



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

THIRD SECTION

CASE OF ANTONOPOULOS AND OTHERS v. GREECE

(Application no. 13353/18)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

27 August 2026

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

In the case of Antonopoulos and Others v. Greece,

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

Úna Ní Raifeartaigh, *President*,

Canòlic Mingorance Cairat,

Vasilka Sancin, *judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 2 July 2026,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in an application against Greece lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) on 13 March 2018.

2. The applicants were represented by Ms E.-L. Koutra, lawyer practising in Athens.

3. The Greek Government (“the Government”) were given notice of the application.

THE FACTS

4. The list of applicants and the relevant details of the application are set out in the appended table.

5. The applicants complained of the inadequate conditions of their detention in the Avlona Juvenile Prison. Some applicants also raised other complaints under the provisions of the Convention.

THE LAW

I. STRIKING OUT OF THE COMPLAINTS LODGED BY APPLCANTS M. DRAGATOGIANNIS, C. KAMPERIS, D. KAMPERIS AND M. LIAKOPOULOS

6. By a letter dated 3 October 2025, sent via the Court’s Electronic Communication Service (eComms), the applicants were requested to inform the Court of any important factual developments in their case that may have taken place since their last correspondence with the Court. They were notified that their reply should be accompanied by a recent detention certificate for all applicants and any other relevant documents. The applicants’ attention was drawn to the fact that if the requested information was not received within the indicated time-limit, the Court may conclude that the applicants no longer wished to pursue their application and decide to strike it from its list of cases. In her reply to that request sent on 23 January 2026, the representative did not

provide any information regarding the applicants, M. Dragatogiannis, C. Kamperis, D. Kamperis and M. Liakopoulos (indicated under nos. 4-6 and 9 in the appended table) nor she submitted any proof that she was still in contact with them.

7. In the light of the foregoing, and in the absence of any special circumstances regarding respect for the rights guaranteed by the Convention and the Protocols thereto, the Court, in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention, considers that it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application in the part lodged by the applicants, M. Dragatogiannis, C. Kamperis, D. Kamperis and M. Liakopoulos (indicated under nos. 4-6 and 9 in the appended table).

8. Accordingly, the case should be struck out of the list with respect to these applicants.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 3 OF THE CONVENTION ON ACCOUNT OF THE CONDITIONS OF DETENTION

9. The remaining applicants, P. Antonopoulos, V.A. Chalilopoulos, G. Dionysopoulos, P. Kamperis, V. Karas and S. Soulimanis (indicated under nos. 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 in the appended table), complained under Article 3 of the Convention about the inadequate conditions of their detention in the Avlona Juvenile Prison. They also complained under the same Convention provision that they had to cover their personal needs at their own expense and that some of them were kept together with convicted prisoners despite having been detained on remand.

10. The Court notes that these complaints are neither manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention nor inadmissible on any other grounds. They must therefore be declared admissible.

11. The applicants maintained that they had been detained in conditions of severe overcrowding leaving them with less than 3 sq. m of personal space. They submitted that they had shared cells of less than 10 sq. m with at least three other detainees. The applicants, indicated under nos. 1 and 3 in the appendix, also complained that they were detained in dormitories of 100 sq. m and 30 sq. m, respectively.

12. The Government submitted that the overall conditions of the applicants' detention did not attain the minimum level of severity required to fall within the scope of Article 3 of the Convention. In particular, they argued that the cells measured between 10 and 11.65 sq. m and that the prison's official capacity had only been exceeded occasionally and by a negligible margin. However, the Government did not provide precise information regarding the number of detainees accommodated in each cell.

13. The Court refers to the principles established in its case-law regarding inadequate conditions of detention (see, for instance, *Muršić v. Croatia* [GC],

no. 7334/13, §§ 96-101, ECHR 2016). It reiterates in particular that a serious lack of space in a prison cell weighs heavily as a factor to be taken into account for the purpose of establishing whether the detention conditions described are “degrading” from the point of view of Article 3 and may disclose a violation, both alone or taken together with other shortcomings (see *Muršić*, cited above, §§ 122-41, and *Ananyev and Others v. Russia*, nos. 42525/07 and 60800/08, §§ 149-59, 10 January 2012).

14. As regards the applicants’ detention in the cells, the Court observes that the Government failed to substantiate their contention that there had been no overcrowding, as they did not produce any documentary evidence indicating the number of detainees accommodated in each cell. Even assuming that the cells measured between 10 and 11.65 sq. m, the absence of such records cannot be regarded as capable of refuting the applicants’ allegation that, throughout their detention in the cells, they were afforded less than 3 sq. m of personal space.

15. In the light of the applicants’ submissions, the official tables produced by the Government (nine in total), which reflect the prison population on the basis of headcounts conducted twice monthly, on the 1st and 15th day of each month, and which show that the prison population exceeded the official capacity in four of the nine recorded counts, and in the absence of any convincing evidence to the contrary, the Court accepts the applicants’ contention that the Avlona Juvenile Prison operated beyond its intended capacity during the relevant period of their detention, resulting in a manifest shortage of personal space. Furthermore, it is evident that such a deficiency in personal space cannot be regarded as short, occasional or minor within the meaning of the Court’s case-law (see *Muršić*, cited above, § 130).

