to EU law and the European Convention on human rights. They further argue that the non-recognition of same-sex civil partnerships and resulting refusal is discriminatory.	- CJEU - T - Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) - Art. 21 - Freedom of movement - CJEU - T - Treaty Establishing the European Community (TEC) - Art. 18 - Freedom of movement
L.L. v. Slovakia, Application no. 13880/24, pending (ECtHR).	08/04/2026	Pending	Sexual orientation	- Citizenship rights	The application concerns the loss of the applicant's Slovak citizenship after he acquired British citizenship following the conclusion of a same-sex marriage although Slovak law provides that a person may hold dual citizenship if they obtained the citizenship of another State due to conclusion of a marriage, as a marriage is understood as a union between a man and a woman.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life

New judgments rendered from January 2025 until May 2026 organised by themes								
Case	Status	Grounds	Main Themes	Subject Matter	Provisions raised	Section	Importance (ECtHR)	Decision Date
Fedorov v. Russia, Application no. 25590/21, 30 April 2026 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Hate crimes	The applicant is a bisexual man who was lured to a flat by a man under the pretext of a date arranged via a gay dating site, where he was beaten and asked to make a video revealing his sexual orientation by eight men who also threatened to tell his employer and his family about it and threatened that he would be imprisoned for paedophilia if he did not give them money as the person who lured him was allegedly a minor. He filed a complaint with the police and complained of the ineffective investigation into his allegations of ill-treatment before the ECtHR. The Court found a breach of Article 3 as well as of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 3.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECHR - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+3 - Discrimination - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment	Third Section Committee	3	30/04/2026
Kis and Levchuk v. Ukraine, Application no. 910/18, 9 April 2026 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Hate crimes	The application concerns the alleged lack of effective investigation into the applicants' ill-treatment suffered as a result of a social experiment carried out by the applicants, a gay couple, on 15 July 2015, and which was videotaped. The ill-treatment consisted in the applicants being briefly sprayed with pepper gas and kicked by a group of people. The applicants raised their complaint under Articles 3, 8, and 13 of the Convention alongside Article 14 and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1. The Court found that there has been a violation of Article 8 taken in conjunction with Article 14 on account of the authorities' failure to conduct an effective investigation into the attack.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECHR - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+3 - Discrimination - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+13 - Discrimination - Right to an effective remedy - ECtHR - Protocol 12 - Art. 1 - General prohibition of discrimination	Fifth Section Committee	3	09/04/2026
Koutra and Katzaki v. Greece, Application no. 459/16, 7 October 2025 (ECtHR).	Inadmissible	Gender identity and expression	- Hate crimes - Detention and ill-treatment in custody	The application concerns events that were alleged to have taken place in 2013. Trans persons were reportedly stopped by police officers and subsequently brought to the local station for questioning. One of the applicants is a lawyer and human rights activist, while the other was detained by police. They raise a number of complaints, including of discrimination and ill-treatment in police custody. The application was declared inadmissible under article 35 §3 a) as manifestly ill-founded.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+5 - Discrimination - Right to liberty and security	Third Section	3	07/10/2025
Derrek and others v. Russia, Application no. 31712/21, 29 April 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Hate crimes - Detention and ill-treatment in custody - Other abuses by State agents - Association - Assembly	The case concerned a police raid on a venue hosting an LGBT event. The participants were ordered to stand facing the wall for over 30 minutes. They were searched and questioned, and their identity documents were checked and filmed. The police filmed the raid. The chief of police refused to provide any explanations to the applicants and used homophobic slurs. No drugs were found, but the police took the participants to a hospital for mandatory drug testing. One of those arrested lodged a complaint with the Investigative Committee alleging excessive force, that the personal search and drug testing had been unlawful, and that the police's conduct had been hate-motivated and discriminatory. This and other complaints were dismissed. The Court found a violation of Article 3 - Prohibition of Torture - under both the substantive and procedural limbs, in conjunction with Article 14. It also found violations of Articles 5 - Right to liberty and security - and 11 - Right to freedom of assembly.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 11 - Freedom of assembly and association - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14 - Prohibition of discrimination - ECHR - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+3 - Discrimination - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+5 - Discrimination - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+11 - Discrimination - Freedom of assembly and association	Third Section	2	29/04/2025
Bednarek and others v. Poland, Application no. 58207/14, 10 July 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Hate crimes - Hate Speech	The applicants complained that they had been physically and verbally assaulted because of their sexual orientation. Although the perpetrators were prosecuted and convicted of assault, receiving suspended prison sentences, the domestic courts dismissed evidence that the attack had been motivated by bias. The Court held that the State had violated Article 3 in conjunction with Article 14 of the Convention, noting its failure to provide an adequate response to hate-motivated violence.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECHR - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+3 - Discrimination - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+13 - Discrimination - Right to an effective remedy - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - Procedural	First Section	2	10/07/2025
Ilyupin and others v. Russia, Application no. 76797/13, 26 March 2026 (ECtHR).	Inadmissible	Sexual orientation	- Hate crimes - Assembly	The application concerns the applicants' participation in two "pickets" to protest against the adoption of the bill introducing administrative liability for propaganda of homosexuality among minors, and subsequent events. The first took place despite the authorities' refusal to approve the venue. The applicants were charged with a public order offence, but the proceedings were later terminated. At the second picket, three of the applicants complained that they were injured by individuals with homophobic motives. The Court found a breach of Article 3 as a result of the ineffective investigation into allegations of ill-treatment, as well of Articles 11(1), 14 in conjunction with Article 3, and Article 5(1).	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 11 - Freedom of assembly and association - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14 - Prohibition of discrimination	Third Section Committee	3	26/03/2026
