



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

### THIRD SECTION

#### **CASE OF TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA**

*(Applications nos. 32401/10 and 19 others – see appended list)*

#### JUDGMENT

Art 9 (read in light of Art 11) • Art 10 • Freedom of religion • Freedom to impart information  
• Forced dissolution of a Jehovah's Witnesses' (JW) local religious organisation (LRO) •  
Declaration of JW' publications as "extremist" • Not "prescribed by law" and necessary in  
democratic society  
Art 10+11 (read in light of Art 9) • Freedom of expression • Freedom of association •  
Domestic courts' failure to provide relevant and sufficient reasons and to uphold adversarial  
nature of proceedings when declaring JW' publications "extremist" and prosecuting individual  
JW applicants • No balancing exercise conducted by domestic courts for dissolution of a LRO  
for using those publications  
Art 10 (read in light of Art 9) • Freedom to impart and receive information • Withdrawal of  
distribution permit and prosecution of JW for distributing unregistered media • Declaration of  
JW' international website as "extremist" • Neither "prescribed by law" nor necessary in  
democratic society  
Art 9 (read in light of Art 11) • Dissolution of JW' Administrative Centre and LROs • Policy of  
intolerance by authorities • Failure to act in good faith and breach of State's duty of neutrality  
and impartiality  
Art 9 • Art 5 • Arbitrary criminal prosecution of applicants for continuing to practice their  
religion • Unlawful pre-trial detention of individual applicant  
Art 1 P1 • Peaceful enjoyment of possessions • No legal basis for seizure of publications,  
immovable and personal property  
Art 46 • Individual measures • Respondent state required to take measures to secure the  
discontinuation of pending criminal proceedings against JW and release of all imprisoned JW

STRASBOURG

7 June 2022

*This judgment will become final in the circumstances set out in Article 44 § 2 of the  
Convention. It may be subject to editorial revision.*



**In the case of Taganrog LRO and Others v. Russia,**

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting as a Chamber composed of:

Georges Ravarani, *President*,

Georgios A. Serghides,

Darian Pavli,

Peeter Roosma,

Andreas Zünd,

Frédéric Krenc,

Mikhail Lobov, *judges*,

and Milan Blaško, *Section Registrar*,

Having regard to:

the twenty applications against the Russian Federation (see the list of applications in Appendix I) lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by religious organisations of Jehovah’s Witnesses, publishers of religious literature and individual followers (see a list of applicants in Appendix II) (“the applicants”);

the decision to give notice to the Russian Government (“the Government”) of the complaints relating to the alleged violations of the rights to freedom of religion, expression and association, the right to a fair trial, the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions and the right to be protected against discrimination, and to declare inadmissible the remainder of applications marked with an asterisk in Appendix I;

the decision to give priority to applications nos. 10188/17 and 3215/18 (Rule 41 of the Rules of Court);

the decision by the Danish Government to exercise their right to intervene in the proceedings involving their national, Mr Christensen;

the decision by the German Government not to exercise their right to intervene in the proceedings involving the German company publishing the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ religious literature;

the comments by a third-party intervener, ADF International, which was granted leave to intervene by the President of the Section;

the parties’ observations;

Having deliberated in private on 5 April and 3 May 2022,

Delivers the following judgment, which was adopted on the last-mentioned date:

## INTRODUCTION

1. The case concerns the forced dissolution of Jehovah’s Witnesses religious organisations in Russia, the banning of their religious literature and international website on charges of extremism, the revocation of the

permit to distribute religious magazines, the criminal prosecution of individual Jehovah's Witnesses, and the confiscation of their property.

## THE FACTS

2. The applicants were represented by a legal team led by Dr Petr Muzny, professor of law at the University of Geneva, Switzerland.

3. The Government were initially represented by Mr M. Galperin, the then Representative of the Russian Federation to the European Court of Human Rights, and later by Mr M. Vinogradov, his successor in this office.

4. The facts of the case, as submitted by the parties, may be summarised as follows.

### I. JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES IN RUSSIA

5. Jehovah's Witnesses have been present in Russia since 1891. They were banned after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 and criminally prosecuted for practising their faith in the USSR.

6. After the USSR Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organisations Act was enacted in 1990, the RSFSR Ministry of Justice registered the Administrative Centre of the Religious Organisations of Jehovah's Witnesses in the USSR. On 29 April 1999 that national religious entity was re-registered as the Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia ("the Administrative Centre"), under Russia's new Religions Act.

7. In order to carry out their religious worship and practice throughout Russia, religious associations of Jehovah's Witnesses were formed into groups or communities, called "congregations". They operated under the authority of the Administrative Centre, an umbrella organisation for the Russian Jehovah's Witnesses. There were approximately 400 local congregations and 175,000 individual Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia. Their places of worship were known as "Kingdom Halls".

8. In January 2007 a deputy Prosecutor General sent out a circular letter to regional prosecutors, asserting that Jehovah's Witnesses represented a public threat:

"Various branches of foreign religious and charitable organisations operate in Russia, whose activities do not formally violate the provisions of Russian law but quite often contribute to the escalation of tensions in society. Representatives of foreign religious associations (Jehovah's Witnesses, Unification Church, Church of Scientology, etc.), followers of various Oriental beliefs, and followers of Satanism form branches that frequently carry out activities harmful to the moral, mental, and physical health of their members."

He directed subordinate prosecutors as follows:

"To check whether territorial bodies of the [telecoms regulator Roskomnadzor] ... properly execute their legal duty to uncover extremist material in the media belonging

to religious associations (Church of Scientology, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and other religious organisations that have their own printing facilities).”

## II. CIRCUMSTANCES OF INDIVIDUAL CASES

### **A. Forced dissolution of the Taganrog organisation, confiscation of its property and banning of publications (application no. 32401/10)**

9. The first applicant, the Taganrog local religious organisation of Jehovah’s Witnesses (the “Taganrog LRO”), was originally registered in 1992 as an independent religious association. In 1998 it was re-registered as a local religious organisation operating within the structure of the Administrative Centre (the second applicant). The third and fourth applicants are the German and US publishers of Jehovah’s Witnesses religious literature. The fifth to sixteenth applicants are twelve congregations in Taganrog which shared the Kingdom Hall with the Taganrog LRO.

10. Reacting to the letter from the deputy Prosecutor General, on 13 September 2007 a deputy Rostov Regional Prosecutor directed all town and district prosecutors to carry out inspections of the religious organisations of Jehovah’s Witnesses:

“Structures of the foreign religious organisation (FRO) of Jehovah’s Witnesses, registered ... in the Rostov Region, are actively functioning in the territory of Rostov Region. The organisation, as a matter of course, refuses to recognise the State authority in the countries in which its branches are located. The activity of the FRO has been banned in several jurisdictions.

Despite having official registration, by carrying out their cult activity followers of the FRO of Jehovah’s Witnesses regularly commit violations of Russian law. In particular, they preach refusal to fulfil civil responsibilities (serving in the army, paying taxes, commission of administrative and criminal offences). They forbid their followers from accepting medical assistance in the form of blood transfusions resulting in death or serious harm being caused to their health, including that of children. A characteristic feature of the organisation is the aggression it openly displays towards representatives of other religious confessions ...

The findings of a religious expert study of several printed publications that had been distributed by the Jehovahists in the Rostov Region, carried out in August of this year by the Rostov Center for Court Expert Studies indicate that they contain indicators of incitement to religious enmity.

On the basis of the above, it is necessary for you to organise and conduct a thorough investigation of local religious organisations of Jehovah’s Witnesses located in your jurisdictions, together with the territorial agencies of the Federal Security [Service] and the registration service, and to take all possible reactive measures, including examining the question of preparing and sending to courts applications to liquidate local organisations for violations of law they committed, and to inform the regional prosecutor’s office with details of reactive measures by 10 October 2007.”

11. The expert study to which the deputy prosecutor referred, had been commissioned on 2 August 2007 by the acting prosecutor in the Tarasovskiy district with a view to determining whether or not a number of Jehovah's Witnesses' books and magazines contained "indicators of inciting hatred or hostility, or of debasing human dignity on account of one's attitude toward religion, or of advocating the exclusivity of one religion in comparison with another". An expert from the Rostov Centre for Forensic Studies found that, while the texts studied contained elements of hatred towards the "Christendom", that is all religious movements recognising Jesus Christ and the Bible except Jehovah's Witnesses, there were no expressions inciting hostility which could "encourage readers to take action aimed at the destruction of the object of hatred". The texts also advocated the exclusivity of one religion, inasmuch as the Jehovah's Witnesses' movement pronounced itself to be the only true religion, whereas all other Christian religions were seen to be Satanic.

12. In pursuance of the Rostov Regional deputy prosecutor's letter of 13 September 2007 and referring to the findings of the expert study, on 31 October 2007 the acting deputy Taganrog prosecutor issued a warning to the Taganrog LRO, advising it "to stop extremist activities". The Taganrog LRO sent a written reply, considering the warning to be unlawful.

13. The Taganrog prosecutor also pursued other lines of investigation into the activities of Jehovah's Witnesses in the region. On 17 October 2007 his senior assistant requested the head doctor of the city hospital to provide a copy of the medical record of Ms S. who had been treated in the hospital in 2004, and the contact details of the medical staff in charge of the treatment. S. had been one of the founding members of the Taganrog LRO; on 17 March 2004 she had been admitted to the hospital following a serious traffic accident. Throughout her treatment, she requested that the doctors should refrain from administering blood products. On 8 April 2004 she died due to her extensive injuries. Both the post-mortem diagnosis and the medical examiner who conducted forensic autopsy for the purposes of a criminal investigation against the driver had concurred that her death had been caused by trauma, blood loss and multiple organ failure.

14. On 9 June 2008 the Rostov Regional Prosecutor's office filed a claim in the Rostov Regional Court to liquidate the Taganrog LRO. The stated grounds for liquidation were:

- (a) the death of S. which was alleged to have been the consequence of her refusal of blood transfusion;
- (b) the ongoing distribution of religious literature which the expert study had found to contain indicators of extremism;
- (c) the fact that the Taganrog LRO had held services of worship outside the area of operation indicated in its documents;

(d) the materials of a criminal case against Mr G. who had been convicted of refusing to accept alternative civilian service which was to be carried out at a factory connected with the military;

(e) the failure to amend the list of founders of the Taganrog LRO following S.'s death;

(f) the omission of the full details of the publisher religious organisation in certain printed materials of Jehovah's Witnesses.

15. The Taganrog LRO sought to join the Administrative Centre and two publishers of religious literature as parties to the proceedings since they were responsible for the printing, publishing, and distribution of the religious literature of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia. All such applications were denied.

16. On 11 August 2009 the prosecutor supplemented his claim in the case with the request that the sixty-eight publications of Jehovah's Witnesses submitted for a composite study be declared extremist material. On 7 September 2009 the prosecutor again amended the claim by requesting that the Taganrog LRO not only be liquidated but also be declared an extremist organisation and that its property and all existing copies of the sixty-eight religious publications be confiscated.

17. By judgment of 11 September 2009, the Rostov Regional Court granted the prosecutor's claim, ordering the liquidation of the Taganrog LRO as an extremist organisation and the banning of its activities. The Regional Court founded its judgment on the following evidence.

18. On the charge of extremism, the Regional Court reproduced the findings of the composite expert study which established that thirty-four – out of a total of sixty-eight – publications of Jehovah's Witnesses contained "indicators of inciting religious discord":

"Assessing the research conducted by the experts and their oral evidence before it, the court has reached the conclusion that part of the literature and printed publications distributed by the [Taganrog] LRO contain a number of expressions ... demonstrating the negative attitude of Jehovah's Witnesses toward various elements of traditional Christianity, a negative image of Catholicism as a traditional Christian denomination, and a sharply negative assessment by one religious group, including accompanying illustrations directed at the Roman Catholic Church and the Russian Orthodox Church. The literature contains information capable of undermining the reader's respect for Christian religions (except Jehovah's Witnesses) and for their Christian religious figures, and also contains expressions and content urging [people] to leave other Christian religions (false religions) and to join the religion of Jehovah's Witnesses. Such appeals are expressed in various forms – declarations of intent, directives, pleading, appeals, and advice. Manipulative devices are used to exert psychological influence on the consciousness of the perceiver."

The Regional Court referred to the statements by two Orthodox priests and five Orthodox believers who claimed having been offended by the Witnesses' criticism of Orthodox Christianity. On the basis of their testimony, the Regional Court found that the Witnesses' literature and views

“outrage religious feelings, provoke conflict on interreligious grounds, and inflame religious discord”.

19. The Regional Court then turned to the grounds for the liquidation of a religious organisation established in the Religions Act. On the charge of incitement to refuse medical assistance, the court took evidence from Ms S.’s husband and the head of emergency unit. They confirmed that after the accident Ms S. had been repeatedly offered blood transfusion which she had firmly refused, citing her religious duty as a Jehovah’s Witness. In the doctor’s opinion, the medicine her fellow believers had brought for her had not been the kind of the blood substitutes she had needed. On the basis of the above-mentioned expert study, the testimony by witnesses and Ms S.’s medical record, the Regional Court considered it established that –

“... the refusal of a blood transfusion did lead to a fatal outcome since other methods of treatment turned out to be ineffective. [The court] considers that the establishment of injury to health of at least one person is a proven gross violation of law which would be incompatible with the continued operation of the LRO.”

20. On the issue whether the Taganrog LRO advocated abandonment of civic duties, the Regional Court again referred to the expert study and also heard an official of the Taganrog military drafting office. He stated that in 2007 Mr G. had been one of ten conscripts who professed the religion of Jehovah’s Witnesses. He had learnt of the existence of the Taganrog LRO from two young men who were on their way to serve when “attempts were made to influence them not to serve”. Mr G. had refused a specific assignment to perform alternative civilian service, for which he was found criminally liable. The Regional Court found this evidence sufficient to conclude that a breach of the law on the part of Mr G. had been the product of the influence of the Taganrog LRO:

“... the evidence produced at the trial confirms the fact that the Taganrog LRO committed actions inciting citizens to refuse to fulfil civic duties established by law. Those actions included distributing among believers of literature containing such appeals ... and the influencing of citizens of conscription age not professing the said religion to refuse to perform military service. The last allegation is based on the testimony of the witness ... from the Taganrog military drafting office [who] testified that he learned of the existence of conscripted believers in the spring of 2007 during the spring call-up, when conscripted young men approached him and said that other conscripted persons were influencing them to refuse to undergo service in the army.”

21. The Regional Court further considered the prosecutor’s allegation that the Taganrog LRO involved minors in its activities. The prosecution produced two witnesses: Mr S., former husband of a Jehovah’s Witness, stated that his former wife involved their child in the religious activities, despite his objections. He had sought a judicial order for amending the custody arrangements but it had been refused because his former wife and the child had “excellent living conditions”. The second witness, Ms B., an official of the Child Protection Authority, reported the case of a



sixteen-year-old student who had fallen behind in her studies because she had missed classes twice a week to visit a Sunday school. In the end the child had been helped and had finished school. Two witnesses for the Taganrog LRO, the former wife of Mr S. and another Witness mother, told the court that they read Bible together with their children and attended religious meetings twice a week but they did not celebrate birthdays or State holidays. The Regional Court drew the following conclusion from the testimony before it:

“The testimony ... objectively confirms the arguments in the application regarding minor children being lured into the organisation’s activity, including into the preaching activity, as small or minor children are being obliged, together with their parents, regardless of weather or time of the year, to go on the streets and to apartments with the goal of distributing literature, and to be present for long periods of time at [religious] meetings ...

The circumstances established during the trial testify to the violation by the religious organisation and its members of the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Constitution, and the Family Code, as they involve very young children in the religious organisation without the consent of the other parent, who has equal rights and duties in the upbringing of the children, and do not consider the opinion and interests of the children.

The actions of the members of the Taganrog LRO constitute a direct violation of the provisions of Article 31 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which establishes that the States Parties recognise the right of the child to rest and leisure, to engage in play and recreational activities appropriate to the age of the child, and to participate fully in cultural and artistic life.

The testimony of the witnesses who are members of the organisation, to the effect that they visit the park with their children, take trips to the zoo, and spend time with their children in nature, does not attest to the parents’ ensuring conditions for the full and comprehensive development of the children, since all these activities only take place with the participation of other members of the organisation. Not one of the witnesses demonstrated that their children actively participate in sports or in any type of sports leagues, are receiving a musical education, or are interested in and attending hobby groups of any kind, all of which are necessary for a comprehensive development of personality, abilities, and interests.”

22. The Regional Court also found that the activities of the Taganrog LRO led to destruction of family relations on account of religious differences. The court referred to the findings of the expert study to the effect that “faith in God takes priority over family relationships” and that “non-belief on the part of a spouse or children is considered to be a basis for marital instability ... and also for termination of relations with the non-believing family member”. It also took evidence from Mr St., director of the Consultative Centre, an entity under the patronage of the Orthodox Church, who told the court that Mr S. (see the preceding paragraph) and Mr K. had sought his advice on how to prevent their families from breaking-up because of their wives’ involvement in Jehovah’s Witnesses’ work. Mr S. and Mr K. confirmed that before the court. Five witnesses for

the defence who testified about their harmonious relationships with their spouses were deemed unreliable by the Regional Court: according to the court, Mr V., a non-believer, did not speak the truth because “his wife was in attendance in the courtroom during his testimony” and the four Jehovah’s Witnesses had a vested interest in “continuing the activities of the organisation of which they were members”.

23. Lastly, the Regional Court considered it established that the Taganrog LRO “had encroached on the personality, rights and freedoms of citizens”. That charge had two facets: first, the Taganrog LRO “determined how the believers’ free time [was to be] spent and forbade them to celebrate holidays and birthdays”, and second, the members of the LRO preached at homes uninvited, “without giving heed to the opinion of persons whom they visited and whose private life they interfered with”.

24. On the strength of the above evidence, the Regional Court pronounced the Taganrog LRO to be an extremist organisation and ordered that it be liquidated, its activities banned and its property, including the “Kingdom Hall” and the adjacent plot of land, confiscated and transferred to the State. Thirty-four publications of Jehovah’s Witnesses were declared extremist material and also confiscated.

25. The Taganrog LRO filed a 125-page statement of appeal, in which it dissected the Regional Court’s judgment and complained in particular that the Jehovah’s Witnesses had been singled out for persecution and discrimination. It referred to the prosecutor’s letters which explicitly targeted the organisation, to the press publications about the trial, and to the fact that the Regional Court took evidence from Orthodox priests, avowedly Orthodox Cossacks and the director of an Orthodox-affiliated centre Mr St.

26. On 8 December 2009 the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation rejected the appeal in a summary fashion, without addressing the arguments in detail. On the same day it rejected an application by the Administrative Centre requesting that it be heard as a party to the proceedings.

## **B. Banning and confiscation of religious publications**

27. The applicants in the below cases include the local religious organisations of Jehovah’s Witnesses (LROs), individual members of the affected congregations, the Administrative Centre, and the German and US publishers of the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ literature.

### *1. Banning of eighteen publications in the Altay Region (application no. 44285/10)*

28. On 22 December 2008 the town prosecutor in Gorno-Altaysk in the Altay Region filed an application with the Gorno-Altaysk Town Court to declare extremist twenty-seven religious publications of Jehovah’s Witnesses. He relied on an expert assessment which determined that the

publications proclaimed the superiority of the religion of Jehovah’s Witnesses. The number of publications was later reduced to eighteen, by withdrawing from consideration the publications held to be extremist by the Rostov court.

29. On 7 June 2009 the police searched the place of worship of Jehovah’s Witnesses in Gorno-Altaysk confiscating hundreds of items of religious literature. They also searched the homes of the legal representative of the Gorno-Altaysk LRO, and of another Jehovah’s Witness, seizing religious literature and their personal property.

30. On 1 October 2009 the Town Court declared extremist eighteen religious publications of Jehovah’s Witnesses (one brochure, seven *Awake!* magazines, and ten *Watchtower* magazines). The court endorsed in their entirety the findings of the expert assessment to the effect that the publications promoted “the superiority of Jehovah’s Witnesses’ teachings and the inferiority of other religions.” It ordered that the publications be confiscated and added to the federal List of Extremist Materials. On 27 January 2010 the Supreme Court of the Altay Republic dismissed the appeal in a summary fashion.

*2. Banning of three publications in the Rostov Region (application no. 2269/12)*

31. Following a complaint by a member of the public asserting that certain publications of Jehovah’s Witnesses proclaim the superiority of their religion over others, the town prosecutor in Salsk in the Rostov Region asked a linguistic expert to conduct a study on the literature concerned. The expert concluded that the texts did not contain signs of extremism but that they could “cause the incitement of hostility to other religions” and did contain “traces of propaganda of the superiority of one religion over others”. A subsequent court-appointed study concluded that four publications contained statements capable of “undermining respect, or of evoking hostile feelings, towards religions other than Jehovah’s Witnesses” and information “about the exclusivity and moral superiority of Jehovah’s Witnesses”. The prosecutor filed an application with a court to have the publications declared extremist.

32. On 27 June 2011 the Salsk Town Court granted the prosecutor’s application in part, ruling to pronounce the nine of the twelve publications extremist, extensively quoting from, and fully endorsing the findings of, the expert studies. Following an appeal hearing on 13 October 2011, the Regional Court amended the judgment in the part concerning the six publications which were already on the Federal List of Extremist Materials and upheld the finding of an extremist nature of the remaining three publications.

3. *Banning of four publications in Krasnodar (application no. 2269/12)*

33. On 11 March 2009 the Krasnodar regional prosecutor filed an application with the Pervomayskiy District Court of Krasnodar, requesting that four publications of Jehovah's Witnesses – which had been allegedly discovered in a public park – be pronounced extremist: three issues of *The Watchtower* magazine, and the book *Draw Close to Jehovah*. The claim was based on the findings of a linguist from the Krasnodar regional police and concerned one issue of *The Watchtower* magazine which had been pronounced as not containing signs of extremism in the Rostov proceedings (see paragraph 18 above).

34. On 29 June 2009 the District Court appointed a psychological linguistic assessment of the publications which was completed on 18 February 2011. The experts found that the publications contained indications of disrespectful or hostile attitude to religions other than Jehovah's Witnesses and of their superiority over other religions, but that there were no statements inciting religious hatred or calls for enmity or violent acts against any other social or religious group.

35. Relying on the findings of the expert study, on 22 April 2011 the District Court granted the prosecutor's application in full and pronounced the four publications extremist. It rejected the expert studies that had been supplied by the defence on the grounds, in particular, that the studies had been carried out at the request of a party to the case. On 16 August 2011 the Krasnodar Regional Court upheld the judgment on appeal.

4. *Banning of six publications in Kemerovo (application no. 2269/12)*

36. On 22 September 2010 the Zavodskiy district prosecutor in Kemerovo asked the Zavodskiy District Court to declare six publications of Jehovah's Witnesses (the book *The Bible—God's Word or Man's?*, the brochure *Keep on the Watch!*, and four issues of the *Watchtower* and *Awake!* magazines) to be extremist. The application rested on a linguistic assessment which concluded that the publications incited to enmity and hatred towards Catholicism and Catholic priests but did not contain calls to violence or other unlawful actions. Members of the local congregation, the Administrative Centre or the publishers were not summoned to participate as parties to the case. On the basis of the expert's report as the sole piece of evidence, on 28 October 2010 the District Court granted the prosecutor's application and declared the publications extremist.

37. The applicants only became aware of the decision when the publications appeared on the Federal List of Extremist Materials after it had been updated on 18 January 2011 on the web site of the Ministry of Justice.

38. Between 25 and 27 January 2011 fifteen Jehovah's Witnesses from Kemerovo, the Administrative Centre and the publishing houses filed statements of appeal. On 28 March 2011 the District Court rejected the

appeals, holding that, as the applicants had not participated in the 28 October 2010 hearing, they did not have the right to appeal against the decision.

39. The applicants challenged the refusal to consider their appeals before the Regional Court. On 8 July 2011 the Kemerovo Regional Court rejected the complaint, finding that the District Court’s judgment did not interfere with the applicants’ right to freedom of religion.

*5. Banning of a new edition of the same book in Krasnoyarsk (application no. 74387/13)*

40. On 20 March 2012 the head of the Central Military District of the Federal Security Service (FSB) wrote to the Sovetskiy district prosecutor in Krasnoyarsk that they had been carrying out “operational-investigative measures aimed at suppressing the extremist activity of followers of the Jehovah’s Witnesses” to prevent them from “recruiting military personnel of military units of the Krasnoyarsk garrison into the destructive activity of the religious organisation of Jehovah’s Witnesses”. As a result of these measures, they seized a copy of the book *What Does the Bible Really Teach?* published in Germany in 2009, that was identical in its contents to the earlier 2005 edition which had already been pronounced to be extremist by the Rostov Regional Court in 2009 (see paragraph 18 above). The FSB requested the prosecutor to institute judicial proceedings to have the 2009 edition also declared extremist.

41. On 28 April 2012 the prosecutor filed such an application with the Sovetskiy District Court of Krasnoyarsk. By judgment of 14 February 2013, the District Court granted the prosecutor’s application, finding that the 2009 edition was identical in its contents to the 2005 edition which had been pronounced extremist. On 20 May 2013 the Krasnoyarsk Regional Court upheld the judgment on appeal.

*6. Banning of a brochure in Krasnoyarsk (application no. 79240/13)*

42. On 13 June 2012 the FSB wrote to the Sovetskiy district prosecutor that they had prevented the Jehovah’s Witnesses from carrying out extremist activities and recruiting military personnel and had seized thirteen publications which had the characteristics of extremist material.

43. On 25 June 2012 the prosecutor in Krasnoyarsk filed an application with a court, seeking a declaration that the brochure *Will You Follow Jehovah’s Loving Guidance?* was extremist. By way of justification, the prosecutor referred to an expert assessment. The expert found that the brochure “contained calls to reject one’s own religion in favour of that of Jehovah’s Witnesses” through declaring that “all non-Christian religions [were] clearly false” and “emphasising the true nature of the teachings of Jehovah’s Witnesses”.

44. On 24 January 2013 the Sovetskiy District Court granted the application, fully endorsing the findings contained in the expert opinion. On 24 July 2013 the Regional Court upheld the judgment on appeal.

7. *Banning of the book “Bearing Thorough Witness” About God’s Kingdom (application no. 28108/14)*

45. On 2 November 2011 a district prosecutor of the Krasnodar Region asked the Uspenskiy District Court to declare extremist the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ book “*Bearing Thorough Witness*” *About God’s Kingdom*. A first court-commissioned expert assessment concluded that the book did not contain calls to enmity and hatred or any statements degrading the dignity of others. The second assessment appointed at the prosecutor’s request found that the book contained “indicators of indirectly inciting citizens to refuse to perform lawfully established civic obligations, in particular non-compliance with judicial decisions and government bans conflicting with the principles of the religious teachings of Jehovah’s Witnesses” and statements “capable of creating in the reader a negative perception ... of ministers of traditional Christian denominations”. An Orthodox priest, heard at the request of the prosecutor, was of the view that the book had an extremist character.

46. On 19 June 2013 the District Court pronounced the book extremist, relying exclusively on the findings in the second expert assessment and the statements by the Orthodox priest. On 8 October 2013 the Krasnodar Regional Court dismissed their appeals and upheld the judgment in a summary fashion.

8. *Banning of two brochures (application no. 16578/15)*

47. On 14 October 2013 a military prosecutor in Vladimir asked the Leninskiy District Court of Vladimir to pronounce two brochures of Jehovah’s Witnesses to be extremist on the grounds of an expert’s assessment that the brochures incited religious hatred and advocated superiority of one religion above others. On 23 October 2013 the Leninskiy District Court granted the prosecutor’s application, relying exclusively on the expert report. The publisher of the brochures or any other representatives of Jehovah’s Witnesses were not summoned to the hearings. The judgment became final on 2 December 2013.

48. On 26 May 2014 a prosecutor in Birobidzhan in the Yevreyskiy Region issued an official warning letter to the local organisation of Jehovah’s Witnesses. With reference to the judgment of the Leninskiy District Court of Vladimir, he advised the applicants to cease the distribution of the brochures.

49. Having thus become aware of the judgment of the Leninskiy District Court, the applicants appealed against it, requesting the District Court to restore the time-limit for lodging an appeal. On 7 August 2014 the District

Court dismissed their request, finding that the judgment did not interfere with the applicants' rights and that they did not give a valid reason for missing the time-limit for appeal. On 7 October 2014 the Vladimir Regional Court upheld this decision on appeal.

### **C. Prosecution of applicants for distributing “extremist” literature**

50. In the second half of 2010 individual Jehovah's Witnesses were prosecuted for using the religious literature declared to be “extremist” in religious ministry.

51. Mr Boltnyev and Mr Mardonov in Tatarstan (applications nos. 3488/11 and 3492/11) were stopped by the police in the street. The police demanded to see their documents and contents of their bags; on discovering Jehovah's Witnesses' literature, the police took them to the station and seized all the literature in their possession, including their personal Bibles and notepads. On 9 June 2010 the magistrates' court in Nizhnekamsk found them guilty of “mass dissemination of extremist material”, an offence under Article 20.29 of the Code of Administrative Offences (CAO) on the basis the fact that they had in their possession the book *What Does the Bible Really Teach?* which had been previously declared extremist. They were fined 1,000 Russian roubles (RUB) each. On 7 July 2010 the Nizhnekamsk Town Court rejected their appeals.

52. In the case of Mr Aliyev in Birobidzhan (application no. 14821/11), a certain Mr M., posing as a member of the public, attended a meeting of the local congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses with the stated aim of “studying the religion”. He made audio recording of the meeting and provided it to the Birobidzhan prosecutor, claiming that he was concerned about distribution of extremist literature. A joint team of the police, prosecutors and security services interrupted a religious meeting on 31 March 2010 in which a partial copy of religious textbook *Come be my Follower* was being used. By judgment of 26 May 2010, as upheld on appeal on 11 August 2010 by the Birobidzhan Town Court, the magistrates' court found Mr Aliyev guilty of mass dissemination of extremist material, noting that he had allowed the text to be distributed and commented upon in his presence, and fined him RUB 3,000.

53. Mr Fedorin in the Rostov Region (application no. 17552/11), one of Jehovah's Witnesses since 1959 who had been sentenced to six years' imprisonment in 1972 for his religious convictions, was found guilty of the distribution of religious literature, including “extremist” publications, among residents of the village of Sredniy Yegorlyk. He was fined RUB 1,000 (final decision – 21 September 2010, the Tselinskiy District Court).

54. The police entered the flat of Ms Chekhovskaya in Belgorod (application no. 17552/11) acting on information received from her

grandfather, who had let them in without a search warrant in her absence. The officers seized Ms Chekhovskaya's entire personal library of religious literature, including books, journals, hymn books and Bibles. By judgment of 27 July 2010, as upheld on appeal on 14 September 2010 by the Sverdlovskiy District Court of Belgorod, she was found guilty of possession of extremist literature with the intent of mass dissemination and fined RUB 1,000.

55. Ms Savelyeva in Yoshkar-Ola (application no. 17552/11) and her fellow believers were placed under surveillance by the Centre for Suppression of Extremism (CSE) of the Mariy El Police Department. They were detained in a joint operation carried out by the chief, deputy chief and a senior officer from the CSE, and an officer from the Department for the Protection of the Constitution. By judgment of 12 October 2010, as upheld on appeal on 22 December 2010 by the Yoshkar-Ola Town Court, she was found guilty of disseminating one title of extremist literature and intending to disseminate two others and fined RUB 1,200.

56. On 7 October 2010 officers from the Department for the Protection of the Constitution of the Samara division of the FSB arrived at the residence of Ms Ebenal in the Samara Region (application no. 17552/11). They showed her a court order authorising the inspection of her apartment and asked her to hand over her religious literature, since it was alleged that she had distributed the publication *What Does the Bible Really Teach?* in the spring of that year. The officers seized her entire personal library of religious publications. By judgment of 15 November 2010, as upheld on appeal on 29 December 2010 by the Volzhskiy District Court of Samara Region, she was found guilty of mass dissemination of extremist materials and fined RUB 1,000.

57. In the case of Ms Belimova in Tver (application no. 17552/11), she was initially found guilty of mass dissemination of extremist material on the grounds that she had supplied religious publications to Ms F. and also studied Bible with her (final judgment of 18 March 2011 by the Tsentralniy District Court of Tver). On 18 October 2011 the President of the Tver Regional Court quashed the judgments by way of supervisory review and discontinued the proceedings because communication of extremist materials to one another person did not constitute "mass dissemination" of such materials. The order to confiscate and destroy thirty-eight publications which had been declared extremist was maintained.

#### **D. Forced dissolution of the Samara organisation and confiscation of its property (application no. 15962/15)**

58. The applicants are the local religious organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in Samara (the "Samara LRO") and six members of Jehovah's Witnesses' groups of the Samara Region, including Mr Moskvina from the



Novokuybyshevsk congregation. At the time the Samara LRO had a membership of ten, but the thirteen Jehovah's Witnesses congregations in the Samara Region were made up of more than 1,500 members.

59. On 29 January 2013 the Novokuybyshevsk town police in the Samara Region inspected the premises rented by the Samara LRO in which the Novokuybyshevsk congregation held their religious services. During the inspection, ten issues of the brochures which had been declared extremist by the Rostov court were uncovered and seized. Mr Moskvina, an "elder" (religious minister) of the Novokuybyshevsk congregation, was charged with "mass dissemination of extremist material" under Article 20.29 of the CAO. By judgment of 3 April 2013, as upheld on appeal on 13 May 2013, the Novokuybyshevsk Town Court fined him RUB 3,000.

60. Referring to Mr Moskvina's conviction, a regional prosecutor issued identical warnings to the Novokuybyshevsk congregation and the Samara LRO, advising them that any form of extremist activity was prohibited on pain of liquidation. The Samara LRO replied to the prosecutor that Mr Moskvina was not one of its members and that the Novokuybyshevsk congregation was not a structural division of the LRO. No reply was received to their submission.

61. On 22 January 2014 the Samara Regional police department decided to inspect the premises rented by the Samara LRO at the local community centre for the purpose of "collecting additional information [allowing the prosecutor] to decide on the institution of criminal proceedings". The police were instructed to seize all objects and documents "relevant to the illegal activity". In a box inside a cabinet, they found seven copies of four books which had been declared extremist by the Rostov court. Following the inspection, the Samara LRO was charged with possession of extremist material with intent to mass dissemination. By judgment of 7 March 2014, as upheld on appeal on 17 April 2014, the Sovetskiy District Court of Samara fined it RUB 50,000.

62. On 22 April 2014 the Samara Regional prosecutor asked the Samara Regional Court to declare the Samara LRO "extremist organisation" and to liquidate it. The prosecutor cited the Mr Moskvina's and the Samara LRO's convictions for possession of extremist materials. The Samara LRO objected to the prosecutor's claim, by asserting that the facts of storage of extremist literature were wrongly imputed to it, since Mr Moskvina did not belong to the Samara LRO and that the Novokuybyshevsk community operated as an independent religious group.

63. The Regional Court dismissed the Samara LRO's arguments as an attempt to impeach the findings of the Novokuybyshevsk Town Court and the Sovetskiy District Court. With reference to the final decisions by those courts, on 29 May 2014 the Regional Court held that the Samara LRO's administrative conviction under Article 20.29, intervening as it did within twelve months after the prosecutor had given an anti-extremism warning,

constituted a sufficient ground to declare it an “extremist organisation”, to liquidate it and to confiscate its property.

