



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

THIRD SECTION

CASE OF MANIKAS AND OTHERS v. GREECE

(Application no. 30240/20)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

22 October 2026

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

In the case of Manikas and Others v. Greece,

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting as a Committee composed of:

Úna Ní Raifeartaigh, *President*,

Canòlic Mingorance Cairat,

Vasilka Sancin, *judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *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 an application against Greece lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) on 11 July 2020.

2. The applicants were represented by Ms E.-L. Koutra, a lawyer practising in Athens.

3. The Greek Government (“the Government”) were given notice of the application.

THE FACTS

4. The list of applicants and the relevant details of the application are set out in the appended table.

5. The applicants complained of the inadequate conditions of their detention in the Korydallos Prison. Some applicants also raised other complaints under the provisions of the Convention.

THE LAW

I. STRIKE OUT OF THE APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO APPLICANTS NIKOLAOS PANAGOPOULOS AND META RENOU

6. By letter dated 3 October 2025, sent via the Court’s Electronic Communication Service (eComms), the applicants were requested to inform the Court of any important factual developments in their case, that may have taken place since their last correspondence with the Court. They were notified that their reply should be accompanied by a recent detention certificate or any other relevant documents. The applicants’ attention was drawn to the fact that if the requested information was not received within the indicated time-limit, the Court may conclude that the applicants no longer wished to pursue their application and decide to strike it from its list of cases. In her reply to that request sent on 23 January 2026, the representative did not provide any

information regarding applicants N. Panagopoulos and M. Renoz, indicated under nos. 5 and 6 in the appended table.

7. In the light of the foregoing, and in the absence of any special circumstances regarding respect for the rights guaranteed by the Convention and the Protocols thereto, the Court, in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention, considers that it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application with respect to the applicants N. Panagopoulos and M. Renoz, indicated under nos. 5 and 6 in the appended table.

8. Accordingly, the case should be struck out of the list with respect to these applicants.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 3 OF THE CONVENTION ON ACCOUNT OF THE CONDITIONS OF DETENTION

9. The remaining applicants, C. Manikas, T. Drakogiannakis, M. Sharaf and K. Nikolaou, indicated under nos. 1-4 in the appended table, complained under Article 3 of the Convention of the inadequate conditions of their detention in Korydallos Prison.

A. Admissibility

10. The Government submitted that the applicants M. Sharaf and K. Nikolaou, indicated under nos. 3 and 4 in the appended table, had been released prior to lodging their application with the Court and had, thus, failed to exhaust the remedy provided for under Article 105 of the Introductory Law to the Civil Code.

11. The Court notes that M. Sharaf and K. Nikolaou had been released on 21 February 2020 and 2 July 2020, respectively, that is before they lodged their application with the Court on 11 July 2020. It follows that when they lodged their applications with the Court, the applicants were no longer detained in the conditions of which they complained.

12. Hence, by lodging an application with the Court, the applicants did not seek to put an end to an ongoing violation, but to obtain a subsequent ruling on an alleged past violation of Article 3 on account of the conditions of their detention in prison and, if appropriate, to receive just satisfaction for nonpecuniary damage. Therefore, an action under Article 105 of the Introductory Law to the Civil Code constituted a domestic remedy which should have been used (see *Papadakis and Others v. Greece*, no. 34083/13, §§ 47-48, 25 February 2016, and *Zabelos and Others v. Greece*, no. 1167/15, § 54, 17 May 2018, with further references).

13. In view of the above, the Court upholds the Government's objection and finds that the applicants, listed under nos. 3 and 4 in the appended table, have failed to exhaust domestic remedies, and thus their complaints about

poor detention conditions must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention.

14. As regards the applicants C. Manikas and T. Drakogiannakis, indicated under nos. 1 and 2 in the appended table, the Court notes that their complaint is neither manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention nor inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

B. Merits

15. The Court refers to the principles established in its case-law regarding inadequate conditions of detention (see, for instance, *Muršić v. Croatia* [GC], no. 7334/13, §§ 96-101, ECHR 2016). It reiterates in particular that a serious lack of space in a prison cell weighs heavily as a factor to be taken into account for the purpose of establishing whether the detention conditions described are “degrading” from the point of view of Article 3 and may disclose a violation, both alone or taken together with other shortcomings (see *Muršić*, cited above, §§ 122-41, and *Ananyev and Others v. Russia*, nos. 42525/07 and 60800/08, §§ 149-59, 10 January 2012).

16. The Court also refers to its standard of proof and methods for assessment of evidence in conditions-of-detention cases (see *Muršić*, cited above, §§ 127-28).

17. The Court has already found a violation of Article 3 of the Convention in respect of the conditions of detention in the Korydallos Prison (see *Singh and Others v. Greece*, no. 60041/13, §§ 52-58, 19 January 2017, and, for illustrative purposes, *Cela and Others v. Greece* [Committee], no. 10244/14, §§ 45-50, 20 April 2017).

18. The applicants argued that they had been detained in overcrowded conditions, having been afforded less than 3 sq. m of personal space. They alleged that they had been held together with at least 15 other detainees in dormitories with a capacity to accommodate ten detainees.

