



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

### THIRD SECTION

#### **CASE OF NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA**

*(Applications nos. 11884/22 and 161 others – see appended list)*

#### JUDGMENT

Art 10 • Freedom of expression • Applicants' prosecution in criminal and administrative proceedings and shutdown of applicant media organisations for "discrediting" Russian military and spreading "fake news" about its actions in Ukraine • Applicants subjected to various forms of sanctions for expressing views critical of those actions or disseminating information that diverged from official accounts • Conviction of two of the applicants by Crimean courts on the basis of Russian law not "lawful" • Domestic courts' failure to analyse remaining applicants' statements within their specific context or balance competing interests • Retrospective application of the law not foreseeable • Penalties of exceptional and disproportionate severity, fostering an environment of self-censorship • Disproportionate measures amounted to a broader campaign to suppress dissent regarding military action in Ukraine

Art 34 • Hinder the exercise of the right of application • Failure to comply with interim measures indicated under Rule 39

Art 5 § 3 • Failure to provide relevant and sufficient reasons for pre-trial detention

Art 5 § 1 • Lawful arrest or detention • Detention employed as a pretext to silence one applicant's expression of critical opinions indicating bad faith

Art 5 § 4 • Speediness of review • Excessive delays in examination of detention appeals

Art 3 • Degrading treatment • Confinement in metal cage and small glass cabin during detention hearings

Art 8 • Home • Unjustified searches of journalists' homes

Prepared by the Registry. Does not bind the Court.

STRASBOURG

11 February 2025

*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 Novaya Gazeta and Others v. Russia,**

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

Ioannis Ktistakis, *President*,  
Peeter Roosma,  
Lətif Hüseynov,  
Darian Pavli,  
Oddný Mjöll Arnardóttir,  
Diana Kovatcheva,  
Mateja Đurović, *judges*,  
Olga Chernishova, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to:

the one hundred and sixty-one applications (see application numbers in the appendix) against the Russian Federation lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by media organisations and individual applicants (“the applicants”) on the dates listed in the appendix;

the decision to grant interim measures under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court in application no. 11884/22 (see paragraph 12 below);

the partial inadmissibility decision concerning applications nos. 2156/23 and 7800/23 (see *Pivkina and Others v. Russia* (dec.), nos. 2134/23 and 6 others, 6 June 2023);

the decision to give notice to the Russian Government (“the Government”) of the complaints concerning the applicants’ right to freedom of expression and related complaints, and to declare inadmissible the remainder of the applications;

the applicants’ observations;

the Ukrainian Government’s comments submitted under Article 36 § 1 of the Convention in applications nos. 45470/22, 464/23 and 1385/23;

the decision of the President of the Section to appoint one of the elected judges of the Court to sit as an *ad hoc* judge, applying by analogy Rule 29 § 2 of the Rules of the Court (see *Kutayev v. Russia*, no. 17912/15, §§ 5-8, 24 January 2023);

Having deliberated in private on 14 January 2025,

Delivers the following judgment, which was adopted on that date:

## INTRODUCTION

1. The case concerns the applicants’ prosecution in criminal and administrative proceedings and the shutdown of applicant media organisations for “discrediting” the Russian military and spreading “fake news” about its actions.

## THE FACTS

### I. REPORTING RESTRICTIONS

2. On 24 February 2022 the President of Russia announced the launch of a full-scale military invasion of Ukraine which he described as a “special military operation”.

3. On the same day the Federal Service for Supervision of Communications, Information Technology and Mass Media (Roskomnadzor, “the RKN”) posted the following information on its website:

“... the RKN reminds the media and information resources that, when preparing materials and publications related to the special operation ... they are obliged to use information and data obtained only from official Russian sources ... Disseminating knowingly false information on the Internet will result in the immediate blocking of such materials ... It is recalled that only Russian official information sources have reliable and up-to-date information.”

4. On 26 February 2022 the Prosecutor General’s Office (“the PGO”) issued a demand to the RKN and service providers to restrict access to war reports published by Russian independent media outlets. This demand was justified by the assertion that “the aforementioned news resources disseminate information, which is presented as reliable reports but does not correspond to reality, about the shelling of Ukrainian cities and the death of civilians as a result of actions by the Russian Army, and also characterise the ongoing operation as an attack, invasion, or declaration of war”.

5. On 4 March 2022, within a single working day, the State Duma held an extraordinary meeting to approve in three readings, the Federation Council validated, and the President signed into law, amendments to the Code of Administrative Offences (“the CAO”) and the Criminal Code concerning the dissemination of knowingly false information about the deployment of the Russian Armed Forces, and public calls to prevent their deployment (Federal Law no. 31-FZ of 4 March 2022, see Domestic law below).

6. On 6 March 2022 websites of independent Russian media, including *7x7*, *Mediazona*, *Sobesednik*, *Agentstvo* and others, were blocked for their coverage of the war in Ukraine. Subsequently the RKN also blocked the websites of the Voice of America, Deutsche Welle, BBC Russian Service, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and other foreign media with Russian-language content.

7. On 16 March 2022 the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, in the context of a procedure launched under Article 8 of the Statute of the Council of Europe, adopted Resolution CM/Res(2022)2, by which the Russian Federation ceased to be a member of the Council of Europe as from that date.

## II. SHUTDOWN OF MEDIA ORGANISATIONS (No. 11884/22)

**A. *Novaya Gazeta* and Dmitry Muratov**

8. *Novaya Gazeta* was a Russian independent newspaper with an average weekly circulation of 300,000 copies and an online daily audience of about 3 million people. Mr Muratov was its editor-in-chief. In 2021 he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, jointly with Maria Ressa of the Philippines, “for their efforts to safeguard freedom of expression”. The Nobel Committee specifically commended *Novaya Gazeta* as being “the most independent newspaper in Russia today, with a fundamentally critical attitude towards power”.

9. On 26 February 2022 *Novaya Gazeta* received take-down requests (“TDR”) from the RKN and PGO concerning an editorial by Mr Muratov, “*Novaya Gazeta* against the war”, and a syndicated statement by independent media, “Pain, Anger and Shame. This War is Folly”. It was stated that the content of the publications was illegal because they contained “untrue information of public significance that the Russian Federation had launched full-fledged military hostilities. Whereas, according to the Ministry of Defence, the combined troops of the Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics, with the support of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation, are conducting a special military operation for the protection of the population of the region, and strikes are targeting only military infrastructure”. A judicial challenge to the TDRs was dismissed at first instance by the Tverskoy District Court of Moscow on 5 August 2022 and by the Moscow City Court on appeal on 13 June 2023.

10. Between 26 February and 2 March 2022 *Novaya Gazeta* received four additional TDRs from the RKN. They mandated the removal of two daily live feeds about the war in Ukraine, a five-day summary of events and the news about the shelling of Kharkiv and Chernihiv. According to the RKN, the materials contained false information “about the alleged invasion of Russian troops into Ukraine”. The RKN stated that, “according to official Russian sources, including the Ministry of Defence, that information does not correspond to reality, instils panic among people and creates conditions for mass disorders and violations of public safety”. On 15 June 2022 the Tverskoy District Court, and on 25 April 2023 the Moscow City Court on appeal, dismissed an appeal against the TDRs.

11. On 4 March 2022 *Novaya Gazeta*, faced with the threat of complete blocking and criminal prosecution, was compelled to remove independently the remaining materials published from 24 February to 4 March which contained coverage of the military hostilities or used the term “war” for its description.

12. On 8 March 2022 the Court examined *Novaya Gazeta*’s request for interim measures under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court. The Court decided, in

the interests of the parties and the proper conduct of the proceedings, considering the exceptional context in which the request was lodged, to indicate to the Government of Russia “to abstain until further notice from actions and decisions aimed at fully blocking and terminating the activities of *Novaya Gazeta*, and from other actions that, in the current circumstances, could deprive *Novaya Gazeta* of the enjoyment of its rights guaranteed by Article 10 of the Convention”.

13. On 28 March 2022 the editorial office of *Novaya Gazeta* decided to temporarily suspend the production of both printed and electronic editions, citing the impossibility of operating under current reporting restrictions.

14. In May 2022 the RKN charged *Novaya Gazeta* with disseminating “fake news”, an offence under Article 13.15(9) of the CAO. The charges related to Mr Muratov’s editorial and the syndicated appeal which referred to “war” instead of the official term “special military operation” (see paragraph 9 above) and to a first-person account by journalist Ms Kostyuchenko, who had witnessed the shelling of residential areas in Kherson and seen Russian troops shoot at and abduct protesters at an anti-occupation rally. On 6 July, 10 August and 14 September 2022 the Simonovskiy District Court of Moscow found the newspaper guilty as charged and imposed fines ranging from 300,000 to 350,000 Russian roubles (RUB). On 9 and 20 June and 27 July 2023 the Moscow City Court dismissed the appeals.

15. On 22 July 2022 and other dates the RKN blocked access to the websites [www.novayagazeta.ru](http://www.novayagazeta.ru), [www.novaya.no](http://www.novaya.no) and [www.novaya.media](http://www.novaya.media), alleging a “repeated publication of information aimed at discrediting the actions of the Russian State authorities in the special operation in Ukraine”, without further details. The blocking measures were appealed against to the Tverskoy District Court of Moscow, which upheld them as lawful on 15 December 2022 and 4 and 18 April 2023. On 19 October 2023 and 31 January and 27 February 2024 the Moscow City Court dismissed the appeals.

16. On 5 September 2022 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow suspended the publishing licence of *Novaya Gazeta* for an alleged failure to submit a copy of the editorial office’s charter twenty years ago. On 7 February 2023 the Moscow City Court dismissed the appeal against the suspension decision.

17. On 15 September 2022 the Supreme Court of Russia granted the RKN’s application to terminate the operation of the online version of *Novaya Gazeta* due to the editorial office receiving two warnings. On 22 December 2022 the appellate board of the Supreme Court rejected the appeal from the founder and the editorial office of the online media.

## **B. Dozhd TV and Natalya Sindeyeva**

18. Dozhd TV (Rain TV) was a Russian independent television channel launched in 2010 with an annual audience of about 18 million people. It had a website, a YouTube channel, and a presence on major social media platforms. Ms Sindeyeva was its founder and director general.

19. On 26 February 2022 the RKN notified Dozhd TV that, based on a TDR, it was restricting access to a publication on its website concerning the first civilian casualties of the Russian shelling of Ukrainian cities. It was stated that the “publications ... contained knowingly untrue information about the use of the Russian Armed Forces, their shelling of cities, and civilian casualties, including minors”.

20. On 1 March 2022 the RKN sent another TDR, alleging that the channel’s website contained untrue information about “the goals of the special military operation on the territory of Ukraine, the forms and methods of conducting combat operations, the losses among the Russian troops, shelling, and casualties among [Ukrainian] civilians.” On the same day the RKN blocked access to the tvrain.ru website.

21. On 3 March 2022 the police visited Dozhd TV’s premises and handed over two warnings from the Moscow City Prosecutor against disseminating extremist materials in the media. According to the text, the prosecutors identified materials on Dozhd TV’s YouTube channel that contained “public calls for extremist and terrorist activities, violence against citizens, and incitement to hatred and enmity, including on the basis of ethnic origin”.

22. On 3 March 2022 the RKN began sending letters to satellite and cable communication operators, indicating that the Dozhd TV channel should be removed from their packages pursuant to the PGO’s demand. In its letters to operators, the RKN demanded that “measures be taken to stop the dissemination of unreliable information through the broadcasting of the Dozhd TV channel on their networks”. As a result, network operators ceased retransmitting the Dozhd TV channel.

23. On the same day the TV channel’s editorial office stopped producing and releasing media products. This decision was due to two main reasons: the inability to continue network broadcasting, and the fears of the management that the journalists and staff could be prosecuted for the organisation of, and participation in, extremist activities.

24. By a judgment of 23 May 2022, as upheld on appeal on 9 February 2023, the Tverskoy District Court of Moscow upheld the decision of 1 March about the blocking of access to the website.

### III. PROSECUTION OF INDIVIDUAL APPLICANTS

#### A. Criminal proceedings

##### 1. *Vladimir Kara-Murza (no. 43083/22)*

25. On 11 April 2022 the police detained Mr Kara-Murza, an opposition politician and journalist, in front of his apartment block in Moscow. He was charged with disobedience on the grounds that he had “changed his trajectory of movement and hastened his step upon seeing police officers” and refused to produce identity documents upon their request. The following morning he was taken to the Khamovnicheskiy District Court, which found him guilty as charged and sentenced him to fifteen days of detention, enforceable immediately. On 25 April 2022 the Moscow City Court rejected his appeal.

26. In the meantime, on 12 April 2022, investigators instituted criminal proceedings against Mr Kara-Murza for disseminating “fake news” about the Russian Army, committed for pecuniary gain and for motives of “political hate”, an offence under Article 207.3 § 2 (d) and (e) of the Criminal Code. The charges related to his speech before members of the Arizona State House of Representatives on 15 March 2022, made available online on the Arizona House GOP’s YouTube channel. In his speech, he was alleged to have imparted “knowingly false information” about the Russian troops bombing residential areas and critical infrastructure, including maternity wards, hospitals and schools, using cluster munitions, and unleashing a war of aggression against Ukraine. He had also “negatively referred” to the Russian authorities, including the President of Russia. For that speech, he had received a speaking fee from the Free Russia Foundation (FRF), an organisation designated as “undesirable” in Russia (see *Andrey Rylkov Foundation and Others v. Russia*, nos. 37949/18 and 84 others, §§ 6-12, 18 June 2024).

27. On 22 April 2022 Mr Kara-Murza was designated as a “foreign agent”. On the same day the Basmannyy District Court authorised his detention on remand which was subsequently extended on 9 August, 10 October and 8 December 2022. The Moscow City Court dismissed all appeals against the detention and extension orders.

28. On 13 July 2022 Mr Kara-Murza was additionally charged with involvement in the activities of an “undesirable organisation”, a criminal offence under Article 284.1 of the Criminal Code (*ibid.*, § 61). The charge referred to the fact that, despite having incurred administrative liability for his involvement with Open Russia, another “undesirable organisation”, in 2021 (*ibid.*, §§ 46-50 and a summary of application no. 59894/21 in the appendix to that judgment), he had organised a round-table on prisoners of conscience in Russia in cooperation with the FRF.

29. On 29 August 2022 a third and most serious charge was added: high treason under Article 275 of the Criminal Code, described as “providing consulting or other assistance to a foreign organisation in activities

undermining the security of the Russian Federation”. This charge referred to his membership of the FRF board of directors and his three speaking engagements before the Parliamentary Assembly of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Norwegian Helsinki Committee and the US Helsinki Commission, for which he had received speaking fees from the FRF. His speeches criticised the legitimacy of the 2024 presidential election, exposed State terror and political killings in Russia, and referred to an “information iron curtain” preventing the people of Russia from knowing the truth about the war in Ukraine. Such statements were alleged to have harmed the constitutional foundations and sovereignty of Russia, undermined the people’s trust in its authorities, escalated protest sentiment, and damaged the international standing of Russia by portraying it as a persistent violator of human rights and an “aggressor State”, which may have given cause to increase external political and economic pressure.

30. On 17 April 2023 the Moscow City Court, following a closed trial, found Mr Kara-Murza guilty of all three charges and sentenced him to twenty-five years’ imprisonment in a strict-security facility. The court relied on video footage of his speeches, which the prosecution sourced online, and on invoices for speaking engagements issued to the FRF, which the prosecution acquired from his mobile phone. To establish the falsity of Mr Kara-Murza’s statements, the court referred to a document obtained by the prosecution from the General Staff of the Armed Forces. According to it, “Russia was not at war with Ukraine” and “during the special military operation, the Russian troops did not use any prohibited means or methods of warfare” such as cluster munitions against civilians. On 31 July 2023 the First Appellate Court upheld the conviction.

## 2. *Dmytro Gordon (no. 45470/22)*

31. On 16 March 2022 Mr Gordon, a well-known Ukrainian journalist and political commentator, made the following remarks during an interview with a Ukrainian news channel:

“With Russia, you’ve got to speak the language of force. That’s the only language they understand well ... If [Putin] threatens the US with nukes, [the US] will drop them on him and bury him along with his fascist country ... Russians need to be beaten – not the ordinary people, but Putin’s State and those bastards who invaded our land. Take them down hard, spare no one. They bomb our theatres where women and children are sheltering. They bomb our houses and kill civilians. No pity – kill them all without mercy, get to Putin and kill him. That’s the most important job for the whole civilised world”.

32. On the following day Russia’s Investigations Committee (“the ICRF”) announced that its chairman had personally ordered a review of Mr Gordon’s interview on the grounds that Mr Gordon had called for “violence against the Russian authorities and military personnel” and “the use of nuclear weapons against the Russian Federation”. On 21 March 2022 the ICRF announced in

a press release and video that it had opened a criminal investigation into Mr Gordon on three charges. The ICRF stated that Mr Gordon had appealed “for an armed attack on the Russian Federation using nuclear weapons”, an offence under Article 354 § 2 of the Criminal Code (Public calls to unleashing a war of aggression), that he had called “for the destruction of Russian citizens on the basis of nationality, language and origin”, a hate-speech offence under Article 282 § 2 (a) of the Criminal Code, and also had disseminated “deliberately false information about the bombing by the Russian Armed Forces of civilian infrastructure and civilians on the territory of Ukraine” for reasons of “political hate”, an offence under Article 207.3 § 2 (e) of the Criminal Code.

33. On 6 April 2022 the Russian financial monitor added Mr Gordon’s name to the List of Terrorists and Extremists on the grounds that he was charged with “extremist” offences (see, on the legal and financial consequences of the inclusion, *Yefimov and Youth Human Rights Group v. Russia*, nos. 12385/15 and 51619/15, §§ 26 and 37, 7 December 2021).

34. By decision of 22 July 2022, as upheld on appeal on 10 August 2022, the Basmannyy District Court granted the investigators’ application for an arrest warrant against Mr Gordon.

35. No documents have been served on Mr Gordon by any Russian authority, as part of the criminal proceedings or otherwise. On 29 August and 2 September 2022 he asked the ICRF, the courts and the lawyer who had been appointed to represent him in the detention proceedings for copies of all documentation generated by the proceedings. No responses were received.

36. On 2 September 2022 Mr Gordon was designated as a “foreign agent”.

37. On 1 July 2024 the Second Western Circuit Military Court in Moscow sentenced Mr Gordon *in absentia* to fourteen years’ imprisonment in connection with the charges listed in paragraph 32 above.

### 3. *Aleksandra Skochilenko (no. 45953/22)*

38. On 30 March 2022 Ms Skochilenko, an artist and musician, replaced five price tags in a supermarket in St Petersburg with look-alike tags of her making that carried the following messages:

“The Russian army bombed an art school in Mariupol with four hundred people sheltering there”;

“Russian conscripts are sent to Ukraine. This war will cost us the lives of our children”;

“Stop the war! 4,300 Russian soldiers died in the first three days. Why do they say nothing about it on television?”;

“For twenty years, Putin has been lying to us on TV. These lies have prepared us to justify the war and the senseless deaths”;

“My great-grandfather did not spend four years fighting in the Great Patriotic War for Russia to become a fascist state attacking Ukraine”.

39. On 11 April 2022 she was arrested and charged under Article 207.3 § 2 (e) of the Criminal Code with the aggravating circumstance of acting out of “political hate”. On 13 April 2022 the Vasileostrovskiy District Court in St Petersburg remanded her in custody, citing the gravity of the charges, a lack of permanent employment, the existence of friends in Ukraine, and her sister living in France. On 17 May 2022 the St Petersburg City Court rejected an appeal against the detention order.

40. The District Court further extended Ms Skochilenko’s detention on 30 May, 30 June, 29 July, 30 August, 28 September and 25 October 2022 and 22 March, 6 July and 2 October 2023. These extensions were upheld by the appeal court on 22 July, 11 August, 29 August, 26 September, 27 October and 12 December 2022 and 21 April, 11 August and 10 November 2023. At each detention hearing, she was placed in a metal cage in the courtroom.

41. On 16 November 2023 Ms Skochilenko was found guilty as charged and sentenced to seven years’ imprisonment.

4. *Mikhail Afanasyev (no. 48520/22)*

42. On 4 April 2022 Mr Afanasyev, the editor of the online media outlet *Novyy Fokus*, reported that eleven National Guard officers had refused to take part in the “special military operation” in Ukraine.

43. On 13 April 2022 he was charged under Article 207.3 § 2 (a) of the Criminal Code for that publication, with the aggravating element of committing the offence through the use of his office. His three residences were searched on the same and following days and he was remanded in custody. The court warrants authorising the searches contained no specific indication of items to be found or their relevance to the investigation. The investigators seized his electronic devices, documents, money and materials containing information about his private life and confidential journalistic sources. Mr Afanasyev’s appeals against the search warrants highlighted their vague formulation and lack of safeguards for journalistic materials, noting that despite the court being aware of his role as a journalist and editor-in-chief of an online publication, no special protection was provided for confidential source materials. The appeals were dismissed in a summary fashion.

44. On 7 September 2023 the Abakan City Court of the Republic of Khakassia found Mr Afanasyev guilty as charged and sentenced him to five years and six months’ imprisonment, with an additional prohibition on holding journalistic, editorial or publishing jobs for two and a half years after release.

5. *Olga Smirnova (no. 50247/22)*

45. Between 4 and 9 March 2022 Ms Smirnova, a civil society activist, shared posts against the war in Ukraine in the social media group War Chronicles. One of these posts, promoting an anti-war rally on 6 March, read:

“The gravity of war crimes committed by Russian aggressors within just a few days of this year is comparable only to the atrocities of the German Nazis during World War II. This war is a crime against all mankind! Our views are on our banners”.

46. On 5 May 2022 she was charged under Article 207.3 § 2 (e) of the Criminal Code for dissemination of false information for reasons of “political hate” and remanded in pre-trial detention.

47. On 30 August 2023 the Kirovskiy District Court of St Petersburg found her guilty as charged and sentenced her to six years’ imprisonment, with an additional four-year prohibition on administering web pages. On 20 March 2024 the St Petersburg City Court upheld the conviction on appeal.

6. *Maikl Sidney Naki (no. 57229/22)*

48. Mr Naki is a Russian videoblogger with over a million followers on his YouTube channel. In March 2022 he settled in Lithuania.

49. On 16 March 2022 Mr Naki and his co-host, Mr Karpuk (Leviyev), were charged under Article 207.3 § 2 (b) and (c) of the Criminal Code, with the aggravating elements of acting in a co-ordinated group and “fabricating evidence to support accusations”. The charges were related to their YouTube video uploaded on 5 March 2022, titled “WAR. SUMMARY OF DAY NINE. Strikes on a nuclear power plant, Syria-style clean-up tactics, three Russian war planes downed”. The investigators stated that they had knowingly disseminated false claims that the Russian Army was destroying cities, killing civilians and shelling a nuclear power plant, using video footage to support their allegations. On 12 May 2022 Mr Naki was declared a fugitive from justice with an international warrant for his arrest.

