



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

FOURTH SECTION

CASE OF CHERTOK AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA

*(Applications nos. 20332/17 and 11 others –
see appended list)*

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

9 July 2026

This judgment is final but it may be subject to editorial revision.

In the case of Chertok and Others v. Russia,

The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting as a Committee composed of:

Lorraine Schembri Orland, *President*,

Faris Vehabović,

Anne Louise Bormann, *judges*,

and Uğur Erdal, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 18 June 2026,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in applications against Russia lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) on the various dates indicated in the appended table.

2. The Russian Government (“the Government”) were given notice of the applications.

THE FACTS

3. The list of applicants and the relevant details of the applications are set out in the appended table.

4. The applicants complained of the inadequate conditions of their detention in Simferopol SIZO-1 in Crimea. Some applicants also raised other complaints under various provisions of the Convention.

THE LAW

I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

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

II. JURISDICTION

6. The Court observes that the facts giving rise to the alleged violations of the Convention occurred prior to 16 September 2022, the date on which the Russian Federation ceased to be a party to the Convention. The Court therefore decides that it has jurisdiction to examine the present applications (see *Fedotova and Others v. Russia* [GC], nos. 40792/10 and 2 others, §§ 68-73, 17 January 2023).

7. The Court also reiterates that it has already established that the Russian Federation has exercised extraterritorial jurisdiction over Crimea, within the

meaning of Article 1 of the Convention, in the form of “effective control of an area” as from 27 February 2014 (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)* [GC], nos. 20958/14 and 38334/18, §§ 864 and 873, 25 June 2024).

8. Accordingly, the applications in the present case fall within the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation and the Court has competence to examine them.

III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 3 OF THE CONVENTION

9. The applicants complained principally of the inadequate conditions of their detention in Simferopol SIZO-1. They relied on Article 3 of the Convention.

10. The Court reiterates the general principles concerning conditions of detention under Article 3 of the Convention, as set out in its case-law (see, among many authorities, *Muršić v. Croatia* [GC], no. 7334/13, §§ 96-101, ECHR 2016).

11. The Court observes that the applicants were detained in poor conditions, the details of which are set out in the appended table. In *Ananyev and Others v. Russia*, nos. 42525/07 and 60800/08, 10 January 2012, the Court already found a violation of Article 3 on account of conditions of detention in Russian remand prisons similar to those complained of in the present case. Furthermore, in *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)* (cited above, §§ 1230-38) the Court found an administrative practice of detaining prisoners in inadequate conditions in Simferopol SIZO-1, following the extension of the Russian penitentiary system to Crimea, amounting to degrading treatment, in particular, on account of severe overcrowding, inadequate temperatures, poor ventilation, infestation, lack of privacy of toilets and poor food.

12. Having regard to the material before it and its well-established case-law on the subject, the Court considers that the applicants were detained in conditions incompatible with Article 3 of the Convention. These complaints are therefore admissible and disclose a breach of that provision.

IV. OTHER ALLEGED VIOLATIONS UNDER WELL-ESTABLISHED CASE-LAW

13. Some applicants submitted other complaints which also raised issues under Article 3 of the Convention, given the relevant well-established case-law of the Court (see appended table). These complaints are not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention, nor are they inadmissible on any other ground. Accordingly, they must be declared admissible.

14. Having examined all the material before it and noting that the impugned measures arose from the extension of the Russian legislation and

institutions to Crimea, the Court concludes that these complaints also disclose violations of the Convention in the light of its findings in *Tomov and Others v. Russia*, nos. 18255/10 and 5 others, §§ 114-42, 9 April 2019, concerning the conditions of transport of detainees; *Svinarenko and Slyadnev v. Russia* [GC], nos. 32541/08 and 43441/08, §§ 113-39, ECHR 2014 (extracts), concerning placement in a metal cage in a courtroom during criminal proceedings; and *Reshetnyak v. Russia*, no. 56027/10, §§ 54-90, 8 January 2013, related to inadequate medical treatment in detention.

V. REMAINING COMPLAINTS

15. Some applicants also complained under Article 13 of the Convention that they had no effective domestic remedy in respect of their complaints under Article 3. Having regard to the facts of the case and its findings in paragraphs 12 and 14 above, the Court considers that it has examined the main legal issues raised in the present case and that there is no need to examine the admissibility or the merits of the remaining complaints (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, § 156, ECHR 2014).

