

Inventory of relevant SOGIESC case law and pending cases before the ECtHR and CJEU

2025 Update

This inventory covers relevant SOGIESC cases from 2010 up until December 2024. 2024 continued steady progress with filling gaps in case law related to sexual orientation, gender identity, expression, and sex characteristics. The 2025 inventory highlights four main findings:

- i. The findings of this research concord with those of the 2025 **ILGA-Europe Annual Review** highlighting notably a rise in hate crime and anti-LGBTI rhetoric, with pending cases on these topics constantly increasing. Moreover, the increasing number of gender identity cases, pending and decided, aligns with the rise in transphobic rhetoric in Europe.
- ii. On all topics, there is a progressively closing gap between cases addressing discrimination based on **gender identity** versus sexual orientation. In 2024, 9 judgments were issued by European Courts on sexual orientation and 4 on gender identity. More cases are needed to close the gap in protection on different grounds.
- iii. Applicants increasingly rely on the **CJEU** to advance the fundamental rights of LGBTI people, notably in gender identity cases.
- iv. Monitoring the **implementation** of ECtHR and CJEU judgments is necessary in order to identify the progress in tackling gaps.

§1. Strategic litigation: a mechanism for protecting and advancing the fundamental rights of LGBTI people afforded by European human rights law

The Council of Europe (CoE) and the European Union (EU) have set important European human rights standards as well as legal protection of the rights of LGBTI people at the European level. Judgments of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), and preliminary rulings of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) are part of this standard-setting, ensuring CoE and EU Member States respect their commitments to end discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation (SO), gender identity (GI), gender expression (GE), and sex characteristics (SC). They are also important instruments to ensure implementation and full appliance of existing standards by CoE and EU Member States.

These ECtHR judgments and CJEU rulings set human rights standards which apply to governments across the CoE and the EU respectively. Considering the widespread nature of discrimination against LGBTI people, increased attacks on LGBTI people in a number of countries, still existing legislative gaps in ensuring equality, as well as the fact that some governments have started to actively take back or limit established rights, strategic litigation plays an ever more important role in protecting and advancing equal rights for LGBTI persons across Europe.

ILGA-Europe supports strategic litigation at the European courts to advance the rights of LGBTI people and closing the gap areas discussed below. We also work towards achieving legal change for LGBTI people at the European and national level by enhancing the knowledge and capacity of LGBTI activists and organisations to engage in litigation. Support at the national level ensures that strategic cases reach the European level and serve building stronger protection of LGBTI rights. Before the European courts, ILGA-Europe supports strategic cases by submitting third party interventions before the ECtHR and providing strategic guidance in cases before the CJEU. Where relevant, we also consider submitting collective complaints to the European Committee on Social Rights and the European Commission. Some of our submissions can be consulted on [ILGA-Europe's website](#).

ILGA-Europe also monitors and supports SOGIESC cases throughout the process of execution of judgments by the CoE Committee of Ministers. In collaboration with the European Implementation Network (EIN) and our members and partners, we file Rule 9 submissions before the Committee of Ministers, provide briefings where the gaps exist and make recommendations to assist with the execution process. We also together with LGBTI organisations on national level, monitor implementation of relevant CJEU judgments, including filing complaints to the EC and making the case for infringement in case of ongoing non-implementation of judgments in national laws.

With this inventory ILGA-Europe wants to support members and partners across the region to identify trends and gaps in protection at the European level, and guide strategic litigation that support closing gaps in case law. The inventory can further strengthen cooperation and help guide our work and efforts by others in bringing forward and supporting strategic cases.

This inventory and continuous assessment of the European landscape informs ILGA-Europe's ongoing engagement in strategic litigation through identification and support of strategic opportunities.

§2. Inventory of relevant SOGIESC case-law and pending cases before the ECtHR and CJEU

In this analysis of the inventory of cases we focus on a number of key gap areas we have identified, including:

- i. Areas where protection of rights is not in place to ensure equality for specific groups of LGBTI people in European human rights law, such as for example access to marriage for same-sex couples, as well as parenting rights of trans persons;
- ii. Areas where the human rights of trans and intersex people are not respected. This includes bans on intersex genital mutilation (IGM) as well as ensuring legal gender recognition (LGR) procedures based on self-determination and without any abusive requirements, particularly divorce or medical treatments, and without age limits;
- iii. Issues specific to LGBTI people which have been recognised in ECtHR judgments, but remain contested by a number of states. This would apply particularly to certain family and parenting rights which the ECtHR and CJEU have supported e.g. partnership

recognition, and the need to not have sterilisation requirement or other medical interventions as qualifying criteria for LGR processes;

- iv. Generally recognised rights, which all Member States, in accepting the above Recommendation, have acknowledged to apply to LGBTI people, but which some in practice fail to uphold: for example, protection from hate crimes or hate speech, or freedom of expression or association;

§3. Overview of the SOGIESC cases pending before the European Courts

I. General observations

The 2025 inventory enabled to identify four main findings:

- 1) The increase of pending and decided cases particularly in relation to homophobic hate crimes and hate speech based on SO and GI **aligns with the findings of ILGA-Europe's Annual Review.**

The constant increase in judgments and pending cases concerning hate crime in recent years aligns with the pervasiveness of violence in general, domestic violence and police brutality against LGBTI people in the vast majority of countries across the Council of Europe region, with incidents reported in the vast majority of examined countries (source: ILGA-Europe Annual Review, 2025).

Concerning hate speech, the high number of decided and pending cases in 2024 also aligns with a severe rise of anti-LGBTI rhetoric from politicians and state institutions across the Council of Europe and EU regions, where such rhetoric has become increasingly normalised (source: ILGA-Europe Annual Review, 2025).

On the contrary, the relatively low number of transphobic hate speech cases, pending and decided, contrasts with the empirical observation that the anti-LGBTI rhetoric also targets gender identity and sex characteristics.

There has however been a slight increase in the number of pending cases concerning gender identity in the last year, as described below (2), which shows that the high prevalence of transphobic speech and violence is starting to reach the courts on European level. Inadequate procedures for LGR, with abusive requirements, remain the issue in most cases. This increased body of case law is important as some countries in the region have and continue to make strides towards LGR procedures that are based on self-determination and respect for human rights standards, but unfortunately more and more countries are either not advancing necessary reforms or are even introducing more restrictions or even bans on legal gender recognition. (source: ILGA-Europe Annual Review, 2025).

- 2) Another key observation is the **progressively closing gap** in case law between cases on sexual orientation on the one hand, and gender identity on the other hand.

Over the years, there has been an increase in pending sexual orientation cases (6 new cases in 2024) and of sexual orientation cases decided (12 in 2024). Although there is still a clear disproportion between the number of sexual orientation cases and the number of gender identity cases, the latter number has been consistently growing in the last year, with 10 cases pending and 7 cases decided in the 2024.

However, more cases are still needed to some fill gaps concerning gender identity and sex characteristics.

This is most obvious regarding family rights. While there are always new pending cases and judgments strengthening same-sex partners' family and parenting rights (13 pending and 2 decided cases in 2024), the number of cases addressing family rights specific to couples where one or both parents are trans is significantly low (1 case decided in the last year).

The protection of human rights of intersex people is still an emerging issue in European case law, as much as in European and national legislation. While the 2024 Annual Review already reported a stagnation on IGM bans with governments not following up on commitments they had made (ILGA-Europe Annual Review 2024), the 2025 Annual Review alerts on the persistence of issues related to the imposition of IGM across the Europe (ILGA-Europe Annual Review 2025). Consequently, cases are needed to establish some legal safeguards at the European level.

- 3) The inventory reveals the **increasing importance of CJEU case law** in advancing fundamental rights of LGBTI people.

In the past years, there has been an increase in cases filed to the CJEU on SOGIESC matters. While only 4 judgments were rendered by the CJEU between 2010 and 2017, 8 judgments rendered since 2018, the year of the *Coman* and *MB v Sec of State for Work and Pensions* judgments (6 on sexual orientation and 2 on gender identity) and 7 cases filed since that date (4 on sexual orientation and 3 on gender identity).

Gender identity cases stood out particularly in the last years with the *Mirin* landmark judgment rendered in 2024 on recognition of LGR across Member States in accordance with the right to free movement read in light of the right to private life, a new case filed also on this topic in 2024 and 2 cases for which judgments will be rendered in 2025. The Grand Chamber of the CJEU relied heavily on ECtHR case law on LGR in the *Mirin* judgment, considering it as a minimum standard also applicable under EU law through the Charter of Fundamental Rights. This finding aligns with those of the 2025 Annual Review that countries in the region “continue to maintain restrictive practices or have even rolled back their legislation on gender recognition” (ILGA-Europe Annual Review 2025). These practices are now challenged before both European courts.

4) Monitoring the **implementation** of ECtHR and CJEU cases is **crucial in identifying the progress in tackling gaps**.

The number of leading judgments rendered currently under implementation is very high, with 22 sexual orientation judgments and 8 gender identity leading judgments rendered by the ECtHR still under implementation.

To illustrate this is the gap for example in the area of ‘family rights - access to registered partnership’ concerning the lack of legal protection and recognition of same-sex unions, **8** judgments finding a violation of the ECHR have been issued since 2010 and **5** of such cases are leading cases still under implementation by the Member State.


A second example is the gap ‘legal gender recognition – inadequate procedures’. **11** judgments have been issued by the ECtHR on this topic (in 10 cases) since 2010, of which **9** found a violation of the ECHR. Out of these, **6** are leading cases that have yet to be implemented, including a judgment rendered in 2007.


For extensive information on the supervision of the implementation process, please see **§4**.

II. Key figures on SOGIESC pending cases

Regarding sexual orientation, there are currently **37 cases pending before the European Courts**, concerning *12 different countries*. In the last year, 12 judgments were issued.

Regarding gender identity and sex characteristics, there are currently **10 cases pending before the European Courts**, concerning *8 different countries*. Of these, 9 pending cases concern gender identity and 1 pending case concerns sex characteristics. In the last year, 7 judgments were issued, all of which concern gender identity.





- The gap relating to **hate crime, hate speech and asylum rights** gathers the most pending case in 2024.

Sexual orientation: 21 pending cases in 2024; 9 cases decided in the last year

Gender identity: 3 pending cases in 2024; 1 case decided in the last year

- The gap covering **socio-economic rights** still needs more cases to be filled

Sexual orientation: 3 pending cases in 2024; 1 case decided in the last year

Gender identity: no pending case in 2024; no case decided in the last year

- Concerning the gap relating to **the rights of trans persons**, the observation made in 2020 that there was a good evolution in attempting to filling the gap still applies in 2024, especially regarding access to legal gender recognition.

5 pending cases in 2024; 5 cases decided in the last year.

- The gap relating to **family rights** is a clear example of the disproportion between the progress in tackling sexual orientation specific gaps versus gender identity and sex characteristics.

Sexual orientation: 13 pending cases in 2024; 2 cases decided in the last year

Gender identity: 1 pending case in 2024; 1 case decided in the last year.

- The gap relating to **the rights of intersex persons** is still an emerging issue, so more cases need to be brought before the European Courts.

1 pending case in 2024; no case decided in the last year.

§4. Key figures on SOGIESC judgments from the last year

ECtHR cases under implementation are divided into two categories according to their importance. ‘Leading cases’ reveal new structural and/or systemic problems. Such cases require the adoption of new general measures to prevent similar violations in the future. ‘Repetitive cases’ highlight gaps where the ECtHR has already delivered leading judgments setting European standards of protection, but where the Member States are still continuously violating LGBTI individuals’ fundamental rights in the context of structural and/or general problems. ‘Repetitive cases’ are usually grouped together with the leading cases.

‘Leading cases’ must hence be closely monitored in order to ensure that general measures are adopted to prevent the further violation of LGBTI individuals’ rights in the Member State of concern.

All these precisions explain why the number of pending SOGIESC cases itself is not sufficient to determine whether a particular gap is being addressed by the European Courts. It must be read in the light of the implementation status of judgments delivered in these categories of gaps.

Below are the *key figures* concerning ‘**Leading cases**’ on SOGIESC matters still under implementation.

One clear example is the gap ‘freedom of assembly’. There are currently **4** sexual orientation cases pending before the ECtHR. In parallel, **11** cases were decided since 2010, **all** of which found a violation of the ECHR. Out of these, **5** are leading cases that have yet to be implemented by the relevant Member State.

Another example is the gap ‘legal gender recognition – inadequate procedures’. **11** judgments have been issued by the ECtHR on this topic (in 10 cases) since 2010, of which **9** found a violation of the ECHR. Out of these, **6** are leading cases that have yet to be implemented.

A third example is the gap ‘family rights - access to registered partnership’. **8** judgments have been issued on the lack of legal protection and recognition of same-sex unions by the ECtHR since 2010, **all** of which have found a violation of the Convention. **5** of such cases are leading cases still under implementation by the Member State.

Overall, a total of **30 leading cases** concerning SOGIESC matters have not yet been implemented by Member States, **22** of which concern sexual orientation and **8** of which concern gender identity. The oldest judgment was rendered in 2007. Gap issues for which both the number of pending cases and the number of judgments is high call for increased scrutiny. Indeed, not only did numerous applicants suffer violations of their rights in recent years,

leading to key judgments being delivered to reaffirm strong European standard of protection, but the violations keep occurring, resulting in a constant increase in pending cases.

It is thus crucial to solicit the Committee of Ministers to push for the implementation of the judgments by the relevant Member States, in order to put an end to the continuing violations of LGBTI individuals' fundamental rights in the specific areas of concern.

At the EU level, several key judgments rendered by the CJEU on fundamental family rights questions (notably the judgments rendered respectively in 2018, 2021 and 2022 in the *Coman*, *Pancharevo* and *Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich* cases) have still not been implemented by Romania and Bulgaria respectively to date, leading to the filing of complaints to the European Commission, which should push for their implementation by the relevant Member States, including by starting infringement procedures. The *Mirin* judgment rendered in 2024 has also yet to be implemented by Romania.

1) SEXUAL ORIENTATION: 22 Leading ECtHR judgments under implementation:

- [ALEKSEYEV v. RUSSIA](#) (Application no. [4916/07](#)) 21 October 2010
(Freedom of assembly)
- [IDENTOBA AND OTHERS v. GEORGIA](#) (Application no. [73235/12](#)) 12 May 2015
(Failure to adequately protect applicants from homophobic attack)
- [M.C. AND A.C. v. ROMANIA](#) (Application no. [12060/12](#)) 12 April 2016
(Failure to conduct effective investigation into possible homophobic motives of physical and verbal attack on participants to an LGBTI rally)
- [KAOS GL v. TURKEY](#) (Application no. [4982/07](#)) 22 November 2016
(Freedom of expression)
- [BAYEV AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA](#) (Application no. [67667/09](#)) 20 June 2017
(Freedom of assembly)
- [ZHDANOV v. RUSSIA](#) (Application no. [12200/08](#)) 16 July 2019
(Freedom of assembly)
- [BEIZARAS AND LEVICKAS v. LITHUANIA](#) (Application no. [41288/15](#)) 14 January 2020
(Lack of investigation into homophobic online hate speech and denial of effective remedy in respect of the applicant's complaint)
- [BERKMAN v. RUSSIA](#) (Application no. [46712/15](#)) 1 March 2021
(Freedom of assembly)
- [SABALIĆ v. CROATIA](#) (Application no. [50231/13](#)) 14 April 2021
KEY CASE *(Hate crime)*
- [ASSOCIATION ACCEPT AND OTHERS v. ROMANIA](#) (Application no. [19237/16](#)),
Final 1 September 2021
(Freedom of assembly)
- [J.L. v. ITALY](#) (Application no. [5671/16](#)), Final 27 August 2021
(“Secondary victimisation” of a victim of sexual assault on account of her sexual orientation by domestic courts)
- [OGANEZOVA v. ARMENIA](#) (Applications nos. [71367/12](#) and [72961/12](#)) 17 August 2022

- (Hate crime and hate speech)*
- [ECODEFENCE AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA](#) (Applications nos. [9988/13](#) and 60 others) 10 October 2022
KEY CASE (*Freedom of association*)
 - [FEDOTOVA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA](#) (Applications nos. [40792/10](#), [30538/14](#), [43439/14](#)) 17 January 2023
KEY CASE (*Absence of any form of legal recognition and protection for same-sex couples*)
 - [MACATE v. LITHUANIA](#) (Application no. [61435/19](#)) 23 January 2023
KEY CASE (*No legitimate aim for temporary suspension of children's fairy tale book depicting same-sex relationships and its subsequent labelling as harmful to children under the age of 14*)
 - [BUHUCEANU AND OTHERS v. ROMANIA](#) (Application no. [20081/19](#) and 20 others) 23 May 2023
(Absence of any form of legal recognition and protection for same-sex couples)
 - [KOILOVA AND BABULKOVA v. BULGARIA](#) (Application no. [40209/20](#)) 5 September 2023
(Absence of any form of legal recognition and protection for same-sex couples)
 - [MAYMULAKHIN AND MARKIV v. UKRAINE](#) (Application no. [75135/14](#)) Final 1 September 2023
(Absence of any form of legal recognition and protection for a same-sex couple)
 - [LAPUNOV v. RUSSIA](#) (Application no. [28834/19](#)) 12 September 2023
(Inhuman and degrading treatment during unlawful abduction and detention of applicant due to his perceived sexual orientation and lack of effective investigation into the matter)
 - [PRZYBYSZEWSKA AND OTHERS v. POLAND](#) (Application no. [11454/17](#)) 12 December 2023
(Absence of any form of legal recognition and protection for same-sex couples)
 - [A.K. v. RUSSIA](#) (Application no. [49014/16](#)) 7 May 2024
(Dismissal of a teacher in relation to photos with same-sex partners posted on her private social media found to be a result of discrimination against her sexual orientation)
 - [HANOVS v. LATVIA](#) (Application no. [40861/22](#)) 18 July 2024
(Hate crime)

2) GENDER IDENTITY: 8 leading ECtHR judgments under implementation:

- [L v. LITHUANIA](#) (Application no. [27527/03](#)) 11 September 2007
(Absence of legislation to regulate the conditions and procedure for gender reassignment surgery and legal gender recognition)
- [X v. THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIC REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA](#) (Application no. [29683/16](#)) 17 January 2019
(Failure to provide quick, transparent and accessible procedures for legal gender recognition)
- [RANA v. HUNGARY](#) (Application no. [40888/17](#)) 16 July 2020
(Failure to provide quick, transparent and accessible procedures for legal gender recognition)
- [X AND Y v. ROMANIA](#) (Application nos. [2145/16](#) and [20607/16](#)) Final 19 April 2021

(Refusal of national authorities to allow LGR in the absence of gender reassignment surgery)

- [P.H. v. BULGARIA](#) (Application no. [46509/20](#)) 27 September 2022
(Failure to provide quick, transparent and accessible procedures for legal gender recognition)
- [A.D. AND OTHERS v. GEORGIA](#) (Application no. [57864/17](#)) 1 December 2022
(Failure to provide quick, transparent and accessible procedures for legal gender recognition)
- [SAVINOVSKIKH v. RUSSIA](#) (Application no. [16206/19](#)) 9 July 2024
(Termination of custody and of foster care agreement of a trans parent on the ground of his gender identity and transition)
- [W.W. v. POLAND](#) (Application no. [31842/20](#)) 11 July 2024
(Authorities' refusal to allow a transgender woman to continue hormone therapy while in prison)

§5. Focus area categorisation in identifying judgments and pending cases to address existing gaps in the protection of LGBTI rights

This overview explains how pending cases and delivered judgments have been categorised for this inventory. They aim at providing a clear idea of the areas where the protection of LGBTI rights needs to be advanced. It also helps identifying most pressing issues to be addressed through strategic litigation.

I. Hate crime, hate speech and asylum rights

I a Hate crime – failure of state to provide protection

1. Failure of states to uphold **positive obligation to protect LGBTI people** from crimes motivated by LGBTI phobia, for example:
 - i. Ill-treatment by private individuals or state officials, whether at public events such as pride marches, in police stations or places of detention, or through death threats.
 - ii. Attacks on known LGBTI venues
 - iii. LGBTI phobia violence by family members
 - iv. Lack of effective investigations into the above types of incident.

I b Discrimination by agents of the state in the execution of their duties

2. **Direct harassment/discrimination against LGBTI people by the police, or other officials**, including: arbitrary detention and arrest; illegal collection and retention of private data; police investigation data or criminal record maintained after repeal of discriminatory law; right to fair trial prejudiced by discriminatory attitude of courts.

I c Medical abuse

3. Forced and intrusive **medical examinations, commitment to medical/psychiatric facilities** with intention of "curing" the person; designation of homosexuality/gender identity as a mental health problem.

I d Hate speech

4. Failure of states to protect LGBTI people from bias-motivated hate speech, including when propagated over the Internet.

I e Asylum

5. Where an LGBTI asylum seeker is sent back to a country on the basis that sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression or sex characteristics can be concealed (in contrast to political views or religious beliefs).
 - 5a. Use of personality tests in screening LGBTI asylum applicants.

I f Freedom of expression – especially “propaganda of homosexuality” (including addressing argument that information about homosexuality is a danger to children)

6. Cases involving prosecution for disseminating information about homosexuality or trans- and intersex issues

I g Freedom of association

7. Refusal to register LGBTI organisations

I h Freedom of assembly

National interest cases

II. Socio-economic rights

II a Employment

8. General employment discrimination, including workplace harassment (important for those countries outside the EU and which have no effective protection).
9. Discrimination by religious organisations in access to jobs not directly concerned with the exercise of their faith.
10. Extending employment protection under CJEU case law beyond those intending to undergo, undergoing or having undergone reassignment treatment - (case involving discrimination against a trans person not falling under the existing definition of "transsexual", in order to extend protection to those not able or not wishing to undergo gender reassignment treatment).

II b Education

11. Positive obligation of states to take measures to protect LGBTI students from harassment and discrimination in educational establishments.
12. LGBTI phobic materials in the curricula, particularly in state funded faith schools.
13. Cases establishing that the right of parents under ECHR Protocol 1 Article 2 to ensure education in conformity with their religious convictions is subordinated to the right of children, specifically in the context of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and sex characteristics, to an objective and non-discriminatory education.

14. Constructive exclusion from education where a trans student is compelled to wear clothes opposite to their self-identified gender, or forced to use their legal name (where this has not been changed).

