



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

FOURTH SECTION

CASE OF IVANOVA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA

*(Applications nos. 57074/17 and 9 others –
see appended list)*

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

22 October 2026

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

In the case of Ivanova 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 1 October 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 third-party comments were received from the Ukrainian Government, who made use of their right to intervene (Article 36 § 1 of the Convention).

THE FACTS

3. The list of applicants and the relevant details of the applications are set out in the appended table.

4. The applicants mainly complained of the cancellation by the Russian authorities of their titles to plots of land in Sevastopol, Crimea. They also raised other complaints under the provisions of the Convention.

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. THE *LOCUS STANDI* ISSUE FOR APPLICATION NO. 53374/18

9. The Court notes that the applicant in application no. 53374/18, Mrs Mariya Ivanovna Krysina, died on 11 June 2020, while the case was pending before it. Her son, Mr Andrey Anatolyevich Krysin, has expressed his wish to pursue the proceedings on his late mother’s behalf (see the appended table). The Court considers that Mr Krysin has a legitimate interest in pursuing the application in the late applicant’s stead (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, § 97, ECHR 2014). For reasons of convenience, however, the Court will continue to refer to Mrs Krysina as “the applicant”.

IV. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL NO. 1 TO THE CONVENTION

10. The applicants complained of the cancellation by the Russian authorities of their titles to plots of land in Sevastopol, Crimea. They relied on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention.

11. The Court reiterates the general principles concerning the peaceful enjoyment of property and the conditions for any interferences with that right to be deemed compatible with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (see *Lekić v. Slovenia* [GC], no. 36480/07, § 94, 11 December 2018; *G.I.E.M. S.r.l. and Others v. Italy* [GC], nos. 1828/06 and 2 others, § 292, 28 June 2018; and *Iatridis v. Greece* [GC], no. 31107/96, § 58, ECHR 1999-II).

12. 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, as a consequence, that a campaign of expropriation/nationalisation of private property in Crimea based on Russian law did not have a legal basis and was in violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (*ibid.*, §§ 1134-51).

13. The Court observes that the applicants had title cancellation actions brought against them by Russian authorities claiming that the privatisation of

their plots of land under Ukrainian law had been unlawful (see the appended table). These claims were allowed by the Russian “courts”¹ in Crimea.

14. Issues similar to those in the present case have already been examined in the leading case of *Bazhenov and Others v. Russia and Ukraine*, nos. 20092/18 and 11 others, §§ 81-91, 16 July 2026, in which the Court found a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

15. Having examined all the material submitted to it, the Court has not found any fact or argument capable of persuading it to reach a different conclusion on the admissibility and merits of these complaints. Having regard to its case-law on the subject, the Court considers that in the instant case the decisions of the Russian “courts” to cancel the titles and claim the plots of land belonging to the applicants had no basis in law, were not lawful, and created a continuing situation of “deprivation”.

16. These complaints are therefore admissible and disclose a breach of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

V. OTHER ALLEGED VIOLATIONS UNDER WELL-ESTABLISHED CASE-LAW

17. Some applicants complained, explicitly or in substance, that their cases had been determined by courts operating in Crimea which could not be considered as tribunals “established by law” within the meaning of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention (see appended table). These complaints raise an issue under that provision, given the relevant well-established case-law of the Court. These complaints are not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention, nor are they inadmissible on any other ground. Accordingly, they must be declared admissible. Having examined all the material before it, the Court concludes that they also disclose a violation of the Convention in the light of its findings in *Ukraine v. Russia (re Crimea)* (cited above, §§ 1013, 1019 and 1022).

VI. REMAINING COMPLAINTS

18. Some applicants also raised other complaints under Articles 6 (fairness of proceedings, impartiality of tribunal) and 13 of the Convention. Having regard to the facts of the case and its findings in paragraphs 16-17 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).

¹ 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).

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, *Bazhenov and Others*, cited above, § 117), the Court considers it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table and dismisses the remainder of the applicants' claims for just satisfaction. In principle, the Court does not award any sum to the applicants who have failed to submit their just satisfaction claims despite having been invited to do so. Where the applicant has not made a claim under pecuniary damage and/or costs and expenses, the Court, having regard to Rule 60 of the Rules of Court, only awards the sums under those heads where the call was made (see *Nagmetov v. Russia* [GC], no. 35589/08, § 93, 30 March 2017).

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 Andrey Anatolyevich Krysin has standing to pursue the application no. 53374/18 in his late mother's stead;
4. *Declares* the complaints concerning the cancellation by the Russian authorities of property titles in Crimea and the other complaints raised under well-established case-law of the Court, as set out in the appended table, admissible, and *decides* that there is no need to examine the remaining complaints raised under Articles 6 and 13 of the Convention;
5. *Holds* that these complaints disclose a breach of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 concerning the cancellation by the Russian authorities of property titles in Crimea;
6. *Holds* that there has been a violation of the Convention as regards the other complaints raised under well-established case-law of the Court (see appended table);
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;

8. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claims for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 22 October 2026, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Uğur Erdal
Acting Deputy Registrar

Lorraine Schembri Orland
President

IVANOVA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

APPENDIX

List of applications raising complaints under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1
(cancellation by the Russian authorities of property titles in Crimea)

