



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

Published on 7 September 2026

FIFTH SECTION

Application no. 37254/24
Odysseas MICHAILIDIS
against Cyprus
lodged on 9 December 2024
communicated on 20 August 2026

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

The application concerns the applicant's removal from office as Auditor General of the Republic of Cyprus – where he served since 2014 – pursuant to a decision of the Supreme Court's Council of 18 September 2024.

The request for the applicant's dismissal was lodged by the Attorney General of the Republic of Cyprus. The Council concluded that the applicant's conduct involving, *inter alia*, public statements and commentary on issues of public debate, instances of alleged misrepresentation of facts and inter-institutional conflicts between the Law Office or other governmental bodies and the Audit Office, led by the applicant, rendered him unfit to continue performing his duties as Auditor General.

Relying on Article 10 of the Convention, the applicant argues that his removal from office disproportionately interfered with his right to exercise his freedom of expression on matters of public interest. He argues that the public statements he made and his conduct in general were part of his professional duty as Auditor General.

QUESTIONS TO THE PARTIES

1. Has there been an interference with the applicant's right to freedom of expression as guaranteed by Article 10 § 1 of the Convention (see *Wille v. Liechtenstein* [GC], no. 28396/95, §§ 41-44 and 50, ECHR 1999-VII; *Kövesi v. Romania*, no. 3594/19, §§ 179-190, 5 May 2020; *Simić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* ((dec.)), no. 75255/10, §§ 33-35, 15 November 2016; *Harabin v. Slovakia*, no. 58688/11, §§ 149-153, 20 November 2012; *Kudeshkina v. Russia*, no. 29492/05, §§ 79-80, 26 February 2009, *Kayasu v. Turkey*, nos. 64119/00 and 76292/01, §§ 77-81, 13 November 2008 and *Harabin v. Slovakia* (dec.), no. 62584/00, ECHR 2004-VI)?

2. If the answer to the first question is in the affirmative, was such an interference “prescribed by law”, did it pursue one or more legitimate aims referred to in the second paragraph of Article 10 and was it “necessary in a democratic society” (see *Danileț v. Romania* [GC], no. 16915/21, §§ 119-125 and 138-165, 15 December 2025; *Baka v. Hungary* [GC], no. 20261/12, §§ 156-167, 23 June 2016; *Wille*, cited above, § 56; and *Kövesi*, cited above, §§ 191-203)?