Makelelo EPE and Zougla G.R. AE v. Ethniko Symvoulío Radioteleorasis (ESR), Joined Cases C-555/23 and C-556/23, 26 June 2025 (CJEU).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Hate Speech	Two Greek online media outlets were fined by the national regulator for broadcasting programmes that contained homophobic insults and denigrating comments about LGBTI people. The fines were imposed under national rules requiring broadcasters to respect human dignity and refrain from inappropriate content, which formally applied only to traditional media. The Court of Justice of the European Union held that such rules fall within the scope of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive and must apply equally to internet broadcasters. It further ruled that national law cannot exclude online media from these obligations, but nor can courts broaden the law retroactively to cover them, since penalties must be clearly defined by law.	- CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 20 - Equality before the law - CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 21 - Non-discrimination - CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 49 - Principles of legality and proportionality of criminal offences - CJEU - D - Audiovisual Media Services - Directive 2010/13/EU - Art. 6	Fifth Chamber		26/06/2025

Genderdoc-M v. the Republic of Moldova, Application no. 17766/16, 13 November 2025 (ECtHR).	Inadmissible	SOGIESC	- Hate Speech	The application concerns the authorities' positive obligations in the context of hate speech by third parties. A news portal published various news items and invited users to comment in specially reserved comments sections. One such news item about LGBT community's plans for a parade was followed by several statements made under pseudonyms and calling for violence and discrimination against LGBT persons in Moldova. The applicant organisation, representing a number of LGBT persons, complained in court against the news portal, but the courts rejected the complaint since the law did not provide for responsibility for statements made by third parties. The Court declared the application inadmissible <i>ratione personae</i> on the basis that the applicant association could not claim to be a direct or indirect victim.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	Fifth Section Committee	3	13/11/2025
Minasyan and others v. Armenia, Application no. 59180/15, 7 January 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Hate Speech	This case was brought by a LGBTI activists who complained about several press articles, some written about them, that contained hateful language, following their comments challenging Armenian Eurovision jury members' statement criticising the victory of Conchita Wurst at the 2014 Eurovision Song Contest. They argued that Armenia lacked an effective legal framework against homophobic hate speech and discrimination. The Court noted that while certain provisions of the Civil Code could, in theory, offer a degree of protection, their effectiveness was doubtful given the absence of relevant case-law and the way the domestic courts had handled the applicants' claims. It found a violation of Article 8 taken together with Article 14 of the Convention.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 17 - Prohibition of abuse of rights	Fourth Section	2	07/01/2025
Svirplys and Latvys v. Lithuania, Application no. 9195/23, 2 December 2025 (ECtHR).	Struck out or withdrawn ²⁵	Sexual orientation	- Hate Speech	The application concerns a refusal to open a pre-trial investigation into an alleged homophobic verbal assault. While the perpetrators words could be characterised as "unethical", domestic authorities judged that they had not been so dangerous as to warrant criminal liability. The applicants complained <i>inter alia</i> about the ineffective application of criminal hate speech provisions, and the failure of the authorities to conduct a proper investigation, contrary to Article 8, read in conjunction with Article 14, of the Convention. The Court struck out the case as it considered that while the case was pending before the ECtHR, the domestic courts provided the applicants with effective redress (homophobic motive recognised, offence classified as discrimination under criminal law, compensation awarded, judgment not appealed).	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	Second Section	3	02/12/2025
C8 (Canal 8) v. France, Applications nos. 33272/24, 33277/24, 33278/24 and 33280/24, 12 March 2026 (ECtHR).	Inadmissible	Sexual orientation	- Hate Speech - Expression Rights	Sanctions were imposed by the French broadcasting authority on the television channel C8 for content aired in one of its programmes, which included discriminatory and stigmatising depictions of homosexual persons. The Court found no violation of the applicant company's right to freedom of expression under Article 10 of the Convention.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression	Fifth Section Committee	3	12/03/2026
Milashina and others v. Russia, Application no. 75000/17, 4 March 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Hate Speech - Expression Rights	The applicant company was an editorial and publishing house which published a national newspaper – Novaya Gazeta. In April 2017 Novaya Gazeta published two articles stating that there had been mass abductions, arbitrary detentions, torture and killings of Chechen men who were gay, or who were perceived to be gay, by the Chechen authorities. The credibility of those allegations was subsequently confirmed by reports and statements from numerous organisations. In response, Chechen government ministers and other public figures made statements condemning and threatening the publication and the author of the articles, who received anonymous threats over social media. The case concerned the State's substantive and procedural obligations under Article 10 in relation to verbal threats received by the applicants, and the authorities' alleged failure to protect them under Articles 2 and 8 from attacks linked to their publications, as well as alleged discrimination under Article 14 on grounds of "other status." The Court found violations of Articles 8 and 10 in respect of both the individual applicants and the company.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression	Third Section	2	04/03/2025
