

27 YEARS
OF MEMBERSHIP
IN THE COUNCIL
OF EUROPE



**A REVIEW OF GYLA'S
SUCCESSFUL STRATEGIC LITIGATION
AT THE STRASBOURG COURT**

Georgian Young Lawyers' Association

27 YEARS OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

A REVIEW OF GYLA'S SUCCESSFUL STRATEGIC LITIGATION AT THE STRASBOURG COURT

**Tbilisi
2026**

RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PUBLICATION:

TAMAR ONIANI

ALEKSANDRE PATARAIA

It is prohibited to reprint, reproduce or distribute the materials of this publication for commercial purposes without prior written permission of Georgian Young Lawyers Association.

**J. Kakhidze street №15, Tbilisi, Georgia
(+995 32) 295 23 53, 293 61 01
www.gyla.ge**

© 2026, Georgian Young Lawyers Association

Contents

Introduction	5
Right to Life (article 2)	5
1. Tsintsabadze v Georgia	5
2. Dzidzava v Russia	6
3. Maisuradze v. Georgia.....	6
4. Vazagashvili and Shanava v. Georgia	7
5. Edzgeradze v. Georgia	7
6. A and B v. Georgia.....	8
7. Gaidukevich v. Georgia.....	8
8. Matkava and Others v. Russia	9
9. Storimans-Verhulst and Others v. Russia	9
Prohibition of torture (Article 3)	9
10. Chokheli and Others v. Russia.....	9
11. Goguadze v. Georgia	10
12. Women’s Initiatives Support Group and Others v. Georgia	10
13. Kvirikashvili v. Georgia	11
14. Ochigava v. Georgia.....	11
15. Mamulashvili v. Georgia	11
The right to a fair trial (Article 6)	12
16. Megrelishvili v. Georgia	12
17. Tlashadze and Kakashvili v. Georgia.....	12
18. Kalandia v. Georgia	13
19. Shubitidze v. Georgia.....	13
20. Glonti and Others v. Georgia	14
Respect for private and family life (Article 8)	14
21. N.Ts. and Others v. Georgia	14
22. Jugeli and Others v. Georgia	15
23. A. D. and Others v. Georgia.....	15
Freedom of assembly and association (Article 11).....	15
24. Kakabadze and Others v. Georgia	15

25.	Peradze and Others v. Georgia.....	16
26.	Tsaava and Others v. Georgia	16
27.	Mekvabishvili v. Georgia	17
	Right to property (Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1)	18
28.	Klaus and Yuri Kiladze v. Georgia	18
	Right to free elections (Article 3 of Additional Protocol 1)	19
30.	Ramishvili v. Georgia	19

Introduction

On April 27, 2026, Georgia will [mark](#) 27 years since becoming a member state of the Council of Europe in 1999. During this period, the country's engagement with the European human rights system has played a crucial role in shaping domestic standards of rights protection and accountability.

The Georgian Young Lawyers Association (GYLA) began litigating before the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in 2004 and, over the past 22 years, has submitted more than 180 applications. Notably, more than 50 of these concern victims of the 2008 Russia–Georgia war.

Throughout this period, GYLA's strategic litigation before the Court has had a profound impact not only on safeguarding the rights of individual applicants, but also on revealing structural human rights deficiencies in Georgia and contributing to their resolution or mitigation. Through its work, GYLA has also helped shape the broader evolution of European human rights jurisprudence, supporting the development of important legal standards in areas such as state accountability, the prohibition of ill-treatment, due process guarantees, and protection for vulnerable groups.

It is particularly significant that GYLA continues to operate in an increasingly repressive and hostile environment within Georgia. Despite heightened risks, pressure on civil society, and attempts to restrict fundamental freedoms, strategic litigation remains one of the organization's core priorities and most effective tools of human rights protection.

Today, GYLA is pursuing numerous cases before the ECtHR that address ongoing, systemic human rights violations in Georgia, including cases concerning ill-treatment, violations of freedom of peaceful assembly, political justice, and abuses by law enforcement agencies. In parallel, GYLA continues to litigate cases against the Russian Federation arising from the August 2008 war and its long-term consequences for civilians.

Over the years, GYLA has achieved a number of strategically significant victories at the ECtHR. These judgments have not only delivered justice to victims but have also created binding legal precedents that influence domestic reforms, judicial practice, and the broader protection of human rights in Georgia. This document provides an overview of the key decisions that reflect the organization's considerable contribution to the European human rights system.

Right to Life (article 2)

1. Tsintsabadze v Georgia

[Tsintsabadze v. Georgia \(2011\)](#) – no. 35403/06 – The Court examined the death of the applicant's son, who was found [hanged](#) in a prison pantry. The deceased's mother claimed that he had been beaten and killed rather than committed suicide. The Court found that the authorities had failed to conduct an effective investigation into the death, which led to a violation of the procedural limb of Article 2 (right to life) and placed the case in a wider group concerning deaths in custody, ill-treatment,

and systemic investigative deficiencies in Georgia. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2006.**

In the process of supervising the execution of the judgment, the Committee of Ministers established a group of cases, known as the Tsintsabadze Group, **which is under enhanced supervision.** This group of cases has enabled the Council of Europe to carry out sustained institutional monitoring of the independence, effectiveness, and structural capacity of investigative bodies handling torture and death-in-custody cases in Georgia.

2. Dzidzava v Russia

[Dzidzava v. Russia \(2016\)](#) – no. 16363/07 - The case concerns inhuman treatment and [violation](#) of the right to life of a Georgian citizen during her deportation from Russia.

On 4 October 2006, the applicant's wife was arrested by the Russian Federation and placed in a detention centre for foreigners in St Petersburg, where she was held in degrading and difficult conditions of detention. Despite her serious health condition, the applicant's wife was not provided with adequate medical care. On 16 October 2006, she was taken by bus from St Petersburg to Moscow airport for deportation. During the approximately 9-hour journey, despite her health condition, she was not allowed to roll down the window. After getting off the bus at the airport, she fell down after taking a few steps and died. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2007.** The European Court found that Russia had violated Articles 2 (deprivation of life), 3 (prohibition of torture) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

The case of Berdzenishvili and Others v. Russia is included in the group of cases whose enforcement is **subject to enhanced supervision.**

3. Maisuradze v. Georgia

[Maisuradze v. Georgia \(2018\)](#) – no. 44973/09 – The case concerns the death of the applicant's son, Giorgi Toroshelidze, in prison following ineffective and delayed treatment for tuberculosis and the inadequate [investigation](#) into the matter. Toroshelidze was diagnosed with tuberculosis on 19 December 2008 and did not receive effective treatment for approximately 4 months and 2 weeks. **The case was referred to the European Court of Justice in 2009.** The European Court held that such a long delay in providing adequate treatment, especially in circumstances where the disease was rapidly progressive, could not be justified by the late receipt of the results of a drug susceptibility test, particularly in circumstances where the test could have been ordered earlier. In addition, according to the European Court, despite the fact that the investigation into the death of Toroshelidze was initiated immediately and investigative actions were carried out in a timely manner, significant shortcomings were made by the investigative department within the framework of the investigation. In addition, the institutional connection between the investigative body and the persons involved in the incident raised serious doubts about the independence of the investigation conducted. As a result, violations of the substantive and procedural parts of Article 2 (right to life) were established in the case.

The case is included in the [group](#) of cases “Makharadze and Sikharulidze v. Georgia”. The implementation of this group is subject to standard supervision and within its framework, the Council of Europe monitors the steps taken in the direction of medical care and tuberculosis treatment in penitentiary institutions.

4. Vazagashvili and Shanava v. Georgia

[Vazagashvili and Shanava v. Georgia \(2019\)](#) – no. 50375/07 - In the case of Vazagashvili and Shanava v. Georgia (2019) – no. 50375/07 – the European Court examined the applicant’s complaint concerning the killing of the applicant’s son during a police operation and the subsequent [ineffective](#) investigation. **The case was brought before the European Court in 2007.**

The Court found that the first investigation into the murder had been incomplete, as it had been conducted by the police officers involved in the shooting. The second investigation, which had resulted in a conviction, had been conducted only a few years after the crime had been committed and had been based, to some extent, on the investigative work carried out by the first applicant himself. The Court noted in particular that the first applicant’s attempts to expose police misconduct and corruption had ultimately led to his murder by a police officer, which highlighted the authorities’ indifference to prosecuting the perpetrators of the original crime.

The decision regarding enforcement continues to be considered within the Tsintsabadze case group, which is subject to **enhanced supervision**.

5. Edzgeradze v. Georgia

[Edzgeradze v. Georgia \(2022\)](#) – no. 59333/16 - The European Court found a violation of the procedural limb of Article 2 (right to life) of the Convention. The case concerned Mamuka Mikautadze, who committed suicide in the Tbilisi Sea the day after being questioned by the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Mamuka Mikautadze was questioned on 5 July 2013 as part of an investigation into drug offences, during which he was allegedly subjected to physical and psychological violence. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2016.**

The European Court assessed the investigation as a whole and drew attention to the fact that the Prosecutor’s Office closed the investigation in 2016 due to the absence of a crime, noting that the investigation had left crucial questions unanswered. The Court found that the investigation into Mikautadze’s case had not been conducted thoroughly, which undermined its effectiveness. The Court also noted that the investigation had been opened on 6 July 2013 and closed on 25 March 2016, but that no investigative action had been taken between November 2014 and March 2016, and that the Government had not provided any explanation for such investigative inaction.