64. On 12 November 2014 the Supreme Court dismissed an appeal by the Samara LRO in a summary fashion.

**E. Withdrawal of the distribution permit and prosecution of applicants for the distribution unregistered media**

*1. Withdrawal of the permit to distribute religious magazines (application no. 76162/12)*

65. In 1997 the Russian media regulator granted the German publisher of the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ *Watchtower* and *Awake!* magazines a permit to distribute the magazines in Russia. The Administrative Centre was listed in the permit as the “applicant and distributor of the magazines” produced by the German publisher.

66. On 26 April 2010 the successor media regulator (known by its Russian abbreviation “Roskomnadzor”) issued an order to withdraw the permit. The order referred to the judgments by the Rostov Regional Court and the Gorno-Altaysk Town Court by which certain issues of the magazines had been pronounced extremist.

67. The applicants challenged the order in court. The courts at two instances upheld the validity of the order but on 22 June 2011 the Federal Commercial Court of the Moscow Circuit ruled to quash their judgments and remit the matter for a new hearing. It found in particular that the lower courts had not established a legal basis granting Roskomnadzor the power to revoke permits.

68. On 6 October 2011 the Moscow City Commercial Court found that that the order had been unlawful:

“... the law does not authorise [Roskomnadzor] to revoke a permit to distribute a foreign printed periodical ... the disputed order indicates that all issues of the magazines are prohibited for distribution in Russia, whereas court decisions declared only individual issues of these periodicals extremist.

... [Roskomnadzor] did not present adequate evidence to establish that courts had declared extremist all issues of the printed periodicals *Awake!* and *The Watchtower*. Thus, its revocation of the permit to distribute all issues of the printed periodicals *Awake!* and *The Watchtower* in Russia was unlawful.”

69. On 25 January 2012 the Commercial Court of the Ninth Circuit overturned the City Court’s judgment on the grounds that using mass media for the promotion of extremism was prohibited in the Mass-Media Act and that the functioning of a media outlet promoting extremism should be terminated in accordance with the Suppression of Extremism Act.

70. On 29 May 2012 the Federal Commercial Court of the Moscow Circuit upheld that judgment, finding a legal basis for the revocation in section 32 of the Mass Media Act:

“In view of the fact that the legislation does not directly regulate the revocation of a permit to distribute foreign printed periodicals, Roskomnadzor used, by an analogy of law, the legislation governing a similar situation – section 32 of the Mass-Media Act, ‘Revocation of a License’ – in issuing the order.”

71. On 25 October 2012 the Supreme Commercial Court refused the applicants’ supervisory appeal.

*2. Prosecution of applicants for the distribution of unregistered media (application no. 17552/11)*

72. In the second half of 2010 the authorities obtained copies of *The Watchtower* and *Awake!* magazines in various ways. In the case of Mr Sirotyuk in the Primorskiy Region, the head of the village administration and an assistant district prosecutor had asked him for “some religious literature” during a religious meeting. Mr Ebeling in the Smolensk Region was stopped by the police on his way home; they asked him to show them the contents of his bag on the grounds that they had been ordered to detain anyone distributing “banned literature”. In another case from the Primorskiy Region, the police set up video surveillance in a car parked near the building where applicant Mr Konyukhov lived; they also asked a member of the public to go to his flat and obtain magazines from him. In the case of Ms Bondareva from the Kamchatka Region, the police seized magazines from the homes of individuals who told the police that they had received them from her. Lastly, in the case of Mr Komarov in Udmurtiya, the police stopped the car in which he was travelling and seized the publications from the boot of the car.

73. In all cases, the applicants were found guilty on charges of distributing unregistered magazines, an offence under Article 13.21 of the CAO, and were fined between RUB 1,000 to 1,200. The court decisions included an order to confiscate and destroy the publications. The final decisions were issued as follows: Mr Sirotyuk: 19 November 2010, the Khankayskiy District Court of the Primorskiy Region; Mr Ebeling: 13 September 2010, the Gagarinskiy District Court of the Smolensk Region; Mr Konyukhov: 30 September 2010, the Pogradichniy District Court of the Primorskiy Region; Ms Bondareva: 7 December 2010, the Ust-Bolsheretskiy District Court of the Kamchatka Region; and Mr Komarov: 21 December 2010, the Oktyabrskiy District Court of Izhevsk.

**F. Seizure of a consignment of religious literature (application no. 5547/12)**

74. In 2010 the Administrative Centre received from a German organisation of Jehovah’s Witnesses a free gift of religious publications. After going through customs formalities, the publications were released for

unrestricted distribution in the territory of Russia. The Administrative Centre sent a portion of the publications by railway to Kemerovo for the use by local Jehovah's Witnesses, with applicant Mr Gareyev being listed as the recipient. Not one of the publications included in the shipment had been pronounced extremist by a court anywhere in Russia.

75. Applicants Mr Gareyev and Mr Rashevskiy collected the literature and loaded it into a private van with the intention of delivering it to Jehovah's Witnesses in local congregations. On their way, they were intercepted by the armed police and taken to the Investigations Committee for questioning. After they had been questioned, the investigator ordered that the religious literature from the vehicle be seized on the grounds that the van could contain "religious literature relevant to the criminal case". The police seized more than 100 packages of literature weighing over one ton.

76. On 17 February 2011 the applicants complained to a court that the seizure order was unlawful as it did not indicate what specific literature was of relevance to the criminal case. Not one item of the literature in the vehicle had been pronounced extremist or was subject to any restriction under Russian law.

77. By judgment of 1 April 2011, as upheld on appeal on 19 July 2011, the Zavodskiy District Court rejected the complaint. It found that the seizure order had been issued by the investigator lawfully and that the purpose of the seizure was "to form an objective view on the activities of the organisation" rather than to uncover extremist literature.

78. The consignment has never been returned to the applicants.

#### **G. Blocking of access to Jehovah's Witnesses' website (application no. 2861/15)**

79. The applicants are the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York ("Watchtower New York") as the owner of the Jehovah's Witnesses' international website at [jw.org](http://jw.org), the Administrative Centre, and ten individual Russian Jehovah's Witnesses who have various perceptive limitations (visual or hearing impairments).

80. On 7 August 2013 the Tsentralniy District Court in Tver, on an application by a prosecutor, pronounced the Jehovah's Witnesses' website to be extremist on the ground that it contained copies of the brochures *What Does the Bible Really Teach?*, *Draw Close to Jehovah* and the book *Come Be My Follower* which had been previously declared extremist by the Rostov courts. It also referred to the information from the FSB, according to which the website contained copies of the brochures *How Can Blood Save Your Life?* and *What Does God Require of Us?* and copies of *Awake!* and *The Watchtower* magazines whose distribution permit had been revoked. Watchtower New York and the Administrative Centre were not informed about the proceedings. The District Court held that a decision declaring the

website extremist in Russia would not affect the rights of Watchtower New York, making its participation in the proceedings unnecessary.

81. On 12 September 2013 the applicants became aware of the District Court's decision from media reports. They filed separate appeals, complaining in particular that the decision had affected their rights without giving them an opportunity to take part in the proceedings; that the decision to block the access to the entire website had been excessively broad, because, in addition to the material that had been declared extremist, the website contained religious literature, audio and video records in hundreds of languages, and the decision prevented worshippers in Russia from accessing those non-extremist materials. The individual applicants who had physical limitations also complained that the website was the only source of religious materials with special features, such as sign language commentaries or audio recordings for blind users.

82. On 22 January 2014 the Tver Regional Court examined the appeal by Watchtower New York and quashed the decision of 7 August 2013. It found, firstly, that Watchtower New York, as the website's owner, should have been afforded an opportunity to take part in the proceedings. It further noted that the materials declared extremist were no longer accessible on the website from within the Russian territory. Finally, it held that the District Court had gone beyond the scope of the prosecutor's request by referring to other materials on the website, and that the reference to the revocation of the publication permit was irrelevant. The Regional Court further held that publication of certain extremist materials was not a ground for declaring the entire website to be extremist.

83. On 18 March 2014 a judge of the Tverskoy Regional Court refused the prosecutor leave to appeal to the cassation instance.

84. On 21 July 2014 a deputy Prosecutor General lodged a second cassation appeal with the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation. On 2 December 2014 the Supreme Court quashed the Regional Court's decision and reinstated the District Court's decision declaring the website extremist. Watchtower New York was notified about the hearing by registered mail but did not attend because an English translation of the notice had not been ready until after the hearing. On 29 December 2014 and 9 January 2015 it unsuccessfully requested the Supreme Court to re-open the case.

85. On 21 July 2015 the Ministry of Justice added jw.org to the Federal List of Extremist Materials as item 2904.

#### **H. Forced dissolution of the Administrative Centre and local religious organisations (applications nos. 10188/17 and 3215/18)**

86. On 2 March 2016 a deputy Prosecutor General issued an official warning to the Administrative Centre. With reference to the domestic judgments banning local religious organisations of Jehovah's Witnesses

(LROs) and declaring their publications “extremist”, the Administrative Centre was advised to cease any “extremist activity” on pain of liquidation.

87. On 15 March 2017 the Ministry of Justice asked the Supreme Court to declare the Administrative Centre an “extremist organisation”, to liquidate it, together with all 395 LROs of Jehovah’s Witnesses, and to confiscate their property. The Ministry alleged that the Administrative Centre had “systematically breached” the extremism legislation by importing religious publications which had subsequently been declared “extremist”, distributing such publications through its LROs, and also by financing, coordinating and directing LROs, including those whose activities had been declared “extremist”, and by failing to implement any “preventive organisational measures” after being warned about the prohibition on any form of extremist activity. On the same day, the Ministry, on its authority, suspended the activities of the Administrative Centre and of the LROs pending the examination of the liquidation claim.

88. The LROs did not receive notice of the banning claim from the Ministry of Justice or from the Supreme Court. A majority of them learned of the banning claim from the media. On 5 April 2017 they filed an application to be added as co-defendants, and another application to the same effect was lodged by the Administrative Centre. By a same-day decision, the judge summarily rejected the applications. On 10 April 2017 he also returned an appeal against his decision without consideration on the grounds that the decision was not amenable to a separate appeal.

89. The Administrative Centre objected to the claim on the grounds that its liquidation would constitute an unjustified interference with the right to freedom of religion and freedom of assembly and that its activity was entirely peaceful. It further asserted that the LROs of Jehovah’s Witnesses were independent entities and, therefore, the breaches of the Suppression of Extremism Act on their part should not have been imputed to the Administrative Centre and, vice versa, that its possible liquidation should not entail repercussions for the LROs.

90. By judgment of 20 April 2017, the Supreme Court granted the claim, ordering the liquidation of the Administrative Centre and the local organisations of Jehovah’s Witness in Russia and the confiscation of their property. In granting the banning claim, the Supreme Court noted that from 2009 to 2016, eight LROs and eighty-eight publications of Jehovah’s Witnesses and also their website had been banned as “extremist”, and that, after the deputy Prosecutor General’s anti-extremism warning, eight more LROs had been found guilty of “mass dissemination of extremist material”. Accordingly, the Administrative Centre was to be banned as an “extremist organisation” because it had not taken “effective measures” to prevent the LROs from engaging in “extremist activity” after the liquidation warning, and all LROs were to be banned because they were part of the structure of the Administrative Centre. The Administrative Centre was responsible for

all unlawful activities of its regional or structural subdivisions and also for the importation of religious publications which were declared to be extremist. The Supreme Court held that “the application of such an exceptional measure” did not constitute arbitrary interference with, or unlawful restriction on, citizens’ rights to association or freedom of worship. It pursued “a socially significant aim defined by law – counteracting extremist activity” and sought to protect the rights and lawful interests of others and to guarantee national security and public order. It was also proportionate and necessary in a democratic society in so far as the elimination of violations of rights of others and of “a real threat of harm to the person and health of others”, public order, public security, society and the State was “the only means of ensuring a balance of the rights and lawful interests of participants in legal relations in the public legal domain”.

91. On 19 May 2017 the Administrative Centre lodged an appeal against the liquidation order and the refusal to join the LROs as co-defendants. The LROs also lodged appeals, relying on the provision of the Code of Administrative Procedure which stipulated that persons not called to participate in the first-instance hearing may lodge an appeal if the judgment affected their rights and obligations (Article 295 § 2). In May, June and July 2017 the judge of the Supreme Court ruled to return their appeals without consideration on the grounds that the decision to liquidate those organisations as “extremist” and confiscate their property did not “rule on matters concerning their rights and obligations”. Some local organisations also attempted to lodge appeals directly with the Appellate Chamber of the Supreme Court.

92. On 17 July 2017 the Appellate Chamber of the Supreme Court dismissed the appeal by the Administrative Centre in a summary fashion. By decisions rendered in July, August and September 2017, it also summarily rejected the appeals by LROs.

93. Since the date of the Prosecutor General’s liquidation warning to the Administrative Centre, the LROs transferred ownership of their places of worship, to protect them from State seizure, to foreign religious organisations of Jehovah’s Witnesses and in a few cases private individuals who in turn agreed to permit congregations of Jehovah’s Witnesses to continue to use those places of worship on the basis of a contract of free use. The LROs succeeded in transferring 269 properties before the liquidation decision entered into legal force but were unable to transfer the remaining 97 properties.

94. In the months since the liquidation decision entered into legal force, the Russian authorities initiated court proceedings to annul the transfers. In each case, the domestic courts ruled in favour of the State by annulling the transfer and ordering that the property be confiscated by the State based on the liquidation decision. As of 1 September 2021, the Russian authorities have confiscated (1) the 21 properties that were owned by the

Administrative Center on the date of the liquidation decision; (2) the 97 properties owned by the LROs on the date of the liquidation decision; and (3) 128 of 269 properties that had been transferred by the LROs to foreign religious organisations of Jehovah’s Witnesses in the months prior to the liquidation decision.

## **I. Criminal prosecution of Jehovah’s Witnesses**

### *1. Prosecution of applicants in Taganrog and Rostov-on-Don (application no. 24622/16)*

95. On 5 August 2011 the South Federal Circuit police opened criminal proceedings under Article 282-2 of the Criminal Code against “unidentified individuals” who allegedly sought to resume the activities of the banned Taganrog LRO. Those individuals were suspected of renting out premises on which they had organised meetings of followers, distributed banned literature and incited attendants “to refuse medical assistance, break up family ties and abandon civil duties”.

96. On 4 February 2012 another criminal case under the same provision was opened against ten applicants for “participation in an extremist organisation” which the banned Taganrog LRO was taken to be. They were accused of organising daily meetings of followers and services of worship for the Vostochnoye congregation with a view “to preaching the superiority of Jehovah’s Witnesses and inferiority of the other religions”; some applicants were accused of rendering technical assistance during meetings in the way of setting-up audio equipment and passing microphones to members of the congregation who wished to speak.

97. On 30 May 2012 a third criminal case was opened under Article 150 § 4 of the Criminal Code (“involving a minor in a criminal organisation”). The “elders” of the congregation were alleged to have “lured” the sixteen-year-old applicant Mr Kruglikov and ten-year-old N.P. into the “organised extremist criminal group congregation Vostochnoye of the Taganrog LRO”, “assigning them to preaching and distributing literature, and also to providing technical assistance to the elders in the organisation of meetings.”

98. On an unspecified date all criminal proceedings against the applicants were joined into one criminal case and the applicants were required to give an undertaking not to leave the place of their residence.

99. On 5 April 2013 a deputy Prosecutor General approved the list of charges and submitted the case to the Taganrog City Court for trial. The first trial ended with a conviction which was pronounced on 29 July 2014 but later quashed on appeal.

100. The second trial opened on 22 January 2015. The applicants pleaded not guilty. They put forward the following arguments in their defence: (i) the activity of the Taganrog LRO could not have been resumed



after the judgment banning and liquidating the organisation; (ii) that judgment did not concern any other legal entities or individuals apart from the Taganrog LRO and did not affect the applicants' right to practice their religion which they continued to do as an unregistered religious group; (iii) their services of worship were not "extremist", they did not read or discuss any literature banned as "extremist"; (iv) the elders did not "lure" any minors who had attended the services together with their parents and, according to their testimonies and the statements by their parents, did so voluntarily and enjoyed it.

101. The trial court dismissed their arguments as an "attempt to evade criminal liability". By the judgment of 30 November 2015, it held that the applicants, while aware of the judgment of the Rostov Regional Court banning the Taganrog LRO, resumed and continued its activities by calling meetings, organising religious events, conscripting new members, including minors, distributing extremist literature, collecting donations, organising preaching and involving other applicants into the organisation. In doing so, they were driven by extremist motives "manifested by [their] expressions debasing human dignity on the basis of religious orientation; inciting hatred, especially for 'Christendom'; advocating the exclusivity of one religion in relation to another; rejecting medical treatment on religious grounds for people whose life and health are in danger; encouraging citizens to refuse to fulfil legally established civic duties, including performing military service; involving young children and minors in the activity of the organisation".

102. The trial court held that the applicants had formed a "stable extremist group" which had existed from the day the Rostov Regional Court judgment banning the Taganrog LRO became final and which had (i) a common purpose of resuming and continuing the banned activities, (ii) common organisers, (iii) "interchangeable and mutually complementary character of their actions", and (iv) an "illegal income" which the applicants had obtained "in the form of voluntary donations from citizens which was used for the purposes of extremist activities."

103. "The criminal activity of the extremist group" consisted in "inciting religious discord, and advocating the exclusivity and superiority of a religion by degrading other religions", "organising recruitment of new members", "breaking up the family, marriage, and family relationships, alienating people from the family circle because their relatives did not, according to this specific religion, have the correct world view", "choosing only part-time work in order to devote more time to preaching and service considering the work of the organisation to be of primary importance", "distributing extremist materials and ... possessing them with the intent to mass distribute them and use them in religious services, sermons, and speeches", "inciting citizens to refuse to fulfil their legally established civic duties by not entering military service", "inciting ... to reject medical treatment on religious grounds .... in particular, the transfusion of blood and

its components even under grave and life-threatening conditions”, and “involving minor children ... in the preaching activity when young children were forced to be in attendance with their parents for discussions at meetings for lengthy periods of time.”

104. The criminal acts committed by the applicants were defined as organising and taking part in a series of religious events in the period between 30 April and 15 August 2011 and giving “extremist speeches” during these meetings. The trial court also found it established that “the elders” of the community “by deceit and by other means” had involved applicant Mr Kruglikov and N.P. in the criminal activity, assigning them to preaching, distributing literature and assisting during the meetings.

105. The Town Court sentenced the “elders” of the community to five years’ imprisonment conditional on five years’ probation and fined them RUB 100,000 each. The other applicants were convicted of membership of an extremist religious organisation and fined between RUB 20,000 and 70,000.

106. The applicants appealed. On 17 March 2016 the Rostov Regional Court corrected an erroneous legal characterisation of the offences in respect of twelve applicants, reduced the amount of their fines and upheld the judgment in the remaining part. On 22 December 2016 and 24 April 2017 the Rostov Regional Court and the Supreme Court of Russia, respectively, refused the applicants leave to appeal to the cassation instance.

*2. Imprisonment of an applicant for “continuing the activities of an extremist organisation” (applications nos. 39417/17 and 44386/19)*

107. Mr Dennis Ole Christensen, a national of Denmark, and his wife, a Russian national, were Jehovah’s Witnesses living in Oryol. By judgment of 14 June 2016, as upheld on appeal on 18 October 2016, the Orlovskiy District Court liquidated and banned the Oryol local religious organisation of Jehovah’s Witnesses (“the Oryol LRO”) on the grounds of possession of “extremist” publications. Mr Christensen was not a member of the Oryol LRO; he was a member of the Tsentralnoye religious group, one of three congregations of Jehovah’s Witnesses without legal-entity status.

108. On 16 February 2017 the Regional Court granted the request of an FSB investigator to conduct covert surveillance of the Kingdom Hall of Jehovah’s Witnesses in Oryol. The surveillance recorded Mr Christensen taking part in Bible-themed discussions.

109. On 25 May 2017 the FSB officers first interrupted the religious service in the Kingdom Hall and carried out a personal search of everyone in attendance. Later they searched Mr Christensen’s flat and arrested him on charges of continuing the activities of an extremist organisation, the Oryol LRO. Following Mr Christensen’s overnight detention, the Sovetskiy District Court authorised his detention on remand, holding that his ten-year-long legal residence in Russia, stable income and a Russian wife were all

insufficient guarantees against absconding in view of his foreign nationality. On 21 June 2017 the Oryol Regional Court upheld the detention order in a summary fashion. Subsequently, the pre-trial detention was extended several times, each time on the same grounds for an additional three- to four-month period. The detention was maintained even after Mr Christensen had obtained, on 15 September 2017, a letter from the Danish embassy in Moscow giving the assurance that the embassy would not issue him with a new passport or otherwise help him leave Russia.

110. On 9 February 2019 the Zheleznodorozhniy District Court in Oryol sentenced Mr Christensen to a six-year term in a general regime penal colony for having continued the activities of an extremist organisation:

“... the liquidation of the [Oryol LRO] did not deprive that organisation’s participants of the possibility to individually perform religious worship that was not associated with the distribution of extremist religious literature. However, it has been established in the case that D. O. Christensen did not individually perform worship but performed administrative functions within the [LRO] in accordance with its goals and plans and with the intent of continuing the organisation’s activity, which he knew had been banned on the basis of a court decision ...

It can be seen from the combined testimony of said individuals that D. O. Christensen was the leader of the LRO ... As an elder, he opened and closed the religious premises. He organised the cleaning of the building and adjacent territory. He assigned persons to be on duty at the entrance before the meeting. He determined who gave sermons and other presentations at the meetings, and designated persons to engage in preaching activity. In the absence of religious literature, he recommended that fellow believers study the literature using electronic devices with access to the Internet. He personally conducted meetings, during which he gave advice, explained the meaning of religious literature and designated the persons participating in the discussion of that literature. He reminded people of the need to donate money and collected the money that was received.”

111. In his appeals, Mr Christensen submitted that his religious activities had been part of his worship and were therefore protected by his right to freedom of religion. He emphasised that he had never been a member of the Oryol LRO.

112. On 23 May 2019 the Oryol Regional Court upheld the judgment on the basis that Mr Christensen “harmonised and coordinated his actions in directing the [Oryol LRO] with the [Administrative Centre] liquidated by the Supreme Court’s judgment dated 20 April 2017”. As to the alleged lack of extremist motives in his conduct, the Regional Court noted:

“The fact of organising the activity of a religious association declared extremist and distributing information that incites religious discord and advocates the exclusivity, superiority and inferiority of citizens based on their attitude toward religion, indicates in itself that the motive behind [his] actions was religious hatred.”

### *3. Further criminal proceedings against Jehovah’s Witnesses*

113. As of 1 September 2021, 559 Jehovah’s Witnesses in Russia have been charged for allegedly organising, participating in or financing the

activity of an “extremist” organisation. Similar to Mr Christensen, 133 Jehovah’s Witnesses have already been convicted and sentenced under Article 282.2 of the Criminal Code; at least 255 Jehovah’s Witnesses have been placed in pre-trial detention or under house arrest, and more than 1,547 homes of Jehovah’s Witnesses have been searched by police.

## RELEVANT LEGAL FRAMEWORK

### I. RUSSIAN LAW

#### A. Suppression of Extremism Act (Law no. 114-FZ of 25 July 2002)

114. Section 1(1) – as worded at the time of the proceedings against the Taganrog LRO – defined “extremist activity (extremism)” as follows:

“– a forcible change of the foundations of the constitutional system and violations of the integrity of the Russian Federation;

– the public justification of terrorism and other terrorist activity;

– the stirring up of social, racial, ethnic or religious discord;

– propaganda about the exceptional nature, superiority or deficiency of persons on the basis of their social, racial, ethnic, religious or linguistic affiliation or attitude to religion;

– violations of human and civil rights and freedoms and lawful interests in connection with a person’s social, racial, ethnic, religious or linguistic affiliation or attitude to religion;

...

– public appeals to carry out the above-mentioned acts or the mass dissemination of knowingly extremist materials, and likewise the production or storage thereof with the aim of mass dissemination;

...

– the organisation of and preparation for the aforementioned actions and inciting others to commit them;

– funding the aforementioned actions or any assistance in organising, preparing or carrying them out, including the provision of training, printing and material/technical support, telephonic or other types of communication links or information services.”

115. Where indicators of extremist activities are identified in the activities of an association, a competent prosecutor or executive body may issue a letter of warning to caution the association against extremist activities. If new indicators of extremist activities are identified within twelve months of the date of the letter, the association is subject to dissolution (section 7).

116. A religious association engaging in “extremist activities resulting in a violation of human and civil rights and freedoms, harm to a person’s health, environment, public order, public safety, property, or the lawful

economic interests of individuals or legal entities, society and the State or creating a real threat of causing such harm” may be liquidated by a judicial decision and its property confiscated (section 9).

117. The grounds for the liquidation of a religious organisation and the banning of its activities are set out in section 14(2) of the Religions Act (Law no. 125-FZ of 26 September 1997). They include in particular the “undermining of social order and security”, “actions aimed at inciting extremist activities”, “forcing the breakup of family”, “infringement on the identity, rights and freedoms of a citizen”, “encouraging suicide or refusal on religious grounds of medical help to persons in life-threatening or health endangering situations”, and “inciting citizens to refuse to fulfill their civic obligations established by law” (see, for details, *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others v. Russia*, no. 302/02, § 77, 10 June 2010).

### **B. Criminal Code**

118. Actions aimed at inciting hatred or enmity and undermining the dignity of an individual or a group of individuals on account of, in particular, ethnic origin, religion or membership of a social group, are punishable with a fine, mandatory works or up to two years’ deprivation of liberty (Article 282(1)). The same acts if committed by an organised group are punishable with up to five years’ imprisonment (Article 282(2)(c)).

119. The establishing or leading of a religious or public association whose activities involve violence or harm to a person’s health, inducement to refuse to perform civic duties or to commit other unlawful acts, may be punishable with up to three years’ imprisonment (Article 239(1)). Participation in the activities of such an association may be punishable by deprivation of liberty for up to two years (Article 239(2)).

### **C. The Mass Media Act (Law no. 2124-1 of 27 December 1991)**

120. Section 4 prohibits mass media from being used for the distribution of extremist materials.

121. Section 32, as worded prior to its repeal on 10 November 2011, established that a broadcasting license could be revoked (1) if it had been obtained fraudulently, (2) if the licencing conditions had been breached and a written warning had been issued, (3) if the license had been secretly transferred to another entity.

### **D. Code of Administrative Offences**

122. Article 20.29 provides that “mass dissemination of extremist materials listed in the published Federal List of Extremist Materials, and also production or possession thereof with the intent to disseminate”, may

be punishable with a fine of between 1,000 and 5,000 Russian roubles or with up to fifteen days' detention.

#### **E. Case-law of the Constitutional Court**

123. On 21 April 2010 the Constitutional Court gave judgment no. 10-P concerning the exercise of the right to appeal by persons who were not parties to the proceedings at first instance. It affirmed its constant position that hearing a claim in the absence of persons whose rights and obligations might have been affected undermined their right to the judicial protection and the principles of fairness and adversarial nature of the proceedings. If a judicial decision affected the rights or freedoms of, or imposed additional obligations on, the person which was not a party to the proceedings, such person should have the right to submit an appeal which a court of appeals would have to consider (paragraph 3.1).

124. On 2 July 2013 the Constitutional Court declared inadmissible a complaint by a member of the Church of Scientology who had seen his copy of a Ron Hubbard's book confiscated on the basis of a Moscow court's decision pronouncing Scientology literature to be extremist material (decision no. 1053-O). In the Constitutional Court's view, the pronouncement of certain materials to be extremist implied *ipso facto* that they represented a real threat to human rights and freedoms, to the constitutional foundations, integrity and security of the Russian Federation. Irrespective of where such material was found, kept or used, the finding of their extremist nature cannot but be followed by a confiscation measure seeking to curtail access to such material and to prevent the threat of their negative impact on anyone, including their owners. The owner must be able to take part in the proceedings in which the extremist nature of the materials is established and their confiscation ordered; otherwise, the constitutional right to the judicial protection of private property would not be secured.

#### **F. Guidance by the Plenary Supreme Court**

125. The Plenary Supreme Court's Resolution on judicial practice in criminal cases concerning extremist offences, no. 11 of 28 June 2011, provides that actions aimed at inciting hatred or enmity were to be understood as comprising in particular the speech justifying or advocating a genocide, mass repression, deportations and other illegal actions, including use of violence against members of a certain ethnicity or race or followers of a certain religion. The criticism of political organisations, ideological and religious associations, political, ideological and religious beliefs, national and religious customs should not, in itself, be regarded as actions aimed at inciting hatred or enmity (paragraph 7).

126. Paragraph 20, as amended by the Plenary Supreme Court on 28 October 2021, reads as follows: “Where there is a final court decision to dissolve or ban the activities of a public or religious association or another organisation in connection with extremist activities, subsequent individual acts unconnected with the continuation or resumption of activities of the extremist organisation concerned that consist solely in the exercise of the right to freedom of conscience and freedom of religion, including through individual or joint religious worship, the performance of religious services or other religious rites and ceremonies, do not in themselves constitute criminal offences under Article 282.2 of the Criminal Code provided they do not contain indicators of extremism”.

127. Experts who carry out a forensic assessment of extremist material may not be requested to resolve issues of law which fall outside their competence and involve a characterisation of the impugned act. Determination of such issues shall be the exclusive competence of a court. In particular, experts may not be requested to answer questions whether a text contains calls for extremist activity or whether material is directed at inciting hatred or enmity (paragraph 23).

## II. COUNCIL OF EUROPE

### A. Parliamentary Assembly

128. In the report on the honouring of obligations and commitments by the Russian Federation (Doc. 13018, 14 September 2012), the Monitoring Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) expressed the concern that the extremism law had been “misused as a tool against the activities of certain religions, particularly Jehovah’s Witnesses, a large community of 162 000 people in Russia” and that the “misuse has dramatically increased since the introduction of amendments to the law in 2006” which removed the phrase “associated with violence or calls to violence” from the definition of “extremism” (paragraphs 497-98).

### B. Venice Commission

129. The Report by the European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission) on the Relationship Between Freedom of Expression and Freedom of Religion (CDL-AD(2008)026, 23 October 2008) emphasised that “the purpose of any restriction on freedom of expression must be to protect individuals holding specific beliefs or opinions rather than to protect belief systems from criticism” and that “it should be allowed to scrutinise, openly debate, and criticise, even harshly and unreasonably, belief systems, opinions, and institutions, as long as this does not amount to advocating hatred against an individual or groups”

(§ 49). The Venice Commission underlined that “religious groups must tolerate, as other groups must, critical public statements and debate about their activities, teachings and beliefs, provided that such criticism does not amount to incitement to hatred and does not constitute incitement to disturb the public peace or to discriminate against adherents of a particular religion” (§ 72). It also stressed that “it must be possible to criticise religious ideas, even if such criticism may be perceived by some as hurting their religious feelings” (§ 76).

130. In its revised opinion on Russia’s Suppression of Extremism Act (CDL(2012)011rev, 1 June 2012), the Venice Commission expressed the opinion that “in order to qualify ‘stirring up of social, racial, ethnic or religious discord’ as ‘extremist activity’, the definition should expressly require the element of violence” (§ 38). In the view of the Commission, “to proclaim as extremist any religious teaching or proselytising activity aimed at proving that a certain worldview is a superior explanation of the universe” could “affect the freedom of conscience or religion of many persons” and could “easily be abused in an effort to suppress a certain church thereby affecting not only the freedom of conscience or religion but also the freedom of association” (§ 40). The Commission concluded that the Suppression of Extremism Act “on account of its broad and imprecise wording” gives “too wide discretion in its interpretation and application, thus leading to arbitrariness” and carries “potential dangers to individuals and NGOs” of being “interpreted in harmful ways” (§§ 77-78).

### **C. European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)**

131. ECRI’s General Policy Recommendation No. 15 on combating hate speech, adopted on 8 December 2015 indicated that “hate speech” should be understood as “the advocacy, promotion or incitement, in any form, of the denigration, hatred or vilification of a person or group of persons, as well as any harassment, insult, negative stereotyping, stigmatization or threat in respect of such a person or group of persons [on account of their characteristics]”, while recognising that “forms of expression that offend, shock or disturb will not on that account alone amount to hate speech”. It recommended the Governments of member States to take action “against the use, in a public context, of hate speech which is intended or can reasonably be expected to incite acts of violence, intimidation, hostility or discrimination” (see, for a fuller citation of the ECRI’s Recommendation, *Karastelev and Others v. Russia*, no. 16435/10, § 44, 6 October 2020).

132. In its fifth periodic report on the Russian Federation (5 March 2019)<sup>1</sup>, ECRI reiterated its concern that “the anti-extremism legislation was

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://rm.coe.int/fifth-report-on-the-russian-federation/1680934a91>. Last accessed on the date of the judgment.



being used against certain minority religions, notably Jehovah’s Witnesses”. It noted that the situation had “deteriorated substantially” since its previous report on account of the 2017 extremism ruling by the Supreme Court which had “effectively bar[red] Jehovah’s Witnesses from practising their faith throughout the country” (§ 101). As regards Jehovah’s Witnesses who had been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment and fines, ECRI recalled that “criminal law has a symbolic effect which raises the awareness of society of the seriousness of the conduct and has a strong dissuasive effect” and did not accept that peaceful practice of a religion “could justify criminal prosecution” (§ 102). ECRI was alarmed at the Plenary Supreme Court’s guidance, according to which parents could be stripped of their parental rights “for involving their children in the activity of a banned public or religious association”, and the Ministry of Education’s recommendation on “resocialisation of adolescents subjected to destructive psychological influence” which named specifically children of members of the ISIS and children in families of Jehovah’s Witnesses”. It considered that “the association of Jehovah’s Witnesses with a terrorist organisation” was “seriously misleading and unreasonable” (§ 103). ECRI expressed concern about those developments, noting that “Jehovah’s Witnesses [were] another group whose departure from ‘traditional values’ [had] prompted persecution and repression” (§ 104).

#### **D. Committee of Ministers**

133. At its 1419th meeting (30 November – 2 December 2021), the Committee of Ministers considered the state of execution of the cases concerning the dissolution of the Moscow community of Jehovah’s Witnesses (*Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, no. 302/02) and the dispersal of a peaceful religious ceremony (*Krupko and Others*, no. 26587/07) (CM/Del/Dec(2021)1419/H46-31). The Ministers’ Deputies reiterated “serious concerns about the 2017 blanket ban criminalising any participation in the activities of this religious group and its alarming effects, evidenced by different sources that, as a consequence of this ban, members of the religious community of the Jehovah’s Witnesses continue to be arrested, prosecuted and imprisoned merely for manifesting their religious beliefs” (§ 3). They called on the Russian authorities “to take all necessary measures to re-establish the right of Jehovah’s Witnesses to freedom of religion, such as by reversing the 2017 ban, re-examining the related criminal cases, as well as reviewing the current anti-extremism legislation” (§ 4).