50. On 26 May 2022 the Basmannyy District Court of Moscow granted a prosecutor’s application to attach Mr Naki’s bank accounts for up to RUB 5,000,000, described as an amount “commensurate to the damage caused by the offence”. On 3 August 2022 the Moscow City Court dismissed an appeal against the attachment order.

51. On 9 September 2022 Mr Naki and Mr Karpuk were designated as “foreign agents”.

52. On 29 August 2023 the Basmannyy District Court found Mr Naki and Mr Karpuk guilty as charged *in absentia* and sentenced each of them to eleven years’ imprisonment. On 13 December 2023 the Moscow City Court dismissed an appeal against the conviction.

7. *Vsevolod Korolev (no. 2156/23)*

53. In March and April 2022 Mr Korolev, a documentary filmmaker, posted on social media that ten thousand people had died in Mariupol, that Donetsk had been shelled with cluster munitions from Russian-controlled territory, and that “people who refused to believe that the massacres in Bucha and Borodyanka had been perpetrated by Russian troops displayed a remarkable degree of naiveté”.

54. On 11 July 2022 he was charged under Article 207.3 of the Criminal Code in connection with his social media posts and remanded in custody. On 8 September and 10 October 2022 the Vyborgskiy District Court in St Petersburg extended his detention. At every detention hearing, Mr Korolev was held in a fully enclosed glass booth which was narrow and stifling.

55. On 20 March 2024 the Vyborgskiy District Court found Mr Korolev guilty as charged and sentenced him to three years’ imprisonment. On 2 July 2024 the St Petersburg City Court dismissed his appeal and increased the sentence to seven years’ imprisonment.

## **B. Administrative proceedings**

56. Except where otherwise specified, all the other individual applicants were prosecuted and convicted under Article 20.3.3 of the CAO for the offence of “discrediting” the Russian military. The facts giving rise to their convictions and the penalties imposed are summarised below and set out in detail in the appendix.

57. The most common form of the applicants’ anti-war expression, in approximately one third of individual cases, was a direct and straightforward message “NO TO WAR” («НЕТ ВОЙНЕ») or its close variations. The applicants used that phrase on their signs, placards, clothing, stickers, social media posts, hashtags and drawings. For instance, Mr Kurkov held a sign stating “NO TO WAR” in central St Petersburg (no. 46061/22). Ms Chubinidze was arrested at an airport for wearing a backpack with a sign “No to War” (no. 1699/23). Mr Berdnikov used the hashtags #NoToWar, #IAmAgainstWar, and #NoWar on his social media account (no. 55820/22), and Ms Bashmakova placed a “NO TO WAR” sign on her car (no. 55543/22).

58. The phrase became so recognisable that domestic courts penalised its reproduction even in masked but easily identifiable forms. Mr Kallas was fined for attaching a series of asterisks to his car’s rear window, their layout matching the number of letters in the Russian phrase “No to war” (no. 2867/23). The domestic courts reasoned that the mere use of the word “war” was damaging to the reputation of the Russian Army, as the official narrative characterised the situation as a “special military operation” rather than a “war”.

59. Applicants who did not use the word “war” and whose message was essentially pro-peace were also convicted. Ms Svalova was fined for holding

a sign featuring a white dove alongside the words “I stand for peace” (no. 4828/23) and Ms Feygina for stencilling a peace dove image onto a public thoroughfare (no. 2867/23).

60. Expressions of support or solidarity with Ukraine, including references to the distinctive blue and yellow colours of the Ukrainian national flag, were sanctioned. Ms Shlosberg and Mr Olkhovik were prosecuted for posting online, even before the start of the invasion, respectively, selfies in Ukrainian-themed clothing (no. 48958/22) and a picture of the Ukrainian national flag with an anti-war comment (no. 1200/23). Mr Nadein was arrested twice for jogging outdoors in a hoodie with the Ukrainian flag (no. 45083/22), while Ms Sokolova was detained for wearing a blue-and-yellow hat with a peace sign and a heart-shaped badge (no. 44505/22).

61. Several applicants were punished for defacing the “Z” symbol, an emblem of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, or for juxtaposing it with Nazi symbols to highlight their apparent similarity. Ms Kislyakova tore down a “Z” sign from a university wall (no. 121/23). Mr Balyasin defaced a “Z” in a city road sign that the authorities had modified to include the invasion symbol (no. 7824/23). Ms Sveshnikova transformed the “Z” into a warning traffic signal (no. 39003/22). Ms Stativka and Ms Olkhova either combined the “Z” with a derogatory term in graffiti (no. 925/23) or posted a picture of a dog defecating on it (no. 464/23). Mr Otradnov compared the “Z” with the Wolfsangel, a Nazi symbol (no. 51325/22), and Mr Broy compared it with the swastika (no. 45045/22).

62. Drawing historic parallels between the Nazi invasion of the USSR during World War II and the Russian invasion of Ukraine also constituted forms of expression liable to be suppressed. Mr Sukhorukov and Mr Samusev referred in different ways to the tragic fate of a survivor of Nazi concentration camps who had been killed by Russian shelling of Kharkiv (nos. 54147/22 and 1750/23). Mr Moyseyenko, an 86-year-old survivor of the Nazi occupation himself, expressed support for anti-war protest (no. 860/23). Mr Glushkov put side by side images of people sheltering in metro stations in 1941 Moscow and 2022 Kharkiv (no. 57672/22). Ms Vedyagina shared a post comparing a protesting Russian journalist to a man who refused to give the Nazi salute in 1936 (no. 1572/23). Challenging the patriotic narrative of Russia’s Victory Day parade, Mr Litvinenko and Mr Saltevskiy raised signs claiming that Russia’s policies represented a new form of fascism that needed to be defeated, just as the old fascism was (nos. 3733/23 and 14801/23), and Mr Akhunov held up a photograph of his great-grandfather with the text stating that he had given “his life so we could have peace” (no. 4920/23).

63. Some applicants used their positions and access to audiences to convey anti-war messages. An Orthodox priest, Mr Burdin, shared an anti-war sermon on his parish website and read it to his parishioners before the liturgy, reminding them of the Christian duty to oppose the killing of

brethren (no. 43213/22). Ms Yanovskaya, a newspaper editor, published an opinion piece expressing anti-war sentiments (no. 48104/22). Ms Bezaziyeva, a Crimean Tatar teacher in Crimea, told her secondary-school students about atrocities committed by Russian soldiers (no. 1385/23). Mr Nefedov, the head of a Moscow municipal district, signed and published a statement calling for an end to war and for Putin's resignation (no. 47616/22), and municipal councillors in St Petersburg voted for an appeal to Parliament to have Putin indicted for treason (nos. 16711/23, 16717/23 and 16721/23).

64. While many applicants resorted to traditional forms of anti-war expression such as individual vigils with placards or social media posts, a few found creative ways of conveying their opposition to war. Ms Derisheva replaced supermarket price tags with protest messages similar to those used by Ms Skochilenko (no. 47115/22), while Ms Kulikovskaya stamped anti-war text on money, hoping to give wider circulation to her message (no. 280/23). Mr Malinovskiy wore an anti-war sticker on his coat and projected the text "NO.WAR.RUSSIA" onto a building façade at night (no. 53823/22). Mr Mitrofanov crafted a cardboard box shaped like a cigarette pack with the warning message "Common sense warning: special military operation kills" (no. 44304/22). Ms Panina designed a sign made up of eight squares, each containing a different scenario of how the war affected various individuals (no. 50659/22), and Ms Isayeva poured red paint over herself while shouting "My heart is bleeding" to create a visceral representation of the war's impact (no. 39794/22). Mr Krivtsov put up crosses in a public park in Moscow, displaying the question "How many died in Mariupol? And what for?" (no. 13844/23).

65. Expressing anti-war views outside of public sphere, even in private or professional settings, also resulted in prosecutions and convictions. Mr Pistsov faced legal consequences for stating his opposition to the "unjust war" during a military service medical examination (no. 37076/22). Ms Chernyakevich was reported to the police by her own spouse for sharing anti-war content from Ukrainian sources in private family exchanges (no. 57642/22), while Mr Shabanov was denounced by his work colleagues for sharing anti-war videos among them (no. 55460/22).

66. On 5 March 2022 Mr Arinichev posted a video to his YouTube channel (no. 8102/23). It was the only video on a channel with one follower. In the video, he spoke approvingly of the sanctions against Russian companies and politicians due to Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine. Administrative proceedings were instituted against Mr Arinichev under Article 20.3.4 of the CAO. By judgment of 8 March 2022, as upheld on appeal on 21 September 2022, the Lefortovskiy District Court of Moscow found him guilty as charged and imposed a fine of RUB 35,000.

## RELEVANT LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND MATERIAL

### I. DOMESTIC LAW

#### A. Criminal Code

67. Article 207.3, as introduced on 4 March 2022, stipulated that “public dissemination of knowingly false information, presented as reliable reports, about the deployment of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation for the protection of the interests of the Russian Federation and its citizens and maintenance of international peace and security” shall be punishable with a fine of up to RUB 1,500,000, correctional or compulsory labour, or imprisonment for up to five years.

68. Paragraph 2 of this provision provided for harsher penalties for aggravated forms of the offence, including its commission (a) through the use of one’s office, (b) in an organised or co-ordinated group, (c) “using evidence specifically fabricated to support accusations” (*с искусственным созданием доказательств обвинения*), (d) for pecuniary motives, and (e) “for reasons of political, ideological, racial, ethnic or religious hate”. The possible penalties include a fine of between RUB 3,000,000 and 5,000,000 or imprisonment for a period of between five and ten years.

#### B. Code of Administrative Offences

69. Article 13.15(9) establishes liability for “dissemination of knowingly false information of public significance presented as reliable reports” (*заведомо недостоверной общественно значимой информации под видом достоверных сообщений*) in the media or in telecommunication networks that creates a risk of harm to citizens’ life and health or property, a risk of widespread disturbances of public order and safety or a risk of disruptions or halting of operations of critical infrastructure, transport, social infrastructure, financial institutions, energy plants, industry, or communication systems”. These actions are punishable with a fine of between RUB 30,000 and 100,000 for individuals, RUB 60,000 to 200,000 for officials, and RUB 200,000 to 500,000 for legal entities.

70. Article 20.3.3, as originally introduced on 4 March 2022, stipulated, in part 1, that “public actions aimed at discrediting the deployment of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation for the protection of the interests of the Russian Federation and its citizens and maintenance of international peace and security, including public calls to obstruct the deployment of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation for these purposes” would be punishable with a fine of between RUB 30,000 and 50,000 for individuals, RUB 100,000 to 200,000 for officials, and RUB 300,000 to 500,000 for legal entities.

71. Part 2 provided for higher fines in situations where such actions “were accompanied by calls for unauthorised public assemblies” or “created a risk of harm to citizens’ life and health or property, a risk of widespread disturbances of public order and safety or a risk of disruptions or halting of operations of critical infrastructure, transport, social infrastructure, financial institutions, energy plants, industry, or communication systems”.

72. Article 20.3.4 establishes that a Russian citizen or legal entity calling for a foreign State or a group of States to implement restrictive measures, such as the introduction or extension of political or economic sanctions against the Russian Federation, Russian nationals or companies, shall incur a fine of between RUB 30,000 and 50,000 for individuals, RUB 100,000 to 200,000 for officials, and RUB 300,000 to 500,000 for legal entities.

## II. INTERNATIONAL MATERIAL

73. Joint Statement on the Invasion of Ukraine and the Importance of Freedom of Expression and Information, issued by the monitors for freedom of expression and freedom of the media for the United Nations, the African Commission of Human Rights, the Inter-American Commission for Human Rights and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) on 2 May 2022, noted that “the erosion of the right to freedom of expression and other human rights over a prolonged period of time and the silencing of critical voices in the Russian Federation have contributed to create an environment that facilitates Russia’s war against Ukraine”. The monitors were “alarmed at the further tightening of censorship and repression of dissent and pluralist sources of information and opinion in the Russian Federation, including the blocking of social media platforms and news websites, interruption of services from foreign content and service providers, massive labelling of independent journalists and media as ‘foreign agents’, introduction of criminal liability and imprisonment of up to fifteen years for spreading so-called ‘fake’ information about the war in Ukraine or questioning Russian military actions in Ukraine or simply standing for peace or even mentioning the word ‘war’”.

74. The Second Report of the OSCE Moscow Mechanism’s mission of experts dated 14 July 2022 noted that “the Russian State-owned media continue to deny that the Russian Federation wages a full-fledged war against Ukraine, adhering to the special military operation label. They also fail to inform about the allegations of crimes committed by the Russian armed forces ...”.

75. In its concluding observations on the eighth periodic report of the Russian Federation (CCPR/C/RUS/CO/8, 1 December 2022), the United Nations Human Rights Committee stated that it was “deeply concerned” about the amendments to the Criminal Code made in March 2022, which criminalised the public dissemination of knowingly false information about

the Russian Army. The Committee was also concerned about the decision of the telecoms regulator, made at the PGO's request, which mandated that, with regard to the war in Ukraine, journalists were to report only information provided by the Government of the Russian Federation or face fines and being blocked on the Internet. It was likewise concerned about "reports that thousands of Internet sites and resources and a number of social media platforms (Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram) have been blocked and that more than 20 media outlets, both national and international, have been suspended, including the major independent news outlet Novaya Gazeta". The Committee expressed its "substantial concern" about "limitations on freedom of expression, in particular with respect to anti-war statements, including in educational institutions, as well as in public".

### III. STATISTICS SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANTS

76. OVD-Info, a Russian independent human-rights monitor and media project, has tracked criminal and administrative convictions for anti-war expression since the first day of the Russian invasion of Ukraine. As of May 2024, when the most recent tally was published, 935 criminal cases had been instituted in connection with anti-war statements, including 296 cases under Article 207.3 of the Criminal Code. A total of 9,495 administrative cases were instituted, the majority under Article 20.3.3 of the CAO.

## THE LAW

### I. PRELIMINARY ISSUES

#### **A. Joinder of the applications**

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

#### **B. Consequences of the Government's failure to participate in the proceedings**

78. The Court further notes that the respondent Government, by failing to submit any written observations, manifested an intention to abstain from participating in the examination of the case. However, the cessation of a Contracting Party's membership in the Council of Europe does not release it from its duty to cooperate with the Convention bodies. Consequently, the Government's failure to engage in the proceedings cannot constitute an obstacle to the examination of the case (see *Svetova and Others v. Russia*, no. 54714/17, §§ 29-31, 24 January 2023).

### C. The Court's jurisdiction

79. The Court observes that the facts constitutive of the alleged interference with the applicants' rights occurred prior to 16 September 2022, the date on which the Russian Federation ceased to be a Party to the Convention (see paragraphs 94-96 below). The Court therefore has jurisdiction to examine the present applications (see *Pivkina and Others v. Russia* (dec.), nos. 2134/23 and 6 others, §§ 75-77, 6 June 2023).

80. The Court further notes, with regard to the applicants Anzhelika Kosareva (no. 38123/22) and Susana Bezaziyeva (no. 1385/23) who were convicted by courts in Crimea, that the Russian Federation has exercised jurisdiction over Crimea at least since 18 March 2014 (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)* [GC], nos. 20958/14 and 38334/18, § 873, 25 June 2024). Accordingly, the events these applicants complained of fall within the "jurisdiction" of the respondent Government and the Court has competence to examine them.

## II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 10 OF THE CONVENTION

81. The applicants complained that the shutdown of media organisations and the prosecution of individual applicants in connection with their war reporting or statements advocating for peace and against the war had violated their right to freedom of expression under Article 10 of the Convention, the relevant parts of which read as follows:

### Article 10

"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 ..."

### A. Admissibility

82. The Court notes that this complaint is neither manifestly ill-founded nor inadmissible on any other grounds listed in Article 35 of the Convention. It must therefore be declared admissible.

## B. Merits

### 1. *Submissions by the parties and third-party intervener*

#### (a) **The applicants**

##### (i) *The applicant media organisations*

83. The media organisations submitted that the overnight introduction of criminal liability for “fakes” about the Russian military and for their “discrediting” had a significant chilling effect, leading to self-censorship and the eventual suspension of both printed and online media outlets. Liability for “fakes” was imposed solely because the publications did not align with the official information about the “special military operation” from the Ministry of Defence. Only information from the Ministry was considered “reliable”; any other information was treated as deliberate “fakes”. While the former “fake-news” provision, Article 13.15(9) of the CAO, required at least the existence of some facts, the new “discreditation” provision, Article 20.3.3 of the CAO, dispensed with such appearances and allowed the domestic authorities to penalise any opinions about the Armed Forces. In June 2022 the Ministry of Justice issued guidelines stating that asserting facts amounts to “dissemination of fakes” and voicing negative opinions constitutes “discreditation”.

84. Regarding the termination of media registration, the alleged failure to submit an updated charter had not been an issue for more than twenty years. However, in 2022, this became an insurmountable obstacle to the continued existence of the media, leading the RKN to seek the annulment of *Novaya Gazeta*’s registration. The national courts did not specify which rights and legitimate interests were being protected by cancelling the registration, whether this measure was proportionate and adequate, or whether the alleged violations could be addressed otherwise without severely curtailing the right to freedom of expression.

##### (ii) *The applicants convicted in criminal proceedings*

85. The applicants noted that, according to information from the PGO published by the independent news outlet *Mediazona*, 187 cases were filed under Article 207.3 of the Criminal Code just in the first year of the Russian invasion. The defendants were primarily individuals who mentioned on social media the shelling of a maternity hospital in Mariupol, the killing of civilians in Bucha or the missile attack on the train station in Kramatorsk. The criminal prosecution, applied in conjunction with other restrictive provisions of Russian law, such as those governing the designation as “foreign agents” and “extremists”, created a *de facto* situation of “military censorship” which prohibited criticism of Russian military actions and State policy in general. The applicants incurred penalties solely for disseminating information that did not correspond to the official position of the Russian authorities.

86. In the applicants' submission, the definition of information as "false" was not specific enough to withstand judicial scrutiny. Among other guarantees of freedom of expression, international and national courts tested whether there was actual intent to cause harm by false information, accidental error or honest mistake. Relevant international case-law indicated that even if the information disseminated was wrong, it might be considered a wrongdoing only when false statements were made with actual malice, that is, with knowledge of their falsity or with a "reckless disregard for the truth" (*New York Times Co v Sullivan*, 376 US 254 (1964)). The statements made had to be objectively false, obviously inaccurate, or misleading, which excluded opinions, parodies, partial inaccuracies and simple exaggerations. The dissemination of such statements had to be "artificial or automated, massive, and intentional" (France's *Conseil Constitutionnel*, decision no. 2018-773-DC, § 21, 20 December 2018). In many cases, legal provisions against the "dissemination of false information" were incompatible with basic human rights due to overly broad wording, leading to an unacceptable "chilling effect" on freedom of expression.

87. During wartime, when information warfare techniques are employed and communications are difficult, even the most diligent publicists may mistakenly disseminate inaccurate information. Yet it is in wartime that freedom of speech becomes especially valuable, for it allows people to verify information, present alternative versions and point out errors. However, Article 207.3 of the Criminal Code, as interpreted by Russian courts, meant that any statement concerning the actions of the Russian army in Ukraine was punishable if it differed from the official statement of the Ministry of Defence. If the events in question were not mentioned in a statement of the Ministry of Defence, statements concerning such events were also deemed "fake". This clearly demonstrated that the Russian authorities had never pursued the goal of protecting reliable information about the war. Quite the contrary, they sought to become the sole controller of the narrative so that no independent publicist would challenge the information disseminated by official authorities. The "fake news" legislation was adopted precisely to silence those who opposed the so-called "special military operation" against Ukraine and other critics of the Russian authorities. The applicants were unaware of any case where Article 207.3 of the Criminal Code was applied against anyone aside from pacifists and individuals who spoke against the invasion of Ukraine, whether actual or perceived as such. The practice of application of that provision showed that the Russian authorities did not seek to strike a balance between the defendants' right to freedom of expression and the other rights which the authorities allegedly protected. Actions of persons charged under that provision were not assessed in terms of actual harm to any protected interests. For that reason, the applicants submitted that their prosecution and conviction could not be regarded as "necessary in a democratic society".

*(iii) The applicants convicted in administrative proceedings*

88. On the “prescribed by law” requirement, the applicants submitted that Article 20.3.3 of the CAO lacked clear and specific definitions of key terms such as “discrediting” and “[actions aimed to] protect the interests of the Russian Federation and its citizens”. This lack of clarity left room for subjective interpretation and arbitrary enforcement. Without precise definitions, it became impossible to understand the boundaries of acceptable speech and behaviour, leading to a chilling effect on freedom of expression. The absence of specific criteria allowed for broad interpretations and potential misuse of the law, as individuals could not be certain whether their expressions fell within its scope. Article 20.3.3 was routinely applied to punish individuals for innocent and symbolic gestures, including proclaiming basic pacifist slogans and displaying Ukrainian or anti-war symbols. The vague and overly broad legal provision of Article 20.3.3 permitted the punishment of any individual who spoke out against the war, no matter how delicately or carefully.

89. The applicants further submitted that Article 20.3.3 did not pursue any legitimate aim within the meaning of Article 10 of the Convention because its true purpose was to suppress any legitimate discussion of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. While the protection of national security can be a legitimate aim for restricting expression, this was not the genuine motive behind that provision. Its true purpose, and evident effect, was to stifle any form of public protest or critical journalism, obfuscate the truth, censor legitimate criticism of the war, and punish those who questioned the official narrative of the war.

90. Finally, the applicants submitted that the domestic authorities did not attempt to prove that their statements caused any damage or violated anyone’s rights. It was sufficient that the statement criticised the Russian Armed Forces or contained abstract calls to hold an unauthorised public event. The authorities did not even analyse whether the event had actually taken place. Thus, the applicants submitted that not only their convictions but the criminalisation of anti-war speech as such could not be considered “necessary in a democratic society” and compatible with the Convention. In a democratic society, individuals should have the right to express their opinions and engage in peaceful public discussion, including criticising government policies or expressing opposition to war, as long as it does not incite violence or hatred.

**(b) Ukrainian Government, third-party intervener**

91. The Ukrainian Government, intervening as a third party in the three applications lodged by Ukrainian nationals, submitted that their prosecution formed part of a widespread and systematic administrative practice by Russia, targeting those who expressed dissident opinions, criticised Russian official policy, and opposed Russia’s aggression against Ukraine and its systematic

human rights violations. The Ukrainian Government highlighted consistent criticism of Russian laws and their implementation by international organisations and independent observers. In their view, these elements demonstrated the existence of a “repetition of acts” and “official tolerance” of human rights violations which the Court established in the inter-State case regarding Crimea (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)*, cited above, §§ 1092-104).

**(c) The applicants’ reply to the Ukrainian Government’s submissions**

92. The applicants replied that they agreed in full with the observations of the Ukrainian Government, particularly regarding the need to address, explicitly and separately, the alleged violations affecting Ukrainian citizens in occupied Crimea, as the situation of victims in occupied Crimea was qualitatively different from those in Russian sovereign territory.