The enforcement of the judgment is still pending in the Tsintsabadze case group, which is subject to **enhanced supervision**.

6. A and B v. Georgia

[A and B v. Georgia \(2022\)](#) – no. 73975/16 - The case concerns domestic violence and femicide, specifically the femicide of a 19-year-old woman (A's daughter and B's mother) by her ex-husband, a police officer, who shot her with his service weapon in a local park following a history of systematic domestic violence. This was compounded by a passive and compliant attitude on the part of the law enforcement authorities. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2016.**

The Court found that the authorities had violated Article 2 of the Convention, in accordance with both its substantive positive obligations and procedural obligations, in conjunction with Article 14 of the Convention, by failing to implement protective measures following reports of violence and by failing to effectively investigate the actions of the police officers and prosecutors. The investigation also ignored any gender discrimination that might have influenced the conduct of the law enforcement agencies. The Court stressed the urgent need for a thorough investigation into the inaction of the law enforcement authorities, which might have been due to gender discrimination, particularly given the perpetrator's status as a police officer, which likely contributed to a sense of impunity. Furthermore, the Court found the prosecution and conviction process to be deficient for failing to consider the role of gender discrimination in the killing or whether gender discrimination had influenced the police's tolerance of violence, or whether officers had turned a blind eye to the perpetrator's conduct. The Court found it particularly disturbing that the perpetrator used his law enforcement position to commit violence in the context of ongoing domestic violence, which clearly posed an immediate threat to the victim.

The case is part of the "Thekhelidze v. Georgia" [group](#) of cases, which is subject to **enhanced supervision**. The cases in this group concern the protection of victims of domestic violence, the State's preventive obligations, and systemic problems of gender-based discrimination in Georgia.

7. Gaidukevich v. Georgia

[Gaidukevich v. Georgia \(2023\)](#) – no. 38650/18 - In the case, the European Court examined the State's failure to take appropriate preventive measures to protect a victim of domestic violence, despite the fact that law enforcement authorities had been informed on numerous occasions about the violence perpetrated against the applicant's son. Despite repeated reports, the authorities failed to provide effective protection, resulting in the death of the victim. **The case was referred to the European Court in 2018.** The Court found that the State had failed to fulfil its positive obligation to protect life and had also failed to ensure an effective investigation, including by failing to assess the possible role of gender. As a result, there had been a violation of both the substantive and procedural limbs of Article 2 (right to life) in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

The case is included in the [group](#) of cases "Thekhelidze v. Georgia", which is **subject to enhanced supervision**.

8. Matkava and Others v. Russia

[Matkava and Others v. Russia \(2023\)](#) – no. 3963/18 – The case concerns the murder of [Giga Otkhozoria](#) by a so-called border guard of the de facto authorities of Abkhazia in 2016, on territory controlled by Georgia. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2018.**

Although the Russian Federation referred to Abkhazia as a “sovereign state” in its written submissions to the Court, the European Court of Human Rights upheld the applicants’ request and ordered the Russian Federation to provide copies of all investigative materials obtained by the de facto authorities of Abkhazia in the course of their investigation into the murder of Giga Otkhozoria.

The Russian Federation failed to comply with this obligation. The case of Giga Otkhozoria is of state importance, as the Court assessed the extent to which the Russian Federation exercises effective control over the territory of Abkhazia and the degree to which it bears responsibility for the actions of representatives of the de facto authorities of Abkhazia. The Court found that the Russian Federation had violated the substantive and procedural limbs of Article 2 (right to life) of the Convention. It also found a violation of Article 38, as the Russian authorities had failed to cooperate with the Court in the fact-finding process.

The case falls under the category of “Mamasakhlisi and Others v. Russia,” [group cases](#), the enforcement of which is subject to enhanced supervision.

9. Storimans-Verhulst and Others v. Russia

[Storimans-Verhulst and Others v. Russia \(2025\)](#) – no. 26302/10 – The case concerns the killing of Dutch cameraman Stan Storimans in the town of Gori during the August 2008 war. **The case was brought before the European Court of Human Rights in 2010.** The applicants alleged that the cameraman had been killed by Russian ammunition, which was exclusively available in the arsenal of the Russian Federation. [The Court found that the Russian Federation](#) had failed to conduct an effective and independent investigation into the circumstances of the journalist’s death and had therefore violated the procedural limb of Article 2 (right to life).

The procedure for supervising the execution of the judgment (standard or enhanced) has not yet been [determined](#).