VI. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

16. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Ananyev and Others v. Russia*, nos. 42525/07 and 60800/08, § 172, 10 January 2012, and *Butko v. Russia*, no. 32036/10, § 68, 12 November 2015), the Court considers it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Holds* that it has jurisdiction to deal with these applications;
3. *Declares* the complaints under Article 3 of the Convention admissible;
4. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention concerning the inadequate conditions of detention in Simferopol SIZO-1 in respect of all applicants;
5. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention as regards the other complaints raised under well-established case-law of the Court (see appended table);

6. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the admissibility and merits of the remaining complaints under Article 13 of the Convention;
7. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, within three months, the amounts indicated in the appended table, plus any tax that may be chargeable;
 - (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.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 9 July 2026, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Uğur Erdal
Acting Deputy Registrar

Lorraine Schembri Orland
President

CHERTOK AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

APPENDIX

List of applications raising complaints under Article 3 of the Convention
(inadequate conditions of detention)

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Facility Start and end date Duration	Sq. m per inmate	Specific grievances	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in euros) ¹
1.	20332/17 09/03/2017	Vladimir Andreyevich CHERTOK 1989	SIZO-1 Simferopol 01/08/2014 to 20/09/2016 2 years and 1 month and 20 days	<2 m ²	Overcrowding, insufficient number of sleeping places, lack of fresh air, lack of privacy for toilet, no or restricted access to potable water, no or restricted access to warm water, poor quality of food, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, lack of requisite medical assistance.	Art. 3 - inadequate conditions of detention during transport - the applicant states that his transfer from SIZO-1 to the hearing in the "Supreme Court of the Republic of Crimea" on 12/09/2016 lasted 5-6 hours in inhuman conditions, notably there were 20-25 prisoners in the van, lack of space, lack of ventilation, no access to toilet; Art. 3 - use of metal cages and/or other security arrangements in courtrooms - placement in a metal cage during the court hearing at the "Supreme Court of the Republic of Crimea" on 12/09/2016.	11,200
2.	22284/17 07/03/2017	Aleksandr Valeryevich MILOVSKIY 1980	SIZO-1 Simferopol 08/10/2015 to 08/11/2016 1 year and 1 month and 1 day	1 m ² , 2.3 m ² , 2.5 m ²	Overcrowding, lack of fresh air, lack of or insufficient electric light, lack of privacy for toilet, passive smoking, no or restricted access to running water, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, mouldy or dirty cell.		5,600

CHERTOK AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Facility Start and end date Duration	Sq. m per inmate	Specific grievances	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in euros) ¹
3.	71278/17 01/09/2017	Andrey Vasilyevich RASSKAZOV 1984	SIZO-1 Simferopol 10/01/2016 to 21/05/2017 1 year and 4 months and 12 days	<2 m ²	Overcrowding, insufficient number of sleeping places, lack of or insufficient electric light, passive smoking, lack of fresh air, inadequate temperature, lack of or poor quality of bedding and bed linen, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, lack of privacy for toilet, no or restricted access to shower, lack of or insufficient physical exercise in fresh air, no or restricted access to warm water, mouldy or dirty cell.		6,400
4.	77394/17 20/10/2017	Yevgeniy Vladimirovich SUPRUNYUK 1955	SIZO-1 Simferopol 26/01/2016 to 16/05/2017 1 year and 3 months and 21 days	<2 m ²	Overcrowding, insufficient number of sleeping places, lack of or insufficient quantity of food, inadequate temperature, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, lack of requisite medical assistance, passive smoking, mouldy or dirty cell, lack of or insufficient electric light.	Art. 3 - inadequate conditions of detention during transport - the applicant complains about poor and inhuman conditions during his transport from SIZO-1 Simferopol to IK-5 Kirov: (1) van, Simferopol – Krasnodar, 16/05/2017: 16-hour transportation in a single-prisoner cubicle (“ <i>stakan</i> ”) with heavy luggage on laps and limited access to the toilet; (2) train, Krasnodar – Volgograd - Kazan - Kirov, 02/06/2017 -06/06/2017: separate transfers, 24-hour each, overcrowding, insufficient number of sleeping places, lack of fresh air, inadequate temperature, restricted access to toilet, lack or insufficient quantity of food.	8,000
5.	84281/17 06/12/2017	Artem Vaagnovich AGAKARYAN 1986	SIZO-1 Simferopol 23/10/2015 to 26/08/2017 1 year(s) and 10 month(s) and 4 day(s)	<2.5 m ²	Overcrowding, lack of or insufficient electric light, passive smoking, lack of fresh air, inadequate temperature, lack of or poor quality of bedding and bed linen, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, lack of privacy for toilet, poor quality of food, no or restricted access to shower, lack of or insufficient physical exercise in fresh air, no or restricted access to warm water, lack of requisite medical assistance, no or restricted access to potable water.	Art. 3 - inadequate medical treatment in detention - the SIZO-1 administration's failure to transfer the applicant to a specialised medical facility for the treatment of his injury, to provide him with adequate therapy and conduct his medical examination between 23/10/2015 and 26/08/2017.	19,500

