



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

Published on 21 September 2026

FOURTH SECTION

Application no. 4484/15
Refat Abdurakhmanovich CHUBAROV against Russia
and 4 other applications
(see list appended)
communicated on 1 September 2026

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

The applications arise from the conflict between Ukraine and the Russian Federation, following the latter's assertion of jurisdiction over Crimea as of 27 February 2014 (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)* (dec.) [GC], nos. 20958/14 and 38334/18, § 335, 16 December 2020). They primarily concern entry bans imposed on the applicants by the Russian authorities in relation to Crimea. The applicants, most of whom are of Crimean Tatar origin who were either residents of Crimea or had close personal ties to the peninsula, were prohibited from entering Crimea on various dates between 2014 and 2019 for periods ranging from five to thirty-five years. The entry bans were imposed by decisions issued by the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation ("the FSB") on national security grounds. The facts of the individual cases, as submitted by the applicants, are summarised in the Appendix.

The applicants complain under Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 to the Convention about the restrictions imposed by the Russian authorities on their movement between Crimea and mainland Ukraine.

The applicants in applications nos. 55909/19 and 11787/21 raise complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention. In particular, Mr Bekirov complains that the domestic courts failed to address his principal argument that the entry ban in question had been imposed on a different person with the same surname. Mr Scandel complains that the principle of equality of arms

was breached because the FSB decision and the supporting documents had been classified by the Russian authorities, thereby preventing him from effectively challenging the restrictions imposed on him.

All the applicants submit that the impugned restrictions on their movement seriously affected their family and personal lives and amounted to an unjustified interference with their rights under Article 8 of the Convention.

The applicant in application no. 4484/15, who is a prominent political figure, also complains under Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention that the entry ban imposed on him in respect of Crimea and his subsequent criminal prosecution were linked to his opposition to the “accession” of Crimea to the Russian Federation and his participation in a demonstration organised by the Crimean Tatar community in Armiansk on 3 May 2014 (see, for context, *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)* [GC], nos. 20958/14 and 38334/18, §§ 398-99, 25 June 2024, and *Ametov and Others v. Russia* [Committee], no. 73977/14, § 3, 7 July 2026).

The applicants in applications nos. 4484/15 and 30263/16 further complain under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention that they had lost access to and use of their property in Crimea. They also allege under Article 18 of the Convention that the movement restrictions imposed on them in connection with their rights guaranteed by Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention, Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and Article 2 of Protocol No. 4, were applied for purposes other than those prescribed by those provisions.

Finally, the applicants in applications nos. 4484/15 and 11787/21 complain under Article 1 of Protocol No. 7 to the Convention, and the applicant in application no. 55909/19, under Article 13 of the Convention, that they had no procedural guarantees or effective remedies in respect of the restrictions imposed on their movement.

COMMON QUESTIONS TO THE PARTIES

1. Have the applicants complied with the admissibility requirements set forth in Article 35 § 1 of the Convention?
2. Has there been a violation of the applicants’ right to liberty of movement under Article 2 § 1 of Protocol No. 4 to the Convention (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)*, cited above, §§ 1170-75)?
3. Has there been a violation of the applicants’ right to respect for their private and family lives under Article 8 of the Convention?

CASE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Application no. 4484/15

1. Has there been a violation of the applicant's right to freedom of expression, in particular his right to impart information and ideas, contrary to Article 10 of the Convention (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)*, cited above, §§ 1097-1102)?

2. Has there been a violation of the applicant's right to freedom of assembly, contrary to Article 11 of the Convention (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)*, [GC], cited above, §§ 1121-28)?

Applications nos. 55909/19 and 11787/21

Did the applicants have a fair hearing in the determination of their civil rights and obligations, in accordance with Article 6 § 1 of the Convention?

Applications nos. 4484/15 and 30263/16

1. Has there been a violation of the applicants' right to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions within the meaning of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention (see *Loizidou v. Turkey* (merits), 18 December 1996, § 63, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-VI)?

2. Were the restrictions imposed by the respondent Government on the applicants, purportedly pursuant to Articles 8, 10 and 11 of the Convention as well as Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and Article 2 of Protocol No. 4, applied for a purpose not envisaged by those provisions, in breach of Article 18 of the Convention (see *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)*, cited above, §§ 1351-82)?

Applications nos. 4484/15, 55909/19 and 11787/21

Did the applicants have an effective domestic remedy in respect of their complaints under Article 8 and Article 2 of Protocol No. 4, as required by Article 13 of the Convention?