Prohibition of torture (Article 3)

10. Chokheli and Others v. Russia

[Chokheli and Others v. Russia \(2016\)](#) – no. 16369/07 – The case concerns the detention of Georgian citizens by the Russian Federation, their placement in inhuman conditions in police stations, the imposition of fines, and their subsequent deportation from the Russian Federation to Georgia by passenger or cargo aircraft. **GYLA submitted an application to the European Court of Human Rights in 2007 on behalf of 11 individuals affected by these collective expulsions.** The European Court found

that the Russian Federation had violated Articles 3 (prohibition of torture), 5 (right to liberty and security), Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens), and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention in respect of 8 individuals represented by GYLA.

This case forms part of the judgment *Berdzenishvili and Others v. Russia* (2016, nos. 14594/07, 14597/07, 14976/07, 14978/07, 15221/07, 16369/07, 16706/07), the execution of which is subject to [enhanced supervision](#).

11. Gogvadze v. Georgia

[Gogvadze v. Georgia \(2019\)](#) – no. 40009/12 – Nikoloz Gogvadze was arrested on 26 May 2011 during the so-called Kintsvisi special operation. During and after his arrest, Gogvadze was subjected to ill-treatment by law enforcement officers in order to punish him and extract a confession. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2012.** The European Court found that the applicant had sustained multiple injuries while under the control of the authorities—injuries he did not have prior to his arrest.

The investigation into Gogvadze’s ill-treatment was ineffective, marked by significant shortcomings in the investigative process. Gogvadze’s case is included in the Tsintsabadze group of cases and is subject to **enhanced supervision**.

12. Women’s Initiatives Support Group and Others v. Georgia

[Women’s Initiatives Support Group and Others v. Georgia \(2021\)](#) - nos. 73204/13, 74959/13 - **The case concerned** events that took place on 17 May 2013, the International Day against Homophobia and Transphobia. On that day, the applicants had planned to hold a peaceful demonstration aimed at raising public awareness of LGBTQI discrimination in Georgia. The peaceful demonstration failed to take place because the State did not ensure the security of the event. The actions of a group of radical counter-demonstrators went beyond the scope of a peaceful assembly and took on an unlawful and violent character, endangering public order as well as the life, health and safety of the applicants. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2013.** The European Court found violations of Articles 3 (prohibition of torture), 11 (freedom of assembly and association) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention.

The European Court held that the authorities failed to take effective measures to protect LGBTQI people from counter-demonstrators, despite being duly informed of the risks. In addition, evidence – in particular video footage filmed by independent journalists – confirmed the incitement of violent acts by State agents. The Court also found that the unprecedented scale of the violence was influenced by the authorities’ inaction, including their failure to conduct a timely and objective investigation into past attacks on the LGBT community, and referred to the case “*Identoba and Others v. Georgia*” (2015, no. 73235/12).

This case is part of the **Identoba group**, which is under enhanced supervision.

13. Kvirikashvili v. Georgia

[Kvirikashvili v. Georgia \(2022\)](#) - no. 34720/16 - In August 2014, the applicant, Mr Kvirikashvili, was stopped by the police for an alleged traffic violation. After he protested against the imposition of a fine, the officers physically and verbally abused him and arrested him. The day after his arrest, the applicant was found guilty of disobeying the lawful orders of law enforcement officers and fined 600 GEL. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2016.** The European Court found that, despite Mr Kvirikashvili's consistent statements, supported by medical evidence, there had been no timely or adequate investigation into the incident. As a result, there had been a violation of both the substantive and procedural limbs of Article 3 of the European Convention.

Kvirikashvili's case is included in the Tsintsabadze group of cases and is subject to **enhanced supervision**.

14. Ochigava v. Georgia

[Ochigava v. Georgia \(2023\)](#) - no. 14142/15 - **The case was referred to the European Court in 2015.** In the case, the European Court examined the facts of the applicant's [systematic ill-treatment by prison staff](#), which included severe beatings and solitary confinement. Although the national investigation led to the conviction of seven individuals for the crimes committed against the applicant, the European Court of Human Rights highlighted the lengthy delays and shortcomings of the investigation. In particular, according to the Court, while the applicant had complained about ill-treatment in October 2012, it took the national authorities more than five years to identify the perpetrators. The Court found that there had been periods of inaction by the investigative authorities between 2012 and 2016, and that the applicant had unjustifiably lacked victim status, preventing him from participating in the investigation. According to the Court, "justice delayed is often justice denied". The Court found that the authorities had failed to conduct a timely and effective investigation into the ill-treatment. As a result, it found a violation of both the substantive and procedural parts of Article 3 (prohibition of torture).

The Ochigava case falls within the Tsintsabadze group of cases and is subject to **enhanced supervision**.