Străisteanu v. Republic of Moldova, Application no. 9989/20, 5 June 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Expression Rights	The application concerned an alleged violation of freedom of expression resulting for the applicant, a lawyer representing LGBTI applicants, from the obligation imposed on her to remove from her Facebook page videos showing a colleague making insulting homophobic remarks towards her. The applicant relied on Article 10 of the Convention. The applicant had made and posted videos of T.P., another lawyer, making homophobic remarks and damaging her property. T.P. complained of a personal data breach to the National Centre for Personal Data Protection, which found that the applicant had not complied with provisions of the Personal Data Protection Act and ordered her to delete the recordings. The applicant complained of a violation of her right to freedom of expression. The court concluded that the domestic courts failed to strike a fair balance between the various rights at stake in the present case and had failed to provide relevant and sufficient reasons to justify the interference with the applicant's right to freedom of expression. There had been a violation of Article 10.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression	Fifth Section	2	05/06/2025
Dimitriyev and others v. Russia, Application no. 23887/17 and 6 others, 18 September 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights	The applications - made by 7 individuals - concern complaints raised under Article 10 of the Convention relating to various restrictions on the right to freedom of expression which are the subject of well-established case law of the Court. One application concerns a demonstration in support of LGBT rights. The Court found a violation of Article 10.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 11 - Freedom of assembly and association	Third Section Committee	3	18/09/2025

Google LLC and others v. Russia, Application no. 37027/22, 8 July 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights	The case concerns the applicant companies' complaints that Russian authorities imposed excessive fines to enforce demands for the removal of political-opposition and war-reporting content from YouTube and for the hosting of content from a Russian television channel. Some of the content in question was supportive of LGBT rights. Finding <i>inter alia</i> that these measures struck at the very heart of the Internet's function as a means for the free exchange of ideas and information, the Court found violations of Articles 10 and 6.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression	Third Section	2	08/07/2025
Klimova and others v. Russia, Application nos. 33421/16 and 6 others, 4 February 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Expression Rights	The case concerned the applicants' convictions for an administrative offence and/or the blocking of their websites or webpages on social networking sites for "promoting homosexuality among minors". This included the administrator of the site "Children-404. LGBT teenagers" who was charged with an administrative offence and whose VK social networking community was blocked. The applicants complained that their convictions and/or the blocking of their sites violated their right to freedom of expression (Article 10) and, under Article 14 of the Convention, taken in conjunction with Article 10, that they were discriminated against on the ground of sexual orientation. The Court found violations of Article 10 in all cases, and a violation of Article 8 in one case.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+10 - Discrimination - Freedom of expression	Third Section	2	04/02/2025
ООО Kulturnyye Proekty v. Russia, Application no. 602/24, 30 April 2026 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights	The applicant company is the organiser of annual Side by Side International LGBT film in Russia. The screening of the film was interrupted after the police received false bomb threat. The Court found that the State has failed to discharge its obligations under Article 10 by securing the safe and uninterrupted conduct of the film festival and a violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 10 in respect of the refusal to include its film festival in the list of approved festival.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14 - Prohibition of discrimination	Third Section Committee	3	30/04/2026
Zakharov and others v. Russia, Application no. 3292/24 and 31 others, 6 March 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights - Association	The applicants complained of restrictions imposed by the "foreign agent" legislation, including their designation as "foreign agents", the imposition of additional requirements and restrictions on their activities, and sanctions for alleged non-compliance. The applicants complained principally of restrictions on their freedom of expression through the "foreign agent" legislation, including compulsory registration, labelling requirements and punitive sanctions. One of the 32 applicants was an LGBT association. In <i>Kobalya and Others v. Russia</i> , the Court found that the designation of "foreign agent" was stigmatising and misleading, and that the measures under the legislation were found to be neither justified by a "pressing social need" nor "necessary in a democratic society". Finding no reason to diverge in this case, the Court found that there had been a violation of Articles 10 and 8.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression	Third Section Committee	3	06/03/2025
Bogomolov and others v. Russia, Application no. 9856/16 and 11 others, 13 November 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Gender identity and expression	- Expression Rights - Assembly	The applications concern complaints raised under Article 10 of the Convention relating to disproportionate measures against solo demonstrators (manifestation for transgender rights, protest against amendments into the family code). The Court found a violation of Article 11.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 11 - Freedom of assembly and association	Third Section Committee	3	13/11/2025
Sverdlova and Shevchenko v. Ukraine, Application no. 73596/13, 23 January 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights - Assembly	On 25 March 2013 the Kyiv City State Administration adopted an agenda for the celebration of Kyiv Day, which was planned for 25 May 2013. In April the two applicants - together with other LGBTI activists and organisations - informed the authorities that they intended to organise an "Equality March", a public event promoting LGBTI rights, also on 25 May 2013. Further to court decisions the applicants had to change a venue of their planned event. They complained that this decision amounted to a violation of their rights under Articles 10, 11, 13 and 14 of the Convention. The Court found that the ban on demonstrations in the city centre, resulting in the organisers changing the venue, constituted an interference with the applicants' rights under Article 11. Finding that the authorities had prohibited all public events in the city on the day in question, and that the applicants did not submit any evidence that the court dealing with their case was prejudiced against the LGBTI community, it rejected the claim under Article 11 with Article 14.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 11 - Freedom of assembly and association - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+10 - Discrimination - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+11 - Discrimination - Freedom of assembly and association	Fifth Section Committee	3	23/01/2025
P. v. Poland, Application no. 56310/15, 13 February 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Expression Rights - Employment	The case concerned the dismissal of a secondary school teacher for, among other things, writing a blog for adults featuring some sexually explicit content, including descriptions of sexual acts between men. The applicant was well-regarded, having been awarded prizes for best teacher. Disciplinary proceedings were brought against the applicant in 2013 citing breaches of rules regarding school trips - the applicant having brought his partner on two such trips - and "running a blog containing texts and images unworthy of the teaching profession". The applicant admitted to the breach of the rules regulating school trips and to the writing of the blog, which he said had been deleted. The applicant was dismissed from his position. He appealed, arguing that the sanction was disproportionate; the appeal was successful but was overturned by the Court of Appeal. The applicant complained that the sanction - his dismissal - stemmed from prejudice against his sexual orientation and his relationship with a partner of the same sex. The court found that the applicant's blogging activity did not threaten the protection of morals of minors in a manner justifying the sanction imposed. By a majority of 4 to 3, the court held that the applicant's right under Article 10 had been violated.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+10 - Discrimination - Freedom of expression	First Section	3	13/02/2025

Commission v. Hungary, Case C-769/22, 21 April 2026 (CJEU).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Expression Rights - Education - Other goods and services	In 2022, the European Commission brought infringement proceedings against Hungary over legislation that banned LGBTI related content from media and education settings under the guise of protecting children. The CJEU found that by enacting this law, Hungary breached (1) the freedom to provide and receive services under Article 56 TFEU and various provisions of the E-commerce Directive, Services Directive and Audiovisual Media Services Directive, (2) the Charter of Fundamental Rights, namely the right to human dignity, the prohibition of discrimination based on sexual orientation or on sex, which the Court found for the first time when applying the Charter, includes discrimination based on gender identity, the right to respect for private and family life, the freedom of expression and information, (3) Article 2 TEU (found as a separate infringement for the first time) which lists the EU values as the Hungarian legislation introduces a coordinated series of discriminatory measures, resulting in the stigmatisation and marginalisation of LGBTI people, tantamount to establishing, maintaining or reinforcing the social "invisibility" of some members of society, (4) GDPR and the right to the protection of personal data guaranteed by the Charter.	- CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 1 - Human dignity - CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 7 - Private and family life - CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 8 - Protection of personal data - CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 11 - Freedom of expression and information - CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 21 - Non-discrimination - CJEU - T - Treaty on European Union - Art. 2 - CJEU - T - Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) - Art. 56 - Services - CJEU - T - Treaty Establishing the European Community (TEC) - Art. 49 - Services - CJEU - R - General Data Protection - Regulation 2016/679 - Art. 21 - CJEU - D - Audiovisual Media Services - Directive 2010/13/EU - Art. 2 - CJEU - D - Audiovisual Media Services - Directive 2010/13/EU - Art. 3 - CJEU - D - Audiovisual Media Services - Directive 2010/13/EU - Art. 6A - CJEU - D - Audiovisual Media Services - Directive 2010/13/EU - Art. 9 - CJEU - D - Directive on Electronic Commerce - Directive 2000/31/EC - Art. 3 - CJEU - D - Services - Directive 2006/123/EC - Art. 16 - CJEU - D - Services - Directive 2006/123/EC - Art. 19	Full Court		21/04/2026
C.N. v. Moldova, Application no. 54210/15, 12 February 2026 (ECtHR).	Inadmissible	Sexual orientation	- Risk of persecution	The applicant is a Nigerian national who requested asylum in Moldova on the basis that he was perceived as gay because his roommate was arrested for homosexual conduct. The authorities rejected his request. He complains about the risk of persecution upon return in Nigeria. The Court found the case inadmissible on the basis that it is manifestly ill founded under articles 35(3) and (4).	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 2 - Right to life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment	Fifth Section Committee	3	12/02/2026
A.A. v. Belgium, Application no. 55365/20, 27 March 2025 (ECtHR).	Inadmissible	Sexual orientation	- Risk of persecution - Procedural issues	The applicant is an Iraqi national whose application for international protection in Belgium was rejected by the asylum authorities for a lack of credibility. The applicant complained that the asylum authorities questioned his sexual orientation. In particular, he argued that the national authorities did not carry out a rigorous and careful examination of the evidence he had provided in support of his third application for international protection. The application was declared inadmissible under Article 35 § 3 a) as manifestly ill-founded.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 2 - Right to life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy	Fifth Section Committee	3	27/03/2025
B.F. v. Greece, Application no. 59816/13, 14 October 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Detention and reception conditions	The applicant is an Iranian national who applied for asylum in Greece on account of his sexual orientation and religious beliefs. He complains about the unlawfulness of his detention and the conditions thereof, the lack of an effective remedy in respect of those conditions and the absence of a substantive judicial review of the lawfulness of his detention pending the examination of his asylum request. The Court found a violation of Article 3, Article 13 taken in conjunction with Article 3, rejected the claim under Article 5 § 1 and found it not necessary to examine the complaint under Article 5 § 4.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy	Third Section	2	14/10/2025
Bespalov and others v. Russia, Applications no. 16181/18 and 24 others, 13 November 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Assembly	The applicants complained against disproportionate measures taken against them as organisers or participants of public assemblies (series of solo demonstrations for transgender rights and protest against amendments into the Family Code of Russia). The Court found a breach of Article 11.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 11 - Freedom of assembly and association	Third Section Committee	3	13/11/2025
Grabetskaya and others v. Russia, Application nos. 13024/18 and 19 others, 16 January 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Assembly	The case considered 20 applications in which the applicants complained of disproportionate measures against solo demonstrators. Some applicants also raised other complaints under the provisions of the Convention. The applicants complained of violations of Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention. The first applicant had demonstrated in support of the LGBT community. The Court found her rights had been violated under Article 10.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 11 - Freedom of assembly and association - ECtHR - Protocol 7 - Art. 2 - Right of appeal in criminal matters	Third Section Committee	3	16/01/2025