CHERTOK AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Facility Start and end date Duration	Sq. m per inmate	Specific grievances	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in euros) ¹
6.	17806/18 29/03/2018	Ruslan Fayzullayevich KHODZHAYEV 1988	SIZO-1 Simferopol 28/03/2017 to 01/10/2017 6 months and 4 days	<2 m ²	Overcrowding, insufficient number of sleeping places, inadequate temperature, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, lack of fresh air, lack of requisite medical assistance, mouldy or dirty cell, no or restricted access to running water, no or restricted access to shower, no or restricted access to toilet.	Art. 3 - inadequate conditions of detention during transport - the applicant complains about poor conditions during his transport by different means of transport: (1) van, 01/10/2017, < 2 sq. m per inmate, lack of fresh air, lack of or insufficient electric light, no or restricted access to toilet; (2) train, 02/10/2017-24/10/2017, < 2 sq. m per inmate, overcrowding, insufficient number of sleeping places, no or restricted access to toilet, lack of or insufficient quantity of food, lack of fresh air, no or restricted access to potable water.	4,200
7.	19594/18 01/04/2018	Stanislav Yuryevich SERDYUKOV 1993	SIZO-1 Simferopol 30/03/2017 to 27/12/2017 8 months and 28 days	<3 m ²	Overcrowding, inadequate temperature, lack of or insufficient electric light, lack of fresh air, mouldy or dirty cell, poor quality of food, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, lack of privacy for toilet, lack of or insufficient physical exercise in fresh air, no or restricted access to warm water, no or restricted access to running water, lack of or poor quality of bedding and bed linen.		4,000
8.	27175/18 30/05/2018	Sergey Viktorovich MALINOVSKIY 1990	SIZO-1 Simferopol 27/05/2017 to 05/02/2018 8 months and 10 days	2.1 m ²	Overcrowding, lack of privacy for toilet, lack of fresh air, passive smoking, inadequate temperature, no or restricted access to potable water, insufficient number of sleeping places, lack of requisite medical assistance, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, sharing cells with inmates infected with contagious disease, no or restricted access to warm water, mouldy or dirty cell, lack of or inadequate hygienic facilities, frequent outbreaks of violence.		4,000

CHERTOK AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Facility Start and end date Duration	Sq. m per inmate	Specific grievances	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in euros) ¹
9.	42939/18 16/08/2018	Ayder Bakhtiyarovich ASAYEV 1981	SIZO-1 Simferopol 17/10/2016 to 14/04/2018 1 year and 5 months and 29 days	<3, m ² , <4 m ²	Overcrowding, lack of fresh air, lack of or insufficient natural light, inadequate temperature, no or restricted access to potable water, passive smoking, lack of or insufficient physical exercise in fresh air, lack of requisite medical assistance.		6,600
10.	10296/19 04/02/2019	Aleksey Yaroslavovich PYZHYANOV 1997	SIZO-1 Simferopol 10/09/2018 to 08/10/2018 29 days	<3.6 m ²	Overcrowding, insufficient number of sleeping places, no or restricted access to running water, no or restricted access to warm water, mouldy or dirty cell, lack of fresh air, lack of or inadequate hygienic facilities, no or restricted access to toilet, lack of or insufficient electric light, lack of or insufficient natural light, passive smoking, sharing cells with inmates infected with contagious disease, no or restricted access to shower, lack of or insufficient quantity of food.		1,000
11.	44685/19 10/08/2019	Anton Aleksandrovich OSADCHUK 1983	SIZO-1 Simferopol 12/08/2018 to 21/03/2019 7 months and 10 days	2.5 m ²	Overcrowding, lack of fresh air, passive smoking, insufficient number of sleeping places, lack of or poor quality of bedding and bed linen, poor quality of food, lack of or insufficient physical exercise in fresh air, lack of requisite medical assistance, inadequate temperature, lack of or insufficient quantity of food, no or restricted access to potable water, lack of or insufficient electric light.		3,600

CHERTOK AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Facility Start and end date Duration	Sq. m per inmate	Specific grievances	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in euros) ¹
12.	50507/19 09/09/2019	Artem Sergeyevich KLIMOV 1991	SIZO-1 Simferopol 11/10/2017 to 11/03/2019 1 year and 5 months and 1 day	<3.5 m ²	Overcrowding, lack of fresh air, passive smoking, lack of privacy for toilet, mouldy or dirty cell, infestation of cell with insects/rodents, lack of or insufficient natural light, no or restricted access to warm water, no or restricted access to toilet.	Art. 3 - inadequate conditions of detention during transport - the applicant complains about poor conditions during his transport on numerous occasions: (1) train, 04/04/2019-05/04/2019, 0.6 sq. m per inmate, insufficient number of sleeping places, overcrowding, passive smoking, lack of fresh air, no or restricted access to toilet, lack of privacy for toilet, no or restricted access to potable water, lack of or poor quality of bedding and bed linen; (2) train, 10/04/2019 -11/04/2019, insufficient number of sleeping places, overcrowding, no or restricted access to toilet, lack of privacy for toilet, lack of or poor quality of bedding and bed linen, lack of fresh air, passive smoking; (3) train, 16/04/2019-17/04/2019, insufficient number of sleeping places, overcrowding, lack of fresh air, passive smoking, no or restricted access to toilet, lack of privacy for toilet, lack of or poor quality of bedding and bed linen.	8,600

¹ Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants.