



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

FOURTH SECTION

CASE OF YAKUBOV AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA

(Applications nos. 2972/15 and 19 others – see appended list)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

24 September 2026

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

In the case of Yakubov 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 3 September 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 that their cases had been determined by courts operating in Crimea under the Russian legal framework, which could not be regarded as tribunals “established by law”.

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. LOCUS STANDI IN APPLICATION NO. 41806/15

9. Following the death of Mr Anatoliy Fedorovich Ryabokon on 9 March 2018, his son, Mr Yuriy Anatolyevich Ryabokon, expressed his wish to pursue the proceedings before the Court on behalf of the deceased applicant (see the appended table).

10. The Court reiterates that, in cases where an applicant has died during the Convention proceedings, his or her heirs may in principle continue the proceedings before the Court on behalf of the applicant, provided that he or she can demonstrate a sufficient interest in the case (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, § 97, ECHR 2014).

11. In view of the above and having regard to the circumstances of the present case and the documents submitted by Mr Yuriy Anatolyevich Ryabokon, the Court accepts that he has a legitimate interest in pursuing the application in the late applicant’s stead. For convenience, the present judgment will refer to Mr Anatoliy Fedorovich Ryabokon as an applicant.

IV. VICTIM STATUS IN APPLICATION NO. 26225/18

12. The Court notes that, in application no. 26225/18, only the first applicant, Mr Anatoliy Viktorovich Brovko, was a party to the civil proceedings determined by Russian “courts” in Crimea. The second applicant, Mr Ruslan Valentinovich Tarasov, merely represented Mr Brovko in those proceedings and cannot therefore claim to be a “victim” of the alleged violation of Article 6 § 1 within the meaning of Article 34 of the Convention. It follows that this complaint, in so far as it was brought by Mr Tarasov, is incompatible *ratione personae* with the provisions of the Convention within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) and must be rejected, pursuant to Article 35 § 4 of the Convention.

V. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION

13. The applicants complained that their cases had been determined by courts operating in Crimea which could not be considered as tribunals “established by law”. They relied on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

14. The Court reiterates the general principles concerning the requirement that a tribunal be “established by law” within the meaning of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, as set out in its case-law (see *Guðmundur Andri Ástráðsson v. Iceland* [GC], no. 26374/18, §§ 223 and 299, 1 December 2020, and *Jorgic v. Germany*, no. 74613/01, §§ 64 and 65, ECHR 2007-III).

15. The Court observes that the applicants were parties to various judicial proceedings before courts operating in Crimea, which rendered decisions affecting their civil rights and obligations or determined criminal charges against them (see the appended table). Those proceedings took place after the entry into force of the so-called “Accession Treaty” in March 2014 and were conducted entirely on the basis of Russian legislation.

16. The Court further reiterates its findings in *Ukraine v. Russia (re-Crimea)* (cited above, §§ 942 and 946), in which it held that the extension of Russian law to Crimea was contrary to the Convention, as interpreted in the light of international humanitarian law, and could not be regarded as “law” within the meaning of the Convention. It further held that, as a consequence, the judicial system operating in Crimea after March 2014 could not be regarded as “established by law” within the meaning of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention (*ibid.*, §§ 1013, 1019 and 1022).

17. Having regard to the material before it and to its findings in *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)*, the Court considers that the applicants’ cases were determined by tribunals which were not “established by law” within the meaning of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention. These complaints are therefore admissible and disclose a breach of that provision.

VI. REMAINING COMPLAINTS

18. Some applicants raised further additional complaints under various provisions of the Convention. Having regard to the facts of the case and its findings in paragraph 17 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*, cited above, § 156).

VII. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

19. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Ametov and Others v. Russia* [Committee], no. 73977/14, 7 July 2026), 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. *Holds* that Mr Yuriy Anatolyevich Ryabokon has standing to pursue the application no. 41806/15 in his late father's stead;
4. *Declares* admissible the complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention in respect of all applicants except Mr Ruslan Valentinovich Tarasov (application no. 26225/18);
5. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention in respect of all applicants on account of their cases having been determined by tribunals not "established by law";
6. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the admissibility and merits of the remaining complaints;
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 24 September 2026, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Uğur Erdal
Acting Deputy Registrar

Lorraine Schembri Orland
President

APPENDIX

List of applications raising complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention
(tribunal not “established by law”)