Kostromina and others v. Russia, Applications nos. 56957/15 and 16 others, 11 December 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Assembly	The applicants complained against disproportionate measures taken against them as organisers or participants of public assemblies (one of the application concerns a public event in support of the LGBT community of the Chechen Republic). The Court found a breach of Article 11.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 11 - Freedom of assembly and association	Third Section Committee	3	11/12/2025
Vinogradova and others v. Russia, Applications nos. 54829/12 and 9 others, 11 December 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	SOGIESC	- Assembly	The applicants complained against disproportionate measures taken against them as solo demonstrators. One of the applications concerns a protest against restrictions of rights of LGBT people. The Court found a breach of Article 10.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 5 - Right to liberty and security - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 10 - Freedom of expression - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 34 - Individual applications	Third Section Committee	3	11/12/2025

Semenya v. Switzerland, Application no. 10934/21, 10 July 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sex characteristics	- Participation in sports	The applicant, Caster Semenya is an elite South African athlete who won Olympic gold medals in the women's 800m race in 2012 and 2016. She complained that she was obliged to decrease her natural testosterone level in order to be permitted to take part in the female category of international competitions as a result of the "Eligibility Regulations for the Female Classification (Athletes with Differences in Sex Development)" (the "DSD Regulations"), issued by World Athletic, a private law association based in Monaco. The applicant brought an action challenging the DSD Regulations, to the Court of Arbitration for Sport ("CAS") which has its seat in Switzerland. The action was dismissed. The Applicant appealed the CAS decision to the Federal Supreme Court of Switzerland, which dismissed the appeal in September 2020. She then brought a case under the ECHR, relying on Article 3, Article 6(1), Article 8, Article 13, and Article 14 (taken with Article 8). In 2023, a Chamber of the ECtHR held that there had been a violation of Article 14 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 8, and of Article 13 in relation to Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 8. Switzerland requested referral to the Grand Chamber. The Grand Chamber found that the applicant did not fall within Switzerland's jurisdiction and so her complaints under Articles 8, 13 and 14 were inadmissible. However, the Grand Chamber did find a violation of Article 6, as the Swiss Court had not examined the compatibility of the CAS decision with sufficient rigour.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 13 - Right to an effective remedy - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	Grand Chamber	1	10/07/2025
Noam Gilbert v. Czech Republic, Application no. 19280/24, 19 February 2026 (ECtHR).	Struck out or withdrawn	Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Name and gender markers - Medical and diagnosis requirements - Bodily integrity	The applicant complains about the State's refusal to grant legal gender recognition on the grounds that he has not undergone irreversible surgery entailing sterilisation. The case was struck out of the list of cases further to a friendly settlement.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - Substantive - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECHR - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+3 - Discrimination - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	Fifth Section Committee	3	19/02/2026
T.H. v. the Czech Republic, Application no. 33037/22, 12 June 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Name and gender markers - Medical and diagnosis requirements - Bodily integrity	The application was brought by a non-binary person and concerned the requirement of medical transition as a statutory condition for changing the personal numerical code denoting gender, and the authorities' refusal to grant the applicant's request for such a change. The applicant complained of violations of Articles 3 and 8, both alone and in conjunction with Article 14. The court examined the complaint solely under Article 8. It found that making legal gender recognition conditional on undertaking a surgical operation entailing or possibly entailing sterilisation against their wishes, amounted to making the full exercise of their right to respect for private life conditional on relinquishing full exercise of the right to respect for physical integrity. There had been a violation of Article 8.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - Substantive - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECHR - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+3 - Discrimination - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	Fifth Section	2	12/06/2025
Mousse v. Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés (CNIL) and SNCF Connect, Case C-394/23, 9 January 2025 (CJEU).	Decision on the merits	Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Data processing and digital profiling - Name and gender markers	The French national railway company required passengers buying tickets online to select either "Monsieur" or "Madame," with no alternative option. The Court of Justice found that forcing passengers to provide such binary titles is not necessary for the performance of a contract or for legitimate commercial interests and was thus contrary to the principle of data minimisation, especially given the risk of discrimination on grounds of gender identity.	- CJEU - R - General Data Protection - Regulation 2016/679 - Art. 6 - CJEU - R - General Data Protection - Regulation 2016/679 - Art. 21	First Chamber		09/01/2025
Deldits (VP v. Országos Idegenrendészeti Főigazgatóság), Case C-247/23, 13 March 2025 (CJEU).	Decision on the merits	Gender identity and expression	Legal gender recognition broadly - Bodily integrity - Name and gender markers - Medical and diagnosis requirements - Asylum and citizenship (LGR) - Data processing and digital profiling	The applicant, a trans Iranian man, was granted refugee status in Hungary based on a well-founded fear of persecution because of his gender identity. He requested the correction of his gender marker and name on the national asylum registry. Despite Hungarian authorities granting the applicant refugee status, his gender marker was registered incorrectly, and he could not correct it as there was no legal framework regulating the conditions for legal gender recognition in the country. According to the Court, national authorities responsible for keeping public registers (including asylum registers) are required to correct data on gender identity when it is inaccurately recorded based on the right to rectification under GDPR. The right to rectification cannot be made conditional upon an applicant producing evidence of surgery.	- CJEU - R - General Data Protection - Regulation 2016/679 - Art. 5 - CJEU - R - General Data Protection - Regulation 2016/679 - Art. 16	First Chamber		13/03/2025
