



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

Published on 3 August 2026

FIFTH SECTION

Application no. 64414/19
Alexei DIMITROV
against the Republic of Moldova
lodged on 29 November 2019
communicated on 17 July 2026

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

The application concerns the applicant's administrative conviction for hooliganism in the absence of an oral hearing.

On 11 December 2018 the applicant had a dispute with a lawyer inside a courthouse in Chişinău.

On 27 February 2019, following that incident and in the absence of the applicant, the police drew up an administrative offence report for hooliganism and fined him 1,000 Moldovan lei – approximately 50 euros at the time of the event. The applicant challenged that decision.

On 4 April 2019 a first-instance court admitted the case for examination and requested the parties to submit, within ten days, their position on the examination of the case in a written procedure and on the merits of the case.

On 16 April 2019 the applicant objected to the examination of the case in a written procedure. He argued that an oral hearing would offer him greater opportunities to defend his rights.

On 18 April 2019 the court dismissed the applicant's objection and ordered that the case be examined in a written procedure. In doing so, the court referred to general legal provisions and simply concluded that an oral hearing was not necessary.

In a judgment of 26 April 2019 the court upheld the administrative offence report and rejected the applicant's complaint.

The applicant appealed on points of law against that judgment.

DIMITROV v. THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA –
SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE AND QUESTIONS

On 29 May 2019 the Chişinău Court of Appeal, having heard the case with the participation of the applicant and his lawyer, dismissed his appeal on points of law as unsubstantiated.

The applicant complains, relying on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 of the Convention, about the lack of an oral hearing and the first-instance court's insufficient reasons in this respect as well as the lack of sufficient reasons provided by the domestic courts in their judgments on the merits of the case.

QUESTIONS TO THE PARTIES

Did the applicant have a fair hearing in the determination of the criminal charges against him, in accordance with Article 6 § 1 of the Convention? In particular, was dispensing with an oral hearing in the present case justified, given the specific context of the case (see *Sancaklı v. Turkey*, no. 1385/07, § 45, 15 May 2018, and *Flisar v. Slovenia*, no. 3127/09, § 38, 29 September 2011), and did the domestic court provide sufficient reasons for its decision not to hold an oral hearing (see *Mtchedlishvili v. Georgia*, no. 894/12, § 39, 25 February 2021)?