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name Location	Summary of facts	Type of proceedings	Relevant domestic decision Date	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros)	Amount awarded for costs and expenses
1.	2972/15 17/12/2014 (3 applicants)	Oleksandr Oleksandrovych YAKUBOV 1951 Sergiy Volodymyrovych KUZMENKO 1978 Oleksandr Ivanovych SAKHNO 1974	Borodkin Dmytro Ivanovych Kyiv	The applicants, members of a cooperative, asked a court to uphold changes to the structure and management of a cooperative, including the election of the first applicant as the chairman. These changes were upheld by Ukrainian courts before 2014, and subsequently overruled by Russian “courts” in Crimea.	civil	“Appeal Court of Sevastopol” ⁱ , 10/11/2014	EUR 6,000 to each applicant	EUR 250
2.	9857/15 04/02/2015	Ruslan Nikolayevich CHEREPNIN 1980	Martynovskyy Roman Yuriyovych Kyiv	The applicant was a defendant in civil debt-recovery proceedings. In 2002 the Leninskyy District Court of Sevastopol lifted an interim measure concerning the foreclosure of the applicant's apartment. The applicant received a copy of that decision in 2013 and lodged an appeal. On 24/04/2014 the “Sevastopol City Court of Appeal” dismissed the appeal on the merits, and the ensuing cassation appeal was unsuccessful.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 07/08/2014	EUR 6,000	EUR 250
3.	16390/15 28/03/2015	Ayshe Abduramanovna BABAYEVA 1941		The applicant unsuccessfully sought to obtain rehabilitation documents relating to the deportation of Crimean Tatars during the Soviet period, which would have entitled her to certain benefits.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 28/10/2014	EUR 6,000	-
4.	41806/15 11/08/2015	Anatoliy Fedorovich RYABOKON 1944 Died in 2018 HEIR: Yuriy Anatolyevich RYABOKON Born in 1971	Ryabokon Yuriy Anatolyevich Kyiv	The applicant, a co-owner of a mortgaged property, sought the invalidation of the mortgage agreement; his claims were dismissed in three instances of judicial review.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 13/02/2015	EUR 6,000	-
5.	44753/15 03/09/2015	UKRAINSKIY FINANSOVO-PROMYSHLENNYY KONTSEYN UFPK		The applicant company sought to recover a debt owed to it by another company in the process of bankruptcy, initiated under the Ukrainian law. Russian courts declined to transfer the case to the	civil	“Commercial Court of the Republic of	EUR 6,000	-

YAKUBOV AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name Location	Summary of facts	Type of proceedings	Relevant domestic decision Date	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros)	Amount awarded for costs and expenses
				relevant court in Ukraine with jurisdiction over the matter.		Crimea", 10/07/2015		
6.	59289/15 18/11/2015	Yelena Aleksandrovna RYSHCHUK 1964		The applicant, a former nurse at a military sanatorium operated by the Ministry of Defence of Ukraine, was asked to resign voluntarily following the extension of Russian legislation to Crimea in order to continue working in the same position. However, when she subsequently re-applied for re-employment, her application was rejected. She then brought court proceedings challenging her dismissal and the refusal to re-employ her. On 31/10/2014 the "Feodosiyskiy District Court" partially allowed her claim, finding her dismissal unlawful and awarding her 3,000 Russian roubles (RUB) in non-pecuniary damages. Her further claims for reinstatement, compensation for lost wages, and discrimination were dismissed, and subsequent appeals were unsuccessful.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 06/10/2015	EUR 6,000	-
7.	19795/16 14/03/2016	Shakhin Alliyevich MAMEDOV 1970		On 26/12/2014 the applicant was convicted of murder by the "Central District Court of Simferopol" and sentenced to life imprisonment under Russian law. His subsequent appeals were unsuccessful.	criminal	"Supreme Court of the Republic of Crimea", 05/03/2018	EUR 6,000	-
8.	76870/16 24/11/2016	Roza Ivanovna KAVALEROVA 1941		The applicant, who co-owned a flat with her son and his family, sought to have her ownership rights recognised under Russian law in order to obtain an ownership certificate in her name. Her claim was unsuccessful.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 28/09/2016	EUR 6,000	-
9.	26225/18 23/05/2018	Anatoliy Viktorovich BROVKO 1950		The applicant owned a garage in a garage construction cooperative in Simferopol. In 2016 he brought civil proceedings against the Crimean electricity supplier seeking restoration of electricity supply to the garage. His claims were dismissed.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 01/12/2017	EUR 6,000	-
10.	46034/18 11/09/2018	Aleksandr Nikolayevich KOZAK 1961		The applicant's driving licence was suspended, and he was imposed an administrative fine for refusing to re-register his car under the Russian legislation. The applicant sought restoration of the time-limit to appeal against the above decisions but to no avail.	criminal	"Razdolnoye District Court of the Republic of Crimea" 13/03/2018	EUR 6,000	-
11.	55094/18 08/11/2018	Sergey Nikolayevich ZYKOV 1955		The applicant sought to recover his seized bank deposits due to termination of a criminal case against him and initiated two sets of proceedings on different	civil	(1) Supreme Court of the Russian	EUR 6,000	-