### III. UNITED NATIONS

#### A. Special Rapporteur

134. The Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Mr Frank La Rue, submitted in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 16/4, A/67/357, of 7 September 2012, listed the elements essential for determining whether an expression constitutes incitement to hatred: “real and imminent danger of violence resulting from the expression”; “intent of the speaker to incite discrimination, hostility or violence”; and “careful consideration by the judiciary of the context in which hatred was expressed, given that international law prohibits some forms of speech for their consequences, and not for their content as such”. The Special Rapporteur emphasised that “any contextual assessment must include consideration of various factors, including the existence of patterns of tension between religious or racial communities, discrimination against the targeted group, the tone and content of the speech, the person inciting hatred and the means of disseminating the expression of hate” (§ 46). The Special Rapporteur reiterated that “no one should be penalized for the dissemination of hate speech unless it has been shown that they did so with the intention of inciting discrimination, hostility or violence” (§ 50 (b)).

#### B. Human Rights Committee

135. The Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee of 31 March 2015 on the seventh periodic report of the Russian Federation on the observance of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (CCPR/C/RUS/7/CO) reflected the Committee’s concerns that “the vague and open-ended definition of ‘extremist activity’ [in Russian law] [did] not require any element of violence or hatred to be present” and that “numerous reports [indicated] that the law [was] increasingly used to curtail freedom of expression, including political dissent, and freedom of religion, targeting, *inter alia*, Jehovah’s Witnesses ...” (§ 22).

#### C. Working Group on Arbitrary Detention

136. In 2019 and 2020 the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention of the UN Human Rights Council adopted three opinions (nos. 11/2019, 34/2019 and 10/2020) concerning more than twenty Jehovah’s Witnesses in Russia who had been held in pre-trial detention, under house arrest or had been imprisoned following conviction on the charges of continuing the activities of an “extremist organisation”. The Working Group found that their deprivation of liberty was arbitrary on four separate grounds.

First, their pre-trial detention had no legal basis as no reasons for that measure had been provided and as their appeals against the detention order had been summarily dismissed.

Second, the arrest and imprisonment were arbitrary because they resulted from the lawful exercise of their human rights. None of the activities imputed to them could be described as being “extremist”, and the sole reason for their arrest and prosecution was “the peaceful exercise of their right to freedom of religion under article 18 of the Covenant”. Their actions had “always been entirely peaceful” and there was no evidence that “[they] or indeed the Jehovah’s Witnesses in the Russian Federation [had] ever been violent or incited others to violence”. The Working Group emphasised that none of the Jehovah’s Witnesses “should have been arrested and held in pre-trial detention and no trial of any of them should take or should have taken place”.

Third, the deprivation of liberty was arbitrary on account of Jehovah’s Witnesses being kept in cages in the courtrooms and the initial arrests being carried out by large numbers of police officers and use of force, even though no one resisted the arrest or was violent, which was indicative of intimidation and a breach of the presumption of innocence.

Fourth, in so far as these individuals were part of a growing number of Jehovah’s Witnesses in Russia who had been arrested, detained and charged with criminal activity on the basis of mere exercise of freedom of religion, their deprivation of liberty was discriminatory on the basis of religion. While noting that its opinion concerned the particular situation of the complainants, the Working Group emphasised that “its findings in this opinion [should] apply to all others in similar situations”.

The Working Group requested the Russian Government “to take the steps necessary to remedy the situation” of the affected individuals “without delay and bring it into conformity with the relevant international norms”. It considered that “the appropriate remedy would be to release [the detained individuals] “immediately” and “unconditionally”, “expunge their criminal records” and “accord them an enforceable right to compensation and other reparations”.

## THE LAW

### I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

137. Having regard to the similar subject matter of the applications, the Court finds it appropriate to examine them jointly in a single judgment.

## II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLES 9, 10 AND 11 OF THE CONVENTION ON ACCOUNT OF FORCED DISSOLUTION OF THE TAGANROG RELIGIOUS ORGANISATION

138. The Court will first consider the complaint of the forced dissolution of the Taganrog local religious organisation (“Taganrog LRO”), the banning of its activities and the declaration of religious literature to be “extremist material” (section A of the Facts). The applicants complained that the measures had breached their rights to freedom of religion, expression and association guaranteed by Articles 9, 10 and 11 of the Convention which read as follows:

### **Article 9 – Freedom of thought, conscience and religion**

“1. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance.

2. Freedom to manifest one’s religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, for the protection of public order, health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.”

### **Article 10 – Freedom of expression**

“1. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority ...

2. The exercise of these freedoms, since it carries with it duties and responsibilities, may be subject to such formalities, conditions, restrictions or penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society, in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others ...”

### **Article 11 – Freedom of assembly and association**

“1. Everyone has the right ... to freedom of association with others ...

2. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of these rights other than such as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others ...”

## **A. Admissibility**

139. The Government submitted that the complaint was inadmissible by virtue of Article 17 of the Convention which prohibits “groups or individuals with totalitarian goals from using the principles provided for in

the Convention for their own interests” (they referred to *W.P. and Others v. Poland* (dec.), no. 42264/98, ECHR 2004-VII (extracts), and *Norwood v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), no. 23131/03, ECHR 2004-XI). In their view, the Court should use the same approach it had followed to declare inadmissible an application by a militant Islamic group which called for the destruction of Israel and killing of its citizens (*Hizb ut-Tahrir and Others v. Germany* (dec.), no. 31098/08, 12 June 2012).

140. The applicants replied that it was a well-established fact that Jehovah’s Witnesses are a religion committed to pacifism (they referred to *Bayatyan v. Armenia* [GC], no. 23459/03, § 111, ECHR 2011). The mere allegation that some persons might be “offended” by their religious publications or by the claim that they displayed a “negative attitude” towards “traditional” religions did not remove them from the protection of Article 10 of the Convention.

141. The Court finds that Article 17 of the Convention has no application to this case. This Article is applicable only “on an exceptional basis” and “in extreme cases”, such as to statements denying crimes against humanity or vilifying entire ethnicities or religions, as is illustrated by the Court’s case-law (see *Paksas v. Lithuania* [GC], no. 34932/04, §§ 87-88, ECHR 2011 (extracts), with further references). The Court cannot find any such expressions in the applicants’ activities or publications.

142. The Court considers that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention. It further notes that it is not inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

## **B. Merits**

### *1. Submissions by the parties*

143. The applicants submitted that the liquidation of the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ organisation deprived believers of a registered religious organisation and exposed them to criminal and administrative liability. The interference was neither “prescribed by law” nor “necessary in a democratic society”. The definition of what constituted “extremism” under Russian law was not sufficiently accessible or foreseeable because it could be misapplied to any religious activities or religious speech, no matter how peaceful. It would be absurd to suggest that Jehovah’s Witnesses had been a threat to “national security” or that the liquidation of their organisations had been necessary to “prevent disorder”. The Russian authorities had previously liquidated the religious organisation of Jehovah’s Witnesses in Moscow using the same allegations that they had used for dissolving the Taganrog and Samara organisations in the instant case. In *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others v. Russia* (no. 302/02, 10 June 2010), the Court had found a violation of Articles 9 and 11 on account of the forced dissolution

of the Moscow community of Jehovah’s Witnesses on similar charges and the same conclusions would apply here.

144. The Government submitted that the interference with the applicants’ rights was lawful and justified. The Taganrog LRO had engaged in illegal activities, including by distributing printed materials which proclaimed the superiority of their religion. It had also been active outside of Taganrog, in two adjacent districts in which it had not established local chapters. The courts had established that Jehovah’s Witnesses had imposed their views on Orthodox believers, incited their followers to refuse medical assistance on religious grounds and to carry the No-Blood card, and involved children in door-to-door preaching without the consent of the other parent.

## 2. *The Court’s assessment*

### (a) **General principles**

145. As enshrined in Article 9, freedom of thought, conscience and religion is one of the foundations of a “democratic society” within the meaning of the Convention. This freedom is, in its religious dimension, one of the most vital elements that go to make up the identity of believers and their conception of life, but it is also a precious asset for atheists, agnostics, sceptics and the unconcerned. The pluralism indissociable from a democratic society, which has been dearly won over the centuries, depends on it (see *Kokkinakis v. Greece*, 25 May 1993, § 31, Series A no. 260-A, and *İzzettin Doğan and Others v. Turkey* [GC], no. 62649/10, § 103, 26 April 2016; for relevant principles under Articles 10 and 11, see *Bédat v. Switzerland* [GC], no. 56925/08, § 48, 29 March 2016, and *Sidiropoulos and Others v. Greece*, 10 July 1998, § 40, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-IV).

### (b) **Existence of interference**

146. The Russian courts’ decision to dissolve the Taganrog LRO and ban its activities had the effect of stripping it of legal personality and preventing it from exercising a wide range of rights reserved under Russian law to registered religious organisations, such as the right to establish places of worship or to hold religious services in public places. The Taganrog LRO ceased to exist as a registered religious organisation and the individual applicants, as its members, were deprived of the right to manifest their religion in community with others and to carry out activities which were an integral element of their religious practice. The Court finds that the forced dissolution of the Taganrog LRO amounted to interference with the organisation’s and its members’ rights under Article 9 of the Convention, which must be interpreted in the light of Article 11 since religious

communities traditionally exist in the form of organised structures (see *Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, §§ 101-03).

147. In so far as the decision also declared a number of Jehovah's Witnesses' publications to be "extremist" resulting in a State-wide ban on their distribution and use in worship, it also interfered with the organisation and its members' right to freedom of religion and the right of the applicant publishers of Jehovah's Witnesses' literature to impart information under Article 10 of the Convention (see *Association Ekin v. France*, no. 39288/98, § 42, ECHR 2001-VIII).

148. The requirements and structure of the three provisions – Articles 9, 10 or 11 of the Convention – are essentially similar. The interference will infringe the Convention unless it can be shown that it was "prescribed by law", pursued one or more of the legitimate aims set out in paragraph 2 of the respective provision and was "necessary in a democratic society" to achieve those aims.

**(c) Justification for the interference**

*(i) General principles*

149. The Court observes at the outset that the interference in question consisted in the dissolution of the applicant religious and the banning of its activities and religious literature, with immediate effect, which are harsh measures entailing significant consequences for the believers (see *Biblical Centre of the Chuvash Republic v. Russia*, no. 33203/08, § 54, 12 June 2014). Such a drastic measure as the forced dissolution would be warranted only in the most serious of cases, as the exceptions to the rights to freedom of religion and association are to be construed strictly and only convincing and compelling reasons can justify restrictions on that freedom (see *Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, §§ 102 and 108, and *Association Rhino and Others v. Switzerland*, no. 48848/07, § 62, 11 October 2011, with further references).

150. When the Court carries out its scrutiny, its task is not to substitute its own view for that of the relevant national authorities but rather to review the decisions they delivered in the exercise of their discretion. This does not mean that it has to confine itself to ascertaining whether the respondent State exercised its discretion reasonably, carefully and in good faith; it must look at the interference complained of in the light of the case as a whole and determine whether it was "proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued" and whether the reasons adduced by the national authorities to justify it are "relevant and sufficient". In so doing, the Court has to satisfy itself that the national authorities applied standards which were in conformity with the principles embodied in the Convention and, moreover, that they based their decisions on an acceptable assessment of the relevant facts (see

*United Communist Party of Turkey and Others v. Turkey*, 30 January 1998, § 47, *Reports* 1998-I).

(ii) “Prescribed by law”

151. On the first limb of its inquiry – whether the interference was “prescribed by law” – the Court notes that the sanction imposed was contained within the range of penalties provided for in the Suppression of Extremism Act and the Religions Act. In that sense, it can be said that the interference was “prescribed by law”. However, the Court’s scrutiny of the lawfulness requirement does not stop at ascertaining that there was a statutory basis for the interference. The Court must be satisfied that the statutory basis, as interpreted by the domestic courts, was sufficiently precise and foreseeable in its application so as to enable the applicants to anticipate the legal consequences of their acts and regulate their conduct accordingly. To that end, the Court will consider individually each of the charges raised against the Taganrog LRO.

(α) On the proclamation of the superiority of Jehovah’s Witnesses

152. The first ground for declaring the Taganrog LRO to be an “extremist” organisation was the charge that its texts stoked religious hatred by casting “traditional” Christian denominations in a negative light, undermining respect for their religious figures, urging people to leave those religions, and proclaiming the superiority of the religion of Jehovah’s Witnesses (see paragraph 18 above).

153. The Court reiterates that preference for one’s own religion, the perception of it as unique and the only true one or as a “superior explanation of the universe” is a cornerstone of almost any religious system, as is the assessment of the other faiths as “false”, “wrong” or “not conducive to salvation” (see *Ibragim Ibragimov and Others v. Russia*, nos. 1413/08 and 28621/11, §§ 116-17, 28 August 2018). Proclaiming the superiority of a particular religious dogma or conception of life is an essential aspect of a legitimate exercise of the right to try to convert others by means of non-coercive persuasion which enjoys the protection under Article 9 of the Convention (see *Kokkinakis*, cited above, § 48, and *Larissis and Others v. Greece*, 24 February 1998, §§ 51 and 59, *Reports* 1998-I). In the absence of expressions that seek to incite or justify violence or hatred based on religious intolerance, any religious entity or individual believers have the right to proclaim and defend their doctrine as the true and superior one and to engage in religious disputes and criticism seeking to prove the truth of one’s own and the falsity of others’ dogmas or beliefs (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Gündüz v. Turkey*, no. 35071/97, § 51, ECHR 2003-XI).

154. The Regional Court attached significant weight to the fact that Orthodox priests and believers felt offended by the texts of Jehovah’s



Witnesses. The Court reiterates that, in a pluralist and democratic society, those who exercise their right to freedom of religion, whether as members of a religious majority or a minority, cannot reasonably expect to be shielded from exposure to ideas that may offend, shock or disturb. They must tolerate and accept the denial by others of their religious beliefs and even the propagation by others of doctrines hostile to their faith (see *Otto-Preminger-Institut v. Austria*, 20 September 1994, § 47, Series A no. 295-A, and *Sekmadienis Ltd. v. Lithuania*, no. 69317/14, § 81, 30 January 2018). Religious people may be genuinely offended by claims that others' religion is superior to theirs. However, just because a remark may be perceived as offensive or insulting by particular individuals or groups does not mean that it constitutes "hate speech". Although such sentiments are understandable, they cannot in themselves set limits on freedom of expression, let alone inhibit the enjoyment of freedom of religion by others (see *Ibragim Ibragimov and Others*, cited above, § 115, and paragraph 130 above).

155. The key issue is thus whether the expressions in question, when read as a whole and in their context, could be seen as promoting violence, hatred or intolerance (see *Perinçek v. Switzerland* [GC], no. 27510/08, § 240, ECHR 2015 (extracts)). Inciting to hatred does not necessarily entail a call for an act of violence, or other criminal acts. Attacks on individuals committed by insulting, holding up to ridicule or slandering vulnerable groups of the population can be a sufficient ground warranting the suppression of such speech (see *Féret v. Belgium*, no. 15615/07, § 73, 16 July 2009, and *Vejdeland and Others v. Sweden*, no. 1813/07, § 55, 9 February 2012).

156. The Regional Court's judgment did not identify any expressions promoting violence, hatred or intolerance in the texts of the Jehovah's Witnesses' publication which it held to be "extremist". Even accepting that the texts promoted the idea that the religion of Jehovah's Witnesses was superior to others or that it was better to be a Jehovah's Witness than a member of another Christian denomination, it is significant that the texts did not insult, hold up to ridicule or slander non-Witnesses; nor did they use abusive terms in respect of them or of matters regarded as sacred by them (see *Ibragim Ibragimov and Others*, cited above, § 117, with further references). The Court concurs with the Venice Commission in that there is nothing extremist about criticising, "even harshly and unreasonably, belief systems, opinions, and institutions, as long as this does not amount to advocating hatred against an individual or groups" (see paragraph 130 above). Peacefully seeking to convince others of the superiority of one's own religion and urging them to abandon "false religions" and join the "true one" is a legitimate form of exercise of the right to freedom of religion and freedom of expression which enjoys the protection under Articles 9 and 10 of the Convention.

157. For the Court, it is highly significant that no evidence of violence, hatred or coercion was adduced in the proceedings against the Taganrog LRO. Both the applicants' religious activities and the content of their publications appear to have been peaceful in line with their professed doctrine of non-violence. It was not shown that anyone, whether members of the Taganrog LRO or third parties, had been forced, prevailed upon or pressured into following religious injunctions against his or her will. The courts failed to identify evidence of the use of any improper methods to persuade others to prefer the religion of Jehovah's Witnesses. Not one of the banned publications was found to contain calls or incitement to violence or any insulting, slanderous or discriminatory statements against members of other faiths.

158. It follows that the Russian authorities failed to put forward any elements which, according to the Court's case-law, could have warranted interference with the applicants' rights to freedom of religion, expression or association. The Court concurs with the assessment by the Venice Commission, the Monitoring Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, and the UN Human Rights Committee that the interference with the applicants' fundamental rights was made possible because of the overly broad definition of "extremism" in Russian law (see paragraphs 128, 130 and 135, and also *Ibragim Ibragimov and Others*, cited above, § 85). The Court reiterates that it is vitally important that criminal law provisions directed against expressions that stir up, promote or justify violence, hatred or intolerance clearly and precisely define the scope of relevant offences, and that those provisions be strictly construed in order to avoid a situation where the State's discretion to prosecute for such offences becomes too broad and potentially subject to abuse through selective enforcement (see *Savva Terentyev v. Russia*, no. 10692/09, § 85, 28 August 2018). The protection against arbitrariness is also an aspect or element or function of the principle of effectiveness as a norm of international law. However, the extremely broad definition of "extremist activities" in section 1 of the Suppression of Extremism Act which does not require any elements of violence or hatred opens up the possibility of having individuals and organisations prosecuted on extremism charges for entirely peaceful forms of expression or worship, such as those pursued by the applicants in the instant case. That broad definition of "extremism" not only could – and did – lead to arbitrary prosecutions, but also prevented individuals or organisations from being able to anticipate that their conduct, however peaceful and devoid of hatred or animosity it was, could be categorised as "extremist" and censured with restrictive measures. As the Venice Commission observed, "where definitions are lacking the necessary precision, a law such as the Extremism Law dealing with very sensitive rights ... can be interpreted in harmful ways" and misused for the

prosecution of believers or religious ministers on the basis of the content of their beliefs alone (see paragraphs 130 and 135 above).

159. Accordingly, the Court finds that the definitions of “extremism” and “extremist activities” in section 1 of the Suppression of Extremism Act, as formulated and applied in practice by the Russian authorities, fell short of the lawfulness requirement. Furthermore, the facts of the present case demonstrate that a judicial review of the charges against the Taganrog LRO did not provide adequate and effective safeguards against an excessively broad interpretation of the concept of “extremism” by the prosecution authorities. In considering the charges, the courts failed to examine the matter in the light of the principles established in the Court’s case-law. The impermissibly broad definition of “extremist activities”, coupled with a lack of judicial safeguards, is sufficient for a finding of a violation on the basis that the interference on the charge of “proclaiming superiority” was not “prescribed by law”.

(β) The other charges

160. As regards the other charges levelled against the Taganrog LRO under section 14 of the Religions Act, the Court is prepared to assume, as it did in the previous case of *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow*, that the interference was “prescribed by law” and pursued the legitimate aims of the protection of health and the rights of others (see *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, §§ 105 and 107). It will consider the justification for those charges from the standpoint of the necessity requirement (*ibid.*, § 108).

(iii) “Necessary in a democratic society”

(α) On the refusal of medical assistance

161. The Rostov court held the Taganrog LRO responsible for causing death of its founding member S. by encouraging her to refuse a blood transfusion (see paragraph 19 above).

162. The Court has found that the provisions of Russian law on “the incitement to refuse medical assistance” reflect the assumption that the State’s power to protect believers from the harmful consequences of their medical choices ought to override the right to respect for their private life and the freedom to manifest their religion in practice and observance (see *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 134). However, the freedom to accept or refuse specific medical treatment or to select the alternative form of treatment is vital to the principles of self-determination and personal autonomy. For this freedom to be meaningful, patients must have the right to make choices that accord with their own views and values, regardless of how irrational, unwise or imprudent such choices may appear to others. A competent adult patient is free to decide, for instance, whether

or not to undergo surgery or, by the same token, to have a live blood transfusion or to prefer artificial blood substitutes. Free choice and self-determination are fundamental constituents of life and that, absent any indication of the need to protect public health, the State must abstain from interfering with the individual freedom of choice in the sphere of health care, for such interference can only lessen and not enhance the value of life (ibid., §§ 135-36, and *Vavříčka and Others v. the Czech Republic* [GC], nos. 47621/13 and 5 others, § 276, 8 April 2021).

163. This position has been reflected in Russian law which safeguards the patients' freedom of choice in the sphere of medical assistance. The Fundamentals of Russian Legislation on Health Protection, in force at the material time, and the Health Protection Act (Law no. 323-FZ of 21 November 2011), which replaced it with effect from 1 January 2012, have established the patients' right to refuse a specific medical treatment or to request its discontinuation on condition that they have received full and accessible information about the possible consequences of that decision (see *Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 137).

164. The informed-consent requirement is particularly relevant in the circumstances of the instant case in which the refusal of blood transfusion had been formulated by an adult Jehovah's Witness having capacity to make medical decisions for herself. However, the fact that she had exercised her legal right to refuse a specific form of medical treatment was not addressed or mentioned in the domestic judgments. For the Court, the crucial legal test in this situation is whether the refusal was an expression of the person's authentic will or whether the degree of external influence brought to bear on the person had been such as to persuade him or her to depart from his or her own wishes (ibid., § 138). Yet, nothing in the domestic judgments suggests that any form of improper pressure or undue influence was applied. There is no evidence that she wavered in her refusal of a blood transfusion upon admission to hospital. There was accordingly no factual basis for claiming that her will was overborne or that the refusal of a blood transfer did not represent her true or genuine decision.

165. In the absence of any evidence of improper pressure, the refusal of blood transfusion was an expression of free will of a community member exercising her right to personal autonomy in the sphere of health care protected both under the Convention and in Russian law. The imputation of Ms S.'s death to the Taganrog LRO solely because Jehovah's Witnesses preach the doctrinal importance of abstaining from blood transfusions in their religious literature amounted to a declaration that their religious beliefs relating to the sacred nature of blood were illegitimate (see *Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 141). The Court reiterates that States do not have the right under the Convention to decide what beliefs may or may not be taught because the right to freedom of religion as guaranteed under the Convention excludes any discretion on the part of the

State to determine whether religious beliefs or the means used to express such beliefs are legitimate (see *Manoussakis and Others v. Greece*, 26 September 1996, § 47, *Reports* 1996-IV, and *Hasan and Chaush v. Bulgaria* [GC], no. 30985/96, § 78, ECHR 2000-XI).

(β) On the abandonment of civic duties

166. The Rostov court further held it against the Taganrog LRO that a conscript had requested alternative civilian service unconnected with military facilities as a result of talking to other conscripts who tried to convince him “not to serve” (see paragraph 20 above).

167. It is a well-known fact that Jehovah’s Witnesses are a religious group committed to pacifism and that their doctrine prevents individual members from performing military service, wearing uniform or taking up weapons (see *Thlimmenos v. Greece* [GC], no. 34369/97, § 42, ECHR 2000-IV). Jehovah’s Witnesses agree to carry out alternative civilian service on condition it is not connected with military organisations (see *Faizov v. Russia* (dec.), no. 19820/04, 15 January 2009). Russia’s Constitution (Article 59 § 3) and the Religions Act (section 3 § 4) explicitly recognise the right of Russian nationals to conscientious objection to military service in which case it may be substituted with alternative civilian service. The right to alternative civilian service has been consistently upheld by the Russian courts, including in cases where it was exercised by a Jehovah’s Witness (see *Faizov*, cited above).

168. The Court reiterates that the right “to try to convince one’s neighbour” is an essential element of religious freedom (see *Kokkinakis*, cited above, § 31, and *Larissis and Others*, cited above, § 45). In the *Larissis* case the Court drew a distinction between the position of servicemen who had found it difficult to withdraw from religious conversations initiated by their superiors, and that of civilians who had not been subject to pressures and constraints of the same kind as military personnel. The former could be viewed as a form of harassment or the application of improper pressure, whereas the latter would be seen as an innocuous exchange of ideas (see *Larissis and Others*, §§ 51, 54, and 59).

169. In the instant case, the discussion about military service took place among conscripts, with Jehovah’s Witnesses trying to convince others of the virtue of their pacifist beliefs and sharing their religious literature with them. The conscripts were peers, there was no formal hierarchy among them, no superiors or subordinates. The domestic courts did not establish that any harassment or improper pressure had been brought to bear on the conscripts who were not Jehovah’s Witnesses. They were free to withdraw from the conversation or refuse to engage with the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ arguments. The religious admonishment to refuse military service did not break any Russian laws and the Jehovah’s Witnesses were entitled to seek to

persuade others that they should prefer alternative civilian service instead of taking up weapons.

170. For the Court, it is obvious that choosing one of the two legally available alternatives does not amount to incitement to abandon the civil duties. In the absence of any evidence of improper pressure, holding the Taganrog LRO responsible for disseminating pacifist convictions among conscripts also amounted to an impermissible judgment on the legitimacy of Jehovah’s Witnesses’ beliefs and means of their expression.

(γ) On the involvement of minors

171. The Rostov court held the Taganrog LRO liable for violating children’s right to leisure and recreation as a result of their participation in door-to-door preaching and religious meetings, despite the objections of a non-religious parent. It also held that the children did not thrive because all recreational activities were taking place “with the participation of other members of the organisation” and because they did not attend any sports, music or hobby groups (see paragraph 21 above).

172. The Court has held that the decisions of Jehovah’s Witnesses regarding their employment, celebration of events significant to them, and allocation of free time are all matters falling the sphere of “private life” of community members (see *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 117). It is a common feature of many religions that they determine doctrinal standards of behaviour by which their followers must abide in their private lives, including matters such as attendance at church services, performance of rituals, wearing specific clothes or observing dietary restrictions. Jehovah’s Witnesses’ regulations on engaging in door-to-door preaching and attendance at religious meetings are no different from similar limitations that other religions impose on their followers’ private lives. By obeying these precepts in their daily lives, believers manifest their desire to comply strictly with the religious doctrine they profess and their freedom to do so is guaranteed by Article 9 of the Convention (*ibid.*, § 118). An interference with that freedom may only be permissible if their choices are incompatible with the key principles underlying the Convention, such as polygamous or underage marriage or a flagrant breach of gender equality, or if they are imposed on the believers by force or coercion, against their will (*ibid.*, § 119, with further references).

173. The Court reiterates that Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 requires the State to respect the rights of parents to ensure education and teaching in conformity with their own religious convictions and that Article 5 of Protocol No. 7 establishes that spouses enjoy equality of rights in their relations with their children. Russia’s Religions Act does not make religious education of children conditional on the existence of an agreement between the parents. Both parents, even in a situation where they adhere to differing doctrines or beliefs, have the right to raise their children in accordance with

their religious or non-religious convictions and any disagreements between them in relation to the necessity and extent of the children's participation in religious practices and education are private disputes that are to be resolved according to the procedure established in family law (*ibid.*, § 125).

174. The Court finds no legal or factual basis for the Regional Court's finding that the children's alleged lack of participation in sports, music or hobby groups was detrimental to their development or imputable to the Taganrog LRO. There is no single normative parenting style or mandatory set of parenting practices, and the general conclusion that such are elements of a harmonious development, regardless of the age or circumstances of a child, would normally be supported by evidence of scientific, legal or social consensus, which was not the case here. It is significant that, in reaching its findings, the Regional Court did not hear any evidence from the children themselves and did not identify any instances of abuse, coercion or non-consensual involvement of children in the religious practices.

175. As long as there is no evidence of abuse, violence or unlawful coercion, decisions about whether to give a child a religious or non-religious education, whether to involve him or her in sports, science, arts or music, whether to provide unstructured free time or a strict daily routine, and whether to keep company with like-minded people, are to be made exclusively by the child's parents or, as the case may be, the custodial parent. Such decisions fall within the sphere of the private and family life which is protected from unjustified State interference. It follows that what was taken by the Russian courts to constitute impermissible involvement of minors was in fact a manifestation of the parents' beliefs in their private lives in the sense protected by Article 9 (*ibid.*, § 121).

176. Lastly, the Regional Court did not give any reasons for the finding that the Taganrog LRO should be held responsible for the parents' decision to involve their children in religious activities. Russia's Religions Act prohibits those who are not parents or substitute parents from coercing a child into participation in religious practices or education (*ibid.*, §§ 73 and 124). In holding the Taganrog LRO responsible, the Regional Court did not point to any evidence showing that the organisation itself or any non-parent members of the organisation had resorted to improper methods for involving minors in its activities, whether against their own will or that of their parents. On the contrary, the involvement of children in the community's religious life appears to have been approved and encouraged by one of the parents who had been a Jehovah's Witness himself or herself. Thus, the situation which had been imputed to the organisation had not actually been related to anything the organisation did or did not do, but to the actions of its individual members who were parents of those children (*ibid.*, § 124).

## (δ) On the destruction of family relationships

177. The Rostov court found that the Taganrog LRO encouraged the “destruction of family relationships” in that it had forced the families of its members to break up (see paragraph 22 above).

178. The Court has previously found, in relation of a similar charge, that, in so far as the Russian courts did not give examples of any coercive, forceful or threatening action on the part of the applicant organisation, what was taken by the courts to constitute “coercion into destroying the family” was the frustration that non-Witness family members experienced as a consequence of disagreements over the manner in which their Witness relatives decided to organise their lives in accordance with the religious precepts, and their increasing isolation resulting from having been left outside the life of the community to which their Witness relatives adhered. It is a known fact that a religious way of life requires from its followers both abidance by religious rules and self-dedication to religious work that can take up a significant portion of the believer’s time. Nevertheless, as long as self-dedication to religious matters is the product of the believer’s independent and free decision and however unhappy his or her family members may feel about that decision, the ensuing estrangement cannot be taken to mean that the religion caused the break-up in the family. Quite often, the opposite is true: it is the resistance and unwillingness of non-religious family members to accept and to respect their religious relative’s freedom to manifest and practise his or her religion that is the source of conflict. It is true that friction often exists in marriages where the spouses belong to different religious denominations or one of the spouses is a non-believer. However, this situation is common to all mixed-belief marriages and Jehovah’s Witnesses are no exception (*ibid.*, §§ 110-11).

179. The Court is not satisfied that the Regional Court’s findings were based on an acceptable assessment of facts. There was nothing to indicate that the religious organisation had made any demands on its members as a condition for continuing their family relationship or, in the other sense, that it had imposed any kind of condition or made any demands on non-Witness members of the families of its followers under threat of breaking up their family relationship.

180. In addition, the way in which the Regional Court dealt with witness evidence was tainted by bias against Jehovah’s Witnesses. Its decision on the credibility of testimony had nothing to do with its factual accuracy but referred, as the sole criterion, to the witnesses’ affiliation with the religion of Jehovah’s Witnesses. The evidence of a harmonious family life given by four Jehovah’s Witnesses and the non-religious spouse of a Jehovah’s Witness had not been shown to be untrue. However, the Regional Court refused to accept it, finding the members of the Taganrog LRO to be inherently unreliable witnesses, while at the same time accepting as reliable



the evidence from the aggrieved non-believer spouses and a member of an Orthodox entity (see paragraph 22 above).

(ε) On the encroachment on the rights of others

181. Lastly, the Rostov court established that the Taganrog LRO had encroached on the rights of its members by determining how they were spending their free time and prohibiting them from celebrating holidays and birthdays. It also encroached on the rights of those whom Jehovah’s Witnesses had visited at their homes without invitation (see paragraph 23 above).

182. On the first limb of the charge, the Court reiterates that the right of Jehovah’s Witnesses to organise their lives, including their daily routines, in accordance with the precepts of their religion is protected by Article 9 of the Convention (see paragraph 172 above). The Russian courts did not cite any evidence showing that members of the Taganrog LRO had been forced or prevailed upon to devote their free time to preaching and Bible study or to abstain from celebrating State holidays or personal events (*ibid.*, § 120). Moreover, the Court reiterates that “participation in celebrations during State holidays” is not a civil duty as defined by law. In fact, there is no law compelling celebration of any holidays, whether secular or religious, and such compulsory participation in celebrations, had it been elevated to the rank of a legal obligation, could arguably have raised an issue under Articles 9 and 10 of the Convention (compare *Efstathiou v. Greece*, 18 December 1996, § 32, *Reports* 1996-VI, concerning the participation of Jehovah’s Witness children in a school parade).

183. The allegation that the Witnesses’ practice of door-to-door preaching had invaded the privacy of others was not supported with any evidence. As the Court observed in the *Kokkinakis* case, “bearing Christian witness ... [is] an essential mission and a responsibility of every Christian and every Church” which has to be distinguished from improper proselytism that takes the form of offering material or social advantages with a view to gaining new members for a church, exerting improper pressure on people in distress or in need or even using violence or brainwashing (see *Kokkinakis*, cited above, § 48). The Regional Court did not cite a single case in which members of the Taganrog LRO had resorted to such abusive or improper methods or had trespassed into anyone’s home. There is nothing to indicate that non-religious people were forced to talk to them or compelled to open the door and let them in.

(στ) Nature and severity of the penalty

184. The Court has thus found that none of the charges against the Taganrog LRO were borne out by an adequate assessment of facts or justified with “relevant and sufficient” reasons. It considers nevertheless

that the particular character of the interference in the present case entailing as it does significant consequences for the believers requires it to consider briefly the issue whether a sanction of that nature and severity could be justified as being “necessary in a democratic society” (see *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 154).

185. The Court reiterates that, to discharge their duty to uphold the right to freedom of religion in democratic societies in which several religions coexist within one and the same population, States have responsibility for ensuring, neutrally and impartially, the exercise of various religions, faiths and beliefs. Their role is to help maintain public order, religious harmony and tolerance, including in relations between the adherents of various religions, faiths and beliefs. Since States are not allowed to assess the legitimacy of religious beliefs or the ways in which those beliefs are expressed, the role of the authorities is not to remove the cause of tension by eliminating pluralism, but to ensure that the competing groups tolerate each other (see *Ibragim Ibragimov and Others*, cited above, § 90, with further references).

186. As in a previous case concerning the forced dissolution of the Moscow congregation of Jehovah’s Witnesses, the Court finds that a blanket ban on the activities of a religious community belonging to a known Christian denomination is an extraordinary occurrence (see *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 155). It is even more extraordinary when such measure is imposed on grounds of the protection of members of a majority religion from attempts to convince them peacefully of the superiority of a minority religion (see paragraphs 153-156 above). The free exchange of ideas is what characterises a democratic society. As the Court has held, democracy does not simply mean that the views of a majority must always prevail: a balance must be achieved which ensures the fair treatment of people from minorities and avoids any abuse of a dominant position (see *İzzettin Doğan and Others*, cited above, § 109).