15. Mamulashvili v. Georgia

[Mamulashvili v. Georgia \(2024\)](#) - no. 15355/15 - **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2015.** In the case, the European Court examined the facts of [torture and ill-treatment](#) of the applicant in a penitentiary institution, severe beatings, delays in medical care and ineffective investigation of these facts. In particular, **Zaza Mamulashvili first applied to the European Court of Human Rights in 2010**, where he complained about the beatings and ill-treatment by Erekle Kodua, as well as the conditions of detention and inadequate medical care in the penitentiary institution (Mamulashvili v Georgia application no. 71672/10). On 17 February 2014, the State admitted the violation committed against the applicant by a unilateral declaration. It is noteworthy that the applicant was subjected to repeated ill-treatment in 2012 precisely because of the complaint filed before the Strasbourg Court. The victim applied to the prosecutor's office in 2012, but the investigative

body did not investigate the case, despite the fact that the latter was aware of the systematic practice of torture in penitentiary institutions after the publication of the so-called prison records. Moreover, in 2014, the applicant learned that the persons involved in his torture had been promoted in the penitentiary system and the Ministry of Internal Affairs and had occupied various high positions. Since the state did not intend to investigate the case even under the new government and continued to create criminal procedural barriers for the applicant, Zaza Mamulashvili, with the assistance of GYLA, repeatedly applied to the European Court of Human Rights. The Court found that there had been a violation of both the substantive and procedural parts of Article 3 of the Convention (prohibition of torture).

Mamulashvili's case is included in the Tsintsabadze group of cases and is subject to **enhanced supervision**.

The right to a fair trial (Article 6)

16. Megrelishvili v. Georgia

[Megrelishvili v. Georgia \(2020\)](#) – no. 30364/09 - The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2009. The Court found a violation of Article 6(1) (right to a fair hearing) of the European Convention on Human Rights against Georgia. According to the judgment, the applicant was unjustifiably denied the right to summon witnesses during the search, and the domestic courts failed to properly consider his argument that the police had [planted drugs](#).

The Committee of Ministers continues to monitor the implementation of the general measures in relation to the shortcomings identified in the case within the framework of the [Kartvelishvili](#) and [Rostomashvili](#) groups.

17. Tlashadze and Kakashvili v. Georgia

[Tlashadze and Kakashvili v. Georgia \(2021\)](#) – no. 41674/10 - The applicants were representatives of various opposition parties/movements and actively [participated](#) in mass protests against the government organized by the opposition parties in 2009. In its application to the European Court, GYLA argued that in 2009–10, law enforcement officers had found firearms and/or narcotics in the applicants' possession during personal searches, and that the domestic courts had based their convictions solely on the search and detention protocols, the testimonies of the police officers who conducted the searches and detentions, and the evidence seized as a result of the searches. **The case was referred to the European Court in 2010.** The European Court found a violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention because the applicants' searches were conducted on the basis of intelligence information, the accuracy and reliability of which were not properly assessed by the national courts either at the pre-trial or substantive hearings; the applicants' personal searches were conducted under the regime of urgent necessity, however, the resolutions on urgent necessity did not contain any justification for the need to conduct the searches under such a regime; and the

national court did not verify the lawfulness of the searches or assess the fact that the police officers who gave evidence had a direct interest in the case.

The Committee of Ministers continues to monitor the implementation of the general measures regarding the shortcomings identified in the case within the framework of the [Kartvelishvili](#) and [Rostomashvili](#) groups.

18. Kalandia v. Georgia

[Kalandia v. Georgia \(2021\)](#) - (no. 57255/10) - The applicant, Tengiz Kalandia, [alleged](#) that in 2009 he was drugged for actively supporting his opposition-leaning friend. The European Court found that, when conducting a search based on operational information, the domestic court failed to verify the accuracy and reliability of the information; the applicant's detention and personal search were unlawful and unjustified. The applicant was also not given the opportunity to invite witnesses during the search. The evidence in Kalandia's case consisted of the testimonies of the police officers who were directly involved in his detention and search and who were also involved in the investigation of his case. The above-mentioned persons were representatives of the prosecution and, therefore, were interested in the outcome of the case, and their testimonies were not supported by any other reliable and neutral evidence. In addition, the testimonies of the police officers were essentially contradictory. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2010.** As a result, the European Court found a violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial).

The Committee of Ministers continues to monitor the implementation of the general measures regarding the shortcomings identified in the case within the framework of the [Kartvelishvili](#) and [Rostomashvili](#) groups.

19. Shubitidze v. Georgia

[Shubitidze v. Georgia \(2021\)](#) - no. 43854/12 - In the [case](#) in question, the applicant alleged that he had been drugged (marijuana) by police officers in 2011. He was arrested by police officers on 26 June 2011 on suspicion of being under the influence of drugs. An examination established that the applicant was not under the influence of drugs at the time of the test, although traces of cannabis were found in his urine. Subsequently, the police officers, "based on operational information," conducted a body search of the applicant without a court order, which was not attended by witnesses. The court sentenced the applicant to 3 years' imprisonment and a fine of 2,000 GEL. He was also disqualified from driving and engaging in various activities for 5 years. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2012.** The European Court found a violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention due to the failure to verify the accuracy and reliability of the operational information, the failure to consider the admissibility of the evidence, and the failure to properly assess the applicant's main arguments.