**2. The Court’s assessment**

**(a) Existence of interference**

93. The Court reiterates that the State actions which have been found to amount to an interference with the right to freedom of expression may encompass a wide variety of measures in the form of a “formality, condition, restriction or penalty” (see *Wille v. Liechtenstein* [GC], no. 28396/95, § 43, ECHR 1999-VII).

94. Regarding criminal proceedings against seven individual applicants, their convictions were pronounced after the termination date in respect of the respondent State, 16 September 2022. Nevertheless, the arrest and prolonged detention on remand of five of those applicants before the termination date, in connection with their statements about the atrocities of the Russian invasion in Ukraine, constituted an interference with their right to freedom of expression (see *Nedim Şener v. Turkey*, no. 38270/11, §§ 95-96, 8 July 2014, and *Döner and Others v. Turkey*, no. 29994/02, § 88, 7 March 2017). Two of the applicants, Mr Gordon and Mr Naki, had not been arrested as they were outside the reach of Russian authorities. However, their designation as “foreign agents”, the freezing of Mr Naki’s bank accounts, and the inclusion of Mr Gordon’s name on the list of terrorists and extremists amounted to a manifestation of the “chilling effect” resulting from criminal prosecution in connection with their expressive conduct and likewise constituted an interference with their Article 10 rights (see *Yefimov and Youth Human Rights Group v. Russia*, nos. 12385/15 and 51619/15, § 37, 7 December 2021).

95. Regarding the administrative proceedings, the Court notes that they concluded with the applicants’ convictions, which were pronounced while the Convention was still in force in respect of the respondent State, although some of the judgments became final after the termination date. Since these

proceedings were initiated in connection with the applicants' anti-war expressive activity, they constituted an interference with their right to freedom of expression (see *Pivkina and Others*, cited above, § 77).

96. Finally, regarding the complaints by the applicant media organisations and their editor and director general, the Court finds that the blocking of their websites, the finding of *Novaya Gazeta's* liability in administrative-offence proceedings, and the revocation of its publishing licence, all of which occurred before the termination date, amounted to interference with their right to freedom of expression, as these actions were the domestic authorities' reaction to the war reporting in these media outlets.

**(b) Justification for the interference**

97. The Court reiterates that an interference will constitute a breach of Article 10 unless it is "prescribed by law", pursues one or more of the legitimate aims listed in Article 10 § 2 and is "necessary in a democratic society" to achieve such aim or aims.

*(i) "Prescribed by law"*

98. With regard to the applicants Anzhelika Kosareva (no. 38123/22) and Susana Bezaziyeva (no. 1385/23) who were convicted by the "courts" in Crimea, installed by Russia within the internationally recognised sovereign territory of Ukraine, the Court reiterates that the application of Russian law has been extended to Crimea in contravention of the Convention, as interpreted in the light of international humanitarian law, and that, accordingly, Russian law cannot be regarded as "law" within the meaning of the Convention (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)*, cited above, § 946). Accordingly, the interference resulting from the applicants' conviction on the basis of Russian law cannot be regarded as "lawful" within the meaning of Article 10 § 2 of the Convention (*ibid.*, § 1099).

99. As regards the other applications by individual applicants, the Court notes that their convictions were based on provisions of the Russian Criminal Code and Code of Administrative Offences which were introduced or amended shortly after the commencement of Russia's full-scale military invasion of Ukraine. The expression "prescribed by law" within the meaning of Article 10 § 2 of the Convention requires not only a basis in domestic law, but also that the law is foreseeable in its consequences and compatible with the rule of law. For domestic law to meet the requirement of lawfulness, it must therefore provide adequate protection against arbitrariness and be sufficiently clear in its terms to offer individuals a proper indication of the circumstances and conditions under which public authorities are empowered to implement measures restricting their rights under the Convention (see *Ahmet Yıldırım v. Turkey*, no. 3111/10, § 59, ECHR 2012).

100. The Court takes note of the applicants' argument that the terms "discrediting" and "knowingly false information" used in the relevant provisions were not sufficiently clear and that the domestic courts' interpretation of these terms was excessively broad, covering a wide range of statements critical of the Russian military action in Ukraine, including expressions of pacifist views and factual information from non-official sources.

101. In these circumstances, the Court has serious doubts as to whether the interference with the applicants' freedom of expression was "prescribed by law" within the meaning of Article 10 § 2 of the Convention. However, in light of its findings below on the necessity of the interference in a democratic society, the Court does not consider it necessary to reach a definitive conclusion on this point. It will also address the issues relating to the shutdown of the applicant media organisations from the standpoint of the necessity requirement.

(ii) *Legitimate aim*

102. The Court notes that the Government did not submit any observations on the aims pursued by the impugned measures. It appears however that the domestic courts and authorities referred to the protection of national security, territorial integrity and public safety as the ostensible aims of the legislation under which the applicants were prosecuted.

103. The Court reiterates that while the protection of national security, territorial integrity and public safety may in principle constitute legitimate aims, these concepts must be applied with restraint and interpreted restrictively, and should only be brought into play where it has been shown to be necessary to suppress the release of information (see *Stoll v. Switzerland* [GC], no. 69698/01, § 54, ECHR 2007-V).

104. The Court observes that the impugned measures were applied indiscriminately to a wide range of expressions, including peaceful anti-war protests, factual reporting on the events in Ukraine from non-official sources and statements of support for Ukraine. It finds it difficult to discern how expressions of pacifism or independent reporting could pose a genuine threat to national security, territorial integrity or public safety. Moreover, the Court notes that the domestic authorities made no attempt to demonstrate how the applicants' specific statements or actions harmed or threatened these interests. The mere fact that the expressions diverged from the official narrative was deemed sufficient to warrant prosecution.

105. In these circumstances, the Court is not satisfied that the interference genuinely pursued the legitimate aims invoked by the domestic authorities. However, even assuming that the interference pursued the stated aims, the Court will examine whether it was "necessary in a democratic society" to achieve those aims.

## (iii) “Necessary in a democratic society”

## (α) General principles

106. The Court reiterates that freedom of expression constitutes one of the essential foundations of a democratic society and one of the basic conditions for its progress and for each individual’s self-fulfilment. Subject to paragraph 2 of Article 10, it is applicable not only to “information” or “ideas” that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also to those that offend, shock or disturb. Such are the demands of pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there is no “democratic society” (see *Handyside v. the United Kingdom*, 7 December 1976, § 49, Series A no. 24).

107. The adjective “necessary”, within the meaning of Article 10 § 2, implies the existence of a “pressing social need”. The Contracting States have a certain margin of appreciation in assessing whether such a need exists, but it goes hand in hand with European supervision, embracing both the legislation and the decisions applying it, even those given by an independent court. The Court is therefore empowered to give the final ruling on whether a “restriction” is reconcilable with freedom of expression as protected by Article 10 (see, among many other authorities, *Bédat v. Switzerland* [GC], no. 56925/08, § 48, 29 March 2016).

108. The Court’s task, in exercising its supervisory jurisdiction, is not to take the place of the competent national authorities but rather to review under Article 10 the decisions they delivered pursuant to their power of appreciation. This does not mean that the supervision is limited to ascertaining whether the respondent State exercised its discretion reasonably, carefully and in good faith; what the Court has to do is to 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” (see *Perinçek v. Switzerland* [GC], no. 27510/08, § 196, ECHR 2015 (extracts)).

109. The Court has consistently emphasised that there is little scope under Article 10 § 2 of the Convention for restrictions on political speech or on debate on matters of public interest (see *Sürek v. Turkey (no. 1)* [GC], no. 26682/95, § 61, ECHR 1999-IV). The limits of permissible criticism are wider with regard to the government than in relation to a private citizen or even a politician. In a democratic system the actions or omissions of the government must be subject to the close scrutiny not only of the legislative and judicial authorities but also of the press and public opinion (see *Castells v. Spain*, 23 April 1992, § 46, Series A no. 236). Moreover, even harsh criticism of the government, using caustic language, would still be protected by Article 10, provided that it does not incite to violence or hatred (see

*Perinçek*, cited above, § 206, and *Özgür Gündem v. Turkey*, no. 23144/93, § 64, ECHR 2000-III).

110. The Court has also held that in a democratic society even small and informal campaign groups must be able to carry on their activities effectively. There exists a strong public interest in enabling such groups and individuals outside the mainstream to contribute to the public debate by disseminating information and ideas on matters of general public interest (see *Steel and Morris v. the United Kingdom*, no. 68416/01, § 89, ECHR 2005-II).

(β) Application of the principles

111. In the present case, the Court observes that the applicants were subjected to various forms of interference with their freedom of expression, including administrative fines, pre-trial detention, prison sentences and closure of media outlets, for expressing views critical of Russia's military actions in Ukraine or disseminating information that diverged from official accounts. The expressions for which the applicants were sanctioned fell into several categories: peaceful anti-war protests, such as displaying the slogan "No to war"; expressions of support or solidarity with Ukraine; drawing historical parallels between the current conflict and past wars; sharing information about civilian casualties and alleged war crimes; general criticism of Russian military actions and government policy, and support for international sanctions against the Russian leadership.

112. The Court observes that all the aforementioned expressions pertained to a matter of intense public interest and significance: an unprovoked military aggression against a neighbouring State, leading to a major international armed conflict with profound implications for both European and global security. Public debate on such issues is crucial in a democratic society, and any restrictions on such debate warrant the Court's closest scrutiny. It has been the Court's constant approach to require very strong reasons for justifying restrictions on political speech, since broad restrictions imposed in individual cases would undoubtedly affect respect for freedom of expression in general in the State concerned (see, for example, *Feldek v. Slovakia*, no. 29032/95, § 83, ECHR 2001-VIII). Furthermore, even in situations of derogation from the Convention under Article 15, the existence of a "public emergency threatening the life of the nation" must not serve as a pretext for limiting freedom of political debate, which is at the very core of the concept of a democratic society. In the Court's view, even in a state of emergency the Contracting States must bear in mind that any measures taken should seek to protect the democratic order from the threats to it, and every effort must be made to safeguard the values of a democratic society, such as pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness (see *Mehmet Hasan Altan v. Turkey*, no. 13237/17, § 210, 20 March 2018).

113. Turning to the content of most applicants' expression, the Court notes that their statements did not contain calls to violence, hatred,

discrimination or any unlawful activity. The mere use of the term “war” does not indicate an intention to incite violence, as all expression must be assessed within its specific context. Even strong words such as “war”, though they may add a certain virulence to political criticism, do not in themselves justify interference with the conduct of a vigorous public debate (see *Erdoğdu v. Turkey*, no. 25723/94, § 67, 15 June 2000). The applicants were prosecuted for using the term “war” in their pacifist statements solely because the Russian authorities’ official narrative described the aggression against Ukraine as a “special military operation”. This appeared to be a semantic choice intended to diminish the perceived scale and nature of the hostilities, portraying the conflict as limited and justified rather than as large-scale aggression. The prosecution of individuals for the mere use of the word “war” in opposition to this narrative represents a misuse of legal mechanisms to enforce ideological conformity and suppress legitimate public debate.

114. The prosecution of applicants for expressing solidarity with Ukraine or displaying Ukrainian national colours is of particular concern to the Court. It reiterates that the display of foreign national symbols is a form of expression protected under Article 10, and that any restriction must be examined carefully within its specific context to distinguish between protected expression and that which may forfeit protection in a democratic society (see *Fáber v. Hungary*, no. 40721/08, § 36, 24 July 2012). While the prohibition of certain symbols has been found justified on account of their close association with military aggression or occupation in specific historical and contemporary contexts (see *Borzykh v. Ukraine* (dec.), no. 11575/24, §§ 49-51 et passim, 19 November 2024), expression of support for a neighbouring country under attack and its people does not inherently threaten national security or public order, nor does it imply endorsement of any extremist ideology. The prosecution of applicants for engaging in such symbolic expression reveals a policy aimed at suppressing and stigmatising any sentiment perceived as sympathetic to Ukraine, thereby imposing a one-sided Russia-dominated reading of the conflict. By sanctioning even these innocuous expressions of solidarity, the Russian authorities demonstrated a level of intolerance towards dissenting views that is fundamentally incompatible with the pluralism and open debate essential to a democratic society.

115. The Court further observes that certain applicants employed satirical or provocative forms of expression to convey their anti-war messages. For instance, Ms Olkhova utilised an image of a defecating dog to express her contempt for the invasion symbol (no. 464/23), while Mr Mitrofanov employed a “smoking kills” style warning against the “special military operation” to mock the official euphemism for the war (no. 44304/22). The Court reiterates that satire constitutes a form of artistic expression and social commentary, which, through its inherent features of exaggeration and distortion of reality, is naturally intended to provoke and agitate (see

*Handzhiyski v. Bulgaria*, no. 10783/14, § 51, 6 April 2021). The applicants' creative forms of expression, even if occasionally crude and shocking to some, contributed to a debate on matters of public interest and ought to have been afforded protection under Article 10 of the Convention.

116. The use of controversial and provocative imagery, such as Nazi symbols, to draw parallels with current events may also constitute a legitimate rhetorical device to stimulate public debate. For example, Mr Otradnov (no. 51325/22) and Mr Broy (no. 45045/22) drew comparisons between the "Z" symbol used by Russian forces and Nazi emblems, including the swastika. While some States have a special moral responsibility stemming from their historical experience to maintain a prohibition on the use of Nazi symbols (see *Nix v. Germany* (dec.), no. 35285/16, § 47, 13 March 2018), the Court must examine how such imagery is used in its overall context, including whether it forms part of analytical reporting or criticism of contemporary phenomena (see *RID Novaya Gazeta and ZAO Novaya Gazeta v. Russia*, no. 44561/11, §§ 107-09, 11 May 2021). In the present case, by associating the invasion's emblem with universally recognised symbols of past atrocities, the applicants sought to transfer the stigma attached to Nazi imagery onto contemporary symbols of aggression. Unlike in *Nix*, where the use of Nazi symbols was found to be gratuitous and disconnected from any clear message opposing Nazi ideology (§§ 53-54), the applicants' use of such imagery was intrinsically linked to their criticism of current military actions. While such comparisons may be deeply offensive to some, the Court considers that they represented a powerful method of political criticism, intended to provoke reflection on the nature of the conflict.

117. Several applicants were sanctioned for expressing outrage at, or sharing factual information about, alleged Russian war crimes, including the Bucha massacre and the Mariupol theatre bombing. For example, Ms Skochilenko spread messages about the victims of the Mariupol bombing (no. 45953/22); Ms Markus called on President Putin to account for Bucha (no. 55435/22), and Ms Vorobyeva questioned the official Russian account of Bucha (no. 13844/23). The Court observes that these events were widely reported and investigated internationally and finds that sharing such information was of legitimate public interest. It emphasises the public's right to be informed of a different perspective on the situation in Ukraine, irrespective of how unpalatable that perspective may be for some members of the public (see *Sürek v. Turkey* (no. 4) [GC], no. 24762/94, § 58, 8 July 1999). While the authorities must remain vigilant against acts capable of fuelling violence in sensitive contexts (see *Erdoğan v. Turkey*, cited above, § 50), debate about acts which may amount to war crimes or crimes against humanity must be able to take place freely (see *Fatullayev v. Azerbaijan*, no. 40984/07, § 87, 22 April 2010). The domestic authorities, however, automatically classified any information contradicting official accounts as "fake news", regardless of its source or potential accuracy. They made no

effort to verify the applicants' statements or to balance the protection of national security with the public's right to be informed of serious war crime allegations. Restricting the dissemination of reports about alleged atrocities serves only to shield potential wrongdoing from scrutiny and undermine accountability, while blanket prohibitions on discussing alleged war crimes are incompatible with Article 10 of the Convention.

118. In sum, the Court observes a systemic and widespread pattern of unjustified restrictions on expression related to the war in Ukraine. The measures imposed on the applicants extended well beyond addressing expressions that might genuinely threaten national security or public safety. Instead, they targeted a wide range of statement, from simple pacifist slogans to detailed reports on alleged war crimes, indicating a coordinated effort by the Russian authorities to suppress dissent rather than mitigate specific security threats. These restrictions appeared to be part of a broader campaign to stifle criticism or dissent concerning military actions in Ukraine. This is evidenced by the variety of targeted expressions and the manner in which the relevant legislation was formulated and applied, enabling a broad interpretation of terms such as "discrediting" the armed forces or disseminating "knowingly false information". Such an approach facilitated the prosecution of statements that should be protected in a democratic society, including criticism of foreign policy or the sharing of information from diverse sources during an armed conflict. The Court finds no justification for restricting peaceful, non-violent expression, particularly through the imposition of criminal sanctions involving pre-trial detention and deprivation of liberty. The use of such measures, as in the present case, inevitably exerts a chilling effect on freedom of expression, intimidating civil society and silencing dissenting voices (see *Mehmet Hasan Altan*, cited above, §§ 211-12).

119. The domestic courts appeared to have considered the charges against the applicants on the premise that any criticism of military actions or divergence from official narratives was inherently detrimental to national interests. No genuine effort was made to balance the applicants' right to freedom of expression with the purported aims of protecting national security or public safety. Instead, any deviation from the official narrative, including the use of the term "war" rather than "special military operation", was regarded as harmful, without consideration of the content or context of the expressions in question. In cases involving the dissemination of information on alleged war crimes or civilian casualties, the domestic courts made no attempt to assess the accuracy of the information or the applicants' good faith in sharing it. Instead, they relied exclusively on official denials, effectively criminalising the reporting of any information that contradicted the official narrative.

120. The Court needs to address specifically the case of Mr Gordon, whose statements may be interpreted as advocating violence against Russian

military personnel and leadership, including the phrase “kill them all without mercy”. The Court reiterates that States enjoy a broad margin of appreciation in regulating expressions that amount to the glorification of violence (see *Sürek (no. 1)*, cited above, § 62 *in fine*). Nevertheless, when assessing whether such statements amount to incitement to violence, domestic courts are required to conduct a thorough examination of both their content and the context in which they were made (see *Gözel and Özer v. Turkey*, nos. 43453/04 and 31098/05, § 52, 6 July 2010).

121. In the present case, while certain statements made by Mr Gordon were undeniably violent in their content, the domestic courts failed to undertake any analysis of these statements within their specific context. They did not take into account that the remarks were made by a Ukrainian journalist shortly after the commencement of Russia’s full-scale invasion of his country, during a time when Ukrainian cities were shelled and bombarded and civilian casualties were rising. When viewed in their proper context, it is evident that his statements were specifically directed at Russian military personnel engaged in active combat operations and the political leadership responsible for initiating the hostilities, rather than at Russian civilians or the Russian population as a whole. His comments concerning nuclear weapons were made in direct response to nuclear threats issued by Russia’s leadership and were framed in the context of deterrence. The domestic courts did not assess whether, despite their violent rhetoric, the statements were capable of directly inciting unlawful acts of violence, or whether they were actually instead expressions of emotional support for Ukraine’s legitimate right to self-defence under international law (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Başkaya and Okçuoğlu v. Turkey* [GC], nos. 23536/94 and 24408/94, § 65, ECHR 1999-IV). Such an undifferentiated approach indicates that the prosecution was not directed at preventing genuine incitement to violence but rather at suppressing any criticism of Russian military actions, irrespective of its nature or context (see *Karataş v. Turkey* [GC], no. 23168/94, § 52, ECHR 1999-IV).

122. The Court also notes with concern that certain applicants were held accountable for online expressions which had been posted prior to the enactment of the “discreditation” laws on 4 March 2022 but remained accessible thereafter. For instance, Mr Dorokhov (no. 41428/22) was convicted for sharing the text “NO TO WAR” on 24 February 2022; Ms Shlosberg (no. 48958/22) for posting a photograph of herself wearing a Ukrainian embroidered shirt and other items between 26 January and 2 March 2022; and Mr Olkhovik (no. 1200/23) for sharing anti-war messages on 23 and 25 February 2022. The Court has already held that the retrospective application of the law, and the expectation placed upon applicants to anticipate future legal prohibitions not yet in force at the time of their actions, raises a fundamental problem (see *Andrey Rylkov Foundation and Others*, cited above, § 111). This principle applies equally in the present case, where

the applicants' expressions were not in breach of any law at the material time. Consequently, they could not have realised that they were committing any transgression, whether with intent or negligence. Imposing an obligation on the applicants to anticipate future legislative changes or to monitor continually their accounts and remove past online content that might have later become unlawful due to subsequent legal developments constitutes an unreasonable and disproportionate burden, resulting in a "chilling effect" on freedom of expression (*ibid.*).

123. In light of the above considerations that the applicants' prosecution lacked justification in a democratic society, the Court need not separately address the proportionality of the sanctions. Nevertheless, it cannot overlook the exceptional and disproportionate severity of the penalties imposed. Mr Kara-Murza (no. 43083/22) was sentenced to twenty-five years' imprisonment, Ms Skochilenko (no. 45953/22) to seven years, and Mr Afanasyev (no. 48520/22) to five years and six months. Even in administrative proceedings, the fines imposed were substantial, ranging from 30,000 to 150,000 Russian roubles, amounting to several months' or even years' worth of subsistence income (see *Ecodefence and Others v. Russia*, nos. 9988/13 and 60 others, §§ 181-82, 14 June 2022). The Court considers that the nature and severity of these penalties appear intended not merely to punish the individual applicants, but to send a clear and intimidating message to society at large, thereby stifling public debate on matters of vital public interest. Such an approach inevitably fosters an environment of self-censorship, deterring others from exercising their right to freedom of expression, which is essential for the functioning of a democratic society (see *Cumpănă and Mazăre v. Romania* [GC], no. 33348/96, § 114, ECHR 2004-XI, and *Morice v. France* [GC], no. 29369/10, § 176, ECHR 2015).

124. Lastly, with regard to the closure of applicant media outlets in connection with their war coverage, the Court has previously addressed the termination of a media outlet's registration in *Mukhin v. Russia* (no. 3642/10, §§ 178-181, 14 December 2021). In that case, the Court found that when such a measure is based solely on the formal issuance of warnings, without any assessment of its necessity and proportionality, it fails to meet the standards required under Article 10 of the Convention. A similar situation arises in the present case, where *Novaya Gazeta's* publishing licence was terminated without judicial consideration of whether there was a pressing social need for such a drastic measure or whether it was necessary in a democratic society. As regards the blocking of websites of Dozhd TV and *Novaya Gazeta*, the domestic courts also failed to provide a separate justification beyond a reference to the previous warnings or establish any exceptional circumstances justifying the termination of a media outlet. There was no evaluation of whether the termination pursued a legitimate aim or was proportionate to that aim, as required for such a severe restriction on freedom of expression. The blocking of the websites of Dozhd TV and *Novaya Gazeta* and the revocation

of the latter's publishing licence effectively silenced important independent voices in Russian society, significantly restricting the public's access to diverse sources of information on matters of crucial public interest. Such sweeping restrictions on press freedom are incompatible with the Court's consistent emphasis on the essential role of the press as a "public watchdog" in a democratic society (see *Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland* [GC], no. 931/13, § 126, 27 June 2017).

(iv) *Conclusion*

125. In light of the above considerations, the Court finds that the reasons given by the domestic authorities to justify the interference with the applicants' freedom of expression were neither relevant nor sufficient. The measures imposed were disproportionate to any legitimate aims pursued and were not necessary in a democratic society. Rather, the cumulation of so many similar cases shows that they were part of a broader campaign to suppress dissent regarding the military action in Ukraine.

126. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 10 of the Convention.

### III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 34 OF THE CONVENTION

127. The applicants in the case of *Novaya Gazeta and Others* (no. 11884/22) complained that the Russian authorities had breached the terms of the Court's indication of interim measures by pursuing and obtaining the cessation of the newspaper's publication and blocking access to its websites.

128. Article 34 of the Convention provides:

"The Court may receive applications from any person, non-governmental organisation or group of individuals claiming to be the victim of a violation by one of the High Contracting Parties of the rights set forth in the Convention or the Protocols thereto. The High Contracting Parties undertake not to hinder in any way the effective exercise of this right."

129. The Court reiterates that by virtue of Article 34 of the Convention Contracting States undertake to refrain from any act or omission that may hinder the effective exercise of an individual applicant's right of application. A failure by a Contracting State to comply with interim measures is to be regarded as preventing the Court from effectively examining the applicant's complaint and as hindering the effective exercise of his or her right and, accordingly, as a violation of Article 34 (see *Mamatkulov and Askarov v. Turkey* [GC], nos. 46827/99 and 46951/99, § 128, ECHR 2005-I).

130. In the present case, on 8 March 2022 the Court, under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, indicated to the Russian Government to refrain from blocking or terminating *Novaya Gazeta's* activities or taking any actions that could

deprive it of the enjoyment of its rights guaranteed by Article 10 of the Convention (see paragraph 12 above).

131. Notwithstanding the interim measure, on 5 and 15 September 2022 the Russian courts suspended the publishing licence of *Novaya Gazeta* and granted an application to terminate the operation of its online version (see paragraphs 16 and 17 above).

132. The Court considers that these actions by the Russian authorities were in direct contradiction to the interim measure indicated by the Court. By filing a termination claim against *Novaya Gazeta* and obtaining court orders terminating its activities, the Russian authorities deliberately disregarded the Court's interim measure and deprived it of its purpose and effect.

133. The Court concludes that, by failing to comply with the interim measures indicated under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, Russia is in breach of its obligations under Article 34 of the Convention.

#### IV. OTHER ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE CONVENTION

134. Mr Kara-Murza, Ms Skochilenko, Mr Afanasyev, Ms Smirnova and Mr Korolev further complained under Article 5 § 3 of the Convention that they had been placed in pre-trial detention without relevant and sufficient reasons. Additionally, Ms Skochilenko and Mr Korolev complained that their confinement to a metal cage and a narrow glass cabin, respectively, during detention hearings had breached Article 3 of the Convention. Mr Kara-Murza complained under Article 5 of the Convention that his arrest on 11 April 2022 and subsequent detention had been arbitrary, as he had committed no offence. Ms Skochilenko also complained of excessive delays in the examination of her appeal against the detention orders of 13 April and 30 May 2022, in breach of Article 5 § 4. Mr Afanasyev complained under Article 8 about unwarranted searches of his residences. Further alleged violations concerned Articles 6 and 18 of the Convention and Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (Mr Kara-Murza), Article 13 (Ms Skochilenko), and Articles 6, 14 and 18 (some applicants convicted in administrative proceedings and the applicant media organisations).

135. The Court notes that the above complaints are not manifestly ill-founded or inadmissible on any other grounds. Accordingly, they must be declared admissible.

136. The Court considers that in cases involving non-violent expression, pre-trial detention should be resorted to only in exceptional circumstances, if at all (see *Mehmet Hasan Altan*, cited above, § 212). The applicants were prosecuted for expressions that did not involve violence or incitement, and the domestic authorities failed to provide relevant and sufficient reasons to justify the imposition of such an exceptional measure, thereby breaching Article 5 § 3 of the Convention. In respect of Mr Kara-Murza's complaint concerning the arbitrariness of his arrest and detention, the Court reiterates

that detention will be regarded as “arbitrary” where, notwithstanding formal compliance with national law, there has been an element of bad faith or deception on the part of the authorities (see *Mooren v. Germany* [GC], no. 11364/03, § 78, 9 July 2009). In the present case, the circumstances of Mr Kara-Murza’s arrest and the timing of the criminal charges against him strongly suggest that these measures were employed as a pretext to silence his expression of critical opinions, indicating bad faith and revealing a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention.

137. Regarding other complaints, the Court refers to its established case-law finding violations in similar circumstances: confinement in metal cages or small and poorly ventilated glass cabins during hearings (Article 3: *Svinarenko and Slyadnev v. Russia* [GC], nos. 32541/08 and 43441/08, §§ 138-39, ECHR 2014 (extracts), and *Yaroslav Belousov v. Russia*, nos. 2653/13 and 60980/14, §§ 125-28, 4 October 2016); excessive delays in examining detention appeals (Article 5 § 4: *Shcherbina v. Russia*, no. 41970/11, § 62, 26 June 2014), and unjustified searches of journalists’ homes (Article 8: *Ernst and Others v. Belgium*, no. 33400/96, §§ 115-16, 15 July 2003). The Court sees no reason to depart from these findings in the present case.

138. Finally, the Court considers that it is not necessary to examine separately the remaining complaints under Articles 6, 13, 14 and 18 of the Convention and Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, § 156, ECHR 2014).

## V. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

139. 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 part”.

140. The applicants’ claims for damages and costs are itemised in the appendix. Their claims in respect of pecuniary damage represent the amount of fines they paid, converted into euros on the dates of the final judgment.

141. Regard being had to the supporting documents and its case-law in similar cases, the Court awards the amounts claimed as per the appendix in respect of pecuniary damage, 7,500 euros (EUR) each or such smaller amount as was actually claimed in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and EUR 850 each or such smaller amount as was actually claimed, per applicant, in respect of costs and expenses, plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants (see, for a similar approach, *Taganrog LRO and Others v. Russia*, nos. 32401/10 and 19 others, § 300, 7 June 2022).

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Holds* that the Court has jurisdiction to examine the case and the Government's failure to participate in the proceedings presents no obstacles for the examination of the case;
3. *Declares* the applications admissible;
4. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 10 of the Convention;
5. *Holds* that Russia has failed to comply with its obligations under Article 34 of the Convention in respect of *Novaya Gazeta*;
6. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 3 of the Convention in respect of Mr Kara-Murza, Ms Skochilenko, Mr Afanasyev, Ms Smirnova and Mr Korolev;
7. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention in respect of Mr Kara-Murza;
8. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention in respect of Ms Skochilenko and Mr Korolev;
9. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 4 of the Convention in respect of Ms Skochilenko;
10. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention in respect of Mr Afanasyev;
11. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the remainder of the complaints;
12. *Holds*
  - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, within three months from the date on which the judgment becomes final in accordance with Article 44 § 2 of the Convention, the following amounts, to be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable at the date of settlement:
    - (i) the amounts claimed as per the appendix in respect of pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable;

- (ii) EUR 7,500 (seven thousand five hundred euros) or such smaller amount as was actually claimed in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable;
- (iii) EUR 850 (eight hundred and fifty euros) or such smaller amount as was actually claimed, per applicant, in respect of costs and expenses, plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants;
- (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;

13. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claim for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 11 February 2025, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Olga Chernishova  
Deputy Registrar

Ioannis Ktistakis  
President

In accordance with Article 45 § 2 of the Convention and Rule 74 § 2 of the Rules of Court, the separate opinion of Judge Pavli is annexed to this judgment.

## CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE PAVLI

1. In the lead-up to the 2012 Russian presidential election, Valeriy Lyutarevich, an ordinary resident of Rodniki, was prosecuted for having the following phrase handwritten on the rear window of his car: “United Russia is a party of crooks and thieves”. His crime, under the provisions of Russia’s already Orwellian laws on electoral propaganda, was to have engaged in “unlawful pre-election campaigning”<sup>1</sup>. One of the applicants in the present case was Olga Svalova, another ordinary Muscovite who was prosecuted in the aftermath of the 2022 attack on Ukraine for holding up a sign with the image of a white dove and the words “I stand for peace”. Her crime: the brand-new offence of having “discredited” the Russian military (see paragraph 59 of the judgment). The path from Mr Lyutarevich’s ordeal to that of Ms Svalova, a mere decade later, has been brutish and short.

2. Has the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights taken proper notice of the trajectory followed by the Russian Federation? And could it have done something (more) about it? These are the questions that this separate opinion seeks to address, at a distance of more than two years since Russia’s expulsion from the Council of Europe, and with the benefit of having sat in dozens of cases against Russia heard by the Court in the past several years. (As to the merits of the present case, which is among the most discouraging in respect of *any* State during my time on this bench, I share the Chamber’s analysis and conclusions in full).

### Democracy and the Convention

3. The notion of democracy is fundamental to the Convention. As an overarching value, it is firmly enshrined in both the text itself and the Court’s interpretation thereof. The preamble notes that the fundamental freedoms protected by the Convention “are best maintained ... by an effective political democracy” and speaks of a “common heritage of political traditions, ideals, freedom and the rule of law”. The Contracting Parties that have ratified the Convention in the successive waves of democratisation that followed its original adoption presumably consider themselves to share this “common heritage” and aspire to remain true to its ideals. In its case-law, the Court has gone even further. It has relied on this special bond to hold, perhaps uniquely among international human rights bodies, that democracy “appears to be the only political model contemplated by the Convention and, accordingly, the only one compatible with it”<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Teslenko and Others v. Russia*, nos. 49588/12 and 3 others, § 131, 5 April 2022.

<sup>2</sup> See *United Communist Party of Turkey and Others v. Turkey*, no. 19392/92, § 45, 25 May 1998.

4. Beyond such value-based references, the Convention provisions on civil and political rights and freedoms (Articles 8 to 11, together with Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 that safeguards freedom of movement) expressly require the Court to determine whether interference with such rights is “necessary in a democratic society”. In this aspect as well the drafters of the Convention were trailblazers, as no such express clauses are to be found in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights<sup>3</sup> and similar clauses were later included in only a handful of the political-rights provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (namely, the right of peaceful assembly and right to freedom of association, but not, for example, the right to freedom of expression).

5. At the same time, the drafting history of the Convention does not shed a great deal of light on how the notion of “democratic society” is to be interpreted in this context. Admittedly, the Court’s case-law has made the rather obvious point that “the only type of necessity capable of justifying an interference with any of those rights is ... one which may claim to spring from ‘democratic society’”<sup>4</sup>. However, other questions of method and approach are less settled.

### **Of trees and forests**

6. In particular, is the necessity clause to be construed as an abstract yardstick, derived from a sort of idealised form of democracy, against which any interference with these fundamental rights is to be judged? Or should the Court also take account of the specific national context – the *particular* “democratic society” – in which such interference has taken place? Put another way, can an individual form or instance of interference be deemed to have been “necessary in [an abstract] democratic society” if the general democratic credentials of a particular political system, at a particular moment in time, are in serious doubt? Presumably, it makes little sense, from a prophylactic perspective, to focus on the health of individual trees if a fire is raging in the forest. Worse still, were the Court to adopt such an approach, might it be seen as providing false assurances about the state of the forest as a whole?

7. Returning to the Court’s case-law in respect of Russia over the past two decades, it amounts, on my reading, to a sad chronicle of the incremental but systematic shrinking of democratic spaces in that country. While it has been

---

<sup>3</sup> The Declaration contains a single reference to democracy, in Article 29 § 2, which can nevertheless be seen as a precursor to the European Convention’s “necessary in a democratic society” clauses: “In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society”.

<sup>4</sup> See *United Communist Party of Turkey*, cited above, § 45.

possible for outsiders to use the Court’s findings in individual cases (among other sources) to piece together a composite picture of the state of Russian democracy – and some have done so<sup>5</sup> – the Court itself has rarely “taken stock” of the situation as a whole.

8. In fact, there has been a great deal to take stock of. Under the two prongs of Article 11 of the Convention – the freedoms of assembly and association – the Court has, in scores of cases, documented sustained restrictions of virtually every aspect of those freedoms, from the ability to hold solo demonstrations with handwritten signs to the mass crackdown on the many groups of “foreign agents” so designated under Russian laws<sup>6</sup>. Under Article 10 of the Convention, the impermissible restrictions imposed have been equally varied and comprehensive: in times of election campaigns and outside them; against ordinary citizens, opposition leaders and Nobel Prize winners alike; in both online and offline environments; against domestic and international “extremists” of all stripes; from the Red Square to the frozen waters of the Arctic Ocean to the general lawlessness of Chechnya<sup>7</sup>. This heavy-handed approach has included a crackdown on groups – such as the widely respected Memorial network founded by Andrei Sakharov as early as 1987 – that sought to document and shed light on the crimes of the Soviet era: they were increasingly denied access to the archives, their activists were harassed and the groups themselves were eventually shut down. They thus lost the fight on behalf of historical truth.

9. Under Article 9, which protects the hard-earned freedom of religion, the Court’s case-law has documented how the members and congregations of various religious minorities – Jehovah’s Witnesses, Muslims, Mormons and even Christian Orthodox sects not favoured by the mainstream religious

---

<sup>5</sup> This includes former judges of the Court, who have addressed the question after leaving the bench. See, for example, Prof. Angelika Nussberger, “Human Rights and Peace – Disillusionment or Hope? The Russian Example”, in *Liber Amicorum Robert Spano* (Anthemis, 2022), pp. 511-22.

<sup>6</sup> See, among other leading cases, *Lashmankin and Others v. Russia*, nos. 57818/09 and 14 others, 7 February 2017; *Navalnyy v. Russia* [GC], nos. 29580/12 and 4 others, 15 November 2018; and *Pleshkov and Others v. Russia*, nos. 29356/19 and 31119/19, 21 November 2023.

<sup>7</sup> On anti-extremism legislation, see, in particular, *Karastelev and Others v. Russia*, no. 16435/10, 6 October 2020; *RID Novaya Gazeta and ZAO Novaya Gazeta v. Russia*, no. 44561/11, 11 May 2021; *Yefimov and Youth Human Rights Group v. Russia*, nos. 12385/15 and 51619/15, 7 December 2021; and *Mukhin v. Russia*, no. 3642/10, 14 December 2021. On “foreign agents” and “undesirable organisations”, see *Ecodefence and Others v. Russia*, nos. 9988/13 and 60 others, 14 June 2022; *Andrey Rylkov Foundation and Others v. Russia*, nos. 37949/18 and 83 others, 18 June 2024; and *Kobaliya and Others v. Russia*, nos. 39446/16 and 106 others, 22 October 2024. On restrictions of speech online, see *OOO Flavus and Others v. Russia*, nos. 12468/15 and 2 others, 23 June 2020; *Engels v. Russia*, no. 61919/16, 23 June 2020; and *Bulgakov v. Russia*, no. 20159/15, 23 June 2020. On repressive use of new technologies, including real-time facial recognition, see *Glukhin v. Russia*, no. 11519/20, 4 July 2023.

authorities – have been widely harassed, prosecuted and sometimes driven out of the country entirely<sup>8</sup>. While this may be a good time for self-critical reflection, we cannot ignore the contribution that this large body of Russia-related case-law – and above all the applicants and lawyers who brought these cases to Strasbourg – has made to the development of the Court’s “democratic society” doctrine.

10. Lastly, in a small number of high-profile cases, the Court has found violations of Article 18 of the Convention by the Russian authorities, based on the existence of “ulterior motives” – typically seeking to suppress political dissent – in restricting fundamental rights such as personal liberty and freedom of protest. However, only two of these cases, both involving applications brought by the late Alexei Navalnyy, were decided prior to Russia’s expulsion from the Council of Europe<sup>9</sup> in what is arguably an instance of “too little too late”<sup>10</sup>. The mere granting of financial compensation to the victims in case after case decided by the Court against Russia seems to have been treated in Moscow purely as an exercise in setting the price for ongoing repression (a price the national authorities have seemed content to pay in the great majority of cases). It was only in the most recent of its “foreign agent” rulings that the Court included the strongly-worded finding that the relevant legislation “bears the hallmarks of a totalitarian regime”<sup>11</sup>.

11. The Court’s case-law in respect of Russia reveals another, more disturbing pattern, if one tries not to miss the forest for the trees. The widespread restrictions on political freedoms over the past two decades have often been facilitated, and “justified”, by fairly elaborate legal frameworks that have tended to employ respectable human-rights language, such as the concepts of necessity and proportionality, in line with the country’s supposed level of democratic development. The national Constitutional Court has – at least some of the time – made careful pronouncements about the need for moderation, only to be systematically ignored in the practice of the ordinary courts and law-enforcement agencies. A favoured method of the Russian authorities has been to identify, on any given topic, the most restrictive models they could find around the democratic world and to combine and

---

<sup>8</sup> See, among other leading cases, *Taganrog LRO and Others v. Russia*, nos. 32401/10 and 19 others, 7 June 2022, and *Ossewaarde v. Russia*, no. 27227/17, 7 March 2023.

<sup>9</sup> See *Navalnyy v. Russia*, cited above, and *Navalnyy v. Russia (no. 2)* [GC], no. 43734/14, 9 April 2019.

<sup>10</sup> Since the Russian Federation ceased being a party to the Convention in September 2022, the Court has found violations of Article 18 in another four cases, including one inter-State case and three individual cases (two of which involved deprivation of the applicants’ liberty by the Chechen authorities). In the words of Prof. Nussberger, a former Vice-President of the Court: “...the condemnation of the authorities’ war against civil society was too late and probably not effective enough. When violations of freedom of expression and freedom of assembly were already widespread, finding violations in individual cases and granting compensation could no longer change the course of events”. *Op. cit.*, p. 520.

<sup>11</sup> See *Kobaliya and Others v. Russia*, cited above, § 86.

supercharge them into a toxic and distinctly anti-democratic mix. This can perhaps be seen most clearly in the cases stemming from the application of the “foreign agent” laws, which, moreover, were pending before the Court for an unjustifiably long time before they were decided.

12. And yet, this massive legal edifice of “rule *by* law” – of gradual suffocation through a thousand regulations devised and tightened over time to control every inch of Russian political space<sup>12</sup> and much of the personal space of ordinary Russians – is hard to gauge by focusing exclusively on individual cases. It requires a bird’s-eye view for which the Court has arguably not equipped itself sufficiently in its working methods and overall approach. This is true even in Article 18 cases, which still tend to focus on the specifics of the application immediately before the Court.

### **The Court as watchdog of democracy**

13. To remedy this deficiency the Court could have made greater use of existing procedures, such as more extensive Article 46 indications; more in-depth review of allegations of Article 18 violations or of the governmental “legitimate aims” claimed under the qualified rights provisions; granting Rule 39 measures in a broader range of situations; or making greater use of referrals to the Committee of Ministers under the Rules of the Court as they currently stand. But it may also be necessary for the Court to develop entirely new “stock-taking tools” in relation to democratically-challenged national systems.

14. It is worth recalling that part of the foundational mission of the Court, an institution born of post-authoritarian trauma, has always been to sound the alarm at the first hint of *déjà vu*. The drafting history of the Convention reveals the founders’ hopeful intent to create a tribunal that would help “prevent rebirth of totalitarianism”, “defend our people from dictatorship” and “strengthen the resistance in all our countries against insidious attempts to undermine our way of life”<sup>13</sup>. It is hard to imagine that, in so doing, the founders meant this new court to deal exclusively with the rights of isolated individuals, at isolated points in time, without concerning itself with the state of the “democratic forest” as a whole.

15. In the case of the Russian Federation, with the benefit of some hindsight and a large body of case-law behind us, can it be said that the Court

---

<sup>12</sup> For an illustration of this point in the field of electoral speech, see the Court’s analysis of the increasingly Byzantine national legal framework in a string of cases involving print media, independent electoral watchdogs and even individual voters: *Orlovskaya Iskra v. Russia*, no. 42911/08, 21 February 2017; *OOO Informatsionnoye Agentstvo Tambov-Inform v. Russia*, no. 43351/12, 18 May 2021; *Assotsiatsiya NGO Golos and Others v. Russia*, no. 41055/12, 6 November 2021; and *Teslenko and Others v. Russia*, nos. 49588/12 and 3 others, 5 April 2022. See also my Concurring Opinion in the latter case.

<sup>13</sup> Council of Europe, Collected Edition of the “*Travaux préparatoires*” of the European Convention on Human Rights, vol. 1, 30, 192; vol. 5, 332 (1975-1985).

sounded the alarm loudly enough, and early enough? And more importantly for the future, is it now prepared to do so in relation to other European political systems whose democratic protections might be eroding in ascertainable ways? It is possible, in my view, to adopt such an approach without prejudging in any way the outcome of individual cases, or undermining the Court's overall impartiality, as these assessments would be based primarily on its *own* prior judicial findings. The additional work (and value) would be simply a matter of connecting the dots.

16. I would concede, in conclusion, that it is not for an international human rights court to make final pronouncements as to which countries deserve to be called democracies and which do not; that is *not* what this separate opinion is advocating. There is an obvious political dimension to such an exercise, and a number of value judgments that are ultimately for the collective membership of the Council of Europe to make. Furthermore, as judges, we should always be realistic about the limits of the Court's potential impact, despite the sometimes impossible expectations of the outside world. At the same time, it is implausible, in my view, that the Court should have nothing to say on the matter of democratic health among the States Parties, while staying true to the mission entrusted to it by its founders.

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

APPENDIX

List of applications:

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
11884/22	Novaya Gazeta and Others v. Russia	03/03/2022	<b>NOVAYA GAZETA</b> 1998 Moscow  <b>Dmitriy Andreyevich MURATOV</b> 1961 Moscow  <b>OOO TELEKANAL DOZHD</b> 2008 Moscow  <b>Natalya Vladimirovna SINDEYEVA</b> 1971 Moscow	Yaroslav Sergeyevich KOZHEUROV	See the Facts section of the judgment.		TBD <sup>2</sup>	
30136/22	Nesterenko v. Russia	28/05/2022	<b>Vadim Igorevich NESTERENKO</b> 2000 Tomsk	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 06/03/2022, the applicant held up a sign that read: "Are tens of thousands of deaths a price to pay for being a great power? #notowar". Fine: RUB 45,000. Final decision: 29/03/2022, Tomsk Regional Court.		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
32871/22	Shatryuk v. Russia	20/06/2022	<b>Kristina Yevgenyevna SHATRYUK</b> 1997 Ilanskiy	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 06/03/2022, the applicant held up a sign in the central park of Ilanskiy that read: "15 years' imprisonment for the words NO TO WAR?". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 13/04/2022, Krasnoyarsk Regional Court.		TBD	
34131/22	Gorinov v. Russia	23/06/2022	<b>Yevgeniy Gennadyevich GORINOV</b> 1989 Tomsk	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	The applicant was charged with "expressing silent support" by participating in a gathering of people at a central location in Tomsk on 06/03/2022. According to domestic judgments, people had gathered "to sway local residents towards a negative view of Russia's special military operation". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 15/04/2022, Tomsk Regional Court.		5,000	
35604/22	Erdneyev v. Russia	01/07/2022	<b>Aducha Arankovich ERDNEYEV</b> 1959 Troitskoye	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 10/03/2022, the applicant reposted an appeal by the organisation of the Kalmyk-language people to avoid taking part in the war in Ukraine. It concluded with the words, "No to war! Peace to the world!" Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 13/05/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Kalmykiya.	427	TBD	
35641/22	Badmayev v. Russia	01/07/2022	<b>Valeriy Antonovich BADMAYEV</b> 1951 Elista	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 02/03/2022, the applicant posted a video on social media with the title, "War in Ukraine must be stopped, and Putin must resign. Opinion of a public figure". Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 16/05/2022,		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					Supreme Court of the Republic of Kalmykiya.			
36648/22	Trofimov v. Russia	29/06/2022	<b>Yaroslav Andreyevich TROFIMOV</b> 1995 Krasnodar	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	The applicant was convicted for “being present in a group of citizens pursuing a single objective directed against the deployment of the Russian Army in Ukraine”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 13/04/2022, Krasnodar Regional Court.		5,000	
36757/22	Olyunina v. Russia	15/07/2022	<b>Alisa Aleksandrovna OLYUNINA</b> 1998 Volgograd	Varvara Dmitriyevna MIKHAYLOVA	On 13/03/2022, the applicant, and three of her friends, put stickers with the text “No to war” on buildings and poles in Volgograd. She was arrested the same day and escorted to a police station. She refused to submit to a toxicology examination since she did not consume any substances. She was convicted for disobeying a lawful order and for the offence of “discreditation” and sentenced, respectively, to a 6-day detention and a fine of RUB 40,000. Final decision: 05/05/2022, Volgograd Regional Court.		TBD	
36838/22	Samylova v. Russia	14/07/2022	<b>Lyubov Sergeyevna SAMYLOVA</b> 1999 St Petersburg	Varvara Dmitriyevna MIKHAYLOVA	On 13/03/2022, the applicant, and three of her friends, put stickers with the text “No to war” on buildings and poles in Volgograd. She was arrested the same day and escorted to a police station. She refused to submit to a toxicology examination since she did not consume any substances. She was convicted for disobeying a lawful order and for the offence of	323	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					“discreditation” and sentenced, respectively, to a 6-day detention and a fine of RUB 40,000. Final decision: 27/04/2022, Volgograd Regional Court.			
36842/22	Klimova v. Russia	14/07/2022	<b>Kseniya Dmitriyevna KLIMOVA</b> 1997 Volgograd	Varvara Dmitriyevna MIKHAYLOVA	On 13/03/2022, the applicant, and three of her friends, put stickers with the text “No to war” on buildings and poles in Volgograd. She was arrested the same day and escorted to a police station. She refused to submit to a toxicology examination since she did not consume any substances. She was convicted for disobeying a lawful order and for the offence of “discreditation” and sentenced, respectively, to a 6-day detention and a fine of RUB 30,000. Final decision: 28/04/2022, Volgograd Regional Court.		TBD	
36875/22	Buyanova v. Russia	01/07/2022	<b>Valeriya Vladimirovna BUYANOVA</b> 2000 Samara	Aleksandra Nikolayevna BAYEVA	The applicant was convicted for “being in a group of people who were taking part in an unauthorised manifestation and shouting ‘No to war’”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 12/05/2022, Samara Regional Court.		5,000	
37076/22	Pistsov v. Russia	18/07/2022	<b>Mikhail Mikhaylovich PISTSOV</b> 1995 Belyayev	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 18/04/2022, the applicant went to a military drafting commission for a medical exam to determine his fitness for service. When asked if he wanted to serve in the Russian Army, he said no, explaining that the army was waging an unjust war in Ukraine, which did not attack Russia, and was		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					committing war crimes there. Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 08/06/2022, Stavropol Regional Court.			
37532/22	Chuzayeva v. Russia	20/07/2022	<b>Mariya Nikolayevna CHUZAYEVA</b> 1999 Arino	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 14/03/2022, the applicant held up a paper in the colours of the Ukrainian national flag, overlaid with a red heart. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 29 April 2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Mari El.		5,000	
38123/22	Gorelov and Others v. Russia	14/07/2022	<b>Nikolay Aleksandrovich GORELOV</b> 1985 Kaliningrad  <b>Semen Viktorovich ALEKSIN</b> 1995 Tyumen  <b>Valeriya Vladimirovna BUYANOVA</b> 2000 Samara  <b>Anzhelika Vitalyevna KOSAREVA</b> 1997 Pozharskoye  <b>Mariya Gennadyevna</b>	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 06/03/2022, Nikolay Gorelov was arrested for shouting “No to war” at an anti-war rally in central Kaliningrad. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 31/05/2022, Kaliningrad Regional Court.  On 13/03/2022, Mariya Prutskova was arrested for holding up a sign “No to war” in a Moscow park. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 26/04/2022, Moscow City Court.  On 06/03/2022, Semen Aleksin was arrested for holding up a sign “No to war” in central Tyumen. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 20/04/2022, Tyumen Regional Court.  On 24/03/2022, Anzhelika Kosareva was arrested for holding up a sign “I am for peace” in Simferopol, Crimea. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 13/04/2022, “Supreme Court of the Republic of Crimea”.		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			<b>PRUTSKOVA</b> 1983 Moscow  <b>Olesya Yuryevna TROFIMOVA</b> 1997 Krasnodar		<p>On 06/03/2022, Valeriya Buyanova was arrested for shouting “No to war” at an anti-war rally in central Samara. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 04/04/2022, Samara Regional Court.</p> <p>On 06/03/2022, Olesya Trofimova was arrested for taking part in an anti-war rally. She was charged with “joining a group of citizens pursuing a single objective directed against the deployment of Russian troops”. Fine: RUB 15,000. Final decision: 25/04/2022, Krasnodar Regional Court.</p>			
39003/22	Sveshnikova v. Russia	25/07/2022	<b>Taisiya Vasilyevna SVESHNIKOVA</b> 1994 Taganrog	Irina Vladimirovna GAK	<p>On 19/03/2022, the applicant painted the letter “Z” - an emblem of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine - inside a red circle with a diagonal line through it, resembling a restricted traffic sign. She also added the words “NO PASARAN” (“they shall not pass” in Spanish, a slogan used during the Spanish Civil War to signal a determination to defend a position). On 24/03/2022 in central Taganrog, she held up a sign saying “War is 50 km away” while dressed in black and carrying two roses - an even number of flowers symbolising mourning in the Russian funeral tradition. She was convicted for the offences of minor disorderly acts and</p>		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					“discreditation” and fined RUB 500, RUB 30,000 and RUB 35,000 respectively. Final decisions: 12/05/2022, 19/05/2022 and 06/06/2022, Rostov Regional Court.			
39367/22	Grodnikova v. Russia	22/07/2022	<b>Tamara Ivanovna GRODNIKOVA</b> 1960 Volgograd	Roman Olegovich ZAYTSEV	On 16/03/2022, the applicant held up signs in central Volgograd with the text: “Truth is the first casualty of war”, “I am against the war in Ukraine”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 02/06/2022, Volgograd Regional Court.		TBD	
39794/22	Isayeva v. Russia	30/07/2022	<b>Yevgeniya Maksimovna ISAYEVA</b> 1988 St Petersburg	Sergey Viktorovich PODOLSKIY	On 27/03/2022, the applicant stationed herself on the steps leading up to the St Petersburg city legislature and poured red paint over herself while shouting “My heart is bleeding”. She held up a sign stating: <i>“Appealing to reason seems useless, so I appeal to your hearts. Every day in Ukraine, women, children, and the elderly are dying from bombings, hunger, being trapped under rubble, or not having medicine. Their graves with homemade crosses fill the yards and playgrounds. Thousands are injured and maimed, and millions of lives are ruined. If you can justify this, your heart is blinded. Do not support the bloodshed.”</i> She was convicted on the same day for the offence of “discreditation” under Article 20.3.3 of the CAO and fined RUB 45,000. Final judgment: 12/05/2022, St Petersburg City Court.		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					On leaving the courthouse, she was arrested and later convicted under Article 20.1(1) of the CAO for minor disorderly acts consisting of damaging the steps of a government building with red paint. She was sentenced to an eight-day detention, with immediate enforcement. Final decision: 04/04/2022, St Petersburg City Court.			
40288/22	Balakina v. Russia	25/07/2022	<b>Anastasiya Igorevna BALAKINA</b> 2001 Bor	Kristina Olegovna TYURINA	On 01/04/2022, the applicant posted in a private Telegram channel in support of a nationwide event to honour the victims of Russian shelling in Mariupol. She stated: "I want to support the putting-up crosses act. I live in Bor, so I plan to place a cross at the Bor Eternal Flame. If you know anyone here, please tell them there will be a mini-memorial (my cross is small, about 35 cm). I will put it up in the morning and hope it stays all day." The next morning, around noon, she placed a small wooden cross with a plaque at Victory Square in Bor. The plaque read: "Russian troops killed 5000 civilians in Mariupol. Now they are being buried in their yards. This is a war, not a special operation. #mariupol5000." She was arrested by the police later that day. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 16/06/2022, Nizhnyy Novgorod Regional Court.		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
41158/22	Veretennikova v. Russia	12/08/2022	<b>Marina Viktorovna VERETENNIKOVA</b> 1967 Tomsk	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 06/03/2022, in central Tomsk, the applicant held up a sign that read: "For peace". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 15/04/2022, Tomsk Regional Court.	238	TBD	
41428/22	Dorokhov v. Russia	13/08/2022	<b>Vladimir Yuryevich DOROKHOV</b> 1985 Barsuki	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 24/02/2022, the applicant shared a picture with the text "NO TO WAR" on his social media account and commented: "Today we are all witnessing the gates of hell opening. While it's not too late, we must close them again. NO TO WAR!". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 31/05/2022, Tula Regional Court.		TBD	
42762/22	Mamedov v. Russia	24/08/2022	<b>Oleg Iskanderovich MAMEDOV</b> 2001 Ufa	Anna Yevgenyevna BOCHILO	On 10/03/2022, the applicant crafted posters with messages such as "Conscripts = cannon fodder #notowar", "No to fascism", "No to war", and "Cargo 200 [fallen in action] has arrived, ready for more? #notowar", and placed them on the entrance doors of apartment buildings. Fine: RUB 45,000. Final decision: Supreme Court of the Bashkortostan Republic.		TBD	
43065/22	Perekrestova v. Russia	26/08/2022	<b>Yelizaveta Yevgenyevna PEREKRESTOVA</b> 1993 Elista	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 06/03/2022, the applicant was arrested for carrying a sign attached to her backpack that read "NO TO WAR". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 27/04/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Kalmykia.		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
43083/22	Kara-Murza v. Russia	24/08/2022	<b>Vladimir Vladimirovich KARA-MURZA</b> 1981 Moscow	Vadim Yuryevich PROKHOROV	See the Facts section of the judgment.		20,000	
43213/22	Burdin v. Russia	25/08/2022	<b>Viktor Valeryevich BURDIN</b> 1972 Nikolskoye	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 06/03/2022, the applicant, an Orthodox priest, shared a message on his parish website that read: <i>"Say no to war. Brothers and sisters, on the early morning of 24 February, Ukraine was attacked by Russian troops. Shelling is happening in Kyiv, Odesa, Kharkiv, Mariupol, and other Ukrainian cities. Russian soldiers are taking the lives of their brethren in Christ. We, as Christians, cannot remain indifferent when a brother slays a brother, a Christian slays a Christian... The blood of the Ukrainian people stains not only the hands of Russia's leaders but also the soldiers carrying out the orders. This blood is the hands of each of us, those who have condoned this war or simply remained silent"</i> . Later that day, he read this text to his parishioners before Mass, reminding them that the spilling of any blood is a sin, and it's imperative to halt all military operations in Ukraine immediately and seek peace. Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 26/04/2022, Kostroma Regional Court.	456	TBD	
43410/22	Popova v. Russia	18/08/2022	<b>Arina Vladimirovna POPOVA</b>	Ruslan Yuryevich BANNIKOV	On 24/02/2022, the applicant was arrested at an anti-war rally while holding a sign that	244	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1982 Voronezh		<p>read “No to war”. She was convicted under Article 20.2(5) of the Code of Administrative Offences for taking part in an unauthorised manifestation and fined RUB 5,000. Final decision: 24/05/2022, Voronezh Regional Court.</p> <p>On 06/03/2022, the applicant was arrested for holding up a sign in central Voronezh that stated “Citizens, our country is in danger! Our tanks are on foreign soil!”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 07/06/2022, Voronezh Regional Court.</p>			
43414/22	Priymak v. Russia	12/08/2022	<b>Kseniya Vitalyevna PRIYMAK</b> 1998 Vladivostok	Sergey Aleksandrovich VALIULIN	On 28/02/2022, the applicant was arrested as she was about to put up homemade leaflets inviting people to an anti-war rally in Vladivostok. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 19/04/2022, Primorskiy Regional Court.		TBD	
43594/22	Davydova v. Russia	26/08/2022	<b>Olga Nikolayevna DAVYDOVA</b> 1978 Moscow	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 13/03/2022, the applicant was arrested on her way to an anti-war rally in Moscow because she was allegedly holding up a sign that read, in the original English, “STOP WAR IN UKRAINE”. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 26/04/2022, Moscow City Court.		5,000	
43935/22	Sandzhiyev v. Russia	28/08/2022	<b>Arslang Bambayevich SANDZHIYEV</b>	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 07/03/2022, the applicant, chairman of an organisation of the Kalmyk-language people,		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1960 Barnaul		<p>posted an anti-war manifesto on social media, which included the text: “We are against the death of civilians: children, women and the elderly. We stand in solidarity with the people of Ukraine in their just struggle for peace and freedom. We demand the immediate withdrawal of Russian troops from the territory of our brother Ukraine. No to war! Peace to the world!”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 12/05/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Kalmykia.</p> <p>On 10/03/2022, the applicant made another post that read: “We do not need this special military operation in Ukraine, where our youth are dying! We call on all sensible people – our fellow countrymen, all Russians, not to participate in the insane slaughter in Ukraine, and peace will come sooner! No to war! Peace to the world!”. Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 29/04/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Kalmykia.</p>			
44205/22	Smyshlyayeva v. Russia	19/08/2022	<b>Alena Mikhailovna SMYSHLYAYEVA</b> 1977 Rezh	Aleksey Vladimirovich BUSHMAKOV	On 09/03/2022, the applicant posted on her social media account: “ <i>Russia has long waged war on me and my people... Right now, refrigerator trucks full of bodies are at the border with Ukraine. My dear, my lovely, my warm, my living Ukraine, you are helping me. I believe that my enemies will die before I</i> ”		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non- pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					<p><i>do. I will survive and live freely and beautifully on this free, beautiful, and kind land... Our children are worth ten of these scumbags. Putin will croak; he cannot help but croak, there is too much venom in him ... I call on the troops, do not go to war, stay with us. I call on the military, get the fuck out of Ukraine."</i> Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 06/07/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p> <p>On 10/03/2022, the applicant posted on her social media account: "<i>After the maternity ward was destroyed by bombs, this poem, composed in the early days of war, sounds terrifying... The Kremlin smells of dead bodies / Alarm alarm alarm / Mariupol has been bombed, Kharkiv destroyed too / And our brave troops / Will wipe my ass.</i>" Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 29/06/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p> <p>On 23/03/2022, the applicant posted on her social media account: "Shout and grab at the legs [of men who are leaving for Ukraine], do not let them shoot. 121 children have died since the war began". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 06/07/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p> <p>On 27/03/2022, the applicant posted on her</p>			

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non- pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					<p>social media account: “The murders and capture of journalists indicate that Russian troops are committing crimes in Ukraine and want to cover up these crimes”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 13/07/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p> <p>On 01/04/2022, the applicant posted on her social media account: “Russian occupiers may have forcibly taken as many as forty Ukrainians to Russia”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 06/07/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p> <p>On 03/04/2022, the applicant shared on her social media account a call to subscribe to a blogger, stating: “I advise you to follow ... Because of the war in Ukraine, [he] stopped releasing videos, he had to flee from Kharkiv that was being shelled by Russians”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 15/06/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p> <p>The applicant was also fined RUB 50,000 for posting content disrespectful of the President of Russia under Article 20.1(3) of the Code of Administrative Offences. Final decision: 06/07/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court. Additionally, the applicant was fined RUB 12,000 for taking part in an anti-war</p>			

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					rally under Article 20.2(5) of the Code of Administrative Offences. Final decision: 03/08/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.			
44304/22	Mitrofanov v. Russia	19/08/2022	<b>Pavel Aleksandrovich MITROFANOV</b> 1991 Yekaterinburg	Aleksey Vladimirovich BUSHMAKOV	On 06/03/2022, the applicant created a cardboard box shaped like a cigarette pack with the warning message “Common sense warning: special military operation kills” and placed it in a public spot in central Yekaterinburg. Fine: RUB 45,000. Final decision: 27/04/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.		TBD	
44505/22	Sokolova v. Russia	25/08/2022	<b>Svetlana Yuryevna SOKOLOVA</b> 1979 Moscow	Valeriya Aleksandrovna ARSHINOVA	On 13/03/2022, the applicant was arrested for wearing a blue-and-yellow hat with the peace sign and a heart-shaped badge, also in the colours of the Ukrainian national flag. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 26/04/2022, Moscow City Court.		TBD	
44796/22	Zelenskiy v. Russia	23/08/2022	<b>Konstantin Sergeyevich ZELENSKIY</b> 1984 Novorossiysk	Aleksey Alekseyevich DUBROVIN	On 06/03/2022, in central Novorossiysk, the applicant held up a sign with the text “We are brothers” and a hashtag #Iamagainstthewar. Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 25/04/2022, Krasnodar Regional Court.	542	TBD	
44813/22	Kholkin v. Russia	26/08/2022	<b>Aleksey Ilyich KHOLKIN</b> 1987 Sylva	Matvey Sergeyevich TRUTNEV	On 06/03/2022, in Perm, the applicant held up a sign that read “GO HOME / NO TO WAR”. Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 27/04/2022, Perm Regional Court.	526	100,000	3,947

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
44853/22	Semenychev v. Russia	25/08/2022	<b>Vyacheslav Valeryevich SEMENYCHEV</b> 1984 Nizhny Novgorod	Kristina Olegovna TYURINA	On 09/04/2022, in Nizhny Novgorod, the applicant held up a sign that read “War will not make anyone happier”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 22/06/2022, Nizhny Novgorod Regional Court.		5,000	
45045/22	Broy v. Russia	31/08/2022	<b>Andrey Yuryevich BROY</b> 1980 Yaroslavl	Aleksandr Vyacheslavovich LIKVIDOV	The applicant commented on someone else’s post on social media, saying “Have you got the Z swastika tattoo yet?”, comparing the letter Z, an emblem of the Russian invasion in Ukraine, with the Nazi swastika symbol. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 22/07/2022, Yaroslavl Regional Court.		TBD	
45083/22	Aptysheva and Others v. Russia	25/08/2022	<b>Olga Romanovna APTYSHEVA</b> 1985 Murmansk  <b>Konstantin Valeryevich NADEIN</b> 1968 Ingersheim  <b>Valentina Olegovna POMAZANOVA</b> 2002 Saratov	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 18/03/2022, Olga Aptysheva held up a sign in central Moscow that read: “I am horrified of what the Russian State is doing to our closest friend and country, PLEASE STOP WAR, I do not want to be scared of the future”. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 26/04/2022, Moscow City Court.  On 30/03/2022 and 02/04/2022, the police twice arrested Konstantin Nadein who was jogging in a hoodie with the Ukrainian flag and the text: “Putin is a thief! Glory to Ukraine”. Fines: RUB 50,000 and RUB 30,000. Final decision: 26/04/2022, St Petersburg City Court.		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					On 06/03/2022, Valentina Pomazanova held up a sign in central Saratov that stated: "I do not want to go to prison, but a prison sentence will eventually end. If my country becomes a prison, it will never end. #nowar" Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 06/05/2022, Saratov Regional Court.			
45470/22	Gordon v. Russia	15/09/2022	<b>Dmytro GORDON</b> 1967 Kyiv	Shaul BRAZIL	See the Facts section of the judgment.		Not claimed	
45909/22	Bondar v. Russia	23/08/2022	<b>Aleksandr Leonidovich BONDAR</b> 1974 Moscow	Nikolay Sergeyevich ZBOROSHENKO	On 09/04/2022, the applicant stationed himself in front of the Ministry of Defence in Moscow with a sign that read: "Bucha – is this how we are going to win?". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 11/05/2022, Moscow City Court.		10,000	
45911/22	Bondar v. Russia	23/08/2022	<b>Mariya Olegovna BONDAR</b> 1976 Moscow	Nikolay Sergeyevich ZBOROSHENKO	On 10/04/2022, the applicant held up signs in central Moscow that read: "We will not forget, we will not forgive" and "Stop this war". Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 11/07/2022, Moscow City Court.		10,000	
45937/22	Shelevoy v. Russia	07/09/2022	<b>Aleksey Leonidovich SHELEVOY</b> 1967 Novokuznetsk	Dmitriy Dmitriyevich MIROPOLTSEV	Between 28/02/2022 and 06/03/2022, the applicant posted a series of comments on social media, calling on residents of his region to hold the governor and members of parliament to account for ratifying the President's decision to invade Ukraine. He	300	10,000	700