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Plot number and address	Area (sq. m)	Acquisition details	Final decision	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses per application (in euros) ²
1.	57074/17 25/07/2017	Nataliya Anatoliyivna IVANOVA 1986	Angelova Yuliya Sevastopol	Land plot no. 27/13, Okeanska St, Sevastopol	607	Allocated to Ms Ivanova by the Sevastopol City Administration ("SCA") decision no. 962-p dated 02/04/2010 (re "Optima-S" cooperative); title registered on 14/02/2014	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 24/03/2017	Art. 6 (1) - tribunal not "established by law" - the applicant's case was determined by courts operating in Crimea under the Russian legal framework, which could not be regarded as tribunals "established by law".	10,000	
2.	79970/17 11/11/2017	Anna Valentinovna LYSENKO 1975	Mustafina Galiya Saidovna Moskow	Land plot no. 42/17, Pozharova St, Sevastopol	700	Allocated to a certain Ms Sh. by the SCA decision no. 954-p dated 02/04/2010; purchased by Ms Lysenko from Ms Sh. with the former's title registered on 31/07/2013	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 07/07/2017			
3.	44104/18 06/09/2018	Roman Yuriyovych MARTYNOVSKYY 1965	Yakovlev Andriy Viktorovych Kyiv	Land plot no. 28, Bashenna St, Sevastopol	1,000	Allocated to a certain Ms L. by the SCA decision no. 960-p dated 02/04/2010; purchased by Mr Martynovskyy from Ms L. with the	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 06/03/2018	Art. 6 (1) - tribunal not "established by law" - the applicant's case was determined by courts operating in Crimea under the Russian legal framework, which could not be	10,000	250

¹ Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants.² Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants.

IVANOVA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Plot number and address	Area (sq. m)	Acquisition details	Final decision	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses per application (in euros) ²
						former's title registered on 27/10/2010		regarded as tribunals "established by law".		
4.	47224/18 04/10/2018	Mariya Ivanovna KOSYAKOVA 1949	Morozova Natalya Yuryevna Moscow	Land plot no. 57/45, Kompozitorskaya St, Sevastopol	1,000	Allocated to Ms Kosyakova by the SCA decision no. 1256-p dated 07/04/2010 (re "Druzhba-9" cooperative); title registered on 06/05/2014	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 09/06/2018		10,000	250
5.	50499/18 23/10/2018	Oleg Borisovich KONOPATSKIY 1964	Morozova Natalya Yuryevna Moscow	Land plot no. 57/42, Kompozitorskaya St, Sevastopol	1,000	Allocated to Mr Konopatskiy by the SCA decision no. 1256-p dated 07/04/2010 (re "Druzhba-9" cooperative); title registered on 24/04/2014	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 11/05/2018		10,000	250
6.	51946/18 30/10/2018	Aleksandr Vladimirovich NAMINAS 1962	Morozova Natalya Yuryevna Moscow	Land plot no. 55/39, Kompozitorskaya St, Sevastopol	1,000	Allocated to Mr Naminas by the SCA decision no. 1257-p dated 07/04/2010 (re "Druzhba-1" cooperative); title registered on 05/05/2014	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 11/05/2018	Art. 6 (1) - tribunal not "established by law" - the applicant's case was determined by courts operating in Crimea under the Russian legal framework, which could not be regarded as tribunals "established by law".	10,000	250
7.	52048/18 30/10/2018	Stanislav Olegovich KONOPATSKIY 1995	Morozova Natalya Yuryevna Moscow	Land plot no. 56/57, Kompozitorskaya St, Sevastopol	1,000	Allocated to Mr Konopatskiy by the SCA decision no. 1250-p dated 07/04/2010 (re "Druzhba-8" cooperative); title registered on 06/05/2014	"Sevastopol City Court", 20/04/2018		10,000	250

IVANOVA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA JUDGMENT

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Plot number and address	Area (sq. m)	Acquisition details	Final decision	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros) ¹	Amount awarded for costs and expenses per application (in euros) ²
8.	52101/18 30/10/2018	Nadezhda Valentinovna KOSYAKOVA 1978	Morozova Natalya Yuryevna Moscow	Land plot no. 56/62, Kompozitorskaya St, Sevastopol	1,000	Allocated to Ms Kosyakova by the SCA decision no. 1250-p dated 07/04/2010 (re "Druzhba-8" cooperative); title registered on 23/04/2014	"Sevastopol City Court", 04/05/2018		10,000	250
9.	53015/18 07/11/2018	Vladimir Viktorovich BULGAKOV 1960	Morozova Natalya Yuryevna Moscow	Land plot no. 55/38, Kompozitorskaya St, Sevastopol	1,000	Allocated to Mr Bulgakov by the SCA decision no. 1257-p dated 07/04/2010 (re "Druzhba-1" cooperative); title registered on 06/04/2014	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 11/05/2018	Art. 6 (1) - tribunal not "established by law" - the applicant's case was determined by courts operating in Crimea under the Russian legal framework, which could not be regarded as tribunals "established by law".	10,000	250
10.	53374/18 09/10/2018	Mariya Ivanovna KRYSSINA 1938 Died in 2020 HEIR: Andrey Anatolyevich KRYSSIN Bron in 1965	Morozova Natalya Yuryevna Moscow	Land plot no. 57/155, Kompozitorskaya St, Sevastopol	1,000	Allocated to Ms Kryssina by the SCA decision no. 1256-p dated 07/04/2010 (re "Druzhba-9" cooperative); title registered on 06/04/2014	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 11/05/2018	Art. 6 (1) - tribunal not "established by law" - the applicant's case was determined by courts operating in Crimea under the Russian legal framework, which could not be regarded as tribunals "established by law".	10,000	250