The Committee of Ministers continues to monitor the implementation of the general measures regarding the shortcomings identified in the case within the framework of the [Kartvelishvili](#) and [Rostomashvili](#) groups.

20. Glonti and Others v. Georgia

[Glonti and Others v. Georgia \(2025\)](#) - no. 13708/18 - The [case](#) concerns the prosecution of employees of the Ministry of Defence for alleged embezzlement and abuse of official authority in the so-called “Cables Case”. **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2018.** The applicants alleged that they had not had a proper opportunity to present their defence, including due to the unavailability of certain evidence and documents and the legal re-qualification of the charges, which they only learned about when they were handed down the judgment of the Court of Appeal. Before issuing the new judgment, the Tbilisi Court of Appeal did not warn the applicants that their charges might be re-qualified. The trial was not adjourned for additional consideration and the elements of the new charges were not discussed in court. The applicants only learned of the legal assessment of the facts when they were served with the judgment of the Court of Appeal. The Court noted that in such circumstances, while the European Court allows for the possibility of reclassification of the crime, the defence must have a practical, timely and effective opportunity to present its defence. The European Court found a violation of Article 6 of the Convention (right to a fair trial). The case has been granted the status of **a lead case (key case)** and its execution is subject to standard procedure supervision.

Respect for private and family life (Article 8)

21. N.Ts. and Others v. Georgia

[N.Ts. and Others v. Georgia \(2016\)](#) - no. 71776/12 - The decision concerns a violation of the right to respect for private and family life in the context of the protection of the best interests of the child. **The case was referred to the European Court in 2012.** The applicant in the case was an aunt with whom her three minor nephews were growing up. After the death of the applicant’s sister (the children’s mother), the children’s place of residence was determined by the national courts to be the place of residence of their father. The European Court fully shared the arguments presented by GYLA and found a violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, since the children were not properly involved in the proceedings, the national courts and social workers failed to take into account the children’s best interests and did not take into account their wish to live with the aunt’s family when making the decision.

“N.Ts. and Others v. Georgia” is a leading case. It is subject to standard supervision. The enforcement process of the decision had a significant positive impact on subsequent legislative changes, including the adoption of the Law on Social Work and the Code of the Rights of the Child, as well as amendments to the Code of Civil Procedure on the participation of children in court proceedings, although the sharp gap between legislative guarantees and their practical implementation remains a challenge.

22. Jugeli and Others v. Georgia

[Jugeli and Others v. Georgia \(2017\)](#) – no. 38342/05 - The applicants argued that a thermal power plant located four metres from the applicants’ apartment building in the centre of Tbilisi posed a threat to their health and made it impossible to exercise their right to live in a [safe environment](#). **The case was brought before the European Court of Human Rights in 2005.**

Despite the applicants’ requests, the domestic courts did not order the plant to take specific measures to mitigate the damage. Such measures could have included requiring the plant to install special filters on its furnaces or ordering it to carry out the activities causing the damage away from its premises. The European Court shared the arguments presented by GYLA and found that Georgia had violated the applicants’ right to respect for their private and family life due to the environmental pollution in their place of residence (Article 8 of the European Convention).

The supervision of the execution of the case has now been closed. During the execution process, the Council of Europe monitored important legislative changes aimed, among other things, at improving the regulatory framework governing environmental assessment and environmental liability.

23. A. D. and Others v. Georgia

[A. D. and Others v. Georgia \(2022\)](#) – no 57864/17 - The European Court of Human Rights found a violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights in the case of three transgender men. **The application was sent to the European Court in 2019.** The applicants applied to the European Court because they had been unable to obtain legal recognition of their gender in Georgia and to have the gender marking on their identity documents [changed](#) to reflect their gender identity. The Court considered that the absence of a clear legal basis left the decision-making authorities with a wide discretion, which created the risk of arbitrary decisions in the examination of applications for legal recognition of gender.

The case has been granted lead case status and its execution is subject to **enhanced supervision**.

Freedom of assembly and association (Article 11)

24. Kakabadze and Others v. Georgia

[Kakabadze and Others v. Georgia \(2012\)](#) – no. 1484/07 – **The case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights in 2006.** In the case, the European Court found that the applicants’ arrest and 30-day detention were arbitrary and not based on clear and foreseeable legal grounds, and that the examination of the case by the President of the Tbilisi Court of Appeal, based on written testimonies by bailiffs, without hearing the applicants, constituted a complete disregard for the elementary procedural requirements of a fair trial. The Court also concluded that the State had failed to provide sufficient and relevant justification for the interference with freedom of assembly and had applied a disproportionate sanction. The European Court, in addition to the violation of freedom of assembly

(Article 11), found a violation of the right to liberty (Article 5), the right to a fair trial (Article 6), and the right to appeal in criminal cases (Article 2 of Protocol No. 7).