187. As the Court has found above, the proceedings resulting in the banning of the Taganrog LRO were based on the assessment of Jehovah’s Witnesses’ religious beliefs and practices rather than on any evidence of incitement to hatred or violence (see paragraphs 165 and 170 above). Before the decision dissolving it was made, the local religious organisation of Jehovah’s Witnesses in Taganrog had been in existence and operated legally for more than seventeen years, from 1992 to 2009. Throughout that period, the organisation, its elders or members had not been held liable for any criminal or administrative offence or a civil wrong; no such evidence was produced in the domestic dissolution proceedings or before the Court. Remarkably, an inquiry into the cause of death of a founding member of the organisation in 2004 did not begin until three years later, after first the deputy Prosecutor General and later the regional prosecutor had instructed their subordinates to investigate communities of Jehovah’s Witnesses and

lodge applications for liquidation of their organisations (see paragraphs 8 and 10 above). The regional prosecutor’s letter appeared to consider “violations of law [committed by Jehovah’s Witnesses]” to be an established fact, disclosing a predisposed bias against Jehovah’s Witnesses and a determination to achieve the desired outcome of terminating the legal existence of their organisation. By instituting and conducting the extremism proceedings in the absence of any evidence of hatred or violence on the part of the applicants, the Russian authorities had not acted in good faith and had breached the State’s duty of neutrality and impartiality vis-à-vis the applicants’ religious organisation (see *Kuznetsov and Others v. Russia*, no. 184/02, § 74, 11 January 2007; *Members of the Gldani Congregation of Jehovah’s Witnesses and Others v. Georgia*, no. 71156/01, §§ 131 and 132, 3 May 2007; and *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 157). This was also incompatible with the principle of effectiveness which requires that the permissible exceptions to the right to freedom of association must be narrowly interpreted so as to give practical and effective protection to that freedom (see *Sidiropoulos and Others*, cited above, § 38, and *Demir and Baykara v. Turkey* [GC], no. 34503/97, § 146, ECHR 2008).

188. The judicial decisions brought an end to the legal form of existence of an entire religious community and imposed an indefinite ban on its activities. The Court reiterates that this was obviously the most severe form of interference, affecting, as it did, the rights of many local congregations and hundreds of individual Jehovah’s Witnesses who were consequently denied the possibility of joining with fellow believers in prayer and observance (see *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 159). The additional confiscation order deprived the applicants of many items of religious literature and the prayer hall, leaving them without a place where to come for worship and Bible study. The Court reiterates that, if a religious community cannot have a place to worship, the right to freedom of religion in its collective dimension will be devoid of all substance (see *Association for Solidarity with Jehovah’s Witnesses and Others v. Turkey*, nos. 36915/10 and 8606/13, § 90, 24 May 2016). Most importantly, the finding of the “extremist” nature of the religious organisation and their publications exposed the applicants to the risk of criminal prosecution which did not fail to materialise (see paragraphs 95-106 above). The domestic courts, faced with a decision of such a sweeping scope which was to curtail the fundamental rights of many believers, did not even acknowledge, let alone consider at any length, the effect of the dissolution, banning and confiscation orders on the applicants’ rights under Articles 9, 10 and 11 of the Convention or their domestic-law equivalents (see *Perinçek*, cited above, § 277, and *Ibragim Ibragimov and Others*, cited above, § 107). Accordingly, the Court finds that the interference was also not “necessary in a democratic society”.

*(iv) Conclusion*

189. Having regard to the foregoing, the Court concludes that the interference was not “prescribed by law” in so far as it was based on the provisions of section 1(1) of the Suppression of Extremism Act and that it was also not “necessary in a democratic society”. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 9 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 11, on account of the forced dissolution of Taganrog LRO and a violation of Article 10 of the Convention on account of the declaration of Jehovah’s Witnesses’ publications “extremist”.

### III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLES 9, 10 AND 11 OF THE CONVENTION ON ACCOUNT OF THE BANNING OF JEHOVAH’S WITNESSES PUBLICATIONS AND PROSECUTION FOR THEIR USE IN RELIGIOUS MINISTRY

190. The Court will next consider the applicants’ complaints relating to the banning of Jehovah’s Witnesses’ religious publications as extremist material (section B of the Facts) and also the prosecution of individual Jehovah’s Witnesses and forced dissolution of their organisations for using such publications in religious ministry (sections C and D of the Facts). The applicants complained that such actions by the Russian authorities had been in breach of Articles 9, 10 and 11 of the Convention.

#### **A. Admissibility**

191. The Government submitted that the complaints by Mr Fedorin and Ms Chekhovskaya in application no. 17552/11 were belated as the application form was dated more than six months after the final decisions in their cases. The applicants replied that the date of introduction should be the date of the letter stating their intention to lodge an application with the Court. As that letter had been sent within six months of the final decisions, their complaints were not belated.

192. In accordance with its practice and the Rules of Court, as they applied at the material time, the Court considered the date of the introduction of an application to be the date of the first communication indicating an intention to lodge an application and giving some indication of its nature. Such first communication was in principle sufficient to interrupt the running of the six-month period, provided that it was followed up by the submission of the completed application form within the time-limit fixed by the Court (see *Yartsev v. Russia* (dec.), no. 13776/11, §§ 21-22, 26 March 2013). In application no. 17552/11, on 28 March 2011 the Court acknowledged receipt of the introductory letter of 11 March and asked the applicants to return the completed application form no later than 23 May, which they actually did on 20 May. The date of introduction is therefore

11 March 2011. As that date was less than six months from the dates of the final decisions (see paragraphs 53-54 above), the complaints are not belated.

193. The Government also claimed that the complaint was inadmissible by virtue of Article 17 of the Convention. The Court has dismissed the Government's identical objection in paragraph 141 above and does not need to revisit this finding.

194. The Court further notes that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention or inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

## **B. Merits**

### *1. Submissions by the parties*

195. The applicants submitted that the ban on religious publications had interfered with their ability to study and discuss religious texts and exposed them to criminal and administrative liability for using the publications the courts declared "extremist". The courts had banned the publications simply because they demonstrated a negative attitude toward various elements of traditional Christianity and urged people to leave other Christian religions. Yet peaceful disagreements about religious doctrine and practices were at the heart of religious pluralism guaranteed by Article 9, and the right "to try to convince one's neighbour" was an essential element of religious freedom. The expert assessment of the publications amounted to an impermissible State evaluation of the legitimacy of their religious beliefs but, even so, the experts concurred that the publications did not contain calls or incitement to violence, and the Government did not argue otherwise. The publications had not been gratuitously offensive, disrespectful or hateful. They had been sincere statements of religious belief on the interpretation and application of scriptures from the Bible. In the case of the Samara LRO, the applicants alleged that the banned literature had been planted on its premises by police officers disguised as "electricity inspectors". When they had come back in uniform, they had known where precisely to look and found seven copies of brochures in a closed box in the cloakroom. Using planted evidence as a basis for dissolving the organisation rendered the interference unlawful. In addition, holding the Samara LRO liable for the activities of its congregations contradicted the position of Russia's Supreme Court which held that religious groups, such as congregations, could not be part of the structure of religious organisations. Mr Moskvina had not been the director or member of the Samara LRO, and his conviction was not imputable to the organisation. Finally, it was disproportionate to punish the Samara LRO with a modest fine in the administrative proceedings and, less than three months later, to pronounce the most severe sanction, the forced dissolution, without any further alleged violations by the Samara LRO.

196. The Government submitted the applicants’ rights to freedom of religion and expression had to be weighed against the public interest in the protection of national security and the prevention of disorder or extremist offences. Distribution of extremist material was not a form of lawful exercise of the applicant’s rights under Articles 9 and 10 of the Convention. The Russian courts had thoroughly and comprehensively scrutinised the publications and upheld the prosecutor’s claim that, even though the literature of Jehovah’s Witnesses did not contain direct calls for violence or incitement to violence, it nevertheless offended religious feelings, incited religious enmity, provoked inter-faith conflicts and encouraged relinquishment of civil duties. The individual applicants had been brought to administrative liability for breaching the ban on disseminating extremist material, not for their religious convictions or for the exercise of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly. In the case of the Samara LRO, there had existed a close connection between the Novokuybyshevsk community and the Samara LRO. The latter had rented the place where the former had celebrated religious services. The Novokuybyshevsk community had not sent a notice to the municipal authorities to inform them of its existence as an independent religious group; instead, it had functioned as part of the Samara LRO. By keeping the publications which it ought to have known to have been extremist, the Samara LRO had maliciously carried on its extremist activities after the prosecutor’s warning. In those circumstances, after preventive measures had turned out to be ineffective, the Russian courts had deemed liquidation to be the only appropriate sanction.

## 2. *The Court’s assessment*

### (a) **Existence of interference**

197. There is no dispute between the parties that declaring Jehovah’s Witnesses’ publications “extremist” and sanctioning the applicants for the possession or distribution of the publications amounted to “interference by a public authority” with their right to freedom of expression under Article 10 of the Convention which must be interpreted in the light of Article 9 to take account of the religious nature of the publications and their intended use it for religious purposes. As the Court stated, the “collective study and discussion of religious texts by the members of the religious group of Jehovah’s Witnesses [is] a recognised form of manifestation of their religion in worship and teaching” (see *Kuznetsov and Others*, cited above, § 57). The ban on publications also interfered with the rights of the applicant publishers of the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ literature (see paragraph 147 above).

198. In so far as possession of prohibited publications was relied upon as a ground for the forced dissolution of a religious organisation, the complaint must be considered as an instance of interference with the applicants’ right to freedom of association safeguarded by Article 11 of the Convention,

interpreted in the light of Article 9. Such interference will infringe the Convention unless it can be shown that it has satisfied the requirements of the second paragraph of those provisions.

**(b) Justification for the interference**

199. The general principles regarding freedom of expression and religion have been summarised in the case of *Ibragim Ibragimov and Others*, cited above, §§ 88-99. In its assessment of the interference with freedom of expression in cases concerning allegedly extremist speech, the Court takes into account such factors as the existence of a tense political or social background; the presence of calls for – or a justification of – violence, hatred or intolerance, the manner in which the statements were made, and their potential to lead to harmful consequences. It is normally not sufficient that the interference was imposed because its subject-matter fell within a particular category or was caught by a legal rule formulated in general terms; what is rather required is that it was necessary in the specific circumstances (see also *Perinçek*, cited above, §§ 205-08).

200. The Court notes that the Russian courts banned the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ publications as “extremist” on the grounds that they incited religious hatred and discord by proclaiming the “superiority” of the “true” religion of Jehovah’s Witnesses and “hostility” to other “false” religions or their ministers and that they encouraged relinquishment of civic duties and military service. However, no elements of violence, hatred, abuse, insults, ridicule or calls for anyone’s exclusion or discrimination have been identified in any of the publications (see paragraphs 30, 31, 34, 36, 40, 43, 45 and 47 above). There is no indication that the domestic courts perceived the texts in question as capable of leading to public disturbances or unrest. Neither the domestic courts nor the Government referred to any circumstances indicative of a sensitive background at the material time. Although the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ publications have been widely available in many countries for decades, including in Russia, the Government have not submitted any evidence that they have caused interreligious tensions or led to any harmful consequences or violence, in Russia or elsewhere (see, for similar reasoning, *Öztürk v. Turkey* [GC], no. 22479/93, § 69, ECHR 1999-VI).

201. The Court has found above that peaceful and non-violent attempts to persuade others of the virtues of one’s own religion and the flaws of others and to urge them to abandon “false religions” and join the “true one” is a legitimate form of exercising the rights to freedom of religion and expression, and that it was also permissible to seek to convince others to prefer alternative civilian service (see paragraphs 156 and 170 above). It has also found that the banning of Jehovah’s Witnesses’ publications solely on that basis, in the absence of any statements advocating violence, hatred or intimidation, was only possible because the definition of “extremism” in

Russian law was overly broad and could be, and had been, applied to entirely peaceful forms of expression (see paragraph 158 above). This sweeping definition enabled the Russian authorities to restrict the distribution of non-violent religious publications but also prevented publishers and users of the publications to anticipate, on account of its lacking the necessary precision, which publications could be categorised as “extremist” and banned on that account. It thus failed to meet the quality-of-law requirement which is a key element of the test of whether the interference was “prescribed by law” (see paragraph 159 above).

202. Apart from the above elements, the principle of effectiveness and the procedural guarantees afforded are the factors which may have to be taken into account when assessing the interference with freedom of expression (see *Karácsony and Others v. Hungary* [GC], nos. 42461/13 and 44357/13, § 133, 17 May 2016, with further references). The Court reiterates that it was first of all for the national authorities to carry out a comprehensive assessment of the statements in the context, putting forward relevant and sufficient reasons for justifying the interference and considering the applicant community’s right to freedom of expression and religion (see *Religious Community of Jehovah’s Witnesses v. Azerbaijan*, no. 52884/09, § 36, 20 February 2020).

203. The Court has previously identified a number of fundamental procedural flaws in the manner in which Russian courts have considered applications to categorise materials as “extremist”. The first such flaw is the courts’ relinquishment of their duty to rule on issues of law in favour of a wholesale endorsement of expert conclusions which go beyond addressing purely specialist issues, such as clarifying the import or meaning of particular words and expressions, and provide what is in effect a legal assessment of publications. The Court has found that situation unacceptable and stressed that all issues of law should be determined exclusively by judges (see *Mariya Alekhina and Others v. Russia*, no. 38004/12, § 262, 17 July 2018, and *Dmitriyevskiy v. Russia*, no. 42168/06, § 113, 3 October 2017). This position has been also reflected in the binding guidance by the Supreme Court of Russia (see paragraph 127 above). A second procedural flaw stems from the fact that Russian law does not establish explicitly the right for affected parties, such as authors or publishers of the texts liable to be banned, to participate in the proceedings under the Suppression of Extremism Act. The Court has held that a domestic court would not be in a position to provide “relevant and sufficient” reasons for the interference without some form of adversarial proceedings in which the arguments put forward by the prosecutor could be weighed up against those of the affected party (see *Mariya Alekhina and Others*, cited above, §§ 265-67).

204. In the instant case, the domestic courts’ decisions were based on expert reports obtained by the prosecutors or police from experts in linguistics or in religious studies, and, in one case, on a statement by an



Orthodox priest who offered his opinion on the “extremist” nature of the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ publications (see paragraph 47 above). The courts limited their analysis to reproducing a summary of findings by expert witnesses which they endorsed in their entirety without drawing any legal conclusions from them, stating simply that they had no reason to doubt them. It is apparent from the judgments that it was not the court that made the decisive findings as to the “extremist” nature of the Jehovah’s Witnesses publications but the experts selected by the prosecutors and police (see *Dmitriyevskiy*, cited above, § 113). The courts made no attempt to conduct their own legal analysis of the allegedly “extremist” statements and consider them in the broader context of publications, seeking to establish the ideas they sought to impart. Nor did they apply the Court’s case-law relating to the extremist speech and freedom of expression in general or assess the effect of the ban on the applicants’ rights under Article 9 of the Convention or its domestic-law equivalent (see *Ibragim Ibragimov and Others*, cited above, § 107). The Court cannot therefore accept the reasons provided by the Russian courts as “relevant and sufficient” for the purpose of justifying the interference in question.

205. Furthermore, not only did the courts fail to provide relevant and sufficient reasons to justify the interference, they also failed to uphold the adversarial nature of the proceedings. Some applicants were unable to effectively put forward arguments in defence of their position, as the courts rejected their evidence, including alternative expert opinions, on the grounds that they had been prepared by a party to the case (see paragraph 35 above). Other applicants had not been even informed of the banning proceedings and denied the possibility to challenge the first-instance judgment by way of appeal (see paragraphs 37-39 above). This brings the Court to the conclusion that the applicants were stripped of the procedural protection that they were entitled to enjoy by virtue of their rights under Article 10 of the Convention (see *Dmitriyevskiy*, cited above, § 116).

206. As regards the applicants who were convicted on charges of “mass dissemination of extremist literature” for using the previously banned publications in religious ministry, the Court notes that an offence of mass dissemination of extremist material under Article 20.29 of the CAO is conceptualised under Russian law as a formal offence. It is sufficient to establish that the publication in question was included in the Federal List of Extremist Material and that the offender engaged in its dissemination or possessed it with a view to disseminating. The law does not require the courts hearing the charges to evaluate the context in which the dissemination occurred, to examine the intentions of the offender, or to assess its actual or likely deleterious consequences. Because of the formal nature of the offence, the court decisions holding the applicants liable for the dissemination of extremist material did not contain any assessment of the context of dissemination or its potential for harmful consequences.

However, the fact that domestic law does not require proof that the offence has had any concrete effect does not obviate the need to justify the interference and to show that it was necessary in the specific circumstances (see *Öztürk*, cited above, § 69, and *Perinçek*, cited above, § 275). By focusing exclusively on the formal elements of an offence under Article 20.29 of the CAO, the domestic courts failed to consider the criteria developed by the Court in cases relating to freedom of expression and religion and adduce “relevant and sufficient” reasons for the interference (see *Gözel and Özer v. Turkey*, nos. 43453/04 and 31098/05, § 51, 6 July 2010). In the case of the Samara LRO, the domestic courts neither considered a very serious allegation that the extremist publications had been planted on their premises (see paragraph 195 above) nor assessed the proportionality and necessity of such a drastic measure as the dissolution of a religious organisation in a situation where copies of the “extremist” publications were apparently kept in a locked cabinet. The failure to carry out a balancing exercise leads the Court to the conclusion that the interference did not pursue any “pressing social need” and was therefore not “necessary in a democratic society”.

207. There has therefore been a violation of Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 9, on account of the declaration of the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ publications “extremist” and the prosecution of individual applicants and the forced dissolution of the Samara LRO for using those publications in their religious ministry.

#### IV. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 10 OF THE CONVENTION, READ IN THE LIGHT OF ARTICLE 9, ON ACCOUNT OF THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE DISTRIBUTION PERMIT

208. The applicants complained that the decision to withdraw the permit to distribute religious magazines (see section E of the Facts) had had no basis in Russian law and was not necessary in a democratic society. They relied in particular on Articles 9 and 10 of the Convention which have been cited above.

##### **A. Admissibility**

209. The Government submitted that the complaints by Mr Ebeling and Mr Konyukhov in application no. 17552/11 were belated. The Court has dismissed a similar objection in paragraph 192 above in which it established the date of introduction of that application to be 11 March 2011. As that date was less than six months from the dates of the final decisions (see paragraph 73 above), the complaints were not belated.

210. The Court considers that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention. It

further notes that it is not inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

## **B. Merits**

### *1. Submissions by the parties*

211. The applicants emphasised that the application of section 32 of the Mass Media Act “by analogy”, without any advance notice, without a court hearing or court order and by reference to the Rostov and Gorno-Altaysk proceedings, to which neither the applicant nor the Roskomnadzor had been parties, was not foreseeable. Section 32 related exclusively to television and radio broadcasting; it had never been applied to print media. The Roskomnadzor had not invoked that provision when making the 2010 order. It was raised for the first time in the Federal Commercial Court’s decision of 29 May 2012. By that time, however, section 32 was no longer in force, having been replaced in 2011 with a new procedure in which a license could be revoked only on notice and only by court order. The applicants submitted that they could not have foreseen which of many provisions the Roskomnadzor would apply “by analogy”, for it could have issued instead a “warning” or make an application to a court to suspend the circulation of periodicals. Finally, the decision did not pursue any “pressing social need”. Contrary to the Government’s assertion, the publications had not incited “religious hatred”, as mere comparison of religions and beliefs, even unfavourable, was not tantamount to inciting “hatred”.

212. The Government submitted that the *Watchtower* and *Awake!* magazines were foreign printed media which could be distributed in Russia on the basis of a permit. After the Rostov and Gorno-Altaysk courts had identified certain publications to be extremist, the applicants should have faced the consequences of publishing such materials. Since the Russian legislation at that time had not established a clear procedure for annulling the distribution permit, section 32 of the Mass Media Act had been applied by analogy which, in the Government’s view, was the only accessible mechanism for exercising State control over distribution of extremist materials in Russia. The decision to revoke the permit had pursued the legitimate aims of the protection of national security, prevention of disorders and crimes of extremist nature. There had been a trend towards an increasing number of extremist publications: of the twenty-six publications printed between 1998 and 2009, eleven had been issued after 2007.

### *2. The Court’s assessment*

213. The Court notes that under Russian law, distribution of foreign printed periodicals in Russia requires a distribution permit. The decision to withdraw the permit had prevented both the German publisher of the

Jehovah's Witnesses' magazines and the Administrative Centre from distributing them in Russian territory and exposed individual applicants to administrative sanctions for doing so. Accordingly, it amounted to an interference with their freedom to impart information under Article 10 of the Convention which must also be examined in the light of the requirements of Article 9 (see *Religious Community of Jehovah's Witnesses*, cited above, §§ 24-25).

214. On the legal basis for the interference, the Court reiterates that the expression "prescribed by law" not only refers to a statutory basis in domestic law, but also requires that the law be formulated with sufficient precision to enable the individual to foresee the consequences which a given action may entail. The law must afford a measure of legal protection against arbitrary interferences by public authorities with the rights safeguarded by the Convention, and indicate with sufficient clarity the scope of any discretion conferred on the competent authorities and the manner of its exercise (see *Hasan and Chaush*, cited above, § 84). The scope of a restriction must not be extended to the detriment of the person concerned, for instance by analogy (see *Karademirci and Others v. Turkey*, nos. 37096/97 and 37101/97, § 40, ECHR 2005-I).

215. In the instant case, the domestic courts at all levels of jurisdiction recognised that Russian law did not specify the conditions under which a permit to distribute foreign printed periodicals could be withdrawn (see paragraphs 68, 69 and 70 above). The reference to section 32 of the Mass Media Act was not part of the original decision to revoke the permit and appeared for a first time in a judicial decision taken six months after that provision had been repealed (see paragraphs 71 and 121 above). In any event, that provision set out the conditions for revoking broadcasting licences which were granted and regulated by their own set of norms. The court did not explain why that particular provision and not another should be applied "by analogy", did not refer to any jurisprudence in which such an application "by analogy" had been previously made and did not indicate which of the three conditions set out in that provision had not been met. In these circumstances, the Court finds that the interference did not have a clear and foreseeable legal basis.

216. The Court also considers that, in addition to lacking a clear and foreseeable legal basis, the interference was not "necessary in a democratic society". The decision to withdraw the permit had not been preceded with any advance notice or warning to the applicants, depriving them of the opportunity to put right the alleged violation (see *Biblical Centre of the Chuvash Republic*, cited above, § 57). The Court also concurs in the assessment made by the Moscow City Commercial Court that the measure was excessively broad in its effects in that it affected the distribution of any and all issues of the magazines, of which only certain issues were declared extremist (see paragraph 68 above). After the Moscow City Commercial

Court’s decision had been overturned on appeal, no assessment of the proportionality of the measure was conducted in the subsequent proceedings.

217. As regards the individual applicants prosecuted for “distributing” unregistered media, the Court notes that the proceedings against them were brought at a time when the judicial challenge to the withdrawal decision was still being considered. It does not appear that the applicants were aware that they were breaking the law by continuing to use the magazines in their religious ministry or that they had in fact engaged in the “distribution” in so far as the publications had been obtained by the authorities on their own initiative including through the use of special police measures (see paragraph 72 above). By seeking to sanction the applicants without waiting for the outcome of the proceedings, the domestic authorities revealed their determination to impose undue burden on the exercise of the right to freedom of religion by individual Jehovah’s Witnesses (compare *Biblical Centre of the Chuvash Republic*, cited above, § 57). Accordingly, the interference with their rights was not “necessary in a democratic society”.

218. There has been a violation of Article 10 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 9, on account of the withdrawal of the distribution permit and the prosecution of the applicants for distributing unregistered media.

#### V. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 10 OF THE CONVENTION, READ IN THE LIGHT OF ARTICLE 9, ON ACCOUNT OF DECLARING THE JEHOVAH’S WITNESSES’ WEBSITE “EXTREMIST”

219. The applicants complained that the decision to declare the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ international website “extremist” (see section G of the Facts) had no basis in Russian law and was not necessary in a democratic society. They relied in particular on Articles 9 and 10 of the Convention which have been cited above.

##### A. Admissibility

220. The Court considers that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention. It further notes that it is not inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

##### B. Merits

###### 1. *Submissions by the parties*

221. The applicants submitted that the material on *jw.org* was crucially important to Jehovah’s Witnesses’ public ministry of and Bible study, as

religious publications and videos were available in more than 900 spoken languages and also in many of the world's sign languages. The website was also accessible to the visually impaired believers by being compatible with software that audibly reports cursor movements. Blocking access to jw.org had deprived the individual applicants of a significant means of exercising their right to freedom to receive information and ideas and deprived applicant Watchtower New York of its right to impart information to individual Jehovah's Witnesses and other interested persons in Russia. The banning of the website as extremist had also exposed all Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia to criminal sanctions for attempting to access it or encouraging others to do so. That interference had to be seen in the light of the Russian authorities' simultaneous decision to prohibit all imports of Jehovah's Witnesses' literature and to seize thousands of copies of the Bible and other literature. The interference was not "prescribed by law" because the applicants could not foresee that the entire website would be declared extremist due to the presence of three "extremist" publications, representing a minuscule fraction (0.07%) of the 3,900 religious items available on the site. Watchtower New York had not received a prior warning or notice of the impending ban. The interference also did not pursue a legitimate aim because as soon as Watchtower New York had found out of the first-instance court's decision it had blocked access to the three "extremist" publication from within Russia. That happened more than fourteen months before the Supreme Court had ruled to ban the entire website. Lastly, the interference had not been necessary in a democratic society. The website did not contain "extremist material" and none of the publications had contained calls to violence, hatred or intolerance. In any event, declaring the entire website "extremist" was disproportionate. If the authorities had a legitimate concern, they could have blocked access to the offending web pages only. This was done in many other cases: the Federal List of Extremist Materials included hundreds of "extremist" web pages from YouTube or social network websites which however had not been declared "extremist" in their entirety.

222. The Government reiterated that a number of publications which had been available on the website had been found to be extremist by the Rostov court. The fact that those publications were available for downloading from the website had been sufficient to restrict access to that website. Access to the blocked website could be restored if the offending information had been removed. However, Watchtower New York had not produced evidence that it had deleted such information and had informed the telecoms regulator accordingly. Watchtower New York had been informed by registered mail about the date and time of the cassation hearing before the Supreme Court.

## 2. *The Court's assessment*

### (a) General principles

223. The Court reiterates that owing to its accessibility and capacity to store and communicate vast amounts of information, the Internet has now become one of the principal means by which individuals exercise their right to freedom of expression and information. The Internet provides essential tools for participation in activities and discussions concerning political issues and issues of general interest, it enhances the public's access to news and facilitates the dissemination of information in general. Article 10 of the Convention guarantees "everyone" the freedom to receive and impart information and ideas. It applies not only to the content of information but also to the means of its dissemination, for any restriction imposed on the latter necessarily interferes with that freedom. The measures blocking access to websites are bound to have an influence on the accessibility of the Internet and, accordingly, engage the responsibility of the respondent State under Article 10 (see *Ahmet Yıldırım v. Turkey*, no. 3111/10, §§ 48-54, ECHR 2012).

### (b) Existence of interference

224. For the Court, it is clear that the declaration of an extremist nature of the Jehovah's Witnesses' international website which was owned and operated by applicant Watchtower New York (see paragraph 79 above) interfered with its right to impart information to individual Jehovah's Witnesses and other interested persons in Russia. The measure which prevented visitors to Jehovah's Witnesses' website from accessing its content from within Russia amounted to "interference by a public authority" with the right to receive and impart information since Article 10 guarantees not only the right to impart information but also the right of the public to receive it (see *Cengiz and Others v. Turkey*, nos. 48226/10 and 14027/11, § 56, ECHR 2015 (extracts), and *OOO Flavus and Others v. Russia*, nos. 12468/15 and 2 others, § 29, 23 June 2020). Since the affected material was of a religious nature, the interference must also be examined in the light of the requirements of Article 9 of the Convention.

225. As regards the individual applicants, the Court reiterates that the answer to the question whether an applicant can claim to be a victim of a measure blocking access to a website will depend on an assessment of all circumstances of each case, in particular the way in which the person concerned uses the website and the potential impact of the measure on him or her. For the applicants having various types of perceptive limitations, such as a visual or hearing impairment, the Jehovah's Witnesses' website was the only accessible source of downloadable religious materials addressing their specific needs: audio books and descriptions, sign language commentaries, etc. It follows that the blocking of those applicants' access to

the specifically adapted religious materials available on jw.org amounted to interference with their right to receive information under Article 10 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 9.

226. Lastly, in so far as the blocking of access to the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ website affected the religious literature accessible from within Russia which was a crucial element of religious ministry, it also constituted interference with the Administrative Centre’s right to receive and impart information under Article 10 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 9, which the Administrative Centre enjoyed as a collective body established to uphold and defend the rights and interests of Jehovah’s Witnesses (see *Association for Solidarity with Jehovah’s Witnesses and Others*, cited above, § 87).

**(c) Justification for the interference**

227. The Court reiterates that interference must be “prescribed by law”, pursue one or more of the legitimate aims and be “necessary in a democratic society” to achieve those aims. In the present case the questions of compliance with the law and of the existence of a legitimate aim cannot be dissociated from the question of whether the interference was “necessary in a democratic society”. The Court will therefore examine them together, having regard to its findings in similar cases concerning the blocking of access to websites in Russia (see, among others, *OOO Flavus and Others*, cited above, and *Bulgakov v. Russia*, no. 20159/15, 23 June 2020).

228. As the Court has previously found, Russian law contains no procedural safeguards capable of protecting website owners from arbitrary interference. It does not provide for any form of their participation in the blocking proceedings and does not give them an opportunity to remove the offending content before the blocking decision takes effect. Nor does it require the authorities to assess the impact of the blocking measure, to justify the necessity and proportionality of the interference with the freedom of expression online, and to ascertain that the blocking measure strictly targets the unlawful content and has no arbitrary or excessive effects, including those arising from blocking access to the entire website (see *OOO Flavus and Others*, cited above, §§ 40-41).

229. In the instant case, Watchtower New York as the owner of the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ international website had not received a warning or any other notice that the website was allegedly in breach of the extremism legislation. The prosecutor’s application for a blocking order had been prepared without advance notification to the parties whose rights and interests were likely to be affected. Watchtower New York had not been informed of the prosecutor’s application or afforded the opportunity to remove the allegedly illegal content before the application was lodged with the court. Nor had it been invited to participate in the blocking hearing on the basis that the blocking would not interfere with its rights (see



paragraph 80 above). Even after the court of appeals acknowledged that its participation in the proceedings was essential, it had not been properly summoned to the Supreme Court hearing at which the blocking decision was reinstated (see paragraph 84 above). The Court finds that the blocking proceedings which were conducted in the website owner's absence were not adversarial in nature and did not provide a forum in which the interested parties could have been heard (see *Bulgakov*, cited above, §§ 35-36).

230. Turning next to the scope of the decision declaring the entire website “extremist”, the Court reiterates that the wholesale blocking of access to a website is an extreme measure which deliberately disregards the distinction between lawful and unlawful information that a website may contain and renders inaccessible a large amount of content which has not been identified as unlawful. Blocking access to the entire website has the practical effect of extending the scope of the blocking order far beyond the unlawful content that was originally targeted (see *OOO Flavus and Others*, cited above, § 37).

231. The Court has found above that the decision to declare the Jehovah's Witnesses' religious publications “extremist” disclosed a violation of the Convention. This finding applies to the publications, brochures and magazines which had been referenced in the request for a blocking order. However, even if there had been exceptional circumstances justifying the blocking of unlawful content, the measure blocking access to the entire website would have needed a justification of its own, separately and distinctly from the justification underlying the order targeting unlawful content, and by reference to the criteria established by the Court under Article 10 of the Convention. Blocking access to legitimate content can never be an automatic consequence of another, more restricted blocking measure because indiscriminate blocking measure – interfering as it does with lawful content as a collateral effect of a measure aimed solely at illegal content – amounts to arbitrary interference with the rights of website owners (see *OOO Flavus and Others*, cited above, § 38).

232. The Government did not indicate a statutory basis or put forward a justification for the wholesale blocking order affecting the international website of Jehovah's Witnesses in its entirety. They did not explain what legitimate aim or “pressing social need” the domestic authorities pursued by blocking access to the entire website which contained a large amount of undisputedly lawful content, including material meeting the particular perceptive needs of the individual applicants. The failure to provide a justification for that broad blocking measure is particularly salient in the light of the fact that Watchtower New York had taken down the offending publications upon learning of the District Court's decision. This fact was acknowledged in the Regional Court's appeal judgment of 22 January 2014 which also considered that the blocking of the entire website was excessive (see paragraph 82 above). By the time the Supreme Court decided to

reinstate the blocking order in December 2014, there had been no arguably unlawful content on the website. Accordingly, the Court finds that the decision to block access to the entire website was unlawful and disproportionate already at a time when the website contained a few items of the allegedly extremist material. This finding applies *a fortiori* to the blocking of the entire website after that material had been removed (see *Bulgakov*, cited above, § 38).

233. As the interference was not “prescribed by law” and was not “necessary in a democratic society”, there has been a violation of Article 10 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 9, on account of the declaration of the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ international website “extremist”.

## VI. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION, READ IN THE LIGHT OF ARTICLE 11, ON ACCOUNT OF THE FORCED DISSOLUTION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CENTRE AND LOCAL RELIGIOUS ORGANISATIONS

234. The applicants complained that the forced dissolution of the Administrative Centre and the LROs of Jehovah’s Witnesses (section H of the Facts) had violated their rights to freedom of religion and association. The Court will consider this complaint under Article 9 of the Convention, interpreted in the light of Article 11.

### A. Admissibility

235. The Government submitted that the complaint was inadmissible by virtue of Article 17 of the Convention. The Court dismisses the objection for the same reasons as above. It further considers that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention or inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

### B. Merits

#### 1. *Submissions by the parties*

236. The applicants submitted that that the liquidation decision had been the culmination of the State’s decades-long attack against Jehovah’s Witnesses to silence and outlaw a peaceful religious minority with had begun in January 2007 when a deputy Prosecutor General directed subordinate prosecutors to find “extremist material” in the religious literature of Jehovah’s Witnesses. During the liquidation proceedings, the Supreme Court denied the Administrative Centre and the 395 LROs the most basic procedural rights, refusing to ensure their effective participation in the proceedings. The liquidation decision had been grossly

disproportionate, as 387 out of the 395 local organisations had never been charged, much less convicted, of any “extremist” activity in the twenty or more years of their legal existence and the decision to ban them as “extremist” was nothing but arbitrary. The Administrative Centre had likewise in all the years of its existence never been charged, much less convicted, of any “extremist” activity. Liquidating the Administrative Centre for the alleged activity of third parties had been also disproportionate. The true effect of the liquidation decision had been severe. It had criminalised the peaceful religious activity of the more than 175,000 Jehovah’s Witnesses in Russia by making it a criminal offence for them to meet together to read and study the Bible, to publicly share religious beliefs, and to teach their children their beliefs and practices. In April 2018 alone four religious ministers of Jehovah’s Witnesses had been arrested and put in pre-trial detention for conducting a meeting of worship. The Ministry of Education had issued a circular letter to specify that children of Jehovah’s Witnesses should be “re-socialised”. Hundreds of families who are Jehovah’s Witnesses had fled Russia. Such severe measures could not be justified as “necessary” in a free and democratic society.