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					stated, in particular: “No to war – the tyrant and coloniser must resign”, “A war is happening! The people of Kuzbass are eager to know how many of their fellow countrymen are dead, captured, or missing in action”, “I stand for the immediate end to the attempt to occupy Ukraine and the return of all soldiers home”, and “I also demand that all Kuzbass MPs and senators who are responsible for the war and deaths of our boys, stop the war! I believe that every decent Kuzbass person must share this demand on their social media”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 08/06/2022, Kemerovo Regional Court.			
45953/22	Skochilenko v. Russia	16/09/2022	<b>Aleksandra Yuryevna SKOCHILENKO</b> 1990 St Petersburg	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	See the Facts section of the judgment.		TBD	
46061/22	Kurkov v. Russia	03/09/2022	<b>Sergey Aleksandrovich KURKOV</b> 1986 St Petersburg	Konstantin Aleksandrovich MALTSEV	On 08/04/2022, the applicant held up a sign that read: “NO TO WAR” in central St Petersburg. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 02/06/2022, St Petersburg City Court.		5,000	
46861/22	Chernyshov v. Russia	15/09/2022	<b>Andrey Valeryevich CHERNYSHOV</b> 1989 St Petersburg	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 05/04/2022, the applicant held up signs in central St Petersburg with the text: “Tribunal for Putin and his soldiers” and “Bucha will not be forgotten.” Fine: RUB 40,000. Final		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					decision: 07/06/2022, St Petersburg City Court.			
46946/22	Selyaninov v. Russia	07/09/2022	<b>Yevgeniy Vyacheslavovich SELYANINOV</b> 1971 Perm	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 04/04/2022, the applicant published a comment on social media that read: "It is hard already to call THIS honey. Investors do not want to have this bitter honey with a taste of blood. Russians will now have to drink this swill for a long time. World-wide boycott of the Russian Federation will keep growing as more information about the crimes of the Russian army comes out". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 04/08/2022, Perm Regional Court.	480	TBD	
46950/22	Ledkov v. Russia	07/09/2022	<b>Valeriy Konstantinovich LEDKOV</b> 1965 Khanty-Mansiysk	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	The applicant posted a photo saying "No to War" on his social media account. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 25/05/2022, Supreme Court of the Khanty-Mansiysk Region.		TBD	
47115/22	Derisheva v. Russia	10/09/2022	<b>Anna Andreyevna DERISHEVA</b> 1999 Izhevsk	Viktor Valeryevich KOCHENKOV	On 06/04/2022, the applicant substituted price tags in a supermarket with texts that read: "For 20 years Putin's been lying to us on TV. These lies have prepared us to justify war and senseless deaths"; "Russian troops didn't let in 14 truckloads of humanitarian aid to the Kherson region. Civilians need food and meds"; "Russian troops have destroyed 80% of Mariupol. What for?"; "In WW2, Nazis killed 8 to 10 million Ukrainians. How		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					many will the Russians kill?"; "Stop the war! Over 500 civilians killed by Russian troops." Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 25/07/2022, Supreme Court of the Udmurtiya Republic.			
47603/22	Kononenko v. Russia	23/09/2022	<b>Konstantin Viktorovich KONONENKO</b> 1990 Barnaul	Anna Yevgenyevna BOCHILO	On 25/05/2022, the applicant held up a sign with a picture of a peace dove and the text "NO TO WAR" in central Barnaul. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 25/05/2022, Altay Regional Court.		TBD	
47616/22	Nefedov v. Russia	14/09/2022	<b>Gordey Yuryevich NEFEDOV</b> 1978 Moscow	Valeriya Aleksandrovna ARSHINOVA	On 03/03/2022, the applicant, head of a municipal district in Moscow, signed an anti-war statement together with three council members, which was published on the council's website. The text read: "Trouble has come to Russia. Completely out of touch with reality and hiding behind delusional slogans of 'denazification', the President of Russia has ordered an attack on Ukraine. This decision has brought perpetual disgrace on all Russians ... It is unbearable to watch the missile attacks on Ukrainian cities, the suffering, and the death of civilians. ... Everyone must do everything possible to immediately stop this war. We, the elected municipal councillors of the Lomonosovsky District of Moscow, categorically reject the war of aggression against Ukraine. We urge the Federation Council to immediately revoke	2449	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					its resolution on the deployment of troops abroad. We urge all citizens to express their anti-war stance by any available means. We call on law enforcement officers to immediately cease forceful actions against peaceful protesters. Our country is on the brink of disaster, and only together can we prevent it. NO TO WAR!" Fine: RUB 150,000. Final decision: 19/05/2022, Moscow City Court.			
47690/22	Mamedov v. Russia	22/09/2022	<b>Dzhavid Elsevar Ogly MAMEDOV</b> 1995 Moscow	Anna Yevgenyevna BOCHILO	<p>On 24/02/2022, the applicant posted on Instagram, urging people to join anti-war protests "at 7pm, in any public place" with the slogan, "#NOTOWAR bring the troops home". He was convicted under Article 20.2(8) of the CAO for calls to participate in an unauthorised demonstration and sentenced to 30 days' detention. Final decision: 26/05/2022, Moscow City Court.</p> <p>On 01/03/2022, the applicant posted another call on Instagram to join anti-war rallies, stating: "Anti-war campaign. Silence means war. 6 March, 3pm." Convicted under Article 20.3.3 of the CAO. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 28/10/2022, Moscow City Court.</p>		TBD	
47972/22	Blagov v. Russia	13/09/2022	<b>Daniil Dmitriyevich BLAGOV</b>	Kseniya Dmitriyevna PROSVIRKINA	On 06/03/2022, the police arrested the applicant in Kaliningrad for shouting "No to		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1999 Kaliningrad		war” and “Disgrace”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 13/05/2022, Kaliningrad Regional Court.			
48104/22	Yanovskaya v. Russia	24/09/2022	<b>Yana Vladimirovna YANOVSKAYA</b> 1976 Kudymkar	Yelena Yuryevna PERSHAKOVA	On 24/02/2022, the applicant posted on her social media account: “This is fucked up, I have no other words... I had refused to believe that WAR would actually happen. Others are saying they are ashamed to be Russian. I am Russian, and I am not ashamed to be Russian. I did not vote for this leadership”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 08/06/2022, Perm Regional Court.  On 09/03/2022, the applicant, who is the editor of a local newspaper, published an opinion piece to express her sentiment. She stated: “Each of us will have to pay for this ‘special operation’ in Ukraine. I do not understand people who support what is happening now”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 08/06/2022, Perm Regional Court.		TBD	
48110/22	Parakhina v. Russia	24/09/2022	<b>Marina Viktorovna PARAKHINA</b> 1973 Perm	Yelena Yuryevna PERSHAKOVA	On 13/03/2022, the police arrested the applicant for wearing a medical face mask with the text: “No to war”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 25/05/2022, Perm Regional Court.	570	TBD	
48314/22	Mamayev v. Russia	23/09/2022	<b>Nikita Alekseyevich MAMAYEV</b>	Aleksey Sergeyevich LAPUZIN	On 06/03/2022, the applicant held up a sign in central Samara that read: “Ukraine is not		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			2000 Samara		our enemy #notowar". Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 26/05/2022, Samara Regional Court.			
48353/22	Orlov v. Russia	14/09/2022	<b>Fedor Ivanovich ORLOV</b> 1988 Voronezh	Daniil Alekseyevich POLYAKOV	On 12/03/2022, the applicant was live streaming an anti-war rally in Voronezh on YouTube. At one point, a participant held up a sign that read: "Down with the war in Ukraine! Down with Putin. Down with fascism". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 29/07/2022, Voronezh Regional Court.		TBD	
48363/22	Filatova v. Russia	14/09/2022	<b>Darya Olegovna FILATOVA</b> 2001 Voronezh	Daniil Alekseyevich POLYAKOV	The applicant was convicted for holding up a sign in central Voronezh with a picture of a woman cradling a child in her hands and the text: "No to war". Fine: RUB 15,000. Final decision: 12/07/2022, Voronezh Regional Court.	250	TBD	
48520/22	Afanasyev v. Russia	07/10/2022	<b>Mikhail Vyacheslavovich AFANASYEV</b> 1976 Abakan	Tumas Arsenovich MISAKYAN	See the Facts section of the judgment.		35,000	
48958/22	Shlosberg and Shlosberg v. Russia	30/09/2022	<b>Zhanna Antonovna SHLOSBERG</b> 1966 Pskov  <b>Lev Markovich</b>	Vladimir Nikolayevich DANILOV	The applicant, Ms Zhanna Shlosberg, was convicted for her social media activity, including a photograph of herself, posted on 26/01/2022, wearing a traditional Ukrainian embroidered shirt with blue and yellow ribbons in the colours of the Ukrainian flag	471 (Zhanna Shlosberg); 510 (Lev Shlosberg)	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			<b>SHLOSBERG</b> 1963 Pskov		<p>and holding a sign that said: “NO TO WAR”; a photograph of her backpack, posted on 25/02/2022, with blue and yellow ribbons and the text: “My dear Ukraine, I stand with you! Shame and disgrace to Russia”; a repost on 28/02/2022 of an anti-war statement by the independent media outlet <i>Meduza</i>; and two pictures posted on 02/03/2022, one showing President Putin chopping the tree branch he is standing on, with the caption: “War solves nothing! No to war”, and another calling for a universal ban on nuclear weapons, with a comment: “The young Ukrainian state renounced nuclear weapons. While Russia’s nuclear warheads have not been decommissioned since the Vietnam War”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 30/05/2022, Pskov Regional Court.</p> <p>The applicant, Mr Lev Shlosberg, shared a video on social media of a protest by a State television journalist who disrupted a live broadcast by holding an anti-war poster behind the news anchor. He added a comment expressing admiration for her act. The courts held that his comment, approving as it did of a journalist who publicly opposed the deployment of Russian military, was sufficient evidence of his intent to discredit the Russian Armed Forces. Fine:</p>			