16. Having regard to its case-law on the subject, the Court considers that the conditions of detention in the cells of the applicants, indicated under nos. 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 in the appended table, were inadequate and that therefore their complaints about the general conditions of detention in the Avlona Juvenile Prison disclose a violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

17. The aforementioned renders it unnecessary for the Court to consider separately the remaining complaints regarding the conditions of their detention, including those which relate to the fact of detention with convicted prisoners, the need to use personal funds to cover personal needs or detention in dormitories for some of the applicants (see *Igbo and Others v. Greece*, no. 60042/13, § 46, 9 February 2017).

III. REMAINING COMPLAINTS

18. The applicants further complained under Article 13 of the Convention that they did not have at their disposal an effective domestic remedy to complain about poor conditions of their detention.

19. Having regard to the facts of the case, the submissions of the parties, and its findings above, the Court considers that it has examined the main legal question raised in the present application and that there is no need to give a separate ruling on that complaint (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, § 156, ECHR 2014).

20. Some of the applicants raised additional complaints under various Convention provisions related to their detention. The Court has examined these complaints and considers that, in the light of all the material in its possession and in so far as the matters complained of is within its competence, these complaints either do not meet the admissibility criteria set out in Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention or do not disclose any appearance of a violation of the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Convention or the Protocols thereto.

21. It follows that this part of the application must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 § 4 of the Convention.

IV. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

22. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Muršić*, cited above), the Court considers it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table to the applicants, listed under nos. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8 and 10 in the appendix, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them on those amounts.

23. The Court also considers it reasonable to award the same applicants the amount of 1,000 euros (EUR) jointly for costs and expenses incurred in the proceedings before it, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to strike the application out of its list of cases in the part lodged by the applicants, M. Dragatogiannis, C. Kamperis, D. Kamperis and M. Liakopoulos (indicated under nos. 4-6 and 9 in the appended table);
2. *Declares* the complaints raised under Article 3 of the Convention by the applicants, indicated under nos. 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 in the appended table, concerning their conditions of detention in the Avlona Juvenile Prison admissible, *finds* that it is not necessary to examine separately the complaint under Article 13 of the Convention about the availability of domestic remedies to complain about poor detention conditions and *declares* the remainder of the application inadmissible;
3. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention concerning the conditions of detention in the overcrowded cells of the

Avlona Juvenile Prison with respect to the applicants indicated under nos. 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 in the appended table;

4. *Holds* that there is no need to examine separately the merits of the remaining complaints under Article 3 of the Convention regarding the conditions of detention raised by the applicants, indicated under nos. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8 and 10 in the appended table;
5. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, indicated under nos. 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 in the appended table, within three months:
 - (i) the amounts indicated in the appended table in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them on those amounts;
 - (ii) EUR 1,000 (one thousand euros) jointly, plus any tax that may be chargeable to these applicants, in respect of costs and expenses;
 - (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 27 August 2026, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Viktoriya Maradudina
Acting Deputy Registrar

Úna Ní Raifeartaigh
President

APPENDIX

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

Applicant's name Year of birth	Facility Start and end date Duration	Specific grievances	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros) ¹
1. Panagiotis ANTONOPOULOS 1996	Avlona Juvenile Prison 13/03/2017-13/10/2017 7 months and 1 day	overcrowding, no or restricted access to warm water, inadequate temperature, mouldy or dirty cell, lack of or inadequate hygienic facilities, poor quality of food	3,600
2. Vasilios-Antonios CHALILOPOULOS 1997	Avlona Juvenile Prison 10/04/2017-14/06/2018 1 year and 2 months and 5 days		5,900
3. Gerasimos DIONYSOPOULOS 1997	Avlona Juvenile Prison 22/09/2016-28/07/2018, 04/08/2018-16/11/2018 2 years and 1 month and 20 days		8,600
4. Marios DRAGATOGIANNIS 1999	Avlona Juvenile Prison Detained in cell: 26/05/2017-09/06/2017, 04/07/2017-10/01/2019 1 year and 6 months and 22 days Detained in dormitory: 09/06/2017- 04/07/2017		N/A
5. Christos KAMPERIS 1997	Avlona Juvenile Prison 03/03/2017-24/06/2018 1 year and 3 months and 22 days		N/A

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

ANTONOPOULOS AND OTHERS v. GREECE JUDGMENT

Applicant's name Year of birth	Facility Start and end date Duration	Specific grievances	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros) 1
6. Dionysios KAMPERIS 1997	Avlona Juvenile Prison 14/09/2016-09/10/2019 3 years and 26 days		N/A
7. Panagiotis KAMPERIS 1997	Avlona Juvenile Prison 31/01/2017-04/07/2018 1 year and 5 months and 5 days		6,600
8. Vasilios KARAS 1997	Avlona Juvenile Prison 02/03/2017-27/12/2018 1 years and 9 months and 26 days		7,600
9. Marios LIAKOPOULOS 1998	Avlona Juvenile Prison 04/08/2017-20/07/2018 11 months and 17 days		N/A
10. Spyridon SOULIMANIS 1996	Avlona Juvenile Prison 24/02/2017-03/04/2019 2 years and 1 month and 11 days		8,600