237. The Government submitted that the court decisions to dissolve the Administrative Centre and the LROs had been based on the provisions of the Constitution, the Religions Act and the Suppression of Extremism Act. They had also pursued the important public interests to protect the rights of others, public order and national security and to oppose extremist activities. Diligent action was required to avoid a situation where the cumulative adverse effect of extremist activities would reach the point of turning the risk of harm to individual rights or public order into actual harm to citizens’ health or life, public order or other public and State interests. The interference had also been necessary in a democratic society as over the previous seven-year period, a total of eighty-eight publications had been declared extremist, eighteen warning letters had been issued cautioning against the continuation of extremist activities, eight LROs had been dissolved for extremist activities and further extremist acts had been committed after the Ministry of Justice’s warning letter. In those circumstances, forced dissolution had been the only measure capable of preventing harm to the health and lives of citizens, public order and national security. The Government emphasised that the liquidation decision did not restrict or prohibit anyone from practising the religion of Jehovah’s Witnesses on an individual basis.

238. The third party, ADF International, submitted that the Russian authorities had enforced restrictions on religious minorities which had been often framed as protection against “extremism”. They referred, by way of example, to the 2016 “anti-terrorism” legislation which prohibited foreigners from engaging in “missionary activities” and required anyone engaged in “evangelisation” to carry permits that showed their connection to

a registered religious group. The third party also provided a summary of the Court’s case-law under Articles 9 and 14 of the Convention.

239. Responding to the AFD International’s submissions, the Government asserted that the allegations of undue pressure being brought to bear on religious minorities in Russia were unsubstantiated. In their view, holding a religious organisation liable for engaging in extremist activities did not violate the constitutional right to freedom of association.

## 2. *The Court’s assessment*

### (a) **Existence of interference**

240. The Court holds that the forced dissolution of the Administrative Centre and the LROs of Jehovah’s Witnesses amounted to interference with these organisations’ and their members’ rights under Article 9 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 11. The dissolution decision had the effect of stripping the organisations of legal personality and preventing them from exercising a wide range of rights reserved under Russian law to registered religious organisations. It also deprived the individual applicants, as their members, of the right to manifest their religion in community with others and to carry out activities which were an integral element of their religious practice (see paragraph 146 above).

### (b) **Justification for the interference**

241. The Court refers to a summary of general principles concerning forced dissolution of associations in paragraphs 149 and 150 above. It emphasises that the right of believers to freedom of religion encompasses the expectation that believers will be allowed to associate freely, without arbitrary State intervention, and that the dissolution of an existing religious organisation requires very serious reasons by way of justification in order to be recognised as “necessary in a democratic society” (see *Biblical Centre of the Chuvash Republic*, cited above, § 54). It also reiterates that the principle of effectiveness – an overarching principle of the Convention underlying every Convention provision securing a human right – requires that all human rights enshrined and guaranteed therein must be protected practically and effectively and not in a theoretical or illusory manner.

242. The decision on the forced dissolution of the Administrative Centre and the LROs relied crucially on earlier decisions to ban the LROs of Jehovah’s Witnesses and to declare their publications “extremist”. Since the Court has found that these earlier decisions violated the applicants’ Convention rights because they lacked a sufficiently foreseeable legal basis (see paragraphs 189 and 207 above), this finding also vitiates the dissolution decision. Nevertheless, it considers the applicants’ claim that the dissolution decision was “the culmination of the State’s decades-long attack against Jehovah’s Witnesses to silence and outlaw a peaceful religious minority” to

be sufficiently serious to warrant an examination of its merits from the standpoint of the requirement that the authorities must in good faith fulfil the duty of neutrality and impartiality towards all religious organisations (see the case-law cited in paragraph 187 above).

243. The Court stresses that legal formalities should not be used to hinder the freedom of association of groups disliked by the authorities or advocating ideas that the authorities would like to suppress. In cases where the circumstances are such as to raise doubts in that regard, the Court must verify whether an apparently neutral measure interfering with an organisation's activities in effect seeks to penalise it on account of the views that it promotes (see *The United Macedonian Organisation Ilinden – PIRIN and Others v. Bulgaria (no. 2)*, nos. 41561/07 and 20972/08, § 83, 18 October 2011). To consider the applicants' allegation that the Russian authorities singled out Jehovah's Witnesses for a campaign of harassment and persecution, the Court will need to review the sequence of events in their entirety, rather than as separate and distinct incidents, in order to place the interference in its proper context (see *Ivanova v. Bulgaria*, no. 52435/99, § 83, 12 April 2007).

244. Since their emergence in the late nineteenth century Jehovah's Witnesses have established a legal presence in many parts in the world, including all European States which are now members of the Council of Europe. In those States, they have been allowed to practise their religion in community with others, although they may have experienced delays and difficulties in obtaining formal recognition (see, among others, *Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 155). Since the early 1990s Jehovah's Witnesses had also been allowed to practice their religion lawfully in Russia and register their religious organisations at the federal and regional levels. Almost four hundred local regional organisations of Jehovah's Witnesses were established throughout Russia (*ibid.*, § 156).

245. After the introduction of the new Religions Act which required religious organisations to apply for new registration, Jehovah's Witnesses appear to have been singled out for a differential treatment, along with other religious organisations deemed to be "non-traditional religions", including the Salvation Army and the Church of Scientology. The Court found that they had all been denied new registration on spurious legal grounds and that, in doing so, the Russian authorities in the capital city of Moscow had not "acted in good faith" and had "neglected their duty of neutrality and impartiality" (see *Moscow Branch of the Salvation Army v. Russia*, no. 72881/01, § 97, ECHR 2006-XI; *Church of Scientology Moscow v. Russia*, no. 18147/02, § 97, 5 April 2007; and *Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, §§ 157 and 181).

246. In parallel, the authorities had instituted forced dissolution proceedings against the Moscow organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses under the provisions of the new Religions Act. The proceedings ended in 2004

with a decision on the forced dissolution of the organisation and a permanent ban on its activities (see *Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, §§ 54-67). Following a detailed analysis of the different justifications advanced by the authorities in support of that decision, the Court found that the domestic courts did not adduce “relevant and sufficient” reasons to show that the Moscow community forced families to break up, infringed the rights and freedoms of its members or third parties, incited its followers to commit suicide or refuse medical care, impinged on the rights of non-Witness parents or their children, or encouraged members to refuse to fulfil any duties established by law. It also held that the sanction of dissolution had been disproportionate to whatever legitimate aim that had been pursued and found a violation of Article 9 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 11 (*ibid.*, § 160).

247. The subsequent developments are particularly significant for the present case. In 2006 the extremism legislation was amended to expand the definition of “extremist activities” by removing the requirement that the allegedly “extremist” activities must contain elements of violence in order to be categorised as such (see paragraph 158 above). Thereafter, a deputy Prosecutor General sent out a circular letter which targeted all “foreign religious associations” in general and named Jehovah’s Witnesses in particular. While acknowledging that they had committed no violations of Russian law, the letter instructed regional prosecutors – as part of their oversight powers over other State agencies – to verify whether the media regulator had properly fulfilled its duty to search for indicators of extremism in the publications of “foreign religious organisations”. Jehovah’s Witnesses came under particular scrutiny due to the fact that they owned printing facilities (see paragraph 8 above).

248. A newly expanded definition of “extremist activities” and the instructions from the deputy Prosecutor General spurred prosecutors in various regions of Russia to seek court decisions declaring dozens of Jehovah’s Witnesses religious publications “extremist”, in the absence of any elements of violence or hatred (see paragraphs 10 and 27-49 above). The categorisation of the publications as “extremist” exposed individual Jehovah’s Witnesses and religious organisations using them in religious ministry and worship to the prosecution on charges of “mass dissemination of extremist material” and the forced dissolution (see paragraphs 62 and 107 above). As the Court has found above, the formal nature of the offence of “mass dissemination” left no room for assessing the proportionality of the interference in the light of the Convention standards (see paragraph 206 above). The “extremist” categorisation was also used to ban the distribution of all issues of two Jehovah’s Witnesses’ magazines and to block access to the entire website of Jehovah’s Witnesses. The Court has held that those decisions were not lawful and were not justified in their excessive breadth (see paragraphs 216 and 233 above).

249. The authorities' campaign against Jehovah's Witnesses did not stop at targeting the organisations and individuals found to be in possession of the banned "extremist" literature. In 2016 a deputy Prosecutor General issued an anti-extremism warning to the national organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses, the Administrative Centre (see paragraph 86 above). Although the Administrative Centre had not been found guilty of a single violation of Russian law in the more than twenty years of its existence, the Suppression of Extremism Act allowed the authorities to hold it objectively liable for any transgressions committed by the LROs which were considered to be part of its structure. Under the Suppression of Extremism Act, the warning was the first step in the procedure leading to the dissolution of the warned organisation if new "indicators of extremism" had been identified within twelve months of the date of warning (see paragraph 115 above).

250. Less than two weeks after the twelve-month time-limit had expired, the Ministry of Justice applied for the forced dissolution of the Administrative Centre, claiming that more LROs had been found guilty of possessing or using "extremist" religious publications in the intervening period and that the Administrative Centre had allegedly failed to prevent such "extremist activities" on their part (see paragraph 87 above). Significantly for the Court's analysis, the claim for the forced dissolution of the Administrative Centre cited no evidence of "extremist activities" on its own part and no conviction of extremist offences or explained how it could have been possible to foresee that publications it had imported years ago would be subsequently declared "extremist". The suspension of the activities of the Administrative Centre by the same-day decision, on the authority of an executive agency, without waiting for the outcome of judicial review, is indicative of the authorities' determination in seeking to put an end to the existence of the organisation (see *Biblical Centre of the Chuvash Republic*, cited above, § 57).

251. The scope of the claim for the forced dissolution of the Administrative Centre went beyond resolving the fate of the national organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses, as the existence of any and all religious organisations of Jehovah's Witnesses registered in Russia was also at stake in those proceedings. This was so because the authorities claimed that LROs should be liquidated along with the Administrative Centre as part of its structure, notwithstanding their legal status as separate and independent legal entities. Leaving aside the question whether or not such course of action was compatible with Russian law, the Court notes that 387 out of the 395 LROs had not been charged, much less convicted, of any "extremist" activity in the twenty or more years of their legal existence and that no extremist charges against them were levelled in the proceedings against the Administrative Centre. The only justification for their forced dissolution was that they were "financed, coordinated and directed" by the same organisation (the Administrative Centre) as the remaining eight LROs

liquidated on extremist charges. The Court considers this connection too tenuous to meet the “very serious reasons” standard which needs to be satisfied in case of a forced dissolution of an association.

252. However, of even greater concern to the Court is the fact that the forced dissolution proceedings were fundamentally flawed in that the LROs, whose very legal existence was in jeopardy, were not informed of the proceedings and were not invited to participate. Their representatives learned of the proceedings from media reports and unsuccessfully attempted to join them. Their application to that effect, and another one from the Administrative Centre, were rejected and an appeal was not even considered (see paragraph 88 above). The LROs were thus prevented from making submissions and putting forward arguments against their forced dissolution. They were also barred from lodging an appeal after the judgment had been passed (see paragraph 91 above). The Court considers that the Supreme Court’s finding that the judgment which ordered their liquidation and confiscation of their property “did not concern their rights and obligations” was arbitrary.

253. The Court lastly reiterates that it fell to the Supreme Court, as the ultimate guardian of individual rights and freedoms, to consider the matter in the light of the Convention standards and to carry out a balancing exercise by examining whether the interference with the applicants’ rights was proportionate to the legitimate aims pursued. Yet the Court cannot find that a genuine balancing exercise has been undertaken in the present case. As noted above, the Supreme Court did not allow the organisations directly affected by its judgment to submit arguments in their defence. Nor did it acknowledge, much less consider at any length, the effect of its dissolution, banning and confiscation decision on the rights of 175,000 individual Jehovah’s Witnesses in Russia who were put before a stark and impossible choice: to reduce their religious activities to praying in isolation, without the company and support of fellow believers and without a place for worship, or to face criminal prosecution on charges of “continuing the activities of an extremist organisation”. It did not explain who the “others” were whose rights were supposedly in need of protection, given that Jehovah’s Witnesses had not been found to have used any coercion or improper methods of conversion, or what kind of “real threat” to public order and security the avowedly peaceful and non-violent religious activities of Jehovah’s Witnesses posed. The Court finds that the Supreme Court’s judgment relied on generalities instead of actually engaging in reasoning and trying to find a balance between competing rights. These shortcomings were not remedied on appeal.

254. Considering the above elements and the sequence of events, the Court finds that the forced dissolution of all religious organisations of Jehovah’s Witnesses in Russia was not merely the result of a neutral application of legal provisions but disclosed indications of a policy of



intolerance by the Russian authorities towards the religious practices of Jehovah's Witnesses designed to cause Jehovah's Witnesses to abandon their faith and to prevent others from joining it. The use of an excessively broad wording of the extremism legislation to disband the communities of Jehovah's Witnesses across Russia, the breaking-up of their religious meetings, the confiscation of their religious publications, searches in their homes and places of worship, surveillance by the security services, and other forms of interference with their religious practices reinforce this conclusion. The Court reiterates that respect for religious diversity undoubtedly represents one of the most important challenges to be faced today; for that reason, the authorities must perceive religious diversity not as a threat but as a source of enrichment (see *İzzettin Doğan and Others*, cited above, § 109). By seeking to suppress the religious activities of Jehovah's Witnesses as they did, the Russian authorities failed to act in good faith and breached the State's duty of neutrality and impartiality vis-à-vis the religion of Jehovah's Witnesses.

255. There has therefore been a violation of Article 9 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 11, on account of the dissolution of the Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia and the LROs of Jehovah's Witnesses.

#### VII. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLES 5 AND 9 OF THE CONVENTION ON ACCOUNT OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION OF JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES

256. The applicants concerned complained that their criminal conviction on charges of "continuing the activities of an extremist organisation" for organising services of worship and practicing their religion in community with others (see section I of the Facts) had violated their rights to freedom of religion and association under Articles 9 and 11 of the Convention. Mr Christensen also complained that his pre-trial detention had been incompatible with the requirements of Article 5 of the Convention, of which the relevant parts read as follows:

"1. Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be deprived of his liberty save in the following cases and in accordance with a procedure prescribed by law:

...

(c) the lawful arrest or detention of a person effected for the purpose of bringing him before the competent legal authority on reasonable suspicion of having committed an offence ...

...

3. Everyone arrested or detained in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 (c) of this Article shall be ... entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial. Release may be conditioned by guarantees to appear for trial."

## A. Admissibility

257. As regards Mr Christensen’s initial application concerning his pre-trial detention imposed for what he considered to be a legitimate exercise of his right to freedom of religion (no. 39417/17), the Government submitted that the complaint under Article 9 was premature and inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies, as the sentence had not yet been passed.

258. The Court reiterates that measures capable of having a chilling effect on the exercise of a Convention right may confer on the affected individuals the status of a “victim” of an alleged violation even in the absence of a final conviction and that the existence of a deprivation of liberty would be indicative of interference with that right (see *Dilipak v. Turkey*, no. 29680/05, § 50, 15 September 2015, and *Döner and Others v. Turkey*, no. 29994/02, § 88, 7 March 2017). In so far as Mr Christensen’s arrest and detention prevented him from continuing to hold services of worship in community with his fellow believers, it falls to the Court to verify whether that measure was designed to repress the exercise of his Convention rights and stifle the spreading of the religion of Jehovah’s Witnesses (see *Nolan and K. v. Russia*, no. 2512/04, § 62, 12 February 2009, and *Cox v. Turkey*, no. 2933/03, § 28, 20 May 2010). By lodging an appeal against the detention order, he afforded the Russian authorities the opportunity to redress, through their own legal system, the alleged violation of his right to freedom of religion and has therefore exhausted the domestic remedies. In any event, the Government’s objection has become moot now that Mr Christensen’s conviction was pronounced and became final.

259. The Court considers that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention. It further notes that it is not inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

## B. Merits

### 1. Submissions by the parties

260. The applicants emphasised that prosecuting and criminally convicting them for organising and attending religious services was a form of State coercion calculated to intimidate them and also their co-believers into abandoning their faith. The trial courts had considered dozens of hours of covert audio and video recordings of Jehovah’s Witnesses’ meetings but had not identified a single “extremist” expression allegedly uttered by any of them or any “extremist” activities such as those that incite violence or religious hatred. In any event, not one of the applicants’ activities had been prohibited by law. Possessing and using religious texts enjoyed the protection of Article 9. It was not illegal to meet together for peaceful

religious worship, and the right of “conducting services of worship not associated with the distribution of extremist literature” was recognised in the liquidation decision concerning the Oryol LRO. Nor was it illegal to receive donations to meet the costs of renting a place for religious services. Minors had taken part in the religious services at the initiative of their parents who were also Jehovah’s Witnesses. The interference did not pursue any legitimate aim. By holding the applicants criminally liable, simply for continuing religious services, the Russian authorities imposed a disproportionate and unjustifiable burden on the exercise of their freedom of religion and association. In addition, the applicants’ criminal records had limited available employment and exposed them to risk of imprisonment should they “re-offend”. Two applicants who were parents of a young girl had left Russia and successfully applied for asylum abroad.

261. The Government submitted that the founding members of the Taganrog LRO could not have been unaware of the liquidation decision which had been published on the websites of the Regional Court and the Ministry of Justice. Nevertheless, acting in an organised group, they had continued the activities of the banned LRO and involved minors into those activities. In the case of Mr Christensen, the court remanded him in custody because it was determined that he could put pressure on witnesses, destroy evidence or flee Russia. Mr Christensen must have been well aware that he was engaging in unlawful activities as he had restricted access to the Kingdom Hall only to pass holders and urged his fellow believers to exercise caution and discretion in the performance of their duties. His activities fully overlapped with those of the banned Oryol LRO; they were carried out in a place of worship supported by donations and included the distribution of religious literature, which is characteristic of a religious organisation since, under Russian law, religious groups cannot own places of worship and distribute literature. Correspondence with the banned Administrative Centre had been found on his computer, and audio surveillance had recorded him discussing the names of persons who could be sent for training to the Administrative Centre’s management school. The Government concluded that all applicants had been prosecuted and convicted for organising, and participating in, the activities of the banned organisations. Their conviction was not related to their religious beliefs and was balanced against the public interest in protecting national security and preventing extremist offences.

262. The Government of Denmark, in their comments on Mr Christensen’s case, submitted that there had been no basis for the charges against him. He had never been a member of the Oryol LRO, nor had it ever been possible for him to become a member because foreign nationals were prohibited from being members of religious organisations under Russian law. Moreover, the liquidation decision had explicitly stated that Jehovah’s Witnesses were not prohibited from conducting services of

worship not associated with the distribution of “extremist” literature. Mr Christensen had reasonably expected that he would be entitled to conduct services of worship of the Tsentralnoye congregation.

263. In response to the Government of Denmark’s comments, the Government submitted that Mr Christensen had been found criminally liable for extremist activities rather than for a manifestation of his religious beliefs.

## 2. *The Court’s assessment*

### (a) **Existence of interference**

264. The Court reiterates that the imposition of criminal sanctions for manifestation of religious beliefs amounts to an interference with the exercise of the right to freedom of religion under Article 9 § 1 of the Convention (see *Kokkinakis*, cited above, § 36, and *Manoussakis and Others*, cited above, § 36).

265. The parties disagreed on the nature of the activities which had been sanctioned by the Russian authorities. For the Government, the prosecution and conviction of the applicants were related not to the exercise of their right to freedom of religion but to their attempts to revive the activities of a banned extremist organisation and to participate in them. The applicants maintained that they had been punished for merely practising their faith and conducting services of worship together with fellow believers. The Court will therefore review the findings of the domestic courts to determine whether or not the sanction was imposed on them for practising their religion in community with others.

266. In the Taganrog and Oryol trials, the Russian courts held that the continuation of the activities of the banned religious organisations consisted of the following elements: organising and conducting religious meetings; opening, closing and cleaning the premises where religious meetings were held and determining the order of speakers at meetings (Mr Christensen); studying and discussing religious literature available on paper or on the Internet; preaching Jehovah’s Witnesses doctrine on blood transfusion and conscientious objection; assigning members of the congregation, including minors, to perform religious duties; bringing new members into the congregation, and collecting donations for the needs of the congregation (see paragraphs 101-104 and 110 above).

267. The Court reiterates that Article 9 lists a number of forms which manifestation of one’s religion or belief may take, namely worship, teaching, practice and observance. It protects the right of believers to meet peacefully in order to worship in the manner prescribed by their religion and also the right to provide, open and maintain places or buildings devoted to religious worship (see *The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints v. the United Kingdom*, no. 7552/09, § 30, 4 March 2014, and

*Cumhuriyetçi Eğitim ve Kültür Merkezi Vakfı v. Turkey*, no. 32093/10, § 41, 2 December 2014). Collecting donations is also an important aspect of freedom of religion guaranteed by Article 9 of the Convention, for without financial resources, religious associations might be unable to provide religious services or ensure their survival (see *Association Les Témoins de Jéhovah v. France*, no. 8916/05, §§ 49 and 53, 30 June 2011).

268. In so far as the domestic judgments appeared to suggest that it was sufficient that the right to manifest one's religion "individually" was allowed (see paragraph 110 above), the Court reiterates that the right to manifest one's religion "in community with others" has always been regarded as an essential part of the freedom of religion and that the two alternatives "either alone or in community with others" in Article 9 of the Convention cannot be considered as mutually exclusive, or as leaving a choice to the authorities, but only as recognising that religion may be practised in either form (see *X. v. the United Kingdom*, no. 8160/78, Commission decision of 12 March 1981, Decisions and Reports 22, p. 27).

269. Accordingly, the Court finds that the applicants were sanctioned for the conduct which amounted to the exercise of their right to freedom of religion in community with others. It notes in this connection that the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention reached the same conclusion in the cases concerning the arrest and prosecution of other Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia on substantially similar charges (see paragraph 136 above). There has therefore been an interference with the applicants' rights protected under Article 9 of the Convention.

**(b) Justification for the interference**

270. The Court has found above that both the decision to liquidate the Taganrog LRO as an "extremist" organisation and the various decisions to categorise the Jehovah's Witnesses publication as "extremist" – which subsequently laid the basis for the decision to liquidate the Oryol LRO – rested on an arbitrarily broad definition of "extremist activities" in Russian law and disclosed, in particular, a violation of Article 9 of the Convention (see paragraphs 157-159 and 201 above).

271. These findings are applicable to the complaint of the applicants' criminal prosecution and conviction, as the grounds for the prosecution and conviction of the applicants were no different from the reasons underlying the decisions to dissolve the Taganrog LRO and to ban the publications of Jehovah's Witnesses. The Court reiterates that only religious statements and actions involving or calling for violence, hatred or discrimination may warrant suppression as being "extremist". Accordingly, the authorities were required to demonstrate that the applicants had made any such statements or engaged in any such acts. Yet the texts of the judgments in the Taganrog or Oryol proceedings go no further than paraphrasing the definition of "extremist activities" in the Suppression of Extremism Act and holding that

the “extremist motives” in the applicants’ conduct were manifested in particular through proclaiming the superiority of the religion of Jehovah’s Witnesses, rejecting medical assistance in the form of blood transfusions, inciting refusal of military service, and involving minors in religious activities (see paragraphs 101 and 112 above). The courts did not identify any word, deed or action by the applicants which would be motivated or tainted by violence, hatred or discrimination against others. The claim that Mr Christensen’s actions were motivated by religious hatred because he had resumed the activities of an organisation banned as “extremist” was flawed because it conflated alleged actions with motives for such actions and because it cited no evidence in support of the conclusion.

272. The State has a narrow margin of appreciation in the sphere of religious freedom and must advance serious and compelling reasons for an interference with the choices that people may make in pursuance of the religious doctrines provided that such choices remain compatible with the key principles underlying the Convention and are the result of a free and independent decision (see *Jehovah’s Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, §§ 111-19). Since the authorities failed to demonstrate that the applicants were involved in any socially dangerous activities of an extremist nature, the Court holds that their prosecution and conviction for peacefully practising the religion of Jehovah’s Witnesses in community with others was based on the impermissibly broad formulation and application of the extremism legislation and also did not pursue any legitimate aim or “pressing social need”.

273. There has therefore been a violation of Article 9 of the Convention on account of the criminal prosecution of the applicants. Having thus found that the entire criminal procedure was tainted with arbitrariness, the Court finds that Mr Christensen’s pre-trial detention and imprisonment were not based on a “reasonable suspicion” of his having committed any offence and was therefore in breach of the requirements of Article 5 of the Convention.

#### VIII. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL No. 1

274. The applicant organisations complained that the decisions to confiscate their publications, places of worship and other property (sections A, B, D and F of the Facts) had violated their right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions. Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 provides as follows:

“Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law ...

The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest ...”

## **A. Admissibility**

275. The Court considers that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention. It further notes that it is not inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

## **B. Merits**

### *1. Submissions by the parties*

276. The applicants submitted that, in addition to “extremist” publications confiscated pursuant to the court orders, a substantial amount of “non-extremist” printed material and electronic devices had been seized from the premises of the applicant organisations and from the individual applicants and never returned. Simple possession of “extremist” material was not an administrative or criminal offence, as only the “mass dissemination” of such material was prohibited under Article 20.29 of the CAO. The interference did not have a legal basis and was arbitrary. As regards the properties transferred to foreign organisations prior to the liquidation decision, the Russian courts had confirmed in their decisions annulling the transfers that the LROs had remained the owners of the properties up to the date on which the liquidation decision became effective.

277. The Government submitted that the confiscation orders had been based on section 13 of the Suppression of Extremism Act, as upheld by the Constitutional Court (see paragraph 124 above). The confiscation orders had pursued the legitimate aim of the protection of rights and freedoms and constitutional order. The authorities had sought to bar access to extremist material for the purpose of preventing its negative impact on the constitutionally important values. Since the LROs had intentionally alienated 269 places of worship, they were no longer the legal owners of those properties and had thus renounced any claim to them.

### *2. The Court’s assessment*

#### **(a) Existence of interference and the applicable rule**

278. The complaint concerns three types of “possessions”: (i) the allegedly “extremist” publications which were seized from the applicants’ homes, places of worship and other premises; (ii) the publications which had not been declared “extremist” and other personal property of the applicants including their computers, notebooks and printed material; (iii) immovable property owned by the Administrative Centre and the LROs.

279. While the Government did not dispute that the applicants were the legal owners of the first and second types of possessions, they did assert that the Administrative Centre and the LROs no longer owned the properties

which they had reassigned to foreign entities. Their position however is inconsistent with the view taken by the domestic courts which considered that the transfer deeds had been null and void under Russian law and that the Administrative Centre or the LROs had been the legal owners of the property on the date of the liquidation decision which incorporated an order for their confiscation (see paragraph 94 above).

280. The Court reiterates that both the seizure and retention of objects in criminal proceedings and confiscation measures fall to be considered from the standpoint of the State's right to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest (see *Smirnov v. Russia*, no. 71362/01, § 54, 7 June 2007, and *Silickienė v. Lithuania*, no. 20496/02, § 62, 10 April 2012).

**(b) Justification for the interference**

281. The first and most important requirement of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 is that any interference by a public authority with the peaceful enjoyment of possessions should be “lawful”. In particular, the second paragraph of Article 1, while recognising that States have the right to control the use of property, subjects their right to the condition that it be exercised by enforcing “laws”. The principle of lawfulness presupposes that the applicable provisions of domestic law are sufficiently accessible, precise and foreseeable in their application (see *Smirnov*, cited above, § 55).

*(i) “Extremist” publications and confiscated property*

282. The Court has found above that the decisions to declare the publications “extremist” and to dissolve the religious organisations of Jehovah's Witnesses were based on an unforeseeable application of extremism legislation (see paragraphs 159, 201 and 242 above). As the confiscation orders in respect of the “extremist” publications and immovable property of the liquidated organisations were integral part of those decisions, the Court finds that they also lacked a clear and foreseeable legal basis and that the interference with the applicants' “possessions” was not lawful.

*(ii) Non-extremist publications and personal property*

283. The Court reiterates that retention of material evidence may be necessary in the interests of proper administration of justice, which is a “legitimate aim” in the “general interest” of the community. It has found however that continued retention of personal property items had no justification where such objects were not in themselves an object, instrument or product of any criminal offence, and constituted thus a disproportionate interference with the right to peaceful enjoyment of



possessions (see *Kruglov and Others v. Russia*, nos. 11264/04 and 15 others, §§ 144-46, 4 February 2020).

284. The Government did not challenge the applicants' contention that the consignment of religious literature had not contained any items pronounced "extremist" or otherwise restricted in circulation under Russian law (see paragraphs 74 and 76 above). Similarly, the applicants' personal items, such as notebooks, magazines and electronic devices, were not in themselves objects, instruments or products of any criminal offence. Nor did the authorities claim that those items had any evidentiary value for the criminal proceedings. In these circumstances, the Court cannot find any legal basis for the domestic authorities' continued retention of the applicants' religious literature and personal property.

*(iii) Conclusion*

285. There has therefore been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 in respect of all types of possessions.

## IX. OTHER ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE CONVENTION

286. Lastly, the applicants complained under Article 14 of the Convention, taken in conjunction with Article 9, that they had been discriminated against on account of their religious beliefs, and under Article 6 of the Convention that the applicants who wished to join the dissolution proceedings had been denied that possibility.

287. As Article 6 is applicable to disputes involving the right to freedom of expression and restrictions on dissemination of information (see *Kenedi v. Hungary*, no. 31475/05, § 33, 26 May 2009), the Court declares these complaints admissible. However, having regard to the facts of the case, the submissions of the parties and its findings above, the Court considers that there is no need to give a separate ruling on the merits of these complaints.

## X. APPLICATION OF ARTICLES 41 AND 46 OF THE CONVENTION

### A. Individual measures

288. Article 46 of the Convention provides in the relevant part:

"1. The High Contracting Parties undertake to abide by the final judgment of the Court in any case to which they are parties.

2. The final judgment of the Court shall be transmitted to the Committee of Ministers, which shall supervise its execution."

289. The Court has found above that the criminal prosecution and sentencing of Jehovah's Witnesses in connection with the peaceful exercise of the right to freedom of religion has disclosed a violation of the

Convention. The Court emphasises that the execution measures that must now be taken by the respondent State, under the supervision of the Committee of Ministers, must be compatible with the conclusions and spirit of this judgment (see *Ilgar Mammadov v. Azerbaijan* (infringement proceedings) [GC], no. 15172/13, § 182, 29 May 2019).

290. However, where the nature of the violation found is such as to leave no real choice as to the measures required to remedy it, the Court may decide to indicate a specific individual measure (see *Assanidze v. Georgia* [GC], no. 71503/01, §§ 202-03, ECHR 2004-II; *Del Río Prada v. Spain* [GC], no. 42750/09, §§ 138-39, ECHR 2013; and *Selahattin Demirtaş v. Turkey (no. 2)* [GC], no. 14305/17, § 442, 22 December 2020, with further references). In the present case, it is apparent that the continued prosecution and imprisonment of Jehovah’s Witnesses would entail a prolongation of the violation of their rights and a breach of the obligation on the respondent State to abide by the Court’s judgment in accordance with Article 46 § 1 of the Convention. This view is also consistent with the requirement of release of all imprisoned Jehovah’s Witnesses addressed to the Russian Government in the Opinion No. 10/2020 by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (see paragraph 136 above). Accordingly, the Court holds that the respondent State must take all necessary measures to secure the discontinuation of all pending criminal proceedings against Jehovah’s Witnesses, including by reference to the recently amended guidance by the Supreme Court of Russia (see paragraph 126 above), and release of all Jehovah’s Witnesses who have been deprived of their liberty.

## **B. Just satisfaction**

291. Article 41 of the Convention provides:

“If the Court finds that there has been a violation of the Convention or the Protocols thereto, and if the internal law of the High Contracting Party concerned allows only partial reparation to be made, the Court shall, if necessary, afford just satisfaction to the injured party.”

### *1. Pecuniary damage*

292. The applicants asked the Court to give the Russian authorities a period of no more than six months to restore the registration of the dissolved organisations and the ownership of the confiscated property. In the alternative, they claimed the value of the properties, reconstruction costs incurred to return them to the state in which they had been seized, and the cost of items which had been held there at the time of seizure. The value of the immovable and movable property, converted into euros (EUR) on the date of submission of the claims and adjusted for inflation, amounted to EUR 91,140 in the case of the Taganrog LRO and EUR 73,276 in the case of the Samara LRO. The twenty-one properties owned by the

Administrative Centre and the ninety-seven properties owned by LROs on the date of the liquidation decision were valued at EUR 40,568,252, and the 280 properties which had been transferred to foreign religious organisations of Jehovah's Witnesses before the liquidation and in respect of which the Russian authorities were seeking to annul transfer deeds, had a total value of EUR 25,510,994. The loss of enjoyment of use of those properties was estimated at EUR 500,000 for the national headquarters of Jehovah's Witnesses, EUR 300,000 and EUR 200,000 for the St Petersburg and Moscow Assembly Halls respectively, and EUR 10,000 for each of the 395 other properties. In addition, the Administrative Centre claimed EUR 6,243, representing the amount of cash seized from its bank accounts.

293. The individual applicants claimed, in respect of pecuniary damage, the amount of the fines they had paid and the replacement value of the property which had been seized from them. Mr Christensen claimed, in two applications, EUR 1,500 for the replacement value of his computer and other personal items seized from him and EUR 16,344 for the loss of income.

294. The Government submitted that no compensation in respect of pecuniary damage should be awarded because there had been no violation of the applicants' rights. In their view, the confiscation orders in respect of the applicants' funds in banks had been "a legitimate act" which could not be considered a violation of the applicants' rights. They pointed out that the Samara LRO did not complain of a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and disputed the ownership of properties in respect of which the Administrative Centre claimed compensation. They also submitted that a statement of Mr Christensen's past income was not sufficient evidence of future losses he claimed. Finally, they added that no compensation for loss of enjoyment was due because there had been no violation.

295. The Court reiterates that a clear causal connection must be established between the pecuniary damage alleged and the violation of the Convention that has been found. It has refused to accept claims for loss of income which allegedly resulted from the domestic authorities' decision to maintain pre-trial detention without sufficient reasons (see *Bykov v. Russia* [GC], no. 4378/02, § 110, 10 March 2009). The situation in Mr Christensen's case is however different in that the Court found that not only his pre-trial detention but also his prosecution and imprisonment had been effected in breach of the Convention. It is therefore satisfied that, had it not been for his arrest, detention and conviction on the extremism charges, he would have continued to earn the established and regular income he had had before his imprisonment. Accordingly, the Court awards Mr Christensen the amount of EUR 16,344 in respect of the loss of income. It also awards Mr Christensen and the other applicants the amounts they claimed for the loss of the seized personal property (see the amounts in

Appendix II) and the fines they had paid, plus any tax that may be chargeable.

296. The Court further notes that a judgment in which it finds a violation of the Convention imposes on the respondent State a legal obligation to put an end to the breach and make reparation for its consequences in such a way as to restore as far as possible the situation existing before the breach (*status quo ante*). If the nature of the violation allows for *restitutio in integrum*, it is the duty of the State held liable to effect it, the Court having neither the power nor the practical possibility of doing so itself. If, however, national law does not allow – or allows only partial – reparation to be made for the consequences of the breach, Article 41 empowers the Court to afford the injured party such satisfaction as appears to it to be appropriate (see *Iatridis v. Greece* (just satisfaction) [GC], no. 31107/96 § 32, ECHR 2000-XI, and *Guiso-Gallisay v. Italy* (just satisfaction) [GC], no. 58858/00, § 90, 22 December 2009).