Shipova, K.M.H. v. Obshtina Stara Zagora, Case C-43/24, 12 March 2026 (CJEU).	Decision on the merits	Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Bodily integrity - Name and gender markers - Cross-border legal gender recognition	The case was brought forward by a Bulgarian trans woman, living in Italy, who was repeatedly denied requests to amend her legal gender on her Bulgarian documents. The Court found that EU Member States must provide legal gender recognition procedures allowing their citizens who have exercised their right to move and reside freely in another Member State to obtain identity documents matching their lived gender under Article 21 TFEU read in light of Article 7 of the Charter in order to avoid considerable inconveniences, in particular during cross-border travel. Separately, the Court reminded that national courts are not bound by constitutional courts' interpretation of the law where that interpretation runs against EU law.	- CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 7 - Private and family life - CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 45 - Freedom of movement and of residence - CJEU - T - Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) - Art. 20 - Citizens rights and duties - CJEU - T - Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) - Art. 21 - Freedom of movement - CJEU - T - Treaty Establishing the European Community (TEC) - Art. 18 - Freedom of movement - CJEU - D - Free Movement - Directive 2004/38/EC - Art. 4	Second Chamber		12/03/2026

Andersen v. Poland, Application no. 53662/20, 24 April 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships - Cross-border recognition of relationships	The applicant complained that his marriage with his same-sex partner, contracted abroad, had not been registered in Poland while there had been no other form of legal recognition and protection for his relationship. Building upon its earlier case law, the Court held that in the absence of a specific legal framework, the applicant had been left in a legal vacuum. The State had overstepped its margin of appreciation. Consequently, there had been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention. There was no need to consider separately the applicant's claims under Article 14.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	First Section Committee	3	24/04/2025
Gruszczyński-Regowski and others v. Poland, Application nos. 5059/22 and 9 others, 7 May 2025 (ECtHR).	Struck out or withdrawn ²	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships - Cross-border recognition of relationships	The applicants complained that their same-sex marriages, contracted abroad, had not been registered in Poland while there had been no other form of legal recognition and protection for their respective relationships. They relied on Article 8 on its own and in conjunction with Article 14 of the Convention. Government proposed to make a unilateral declaration, acknowledging the violations. The declaration discussed draft legislation on civil partnerships, drawn up in 2024 by the Minister for Equality. The Court decided to strike the applications from the list.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	First Section Committee	3	07/05/2025
Trojan v. Wojewoda Mazowiecki, Case C-713/23, 25 November 2025 (CJEU).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships - Cross-border recognition of relationships	Two men, one a Polish and German national, who had married in Germany, sought transcription of their marriage certificate in Poland, which was refused on public policy grounds because Polish law does not recognise same-sex marriage. The Court found that EU Member States must recognise a same-sex marriage lawfully concluded in another Member State in accordance with Articles 20 and 21(1) TFEU read in light of Articles 7 and 21(1) of the Charter for the couple to be able to pursue the family life created in the host Member State. Refusing to do so constitutes a discrimination based on sexual orientation under the Charter, which is a general principle of EU law. In the case of Poland, the Court considered that it must transcribe the marriage certificate into the civil registry as this is the only possible procedure for recognition.	- CJEU - T - Charter of Fundamental Rights - Art. 7 - Private and family life - CJEU - T - Charter of fundamental Rights - Art. 21 - Non-discrimination - CJEU - T - Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) - Art. 20 - Citizens rights and duties - CJEU - T - Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) - Art. 21 - Freedom of movement - CJEU - T - Treaty Establishing the European Community (TEC) - Art. 18 - Freedom of movement - CJEU - D - Free Movement - Directive 2004/38/EC - Art. 2	Grand Chamber		25/11/2025
Szypuła and others v. Poland, Application nos. 78030/14 and 23669/16, 27 February 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships - Cross-border recognition of relationships	The applicants, who are in same-sex couples, complained principally under Article 8 of the Convention that Poland failed to provide them with a certificate allowing them to get married in Spain while in Poland there had been no form of legal recognition and protection for their respective relationships. The court reaffirmed the general principles set out in Fedotova and Others v. Russia that under Article 8, member States are required to provide a legal framework allowing same-sex couples to be granted adequate recognition and protection of their relationship. It found a violation of Article 8 but did not find it necessary to examine the Article 14+8 complaint.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 12 - Right to marry - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	First Section Committee	3	27/02/2025
Kowalski v. Poland, Application no. 40076/22, 18 September 2025 (ECtHR).	Struck out or withdrawn ²	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships - Social and economic benefits of relationships	The applicant has been in a same-sex relationship for over twenty-five years. In 2020 he received a loan from his partner, of which he informed the Tax Office. He indicated that the loan had been received from his "spouse" (being the first and closest group of affiliation, allowed to receive tax-free loans). The Warsaw Tax Office calculated the amount of the tax due by the applicant; a decision upheld by the Tax Office Director. The authorities established that the loan had been received from a person falling within the third group – no affiliation. The applicant's appeals were dismissed by the domestic courts. The applicant complained under Article 8 taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14 of the Convention about absence of any form of legal recognition and protection of same-sex couples. The case was struck out of the list of cases following a unilateral declaration by the Government acknowledging a violation of Article 8.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	First Section Committee	3	18/09/2025
Meszkes v. Poland, Application no. 11560/19, 6 March 2025 (ECtHR).	Inadmissible	Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships - Social and economic benefits of relationships	The applicant complained under Articles 8 and 14 of the Convention that, following his partner's death, he was required to pay the highest rate of inheritance tax because same-sex relationships were not recognised or protected in Poland. The Court declared the application inadmissible as time-barred, noting the applicant's delays in bringing legal proceedings.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	First Section Committee	3	06/03/2025
B.N. v. Poland, Application no. 23032/22, 18 September 2025 (ECtHR).	Struck out or withdrawn ²	Sexual orientation	- Custody and parental responsibility	The applicant's former husband filed a petition for divorce in 2018. Under the terms of their agreement, both parents would retain parental rights. The applicant's daughter would live with her. The applicant agreed to these conditions. However, she claimed that during the divorce hearing, the judge repeatedly questioned her about her sexual orientation. The judge recommended that the father should request custody, as the "mother's sexual preference" could "jeopardise the wellbeing of the child." The applicant complained that her rights under Article 6, 8 and 14 of the Convention have been violated. The case was struck out of the list of cases following a unilateral declaration by the Government acknowledging a violation of Articles 6 and 8 and Article 14+8.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 6 - Right to a fair trial - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	First Section Committee	3	18/09/2025

M.K. v. Latvia, Application no. 26035/23, 3 July 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Custody and parental responsibility	In 2012 the applicant started to live with her same-sex partner, E.G. Four years later, E.G. gave birth to a child following artificial insemination; the couple cared for the child together. In 2022 the couple separated. According to the applicant, after their separation E.G. did not allow her to have any contact with the child. The applicant applied to the domestic authorities for contact with the child. E.G argued that it was not open to the court to grant the applicant contact with the child as she was not his parent, nor did she have custody of him. A psychological assessment of the applicant, E.G. and the child concluded that the child had a secure attachment to the applicant and needed contact with her. The parties engaged in protracted proceedings over claims by the applicant for both interim and regular contact orders. In early 2024 an appeal court granted the applicant contact, but ordered that resumption of contact should be gradual in view of the time which had passed without contact. The applicant complained under Articles 6 and 8 of the Convention of a violation of her right to respect for her private life on account of the failure of the domestic authorities to grant her, interim contact with the child. The court held that the domestic authorities had failed to comply with their positive obligations under Article 8 by failing to examine the interim contact order request. The court noted the applicant's claim that the handling had been driven by homophobic attitudes but declined to consider this, as it had not been raised in the original complaint.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life	First Section	2	03/07/2025
X v. Italy, Application no. 42247/23, 9 October 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Adoption - Assisted reproduction and surrogacy	The applicant is a child born in Italy in 2018 through medically assisted reproduction. His biological and intended mothers were both listed on the original transcription of his birth certificate. Five years later, however, the courts annulled recognition of the intended mother, holding that it was not permitted by domestic law since same-sex couples do not have access to medically assisted reproduction in Italy. Although adoption was suggested as an alternative, the applicant complained under Article 8 that the loss of his legal bond with his intended mother after so many years violated his right to private and family life. The Court (6 votes against 1) concluded that there was no violation of Article 8 as the intended mother could have adopted the child.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	First Section	2	09/10/2025
Bazhenov and others v. Russia, Application nos. 8825/22 and 19130/22, 4 February 2025 (ECtHR).	Decision on the merits	Sexual orientation	- Protection of personal and medical data - Data processing and digital profiling	The case concerned the failure of the domestic authorities to discharge their positive obligation to respond adequately to the non-consensual dissemination of the applicants' private data, including information on their sexual orientation. The applicants were two gay men, who had married in a European country. They owned a chain of shops selling games. In 2020, a homophobic group published a post on social media, which contained the applicants' names and addresses of their shops, revealing their sexual orientation and marriage. The first applicant submitted a criminal complaint and requested an investigation by the relevant authorities. Despite numerous attempts and appeals, neither this first authority nor subsequent authorities opened a criminal investigation. Based on the failure of the authorities to investigate, the applicants claimed a violation of their rights under Article 14 - Prohibition of discrimination - read in conjunction with Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life. The Court found in favour of the applicants.	- ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 8 - Right to respect for private and family life - ECtHR - ECHR - Art. 14+8 - Discrimination - Right to respect for private and family life	Third Section	2	04/02/2025

Leading ECtHR judgments under implementation

Grounds	Main Themes	Decision Date	Hudoc-Exec Link	Case Link	Execution
Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Name and gender markers - Medical and diagnosis requirements	11/09/2007	Link	L. v. Lithuania , Application no. 27527/03, 11 September 2007 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
SOGIESC	- Assembly	21/10/2010	Link	Aleksyev v. Russia , Application nos. 4916/07, 25924/08 and 14599/09, 21 October 2010 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
SOGIESC	- Hate crimes - Assembly	12/05/2015	Link	Identoba and others v. Georgia , Application no. 73235/12, 12 May 2015 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
SOGIESC	- Hate crimes	12/04/2016	Link	M.C. and A.C. v. Romania , Application no. 12060/12, 12 April 2016 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
SOGIESC	- Expression Rights	22/11/2016	Link	Kaos GL v. Türkiye , Application no. 4982/07, 22 November 2016 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: No Just Satisfaction
SOGIESC	- Expression Rights - Assembly	07/02/2017	Link	Lashmankin and others v. Russia , Application nos. 57818/09 and 14 others, 7 February 2017 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Expression Rights	20/06/2017	Link	Bayev and others v. Russia , Application nos. 67667/09, 44092/12 and 56717/12, 20 June 2017 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Awaiting information on payment
Gender identity and expression	- Legal Gender Recognition - Legal gender recognition broadly - Name and gender markers - Medical and diagnosis requirements	17/01/2019	Link	X v. the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia , Application no. 29683/16, 17 January 2019 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid

SOGIESC	- Association	16/07/2019	Link	Zhdanov and others v. Russia, Application nos. 12200/08 and 2 others, 16 July 2019 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Awaiting Action Plan/Report Payment: Awaiting information on payment
Sexual orientation	- Hate Speech	14/01/2020	Link	Beizaras and Levickas v. Lithuania, Application no. 41288/15, 14 January 2020 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure Classification: Complex problem AP Status: Action plan/report under assessment Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Asylum and citizenship (LGR) - Name and gender markers	16/07/2020	Link	Rana v. Hungary, Application no. 40888/17, 16 July 2020 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Awaiting Action Plan/Report Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
SOGIESC	- Assembly	01/12/2020	Link	Berkman v. Russia, Application no. 46712/15, 1 December 2020 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Awaiting Action Plan/Report Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Hate crimes	14/01/2021	Link	Sabalić v. Croatia, Application no. 50231/13, 14 January 2021 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Gender identity and expression	- Detention and ill-treatment in custody	19/01/2021	Link	X. and Y. v. Romania, Application nos. 2145/16 and 20607/16, 19 January 2021 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid

Sexual orientation	- Other abuses by State agents	27/05/2021	Link	J.L. v. Italy, Application no. 5671/16, 27 May 2021 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Hate Speech - Assembly	01/06/2021	Link	Association Accept and others v. Romania, Application no. 19237/16, 1 June 2021 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Hate crimes - Other abuses by State agents - Hate Speech	17/05/2022	Link	Oganezova v. Armenia, Application nos. 71367/12 and 72961/12, 17 May 2022 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Name and gender markers	27/09/2022	Link	P.H. v. Bulgaria, Application no. 46509/20, 27 September 2022 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Not Required Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Bodily integrity - Medical and diagnosis requirements	01/12/2022	Link	A.D. and others v. Georgia, Application nos. 57864/17, 79087/17 and 55353/19, 1 December 2022 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships	17/01/2023	Link	Fedotova and others v. Russia, Application nos. 40792/10, 30538/14 and 43439/14, 17 January 2023 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex problem AP Status: Awaiting Action Plan/Report Payment: No Just Satisfaction
Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships	23/05/2023	Link	Buhuceanu and others v. Romania, Application nos. 20081/19 and 20 others, 23 May 2023 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: No Just Satisfaction

Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships	01/06/2023	Link	Maymulakhin and Markiv v. Ukraine, Application no. 75135/14, 1 June 2023 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Cross-border recognition of relationships	05/09/2023	Link	Koilova and Babulkova v. Bulgaria, Application no. 40209/20, 5 September 2023 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Detention and ill-treatment in custody - Other abuses by State agents	12/09/2023	Link	Lapunov v. Russia, Application no. 28834/19, 12 September 2023 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: CM decision - RUS AP Status: Action Plan/Report Not Required Payment: Awaiting information on payment
Sexual orientation	- Access to marriage or civil partnerships	12/12/2023	Link	Przybyszewska and others v. Poland, Application nos. 11454/17 and 9 others, 12 December 2023 (ECtHR)	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Employment - Data processing and digital profiling	07/05/2024	Link	A.K. v. Russia, Application no. 49014/16, 7 May 2024 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: CM decision - RUS AP Status: Action Plan/Report Not Required Payment: Awaiting information on payment
Gender identity and expression	- Custody and parental responsibility - Non-recognition of parenthood - broad	09/07/2024	Link	Savinovskikh and others v. Russia, Application no. 16206/19, 9 July 2024 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: CM decision - RUS AP Status: Action Plan/Report Not Required Payment: Awaiting information on payment
Gender identity and expression	- Legal Gender Recognition - Legal gender recognition broadly - Medical and diagnosis requirements - Gender recognition and detention	11/07/2024	Link	W.W. v. Poland, Application no. 31842/20, 11 July 2024 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure AP Status: Awaiting Action Plan/Report Payment: Just Satisfaction paid

Sexual orientation	- Hate crimes	18/07/2024	Link	Hanovs v. Latvia, Application no. 40861/22, 18 July 2024 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Risk of persecution	12/11/2024	Link	M.I. v. Switzerland, Application no. 56390/21, 12 November 2024 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Expression Rights - Employment	13/02/2025	Link	P. v. Poland, Application no. 56310/15, 13 February 2025 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Hate Speech - Expression Rights	04/03/2025	Link	Milashina and others v. Russia, Application no. 75000/17, 4 March 2025 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: CM decision - RUS AP Status: Action Plan/Report Not Required Payment: Awaiting information on payment
SOGIESC	- Hate crimes - Detention and ill-treatment in custody - Other abuses by State agents - Association - Assembly	29/04/2025	Link	Derrek and others v. Russia, Application no. 31712/21, 29 April 2025 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure AP Status: Awaiting Action Plan/Report Payment: Awaiting information on payment
Gender identity and expression	- Legal gender recognition broadly - Name and gender markers - Medical and diagnosis requirements - Bodily integrity	12/06/2025	Link	T.H. v. the Czech Republic, Application no. 33037/22, 12 June 2025 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure AP Status: Awaiting Action Plan/Report Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sexual orientation	- Custody and parental responsibility	03/07/2025	Link	M.K. v. Latvia, Application no. 26035/23, 3 July 2025 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
SOGIESC	- Expression Rights	08/07/2025	Link	Google LLC and others v. Russia, Application no. 37027/22, 8 July 2025 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: CM decision - RUS AP Status: Awaiting Action Plan/Report Payment: No Just Satisfaction

Sexual orientation	- Hate crimes - Hate Speech	10/07/2025	Link	Bednarek and others v. Poland, Application no. 58207/14, 10 July 2025 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Enhanced Procedure Classification: Complex Problem AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid
Sex characteristics	- Participation in sports	10/07/2025	Link	Semenya v. Switzerland, Application no. 10934/21, 10 July 2025 (ECtHR).	Type: Leading Supervision: Standard Procedure AP Status: Action Plan/Report Received Payment: Just Satisfaction paid