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					RUB 32,000. Final decision: 30/05/2022, Pskov Regional Court.			
49045/22	Bagin v. Russia	01/10/2022	<b>Aleksandr Aleksandrovich BAGIN</b> 1990 St Petersburg	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 03/04/2022, the applicant held up a poster in central St Petersburg that read: "I think we are killing our future with this war. NOTOWAR". Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 02/06/2022, Saint Petersburg City Court.		5,000	
49441/22	Volodin v. Russia	04/10/2022	<b>Aleksey Ivanovich VOLODIN</b> 1976 Safonovo	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 28/02/2022, the applicant commented on a video showing the police arresting a woman in Red Square, Moscow, titled: "An old woman with a bag saying 'No to war' was arrested at the Kremlin walls. The dangerous criminal has been caught; we can safely go to sleep". The applicant's comment read: "DISGRACE IN UNIFORM". The applicant was charged with the offence under Article 20.1(3) of the CAO (disseminating online content disrespectful of Russian authorities). Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 13/07/2022, Smolensk Regional Court.		TBD	
49447/22	Ardakhanova v. Russia	01/10/2022	<b>Albina Raisovna ARDAKHANOVA</b> 1992 Naberezhnyye Chelny	Rim Faridovich SABIROV	On 28/03/2022, the applicant hung a poster saying: "No to war" from her balcony. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 01/06/2022, Supreme Court of the Tatarstan Republic.		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
49746/22	Zhukov v. Russia	26/09/2022	<b>Nikolay Dmitriyevich ZHUKOV</b> 2000 Tolyatti	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 06/03/2022, the applicant was arrested in Samara for being in a group of people who were shouting: "No to War". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 26/05/2022, Samara Regional Court.		5,000	
50086/22	Naydenova v. Russia	12/10/2022	<b>Aleksandra Olegovna NAYDENOVA</b> 2003 Moscow	Anna Yevgenyevna BOCHILO	The applicant was convicted for daubing the words: "NO TO WAR" and "6 MARCH" on a bus stop and the wall of a block of flats. On the basis of Article 20.1(2) of the CAO sanctioning minor disorderly acts, she was sentenced to a ten-day detention. Final decision: 15/06/2022, Moscow City Court.		TBD	
50237/22	Kalashnikov v. Russia	08/10/2022	<b>Viktor Vladimirovich KALASHNIKOV</b> 1995 Krasnoyarsk	Vladimir Valeryevich VASIN	The applicant distributed leaflets saying "Stop being silent! Say no to the war" in Krasnoyarsk. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 08/06/2022, Krasnoyarsk Regional Court.		TBD	
50247/22	Smirnova v. Russia	08/10/2022	<b>Olga Borisovna SMIRNOVA</b> 1968 St Petersburg	Mariya Sergeyevna ZYRYANOVA	See the Facts section of the judgment.		TBD	
50632/22	Ziv v. Russia	07/10/2022	<b>Anna Mikhaylovna ZIV</b> 1981 St Petersburg	Varvara Dmitriyevna MIKHAYLOVA	On 09/05/2022, the applicant spray-painted the words: "No To War!" on a bus stop and the local administration building. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 09/06/2022, St Petersburg City Court.	422	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
50659/22	Panina v. Russia	23/09/2022	<b>Anush Ivanovna PANINA</b> 1987 St Peterburg	Nikifor Yuryevich IVANOV	On 02/04/2022, the applicant was arrested in St Petersburg during a peaceful anti-war rally. She was holding two signs, one made up of eight squares with the following text: "KIRA won't see her father ever again", "NATASHA thinks her brother went for training", "MASHA is waiting for her son to come home", "ANGELA can't sleep – her husband is missing", "SNEZHANA is hiding her brother's death notice from their mum", "MARINA tried to get her mum out of Kharkiv but now it's too late", "ALLA is planning her 20-year-old sister's funeral", "SVETA saw her fiancé among the prisoners". The applicant was charged with "discreditation" under Article 20.3.3 of the CAO, and with participating in a "simultaneous presence of citizens at the same location in breach of sanitary norms" under Article 20.2.2(1) of the CAO, referring to the 2020 COVID regulations that established a minimum one-metre distance between people. She was fined RUB 40,000 for the offence of "discreditation" and sentenced to a ten-day detention for non-compliance with COVID regulations. Final decision: 24/05/2022, St Petersburg City Court.		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
50678/22	Overkin v. Russia	19/10/2022	<b>Sergey Yevgenyevich OVERKIN</b> 1970 Pskov	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 20/02/2022, the applicant reposted on his social media account photographs of individuals holding signs with messages such as: "The people do not want war" and "Putin, your war with Ukraine will suffocate Russia". On 15/03/2022, he reposted a photograph of an opposition politician who was quoted as saying: "An editor of the First Channel took a stand by going live with an anti-war poster. A commendable act! Putin is just one deranged, bloodthirsty dictator, but we, the people, don't want war." The applicant added his comment: "There are citizens in this country, what we need is a civil society." Fine: RUB 32,000. Final decision: 20/06/2022, Pskov Regional Court.		TBD	
50701/22	Kaburkina v. Russia	20/10/2022	<b>Yuliya Anatolyevna KABURKINA</b> 1986 Cheboksary	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 31/03/2022, the applicant left a sticker stating "War = Death" on a shelf in a local supermarket. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 21/06/2022, Supreme Court of the Chuvash Republic.	485	TBD	
50921/22	Nurgaleyev v. Russia	30/09/2022	<b>Ilyas Nurlislanovich NURGALEYEV</b> 1976 Samara	Yelena Vladimirovna LIPATOVA	The applicant was convicted with participating in an unauthorised gathering on 06/03/2022 in Samara during which people shouted "No to war". Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 09/06/2022, Samara Regional Court.		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
50927/22	Novikova v. Russia	06/10/2022	<b>Yevgeniya Aleksandrovna NOVIKOVA</b> 1985 Moscow	Natalya Aleksandrovna VUNDER	On 10/04/2022, the applicant was arrested in Moscow for wearing a T-shirt with the words “No to war”. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 26/08/2022, Moscow City Court.		2,000	
51103/22	Andryushchenko and Others v. Russia	30/09/2022	<b>Oleg Viktorovich ANDRYUSHCHENKO</b> 1987 Moscow  <b>Darya Andreyevna DEMYANCHUK</b> 1997 Krasnoyarsk  <b>Yegor Nikolayevich VAZHIN</b> 1994 Yaroslavl  <b>Yuliya Igorevna YELISEYEVA</b> 1994 Ulyanovsk	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 18/04/2022, Oleg Andryushchenko was arrested in Moscow for holding up a picture of two doves and the text: “NO TO NAZISM, NO TO FASCISM”. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 02/06/2022, Moscow City Court.  On 06/03/2022, Darya Demyanchuk was arrested in Krasnoyarsk for holding up a sign that read: “Putin, this is a crime against humanity”, and for sporting the text: “I am against the war in Ukraine” on her backpack. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 07/06/2022, Krasnoyarsk Regional Court.  On 06/03/2022, Yegor Vazhin was engaged in anti-war solo picketing in Yaroslavl. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 08/06/2022, Yaroslavl Regional Court.  On 22/04/2022, Yuliya Yeliseyeva was arrested in Moscow for wearing a tote bag with embroidered lettering: “NO TO WAR” and a green ribbon, a symbol of protest against the war in Ukraine. Fine:		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					RUB 50,000. Final decision: 02/06/2022, Moscow City Court.			
51276/22	Gorbunov v. Russia	22/10/2022	<b>Vasiliy Grigoryevich GORBUNOV</b> 1987 Volgodonsk	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	In March 2022, the applicant shared on his social media account his opposition to the war and the “discreditation” laws. He stated, in particular: (i) “Disinformation about the Russian Armed Forces is essentially direct censorship and contradicts the Constitution.”, (ii) “For over two weeks, people have been killed in Ukraine. Even our State television channels talk about explosions in Ukrainian cities and towns. This means that civilians are also dying. Today is already 12 March. The military actions are still ongoing and claiming lives every day ... I am prohibited from calling to stop this horror. But I cannot stay silent either! And I urge everyone: DO NOT STAY SILENT!”, (iii) “It is unimaginable how many losses our army has suffered and how many Ukrainian citizens have died”, (iv) “The unconstitutional law prohibits me from calling for an end to this deadly ‘special operation’ (although I really want to), I will repeatedly call: DO NOT STAY SILENT! Everyone needs to know about the many killings happening in Ukraine right now”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 23/06/2022, Rostov Regional Court.	490	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
51325/22	Otradnov v. Russia	01/10/2022	<b>Dmitriy Vladimirovich OTRADNOV</b> 1993 Kachkanar	Aleksey Vladimirovich BUSHMAKOV	<p>On 02/03/2022, the applicant shared a post on his social media account that compared the letter Z, an emblem of the Russian invasion in Ukraine, with the Wolfsangel, a Z-shaped symbol with a central bar adopted by the Nazi Party and used by various German Wehrmacht and SS units, and currently classified as a hate and neo-Nazi symbol. He commented, "It goes to show that Putler is inspired by Hitler". On 15/03/2022, he posted a status that read, "'Defending the Motherland' has led to funerals of the invaders". For each post, he was fined RUB 30,000. Final decision: 29/06/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p> <p>On 13/03/2022, he posted a status that read, "Fucking Russia is sliding into fucking shit". He was convicted under Article 20.1(3) of the CAO for disseminating online content clearly disrespectful of the Russian State. Fine: RUB 70,000. Final decision: 24/08/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p>		TBD	
51396/22	Mozheyko v. Russia	22/10/2022	<b>Lev Viktorovich MOZHEYKO</b> 1972 Cheboksary	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	<p>On 02/03/2022, the applicant shared a YouTube video of himself speaking against the war and saying, "War is madness, the war needs to be stopped urgently, stopped immediately, stopped this very second. Peace to the world!". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final</p>	561	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					decision: 28/06/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Chuvashiya.			
51651/22	Pavlinin v. Russia	22/10/2022	<b>Andrey Nikolayevich PAVLININ</b> 1972 Nezhdaninskoye	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	Between 24/02/2022 and 29/03/2022, the applicant shared anti-war statuses on her social media account that read, "Russian fascist invaders have attacked Ukraine", "Putin is a war criminal and must be executed", "Glory to Ukraine! Stay strong! Strike back at the aggressor", "Russian scum. 121 children have died during Putin's war with Ukraine, another 167 children are wounded", "In Dolmabahçe, Russian fascists are pretending to negotiate while continuing to murder innocent people". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 23/06/2022, Supreme Court of the Sakha Republic.		TBD	
51731/22	Potemkin v. Russia	20/10/2022	<b>Danila Ivanovich POTEKIN</b> 2000 Tomsk	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	The applicant was charged with participating in an unauthorised gathering on 06/03/2022 in Tomsk, which had the objective of "forming a negative opinion among Tomsk residents about Russia's special military operation abroad". Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 21/06/2022, Tomsk Regional Court.		5,000	
51810/22	Bespokoyev v. Russia	21/10/2022	<b>Demyan Vladimirovich BESPOKOYEV</b> 2001 St Petersburg	Yana Andreyevna NEPOVINNOVA	On 29/03/2022, the applicant was arrested at a subway station for wearing a coat with a statement that read, "This coat belonged to my grandfather. During World War II, he was a starving kid in an occupied territory. Why	720	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					do the horrifying themes of his distant stories resonate in my time? I am hurting and I am scared. I do not want war!". Fine: RUB 45,000. Final decision: 21/06/2022, St Petersburg City Court.			
51812/22	Barabash v. Russia	21/10/2022	<b>Polina Andreyevna BARABASH</b> 2000 Kemerovo	Yana Andreyevna NEPOVINNOVA	On 02/04/2022, the applicant chained herself to a fence in central St Petersburg. Next to her, she placed a wooden cross in the colours of the Ukrainian national flag with the words "AGAINST THE WAR", and a banner with the text: "Refusing to kill is not cowardice or treason. You will be sent to death. You are a human being same as me. Your orders are a gag on your freedom. Do not become a dead body". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 23/06/2022, St Petersburg City Court.		TBD	
52056/22	Savinkina v. Russia	21/10/2022	<b>Tatyana Ivanovna SAVINKINA</b> 1945 Petrozavodsk	Nataliya Nikolayevna CHERNOVA	On 04/04/2022 and 05/04/2022, the applicant put up handwritten signs in the entrance of her block of flats that read "Putin, get out of Ukraine!". Fines (two): RUB 30,000. Final decision: 22/06/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Karelia.	1038	TBD	
52880/22	Nosov v. Russia	17/10/2022	<b>Aleksey Viktorovich NOSOV</b> 1975 Seversk	Yelena Vladimirovna LIPATOVA	The applicant was charged with participating in an unauthorised gathering on 06/03/2022 in Tomsk, which had the objective of "forming a negative opinion among Tomsk residents about Russia's special military		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					operation abroad". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 17/06/2022, Tomsk Regional Court.			
52933/22	Kharitonova v. Russia	21/10/2022	<b>Yekaterina Sergeyevna KHARITONOVA</b> 1986 Ivanovo	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	The applicant was convicted for having a "peace" sign on her backpack. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 23/06/2022, Moscow City Court.		5,000	
53150/22	Azar v. Russia	28/10/2022	<b>Ilya Vilyamovich AZAR</b> 1984 Moscow	Leonid Alekseyevich SOLOVYEV	On 28/02/2022, the applicant posted on his Facebook account, saying: "Today, the residential areas of Kharkiv were hit, with artillery rockets or something similar, and civilians lost their lives. This madness must be stopped. I think the only way to do it is if all the famous people with a big following who have spoken out recently against the war ... could pick a date and time for an anti-war march. They should share it on their social media, urging people to join them on the streets (and be there themselves too)". Fine: RUB 60,000. Final decision: 14/07/2022, Moscow City Court.		TBD	
53414/22	Salnikov v. Russia	26/10/2022	<b>Dmitriy Yuryevich SALNIKOV</b> 1980 Pskov	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	The applicant was convicted twice for putting up a sign "NO TO WAR" on the window of his car. Fines: RUB 15,000 and RUB 30,000. Final decisions: 28/06/2022 and 15/08/2022, Pskov Regional Court.	736	TBD	
53603/22	Durmanov v. Russia	14/10/2022	<b>Aleksey Sergeyevich DURMANOV</b>	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	The applicant was convicted for taking part in an unauthorised public event on 06/03/2022		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			2001 Seltso		in Kaliningrad. During the event, he shouted "NO TO WAR". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 28/06/2022, Kaliningrad Regional Court.			
53823/22	Malinovskiy v. Russia	26/10/2022	<b>Sergey Aleksandrovich MALINOVSKIY</b> 1993 St Petersburg	Luiza Magomedovna MAGOMEDOVA	<p>On 02/04/2022, the applicant was arrested while walking across a central square in St Petersburg with a sticker on his coat that read "No to war". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 28/06/2022, St Petersburg City Court.</p> <p>In connection with that incident, he was also charged with participating in a "mass simultaneous presence of citizens" who were shouting "No to war". He was found guilty of breaching the procedure for conducting public events and sentenced to seven days' detention. Final decision: 25/08/2022, St Petersburg City Court.</p> <p>On 09/05/2022, during the night, the applicant projected the text "NO.WAR.RUSSIA" onto a facade of a building on an embankment in St Petersburg. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 25/08/2022, St Petersburg City Court.</p>		TBD	
54147/22	Sukhorukov v. Russia	10/11/2022	<b>Vladimir Nikolayevich SUKHORUKOV</b>	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 25/02/2022, the applicant posted a selfie on his social media account with the caption "I am a Russian who is against the war"		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1963 Pechory		against the backdrop of the Ukrainian flag. On 07/03/2022, he reposted a link to a publication about the shelling of Kharkiv by Russian troops and commented, "Putin must be court-martialled". On 22/03/2022, he shared a post about the death of a former prisoner of the Nazi concentration camps during the shelling of Kharkiv. Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 11/07/2022, Pskov Regional Court.			
54413/22	Vasilev v. Russia	21/10/2022	<b>Konstantin Olegovich VASILEV</b> 1987 Khimki	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	The applicant held up a sign that read, "40 DAYS OF WAR", in central Moscow. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 29/10/2022, Moscow City Court.		4,000	
54508/22	Latypov v. Russia	09/11/2022	<b>Robert Ramilevich LATYPOV</b> 1973 Perm	Yelena Yuryevna PERSHAKOVA	On 24/02/2022, the applicant posted a statement against the war on his social media account that read, "Today, the President of the Russian Federation, who we believe bears primary responsibility for starting the conflict with Ukraine, declared war. We consider this step to be criminal and disastrous for Russia". Fine: RUB 15,000. Final decision: 21/07/2022, Perm Regional Court.	304	TBD	
54550/22	Gorina v. Russia	03/11/2022	<b>Galina Mikhaylovna GORINA</b> 1960 Chelyabinsk	Andrey Gennadyevich LEPEKHIN	On 05/03/2022, the applicant posted a video to her social media account calling to take part in an anti-war rally on 06/03/2022, stating "No to war. Putin is not Russia. We go out on 6 March". Fine: RUB 50,000. Final	575	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					decision: 05/07/2022, Chelyabinsk Regional Court.			
55435/22	Chernyshov and Others v. Russia	28/10/2022	<p><b>Andrey Anatolyevich CHERNYSHOV</b> 1972 Moscow</p> <p><b>Artemiy Sergeyevich BOBROV</b> 1992 Moscow</p> <p><b>Yekaterina Anatolyevna LITVINENKO</b> 1975 Balashikha</p> <p><b>Kristina Petrovna MARKUS</b> 1984 Moscow</p> <p><b>Aleksandr Vadimovich METS</b> 1979 Moscow</p> <p><b>Aleksandr Gennadyevich</b></p>	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	<p>On 01/05/2022 and 18/06/2022, Andrey Chernyshov held up a sign “Peace for Ukraine, no to war, freedom for Russia” and wore a badge “No to war” at Pushkinskaya Square in Moscow. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decisions: 28/06/2022 and 16/08/2022, Moscow City Court.</p> <p>On 09/05/2022, during Russia’s Victory Day celebrations in Moscow, Artemiy Bobrov held up a photograph of a war hero with the text “He wanted peace”. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 28/06/2022, Moscow City Court.</p> <p>On 09/05/2022, in Moscow, Yekaterina Litvinenko held up a sign “We defeated that fascism before, we can defeat this one now”. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 28/06/2022, Moscow City Court.</p> <p>On 05/04/2022, Kristina Markus held up a sign “Putin, who will answer for the atrocities in Bucha? 24.02 – ? Stop this war!” at a gathering on Red Square in Moscow. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 28/06/2022, Moscow City Court.</p>		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			<b>SAFONOV</b> 1900 Chita  <b>Mariya Andreyevna YEVDOKIMOVA</b> 1984 Moscow		<p>On 10/04/2022, Aleksandr Mets held up a map of Russia painted in white-blue-white colours, deemed a symbol “used by opponents to the Russian invasion in Ukraine”, at a gathering in Red Square, Moscow. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 28/06/2022, Moscow City Court.</p> <p>On 09/05/2022, in Moscow, Aleksandr Safonov held up a sign “No to war”. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 28/06/2022, Moscow City Court.</p> <p>On 14/04/2022, Mariya Yevdokimova held up a sign “Thanks to those who refused to kill and die” at a gathering in Red Square, Moscow. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 28/06/2022, Moscow City Court.</p>			
55460/22	Proskuryakov and Shabanov v. Russia	03/11/2022	<b>Pavel Sergeyevich PROSKURYAKOV</b> 2000 St Petersburg  <b>Aleksandr Aleksandrovich SHABANOV</b> 1989 Kropotkin	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	<p>On 14/03/2022, Pavel Proskuryakov was arrested on exiting a metro station for wearing a badge in the colours of the Ukrainian national flag with the words “No to war”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 05/07/2022, Moscow City Court.</p> <p>On 19/04/2022, Aleksandr Shabanov was denounced by his co-workers for sharing anti-war videos on YouTube and arrested</p>		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					during an anti-war rally. Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 06/07/2022, Krasnodar Regional Court.			
55531/22	Otkhonov v. Russia	13/11/2022	<b>Oleg Andreyevich OTKHONOV</b> 1964 Elista	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 02/03/2022, the applicant shared on his social media account a video by a local activist calling for an end to the war and for Putin's impeachment. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 14/07/2022, Supreme Court of the Kalmykia Republic.		TBD	
55537/22	Gorodiskiy v. Russia	13/11/2022	<b>Ivan Mikhaylovich GORODISKIY</b> 1975 Kamenka	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	The applicant was convicted for comments on his social network account, including a post that read, "8th March special for Russian women: get four parcels from Ukraine and put your son back together", and a comment on a picture of Russian prisoners-of-war, referring to them as "captive barbarians". Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 14/07/2022, Penza Regional Court.	778	TBD	
55543/22	Bashmakova v. Russia	13/11/2022	<b>Vera Yevgenyevna BASHMAKOVA</b> 1984 Moscow	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	The applicant put a "NO TO WAR" sign on her car. Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 14/07/2022, Moscow City Court.	669	TBD	
55557/22	Novikova v. Russia	08/11/2022	<b>Tatyana Vladimirovna NOVIKOVA</b> 1986 Nizhniy Novgorod	Kristina Olegovna TYURINA	The applicant was convicted for commenting on a post about a local conscript who had been killed in action. Her comment read, "being killed makes him a hero? how many civilians did these heroes kill there? how		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					many women did they rape?”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 14/09/2022, Nizhny Novgorod Regional Court.			
55702/22	Kharlamov v. Russia	22/11/2022	<b>Sergey Aleksandrovich KHARLAMOV</b> 1985 Moscow	Konstantin Aleksandrovich MALTSEV	On 28/05/2022, the police arrested the applicant in central Moscow for wearing a pin on his lapel with the national flags of Russia and Ukraine and the text “No to War”. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 16/08/2022, Moscow City Court.  On 06/03/2022, the applicant was arrested for his participation in an anti-war rally in central Moscow. He was convicted, under Article 20.2(5) of the CAO, for taking part in an unauthorised manifestation. Fine: RUB 10,000. Final decision: 19/09/2022, Moscow City Court.		5,000	
55820/22	Berdnikov v. Russia	19/11/2022	<b>Dmitriy Nikolayevich BERDNIKOV</b> 2000 Perm	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	Between 24/02/2022 and 07/03/2022, the applicant’s status on his social media account was set to read, in mixed English and Russian, “#NoToWar #IAmAgainstWar #NoWar”, and he attached the same hashtags to publications he shared in his feed. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 20/07/2022, Perm Regional Court.		TBD	
55915/22	Shangina v. Russia	14/10/2022	<b>Vlada Aleksandrovna SHANGINA</b>	Yelena Vladimirovna LIPATOVA	On 10/03/2022, the applicant held up a sign saying “NO TO WAR” in central Kazan. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision:		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1998 Kazan		15/06/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Tatarstan.			
56008/22	Famiyev v. Russia	20/11/2022	<b>Nafik Akhnafovich FAMIYEV</b> 1960 Yekaterinburg	Yuliya Yevgenyevna FEDOTOVA	The applicant was given three convictions for his posts, stating, “Two outcomes are: the occupation of Ukraine or a peace treaty and the withdrawal of troops. Hard to say which of them scares the Russian authorities more”, “The war with Ukraine, terrible, absurd, and inept – the most vile, shameful, and unjust war in Russia’s history”, “To take down the States, they had to bomb fraternal Ukraine, squander Russia’s gold and foreign exchange reserves, and expose our economy to a real economic slaughter”. Each time he was fined RUB 35,000. Final decisions: 20/07/2022, 27/07/2022, 03/08/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.	1,079	10,000	
56087/22	Alekhin v. Russia	18/11/2022	<b>Yevgeniy Vyacheslavovich ALEKHIN</b> 1976 Moscow	Ilnur Ilgizovich SHARAPOV	On 30/03/2022, as the applicant was trying to leave Russia, the border police forced him to give access to his phone. They uncovered his recent Facebook post that read, “In my view, this is not a war between Russia and Ukraine at all. Above all, we are all human, and that is what truly unites us. Compassion and the willingness to lend a helping hand. This war is about the right to be yourself, to freely express your opinions, to prefer horizontal connections over vertical command structures, and to stop being a cog in the vast		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					and monstrous machinery of a fascist state. Ukraine is the embodiment of all these wonderful values of freedom, justice, and humanity. I trust that the world will emerge changed from this ordeal. Renewed and purified. United". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 20/07/2022, Moscow City Court.			
56627/22	Brosse v. Russia	27/11/2022	<b>Stepan Viktorovich BROSSE</b> 1993 Cheboksary	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	Reacting to a post in a regional Telegram chat about Russian soldiers refusing to storm the Ukrainian city of Mariupol, the applicant said, "Hooray. Finally, someone has given our special forces a good thrashing for what they did to our protesters. These clowns are only good at hitting old ladies and girls". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 28/07/2022, Supreme Court of the Chuvash Republic.	522	TBD	
57019/22	Kuznetsova v. Russia	13/11/2022	<b>Tatyana Leonidovna KUZNETSOVA</b> 1970 Lahdenpohja	Mariya Sergeyevna ZYRYANOVA	On 12/03/2022, the applicant commented on social media, saying in particular: "I am against the war, it's all right to defend the homeland but attacking another country is wicked; if I had a son or husband I would not let them go to Ukraine". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 27/07/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Karelia.		TBD	
57024/22	Vostrov v. Russia	20/11/2022	<b>Vadim Yevgenyevich VOSTROV</b>	Vladimir Valeryevich VASIN	The police documented a post from the applicant's Telegram channel: "Have you noticed that the reasons given for invading	708	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1972 Krasnoyarsk		Ukraine are identical to those Hitler used to invade Poland? Why do twenty-year-olds kill thousands of others who are just like them and speak the same language? Why do we destroy Russian-speaking cities and force millions of their residents to flee to Europe?”. Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 20/07/2022, Krasnoyarsk Regional Court.			
57229/22	Naki v. Russia	02/12/2022	<b>Maykl Sidney NAKI</b> 1993 Vilnius	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	See the Facts section of the judgment.		TBD	
57567/22	Mezin and Others v. Russia	18/11/2022	<b>Mikhail Yefimovich MEZIN</b> 1965 St Petersburg  <b>Denis Alekseyevich GORBACHEV</b> 1988 Voronezh  <b>Dmitriy Aleksandrovich SMELYY</b> 1976 Shopino  <b>Yelizaveta Romanovna TSENKER</b> 1997	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 14/04/2022, Mikhail Mezin held up a sign “No to war” in central St Petersburg. Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 19/07/2022, St Petersburg City Court.  On 10/03/2022, the police accessed Denis Gorbachev’s social media account and discovered videos titled “Ukraine is littered with the remains of Putin’s army. A source of fertiliser for the planting season?”, “The Russian military gunned down a vehicle carrying pensioners”, “Russia’s glory was destroyed in Ukraine”. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 20/07/2022, Voronezh Regional Court. On 30/05/2022, Andrey Zakhoba held up a sign “I am against the war” in central		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			Elektrostal  <b>Andrey Petrovich ZAKHOBA</b> 1981 Moscow		Moscow. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 20/07/2022, Moscow City Court.  On 16/04/2022, Dmitriy Smelyy held up a sign "Stop the war in Ukraine" in central Moscow. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 20/07/2022, Moscow City Court.  On 17/04/2022, Yelizaveta Tsenker held up a sign "I am against the special operation in Ukraine" in central Moscow and was also found to be in possession of a sign that read, in original English, "We will rave on Putin's grave". Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 20/07/2022, Moscow City Court.			
57642/22	Chernyakevich v. Russia	05/12/2022	<b>Marina Nikolayevna CHERNYAKEVICH</b> 1991 Moscow	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	The applicant's spouse reported her to the police for sharing with him and other family members, in their private exchanges over a Russian social network, news and videos about the war from Ukrainian news sources. The courts convicted the applicant on the basis of screenshots from her husband's phone without detailing the content of the messages. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 05/08/2022, Moscow City Court.		TBD	
57672/22	Glushkov v. Russia	02/12/2022	<b>Aleksey Alekseyevich GLUSHKOV</b> 1964 Petrozavodsk	Nataliya Nikolayevna CHERNOVA	On 22/02/2022, the applicant posted a map of Ukraine on his social media account and a poll about the recognition of Russian-backed separatist regions of Donetsk and Luhansk.	480	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					On 24/02/2022, he posted a text that began, "War is death. Death for both ordinary soldiers and civilians," and a poll asking whether people were ready to sacrifice their lives in the war with Ukraine. On 25/02/2022, he posted two photos of people sheltering in a metro station with captions "Moscow 1941" and "Kharkov 2022". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 10/08/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Karelia.			
121/23	Kislyakova and Others v. Russia	11/11/2022	<b>Anna Alekseyevna KISLYAKOVA</b> 2003 Yekaterinburg  <b>Artem Mikhaylovich MEDVEDEV</b> 1989 Khimki  <b>Dmitriy Vladimirovich ZHMYREV</b> 1989 Inzhavino	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	<p>On 08/04/2022, the applicant Anna Kislyakova tore down a paper "Z" sign from the wall of Urals State University in Yekaterinburg. The sign, bearing the message "We don't abandon our people" is an emblem of Russia's invasion in Ukraine. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 13/07/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p> <p>On 31/03/2022, the applicant Artem Medvedev was stopped by the police for carrying a "No to war" sign on his backpack. The court fined him RUB 30,000 and ordered the destruction of his backpack. Final decision: 14/07/2022, Moscow City Court.</p> <p>On 01/06/2022, Children's Day, the applicant Dmitriy Zhmyrev displayed a sign in central Moscow that read, "1 June is for protecting</p>		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					children, not for killing them. Say no to war. Because of Russia's war against Ukraine, 262 children have lost their lives, and another 415 children have been injured or left disabled". Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 14/07/2022, Moscow City Court.			
272/23	Kovalenok v. Russia	28/11/2022	<b>Timofey Sergeyevich KOVALENOK</b> 2003 Smolensk	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 09/05/2022, the applicant held up a sign with the question "Anything but war?" in central Smolensk. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 10/08/2022, Smolensk Regional Court.		TBD	
280/23	Kulikovskaya v. Russia	28/11/2022	<b>Darya Aleksandrovna KULIKOVSKAYA</b> 1991 Azov	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 25/04/2022, the applicant stamped a 1,000-rouble banknote with a text that read, "Do you know what Russian soldiers do on occupied Ukrainian lands? They rob, kidnap, torture, rape, murder", and deposited it in an ATM of a State bank. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 09/08/2022, Rostov Regional Court.	498	TBD	
320/23	Kozhinskaya v. Russia	14/11/2022	<b>Mariya Aleksandrovna KOZHINSKAYA</b> 1980 Moscow	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 06/03/2022, the applicant participated in an anti-war rally in Moscow. She was dressed in a yellow jacket and blue sweater – the colours of the national flag of Ukraine – to which she pinned signs that read, "Peace to the World" and "We cannot turn back, war is behind us". Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 15/07/2022, Moscow City Court.		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
451/23	Kozicheva v. Russia	26/11/2022	<b>Aleksandra Vladimirovna KOZICHEVA</b> 1996 St Petersburg	Mariya Sergeyevna ZYRYANOVA	On 08/03/2022, the applicant took part in an anti-war rally with a banner that read, "Stop sending our soldiers to their deaths. Stop killing the people of Ukraine". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 28/07/2022, St Petersburg City Court.		TBD	
464/23	Olkhova v. Russia	18/11/2022	<b>Olga Aleksandrovna OLKHOVA</b> 1984 Mayskiy	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	The applicant posted on Instagram a picture of a dog defecating on the letter "Z", an emblem of the Russian invasion in Ukraine. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 29/07/2022, Supreme Court of the Kabardino-Balkaria Republic.	491	TBD	
476/23	Grigoryev v. Russia	18/11/2022	<b>Aleksey Vyacheslavovich GRIGORYEV</b> 1977 Petrozavodsk	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	Between 01/03/2022 and 17/03/2022, the applicant took part in online discussions about the war in Ukraine and made disparaging comments about the state of the economy under Putin and the invasion he launched. In particular, he stated that Putin "decided to finish off the Russian people with war," that he "started the war without calling it a war and blamed everything on the Ukrainians", and that "the war will be long because the Russians thought they could win easily, but the Ukrainians are made of tougher stuff! So expect lots of coffins!" He added that Russians were "occupiers, that's a fact" and that "the next three to four generations would not have a normal relationship with Ukraine or its people". Fine:	501	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					RUB 30,000. Final decision: 20/07/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Karelia.			
860/23	Moyseyenko v. Russia	20/11/2022	<b>Georgiy Mefodyevich MOYSEYENKO</b> 1936 Syktyvkar	Vladislav Vladimirovich KOSNYREV	On 15/03/2022, the applicant, an 86-year-old survivor of the Nazi occupation of Ukraine, posted on social media a comment stating his admiration for the protest act of a State television journalist who disrupted a live broadcast by holding an anti-war poster behind the news anchor, and added, "No to war! Put the instigators on trial! No to following criminal orders! Glory to Ukraine! Glory to the heroes! No to war!" Fine: RUB 15,000. Final decision: 20/07/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Karelia.	251	TBD	
925/23	Stativka v. Russia	28/11/2022	<b>Irina Sergeyevna STATIVKA</b> 2001 St Petersburg	Yuliya Valeryevna MALININA	On 22/04/2022, the applicant daubed graffiti on a facade in central St Petersburg combining the letter Z, an emblem of the Russian invasion in Ukraine, with a Russian slang term for the head of the penis that begins with the same letter. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 28/07/2022, St Petersburg City Court.		TBD	
1189/23	Shchekin v. Russia	08/12/2022	<b>Artem Valentinovich SHCHEKIN</b> 1974 Novosibirsk	Olga Yuryevna NECHAYEVA	On 13/03/2022, the applicant wrote "PUTIN STOP THE WAR" using black and red paint on a large sheet of paper and held it up at a central location in Novosibirsk. Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 09/08/2022, Novosibirsk Regional Court.	361	9,500	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
1200/23	Olkhovik v. Russia	02/12/2022	<b>Oleg Aleksandrovich OLKHOVIK</b> 1992 Uspenskoye	Feliks Yevgenyevich VERTEGEL	On 23/02/2022, the applicant shared on his Instagram account a picture of the Ukrainian national flag and a comment, "We're about to commit a huge mistake. These beasts want to invade Ukraine. I refuse to side with those in power; I stand against the war! Hang in there and stay strong." On 25/02/2022, he shared a text, "24 FEBRUARY – A DAY OF NATIONAL SHAME" and a comment: "I could never have imagined that such a terrible event would occur in my lifetime. This day has become the blackest Thursday imaginable. I will never forgive this government and Putin personally for bringing this day upon us. I wish all those responsible burn in hell. If you are my friend, even a close one, and you support the military action, just unfollow me; I do not need any comments on this". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 08/08/2022, Krasnodar Regional Court.	309	TBD	
1385/23	Bezaziyeva v. Russia	09/12/2022	<b>Susana Rasymivna BEZAZIYEVA</b> 1979 Dzhankoy	Jessica GAVRON	On 13/04/2022, the applicant, a Crimean Tatar and teacher at a secondary school in Dzhankoy (Canköy) in the Crimean peninsula, told her pupils that there were no fascists in Ukraine and that Ukrainian people and children were being brutally attacked, killed and even raped by Russian soldiers. Following a complaint by a parent, the	486	8,000	19,497