297. The Court has found above that the decisions to dissolve the applicant organisations and confiscate their property had been made in breach of the Convention requirements. The Court's finding of a violation of the Convention is a ground for reopening domestic proceedings with a view to reviewing the final judgments in the light of the Convention principles (see, among others, *Biblical Centre of the Chuvash Republic*, cited above, § 66). The Court considers that such a review would be the most appropriate means of making reparation for the consequences of the violations it has found and restoring the *status quo ante*, including the return of the confiscated properties to the applicants. Alternatively, should the return of the confiscated properties not be effected within three months of the present judgment becoming final in accordance with Article 44 § 2 of the Convention, the respondent State is to pay, in respect of pecuniary damage, the amounts specified in Appendix II, plus any tax that may be chargeable on these amounts.

## 2. *Non-pecuniary damage*

298. The applicants claimed: EUR 20,000 to the Taganrog LRO and the Administrative Centre and EUR 250 to each individual applicant in the case of the Taganrog LRO; EUR 5,000 to the Gorno-Altaysk LRO, EUR 250 to each member of its congregation and EUR 20,000 to the Administrative Centre and two publishers of the Jehovah's Witnesses' literature; EUR 30,000 to the Samara LRO; EUR 10,000 to Mr Aliyev; EUR 100,000 each to the publisher and distributor of the Jehovah's Witnesses' publications in the case concerning the withdrawal of the distribution permit; EUR 25,000 each to Watchtower New York and the Administrative Centre and EUR 10,000 to the individual applicants in the case concerning the declaration of the website extremist; EUR 15,000 to each applicant in the case concerning the criminal conviction of Jehovah's Witnesses in

Taganrog; EUR 115,000 to Mr Christensen; EUR 250,000 to the Administrative Centre and EUR 30,000 to each LRO in the cases concerning their forced dissolution.

299. The Government submitted that the claims were excessive and that the finding of a violation, if any, would constitute sufficient just satisfaction.

300. The Court awards EUR 15,000 each or such smaller amount as was actually claimed to the individual applicants who were convicted in criminal proceedings; EUR 7,500 each or such smaller amount as was actually claimed to the liquidated or banned applicant organisations and congregations and to the applicants who were convicted in administrative proceedings; and EUR 1,000 each or such smaller amount as was actually claimed to the other applicants, in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable (see Appendix II for the amounts awarded).

### 3. *Punitive damages*

301. Some applicants also claimed punitive damages to reflect the particular character of the violations they suffered and to serve as a deterrent in respect of violations of a similar nature by the respondent State.

302. The Court has declined to award “punitive damages” in the past (see *Carter v. Russia*, no. 20914/07, § 180, 21 September 2021) and finds no reason to depart from its established case-law. It rejects the claims under this head.

### 4. *Costs and expenses*

303. The applicants claimed: EUR 9,000 for the work of their representatives before the Court in the case of Taganrog LRO; EUR 4,483 and EUR 4,500 for the work in the domestic and Strasbourg proceedings respectively in the case of Samara LRO; EUR 9,000 in the case of the Gorno-Altaysk LRO; EUR 3,500 in the case of Mr Aliyev; EUR 22,000 in the case concerning the withdrawal of the distribution permit; EUR 4,500 in the case concerning the banning of the website; EUR 91,078 for the defence of Mr Trotsyuk and other applicants by a team of eight lawyers on 158 court days over a four-year trial and EUR 4,500 for their representation before the Court; EUR 48,450 for Mr Christensen’s representation in the domestic and Strasbourg proceedings; and a total of EUR 35,190 for the work in the cases concerning the dissolution of the Administrative Centre and LROs.

304. The Government submitted that the amounts claimed for costs and expenses were excessive and that evidence of disbursements had not been provided.

305. According to the Court’s case-law, an applicant is entitled to the reimbursement of costs and expenses only in so far as it has been shown that these have been actually and necessarily incurred and are reasonable as

to quantum. The dissolution, administrative and criminal proceedings initiated by the Russian authorities to suppress the activities of the Jehovah's Witnesses community in Russia were exceptionally complex and generated a substantial amount of legal costs and expenses (compare *Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow and Others*, cited above, § 211). Making a global assessment of costs and expenses on the basis of the documents submitted, the Court awards the applicants jointly EUR 125,000, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them on that amount, payable into the bank account specified by their representative before the Court.

#### 5. *Default interest*

306. The Court considers it appropriate that the default interest rate should be based on the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank, to which should be added three percentage points.

### FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT

1. *Decides*, by a majority, to join the applications;
2. *Declares*, unanimously, the applications admissible;
3. *Holds*, by six votes to one, that there has been a violation of Article 9 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 11, on account of the forced dissolution of Taganrog LRO and a violation of Article 10 of the Convention on account of the declaration of Jehovah's Witnesses' publications "extremist";
4. *Holds*, by six votes to one, that there has been a violation of Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 9, on account of the declaration of the Jehovah's Witnesses' publications "extremist" and the prosecution of individual applicants and the forced dissolution of the Samara LRO for using those publications in their religious ministry;
5. *Holds*, by six votes to one, that there has been a violation of Article 10 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 9, on account of the withdrawal of the distribution permit and the prosecution of the applicants for distributing unregistered media;
6. *Holds*, by six votes to one, that there has been a violation of Article 10 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 9, on account of the declaration of the Jehovah's Witnesses' international website "extremist";

7. *Holds*, by six votes to one, that there has been a violation of Article 9 of the Convention, read in the light of Article 11, on account of the dissolution of the Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia and the LROs of Jehovah's Witnesses;
8. *Holds*, by six votes to one, that there has been a violation of Article 9 of the Convention on account of the criminal prosecution of the applicants for continuing to practice their religion and a violation of Article 5 of the Convention in respect of Mr Christensen;
9. *Holds*, by six votes to one, that there has been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1;
10. *Holds*, unanimously, that it is not necessary to give a separate ruling on the merits of the remaining complaints;
11. *Holds*, by four votes to three, that the respondent State is to take all necessary measures to secure the discontinuation of pending criminal proceedings against Jehovah's Witnesses and release of the imprisoned Jehovah's Witnesses;
12. *Holds*, by six votes to one, that the respondent State, in order to satisfy the applicants' claim for pecuniary damage incurred through the confiscation of their properties, is to ensure that the properties be returned to the applicants, within three months of the present judgment becoming final in accordance with Article 44 § 2 of the Convention;
13. *Holds*, by six votes to one, in the alternative that should the respondent State fail to return the properties as specified in the preceding paragraph, it is to pay, within three months from the date on which the judgment becomes final in accordance with Article 44 § 2 of the Convention, the amounts specified in Appendix II, to be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable at the date of settlement in case of the applicants who are resident in Russia;
14. *Holds*, by six votes to one,
  - (a) that the respondent State is to pay, within three months from the date on which the judgment becomes final in accordance with Article 44 § 2 of the Convention, the amounts specified below and detailed in Appendix II, to be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable at the date of settlement in case of the applicants who are resident in Russia:
    - (i) the amounts claimed, plus any tax that may be chargeable, in respect of pecuniary damage;

- (ii) EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) each to the individual applicants who were convicted in criminal proceedings; EUR 7,500 (seven thousand five hundred euros) each to the liquidated or banned applicant organisations and congregations and to the applicants who were convicted in administrative proceedings; and EUR 1,000 (one thousand euros) each or such smaller amount as was actually claimed to the other applicants, plus any tax that may be chargeable, in respect of non-pecuniary damage;
- (iii) EUR 125,000 (one hundred and twenty-five thousand euros) jointly to all applicants in respect of costs and expenses, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them, payable into the bank account specified by their representative before the Court;
- (b) that from the expiry of the above-mentioned three months until settlement simple interest shall be payable on the above amounts at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points;

15. *Dismisses*, unanimously, the remainder of the applicants' claims in respect of non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 7 June 2022, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Milan Blaško  
Registrar

Georges Ravarani  
President



## APPENDIX I: LIST OF APPLICATIONS

Note: asterisks indicate applications in which some complaints were declared inadmissible on giving notice to the Government.

No.	Application no.	Application title	Lodged on
1.	32401/10	<i>Taganrog LRO and Others v. Russia</i>	01/06/2010
2.	44285/10	<i>Gorno-Altaysk LRO and Others v. Russia</i>	23/07/2010
3.	3488/11	<i>Boltnyev v. Russia</i>	03/01/2011
4.	3492/11	<i>Mardonov v. Russia</i>	03/01/2011
5.	14821/11	<i>Aliyev v. Russia</i>	08/02/2011
6.	17552/11	<i>Fedorin and Others v. Russia</i>	11/03/2011
7.	2269/12	<i>Chukan and Others v. Russia</i>	05/01/2012
8.	5547/12	<i>Gareyev and Others v. Russia</i>	10/01/2012
9.	76162/12	<i>Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia and Wachtturm Bibel- und Traktat-Gesellschaft der Zeugen Jehovas e.V. v. Russia</i>	21/11/2012
10.	74387/13	<i>Zinich and Others v. Russia</i>	19/11/2013
11.	79240/13	<i>Verish and Others v. Russia</i>	11/12/2013
12.	28108/14	<i>Novikov and Others v. Russia</i>	04/04/2014
13.	2861/15*	<i>Kravchuk and Others v. Russia</i>	14/01/2015
14.	15962/15*	<i>Samara LRO and Others v. Russia</i>	31/03/2015
15.	16578/15	<i>Birobidzhan LRO and Aliyev v. Russia</i>	07/04/2015
16.	24622/16*	<i>Trotsyuk and Others v. Russia</i>	28/04/2016
17.	10188/17*	<i>Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia and Kalin v. Russia</i>	03/02/2017
18.	39417/17*	<i>Christensen v. Russia</i>	02/06/2017
19.	3215/18*	<i>Glazov LRO and Others v. Russia</i>	15/01/2018
20.	44386/19*	<i>Christensen v. Russia</i>	20/08/2019

## APPENDIX II: LIST OF APPLICANTS AND AWARDS UNDER ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

Note: in each application, applicant organisations are listed before individual applicants. Individual applicants are listed in alphabetical order.

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
<i>Application no. 32401/10, Taganrog LRO and Others v. Russia</i>					
Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia	1999	St. Petersburg		20,000	7,500
Wachturm Bibel- und Traktat-Gesellschaft der Zeugen Jehovas	1956	Selters, Germany		20,000	1,000
Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York	1909	New York, USA		20,000	1,000
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Taganrog"	1992	Taganrog	60,343	20,000	7,500
Matveyev-Kurgan Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Taganrog Armenian Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Taganrog Nikolayevskoye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Taganrog Polyakovskoye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Taganrog Primorskoye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Taganrog Privokzalnoye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Taganrog Severnoye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Taganrog Tsentralnoye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Taganrog Vostochnoye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Taganrog Yuzhnoye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Taganrog Zapadnoye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Vesyoloye Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Taganrog			
Natalya Valeryevna ACHILOVA	1957	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksandr Valeryevich ADONIN	1977	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksey Valeryevich ADONIN	1976	Taganrog		250	250
Lubov Alekseevna ADONINA	1955	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Dmitriyevna ADONINA	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Nikolaevna ADONINA	1976	Taganrog		250	250
Yana Petrovna ADONINA	1975	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Evgenyevna AFONICHEVA	1966	Taganrog		250	250
Narine Gegamovna AGEGEKYAN	1974	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Marina Artyomovna AKHALADZE	1963	Taganrog		250	250
Viktoria Alekseevna AKIMENKO	1939	Taganrog		250	250
Yekaterina Vladimirovna ALHUTOVA	1956	Pokrovskoye		250	250
Vera Georgievna ALYOKHINA	1945	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Mikhaylovna AMBARCUMYAN	1952	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Alekseyevna ANDREEVA	1957	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Petrovna ANDRUSCHENKO	1931	Veselyy		250	250
Valentina Vasilyevna ANDRYUNINA	1933	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Yakovlevna ANTOKHINA	1953	Taganrog		250	250
Alyona Sergeevna ARTEEVA	1985	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Anatolyevna ASOSOVA	1963	Taganrog		250	250
Nelli Sergeyevna ASSELBERG	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Đšlavdiya Ilyinichna ASTAKHOVA	1920	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Dmitrievna ASTAPCHIK	1956	Taganrog		250	250
Yuriy Aleksandrovich BAKLUSHIN	1983	Taganrog		250	250
Oksana Vladimovna BAKLUSHINA	1973	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Irina Vladimirovna BALEYEVA	1963	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Anatolyevna BAZALYUK	1952	Dmitriadovka		250	250
Igor Ivanovich BELIK	1983	Taganrog		250	250
Yekaterina Yuryevna BELIK	1986	Taganrog		250	250
Lubov Vasilyevna BELIK	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksandr Ivanovich BELIK	1986	Taganrog		250	250
Lubov Viktorovna BELINSKAYA	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Denis Vladimirovich BELKIN	1980	Taganrog		250	250
Anna Vasilyevna BELYAEVA	1957	Taganrog		250	250
Vera Ivanovna BEREZHNYAYA	1955	Taganrog		250	250
Yuliya Vladimirovna BIKADOROVA	1981	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Aleksandrovna BOGATIRYOVA	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Vasilievna BOGOSLOVSKAYA	1957	Taganrog		250	250
Yuliya Igorevna BOGUSHEVA	1985	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Savelyevna BOKHENKO	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Dmitriyevna BOLGOVA	1949	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Yuriy Alekseyevich BONDARENKO	1946	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Nadezhda Fyodorovna BORDYUG	1951	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Ivanovna BORISENKO	1937	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Sergeyevna BORKOVSKAYA	1988	Taganrog		250	250
Vasiliy Yakovlevich BOVKUNOV	1947	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Ivanovna BUBASHVILI	1969	Varenovka		250	250
Valentina Petrovna BUDANOVA	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Margarita Vasileevna BUGAYOVA	1936	Novolakedem onovka		250	250
Aleksandr Dmitrievich BURLACHENKO	1950	Russkiy Kolodets		250	250
Yelena Fyodorovna BURLACHENKO	1953	Russkiy Kolodets		250	250
Viktor Aleksandrovich BURLACHENKO	1983	Russkiy Kolodets		250	250
Yevgeniya Vladimirovna BURLACHENKO	1981	Russkiy Kolodets		250	250
Yekaterina Andreyevna CHAPLIGINA	1974	Taganrog		250	250
Lubov Efimovna CHAYKINA	1963	Taganrog		250	250
Yevdokiya Ivanovna CHEREDNICHENKO	1945	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Petrovna CHEREVAKTENKO	1949	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Vladimir Aleksandrovich CHESNOKOV	1949	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Svetlana Nikolaevna CHESNOKOVA	1950	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Afanasyevna CHESNOKOVA	1954	Taganrog		250	250
Đširill Igorevich CHETVERIKOV	1988	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Yuryevna CHETVERIKOVA	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Petrovna CHIBISOVA	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Petrovna DANILOVA	1956	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Andreevna DANYUKOVA	1953	Taganrog		250	250
Tamara Maksimovna DAVIDCHENKO	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Ivanovna DEMYANENKO	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Nikolaevna DENISKINA	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Irina Đeikhaylovna DEREVYANKO	1956	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Irina Olegovna DERKACHYOVA	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Maria Vasilyevna DERKACHYOVA	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksandra Yeliseyevna DERYABOVA	1928	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Vyacheslavovna DERYAGINA	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Pavlina Anatolyevna DERYAGINA	1950	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Antonovna DESNENKO	1949	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Nadezhda Pavlovna DIMKOVSKAYA	1937	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Vladimirovna DORENKO	1952	Taganrog		250	250
Marina Ivanovna DOROFYEVA	1979	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Stepanovna DOROFYEVA	1953	Taganrog		250	250
Alina Vitalyevna DROZDOVA	1992	Taganrog		250	250
Oksana Aleksandrovna DROZDOVA	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Valeriyevna DUROVA	1975	Taganrog		250	250
Taisiya Vasilyevna DVORECKAYA	1945	Pokrovskoye		250	250
Mikhail Vitalyevich DYAKONOV	1986	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Vitalyevna DYAKONOVA	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Nikolaevna DYAKONOVA	1986	Taganrog		250	250
Ðœaria Nikolaevna FEDORYENKO	1939	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Yelisaveta Petrovna FEDOSOVA	1950	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Nadezhda Mikhaylovna FILATOVA	1954	Taganrog		250	250
Larisa Aleksandrovna FILONOVA	1956	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Fyodorovna FOGEL	1936	Taganrog		250	250



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Irina Nikolaevna FOMICHENKO	1974	Taganrog		250	250
Lyubov Mikhaylovna FOMINA	1930	Taganrog		250	250
Yekaterina Ivanovna GABRIEL	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Lubov Viktorovna GALKINA	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Zinaida Stepanovna GALUSHKINA	1936	Novobesserge nevka		250	250
Valentina Andreyevna GALUZA	1953	Petrushino		250	250
Natalya Alekseyevna GARKUSHA	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Vladimir Petrovich GARKUSHA	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Sergeyevna GAVRILINA	1951	Taganrog		250	250
Alla Ivanovna GAVRILOVA	1950	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Ignatyevna GAVRUTENKO	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Evgenyevna GENERALOVNA	1963	Taganrog		250	250
Yevgeniya Alekseyevna GENRALOVA	1987	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Vladimirovna GERASIMOVA	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Givi Mikhaylovich GOGUA	1970	Varenovka		250	250
Nina Petrovna GOLOBURDA	1972	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Lyubov Borisovna GOLOSKO	1947	Taganrog		250	250
Klavdiya Ivanovna GOLOSKOKOVA	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Stanislavovna GOLOSOVSKAYA	1969	Taganrog		250	250
Yuriy Petrovich GOLUBENKO	1957	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Leonidovna GOLUBENKO	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Alla Pavlovna GOLUBENKO	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Leonidovna GOLUBINA	1974	Taganrog		250	250
Nikolay Nikolayevich GOLYASHOV	1954	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Aleksandr Viktorovich GONCHAROV	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Nikolaevna GONCHAROVA	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Ivanovna GONCHAROVA	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Viktorovna GORBACH	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Nikitichna GORBATENKO	1926	Russkaya Slobodka		250	250
Natalya Aleksandrovna GORBUNOVA	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Ðšseniya Aleksandrovna GORBUNOVA	1985	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Mikhaylovna GRIGORYEVA	1952	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Lyudmila Alekseyevna GRISHINA	1951	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Petrovna GUDA	1947	Taganrog		250	250
Oksana Bronislavovna GUDKOVA	1976	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Valentinovna GULEVSKAYA	1955	Botsmanovo		250	250
Yuliya Evgenyevna GUSEVA	1981	Taganrog		250	250
Vera Nikolaevna HIMCHENKO	1960	Taganrog		250	250
Oksana Olegovna HIMCHENKO	1981	Taganrog		250	250
Alyona Viktorovna ISMAILOVA	1974	Taganrog		250	250
Viktoria Valeryevna IVANKOVA	1984	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Viktorovna IVANKOVA	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Pavlovna IVANOVA	1948	Krasnyi Desant		250	250
Raisa Karpovna IVANOVA	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Andreyevna IVANOVA	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Dmitriyevna IVASHENENKOVA	1956	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Anatolyevna IVASHINA	1971	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Gavrilovna IZVEKOVA	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksandr Vladimirovich KALASHNIKOV	1974	Zolotaya Kosa		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Yelena Nikolaevna KALASHNIKOVA	1969	Zolotaya Kosa		250	250
Anna Grigoryevna KAMININA	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Dmitriy Nikolaevich KAPUZA	1975	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Vladimirovna KARPENKO	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Aleksandrovna KARPENKO	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Liliya Fyodorovna KARUNA	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Viktoria Viktorovna KASHIROVA	1987	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Alekseyevna KATAEVA	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksey Vladimirovich KAZACHENKO	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Nikolaevna KAZACHENKO	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Dina Aleksandrovna KHALIMAN	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Grachya Konstantinovich KHANDOYAN	1970	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Nikolaevna KHARCHYOVA	1931	Taganrog		250	250
Andrey Igorevich KHAVIN	1964	Taganrog		250	250
Yekaterina Aleksandrovna KHAVINA	1988	Taganrog		250	250
Ella Yuryevna KHAVINA	1969	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Vasilyevna KHILKO	1944	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Yelena Ivanovna KHLKOVSKAYA	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksey Sergeevich KHUDYAEV	1990	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Gerasimovna KIKHTEEVA	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Yevgeniya Grigoryevna KIPCHATOVA	1926	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Vasilyevna KLEMENTYEVA	1946	Fedorovka		250	250
Aleksandra Viktorovna KLIMENKO	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Vladimirovna KOCHANOVA	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Aykui Aramaisovna KOCHINYAN	1986	Taganrog		250	250
Ermine Aramaisovna KOCHINYAN	1988	Taganrog		250	250
Aramais Gurgenovich KOCHINYAN	1958	Kh. Lomakin		250	250
Valentina Efimovna KOLCHANOVA	1952	Taganrog		250	250
Raisa Mikhaylovna KOLESNIKOVA	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Nikolaevna KOLESNIKOVA	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Anna Anatolyevna KOLOMEYCEVA	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Nikolaevna KOLOMIYCEVA	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Georgievna KOLTUNOVA	1965	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Taisiya Ivanovna KOMPANIETS	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Abramovna KONONOVA	1931	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Alekseyevna KONSTANTINOVA	1937	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Aleksandrovna KOPIIL	1988	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Nikolaevna KOPIIL	1966	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksandra Igorevna KOROBCHENKO	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Georgievna KORZHANENKO	1955	Beglitsa		250	250
Valentina Vladimirovna KOSHKINA	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Alla Stepanovna KOSHKINA	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Irina Viktorovna KOSTYUCHENKO	1964	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Porfiryevna KOVALENKO	1944	Taganrog		250	250
Vladimir Alekseyevich KOVALEV	1947	Taganrog		250	250
Dmitriy Olegovich KOVALYOV	1979	Taganrog		250	250
Andrey Olegovich KOVALYOV	1984	Taganrog		250	250
Kseniya Gennadyevna KOVALYOVA	1981	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Ivanovna KOVALYOVA	1954	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Gennadyevna KOVALYOVA	1958	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Tamara Timofeyevna KOVALYOVA	1939	Veselyy		250	250
Lyudmila Mikhailovna KOVALYOVA	1949	Petrushino		250	250
Vladimir Viktorovich KOZHUKHOV	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Ivanovna KOZHUKHOVA	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Oleg Nikolayevich KOZIKOV	1979	Taganrog		250	250
Inna Vladimirovna KOZIKOVA	1979	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Yakovlevna KRAVCOVA	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Vera Vladimirovna KRETOVA	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Leonidovna KRETOVA	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Maria Pavlovna KRETOVA	1986	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Nikolaevna KRIKUNOVA	1929	Taganrog		250	250
Yevgenia Dmitriyevna KRUGLOVA	1953	Ryasnoye		250	250
Natalya Nikolaevna KUCIKH	1970	Botsmanovo		250	250
Tamara Nikolaevna KUDRYASHOVA	1944	Taganrog		250	250
Larisa Vladimirovna KUDRYAVCEVA	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Valeriy Glebovich KUKOVENKO	1951	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Tatyana Nikolaevna KULAGINA	1952	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Aleksandrovna KULISHOVA	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Ivan Ivanovich KUMSHATSKIY	1930	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Yelena Vladimirovna KURILO	1969	Taganrog		250	250
Vladimir Grigoryevich KURILOV	1966	Veselyy		250	250
Natalya Yuryevna KURILOVA	1970	Veselyy		250	250
Irina Vladimirovna KURILOVA	1991	Veselyy		250	250
Galina Anatolyevna KURYACHAYA	1961	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Maksimovna KURYUCHKINA	1958	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Aleksandrovna KUTLYANCEVA	1947	Taganrog		250	250
Tamara Yakovlevna KUZNECOVA	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Vladimirovna KVASHINA	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Vladimirovna LEBED	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Gennady Nikolayevich LENIN	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Dmitriy Gennadyevich LENIN	1987	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Yuryevna LENINA	1963	Taganrog		250	250



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Natalya Gennadyevna LENINA	1989	Taganrog		250	250
Dora Savelyevna LEVINA	1934	Taganrog		250	250
Anna Alekseyevna LEVSHINA	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Pavlovna LEVSHINA	1988	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Valentinovna LIKHONOS	1952	Taganrog		250	250
Irina Viktorovna LIKOVA	1961	Taganrog		250	250
Taisiya Porfiryevna LISENKO	1934	Taganrog		250	250
Yuliya Fyodorovna LIVINCEVA	1981	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Yuriy Vladimirovich LOBKOV	1962	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Ivanovna LOBKOVA	1966	Taganrog		250	250
Vitaliy Valeryanovich LOGVINOV	1966	Taganrog		250	250
Marina Dmitrievna LOMEY	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Anna Dmitriyevna LOMEY	1951	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Vladimirovna LOVYAGINA	1960	Taganrog		250	250
Igor Vladimirovich LUKYANCHENKO	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Valentinovna LUKYANCHENKOVA	1961	Taganrog		250	250
Nikolay Aleksandrovich LUTS	1958	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Nadezhda Stanislavovna LUTS	1966	Taganrog		250	250
Kira Igoryevna LYAGOVICH	1984	Taganrog		250	250
Dmitriy Viktorovich LYAGOVICH	1985	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Mikhaylovna LYAGOVICH	1978	Taganrog		250	250
Raisa Petrovna LYAGOVICH	1952	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Vladimirovna MAKAROVA	1952	Taganrog		250	250
Assol Genrikhovna MAKHANKO	1966	Taganrog		250	250
Sergey Alekseyevich MAKHANKO	1966	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Alekseyevna MAKHOVIKOVA	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Eduard Vladimirovich MAKSIMENKO	1975	Taganrog		250	250
Anna Leonidovna MAKSIMENKO	1986	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Viktorovna MAKSIMENKO	1971	Taganrog		250	250
Irina Aleksandrovna MAKSIMENKO	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Fyodorovna MALEVA	1950	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Fillipovna MALOFEEVA	1940	Aleksandrova Kosa		250	250
Vera Stefanovna MARCHENKO	1936	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Svetlana Albertovna MARTINOVA	1958	Taganrog		250	250
Siranush Vladimirovna MARTIROSYAN	1983	Taganrog		250	250
Lianna Aslanovna MARTIROSYAN	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Anna Vladimirovna MARTIROSYAN	1982	Taganrog		250	250
Genri Dshachaturovich MARTIROSYAN	1981	Taganrog		250	250
Melanya Levonovna MARTIROSYAN	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Anatolyevna MASHTALYAR	1974	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Timofeyevna MASLOVA	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Mikhailovna MATVIENKO	1983	Taganrog		250	250
Nikolay Vasilyevich MATVIENKO	1980	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Yuryevna MAYEVSKAYA	1969	Taganrog		250	250
Yekaterina Ivanovna MAYOROVA	1939	Botsmanovo		250	250
Andrey Ivanovich MEDVEDEV	1984	Taganrog		250	250
Rayisa Porfirovna MEDVEDEVA	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Melanush Melkonovna MELKONYAN	1950	Taganrog		250	250
Klavdiya Mikhaylovna MELNICHENKO	1931	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Maria Ivanovna MENYAYLOVA	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Evgenyevna MIKHAYLICHENKO	1970	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Anatolyevna MIKHAYLINA	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Sergey Aleksandrovich MILOKHIN	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Sofya Vladimirovna MILOKHINA	1957	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Petrovna MINAEVA	1956	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Sergeyevna MINAEVA	1977	Taganrog		250	250
Alla Gevorkovna MINASYAN	1956	Taganrog		250	250
Oleg Yuryevich MIRONOV	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Yekaterina Fyodorovna MIROSHNICHENKO	1943	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Olga Vfsilyevna MIROZIZOVA	1976	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Anna Aleksandrovna MIRSKAYA	1954	Pokrovskoye		250	250
Artush Albertovich MKRTCHYAN	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Anaida Lernikova MKRTCHYAN	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Covinar Artushevna MKRTCHYAN	1992	Taganrog		250	250
Covinar Vasilyevna MKRTCHYAN	1936	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Vladimir Pavlovich MOISEYENKO	1970	Taganrog		250	250
Albina Vasilyevna MOISEYEVA	1937	Taganrog		250	250
Sergey Vasilyevich MOLCHANOV	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Anna Vyacheslavovna MOLCHANOVA	1981	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Alekseevna MONCHENKO	1954	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Valentina Ilyinichna MUKHORTOVA	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Nikolaevna MURATOVA	1956	Taganrog		250	250
Zagiddin Sharafiddinovich MURTUZALIEV	1960	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Andreevna MURUGOVA	1986	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Vasilyevna MUZIKA	1950	Taganrog		250	250
Irina Leonidovna MUZIKA	1972	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Semyonovna NADOLINSKAYA	1957	Taganrog		250	250
Vyacheslav Georgievich NADOLINSKIY	1977	Taganrog		250	250
Nadezhda Sergeevna NADZGAIDZE	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Vasilyevna NAZARENKO	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Vladimirovna NECHIPORUK	1974	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Mikhaylovna NEDOSTOEVA	1937	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Irina Sergeevna NEFYEDOVA	1952	Taganrog		250	250
Ilya Vladimirovich NEFYODOV	1987	Taganrog		250	250
Aleftina Nikolaevna NEGARA	1934	Taganrog		250	250
Sergey Vitalyevich NESCHIMENKO	1961	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Larisa Ivanovna NESCHIMENKO	1960	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Andrey Sergeyeovich NESHIMENKO	1982	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Lubov Ivanovna NIKANOROVA	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Alevtina Sergeevna NOVIKOVA	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Nelya Evgenyevna OLEYNIK	1944	Taganrog		250	250
Maria Nikolaevna OLEYNIKOVA	1940	Veselyy		250	250
Vitaliy Romanovich ORLOV	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Nikolaevna ORLOVA	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Maria Tikhonova OSTROVSKAYA	1926	Taganrog		250	250
Eudokiya Petrovna OVCHAROVA	1945	Pokrovskoye		250	250
Yekaterina Nikolaevna PANEZHINA	1939	Taganrog		250	250
Vasilij Vasilyevich PANOV	1961	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Nataliya Vasilyevna PANOVA	1982	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Ivanovna PAPCHENKO	1938	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Galina Nikolaevna PARAMONOVA	1961	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Sergeevna PARAMONOVA	1978	Taganrog		250	250
Lubov Pavlovna PAVLOVA	1951	Taganrog		250	250
Yelisaveta Illarionovna PAZONOVA	1929	Taganrog		250	250
Lyubov Radionovna PERMYAKOVA	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Igor Igorevich PETROV	1991	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Nikolaevna PETROVA	1939	Taganrog		250	250
Aleftina Afanasyevna PETROVA	1937	Sambek		250	250
Sofya Ivanovna PETROVA	1957	Novaya Nadezhda		250	250
Tamara Vasilyevna PETROVSKAYA	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Grigoryevna PETRUNKO	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Yuliya Viktorovna PLAKHOTINA	1976	Taganrog		250	250
Sergey Anatolyevich PODOPRIGORIN	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Viktorovna POGOSYAN	1970	Taganrog		250	250
Nadezhda Dzeikhaylovna POKUSOVA	1955	Taganrog		250	250

TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Alla Leonidovna POLKOVNICHENKO	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Vyacheslav Valeryevich PONOMARENKO	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Irina Leonidovna POPOVA	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Fyodorovna POPOVA	1939	Bolshe-Kirsanovo		250	250
Irina Viktorovna POVALYUHINA	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Stepanovna POVIDAYLOVA	1944	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Aleksandrovna PRIMACHENKO	1939	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Ivanovna PRUCKOVA	1939	Taganrog		250	250
Anna Nikolaevna PUCHKOVA	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Vera Ivanovna PUGACH	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Viktoria Anatolyevna PUSHKARYOVA	1962	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Pavlovna PUTEYEVA	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Nikolaevna PYATAKOVA	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Genrietta Aleksandrovna RAKOVA	1937	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Aleksandrovna RAZVALOVA	1955	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Vasilyevna REDKOKASHA	1963	Novobesserge nevka		250	250
Andrey Gennadyevich REPIN	1973	Taganrog		250	250