Supervision of the execution of the aforementioned decision is currently closed. In the process of execution, significant changes were made to the Criminal Procedure and Administrative Offences Codes, including the revision of the powers of the bailiff, the introduction of oral hearings, and the principle of adversarial proceedings. The maximum term of administrative detention was reduced from 90 days to 15 days.

However, it is worth noting that challenges related to unjustified detention, unpredictable prohibitions, ensuring a fair trial, and disproportionate sanctions remain serious problems. This is reflected in the arbitrary detention of participants in the ongoing protests since 2024 and their administrative offence trials, as well as the amendments made to the Administrative and Criminal Codes in 2024–2025, which disproportionately increased administrative sanctions (including the extension of the term of administrative imprisonment to 60 days), as well as the introduction of urgent, unpredictable administrative offences and crimes that restrict the freedom of assembly.¹

25. Peradze and Others v. Georgia

[Peradze and Others v. Georgia \(2022\)](#) - no. 5631/16 - **The case was referred to the European Court in 2016.** In the case, the European Court examined the police’s dispersal of a peaceful assembly and the detention of seven applicants for using obscene slogans during a demonstration against the Panorama Tbilisi construction project. The applicants alleged that the interference was disproportionate and violated their freedom of assembly and expression. The European Court found that the national courts had failed to consider the level of disruption to public life caused by the applicants’ conduct, had not considered the peaceful nature of the protest and had focused solely on its form, and had not assessed the context and purpose of the application. As a result, it found that Article 11 (freedom of assembly) and Article 10 (freedom of expression) were applicable.

The case belongs to the [group](#) of cases “Makarashvili and Others v. Georgia”, the execution of which is subject to **enhanced supervision**. In the context of the group of cases, the European Court of Human Rights monitors the legislative framework and administrative practice related to violations of freedom of assembly and administrative detention.

26. Tsaava and Others v. Georgia

[Tsaava and Others v. Georgia \(2025\)](#) - nos. 13186/20, 16757/20, 20129/21, 20175/21, 39382/21 - The judgment of the Grand Chamber of the European Court concerns the violent dispersal of a demonstration in front of the Parliament on 20-21 June 2019 (the so-called [Gavrilov Night](#)), during which 26 applicants, including journalists and peaceful demonstrators, were injured by the use of force by the police, including rubber bullets (four of whom either suffered damage to their eyesight

¹ See GYLA et al., Human Rights Crisis in Georgia Following the 2024 Parliamentary Elections, 28 November 2024–28 February 2025, 2025, pp. 82-105, <https://www.gyla.ge/post/adamianis-uplebata-krizisi-dokumentirebis-angarishi> [21.04.4026].; Also, Assessment of the Human Rights Situation in Georgia in 2025 by the Georgian Young Lawyers Association, 10 December 2025, pp. 18-22, <https://gyla.ge/post/adamianisuplebebisagartveloshi-2025-GYLA> [21.04.4026]; Also, GYLA, Georgian Dream continues unconstitutional attack on freedom of assembly with new legislative initiative, 09.12.2025, <https://www.gyla.ge/post/GYLA-shekrebistavisuplebaze-shetevisshehexeb> [21.04.4026].

or lost their eyes completely). Applications in the case were submitted to the European Court by GYLA in 2021 on behalf of 22 individuals (Baghashvili and Others v. Georgia; Kurdovanidze and Others v. Georgia). The applicants alleged that the force used was excessive and that they had been ill-treated, especially given that they had been peacefully participating in the demonstration. The State had failed to ensure an effective investigation.

The judgment in the case was delivered on 7 May 2024, which was subsequently appealed by the applicants to the Grand Chamber. **In its judgment of 11 December 2025, the Grand Chamber explained in detail the procedure for the use of kinetic means (rubber bullets), which, in this regard, is a precedent not only for Georgia, but also throughout Europe. In fact, this judgment laid the foundation for the confirmation of the European standard regarding kinetic means through the Strasbourg Court mechanism, and gave binding legal force to the existing soft law on this issue.** The Court found that there had been a violation of both the substantive and procedural parts of Article 3 (prohibition of torture) of the Convention, as well as violations of Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 11 (freedom of assembly).

The case has the status of a leading case and is subject to enhanced supervision. The execution of this case in terms of general measures will lead to the alignment of the regulatory framework for kinetic means in Georgia with the European Convention. The events of June 20-21, 2019 have not lost their relevance in today's reality, and to this day, peaceful protests are suppressed with the use of special means - rubber bullets, tear gas, water cannon, pepper spray - which were often dangerous to life and health.