APPENDIX

List of cases:

No.	Application no. Case name Introduction date	Applicant Year of birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Summary of facts
1.	4484/15 Chubarov v. Russia 04/01/2015	Refat Abdurakhmanovich CHUBAROV 1957 Kyiv Ukrainian	Mykhaylo Oleksandrovych TARAKHKALO	The applicant is a Ukrainian politician of Crimean Tatar origin. Since 2013, he has been the Chairman of the Mejlis of the Crimean Tatar People. On 3 May 2014 the applicant participated in a demonstration of Crimean Tatars in Armiansk. On the same date the Prosecutor of the Republic of Crimea issued a warning to the applicant on the for engaging in extremist activity. On an unspecified date in 2014, Mr Chubarov left Crimea for mainland Ukraine. On his return journey, on 5 July 2014, the applicant was denied entry into Crimea due to a ban imposed by the FSB until 4 July 2019, on national security grounds, in accordance with Article 27 § 1 (1) of Federal Law No. 114-FZ On the Procedure for Entering and Leaving the Russian Federation (“Federal Law no. 114-FZ”). On 29 May 2015 an investigative department of the “FSB in the Republic of Crimea” instituted criminal proceedings against the applicant, accusing him of making public calls for actions violating Russia’s territorial integrity under Article 280.1 § 1 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation. In September 2015 he was placed on an international wanted list by the Russian authorities. On 6 October 2015 the “Kievskiy District Court of Simferopol” ordered his pre-trial detention. The applicant appealed, but without success.
2.	30263/16 Yüksel v. Russia 17/05/2016	İsmet YÜKSEL 1968	Darya Oleksandrivna SVYRYDOVA	The applicant is a Turkish national of Crimean Tatar origin. Since 1996 he has resided in Crimea with his family. He owned and ran a private business as an entrepreneur and was actively involved in the public and political life of the Crimean

CHUBAROV v. RUSSIA AND OTHER APPLICATIONS –
SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE AND QUESTIONS

No.	Application no. Case name Introduction date	Applicant Year of birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Summary of facts
		Kyiv Turkish		Tatar community. In particular, he held the positions of Advisor to the Chairman of the Mejlis on relations with the Republic of Türkiye and General Coordinator of the Crimean News Agency. The applicant regularly travelled between Crimea and mainland Ukraine for both personal and professional reasons. On 10 August 2014, while returning to Crimea, he was informed by Russian border guards that he was subject to a five-year entry ban to the territory of the Russian Federation. The applicant later learned that the ban had been imposed by the FSB by a decision dated 17 July 2014, pursuant to Article 27 § 1 (1) of the Federal Law No. 114-FZ. The applicant appealed against the decision, but without success. The final decision was delivered by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation on 18 November 2015.
3.	55909/19 Skandel v. Russia 10/10/2019	Izzet Ebubekir ogly SKANDEL 1995 Novooleksiivka Ukrainian	Roman Yuriyovych MARTYNOVSKYY	The applicant, a Crimean Tatar of origin, resided in Novooleksiivka, the Kherson region. He stated that he had spent his childhood in Crimea, where his relatives continued to reside. The applicant worked as a taxi driver and regularly travelled to Crimea for personal and work-related purposes. On 22 January 2018, while driving to the Crimean Peninsula, he was informed by the Russian border guards that he was banned from entering the territory of the Russian Federation until 11 January 2048 on the national security grounds, pursuant to Article 27 § 1 (1) of the Federal Law No. 114-FZ. The applicant challenged the travel ban before the national courts, but without success. The final decision was taken by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation on 10 April 2019.
4.	36498/20 Slyvka v. Russia 07/08/2020	Andriy Vasylyovych SLYVKA 1982 Kyiv Ukrainian	Mykhaylo Oleksandrovych TARAKHKALO	The applicant was born in Crimea and has been residing in Kyiv since 1990. On 19 December 2019 he travelled to Crimea to visit his dying father. However, on the same day he was denied entry by the Russian border guards on the grounds that he was subject to an entry ban until 1 February 2054, imposed by the FSB on national security grounds pursuant to Article 27 § 1 (1) of Federal Law No.114-FZ. The

CHUBAROV v. RUSSIA AND OTHER APPLICATIONS – SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE AND QUESTIONS

No.	Application no. Case name Introduction date	Applicant Year of birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Summary of facts
				applicant challenged the entry ban before the national courts, but without success. On 2 March 2021 the Moscow City Court dismissed the applicant's claim. The applicant appealed against this decision before the First Appeal Court of the General Jurisdiction. Despite several requests submitted by the applicant to the court of appeal regarding the outcome of the proceedings, he received no response.
5.	11787/21 Bekirov v. Russia 20/02/2021	Edem Lutfiyevich BEKIROV 1993 Novooleksiivka Ukrainian	Refat Memetovich YUNUS	The applicant, a Crimean Tatar, resided in Novooleksiivka, in the Kherson region. On 25 January 2018 he was denied entry to Crimea by Russian border guards at the "Chonhar" checkpoint while travelling to visit his relatives. He was informed that he was subject to an entry ban to the territory of the Russian Federation until 11 January 2048, imposed by the FSB on national security grounds pursuant to Article 27§ 1 (1) of the Federal Law No. 114-FZ. The applicant challenged the travel ban before the national courts, but without success. The final decision was delivered by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation on 1 June 2020.