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Oksana Ivanovna REPINA	1975	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Sergeevna REZNIKOVA	1985	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Alekseyevna RIKBERG	1953	Taganrog		250	250
Tamara Pavlovna ROMANENKO	1939	Taganrog		250	250
Đšlavdiya Dmitrievna ROMANOVA	1938	Russkaya Slobodka		250	250
Pavel Gerasimovich RUDYASHKO	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Viktorovna RUDYASHKO	1950	Taganrog		250	250
Lubov Pavlovna RYABOKON	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Gabbas Bikmukhametovich SAGITDINOV	1939	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Aleksandrovna SAMORODOVA	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Valentinovna SAVCHENKO	1960	Taganrog		250	250
Kamila Maratovna SAVCHENKO	1989	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Andreevna SAVCHENKO	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Vasilyevna SAVOSTINA	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Zoya Viktorovna SAZONENKO	1937	Taganrog		250	250
Vladimir Aleksandrovich SCHAVELEV	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksandra Ivanovna SCHAVELEVA	1947	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Natalya Nikolaevna SCHEBUNYAEVA	1977	Taganrog		250	250
Vyacheslav Valeryevich SCHEKALYOV	1977	Taganrog		250	250
Ivan Panteleyevich SCHYUR	1970	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Vladimirovna SCHYUR	1961	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Arsenyevna SEMENYUTA	1929	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Fyodorovna SEMIROVA	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Terentyevna SEMYENOVA	1932	Taganrog		250	250
Polina Ivanovna SEMYONCHENCO	1939	Taganrog		250	250
Anna Stepanovna SGIBNEVA	1936	Novoandriano vka		250	250
Tatyana Nikolaevna SHALIMOVA	1951	Taganrog		250	250
Lyubov Pavlovna SHAPRANOVA	1953	Taganrog		250	250
Nataliya Aleksandrovna SHAPRANOVA	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Yuryevna SHEKHOVCOVA	1975	Taganrog		250	250
Ivan Alekseyevich SHEREMETOV	1969	Dolokovka		250	250
Yekaterina Borisovna SHEREMETOVA	1966	Troitskoye		250	250
Svetlana Alekseyevna SHEREMETOVA	1974	Dolokovka		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Tamara Georgievna SHEREMETOVA	1938	Dolokovka		250	250
Valentina Afanasyevna SHERSTOBITOVA	1934	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Mikhaylovna SHEVCHENKO	1955	Russkiy Kolodets		250	250
Nadezhda Fillipovna SHEYKO	1951	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Anatolyevna SHILO	1963	Taganrog		250	250
Inna Vladimirovna SHIPIKA	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Svetlana Vasilyevna SHISHKINA	1965	Pokrovskoye		250	250
Ðœariya Grigoryevna SHKATOVA	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Andreyevna SHOROKHOVA	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksandr Georgiyevich SHUKIN	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Anatolyevna SHUKINA	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Denis Sergeyeovich SILYUTIN	1978	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Ivanovna SILYUTINA	1964	Taganrog		250	250
Albina Alekseevna SIMONOVA	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Fyodorovna SIRINA	1936	Taganrog		250	250
Arina Evgenyevna SIROTENKO	1991	Taganrog		250	250
Yevgeniy Ivanovich SIROTENKO	1967	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Natalya Viktorovna SIROTENKO	1966	Taganrog		250	250
Lyubov Avrahamovna SIROVATSKAYA	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Yevgeniy Nikolayevich SISOYEV	1980	Pokrovskoye		250	250
Nina Vasilyevna SITINA	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Aleksandrovna SKVORTSOVA	1988	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Filippovna SMETANINA	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Rayisa Petrovna SMIRNOVA	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Lubov Vasilyevna SOBOLEVSKAYA	1938	Petrushino		250	250
Valentina Vasilyevna SOLOGUB	1937	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Erikovna SOROKINA	1957	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Sergeyevna SOROKINA	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Vladimirovna STANISLAVSKAYA	1958	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Samoylovna STRELNKOVA	1937	Taganrog		250	250
Vladimir Petrovich STUKALOV	1939	Pokrovskoye		250	250
Valentin Sergeyevich SUPONIN	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Anatoliy Alekseyevich SUSHKOV	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Ivanovna SUSHKOVA	1951	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Galina Fyodorovna SVIRIDOVA	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Zinaida Georgievna SYAGAYLO	1953	Starorotovka		250	250
Nina Vasilyevna TAKUNOVA	1942	Taganrog		250	250
Dmitriy Aleksandrovich TELEGIN	1985	Taganrog		250	250
Kseniya Sergeyevna TELEGINA	1988	Taganrog		250	250
Vera Mikhailovna TIKHOMIROVA	1975	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Viktorovna TIKHONOVA	1962	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Vladimirovna TIMCHENKO	1974	Krasnyi Pakhar'		250	250
Nina Aleksandrovna TIMIREVA	1946	Taganrog		250	250
Lyubov D'orisovna TIMKOVA	1953	Taganrog		250	250
Andrey Igorevich TIMOSHENKO	1988	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Gennadyevna TIMOSHENKO	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Taisiya Andreyevna TKACHENKO	1955	Taganrog		250	250
Larisa Georgievna TKACHENKO	1961	Taganrog		250	250
Kseniya Sergeyevna TKACHENKO	1987	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Vladimirovna TKACHUK	1961	Pokrovskoye		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Zoya Nikolaevna TKAVCH	1958	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Irina Andreevna TREGUBENKO	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Oleg Anatolyevich TREGUBOV	1974	Taganrog		250	250
Irina Viktorovna TREGUBOVA	1976	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Pavlovna TRIKOZ	1934	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Iina Petrovna TRZHTSINA	1970	Taganrog		250	250
Stepan Anatolyevich TSUTSAEV	1970	Taganrog		250	250
Yuriy Mikhailovich TULENEV	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Vladimirovna TULENEVA	1961	Taganrog		250	250
Nataliya Vladimirovna TUMANYAN	1970	Taganrog		250	250
Maria Aleksandrovna VAGANOVA	1990	Taganrog		250	250
Yuriy Viktorovich VAKHNENKO	1971	Taganrog		250	250
Larisa Valentinovna VAKULENKO	1960	Taganrog		250	250
Yevgeniya Dœïkhaylovna VALIKOVA	1948	Taganrog		250	250
Kira Ivanovna VASILINA	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Alekseevna VEDENEYEVA	1929	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250
Olga Viktorovna VERBITSKAYA	1963	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Galina Aleksandrovna VERGELES	1943	Taganrog		250	250
Larisa Aleksandrovna VERYOMENKO	1969	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Borisovna VICHEGZHANINA	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Aleksandrovna VINOGRADOVA	1950	Taganrog		250	250
Zinaida Yakovlevna VODOLAGA	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Irina Igorevna VOLKOVA	1961	Taganrog		250	250
Yekaterina Vasilyevna VOLODINA	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Roman Vladimirovich VOLOSCHUK	1983	Taganrog		250	250
Yekaterina Dmitrievna VOLOSCHUK	1984	Taganrog		250	250
Irina Vladimirovna VOROBYOVA	1978	Veselyy		250	250
Valeriya Nikolaevna VOSKONYAN	1978	Taganrog		250	250
Nadezhda Yegorovna YABLOCHKINA	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Lyudmila Nikolaevna YAKIMENKO	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Leonid Viktorovich YAKIMENKO	1938	Taganrog		250	250
Elmira Rubikovna YASINOVSKAYA	1967	Taganrog		250	250
Mikhail Nikolayevich YEFGRAFOF	1965	Taganrog		250	250
Pyotr Nikolayevich YEFREMOV	1970	Taganrog		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Galina Nikolaevna YEFREMOVA	1983	Taganrog		250	250
Yevgeniya Nikolaevna YELCOVA	1970	Taganrog		250	250
Olga Vladimirovna YELENSKAYA	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Vladimir Vasilyevich YELITENKO	1973	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Nikolaevna YELITENKO	1979	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Aleksandrovna YEMASHEVA	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Nikolay Vasilyevich YEREMENKO	1942	Taganrog		250	250
Valentina Semyonovna YEROCKAYA	1949	Taganrog		250	250
Antonina Petrovna YEROSCHENKO	1957	Taganrog		250	250
Yuriy Leonidovich YERYMENKO	1956	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Lvovna YERYMENKO	1960	Taganrog		250	250
Oksana Anatolyevna YUROVA	1975	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Vladimirovna ZABROVSKAYA	1935	Taganrog		250	250
Yekaterina Ivamovna ZARGARYAN	1941	Taganrog		250	250
Margarita Filipovna ZAYCEVA	1939	Taganrog		250	250
Lidiya Ivanovna ZAYCEVA	1963	Matveyev Kurgan		250	250



TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Galina Petrovna ZHIDENKO	1940	Taganrog		250	250
Galina Anatolyevna ZHITKEVICH	1968	Taganrog		250	250
Yevgeniy Vladimirovich ZHUCHENKO	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Natalya Andreyevna ZHUCHENKO	1960	Taganrog		250	250
Nina Nikolaevna ZIMINA	1956	Taganrog		250	250
Aleksandr Sergeyevich ZMAGA	1955	Taganrog		250	250
Tatyana Petrovna ZMAGA	1961	Taganrog		250	250
Vladimir Anatolyevich ZUEV	1969	Taganrog		250	250
Yelena Olegovna ZUEVA	1971	Taganrog		250	250
Vladimir Alekseevich ZVEREV	1937	Ryasnoye		250	250
Galina Martinovna ZVEREVA	1959	Taganrog		250	250
Application no. 44285/10, <i>Gorno-Altaysk LRO and Others v. Russia</i>					
Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia	1999	St. Petersburg		20,000	See above
Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania	1884	New York		20,000	1,000
Wachturm Bibel- und Traktat-Gesellschaft der Zeugen Jehovas	1956	Selters		20,000	See above
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Gorno-Altaysk"	1999	Gorno-Altaysk		5,000	See below

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Gorno-Altaysk Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		Gorno-Altaysk			
Tatyana Vasilyevna ALKOVA	1955	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Maria Shontoyevna BASHTYKOVA	1949	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Valentina Nikolaevna BOKIYEVETS	1956	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Viktor Ivanovich BYSRITSKIY	1928	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Irma Yakovlevna CHUYKOVA	1928	Mayma		250	250
Enchu Gennadiyevich CHYRBYKOV	1984	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Sergey Nikolayevich FROLOV	1957	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Galina Grigoriyevna FROLOVA	1953	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Oksana Viktorovna GRISHUNINA	1977	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Shakir Borisovich IRKITOV	1968	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Aleksandr Viktorovich KALISTRATOV	1976	Gorno-Altaysk	500	7,500	1,000
Ulyana Aleksandrovna KOLMAKOVA	1982	Mayma		250	250
Lidiya Aleksandrovna KRIVTSOVA	1934	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Lyudmila Svyatoslavovna KUDRYAVTSEVA	1948	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Yrys Kunduyevna IRKITOVA	1971	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Galina Andreyevna LYUDYNA	1963	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Lyubov Viktorovna PESTEROVA	1949	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Irina Aleksandrovna ROGOVAYA	1960	Gorno-Altaysk	500	7,500	1,000
Oksana Aleksandrovna ROGOVAYA	1983	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Yuliya Aleksandrovna ROGOZINA	1985	Mayma		250	250
Tamara Romanovna ROMANOVA	1951	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Lyubov Ivanovna RYAKHOVSKAYA	1962	Mayma		250	250
Aleksandr Yegorovich RYAKHOVSKIY	1955	Mayma		250	250
Tatyana Mikhaylovna RYKOVA	1974	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Aleksandr Nikolayevich SAMYKOV	1972	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Karagys Mikhaylovna SAMYKOVA	1974	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Zinaida Sernyonovna SKORODULINA	1936	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Igor Mikhaylovich SVARICHEVSKIY	1970	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Ulan Nikolayevich TAKYSOV	1985	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Natalya Vladimirovna TOLSTIKHINA	1963	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Nina Mikhaylovna VASCHENKO	1935	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Yelena Pavlovna VASILCHENKO	1934	Mayma		250	250
Natalya Fyodorovna VASILENKO	1972	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Aleksandr Inokentyevich VASILENKO	1972	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Irina Timofeyevna YELCHIIYEKOVA	1952	Gorno-Altaysk		250	250
Application no. 3488/11, <i>Boltnyev v. Russia</i>					
Igor Vladimirovich BOLTNYEV	1969	Nizhnekamsk	25	5,000	5,000
Application no. 3492/11, <i>Mardonov v. Russia</i>					
Farkhod Ashurovich MARDONOV	1969	Nizhnekamsk	25	5,000	5,000
Application no. 14821/11, <i>Aliyev v. Russia</i>					
Alam Abdulaziz Ogly ALIYEV	1963	Birobidzhan	90	10,000	7,500
Application no. 17552/11, <i>Fedorin and Others v. Russia</i>					
Aleksey Nikitovich FEDORIN	1925	Sredniy Yegorlyk	25	15,000	7,500
Vasiliy Vladimirovich SIROTYUK	1971	Kamen-Rybolov	25	1,000	1,000
Yelena Sergeyevna CHEKHOVSKAYA	1985	Belgorod	50	7,500	7,500
Nikolay Yuryevich EBELING	1980	Gagarin	30	1,000	1,000
Sergey Vladimirovich KONYUKHOV	1983	Pogranichnyy	25	1,000	1,000
Alyona Mikhaylovna BONDAREVA	1979	Milkovo	25	1,000	1,000
Konstantin Sergeyevich KOMAROV	1990	Izhevsk	25	1,000	1,000

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Vera Ivanovna SAVELYEVA	1958	Yoshkar-Ola	30	5,000	5,000
Svetlana Anatolyevna EBENAL	1954	Vozhskiy	25	5,000	5,000
Lyubov Panteleymonovna BELIMOVA	1946	Tver		5,000	5,000
Application no. 2269/12, <i>Chukan and Others v. Russia</i>					
Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia	1999	St. Petersburg, Russia		20,000	See above
Wachturm Bibel- und Traktat-Gesellschaft der Zeugen Jehovas	1956	Selters, Germany		20,000	See above
Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania	1884	New York, USA		20,000	See above
Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York	1909	New York, USA		20,000	See above
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Salsk	1998	Salsk	650	2,500	See below
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Krasnodar	1999	Krasnodar		2,500	See below
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Kemerovo"	2006	Kemerovo			
Vasiliy Dmitriyevich CHUKAN	1952	Krasnodar		250	250
Aleksandr Vasilyevich TKACHENKO	1955	Krasnodar		250	250
Igor Yuryevich ANANYIN	1982	Blagoveshchenskaya		250	250

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Sergey Mikhaylovich KUZOVLEV	1964	Rezh		250	250
Marina Iskandarovna IVANNIKOVA	1951	Khanty-Mansiysk		250	250
Aleksandr Anatolyevich BULKIN	1987	Kemerovo		250	250
Viktor Ilyich ZVYAGIN	1958	Kemerovo		250	250
Igor Vasilyevich POTAPOV	1963	Kemerovo		250	250
Application no. 5547/12, <i>Gareyev and Others v. Russia</i>					
Vitaliy Faritovich GAREYEV	1982	Kemerovo		250	250
Aleksandr Alekseyevich RASHEVSKIY	1976	Kemerovo		5,000	1,000
Eduard Rafaelovich AKHUNZYANOV	1973	Kemerovo		250	250
Pavel Konstantinovich GOLOVKO	1980	Kemerovo		250	250
Andrey Mikhaylovich GOLOVANICH	1974	Kemerovo		250	250
Viktor Aleksandrovich ZAVYALOV	1962	Kemerovo		250	250
Nadezhda Petrovna MAKSIMISHINA	1946	Kemerovo		250	250
Application no. 76162/12, <i>Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia and Wachturm Bibel- und Traktat-Gesellschaft der Zeugen Jehovas e.V. v. Russia</i>					
Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia	1999	St. Petersburg		100,000	See above
Wachturm Bibel- und Traktat-Gesellschaft der Zeugen Jehovas	1956	Selters		100,000	See above
Application no. 74387/13, <i>Zinich and Others v. Russia</i>					

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia	1999	St. Petersburg		10,000	See above
Wachturm Bibel- und Traktat-Gesellschaft der Zeugen Jehovas	1956	Selters		10,000	See above
Maria Yaroslavovna ZINICH	1965	Krasnoyarsk		1,000	1,000
Application no. 79240/13, <i>Verish and Others v. Russia</i>					
Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia	1999	St. Petersburg		10,000	See above
Wachturm Bibel- und Traktat-Gesellschaft der Zeugen Jehovas	1956	Selters, Germany		10,000	See above
Aleksey Nikolayevich VERISH	1976	Krasnoyarsk		250	250
Yevgeniy Nikolayevich ZINICH	1966	Krasnoyarsk		250	250
Application no. 28108/14, <i>Novikov and Others v. Russia</i>					
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Uspenskiy District	1996	Volnoye, the Krasnodar Region		10,000	See below
Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania	1884	New York, USA			
Wachturm Bibel- und Traktat-Gesellschaft der Zeugen Jehovas	1956	Selters, Germany			
Aleksey Nikolayevich NOVIKOV	1971	Maryino, the Krasnodar Region			
Anatoliy Ivanovich BAYLO	1958	Volnoye, the Krasnodar Region			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Maksim Nikolayevich KALININ	1979	Nizhniy Novgorod			
Application no. 2861/15, <i>Kravchuk and Others v. Russia</i>					
Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia	1999	St. Petersburg		25,000	See above
Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York	1909	New York, USA		25,000	See above
Galina Leonidovna ALEKSEYEVA	1952	Chelyabinsk		10,000	1,000
Viktor Vasilyevich BERCHATOV	1947	Chelyabinsk		10,000	1,000
Aleksandr BUKHNIN	1968	Moscow		10,000	1,000
Nellya Fedorovna BUTINA	1970	Chelyabinsk		10,000	1,000
Oleg Aleksandrovich KRAVCHUK	1977	Uryupinsk		10,000	1,000
Mindiyamal Mansurovna KHUDAYGULOVA	1960	Chelyabinsk		10,000	1,000
Igor Vladimirovich MARKIN	1987	Chelyabinsk		10,000	1,000
Vitaliy SARKISOV	1957	Torzhok		10,000	1,000
Sergey SHAMIN	1972	Yaroslavl		10,000	1,000
Aleksey SHISHOV	1973	Tver		10,000	1,000
Application no. 15962/15, <i>Samara LRO and Others v. Russia</i>					
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Samara	1999	Samara	73,276	30,000	7,500
Yelena Anatolyevna ALESHINA	1967	Samara			
Tatyana Vitalyevna KUPRIYANOVA	1977	Samara			



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Stanislav Viktorovich MAYDANYUK	1989	Samara			
Pavel Sergeyeovich MOSKVIN	1983	Balakovo			
Sergey Ivanovich POLOSENKO	1968	Samara			
Darya Leonidovna ZAGOSKINA	1983	Samara			
<i>Application no. 16578/15, Aliyev and LRO Birobidzhan v. Russia</i>					
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Birobidzhan	1994	Birobidzhan		10,000	1,000
Alam Abdulaziz Ogly ALIYEV	1963	Birobidzhan			
<i>Application no. 24622/16, Trotsyuk and Others v. Russia</i>					
Yuriy Aleksandrovich BAKLUSHIN	1983	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Kirill Igorevich CHETVERIKOV	1988	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Andrey Viktorovich GONCHAROV	1973	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Oksana Nikolaevna GONCHAROVA	1979	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Alexey Alekseyevich KOPTEV	1944	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Vladimir Viktorovich KOZHUKHOV	1965	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Kirill Mikhaylovich KRAVCHENKO	1982	Rostov-on-Don		15,000	15,000
Tatiana Vladimirovna KRAVCHENKO	1962	Taganrog		15,000	15,000

TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Vladislav Vitallyevich KRUGLIKOV	1994	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Karen Yuryevich MINASYAN	1986	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Vladimir Pavlovich MOISEENKO	1970	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Vyacheslav Valeryevich SHCHEKALEV	1977	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Aleksandr Viktorovich SKVORTSOV	1962	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Nikolay Vladimirovich TROTSYUK	1954	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Sergey Nikolaevich TROTSYUK	1981	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
Roman Vladimirovich VOLOSHCHUK	1983	Taganrog		15,000	15,000
<i>Application no. 10188/17, Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia and Kalin v. Russia</i>					
Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia	1999	St. Petersburg	38,243,874	250,000	See above
Vasiliy Mikhaylovich KALIN	1947	St. Petersburg			
<i>Application no. 39417/17, Christensen v. Russia</i>					
Dennis Ole CHRISTENSEN	1972	Orel	3,543	30,000	15,000
<i>Application no. 3215/18, Glazov LRO and Others v. Russia</i>					
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Abaza	1999	Abaza	40,933	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Achinsk	1999	Achinsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Adler"	1999	Sochi	705,979	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Adygeysk	1999	Adygeysk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Alagir	1999	Alagir	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Aleysk"	1996	Aleysk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Almetyevsk of the "Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia"	2002	Almetyevsk	47,509	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City-Resort Anapa	1993	Anapa	84,613	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Angarsk"	1992	Angarsk	98,788	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Anzhero-Sudzhensk	2000	Anzhero-Sudzhensk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Apatity"	1997	Apatity		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Apsheronk	1993	Apsheronk	258,716	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Arbekovo, Penza"	1998	Penza		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Armavir	1993	Armavir	157,317	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Armyansk	2001	Armyansk	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Arsenyev	1999	Arsenyev	137,746	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Artem	1999	Artem	128,553	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Asino	1992	Asino	48,634	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Astrakhan	1999	Astrakhan	166,034	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Azovskiy District	2000	Azov		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Balakovo of the Saratov Region	1998	Balakovo	408,460	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Balashikhinskiy District	1999	Balashikha	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Balashov of the Saratov Region	1998	Balashov	58,377	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Baltiyskoye"	2007	St. Petersburg	752,829	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Barnaul"	1994	Barnaul	90,630	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Bataysk	1999	Bataysk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Belaya Kalitva	1998	Belaya Kalitva		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Belebey	1999	Belebey	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Belogorsk	1999	Belogorsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Belorechensk	1999	Belorechensk	155,275	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Belovo"	1993	Belovo	48,526	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Town of Beltirskoye	2005	s. Beltirskoye	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Berezovskiy"	1999	Berezovskiy		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation "Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Beslan"	1998	Beslan	43,042	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Bezopasnoye of the Trunovskiy District	2000	s.Â Bezopasnoye	22,831	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Biryusinsk	1999	Beslan	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Biysk"	1994	Biysk	75,909	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Blagodarniy	1995	Blagodarniy	48,944	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Blagoveshchensk	1999	Blagoveshchensk	106,176	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Boguchany of the Krasnoyarsk Territory	1999	s. Boguchany		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Bolshoy Kamen	2006	Bolshoy Kamen		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Borisoglebsk of the Voronezh Region	2000	Borisoglebsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Bratsk"	1993	Bratsk	90,774	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Padunskiy District of the City of Bratsk	1996	Bratsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Bryansk"	1999	Bryansk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Bryanskoye	2001	s. Vilino	66,420	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Budennovsk	1999	Budennovsk	64,866	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Buguruslan	1999	Buguruslan	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Buzuluk	1998	Buzuluk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Chapayevsk	1999	Chapayevsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Chaykovskiy	2001	Chaykovskiy		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Chekhov	1999	Chekhov		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Chelyabinsk"	2003	Chelyabinsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Cheremkhovo	1999	Cheremkhovo		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Cherepovets of the Vologda Region	2000	Cherepovets		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Cherkessk	1998	Cherkessk	103,116	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Chernogorsk	1999	Chernogorsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Chernomorskoye	1997	pgt. Chernomorskoye	130,893	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Chernyakhovsk of the Kaliningrad Region	1999	Chernyakhovsk	39,452	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Chita"	1999	Chita		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Chulman	1999	Neryungri	63,596	30,000	7,500



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Chunskiy	2000	pos. Chunskiy	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Dalnegorsk	1999	Dalnegorsk	226,238	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Dalnerechensk	2006	Dalnerechensk	73,873	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Derbent"	1999	Derbent	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Dimitrovgrad	1998	Dimitrovgrad	136,740	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Dinskaya	1999	st. Dinskaya	112,930	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Donetsk	1998	Donetsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Dorogobuzh	1999	Dorogobuzh	88,568	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Dubna	2000	Dubna	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Dudinka	1999	Dudinka		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Dzerzhinsk of the Nizhegorodskaya Region	1999	Dzerzhinsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Dzhankoy	1992	Dzhankoy	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Feodosiya	1995	Feodosiya	129,850	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Fryazino	1999	Fryazino		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Gelendzhik"	1993	Gelendzhik		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Georgiyevsk	1994	st. Nezlbnaya		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Giaginskaya	1999	st. Giaginskaya		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Glazov	2006	Glazov		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Gorno-Altaysk"	1999	Gorno-Altaysk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Goryachiy Klyuch	2002	Goryachiy Klyuch		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Gubkin	1999	Gubkin	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Gukovo"	1999	Gukovo	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Gulkevichi	2000	Gulkevichi	116,529	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Guryevsk	1998	Guryevsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Gusinozersk	2000	Gusinozersk	47,598	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Gvardeyskoye	2001	pgt. Gvardeyskoye	149,720	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Town of Igra	1998	pos. Igra	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Ilskiy"	1999	pgt. Ilskiy		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Inta	1997	Inta	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Ipatovo"	1999	Ipatovo	38,299	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Irkutsk"	1992	Irkutsk	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Iskitim and the Iskitimskiy District	2007	st. Yevsino	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Ivanovo	1998	Ivanovo	46,325	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Town of Ivanovskiy of the Kochubeyevskiy District of the Stavropol Territory	1999	s. Ivanovskoye	104,597	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Izhevsk	1998	Izhevsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kalach of the Voronezh Region	1999	Kalach	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Kaliningrad"	1998	Kaliningrad	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Kalininskaya	1994	st. Kalininskaya		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kaltan	1999	Kaltan		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kaluga	1999	Kaluga		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kamensk-Shakhtinskiy	2000	Kamensk-Shakhtinskiy		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kamyshin of the Volgograd Region	1999	Kamyshin	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kandalaksha	2001	Kandalaksha		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Kanevskaya	1999	st. Kanevskaya		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Kansk"	1997	Chernogorsk	50,044	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kazan of the "Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia"	2001	Kazan	55,462	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Kemerovo"	1999	Kemerovo		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kerch	2001	Kerch	254,060	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Khabarovsk	1999	Khabarovsk	523,617	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Khanskaya	1999	Maykop	59,295	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralniy Khazan"	1997	pos. Tsentralniy Khazan	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Khimkinskiy District	2000	Khimki		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kholmok	1999	Kholmok		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kineshma	1999	Kineshma	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kirishi	1997	Kirishi	146,466	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kirov	1999	Kirov		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kirovo-Chepetsk	2000	Kirovo-Chepetsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kirovsk	1999	Kirovsk		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kiselevsk	2000	Kiselevsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kislovodsk	1997	Kislovodsk	112,296	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kizlyar	2001	Kizlyar		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Klinskiy District	2001	Klin		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Kochubeyevskiy District	1999	s. Kochubeyevo	60,422	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kogalym	1998	Kogalym		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kokhma	1999	Kokhma	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Komsomolsk-on-Amur	1999	Komsomolsk-on-Amur	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Korenovsk	1999	Korenovsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Korolev	1999	Korolev		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Korsakov"	1997	Korsakov	129,991	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Kostomuksha"	1998	Kostomuksha	110,251	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kostroma	1999	Kostroma		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kotelnikovo of the Volgograd Region	1999	Kotelnikovo		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kotlas	1999	Kotlas		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kotovo of the Volgograd Region	1999	Kotovo	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Krasnoarmeysk of the Saratov Region	2000	Krasnoarmeysk	195,714	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Krasnodar	1999	Krasnodar	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Krasnogorskiy District	1999	Krasnogorsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Krasnogvardeyskoye	1996	pgt. Krasnogvardeyskoe	10,000	30,000	7,500



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Krasnooktyabrskiy of the Maykopskiy District	1999	pos.Krasnooktyabrskiy	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Krasnoperekopsk	1995	Krasnoperekopsk	59,350	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Krasnoselskiy	1992	pgt. Krasnoselskiy	96,884	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Krasnoturyinsk	1998	Krasnoturinsk	30,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Krasnoyarsk"	1999	Krasnoyarsk	39,155	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kropotkin	1999	Kropotkin	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Krymsk	1994	Krymsk	46,646	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Kumertau"	2000	Kumertau		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Kuragino"	1999	pgt. Kuragino	47,989	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Kurdzhinovo"	1999	s. Kurdzhinovo	40,639	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kurgan	1999	Kurgan	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kurganinsk	1999	Kurganinsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses (Kursk)	2003	Kursk	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Kushchevskaya	2000	st. Kushchevskaya		30,000	7,500
Local Christian Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Kuybyshev"	1999	Kuybyshev	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Kyzyl	1999	Kyzyl		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Labinsk	1994	Labinsk	36,057	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Ladozhskoye"	2007	St. Petersburg	235,025	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Town of Lazarevskoye	2000	pos. Sovet-Kvadzhe		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Leninsk of the Volgograd Region	1999	g.Leninsk		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Leninskiy District	2001	Moscow		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Leninsk-Kuznetskiy	2002	Leninsk-Kuznetskiy	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Lesosibirsk	1999	Lesosibirsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Lesozavodsk	2000	Lesozavodsk		30,000	7,500
Local Christian Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Lipetsk	2001	Lipetsk	40,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Liskinskiy District of the Voronezh Region	1999	Liski	30,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Luchegorsk	2000	pgt.Luchegorsk	38,482	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Lysva	2001	g.Lysva		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Lyubertsy	1997	Kotelniki		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Maykop	1999	Maykop	10,000	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Mayskiy	2001	Mayskiy	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Mezhdurechensk"	1995	Mezhdurechensk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Miass	2007	Miass	121,844	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Mikhaylovka of the Volgograd Region	1999	Mikhaylovka	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Mikun"	1999	Mikun	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Millerovo	2001	Millerovo	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Mineralniye Vody"	1999	Mineralnye Vody	184,184	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Minusinsk	1999	Minusinsk	197,690	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Mirniy	2002	Yevpatoriya	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Monchegorsk	2001	Monchegorsk		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Monolit, Volgograd"	1998	Volgograd		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in Moscow	2015	Moscow	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Mozdok	2001	Mozdok		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Murmansk"	1999	Murmansk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Myski"	1999	Myski	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Mytishchinskiy District	2000	Mytishchi		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Naberezhnye Chelny of the "Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia"	2002	Naberezhnye Chelny		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Nakhodka	1999	Nakhodka		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Nalchik	2001	Nalchik	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Nartkala	2001	Nartkala	81,868	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Nazarovo	1999	Nazarovo	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Neftekamsk	2002	Neftekamsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Nefteyugansk	1998	Nefteyugansk	30,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Neman of the Kaliningrad Region	1999	Neman		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Neryungri	2000	Neryungri	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Nevinnomysk	1999	Nevinnomysk	372,334	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Nevskoye"	2007	St. Petersburg		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Nezlobnaya of the Georgiyevskiy District	1992	st.Â Nezlobnaya	683,284	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Nikolayevsk-on-Amur	2002	Nikolayevsk-on-Amur		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Nikolsk"	2000	Nikolsk		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Nizhnegorskiy	1998	pgt. Nizhnegorskiy	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Nizhnekamsk and the Nizhnekamskiy District of the "Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia"	2001	Nizhnekamsk	22,398	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Nizhneudinsk	2001	Nizhneudinsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Nizhnevartovsk	1999	Nizhnevartovsk	145,247	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Nizhniy Novgorod"	1992	Nizhniy Novgorod	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Nizhniy Tagil"	1998	Nizhniy Tagil	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Nizhnyaya Tura	1998	Nizhnyaya Tura	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Nogliki of the Sakhalin Region	2000	pgt. Nogliki		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Norilsk"	1995	Norilsk		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Novoaleksandrovsk	1999	Novoaleksandrovsk	48,987	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Novocherkassk	1998	Novocherkassk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Novokubansk and the Novokubanskiy District	1999	Novokubansk	82,742	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Novokuznetsk"	1999	Novokuznetsk	60,337	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Novopavlovsk	1999	Novopavlovsk	45,673	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Novorossiysk	1999	Novorossiysk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Novoshakhtinsk"	1998	Novoshakhtinsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Novotitarovskaya	1999	st. Novotitarovskaya		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Noyabrsk	1996	Noyabrsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Odintsovskiy District	1999	pos. Vlasikha		30,000	7,500



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Okha	1999	Okha		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Oktyabrskiy	1999	r.pos. Oktyabrskiy	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Omsk"	1994	Omsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Orekhovo-Zuyeveskiy District of the Moscow Region	2001	pos. Vereya		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Orenburg"	1994	Orenburg		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Orsk	1998	Orsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses Osinniki	1993	Osinniki	65,299	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Otradnaya	1998	st.Otradnaya	56,234	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Ozersk	2007	Ozersk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Ozerskiy District	2001	Ozery		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Pavlovskaya	1999	st. Pavlovskaya		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Pechora"	1993	Pechora	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Penza"	1998	Penza		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Pereyaslavka	2000	r. pos. Pereyaslavka	51,062	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Perm	1999	Perm	33,307	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Pervomayskoye	1992	pgt. Pervomayskoye	94,600	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Pervouralsk	1998	Pervouralsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy"	1998	Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Petrozavodsk"	1998	Petrozavodsk	230,242	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Podolsk	1999	Podolsk	10,000	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Polyarniy	1998	Polyarniy		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Primorsko-Akhtarsk	1999	Primorsko-Akhtarsk	55,881	30,000	7,500
Local Christian Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Primorskoye"	2002	Sevastopol	329,284	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Town of Priyutovo of the Belebeyevskiy District of the Republic of Bashkortostan	2005	r.pos. Priyutovo	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Prokhladny	2001	Prokhladny		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Prokopyevsk"	1999	Prokopyevsk	110,503	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Pskov	1998	Pskov	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Pushkinskiy District	2002	Pushkino		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Pyatigorsk	1999	Pyatigorsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Raduzhniy	1999	Raduzhniy	10,000	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Razdolnoye	1993	pgt. Razdolnoye	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Rostov	1998	Rostov		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya of the City of Rostov-on-Don"	1999	Rostov-on-Don		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Rubtsovsk"	1997	Rubtsovsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Rybinsk	1998	Rybinsk	87,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Saki	1997	Saki	197,530	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Salavat"	2000	Salavat		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Salsk	1998	Salsk	52,892	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Saransk"	1999	Saransk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Sarapul	1998	Sarapul	10,000	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Saratov	1998	Saratov		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Sayanogorsk	1998	Sayanogorsk	50,385	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Sayansk"	1999	Sayansk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Sergiyevo-Posadskiy District	2001	Sergiyevo-Posad		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Serov"	1998	Serov		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Serpukhov and the Serpukhovskiy District	1999	Serpukhov		30,000	7,500
Local Christian Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Sevastopol	1997	Sevastopol	312,283	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Severnaya, Tomsk"	1991	Tomsk	214,439	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Severnaya, Usolye-Sibirskoye"	1992	Usolye-Sibirskoye	175,633	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Severodvinsk	1999	Severodvinsk		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Severomorsk	2000	Severomorsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Severouralsk"	1999	Severouralsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Seversk	1998	Seversk	52,238	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Shadrinsk	1999	Shadrinsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Shakhty	1999	Shakhty	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Sharya of the Kostroma Region	1999	Sharya	36,367	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Sharypovo	1998	Sharypovo	78,272	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Shaturskiy District	2000	Shatura	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Shchelkino	2000	Shchelkino	101,650	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Shchelkovskiy District	2000	Shchelkovo		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Shebekino of the Belgorod Region	1999	Shebekino	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Shelekhov	2000	Shelekhov	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Shirinskiy District	1999	s. Shira	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Shushenskoye	1999	pgt. Shushenskoye	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Simferopol	1993	Simferopol	1,271,060	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Sivash"	2001	Dzhankoy	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Skovorodino"	1999	Skovorodino		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Slantsy	1994	Slantsy		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Slavgorod"	1997	Slavgorod	46,377	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Slavyansk-on-Kuban and the Slavyanskiy District	1999	Slavyansk-on-Kuban		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Slyudyanka	2000	Slyudyanka		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Smolensk	1999	der. Novoseltsy (s/pos. Gnezdovskoye )		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Snezhnogorsk"	1999	Snezhnogorsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Sochi"	1995	Sochi	112,634	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Solikamsk	2000	Solikamsk	53,936	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Solnechnodolsk	1999	pos.Â Solnechnodolsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Solnechnogorskiy District	2001	Solnechnogorsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Sorsk	1998	Sorsk	19,747	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Sortavala	1999	Sortavala	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Sosnoviy Bor	1997	Sosnoviy Bor	20,000	30,000	7,500