YAKUBOV AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name Location	Summary of facts	Type of proceedings	Relevant domestic decision Date	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros)	Amount awarded for costs and expenses
				grounds, both unsuccessful in courts: 1) recovery of lost profit, and 2) compensation for damage caused by the unlawful prosecution.		Federation, 11/05/2018; (2) Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 18/10/2018		
12.	12725/19 25/02/2019	Sandi BREZOVNIK 1970	Sokolova Yana Valeriyivna Kharkiv	The applicant sought judicial recognition and enforcement of rights arising from a loan agreement secured by immovable property in Yalta. On 20/04/2015 he brought civil proceedings before the "Yalta City Court". His claim was subsequently joined with another case concerning the same property, in which he participated as a third party with independent claims. The courts dismissed his claims, and his subsequent appeals were unsuccessful.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 30/11/2018	EUR 6,000	EUR 250
13.	27847/19 08/05/2019	Valeriy Ivanovych YERCHENKO 1951		The applicant sought enforcement by the Russian authorities of a judgment delivered by the Yalta City Court on 20 December 2012. After unsuccessful attempts to secure its execution, he instituted proceedings in 2018 seeking a change in the manner of enforcement and the substitution of a party to the enforcement proceedings. His claims were dismissed.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 16/11/2018	EUR 6,000	-
14.	48764/19 09/09/2019	Oleg Valentinovich GOLOVKOV 1971		The applicant sought compensation from the Crimean depositors' protection fund in respect of funds held in an account with a Ukrainian bank between 2011 and 2013. His claim was ultimately unsuccessful.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 27/03/2019	EUR 6,000	-
15.	12702/20 26/02/2020	Oleg Anatolyevich FROLOV 1976		The applicant complained that the military authorities had confiscated his Ukrainian military service book when issuing him with a Russian military service book. He brought court proceedings seeking the return of the document and compensation for non-pecuniary damage allegedly caused by the authorities' unlawful actions. On appeal, the military commission was ordered to return the Ukrainian military service book, while the remainder of the applicant's claims were dismissed.	civil	"Supreme Court of the Republic of Crimea", 26/09/2019	EUR 6,000	-
16.	21667/20 07/05/2020	ARENдноYE PREDPRIYATIYE YALTAMONOLITSTROY 2011		The applicant company challenged the tax authorities' refusal register it as a legal entity under the Russian law.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian	EUR 6,000	-

YAKUBOV AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name Location	Summary of facts	Type of proceedings	Relevant domestic decision Date	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros)	Amount awarded for costs and expenses
						Federation, 08/11/2019		
17.	1881/21 24/02/2021	Andrey Petrovich SANDOVSKIY 1966		The applicant was apprehended on 17/12/2014 at the so-called border between Ukraine and Crimea and subsequently prosecuted for smuggling precursors across the Russian border. On 05/11/2015 he was convicted and sentenced to eleven years' imprisonment. His appeal was unsuccessful.	criminal	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 12/11/2020	EUR 6,000	-
18.	24035/21 12/03/2021	Oleg Anatolyevich FROLOV 1976		The applicant, a dual Ukrainian and Russian national residing in Crimea, had his Ukrainian driving licence confiscated upon the issuance of a Russian driving licence. He subsequently brought civil proceedings seeking the return of the confiscated document, relying on Ukrainian law and international legal instruments. His claims were dismissed at all levels of jurisdiction.	civil	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 23/09/2020	EUR 6,000	-
19.	7380/22 05/11/2021	Viktor Vladimirovich KRETININ 1955	Maryushin Sergey Petrovich Verkhorechye	The applicant asked a court to declare defendant's buildings unauthorised constructions and to authorise their demolition because his right to unrestricted passage was impaired.	civil	Forth Cassation Court of General Jurisdiction, 15/06/2021	EUR 6,000	EUR 250
20.	29060/24 30/12/2014	Nikolay Aleksandrovich BELOBORODOV 1982		The applicant, a former police officer, was convicted of abuse of authority and bribery by the Zaliznychnyy District Court of Simferopol on 14/12/2012 and sentenced to six years and six months' imprisonment. His subsequent appeals were unsuccessful. Following the extension of Russian legislation to Crimea, the domestic courts upheld the conviction while reclassifying the offences under the corresponding provisions of Russian criminal law.	criminal	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 07/08/2014	EUR 6,000	-

ⁱ The names of courts established in Crimea under Russian law are indicated in inverted commas (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)* [GC], nos. 20958/14 and 38334/18, § 41, 25 June 2024).