27. Mekvabishvili v. Georgia

[Mekvabishvili v. Georgia \(2026\)](#) – no. 37567/23 – The applicant was detained in March 2023 during a demonstration against the so-called Russian law, despite not standing on the road or obstructing traffic. He argued before the European Court that his detention was [unlawful](#), violent, and aimed at suppressing his participation in a peaceful protest. **The case was referred to the Court in 2023.**

The European Court found that the authorities failed to justify the need for interference with the applicant's freedom of expression and assembly, noting that the demonstration did not aim to obstruct the work of parliament and that no evidence other than police statements supported the accusations against him. The Court concluded that the domestic authorities had not provided sufficient, relevant, or reliable grounds to deem the interference necessary or proportionate. Consequently, it found violations of Article 6 (right to a fair trial) due to the lack of objective evidence and Article 11 (freedom of assembly) of the Convention.

The case belongs to the Makarashvili and Others v. Georgia [group](#) and its execution is subject to **enhanced supervision**.

Right to property (Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1)

28. Klaus and Yuri Kiladze v. Georgia

[Klaus and Yuri Kiladze v. Georgia \(2010\)](#) – no. 7975/06 – The case concerns the long-standing inability of victims of Soviet-era political repression to obtain compensation due to the absence of the necessary regulatory framework. Klaus and Yuri Kiladze were themselves direct victims of such repression: in 1937 their father was executed on fabricated charges of sabotage and terrorism, their mother was deported to the Gulag in 1938, and the family's property was confiscated. At only 10 and 12 years old, the brothers were placed in an orphanage in Russia for two years before being reunited with their mother.

In 2005, relying on the 1997 Law on the Recognition of Citizens of Georgia as Victims of Political Repression and on Social Protection of Repressed Persons, the Kiladze brothers sought compensation for the grave violations committed against their family. However, their request was rejected because the government had failed to adopt the implementing regulations required to make compensation accessible in practice. **In 2006, the case was brought before the European Court of Human Rights.**

The Court held that Georgia had violated its positive obligations by failing to create an effective legal framework through which victims of Soviet repression could exercise their right to compensation. The Court emphasised that adopting adequate secondary legislation was a direct responsibility of the State, and the absence of such regulations rendered the statutory right to compensation illusory.

The supervision of execution in this case has since been closed, as the judgment prompted significant legislative [amendments](#) in 2011 and 2014. These reforms established a concrete mechanism for awarding monetary compensation to victims of political repression and their heirs and set out the specific amounts and procedures for such compensation, finally enabling the effective enforcement of the rights recognised under the 1997 law.

29. LTD BEQANASI v. GEORGIA

[LTD BEQANASI v. GEORGIA \(2024\)](#) - no. 28407/19 - The case concerned the restriction of a company's property rights by decisions of administrative authorities and domestic courts imposing sanctions on the company for violations of its licence. The applicant alleged that the sanctions imposed on it were disproportionate and had caused substantial damage to its property interests, including the de facto cessation of its activities. The case was referred to the European Court of Justice in 2019.

The Court found that there had been a violation of Article 1 (right to property) of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, as the State's interference had not been based on a fair balance and had breached the principle of proportionality. Furthermore, the approach of the domestic courts had failed to ensure effective protection of the applicant's property interests.

The case has been assigned the status of a lead case and its execution is subject to standard procedure.

Right to free elections (Article 3 of Additional Protocol 1)

30. Ramishvili v. Georgia

[Ramishvili v. Georgia \(2018\)](#) – no. 48099/08 – The case concerns the blanket disenfranchisement of convicted prisoners under the legislation in force during the 21 May 2008 parliamentary elections, which categorically denied all prisoners the right to vote, irrespective of the nature of the offence, the severity of the sentence, or any individual assessment. The applicant, who was serving a prison sentence at the time, **brought the case to the European Court of Human Rights in 2008**, arguing that this automatic and indiscriminate prohibition violated his electoral rights.

The Court found that Georgia's legislation imposed a general, automatic and indiscriminate restriction on the voting rights of all convicted prisoners, without any proportionality assessment or differentiation between categories of offences or sentences. Such a sweeping ban failed to meet the democratic standards required under Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections) to the European Convention. Although Georgia amended its Constitution and Electoral Code in 2011, granting voting rights to prisoners convicted of less serious offences, these later reforms did not remedy the specific violation suffered by the applicant in relation to the 2008 elections.

Accordingly, the Court held that Georgia had violated the applicant's right to free elections. The execution of the judgment has since been closed, following the State's legislative changes and alignment of its electoral framework with Convention standards.