19. The Government submitted that the overall conditions of the applicant’s detention had not attained the minimum level of severity required to fall within the scope of Article 3 of the Convention. However, the Government did not provide precise information regarding the number of co-detainees accommodated in the dormitories in which the applicants had been held.

20. The Court notes that the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture following its visit in March and April 2019 (CPT/Inf (2020) 15) found that the Korydallos Prison was operating at severe overcrowding exceeding 140 % of its capacity, once again calling upon the Greek authorities to take urgent steps to progressively reduce the overcrowding, notably in terms of reducing the occupancy levels in the dormitories. The Court also notes that the Government acknowledged that the Korydallos Prison’s

capacity was 1,270 inmates, while the occupancy rate varied from 1,300 prisoners in 2016 to 1,845 in 2020. Lastly, according to the statistical data of the Ministry of Justice, there was persistent overcrowding in that facility in 2019 and 2020. Accordingly, the Court accepts the applicants' contention that Korydallos Prison operated beyond its intended capacity throughout their detention, resulting in a manifest lack of personal space. It is further evident that such a deficiency in personal space cannot be regarded as short, occasional or minor within the meaning of the Court's case-law (see *Muršić*, cited above, § 130).

21. In view of the above and having regard to its case-law on the subject, the Court finds it established that the detention conditions of the applicants (indicated under nos. 1 and 2 in the appended table) were inadequate. Accordingly, there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

III. REMAINING COMPLAINTS

22. The applicants indicated under nos. 1 and 2 in the appended table further complained under Article 13 of the Convention that they did not have at their disposal an effective domestic remedy to complain about poor conditions of their detention.

23. Taking into account the facts of the case and the finding of a violation of Article 3 on account of the general conditions of detention prevailing in the Korydallos Prison, the Court considers that the main legal question raised in the present application has been resolved. It concludes, therefore, that there is no need to examine this part of the application (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, § 156, ECHR 2014, and, for illustrative purposes, *Fraggopoulos v. Greece* [Committee], no. 550/17, §§ 21-22, 23 January 2025).

24. Finally, the applicants raised other complaints under various Convention provisions about the quality of the medical care in the Korydallos Prison, in particular during the Covid-19 pandemic. The applicant, indicated under no. 2 in the appendix, complained also about the very fact of his detention and the applicants indicated under nos. 3 and 4 complained under Article 13 of the Convention about the lack of an effective remedy in respect of the conditions of their detention.

25. The Court has examined the complaints and considers that, in the light of all the material in its possession and in so far as the matters complained of are within its competence, these complaints either do not meet the admissibility criteria set out in Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention or do not disclose any appearance of a violation of the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Convention or the Protocols thereto.

26. It follows that these complaints must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 § 4 of the Convention.

IV. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

27. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Muršić*, cited above), the Court considers it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table to the applicants, listed under nos. 1 and 2 in the appendix, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them on those amounts and dismisses the remainder of the applicants' claims for just satisfaction.

28. The Court also considers it reasonable to award the same applicants the amount of 1,000 euros (EUR) jointly for costs and expenses incurred in the proceedings before it, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to strike the application out of its list of cases in the part lodged by the applicants N. Panagopoulos and M. Renoz, indicated under nos. 5 and 6 in the appended table;
2. *Declares* the complaints raised under Article 3 of the Convention by the applicants indicated under nos. 1 and 2 in the appended table, concerning the conditions of their detention in the Korydallos Prison admissible, *finds* that it is not necessary to examine separately their complaint under Article 13 of the Convention about the availability of domestic remedies to complain about poor detention conditions and *declares* the remainder of the application inadmissible;
3. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention in view of the detention of the applicants indicated under nos. 1 and 2 in the appended table in overcrowded conditions in the Korydallos Prison;
4. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, indicated under nos. 1 and 2 in the appended table, within three months:
 - (i) the amounts indicated in the appended table, in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable to them on those amounts;
 - (ii) EUR 1,000 (one thousand euros) jointly, plus any tax that may be chargeable to these applicants, in respect of costs and expenses;
 - (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.

5. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claim 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.

Viktoriya Maradudina
Acting Deputy Registrar

Úna Ní Raifeartaigh
President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 3 of the Convention
(inadequate conditions of detention)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Facility Start and end date Duration	Specific grievances	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros) ¹
30240/20 11/07/2020	1. Christos MANIKAS 1957	Korydallos Prison 30/09/2019-23/07/2020 9 month and 24 days	overcrowding, no or restricted access to warm water, inadequate temperature, mouldy or dirty cell, lack of or inadequate hygienic facilities, poor quality of food, lack of fresh air, passive smoking	4,400
	2. Themelis DRAKOGIANNAKIS 1987	Korydallos Prison 18/11/2019-23/08/2020 9 months and 6 days		4,400
	3. Mohammad SHARAF 1988	Korydallos Prison 18/02/2019-21/02/2020 1 year and 4 days		N/A
	4. Konstantinos NIKOLAOU 1961	Korydallos Prison 22/04/2019-02/07/2020 1 year and 2 months and 11 days		N/A
	5. Nikolaos PANAGOPOULOS 1958	Korydallos Prison 14/04/2019-13/07/2020 1 year and 3 months		N/A
	6. Meta RENOZ 1989	Korydallos Prison 24/09/2018-20/07/2020 1 year and 9 months and 27 days		N/A

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