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Sosnovoborsk"	1999	Sosnovoborsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Sovetsk of the Kaliningrad Region	1992	Sovetsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Sovetskaya Gavan	2000	Sovetskaya Gavan	37,241	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Spassk-Dalniy	2001	Spassk-Dalniy		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of Saint-Petersburg	2000	St. Petersburg	1,765,972	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Stariy Krym	1992	Stariy Krym	270,980	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Staronizhlestebliyevskaya of the Krasnoarmeyskiy District	1999	st. Staronizhlestebliyevskaya		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Staroshcherbinovskaya	1999	st. Staroshcherbinovskaya		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia "Tsentralnaya, Stavropol"	1999	Stavropol		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Surgut	1998	Surgut	40,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Surovikino	1999	Surovikino	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Svetliy Yar of the Volgograd Region	1999	r.pos. Svetliy Yar	30,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Svetlograd	1999	Svetlograd	28,965	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Syktyvkar"	1994	Syktyvkar	168,486	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Syzran	2000	Syzran	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Town of Talmenka	2009	pos. Talmenka		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Tashtagol	1995	Tashtagol	14,008	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tayshet"	1994	Tayshet	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Tbilisskaya	1997	st. Tbilisskaya	50,622	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Temryuk	2000	Temryuk	147,690	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Teykovo	1999	Teykovo		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Tikhoretsk	1999	Tikhoretsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Timashevsk	1999	Timashevsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tolyatti"	2000	Tolyatti	65,853	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Tsimlyansk	2000	Tsimlyansk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Tuapse	1999	Tuapse		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Tula	2001	Tula	50,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Tulskiy	2001	pos. Tulskiy	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Tulun	1999	Tulun	10,000	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Tutayev	1998	Tutayev		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Tynda	1999	Tynda	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Uchaly	1999	Uchaly		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Udachniy"	1999	Udachniy		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Ufa"	1999	Ufa		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Ukhta"	1993	Ukhta	40,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Yarega	1998	Ukhta	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Ulan-Ude	1999	Ulan-Ude	176,239	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Ulyanovsk	1999	Ulyanovsk	109,442	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Usinsk"	1999	Usinsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Uspenskiy District	1996	s. Volnoye	90,500	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Ussuriysk	1999	Ussuriysk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Ust-Ilimsk"	1994	Ust-Ilimsk	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Ust-Kut	2005	Ust-Kut	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Ust-Labinsk	1992	Ust-Labinsk	106,250	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Valuyskiy District of the Belgorod Region	2000	Valuyki		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "VelikiyeLuki"	1998	VelikiyeLuki	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Verkhnyaya Pyshma	2002	Verkhnyaya Pyshma	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Vichuga	1999	Vichuga		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Vikhorevka"	1996	Vikhorevka	26,021	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Vilyuchinsk"	1997	Vilyuchinsk		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Vladikavkaz	1999	Vladikavkaz	248,684	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Vladimir	1999	Vladimir	65,182	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Kovrov of the Vladimir Region	2001	Kovrov	62,436	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Vladivostok	1999	Vladivostok	402,698	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Volgodonsk	1999	Volgodonsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Volgograd of the Krasnooktyabrskiy District	2000	Volgograd		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Volgograd of the Krasnooktyabrskiy District	1999	Volgograd	97,138	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Volgograd of the Traktorozavodskiy District	1999	Volgograd	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Vologda"	1996	Vologda		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Volokolamsk	1999	Volokolamsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Volsk of the Saratov Region	1998	Volsk	56,530	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Volzhskiy of the Volgograd Region	1999	Volzhskiy	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Vorkuta	1995	Vorkuta	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Voronezh"	1999	Voronezh		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Voskhod	1996	s. Voskhod	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Voskresenskiy District	2001	Voskresensk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Votkinsk	1998	Votkinsk	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Vyborg	1997	Vyborg	10,000	30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Vyselki	2000	st. Vyselki	36,720	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Yalta	2001	Yalta	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Yaroslavl	1998	Yaroslavl		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Yasniy	1998	Yasniy	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Yekaterinburg	1998	Yekaterinburg		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Yelizovo	1999	Yelizovo		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Yelshanskaya, Volgograd"	1999	Volgograd	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Yessentuki	1992	Yessentuki	186,507	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Tsentralnaya, Yeysk"	1998	Yeysk	65,876	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Yoshkar-Ola"	2000	Yoshkar-Ola		30,000	7,500



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Yugorsk	1999	Yugorsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Yuzhnaya, Abakan"	1999	Abakan		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk	2000	Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk	581,050	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Zainsk of the "Administrative Centre of Jehovah's Witnesses in Russia"	2001	Zainsk	32,856	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Zalari	1997	pos. Zalari	20,000	30,000	7,500
Local Christian Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Zarechnaya, Novosibirsk"	1999	Novosibirsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Zarechniy	2006	Zarechniy		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Zarinsk"	1993	Zarinsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Zelenogorsk	2000	Zelenogorsk		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Zelenokumsk	1999	Zelenokumsk	149,255	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Zeya	1999	Zeya	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses "Zheleznogorsk"	1999	Zheleznogorsk	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Zheleznogorsk	2006	Zheleznogorsk		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Zheleznogorsk-Ilimskiy	1999	Zheleznogorsk - Ilimskiy	53,535	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Zheleznovodsk	1999	Zheleznovodsk	455,984	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Zhukovskiy	1999	Zhukovskiy	277,858	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the City of Zima	1999	Zima	10,000	30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses of the Town of Zimovniki and the Zimovnikovskiy District	2000	pos. Zimovniki		30,000	7,500
Local Religious Organisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the City of Zverevo	1999	Zverevo		30,000	7,500

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Dmitriy Ivanovich AFANASYEV	1969	Sortavala			
Eduard Rafailovich AKHUNZYANOV	1973	Kemerovo			
Aleksey Vladimirovich ALEKSEY	1972	pos. Rozet			
Fedot Borisovich ALEKSEYEV	1973	Neryungri			
Maksim Vladimirovich AMOSOV	1976	Petrozavodsk			
Sergey Viktorovich ANANIN	1967	Belovo			
Andrey Leonidovich ANDREYEV	1976	Kursk			
Yevgeniy Anatolyevich ANDRYUKOV	1968	Severouralsk			
Vitaliy Mikhaylovich APANYUK	1975	pos. Zalari			
Nikolay Pavlovich ARTYUKHIN	1966	Syzran			
Konstantin Sergeyeovich ARZHAVITIN	1984	Nakhodka			
Vladimir Yevgenyevich AULOV	1975	Krasnogorsk			
Vitaliy Viktorovich AYDASHKIN	1974	Minusinsk			
Aram Surenovich AYRIYAN	1963	Derbent			
Igor Vladimirovich BACHKOV	1982	Okha			
Viktor Nikolayevich BACHURIN	1962	Lipetsk			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Mikhail Sergeevich BADALYAN	1980	Balashov			
Albert Georgiyevich BAGDASARYAN	1967	Kislovodsk			
Dmitriy Gennadyevich BALKOV	1969	Tolyatti			
Andrey Grigoryevich BANNYKH	1964	Lesnoy			
Yuriy Sergeevich BEGLETSOV	1982	Balakovo			
Roman Aleksandrovich BELOBORODOV	1984	Cheremkhovo			
Dmitriy Leonidovich BELOUSOV	1969	Bataysk			
Georgiy Aleksandrovich BESSMERTNIY	1969	Zheleznovodsk			
Pavel Fedorovich BEZHENAR	1940	Voskresensk			
Oleg Anatolyevich BEZLIK	1973	Ust-Kut			
Vladimir Ilyich BLAGODATSKIKH	1953	Zheleznogorsk - Ilimskiy			
Dmitriy Vladimirovich BOGATYREV	1974	Nizhniy Tagil			
Andrey Dmitriyevich BOZOV	1973	st. Staroshcherbinovskaya			
Boris Dmitriyevich BRABIN	1954	Zverevo			
Aleksandr Vladimirovich BUNKOV	1964	Apsheronsk			
Anatoliy Ivanovich BURNYSHEV	1956	pos. Solnechniy			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Yaroslav Ignatyevich BURTİK	1966	Biryusinsk			
Yevgeniy Vasilyevich BUTSIY	1969	Sevastopol			
Leonid Sergeyeovich BUYAKOV	1966	s. Kochubeyevsk oye			
Andrey Yuryevich BYKOV	1971	Chapayevsk			
Sergey Vladimirovich BYSTROV	1961	Penza			
Igor Aleksandrovich CHAVYCHELOV	1967	Novoaleksandrovsk			
Vladimir Petrovich CHERANYEV	1963	Kogalym			
Avak Ovanesovich CHERKEZYAN	1958	Sochi			
Dmitriy Aleksandrovich CHERNIKOV	1976	Belogorsk			
Anatoliy Aleksandrovich CHERNYSHOV	1964	Feodosiya			
Yuriy Arkadyevich CHIGRIN	1972	Kropotkin			
Yevgeniy Nikolayevich CHIZHOV	1953	Korolev			
Vasily Vladimirovich CHUBENKO	1963	pos. Chunskiy			
Nikolay Vladimirovich CHURSANOV	1964	Cherepovets			
Vladimir Davydovich DAMM	1947	Novosibirsk			
Andrey Emikovich DANIYELIAN	1969	Rubtsovsk			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Sergey Ivanovich DAVIDYUK	1963	Volgograd			
Andrey Yevgenyevich DAVYDOV	1966	pos. Vlasikha			
Viktor Nikolayevich DEMENTYEV	1941	Kurganinsk			
Aleksandr Vasilyevich DEMIDOV	1971	pgt. Novofedorovka			
Pavel Nikolayevich DENISOV	1969	Slyudyanka			
Vitaliy Yaroslavovich DEREKH	1986	Smolensk			
Pavel Alekseyevich DEYEV	1983	Yalta			
Aleksey Ivanovich DMITRIYEVYKH	1977	Kirov			
Albert Pavlovich DOLGOPOLOV	1938	Volgograd			
Viktor Konstantinovich DROBNEV	1953	pos. Zimovniki			
Vasilij Grigoryevich DRONYAK	1957	Novokubansk			
Andrey Vladimirovich DROZDOV	1972	s. Shira			
Dmitriy Andreyevich DROZDOV	1986	Kyzyl			
Leonid Ivanovich DRUZHININ	1969	Zeya			
Vladimir Anatolyevich DUBOV	1957	Volokolamsk			
Vladimir Nikolayevich FATEYEV	1952	Tsimlyansk			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Rustem Razimovich FAYRUSHIN	1981	Naberezhnye Chelny			
Aleksandr Aleksandrovich FAYT	1962	Vladivostok			
Vladimir Konstantinovich FEDOROV	1957	Zhukovskiy			
Viktor Semenovich FEDOTENKO	1954	s. Kurdzhinovo			
Sergey Viktorovich FILATOV	1972	Dzhankoy			
Igor Viktorovich FILCHIKOV	1983	Roslavl			
Dmitriy Vyacheslavovich GALAKTIONOV	1978	Khimki			
Semen Ivanovich GALATSKIY	1968	Skovorodino			
Aleksey Leontyevich GAPCHENKO	1963	Mineralniye Vody			
Aleksandr Andreyevich GAPONOV	1967	Budennovsk			
Fanil Sharifovich GAREYEV	1958	s. Asekeyevo			
Yevgeniy Vladimirovich GAVRILETS	1977	Tikhoretsk			
Stepan Nikolayevich GAVRILOVSKIY	1957	Angarsk			
Sergey Vasilyevich GECHU	1979	Asino			
Gennadiy Vasilyevich GELICH	1964	s. Ivanovskoye			
Aleksey Vasilyevich GETMAN	1965	pos. Tsentralniy Khazan			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Viktor Alekseyevich GLADYSHEV	1963	Yaroslavl			
Yuriy Vasilyevich GLAZOCHEV	1964	der. Balandino			
Konstantin Ivanovich GLAZUNOV	1953	Borisoglebsk			
Stanislav Vladimirovich GLOTOV	1969	Ulan-Ude			
Mikhail Petrovich GLOTOV	1978	s. Novo-Bataysk			
Aleksey Nikolayevich GLUKHAREV	1968	Krasnoarmeysk			
Sergey Borisovich GOBOZEV	1957	Votkinsk			
Viktor Mikhaylovich GOLIK	1962	Noyabrsk			
Andrey Valeryevich GOLITSYN	1965	Kostroma			
Sergey Anatolyevich GOLOVAN	1960	s. Krasnoselskoye			
Aleksandr Aleksandrovich GOLTSVART	1972	Ust-Ilimsk			
Igor Nikolayevich GONCHAROV	1963	st. Giaginskaya			
Gennadiy Vitalyevich GORBUNOV	1969	Voronezh			
Aleksey Vladimirovich GORSHKOV	1969	Mikun			
Petr Ivanovich GREBENYUK	1955	Arsen'yev			
Vladimir Viktorovich GRIDUNOV	1969	Krymsk			



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Yevgeniy Anatolyevich GRINENKO	1970	Lesozavodsk			
Sergey Vladimirovich GRITSENKO	1960	pos. Krasnooktyabrskiy			
Ivan Alekseyevich GUNDERTAYLO	1965	Inta			
Matvey Vasilyevich GURINOVICH	1957	Yessentuki			
Yuriy Pavlovich GUT	1956	st. Staronizhestebliyevskaya			
Yevgeniy Yuryevich GVOZDEV	1966	Gulkevichi			
Andrey Faatovich IBRAGIMOV	1969	Gusinoozersk			
Sergey Anatolyevich ILYIN	1968	St. Petersburg			
Vladimir Nikolayevich IVANOV	1961	Primorsko-Akhtarsk			
Aleksandr Nikolayevich IZRANOV	1957	Penza			
Vladimir Ivanovich KALASHNIKOV	1966	Neman			
Yevgeniy Mikhaylovich KALININ	1974	Lyubertsy			
Aleksandr Viktorovich KALISTRATOV	1976	Gorno-Altaysk			
Rinat Maratovich KAMALOV	1975	Belebey			
Roman Vladimirovich KAMANIN	1970	Belaya Kalitva			
Ruslan Aliyevich KANAMATOV	1983	Cherkessk			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Yevgeniy Anatolyevich KARPUSHEVSKIY	1968	Blagoveshchensk			
Sergey Vladimirovich KASHENKOV	1975	Sarapul			
Nikolay Nikolayevich KASHTANOV	1960	pos. Priyutovo			
Sergey Petrovich KATKOV	1963	Klin			
Aleksey Aleksandrovich KAVERIN	1974	Artem			
Aleksandr Igorevich KHOKHANOV	1991	Sosnoviy Bor			
Sergey Borisovich KHOTOV	1969	Rostov-on-Don			
Valeriy Romanovich KHUDONOGOV	1954	Nizhneudinsk			
Yuriy Aleksandrovich KIM	1960	Nikolsk			
Yuriy Vitaliyevich KIRSHIN	1963	Dubna			
Igor Sergeyevich KLETKIN	1961	Nikolayevsk-on-Amur			
Aleksandr Nikolayevich KLEVTSOV	1959	Apatity			
Igor Vakhtangovich KLIMOV	1985	Volzhskiy			
Stanislav Yevgenyevich KLYUCHNIKOV	1982	Nizhnekamsk			
Roman Grigoryevich KOBELYUK	1951	Nevinnomyssk			
Lyubov Ivanovna KOBELYUK	1950	Nevinnomyssk			
Viktor Vladimirovich KOBZAR	1967	Udachniy			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Vasiliy Yevgenyevich KOCHEDYKOV	1959	pos. Vereya			
Artur Nikolayevich KOCHIYAN	1968	st. Otradnaya			
Vladimir Ivanovich KOCHURA	1951	pos. Il'skiy			
Sergey Ivanovich KOLESNIKOV	1966	Gelendzhik			
Aleksandr Samsonovich KOLESNIKOV	1952	Saransk			
Yuriy Ivanovich KOLOMIYETS	1963	st. Kislyakovskaya			
Oleg Vladimirovich KOMPANEYETS	1973	Tashtagol			
Oleg Yuryevich KONAKOV	1960	Mytishchi			
Yuriy Ivanovich KONOVALOV	1964	kh. Turoverovo-Glubokinskiy			
Konstantin Petrovich KOPACH	1984	s. Kalinovka			
Vitaliy Eduardovich KOPYTIN	1972	Biysk			
Sergey Stanislavovich KOROLCHUK	1967	Ussuriysk			
Oleg Anatolyevich KOROTENKO	1963	Zheleznogorsk			
Nikolay Vasilyevich KOVALEV	1955	Mikhaylovka			
Konstantin Aleksandrovich KOZLOV	1972	Prokopyevsk			
Andrey Nikolayevich KOZLOV	1972	Gubkin			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Valeriy Viktorovich KOZLOV	1960	Inta			
Mikhail Stanislavovich KREKHOVETSKIY	1964	Bratsk			
Sergey Pavlovich KREPS	1974	Yasniy			
Anatoliy Germanovich KRUMIN	1955	Omsk			
Igor Mikhaylovich KRUSHINSKIY	1960	Anzhero-Sudzhensk			
Aleksandr Vyacheslavovich KRUTOV	1970	Moscow			
Andrey Aleksandrovich KRYLOV	1973	Vichuga			
Sergey Viktorovich KUKLEV	1984	Prokopyevsk			
Vladimir Mikhaylovich KULIK	1956	Ipatovo			
Aleksandr Nikolayevich KULIKOV	1974	Saratov			
Salavat Alfredovich KULMUKHAMETOV	1971	Zainsk			
Viktor Iozovich KUPCHINSKAS	1967	Mezhdurechensk			
Sergey Vasilyevich KURINNOY	1967	Kizlyar			
Vladimir Antonovich KURYATA	1972	Sosnoviy Bor			
Oleg Aleksandrovich KUTSIY	1982	Nizhnevartovsk			
Vladimir Fedorovich KUZ	1959	s. Pervomayskoye			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Oleg Mikhaylovich KUZAN	1968	Bratsk			
Gurami Noyeyevich LABADZE	1962	Tula			
Aleksandr Vasilyevich LAPSHIN	1945	Stavropol			
Aleksandr Sergeyeovich LARIONOV	1978	Volgodonsk			
Vladimir Mikhaylovich LASHUK	1970	Anapa			
Sergey Anatolyevich LAVRENTYEV	1957	Maykop			
Valeriy Mikhaylovich LAVRENTYEV	1958	pgt. Mirniy			
Aleksandr Ivanovich LEBEDEV	1974	Abakan			
Pavel Yuryevich LEBEDEV	1974	Dudinka			
Danil Vladimirovich LEMESHKO	1981	Orsk			
Vladimir Mikhaylovich LENYUCHEV	1968	Krasnoturyinsk			
Stanislav Vladimirovich LEONTYEV	1968	Miass			
Mikhail Vasilyevich LESYUK	1962	st. Nezlobnaya			
Vadim Anatolyevich LEVCHUK	1972	Berezovskiy			
Dmitriy Vladimirovich LISOV	1972	Novorossiysk			
Igor Aleksandrovich LISOVSKIY	1981	Ust-Labinsk			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Aleksandr Viktorovich LITVINYUK	1960	Armyansk			
Yaroslav Dmitriyevich LIVIY	1959	Tulun			
Mikhail Dmitriyevich LIVIY	1966	pos. Tsentralniy Khazan			
Sergey Pavlovich LOGINOV	1961	Surgut			
Andrey Valeryevich LOSEV	1973	pos. Verkhnedneprovskiy			
Valeriy Petrovich LOYTRA	1963	s. Voskhod			
Aleksandr Nikolayevich LUBIN	1956	Shadrinsk			
Oleg Vitalyevich LUCHINKIN	1967	Serpukhov			
Andrey Borisovich LUNEV	1969	Shebekino			
Vitaliy Viktorovich LUNEV	1970	Usolye-Sibirskoye			
Anatoliy Ivanovich LYAMO	1983	Teykovo			
Nikolay Nikolayevich LYASHENKO	1973	Serov			
Anatoliy Nikolayevich LYASHENKO	1961	Astrakhan			
Andrey Vladimirovich LYSENKO	1968	Raduzhniy			
Khachatur Mikhaylovich MADUNTSEV	1973	Svetlograd			
Oleg Aleksandrovich MAKARENKO	1967	pos. Novosinkovo			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Sergey Ivanovich MAKSIMOV	1964	Saint Petersburg			
Yevgeniy Vladimirovich MALASHKEVICH	1966	pgt. Kavalerovo			
Dmitriy Yuryevich MALEVANIY	1990	Spassk-Dalniy			
Aleksey Valeryevich MALTSEV	1979	Fryazino			
Aleksandr Pavlovich MALYKH	1985	pgt. Igra			
Sergey Nikolayevich MALYSHEV	1987	St. Petersburg			
Nikolay Semenovich MANASKUTRA	1956	s. Bolshoy Bukor			
Sergey Nikolayevich MANGILEV	1968	s. Baltym			
Sergey Ivanovich MARDAR	1971	Zarechniy			
Anton Vasilyevich MARINETS	1987	pos. Kavalerovo			
Lev Beybudovich MARKARYAN	1983	Timashevsk			
Igor Vyacheslavovich MARKIN	1967	Pechora			
Anatoliy Nikolayevich MARKOVSKIY	1966	s. Vvedenshchina			
Yuriy Petrovich MASLOV	1966	Mikhaylovsk			
Dmitriy Aleksandrovich MATASOV	1977	Volsk			
Petr Petrovich MATSOLA	1964	Izhevsk			
Gennadiy Vasilyevich MATUS	1954	Krasnoyarsk			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Pavel Viktorovich MATUSHKIN	1974	Krasnodar			
Arunas Albinovich MAURITSAS	1968	Chernyakhovsk			
Valentin Vyacheslavovich MAYER	1964	Krasnoperekopsk			
Vyacheslav Vladimirovich MEDVEDEV	1971	Dalnerechensk			
Mustafa Ibadlayevich MENADIYEV	1962	pos. Sennoy			
Sergey Ivanovich MENIN	1970	Valuyki			
Vladimir Ivanovich MENZHINSKIY	1957	Sovetsk			
Mikhail Vladimirovich MIKHALTSOV	1953	Abaza			
Aleksey Yegorovich MIKHAYLOV	1969	Kuybyshev			
Aleksandr Ivanovich MILLER	1956	pgt. Nizhnegorskiy			
Igor Yevgenyevich MIRONCHIK	1970	Murmansk			
Dmitriy Viktorovich MIRONENKO	1975	Korenovsk			
Mikhail Anatolyevich MOISEYEV	1963	Kandalaksha			
Dmitriy Anatolyevich MOISEYEV	1973	st. Novotitarovskaya			
Denis Vladimirovich MOROZOV	1984	Zelenogorsk			
Georgiy Aleksandrovich MUSOYANTS	1971	Usinsk			



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Sergey Aleksandrovich MYSIN	1965	Ulyanovsk			
Sergey Vyacheslavovich NADEYEV	1974	Korsakov			
Grigoriy Oganesevich NALBANDYAN	1984	Maykop			
Yuriy Fadeyevich NAYDICH	1969	Dzerzhinsk			
Dmitriy Anatolyevich NEGREBA	1976	Nazarovo			
Andrey Aleksandrovich NEKRASOV	1973	Almetyevsk			
Oleg Nikolaevich NEROPOV	1971	Zheleznogorsk			
Dmitriy Vyacheslavovich NIKITIN	1971	Nefteyugansk			
Vladimir Valentinovich NIKITIN	1981	Yoshkar-Ola			
Viktor Aleksandrovich NIKITKOV	1952	r.pos.Lesogorsk			
Sergey Mikhailovich NOVIKOV	1960	Podolsk			
Aleksandr Germanovich NOVOBRITSKIY	1966	Sayansk			
Andrey Pavlovich OGORODNIKOV	1965	Kostomuksha			
Andrey Borisovich OKHAPKIN	1952	Kineshma			
Yuriy Aleksandrovich OMELCHENKO	1968	g.Lesosibirsk			
Andrey Anatolyevich ONOSOV	1965	Pervouralsk			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Vadim Albertovich OPYAKIN	1968	Simferopol			
Stanislav Anatolyevich OREKHOV	1964	Balashikha			
Igor Nikolayevich OSIPENKO	1962	Sharypovo			
Timofey Yuryevich OSTAPENKO	1971	Syktyvkar			
Rafik Gegamovich OVEYAN	1950	kh. Nizhneosinovskiy			
Aleksey Dmitriyevich PANOV	1962	Myski			
Valeriy Viktorovich PANYUSHEV	1964	Severomorsk			
Sergey Georgiyevich PARFENOVICH	1972	s. Petrovka			
Aleksandr Yevgenyevich PARKHACHEV	1958	Shchelkino			
Vladimir Nikolayevich PAVLYK	1967	Moscow			
Mikhail Vasilyevich PAZHITNYKH	1970	s. Pivovarikha			
Aleksey Mikhaylovich PETROV	1960	Barnaul			
Vladimir Anatolyevich PILYUGA	1965	st. Kanevskaya			
Dmitriy Yevgenyevich PLUZHNOV	1963	Monchegorsk			
Yuriy Viktorovich PONOMARENKO	1958	pos. Luchegorsk			
Igor Sergeevich POPOV	1965	Dimitrovgrad			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Viktor Vasilyevich POPOVICH	1950	Angarsk			
Galina Ivanovna POPOVICH	1955	Angarsk			
Andrey Dmitriyevich POSOKHOV	1968	Pyatigorsk			
Aleksandr Nikolayevich PUTINTSEV	1974	Chita			
Pavel Anatolyevich PUZYREV	1984	st. Nezlobnaya			
Aleksey Nikolayevich PYATUNIN	1979	Beslan			
Boris Geradyevich REMIZOV	1973	Salavat			
Anatoliy Gennadyevich RODIONOV	1969	Sochi			
Andrey Andreyevich ROGUTSKIY	1973	pgt. Razdolnoye			
Anatoliy Nikolayevich ROMANYUKOV	1954	Armavir			
Sergey Nikonovich RONSHIN	1962	g.Liski			
Nikolay Nikolayevich RUBEZHANSKIY	1952	Kamyshin			
Vladimir Fedorovich RUDENKO	1988	Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk			
Viktor Mikhaylovich RUDIY	1971	Zelenokumsk			
Aleksandr Vladimirovich RYNDIN	1971	PGT Nogliki			
Pavel Vasilyevich RYSHKOV	1972	g.Labinsk			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Aleksandr Gennadyevich SAFONOV	1970	g.Leninsk			
Andrey Vladimirovich SAFONOV	1973	Volgograd			
Aleksandr Aleksandrovich SAFONOV	1965	kh. Trudobelikovskiy			
Viktor Petrovich SAGIN	1957	Achinsk			
Vladimir Gerasimovich SALTYKOV	1945	pgt. Shushenskoye			
Aleksandr Aleksandrovich SARAPULTSEV	1965	Yeysk			
Vagan Sokratovich SARGSYAN	1970	s. Volnoye			
Leonid Nikolayevich SECHIN	1956	Maykop			
Igor Nikolayevich SEDUNOV	1967	Blagoveshchensk			
Aleksandr Sergeyevich SEGAL	1961	Kerch			
Sergey Anatolyevich SELEZNEV	1972	Vilyuchinsk			
Aleksandr Vasilyevich SELIVANOV	1963	s. Bryanskoye			
Dmitriy Sergeyevich SEMENOV	1974	Glazov			
Aleksandr Vasilyevich SEMIN	1966	Pushkino			
Yuriy Aleksandrovich SERGEYECHEV	1951	Adygeysk			
Sergey Aleksandrovich SEROSHTANOV	1965	Yekaterinburg			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Andrey Grigoryevich SHABUNIN	1970	Petropavlovsk -Kamchatskiy			
Roman Andreyevich SHAUROV	1973	pos. Ishnya			
Sergey Nikolayevich SHEMYAKOV	1971	Buzuluk			
Boris Gennadyevich SHEVCHENKO	1979	Kotelnikovo			
Vasiliy Andreyevich SHEVCHENKO	1948	Chekhov			
Oleg Grigoryevich SHIDLOVSKIY	1969	Zverevo			
Vladimir Viktorovich SHIKHOV	1976	pos. Konosha			
Vitaliy Nikolayevich SHILOV	1974	Kotovo			
Timofey Yuryevich SHILYAYEV	1971	Kirovsk			
Ivan Ivanovich SHINKARENKO	1964	st. Tbilisskaya			
Gennadiy Valerianovich SHPAKOVSKIY	1958	Pskov			
Sergey Aleksandrovich SHUPROV	1960	pos. Shchelkan			
Vladimir Anatolyevich SHURMANOV	1966	Rybinsk			
Pavel Ivanovich SIDORENKO	1958	Goryachiy Klyuch			
Boris Nikolayevich SIMONENKO	1955	Kovrov			
Sergey Aleksandrovich SIMONOV	1975	Volgograd			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Vladimir Yuryevich SKACHIDUB	1961	st. Pavloskaya			
Sergey Vladimirovich SKUDAYEV	1978	Kurgan			
Valeriy Vladimirovich SLASHCHEV	1981	Tynda			
Andrey Anatolyevich SMOLIKOV	1960	Zarinsk			
Igor Vladimirovich SMOLNIKOV	1970	Ozersk			
Aleksandr Vasilyevich SOLOVYEV	1970	Perm			
Sergey Nikolayevich SOPRYSHIN	1969	pos. Rodniki			
Andrey Mikhaylovich SOROKIN	1966	Kansk			
Pavel Aleksandrovich SOROKIN	1974	pos. Svetliy Yar			
Oleg Viktorovich SOYENKO	1969	Sayanogorsk			
Pavel Vasilyevich STARCHENKO	1965	st. Marinskaya			
Timofey Timofeyevich STARIKOV	1940	Kaluga			
Aleksandr Nikolayevich STATSENKO	1977	pgt. Krasnoselskiy			
Nikolay Aleksandrovich STEPANOV	1974	Vologda			
Vyacheslav Vladimirovich STEPANOV	1975	s.Lugovoye			
Vyacheslav Yuryevich STEPANOV	1977	Sergiyev-Posad			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Nikolay Filippovich STRYAPCHEV	1959	Ukhta			
Sergey Vasilyevich SUSHILNIKOV	1957	Novokuznetsk			
Nikolay Vasilyevich SUSLONOV	1975	Kotlas			
Sergey Borisovich SUSLOV	1968	Azov			
Aleksandr Gennadyevich SUVOROV	1980	Orenburg			
Sergey Vladimirovich SUVOROV	1963	Tayshet			
Roman Vladimirovich SVATEYEV	1967	Volgograd			
Yuriy Sergeevich SVISTELNIKOV	1952	Kalach			
Pyotr Ivanovich TALALUYEV	1963	st. Kalininskaya			
Rashid Yunusovich TALIPOV	1964	Vyborg			
Dmitriy Anatolyevich TARANENKO	1975	Chelyabinsk			
Anatoliy Ivanovich TATANKIN	1961	Kumertau			
Roman Borisovich TELYUSHKIN	1971	Tutayev			
Aleksandr Viktorovich TEPLYAKOV	1967	Guryevsk			
Nikolay Grigoryevich TER-AVANESOV	1962	Kaliningrad			
Nikolay Ivanovich TIMOFEYEV	1956	Tomsk			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Vladimir Valentinovich TIMOSHKIN	1968	Solikamsk			
Gennadiy Matveyevich TISHCHENKO	1952	Shchelkovo			
Denis Yuryevich TITARENKO	1979	pos. Pervomayskoye			
Lazar Mikhaylovich TOKOYAKOV	1959	s. Beltirskoye			
Aslan Alikhanovich TOMAYEV	1973	Alagir			
Sergey Serezhovich TOROSYAN	1975	Sochi			
Gennadiy Mikhaylovich TRACH	1958	pos. Pereyaslavka			
Nikolay Ivanovich TRETAKOV	1967	Norilsk			
Mikhail Yuryevich TRINADTSATKO	1962	Khabarovsk			
Viktor Fedorovich TROFIMOV	1967	Polyarniy			
Yuriy Valeryevich TSAREV	1966	Ivanovo			
Aleksey Georgiyevich TSARKOV	1972	Vladimir			
Aleksandr Gennadyevich TSIKUNOV	1967	Kaltan			
Oleg Petrovich TSIMERMAN	1969	Kholmok			
Yuriy Vladimirovich TSUKANOV	1963	g. Leninsk-Kuznetskiy			
Artur Aslanbekovich TSUTSIYEV	1975	Vladikavkaz			



## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Yevgeniy Viktorovich TSVETASH	1968				
Andrey Gennadyevich TSVETKOV	1972	Donetsk			
Aleksey Aleksandrovich TSYGANOV	1969	pgt. Chernomorsko ye			
Aleksey Viktorovich TUSHIN	1971	Ivanovo			
Aleksandr Alekseyevich TYUKPIYEV	1986	s. Malye Arbaty			
Dmitriy Aleksandrovich ULYANOV	1972	Yelizovo			
Ildar Ismagilovich URAZBAKHTIN	1963	Kodinsk			
Nikolay Vasilyevich USHITSKIY	1950	Nartkala			
Leonid Aleksandrovich USOLTSEV	1959	Neftekamsk			
Yuriy Yakovlevich UZBEKOV	1962	Ukhta			
Rustam Ismailovich UZDENOV	1972	Nalchik			
Anas Runarovich VALIAKHMETOV	1978	g.Lysva			
Anatoliy Yemelyanovich VERKHOTUROV	1961	pos. Oktyabrskiy			
Nikolay Aleksandrovich VIZNYAK	1948	Prokhladny			
Dominka Dionisovna VIZNYAK	1949	Prokhladny			
Anatoliy Andreyevich VORONTSOV	1973	Uchaly			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Vladimir Anatolyevich VOVCHENKO	1985	st. Dinskaya			
Anna Stepanovna VOVCHUK	1940	Usolye-Sibirskoye			
Aleksey Karpovich VOYSHCHEV	1968	Chernogorsk			
Maria Antonovna VOZNYUK	1937	Angarsk			
Sergey Vasilyevich YASHIN	1967	Komsomolsk-on-Amur			
Alla Ivanovna YASINSKAYA	1963	Usolye-Sibirskoye			
Anatoliy Nikolayevich YASINSKIY	1963	Usolye-Sibirskoye			
Aleksey Vladimirovich YEFREMOV	1974	Voskresensk			
Sergey Vladimirovich YEGOROV	1973	Ozery			
Nikolay Nikolayevich YELFIMOV	1962	pos. Solnechnodolsk			
Oleg Alekseyevich YELIKOV	1968	Sosnovoborsk			
Aleksey Nikolayevich YELISEYEV	1983	Snezhnogorsk			
Artem Anatolyevich YEMELYANOV	1978	Kazan			
Dmitriy Aleksandrovich YERMOLAEV	1977	Nizhniy Novgorod			
Aleksey Nikolayevich YERSHOV	1953	Seversk			
Sergey Yevgenyevich YERSHOV	1975	st. Yevsino			

## TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Petr Arkadyevich YEVSEYEV	1971	der. Bor			
Andrey Ivanovich YEVSEYEV	1965	Novocherkassk			
Sergey Nikolayevich YUBKO	1973	Bryansk			
Aleksandr Mineyevich YURKOV	1960	Kaltan			
Gennadiy Aleksandrovich ZAGLODIN	1973	Shatura			
Igor Ivanovich ZAITZ	1963	Simferopol			
Albert Benikovich ZAKHARYAN	1972	pos. Tulskiy			
Yuriy Viktorovich ZALIPAYEV	1962	Mayskiy			
Aleksandr Georgiyevich ZAPOROZHETSEV	1954	Novoshakhtinsk			
Ildar Vlarikovich ZARIPOV	1975	Ufa			
Rashit Nurulloevich ZARIPOV	1959	pos. Chulman			
Sergey Gavrilovich ZARYAYEV	1962	s. Barezovskoye			
Vitaliy Miniokmatovich ZAYNULIN	1968	Saint Petersburg			
Sergey Nikolayevich ZHABROV	1966	pos. Zavety Ilyicha			
Sergey Rudolfovich ZHAROVETSEV	1964	Kirovo-Chepetsk			
Nikolay Pavlovich ZHIRYAKOV	1949	Prokhladniy			
Mikhail Anatolyevich ZHIVOV	1974	Rostov-on-Don			

TAGANROG LRO AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA – JUDGMENT

Name of the applicant	Year born / founded	Place of residence / incorporation	Pecuniary damage awarded, EUR	Non-pecuniary damage, EUR	
				Claimed	Awarded
Andrey Aleksandrovich ZHUKOV	1972	Yugorsk			
Application no. 44386/19, <i>Christensen v. Russia</i>					
Dennis Ole CHRISTENSEN	1972	Orel	14,301	85,000	See above