II c Access to services

15. Discrimination in access to services, generally
16. Discrimination in access to non-religious services provided by faith organisations to the general public (e.g. education, medical services, adoption agencies), or by persons of faith working within a non-faith organisation.¹

III. Rights of trans persons

III a Legal gender recognition

17. Inadequate procedures for legal gender recognition (including for non-binary persons)
 - 17a. Refusal by authorities to allow a change of name aligned with gender identity
 - 17b. Abolition of requirement for trans persons to undergo medical interventions prior to legal gender recognition
18. Right to identity, private life and protection of personal and medical data

III b Access to reassignment treatment

19. Private or state insurance systems to cover cost of medically necessary treatment on non-discriminatory basis.²

IV. Family rights - Same-sex partners' rights and parenting by LGBTI individuals

20. Access to **non-parenting rights of married different-sex couples**: any field such as immigration, free movement under EU law, survivor's pension, family benefit, etc
21. Access to **parenting rights of individuals or unmarried different-sex couples**:
 - i. Custody/access to biological child, e.g. following break up of previous different sex relationship, or where child is conceived with the help of medically assisted procreation³
 - ii. Adoption by a single person⁴
 - iii. Access to assisted reproductive treatment by a single woman
 - iv. Access to parental responsibility

¹ The 2013 *Ladele* and *McFarlane vs UK* cases are an important first step in closing this gap.

² Existing cases – *Schlumpf* and *van Kück* are rather narrow in the circumstances they address, giving too much scope for states to escape their obligations. Need clear-cut case in which a private or state health scheme refuses to cover any of the cost of medically necessary reassignment treatment.

³ Although covered in principle by the settled case of *Mouta v. Portugal*, in practice, as experienced in drafting of Committee of Ministers Recommendation, this is strongly contested by a number of member states

⁴ Although covered in principle by the settled case of *E.B. v. France*, in practice, as experienced in drafting of Committee of Ministers Recommendation, this is strongly contested by a number of member states.

- v. Second parent adoption by two women with a child by donor insemination or from a heterosexual relationship;⁵
 - vi. Joint adoption by same-sex couple, where permitted to unmarried different sex couple;
 - vii. Non-genetic father/mother's parenthood not recognised;
 - viii. Access to "maternity" or "paternity" leave for second parent in same-sex couple.
22. Access to **parenting rights of different sex married couples**
- i. Second parent adoption by two women with a child by donor insemination or from a heterosexual relationship;
 - ii. joint adoption by same-sex couple in countries where adoption restricted to opposite sex married couples;
 - iii. Access to assisted reproductive treatment in countries where restricted to opposite sex married couples;
 - iv. Right of bi-national same-sex couple (and their child) legally recognised in one of their two countries, but not the other, to have their child's birth certificate replicated in the second country.
23. Where no right to marry exists, **access to alternative of registered partnership**⁶; includes recognition of registered partnership contracted in a foreign country.
24. Where rights attached to registered partnership fall short of those attached to marriage.
25. Same-sex couples' right to marry.
26. Recognition of foreign marriages contracted by same-sex couples, including right of a foreign partner to reside in partner's country and right of couple's children to nationality; also, refusal of national authorities to provide certificate confirming that their citizen can enter into a [same-sex] marriage abroad.
27. Right of a child of a same-sex couple to parents' citizenship (e.g. in case of surrogate child, or child adopted abroad)
28. Violation of right to privacy, through disclosure on birth certificate of a child of a same-sex couple whose parent was the non-biological parent.

Family rights issues specific to couples where one or both partners are trans, and to trans individuals

- 29. The right of trans persons not to be required to dissolve a marriage entered into prior to their legal gender recognition.
- 30. Custody/access to the child following break up of a marriage or relationship; recognition of parental ties according to gender identity.
- 31. Where single persons are allowed to adopt, adoption rules to be applied without discrimination on grounds of gender identity.

⁵ The 2013 Grand Chamber judgment in *X v. Austria* is an important start to closing this gap. But highly contested, and more cases are needed. Important to include the child as a party in such cases, so as to bring in the best interests of the child.

⁶ *Oliari and Others v Italy*, however need more similar cases from other regions to clarify applicability of Oliari judgment in other Council of Europe States and provide guidance to the scope of rights "specific legal framework" for recognition of same-sex unions would entail.

32. Right to be designated with the legally recognised gender one's child's birth certificate, and related privacy issue re disclosure of trans status.

33. General Issue in parenting

Affirmation that parenting by LGBTI persons is not contrary to the best interests of the child

V. Rights of intersex persons

34. Cases addressing the problem of young intersex children being exposed to IGM (intersex genital mutilation) before they are old enough to give informed consent.
35. Cases addressing intersex persons' access to legal gender recognition.
36. Cases addressing the access to health care of adult intersex persons.
37. Cases addressing non-discriminatory access to sport competitions.

§6. Case-law evolution on the protection of the rights of LGBTI people on European level

The table below provides an overview of the **evolution of case law on LGBTI rights since 2010** when ILGA-Europe started conducting this inventory, including judgments issued since then and cases communicated and still pending, as of December 2023. **The inventory does not cover all cases, but the ones that ILGA-Europe does identify as strategic based on the thinking set out above.**

Pending cases refer to cases communicated, not to applications filed.

Highlighted in yellow: cases decided/communicated over the last year.

All cases are hyperlinked.

• JUDGMENTS

I. Hate crime, hate speech and asylum rights
I a. Hate crimes - failure of the state to protect

Identoba v. Georgia (violation of Art 3, 11, 14 - 2015): Failure to provide adequate protection against inhuman and degrading treatment against LGBTI activists by religious groups during a march in 2012; absence of effective investigation.

↳ *Execution status: enhanced procedure because ongoing problem in identifying hate motives; systematic measures needed to protect LGBTI demonstrators; action plan/report received.*

M.C. and A.C. v. Romania (violation of Art 3 + 14 – 2016): Treatment directed at the applicant's identity, incompatible with respect for their human dignity, ineffective investigations, failure to consider possible discriminatory motives.

↳ *Execution status: enhanced procedure; complex problem; action plan/report received; pending; general measures under assessment; just satisfaction paid.*

Sabalic v. Croatia (violation of Art 3 and 14 - 2020) authorities' response to violent homophobic attack was ineffective. KEY CASE.

↳ *Execution status: standard; Action Plan/Report received, just satisfaction paid.*

Association ACCEPT and others v. Romania (violation of art 8+11+14 - 2021): Police failed to prevent far-right invasion of gay film screening and homophobic abuse.

↳ *Execution status: pending; enhanced procedure since 2022 (was under standard supervision before then); Action Plan/Report received; just satisfaction paid.*

Genderdoc-M and M.D. v. the Republic of Moldova (violation of Art 3+14 – 2021): Failure to conduct effective investigation into whether assault by private party was a hate crime motivated by homophobia.

↳ *Execution status: Closed.*

Oganezova II v. Armenia (72961/12) (violation of Art 3 + 14 – 2022): State's failure to protect LGBT bar owner and activist from homophobic arson, physical and verbal attacks and to carry out effective investigation.

↳ *Execution status: pending; Action Plan/ Report received; complex problem; just satisfaction paid.*

WISG and others v. Georgia (73204/13 and 74959/13) (Violation of Art 3 + 14 and 11 + 14 – 2022): State's failure to take operational preventive measures to protect applicants from homophobic and/or transphobic violence, conduct an effective investigation and ensure LGBT rally proceeded peacefully. Indications of official acquiescence, connivance and active participation in individual acts motivated by prejudice.

↳ *Execution status: paid; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Stovanova v. Bulgaria (56070/18) (Violation of Art 14+2 – 2022): State's failure to consider homophobic motives underlying the murder of a gay man as a statutory aggravating factor, with no measurable effect on sentencing.

↳ *Execution status: enhanced procedure; complex problem; paid.*

Ivanov v Russia (violation of Art 3, 3+14 and 13 – 2023): State's failure to take into account the discriminatory motive of the assault of an LGBTI activist during a demonstration.

↳ *Execution status: enhanced procedure; complex problem; awaiting payment.*

Beus v. Croatia (violation of Art 3, 8 and 14 – 2023): Domestic authorities' lack of appropriate procedural response to acts of homophobic violence

↳ *Execution status: standard procedure; paid.*

Romanov and others v. Russia (violation of Art 3+14, 5 § 1, 11, 11+14 – 2023): State's failure to take effective preventive measures aimed at protecting members of LGBTI community from violent verbal and physical hate-motivated attacks by private individuals during demonstrations and to conduct an effective investigation into homophobic motives of counter-demonstrators

↳ *Execution status: enhanced procedure; awaiting action plan/report; awaiting payment.*

A v. AZERBAIJAN and 24 other applications (struck out - 2024): Police raid against LGBTI individuals leading to ill-treatment, arbitrary detention and forced medical examinations, with lack of effective remedies in respect of those violations

Karter v. Ukraine (violation of Art 3+14 – 2024): Failure of the authorities to investigate homophobic attacks effectively

Execution status: enhanced procedure; complex problem; paid.

Hanovs v. Latvia (violation of Art 3 and 8+14-2024): Failure of the authorities to offer adequate protection for the applicant by ensuring effective prosecution of hate-motivated attacks against him on account of his sexual orientation

↳ *Execution status; pending; action plan received; paid.*

Side by Side International Film Festival and Others v. Russia (violation of Art 10 – 2024):

State's failure to comply with positive obligation to protect organisers of an LGBT festival and its audience

↳ *Execution pending, new case.*

- PENDING

SO.; 'TBILISI PRAIDI' and Others v Georgia and Salome NIKOLEISHVILI and Others v Georgia (602/22 and 13073/22 – 2022); Zoryan Romanovych KIS and Tymur Anzorovych LEVCHUK v. Ukraine (910/18 – 2023)

GIESC: Koutra and Katzaki v. Greece (2017); Şlepac v. Moldova (2024)

- JUDGMENTS

I b Discrimination by agents of the state in the execution of their duty

X v. Turkey (violation of Art 3 + 14 – 2012): conditions of detention in solitary confinement incompatible with human dignity and based on sexual orientation (discriminatory motive); lack of effective remedy.

↳ *Execution closed.*

Aghdgomelashvili v Georgia (violation of Art 3 + 14 – 2021): the inappropriate conduct of the police officers (strip searches, insults, threats of physical violence) incompatible with human dignity; failure to identify the discriminatory motives, namely homophobic and transphobic hatred against the applicants.

↳ *Execution pending, enhanced procedure; complex problem; paid.*

J.L. v. Italy (violation of Art 8-1 – 2021): failure of the national authorities to protect the applicant from secondary victimisation throughout a criminal proceedings (notably in the language and arguments used by the court in a public judgment).

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

GENDERDOC-M and M.D. v. the Republic of Moldova (violation of Art 3 + 14 – 2022): State's failure to conduct effective investigation into whether assault by private party was a homophobic hate crime.

↳ *Execution closed*

Duğan v. Turkey (violation of Art 5 and 14 – 2023): Unjustified short-term detention at a police station of a transgender sex worker, for disrupting traffic

↳ *Execution: standard procedure; awaiting for Action Plan/Report.*

Dzerkhorashvili & Others v. Georgia (violation of Art 5 § 1 – 2023): Administrative arrest and detention of LGBTI activists for about twelve hours not free from arbitrariness, for drawing graffiti on the walls of a church.

↳ *Execution: standard procedure; paid.*

Lapunov v. Russia (violation of Art 3, 14+3 and 5 § 1 – 2023): Discriminatory abduction, detention and torture of a gay man by State agents in Chechnya on account of his sexual orientation and systematic failure to investigate unacknowledged detentions and disappearances in Chechnya.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure.*

Silvia Viktorova DIMITROVA v. Bulgaria (inadmissible – 2023): refusal by the authorities to issue a protection order in a case of domestic violence by a same-sex partner, inadmissible for failure to exhaust local remedies based on Article 35 §§ 1 and 4.

V.P. v. Russia (violation of Art 3 and Art 13 – 2024): inhuman and degrading treatment in Russian penal facilities due to their inferior position within an informal prisoner hierarchy and lack of effective domestic remedies for their complaints in that regard.⁷

↳ *Execution: pending, awaiting information on payment*

- PENDING

SO: S.BEDNAREK and others v Poland (2022);
Irakli ARESHIDZE v. Georgia (2023)

⁷ The ECtHR joined several applications having similar subject matters, including app. 33140/15 based on Art 3 and Art 14+3 (discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation), but did not examine the claim under Art 14 in its judgment. This became a pattern in cases against Russia in the past years, which is a missed opportunity for the Court to rule on SOGIESC grounds in these cases. *See also e.g.* Sozayev and others v. Russia; Shneyder and others v Russia (gap I h).

GIESC: Jand v. Greece (2020)

I c Medical abuse

Forced and intrusive medical examinations, commitment to medical/psychiatric facilities with intention of "curing" the person; designation of homosexuality/trans status as a mental health problem.

I d "Hate speech"

• JUDGMENTS

Vejdeland v. Sweden (no violation – 2012):

Sweden acted in compliance with article 10 by convicting the applicants who had distributed homophobic leaflets in a secondary school.

Beizaras and Levickas v. Lithuania (violation of Art 8 + 14 – 2020): failure to investigate online hateful comments against a gay couple.

↳ *Execution status: pending; standard procedure; complex problem; action plan/report is received; paid.*

Lilliendahl v. Iceland (no violation – 2020):

Iceland acted in compliance with the Convention by convicting and fining the author of homophobic comments. Such prejudicial and intolerant comments, which promoted intolerance and detestation of homosexual persons, fell within the definition of hate-speech under Article 10.

GenderDoc-M v. Moldova (23914/15)

(inadmissible – 2022): Hate speech claim inadmissible because the claimant, an LGBTI association was neither a direct or indirect victim of the acts affecting the rights of its individual members.

Andrea GIULIANO v. Hungary, (inadmissible – 2022):

§30. *"In the light of the above, the Court considers that the investigative actions undertaken by the domestic authorities constituted appropriate, albeit unsuccessful, steps towards identifying and punishing those responsible for the alleged crimes."*

Nepomnyashchiy and others v. Russia (violation of Art 8+14 – 2023):

Domestic authorities' failure to comply with their obligation to respond adequately to homophobic statements made by state officials against members of the LGBTI community published in a newspaper.

Jonas VALAITIS v. Lithuania (no violation – 2023):

The State took wide-ranging and

multifaceted domestic measures combatting hate speech in response to the Court's judgment in Beizaras and Levickas case. An investigation was carried out in the applicant's case.

Public association “Information Centre GENDERDOC-M” v. Moldova (23911/15, 18083/16) (inadmissible – 2023): homophobic statements by politicians and a priest, inadmissible *ratione personae* for lack of victim status of the applicant.

Yevstifev v. Russia (violation of Art 8+14 – 2024): Domestic authorities' failure to comply with their positive obligation to respond adequately to homophobic statements by a politician against participants to the LGBTI column of a rally.
↳ *Execution pending, new case.*

Onurhan SOLMAZ v. Turkey (Inadmissible - 2024): Domestic authorities' failure to prosecute a local council and newspapers' publication of transphobic material. Inadmissibility due to manifestly ill-founded request (statements not amounting to hate speech).

- PENDING

SQ: Minasyan and others v. Armenia (2018); Sahakyan and others v. Armenia (2021); GenderDoc-M v Moldova (17766/16, 2021); GenderDoc-M v Moldova (23907/15, 2022); Makeleio EPE (CJEU, 2023); Zougla SA (CJEU, 2023); New generation humanitarian NGO v. Armenia (2023); Svirplys and Latvys v. Lithuania (2024)

I e Asylum

- JUDGMENTS

X, Y & Z (CJEU – 2013): application of law criminalising homosexual acts is an act of persecution; when assessing an application for refugee status, the competent authorities cannot reasonably expect, in order to avoid the risk of persecution, the applicant for asylum to conceal his homosexuality.

A, B & C (CJEU – 2015): prohibition of refugee assessment based on stereotyped notions concerning homosexuals, sexual practices, and other ‘tests’ (films).

O.M. v. Hungary (violation of Art 5 – 2016): the applicant's detention verged on arbitrariness and did not contain any adequate reflection on his individual

circumstances as a member of a vulnerable group by virtue of belonging to a sexual minority in Iran.

↳ *Execution status: Pending, standard procedure; repetitive case; paid.*

B and C v. Switzerland (violation of Art 3 – 2020): domestic courts’ failure to sufficiently assess the risks of ill-treatment as a homosexual person in the Gambia and the availability of State protection against ill-treatment emanating from non-State actors.

↳ *Execution status: closed, standard procedure; leading case.*

LB v. France (inadmissible – 2023): expulsion to Morocco of an intersex person who had started gender reassignment treatment in France after the rejection of his asylum application. Inadmissible based on failure to exhaust local remedies.

M.I. v Switzerland (violation of Art 3 – 2024):

Domestic courts’ expulsion decision of asylum seeker to Iran without assessing the risk of ill-treatment against him in view of his sexual orientation and by applying concealment reasoning.

↳ *Execution pending, new case.*

- PENDING

SO: V.D. v. Russia (2020);

I f Freedom of expression/association

- JUDGMENTS

Kaos GL v. Turkey (violation of Art 10 – 2016):

Seizure of all copies of a magazine published by an association promoting LGBT rights in Turkey breached its right to freedom of expression.

↳ *Execution status: Pending, standard procedure, repetitive case.*

Bayev v Russia (violation of Art 10 + 14 – 2017):

Laws prohibiting propaganda of homosexuality among minors and penalizing propaganda of bisexuality and trans identity among minors reinforce stigma and prejudice and must be repealed.

↳ *Execution pending, enhanced procedure.*

Ecodefence and others v. Russia (violation of Art

11 and 34 – 2022): Application of Foreign Agents Act to applicant NGO. Violation art 34 on account of the respondent State’s failure to comply with the interim measure indicated by the Court. KEY CASE.

↳ *Execution pending; new case; awaiting AP/R.*

Yevtushenko and Isakov v. Russia (violation of Art 10 and 14+10 – 2023): The State’s ban on "promotion of homosexuality among minors" and its implementation in the case where the applicant was convicted for an administrative offence for picketing with a banner against homophobia, violates Articles 10 and 14+10.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem; awaiting information on payment.*

MACATĖ v. Lithuania (violation of Art 10 and 14+10 – 2023): No legitimate aim for temporary suspension of a children’s fairy tale book depicting same-sex relationships and its subsequent labelling as harmful to children under the age of 14. KEY CASE.

↳ *Execution pending; leading; enhanced procedure; paid.*

C8 (Canal 8) v. France (no violation – 2023): Sanctions imposed by the national broadcasting authority to a television channel for a footage perpetuating a negative and stigmatising stereotype of homosexual people has not infringed its right to freedom of expression.

Lenis v. Greece (inadmissible – 2023): Criminal conviction of senior Greek Orthodox Church official for publishing an article containing hate speech and incitement to violence targeting LGBTI people does not violate his freedom of expression.

- PENDING

SO: Ilupin and Others v. Russia (2018); Klimova v. Russia (2017); Commission v. Hungary (C-769/22); Doina-Ioana STRĂISTEANU v. Moldova (2023); Háttér Tarsasag and Amnesty International Magyarország v. Hungary (2024).

I g Freedom of association

Refusal to register LGBTI organisations

No pending cases

One case was declared inadmissible (**Lambda Istanbul v. Turkey – 2021**)

I h Freedom of assembly

National interest cases

- JUDGMENTS

Alekseyev v. Russia (violation of Art 11 + 13 & 11 + 14 & 11 – 2010) : Authorities’ repeated refusals to authorize gay-pride marches.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Zhdanov v. Russia (violation of Art 6 + 11 + 14&11): Authorities' refusal to register LGBTI associations.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Sozayev and others v. Russia (violation of Art 11 + 5 + 6 – 2020): Abusive administrative offences

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Shneyder and others v Russia (violation of Art 11 + 5 + 6 – 2020): Abusive administrative offences

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Berkman v. Russia (violation of Art 11, 5§1 – 2021): Failure to ensure that public LGBTI awareness event proceeded peacefully.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Yartsev v. Russia (violation of Art 10 – 2021): No legal basis for applicant's conviction for shouting slogans not corresponding to the declared aims of a lawful public event

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Kavkazskiy v. Russia (violation of Art 5§1 – 2022): Unlawful detention.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure.*

Abakumov and others v. Russia (violation of Art 11 – 2023): detention and fine for participating in an assembly against LGBTI discriminations.

↳ *Execution pending; new case.*

Davydov and others v. Russia (violation of Art 11 and 13 – 2023): ban on picketing at the Ministry of Health against the ban on blood donations by homosexuals.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Antropov and Others v. Russia (violation of Art 11 – 2024): Disproportionate measures taken against organisers and participants to events in support of the LGBT community and anti-corruption rallies (arrest and conviction for administrative offences).

↳ *Execution status: pending; enhanced procedure, awaiting payment.*

Potapov and Others v. Russia (violation of Art 11

– 2024): Disproportionate measures taken against organisers and participants to events in support of the LGBT community and opposition rallies (arrest and conviction for administrative offences).

↳ *Execution status: pending; enhanced procedure; awaiting payment.*

- PENDING

SO: Oleksandra Igorivna SVERDLOVA and Olena Olegivna SHEVCHENKO v. Ukraine (2020); Shevchenko and others v. Ukraine (2022); GENDERDOC-M v. Moldova (40235/15, 2022); KaosGL Dernegi v. Turkey (2024);

→ 4 cases **inadmissible in accordance with Article 35 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention.**

II. Socio-economic rights and access to services

II a Employment – general

- JUDGMENTS

ACCEPT v. Fotbal Club Steaua Bucuresti

(CJEU, C-81/12 – 2013): Homophobic statements by the ‘patron’ of a professional football club may shift the burden of proof on to the club to prove that it does not have a discriminatory recruitment policy.

NH v. Associazione Avvocatura per i diritti LGBTI – Rete Lenford

(CJEU, C-507/18 – 2020): statements made by a lawyer during a radio programme, saying he would never recruit a “homosexual” or wish to use the services of such persons, fell within the ambit of the anti-discrimination directive.

J.K. v. TP S.A.

(CJEU, C-356/21 – 2023): Directive 2000/78 on Equal Treatment protects self-employed persons when contracting with third parties during the performance of their activities from being discriminated against on the basis of their sexual orientation.

A.K. v. Russia (violation of Art 8+14 – 2024):

Disproportionate dismissal of a teacher in relation to photos with same-sex partners posted on her private social media found to be a result of discrimination on the grounds of her sexual orientation.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; awaiting information on payment*

- PENDING

SO: Oleynik v. Russia (2020); K.P. v. Poland (2021)

II a Employment – faith organisations

II b Education – discriminatory materials in school curricula

II c Access to services – generally

- JUDGMENT

Gareth Lee v. UK (inadmissible – 2020)

II c Access to services – discrimination on grounds of faith

- JUDGMENT

Ladele v UK and McFarlane v UK (2013): importance of balancing the right to freedom of religion with the public interest in providing non-discriminatory services and ‘ensuring that members of the public, regardless of their sexual orientation, are treated with dignity and have equal access to services.

- PENDING

SO: GENDERDOC-M v. Moldova (54873/18, 2022)

- JUDGMENT

IV Family rights - Same-sex partners’ rights and parenting rights

20. Access to non-parenting rights of married different sex couples

any field such as immigration, free movement under EC law, survivor's pension, family benefit, etc

Hay v. Credit agricole mutuel (CJEU, C-267-12 – 2013): an employee who concludes a civil solidarity pact with a person of the same sex must obtain the same benefits (days of special leave and a salary bonus), as those granted to married employees, where the national rules of the Member State concerned do not allow persons of the same sex to marry.

Taddeucci & McCall v. Italy (violation of Art 8 + 14 – 2016): treating homosexual couples – for the purposes of granting a residence permit for family reasons – in the same way as heterosexual couples who had not regularised their situation was discriminatory.

V.M.A. v Stolichna obshtina, rayon Pancharevo (CJEU, Grand Chamber, Case C-490/20 – 2021)

Articles 20 and 21 TFEU; notion of family; free movement. In the case of a child, being a minor, whose birth certificate, issued by the host Member State, designates as that child’s parents two mothers, the Member State of which that child is a national is obliged (i) to issue to that child an identity card or a passport without requiring a birth certificate to be drawn up beforehand by its national authorities, and

(ii) to recognise the birth certificate for the child to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.

Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich (CJEU, Case C-2/21 – 2022)

EU Member State must recognise family ties established between two mothers and their child in another Member State by transcribing the birth certificate into the national register for civil status for the purposes of freedom of movement and residence under Article 20 and 21 TFEU, read in conjunction with Articles 7 and 24 of the CFR.

- PENDING

SQ: Antoni MESZKES v. Poland (socio-economic rights, 2020); Rafał GROCHULSKI v. Poland (life insurance, 2020); Barbara Gabriela STARSKA v. Poland (name change, 2020); Rafał Kowalski v. Poland (2022)

21. Access to parenting rights of individuals or unmarried different sex couples

X v. Austria (violation of Art 14+ 8 – 2013): excluding second-parent adoption in a same-sex couple, while allowing that possibility in an unmarried different-sex couple, was a distinction incompatible with the Convention.

D.B. and others v. Switzerland (violation of Art 8 – 2022)

Margin of appreciation exceeded. The State's failure to recognize the lawfully issued foreign birth certificate in so far as it concerned the parent-child relationship between the intended father and the child born through surrogacy in the US, without providing for alternative means of recognising that relationship is not in the best interests of the child.

X v. Poland (violation of Art 14 + 8, 2022)

Refusal to grant parental rights and custody based solely or decisively on considerations regarding sexual orientation.

↳ *Execution pending; standard; leading.*

Callamand v. France (violation of Art 8 – 2022)

– Rejection of the applicant's request for contact rights with her former spouse's child (conceived by medically assisted procreation and in respect of whom she had acted as a joint parent for more than two years since his birth).

S.-H. v. Poland (inadmissible – 2022)

– Application for Polish citizenship of children of same-sex parents born via a surrogacy agreement residing in Israel. Inadmissible *ratione materiae*.

S.W. and Others v. Austria (inadmissible – 2022)

– Refusal to issue birth certificate indicating both child’s parents as her mothers in case of adoption by biological mother’s partner in same-sex couple. Application manifestly ill-founded.

Valentina BORTOLATO v. Italy (inadmissible – 2023): no remedy available for a social/intended mother prevented from visiting her children by the biological/legal mother. Inadmissible based on Article 35 § 4 as the State had a wide margin of appreciation.

R.F. and others v. Germany (inadmissible– 2024): authorities’ refusal to recognise as such the genetic mother of same-sex couple’s child (who adopted the child as a second parent). No violation due to margin of appreciation of the State and subsequent legal adoption by genetic mother.

- PENDING

SO.; A.D.-K. and Others v. Poland (2019); B.N. v. Poland (2024)

22. Access to parenting rights of different sex married couples

23. Access to registered partnership

Where no right to marry, **access to alternative of registered partnership**; Includes recognition of registered partnership contracted in a foreign country

- JUDGMENTS

Vallianatos et al v. Greece (violation of Art 14 + 8 – 2013): the Government had not offered convincing and weighty reasons capable of justifying the exclusion of same-sex couples from civil unions.

Oliari v. Italy (violation Art 8 – 2015): taking note of the changing conditions in Italy, the Court noted that the Italian Government had overstepped their margin of appreciation and failed to fulfil their positive obligation to ensure that the applicants have available a specific legal framework providing for the recognition and protection of their same-sex unions

Barmaxizoglou and others v. Greece (violation of Art 14+8 – 2022): the Government had not offered convincing and weighty reasons capable of justifying the exclusion of same-sex couples from civil unions (under law 3719/2008 regime, before the entry into force of law 4356/2015).

↳ *Execution closed.*

Buhuceanu and others v. Romania (violation of Art 8 – 2023): Same-sex couples should have the possibility of entering into a form of civil union or registered partnership in order to have their relationships legally recognised and protected – in the form of core rights relevant to any couple in a stable and committed relationship – without unnecessary hindrance. None of the public-interest grounds put forward by the State prevailed.

↳ *Execution pending; leading; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Maymulakhin and Markiv v. Ukraine (violation of Art 14+8 – 2023): The difference in treatment in the present case, which consisted in the unjustifiable denial to the applicants as a same-sex couple of any form of legal recognition and protection as compared with different-sex couples, amounts to discrimination against the applicants on the grounds of their sexual orientation.

↳ *Execution pending; leading; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Fedotova and others v. Russia (violation of Art 8 – 2023): States are required to provide a legal framework allowing same-sex couples to be granted adequate recognition and protection of their relationship. The State has overstepped its margin of appreciation and has failed to comply with its positive obligation to secure the applicants’ right to respect for their private and family life. KEY CASE.

↳ *Execution pending; leading; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Koilova and Babulkova v. Bulgaria (violation of Art 8 – 2023): The State (which refused to recognise a marriage concluded abroad) has overstepped its margin of appreciation and failed to satisfy its positive obligation to ensure that the applicants had available to them a specific legal framework providing for the recognition and protection of their union as a same-sex couple.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

Przybyszewska and others v. Poland (violation of Art 8 – 2023): The Polish legal framework cannot be said to provide for the core needs of recognition and protection of same-sex couples in a stable and committed relationship. The State has overstepped its margin of appreciation and has failed to comply with its positive obligation to ensure that the applicants had a specific legal framework providing

for the recognition and protection of their same-sex unions.

↳ *Execution pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

- PENDING

SQ: *Todosiiciuc v. Moldova* (2024)

24. Where rights attached to registered partnership fall short of those attached to marriage.

25. Right to marry

The Court no longer considers right to marry limited to two persons of opposite sex. See Schalk & Kopf (2010): the relationship of the applicants, a cohabiting same-sex couple living in a stable *de facto* partnership, falls within the notion of “family life”.

26. Recognition of foreign marriages contracted by same-sex couples

- JUDGMENT

Coman and others v. Inspectoratul General pentru Imigrări and Ministerul Afacerilor Interne (CJEU, Grand Chamber, C-673/16 – 2018): The term ‘spouse’ for the purpose of the grant of family reunification rights under EU free movement law, includes the same-sex spouse of a Union citizen who has moved between Member States. The refusal to recognise the same-sex marriage of a third country national and a Union citizen, which has been concluded in another Member State during the Union citizen’s period of genuine residence in that State, can impede the exercise of the right to free movement of the Union citizen.

↳ *Execution pending.*

Formela and Others v. Poland (Violation of Art 8- 2024): Authorities’ refusal to register a same-sex marriage concluded abroad under any form and failure to ensure that they have a specific legal framework providing for recognition and protection violated applicants’ right to respect for private and family life.

↳ *Execution: enhanced procedure; complex problem; awaiting action plan/report; awaiting info on payment.*

- PENDING:

Coman and others v. Romania (2663/21) (2021); A.B and K.V. v. Romania (17816/21) (2021); Andersen v. Poland (53662/20, 2022); Ferguson and others v. United Kingdom (2023); CJEU,

Wojewoda Mazowiecki (C-713/23) (2023);
Gruszczynski-Regowski v. Poland (2024)

Family rights issues specific to couples where one or both partners are trans, and to trans individuals

30. **Custody/access to the child** following break up of a marriage or relationship; recognition of parental ties according to gender identity.

- JUDGMENT

A.M. and others v Russia (violation of Art 8 and Art 8+14 – 2021): Restriction of applicant’s parental rights and deprivation of contact with her children on gender identity grounds.

↳ *Execution: pending, standard, awaiting info on payment.*

A.H. and others v. Germany (no violation of Art 8 – 2023): refusal of the civil registration authorities to record a trans women who did not give birth to her child in the register of births as mother. KEY CASE.

Savinovskikh v. Russia (violation of Art 8 - 2024): Termination of custody and of foster care agreement of a trans parent on the ground of his gender identity and transition.

↳ *Execution pending; new case.*

O.H. and G.H. v. Germany (no violation of Art 8 – 2023): refusal of the German courts to allow a trans man who gave birth to his child to be recorded as father. KEY CASE.

32. **Right to be designated with the legally recognised gender one’s child’s birth certificate**, and related privacy issue re disclosure of trans status.

- PENDING

Y.P. v. Russia (2017)

Gaps specific to gender identity and sex characteristics

III a Legal gender recognition — inadequate procedures

L v. Lithuania (violation of Art 8 - 2007):

Absence of legislation to regulate the conditions and procedure for gender reassignment surgery and legal gender recognition.

↳ *Execution: pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

A.P., Garçon and Nicot v. France (violation of Art 8, 2017): LGR should not be dependent on gender reassignment surgery or hormonal treatment.

RANA v. Hungary (violation of Art 8, 2020): obligation to provide a procedure allowing LGR extends to all lawfully settled non-national citizens.

↳ *Execution status: Pending; leading; enhanced procedure; complex problem; action plan/report is awaited.*

Y.T. v. Bulgaria (violation of Art 8 – 2020): Unjustified refusal to grant LGR to the applicant for an unreasonable and continuous period although it had been recognised in other cases.

Revision in 2024: application declared inadmissible retroactively due to the fact that the applicant had failed to inform the Court at the time of his obtention of LGR through a different court procedure.

MB v Sec of State for Work and Pensions (CJEU, C-451/16 – 2018): EU Law precludes national legislation which requires a person who has changed gender not only to fulfil physical, social and psychological criteria but also to satisfy the condition of not being married to a person of the gender that they have acquired as a result of that change, in order to be able to claim a State retirement pension as from the statutory pensionable age applicable to persons of their acquired gender.

S.V. v. Italy (violation of Art 8 – 2018): national authorities' refusal to authorise a trans woman to change her name on the grounds that she had not undergone gender reassignment surgery.

X and Y v. Romania (violation of Art 8 – 2021): legal framework not clear or foreseeable; requirement to undergo gender reassignment surgery as a prior condition for LGR amounts to an unjustified interference with the right to private life.
↳ *Execution: Pending; Leading case; enhanced procedure.*

P.H. v. Bulgaria (violation of Art 8 – 2022): absence of legislation to regulate the conditions and procedure for gender reassignment surgery.
↳ *Execution: pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

R.K. v. Hungary (violation of Art 8 – 2023): lack of regulatory framework and failure to provide quick, transparent and accessible procedures for LGR.
↳ *Execution: repetitive, complex problem.*

A.C. and others v. Hungary (inadmissible - 2024): Absence of statutory provisions regulating the procedure for LGR of the applicants, inadmissible as the applicants were in the end able to obtain LGR.

Mirin (CJEU, C-4/23, 2024): Refusal by Romanian authorities to recognise a dual national (Romanian-British) trans man's first name and gender identity acquired through LGR in the United Kingdom, and to record the changes in his birth certificate, is a violation of the right to free movement read in light of the right to private and family life guaranteed by EU law.

E.G. and others v. Hungary (violation of Art 8 – 2024): Lack of quick, transparent and accessible regulatory framework for LGR.

↳ *Execution status: pending; awaiting info on payment; complex problem.*

- PENDING

Deldits (CJEU, C-247/23, 2023); Mousse (CJEU, C-394/23, 2023); Shipov (CJEU, C-43/24, 2024); A.M.P. v. Romania (2024)

III a Legal gender recognition – abolition of harmful and unnecessary medical requirements

Y.Y. v. Turkey (violation of Art 8 – 2015): refusal by the national authorities to authorise gender reassignment surgery on the grounds that the applicant was not permanently unable to procreate.

X. v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (violation of Art 8, 2019): lack of statutory regulation of LGR procedures in the respondent State created a state of uncertainty for trans people, which mitigated in favour of inconsistent practice being created and applied by the domestic authorities.

↳ *Execution status: Pending; leading; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

A.D. and others v. Georgia (violation of Art 8 – 2022): Domestic authorities' failure to provide quick, transparent and accessible procedures for legal gender recognition.

↳ *Execution status: Pending; leading; enhanced procedure; complex problem; paid.*

Csata v. Romania (violation of Art 8 – 2023): Domestic authorities' refusal to grant LGR in the absence of sex reassignment surgery.

↳ *Execution status: Pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem.*

- PENDING

T.H. v. Czech Republic (2023)

<p>III a Legal gender recognition – abolition of divorce requirement</p>	<p><u>MB v Sec of State for Work and Pensions (CJEU, C-451/16 – 2018)</u></p>
<p>III b Access to gender reassignment treatment</p>	<p><u>W.W. v. Poland (Violation of Art 8 – 2024):</u> Authorities’ refusal to allow a trans woman to continue hormone therapy while in prison. ↳ <i>Execution status: pending; awaiting information on payment, new case.</i></p>
<p>Recognition that gender identity covered by non-discrimination Article (14)</p>	<p><u>P.V. v. Spain (No violation of 8 + 14 – 2010):</u> Restriction of contact arrangements between a trans woman and her six-year-old son was in the child’s best interests; “transgender identity is a notion undoubtedly covered by Article 14”</p> <p><u>Identoba v. Georgia (2015)</u> “the prohibition of discrimination under Article 14 of the Convention duly covers questions related to sexual orientation and gender identity” ↳ <i>Execution status: Pending; enhanced procedure; complex problem</i></p>
<p><u>VI Intersex persons’ rights</u></p> <p>34. Cases addressing the wrongful assignment of gender of young intersex children through sex assignment surgery before they are old enough to give informed consent and to express their gender.</p> <p>35. Access to legal recognition by adult intersex persons.</p> <p>36. Cases addressing the access to health care by adult intersex persons.</p> <p>37. Cases addressing the access to sport competitions</p>	<p><u>M. v. France (inadmissible – 2022):</u> Ill-treatment (surgery and medical treatment) carried out on an intersex person without her consent. Inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.</p> <p><u>Y. v. France (no violation – 2023):</u> The applicant is an intersex person, whose birth certificate contains the mention “man”. The authorities refused to replace it by “neutral” or “intersex”. The applicant argues breach of the right to respect of their private life under Article 8 of the Convention. No violation as the State enjoyed a wide margin of appreciation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PENDING <p><u>Semenya v Switzerland (violation of Art 14+8, 13+14+8 – 2023) (referred to the Grand Chamber):</u> Discrimination against a professional athlete with differences of sex development who was required under non-State regulations (World Athletics DSD regulations) to lower her natural testosterone level to compete in women’s category in international competitions</p>