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					applicant was initially charged with a criminal offence under Article 207.3 of the Criminal Code, which was later amended to an administrative charge under Article 20.3.3 of the CAO. On 23/06/2022, the "Dzhankoy District Court" found her guilty and fined her RUB 30,000. Final decision: 10/08/2022, "Supreme Court of the Republic of Crimea".			
1403/23	Pavlov v. Russia	21/12/2022	<b>Roman Sergeyevich PAVLOV</b> 1976 Glazov	Konstantin Aleksandrovich MALTSEV	On 08/05/2022, the applicant held up a sign reading "For the withdrawal of troops and peace" in central Glazov. Fine: RUB 15,000. Final decision: 26/09/2022, Supreme Court of Udmurtiya.		5,000	
1517/23	Pishchalnikov v. Russia	16/12/2022	<b>Aleksandr Sergeyevich PISHCHALNIKOV</b> 1968 Moscow	Valeriya Aleksandrovna ARSHINOVA	On 10/03/2022, the applicant reposted on his Facebook account a New York Times story about a Ukrainian mother and her two children who were killed trying to dash to safety, a moment captured by the newspaper's photographer. He added a comment that read, "To those who approve of the special military operation in Ukraine ... Are you not ashamed?" On 18/04/2022, he reposted a first-person account about a massacre in Irpin perpetrated by Russian troops. Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 16/08/2022, Moscow City Court.	717	TBD	
1569/23	Malegin v. Russia	15/12/2022	<b>Vladimir Dmitriyevich MALEGIN</b>	Anatoliy Vadimovich ALEKSANDROVSKIY	On 08/03/2022, the applicant posted on his social media account a statement that a local	514	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1945 Petrozavodsk		educational organisation had decided to suspend its projects due to the ongoing shelling of Ukrainian cities on the orders of the President of Russia. On 23/04/2022, he posted a photo of himself with a sign, "Categorically AGAINST the Bombing of PEACEFUL CITIES!", and a comment, "Peaceful cities and villages have been destroyed. Peaceful people have died! Many are hiding in basements without drinking water... Millions have LEFT their homes under the threat of death. If this senseless 'meat grinder' is not stopped, more will die tomorrow." On 24/04/2022, he posted a text that read, "... Today is the sixtieth day of the special operation. It is Easter! The entire Christian world is exchanging greetings, while the general reports that overnight the Russian armed forces conducted 432 airstrikes on Ukraine. Are we really to believe that Ukraine poses a deadly threat to our country? Why is there such brutal cruelty towards a country that has never attacked us? So many innocent people are dying, more than in ten years of the war in Afghanistan!" Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 17/08/2022, Supreme Court of Karelia.			
1572/23	Vedyagina v. Russia	15/12/2022	<b>Zhanna Valentinovna VEDYAGINA</b>	Nataliya Nikolayevna CHERNOVA	Between 14/03/2022 and 03/04/2022, the applicant reposted messages from other users	448	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1964 Petrozavodsk		on her social media account. One concerned a protest act by a State television journalist who disrupted a live broadcast by holding an anti-war poster behind the news anchor; the post compared her to August Landmesser, who, in a 1936 photograph, was conspicuously standing with his arms crossed while a large crowd around him was giving the Nazi salute. Another post quoted a prominent Russian screenwriter as saying, "The army of my country bombs residential buildings, hospitals, and theatres in a neighbouring country. But new laws in my country forbid me from saying that this is wrong ..." Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 17/08/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Karelia.			
1699/23	Chubinidze v. Russia	10/12/2022	<b>Ketino Borisovna CHUBINIDZE</b> 1993 Moscow	Konstantin Aleksandrovich MALTSEV	The applicant was arrested at an airport for wearing a backpack with a sign "No to War". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 11/08/2022, Moscow City Court.		5,000	
1750/23	Samusev v. Russia	10/12/2022	<b>Sergey Aleksandrovich SAMUSEV</b> 1978 St Petersburg	Leonid Leonidovich KRIKUN	On 09/05/2022, during Russia's Victory Day celebrations in St Petersburg, the applicant held up a photograph of a Ukrainian Holocaust survivor killed by Russian shelling in Kharkov with the text, "Boris Tikhonovich Romanchenko. Ukrainian public figure, prisoner of four Nazi concentration camps: Peenemünde, Buchenwald, Dora-Mittelbau,	496	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					Bergen-Belsen. He died on 18/03/2022 in Kharkiv. An artillery shell hit his apartment. We remember!" Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 11/08/2022, St Petersburg City Court.			
2023/23	Gutsev v. Russia	08/12/2022	<b>Aleksandr Viktorovich GUTSEV</b> 1975 Chelyabinsk	Andrey Gennadyevich LEPEKHIN	The applicant put a banner on the back window of his car that read, "No to war. Hold on, brothers" (in Ukrainian). Fine: RUB 45,000. Final decision: 11/08/2022, Chelyabinsk Regional Court.	750	TBD	
2088/23	Klyuchko v. Russia	27/12/2022	<b>Yelena Nikolayevna KLYUCHKO</b> 1980 Kebanyel	Kirill Yevgenyevich ERLIKHMAN	On 14/03/2022, the applicant published a social media appeal titled, "I am against what we are required to call a 'special military operation'", along with a photo of a woman being carried on a stretcher away from a destroyed building. She also commented, "The woman on the stretcher has not survived. Her child has not survived". Fine: RUB 15,000. Final decision: 26/10/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Komi.		5,000	
2144/23	Kulesh v. Russia	14/12/2022	<b>Ivan Pavlovich KULESH</b> 1994 Delft	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 24/02/2022, the applicant posted a message on his social media account that said, "A monstrous event has occurred. Russia attacked Ukraine under the fake pretence of 'genocide of the Russian people', declared by the completely insane Putin". On 26/02/2022, he shared a video titled, "A Russian shell falling on a Ukrainian block of		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					flats” and also a message from his wife: “On 24 February, my life was split into before and after. Bloody battles are raging around my hometown of Zaporizhzhia. My parents and little brother are hiding in a bomb shelter from Russian rockets and air raids. My family in Kyiv are sheltering in a cold basement with their toddlers. Our soldiers stand their ground, defending their homeland. They are not fascists or Banderites, but ordinary Ukrainian men who are dying under Russian bullets. We all see them as heroes and defenders of our country. And they have no intention of surrendering. Kadyrov has announced that he is sending his fighters to Ukraine. It is abundantly clear who the real fascist threatening my loved ones is. Russian people! Spread this message if you have even a drop of conscience.” Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 15/08/2022, Pskov Regional Court.			
2156/23	Korolev v. Russia	31/12/2022	<b>Vsevolod Anatolyevich KOROLEV</b> 1987 St Petersburg	Mariya Sergeyevna ZYRYANOVA	See the Facts section of the judgment.		TBD	
2626/23	Fateyev v. Russia	08/12/2022	<b>Vladimir Aleksandrovich FATEYEV</b>	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 22/04/2022, the applicant shared a picture on his social media account, showing St Nicholas the Wonderworker in Ukrainian uniform protecting children from advancing		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1978 Tambov		Russian tanks. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 08/08/2022, Tambov Regional Court.			
2650/23	Tikhonova v. Russia	29/12/2022	<b>Anastasiya Aleksandrovna TIKHONOVA</b> 1988 Moscow	Darya Dmitriyevna AKSENOVA	On 08/05/2022, the applicant held up a sign in central Moscow that said, "Standing for peace is not a crime". Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 08/09/2022, Moscow City Court.		TBD	
2867/23	Lyubimov and Others v. Russia	02/12/2022	<b>Ivan Leonidovich LYUBIMOV</b> 1985 Yekaterinburg  <b>Anastasiya Aleksandrovna FEYGINA</b> 2002 Ryazan  <b>Artem Eduardovich KALLAS</b> 1991 Tambov  <b>Boris Mikhaylovich SHEPELYUK</b> 2002 Moscow	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 14/05/2022, in central Yekaterinburg, Ivan Lyubimov displayed a sign that read, "Evil cannot conquer existence 4:10. The Lord said, 'What have you done? The voice of your brother's blood cries out to me from the earth. Shame to war criminals! Bring marauders, violators, and child killers to justice'". Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 04/08/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.  On 23/06/2022, Ivan Lyubimov held up a banner which read, in part, "No man is an island, entire of itself. Each is a piece of the continent, a part of the main ... Therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee. Since 24 February, 10,308 civilians in Ukraine have been killed or injured due to war". Fine: RUB 45,000. Final decision: 12/10/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non- pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					<p>On 28/07/2022, Ivan Lyubimov showcased a banner displaying the coats of arms of several Ukrainian cities – Odesa, Bucha, Vinnytsia, Chasiv Yar, Kharkiv, and Mariupol. The text on the banner read, “Since 24 February, the war in Ukraine has claimed 12,272 civilian lives”, and “God is not a God of the dead, but of the living. To Him, all are alive”. Fine: RUB 45,000. Final decision: 26/10/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.</p> <p>On 30/04/2022, Anastasiya Feygina stencilled an image of a peace dove onto a street in Ryazan. Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 11/08/2022, Ryazan Regional Court.</p> <p>On 14/06/2022, Artem Kallas attached a series of asterisks to his car’s rear window – three followed by five [“*** *****”] – equivalent to the number of letters in the Russian phrase “No to war”. Fine: RUB 30,000 on two occasions. Final decisions: 14/09/2022 and 19/09/2022, Tambov Regional Court.</p> <p>On 23/03/2022, Boris Shepetyuk attached a sticker reading “No to war” onto the facade of the Timiryazev Agricultural Academy in Moscow. Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 03/08/2022, Moscow City Court.</p>			

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
3733/23	Litvinenko v. Russia	16/12/2022	<b>Pavel Ilyich LITVINENKO</b> 1996 Balashikha	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 09/05/2022, during Russia's Victory Day celebrations in Moscow, the applicant held up a sign reading "We defeated that fascism before, we can defeat this one now" (Победили тот фашизм, победим и этот). Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 16/08/2022, Moscow City Court.		5,000	
3836/23	Salmina v. Russia	24/12/2022	<b>Kseniya Maksudovna SALMINA</b> 1997 Tolyatti	Konstantin Aleksandrovich MALTSEV	On 12/06/2022, at Slavy Square in Samara, the applicant held up a sign reading "No to war". Final decision: 25/08/2022, Samara Regional Court.		5,000	
4828/23	Krasilnikov and Others v. Russia	28/12/2022	<b>Mark Nikolayevich KRASILNIKOV</b> 1992 Yekaterinburg  <b>Olga Mikhaylovna SVALOVA</b> 1956 Moscow  <b>Ilya Yevgenyevich YERMIN</b> 1982 Volzhskiy	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 06/05/2022, Mark Krasilnikov held up a sign reading "No to war" in central Yekaterinburg. He was fined RUB 40,000. Final decision: 01/08/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.  On 20/06/2022, Olga Svalova held up a sign in central Moscow with a picture of a white dove and the words "I stand for peace". She was fined RUB 50,000. Final decision: 08/09/2022, Moscow City Court.  On 25/06/2022, Ilya Yermin held up a sign in central Moscow that read "No to war, freedom of speech". He was fined RUB 50,000. Final decision: 08/09/2022, Moscow City Court.		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
4920/23	Akhunov v. Russia	13/01/2023	<b>Dzhamil Ildarovich AKHUNOV</b> 1994 Kazan	Rim Faridovich SABIROV	On 09/05/2022, during Russia's Victory Day celebrations in Kazan, the applicant held up a photograph of his great-grandfather with the text "Tagirov, 1909-1942, gave his life so we could have peace" and two green ribbons symbolising peace. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 21/09/2022, Tatarstan Supreme Court.	485	TBD	
5107/23	Ispodina v. Russia	14/01/2023	<b>Galina Petrovna ISPODINA</b> 1961 Medvezhyegorsk	Nataliya Nikolayevna CHERNOVA	On 25/02/2022, the applicant took part in a discussion in a local community group and added a few comments that read: "Honestly, I don't see anyone rushing to the military offices to become cannon fodder in a neighbouring country"; "When the new government takes over, I'll be able to look people in the eye because I didn't back the killing of innocent people and the destruction of peaceful cities"; "What do Biden and Zelensky have to do with this? They didn't attack our country". Fine: RUB 20,000. Final decision: 14/09/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Karelia.	322	TBD	
6879/23	Yevtushenko v. Russia	20/01/2023	<b>Anna Timofeyevna YEVTUSHENKO</b> 1994 New York	Olga Yuryevna NECHAYEVA	On 07/05/2022, the applicant stationed herself in front of Novosibirsk State University, holding a banner that read "War affects everyone. Death of loved ones. Absence of a future. Russia, a pariah state" and wearing a sleep mask with the text "Open your eyes". Fine: RUB 35,000. Final		9,500	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					decision: 20/09/2022, Novosibirsk Regional Court.			
7437/23	Motsak v. Russia	23/12/2022	<b>Aleksey Viktorovich MOTSAK</b> 1982 Tashkent	Stanislav Aleksandrovich SELEZNEV	On 17/03/2022, the applicant made a series of posts in a local community WhatsApp group. He listed Ukrainian cities besieged by Russian troops and also posted a photo of the drama theatre in Mariupol, with the word "Children" spelled out on the asphalt. He commented that the theatre, with civilians sheltering inside, was destroyed by a Russian bomb, and that Russian troops are blocking the delivery of food to Ukrainian cities. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 24/08/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.	501	TBD	
7446/23	Livadnaya and Vasilyev v. Russia	06/01/2023	<b>Irina Valeryevna LIVADNAYA</b> 1980 Moscow  <b>Konstantin Olegovich VASILYEV</b> 1987 Khimki	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 04/07/2022, Irina Livadnaya held up a sign "No to war" in central Moscow. On 11/07/2022, she held up a sign "Peace to the world!" Each time, she was fined RUB 50,000. Final decisions: 08/09/2022, Moscow City Court.  On 30/04/2022, Konstantin Vasilyev held up a sign that read "Putin lost the war" in central Moscow. On 01/05/2022, the police stopped him for carrying a sign that read "Feast during the plague - A.S. Pushkin" and for sporting a sticker saying "No to war" on a sleeve of his jacket. Each time, he was fined		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					RUB 50,000. Final decisions: 08/09/2022, Moscow City Court.			
7800/23	Yudina-Klyugvant v. Russia	19/01/2023	<b>Yuliya Grigoryevna YUDINA-KLYUGVANT</b> 1974 Moscow	Ilnur Ilgizovich SHARAPOV	On 16/03/2022, the applicant posted anti-war stickers on the rear window of her car, stating: "Silence is a crime. No to war! Don't stay silent! Stop this madness! People are dying right now! I refuse to let people be killed in my name! Fuck off!" Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 21/09/2022, Moscow City Court.		TBD	
7824/23	Balyasin v. Russia	14/01/2023	<b>Roman Alekseyevich BALYASIN</b> 1981 Zheleznogorsk	Vladimir Valeryevich VASIN	In the summer of 2022, the applicant daubed paint over the letter "Z" on the road sign of the city of Zheleznogorsk. The city council had painted the letter in the colours of the St George ribbon to make it resemble an emblem of the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 14/09/2022, Krasnoyarsk Regional Court.		TBD	
8102/23	Arinichev v. Russia	16/12/2022	<b>Vladislav Vitalyevich ARINICHEV</b> 1993 Druzhba	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	See the Facts section of the judgment.		TBD	
8961/23	Dubyaga v. Russia	03/02/2023	<b>Aleksandr Sergeyevich DUBYAGA</b> 1984 Chelyabinsk	Andrey Gennadyevich LEPEKHIN	On 24/07/2022, the applicant held up a sign that read "No to war" in central Chelyabinsk. Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 06/10/2022, Chelyabinsk Regional Court.	466	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
9050/23	Yermilov v. Russia	20/01/2023	<b>Aleksey Vladimirovich YERMILOV</b> 1974 St Petersburg	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 09/05/2022, during a public rally in central St Petersburg titled "They did not fight for this" in commemoration of Victory Day, the applicant held up a sheet of paper saying "No to War". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 20/09/2022, St Petersburg City Court.		5,000	
10176/23	Kovin v. Russia	11/02/2023	<b>Vitaliy Sergeyevich KOVIN</b> 1970 Perm	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 28/02/2022, the applicant shared a quotation from an anti-war petition by leading political scientists that read, "Politics is what people do instead of going to war. More politics, less war, and the other way around." He also shared a link to the petition, "NO TO WAR - STOP THE WAR". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 13/10/2022, Perm Regional Court.	492	TBD	
10361/23	Kalegin v. Russia	10/02/2023	<b>Yegor Vladimirovich KALEGIN</b> 2001 Asbest	Kristina Olegovna TYURINA	The applicant commented on a social-media report that memorial plaques had been installed to commemorate two Russian combatants killed in Ukraine: "Mmm, it's about time to commemorate criminals". Fine: RUB 15,000. Final decision: 19/10/2022, Nizhny Novgorod Regional Court.		5,000	
11179/23	Arbuzenko v. Russia	27/02/2023	<b>Oksana Ivanovna ARBUZENKO</b> 1980 Tolyatti	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 24/02/2022, the applicant shared a status on her social media account that read: #notowarinUkraine #notowar. Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 27/10/2022, Samara Regional Court.		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
11255/23	Prudovskaya v. Russia	08/02/2023	<b>Lidiya Dmitriyevna PRUDOVSKAYA</b> 1976 Mirnyy	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	Between 04/04/2022 and 16/06/2022, the applicant published six posts on social media about the Bucha massacre. The final post opened with the line, "This is not just a war of Heroic Ukraine against Fascist Russia, a nation populated by cowards and scum, murderers, and fascists. This is a war for each one of us, regardless of the country we live in. A war for the right to be called human beings..." and concluded with the words, "Glory to Ukraine! Glory to everyone who did not retreat into their corner out of fear or indifference". Fine: RUB 35,000. Final decision: 13/10/2022, Arkhangelsk Regional Court.		TBD	
11258/23	Petkiyev v. Russia	08/02/2023	<b>Sergey Sergeyevich PETKIYEV</b> 1993 Elista	Andrey Vasilyevich SABININ	On 27/06/2022, the applicant posted a selfie on Facebook with a poster that says, "No to war and fascist Russia". He also posted a comment that read, "The most important thing now is not to lose hope, not to give up. Don't expect everything to be resolved on its own, without your involvement. Every day of the fascist regime will have a cost for Russia". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 10/10/2022, Supreme Court of the Republic of Kalmykia.		TBD	
12225/23	Morev v. Russia	28/02/2023	<b>Andrey Zinovyevich MOREV</b>	Ilnur Ilgizovich SHARAPOV	On 06/06/2022, the applicant published a post on Facebook that read, "People are dying; children and adults alike. Both Russian and		TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1974 Moscow		Ukrainian soldiers are perishing. The number of war crimes has reached the hundreds, if not thousands. Women and teenagers are being raped, civilians are being shot dead, and children are becoming disabled and orphaned. Over 10 million people have become refugees. The global economy is faltering, inflation is rising, supply chains are collapsing, and the world is facing a food shortage. The Russian economy is under unprecedented pressure, and the Ukrainian economy is also on the brink of collapse. Many buildings and structures have been destroyed. It's a living hell, with no end in sight. There is serious discussion of a second stage, which is expected to be even worse than the first". Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 31/10/2022, Moscow City Court.			
13223/23	Krasnoperov v. Russia	21/03/2023	<b>Dmitriy Vladimirovich KRASNOPEROV</b> 1985 Moscow	Konstantin Aleksandrovich MALTSEV	On 09/05/2022 the applicant held up a sign that read "No to war" in central Moscow. Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 21/11/2022, Moscow City Court.		5,000	
13844/23	Krivtsov and Vorobyeva v. Russia	07/03/2023	<b>Nikolay Aleskandrovich KRIVTSOV</b> 1991 Moscow  <b>Anna Viktorovna VOROBYEVA</b>	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 02/04/22, Nikolay Krivtsov put up crosses in a public park in Moscow, displaying the question, "How many died in Mariupol? And what for?" Fine: RUB 45,000. Final decision: 09/11/2022, Moscow City Court.  On 27/07/22, the police accessed Anna		5,000 (each)	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1986 Tambov		Vorobyeva's social media profile, recording a photo from the Bucha massacre accompanied by the text, "Did any Russian journalists visit Bucha and capture footage of the bodies that had come back to life? International criminologists and reporters have been extensively documenting them, yet they remain where they were shown in the supposedly fake videos ..." Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 07/11/2022, Tambov Regional Court.			
14506/23	Lyubimov and Latushkin v. Russia	24/02/2023	<b>Ivan Leonidovich LYUBIMOV</b> 1985 Yekaterinburg  <b>Artem Igorevich LATUSHKIN</b> 1985 Moscow	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 23/06/2022, Ivan Lyubimov held up a banner which read, in part, "No man is an island, entire of itself. Each is a piece of the continent, a part of the main ... Therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee. Since 24 February, 10,308 civilians in Ukraine have been killed or injured due to war". Fine: RUB 45,000. Final decision: 26/10/2022, Sverdlovsk Regional Court.  On 23/04/2022, Artem Latushkin held up a sign "No to war" in central Moscow. Fine: RUB 40,000. Final decision: 28/10/2022, Moscow City Court.		5,000 (each)	
14801/23	Saltevskiy v. Russia	16/03/2023	<b>Vladimir Aleksandrovich SALTEVSKIY</b>	Natalya Andreyevna BARANOVA	On 09/05/2022, the applicant participated in "the Immortal Regiment" march in Novosibirsk with a banner: "Immortal		5,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
			1986 Novosibirsk		Regiment Saltevskiy Pert Fedorovich, private: I am ashamed of you, grandchildren! We have fought for peace, you have chosen war. We have defeated old Fascism, we will defeat the new one". Fine: RUB 37,000. Final decision: 16/11/2022, Novosibirsk Regional Court.			
16275/23	Vinogradova v. Russia	30/03/2023	<b>Katerina Aleksandrovna VINOGRADOVA</b> 1989 Novosibirsk	Olga Yuryevna NECHAYEVA	On her page on the Russian social network VKontakte, the applicant posted a photograph of a white sheet of paper with the text, "No to War. Don't be silent!". Fine: RUB 20,000. Final decision: 30/11/2022, Novosibirsk Regional Court.		5,000	
16701/23	Kuksina v. Russia	05/04/2023	<b>Nataliya Sergeyevna KUKSINA</b> 1978 Moscow	Anna Yevgenyevna BOCHILO	On 19/05/2022, the applicant published the following post on Facebook: "Yes, our army is more likely to 'fall apart' by autumn; at least the Ukrainian Armed Forces are being supplied with weapons and can announce mobilisation while we only have armchair warriors and poorly trained contract soldiers who still do not understand what they are doing there". Fine: RUB 30,000. Final decision: 07/12/2022, Moscow City Court.	456	TBD	
16711/23	Chebotar v. Russia	30/03/2023	<b>Ivan Kirillovich CHEBOTAR</b> 1986 St Petersburg	Nikifor Yuryevich IVANOV	On 07/09/2022, the applicant, a deputy of the municipal council, publicly supported a decision by the Smolninskiy municipal council to appeal to the deputies of the State Duma with a proposal to accuse Putin of	599	TBD	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					treason in order to remove him from office. Fine: RUB 44,000. Final decision: 01/12/2022, St Petersburg City Court.			
16717/23	Baltrukov v. Russia	30/03/2023	<b>Dmitriy Nikolayevich BALTRUKOV</b> 1979 St Petersburg	Nikifor Yuryevich IVANOV	On 07/09/2022, the applicant, a deputy of the municipal council, publicly supported a decision by the Smolninskiy municipal council to appeal to the deputies of the State Duma with a proposal to accuse Putin of treason in order to remove him from office. Fine: RUB 44,000. Final decision: 06/12/2022, St Petersburg City Court.	435	TBD	
16721/23	Kiseleva v. Russia	30/03/2023	<b>Anna Sergeyevna KISELEVA</b> 1985 St Petersburg	Nikifor Yuryevich IVANOV	On 07/09/2022, the applicant, a deputy of the municipal council, publicly supported a decision by the Smolninskiy municipal council to appeal to the deputies of the State Duma with a proposal to accuse Putin of treason in order to remove him from office. Fine: RUB 44,000. Final decision: 12/12/2022, St Petersburg City Court.	649	TBD	
17386/23	Goldina v. Russia	06/04/2023	<b>Katalisa Sergeyevna GOLDINA</b> 1972 Novosibirsk	Olga Yuryevna NECHAYEVA	On 16/07/2022, the police arrested the applicant at a street café in Novosibirsk as she sat with a laptop, its cover adorned with stickers displaying pictures of children and the phrases “No to war”, “Ukraine, I am with you”, and “Sunny circle, sky around”, a line from a children’s song about peace. She was fined RUB 35,000 for showing these stickers publicly in the café. Final decision:		9,000	

NOVAYA GAZETA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth/Incorp'n Place of Residence	Represented by	Summary of facts Domestic decisions	Pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Non-pecuniary damage claimed <sup>1</sup>	Costs and expenses claimed <sup>1</sup>
					06/12/2022, Novosibirsk Regional Court.  On 26/07/2022, the police accessed her social media profile and documented a photo featuring the phrase "No to war". She was fined RUB 35,000 (twice). Final decisions: 07/12/2022 and 08/12/2022, Novosibirsk Regional Court.			
30201/23	Pshenichnova v. Russia	19/06/2023	<b>Emiliya Minibayevna PSHENICHNOVA</b> 1986 Ufa	Irina Vadimovna SERGEYEVA	The applicant was convicted for tweeting a call to come to the Victory Day parade with photographs of war veterans and the text "They did not fight for this!". Fine: RUB 50,000. Final decision: 25/04/2023, Moscow City Court.		Not claimed	

<sup>1</sup> All amounts are expressed in euros.

<sup>2</sup> The amount to be determined by the Court.