



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

FIFTH SECTION

**CASE OF A.N. AND OTHERS v. GREECE**

*(Applications nos. 65267/19 and 2 others –  
see appended list)*

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

22 January 2026

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



**In the case of A.N. and Others v. Greece,**

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

María Elósegui, *President*,

Gilberto Felici,

Diana Sârcu, *judges*,

and Sophie Piquet, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to:

the applications against the Hellenic Republic lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by the applicants listed in the appended table, (“the applicants”), on the various dates indicated therein;

the decision not to have the applicants’ names disclosed;

the decision to give notice of the applications to the Greek Government (“the Government”), represented by their Agent, Mr Konstantinos Georgiadis, Legal Counsellor and Senior Adviser at the State Legal Council, and his delegates, Ms Ourania Patsopoulou, Ms Asimina Dimitrakopoulou, Ms Stavroula Trekli and Ms Ioulia Kotsoni, in applications nos. 65267/19 and 13892/20, and by Ms Stavroula Trekli, Senior Adviser at the State Legal Council, in application no. 18958/20;

the decision to give priority (Rule 41 of the Rules of Court) to applications nos. 65267/19, 18958/20 and 13892/20, and the decisions to indicate interim measures to the respondent Government under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court in applications nos. 65267/19 and 13892/20 as set out in the appended table;

the observations submitted by the respondent Government and the observations in reply submitted by the applicants;

the comments submitted by the Greek Government, and Association for Legal Studies on Immigration (ASGI), the Law Clinic in Human Rights and Migration Law of the International University College of Turin (IUC), the Law Clinic for Human Rights of the University of Palermo (CLEU) and the National Coordination of Italian Legal Clinics (CCLI), which were granted leave to intervene by the President of the Section in application no. 13892/20;

Having deliberated in private on 11 December 2025,

Delivers the following judgment, which was adopted on that date:

## SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

1. The case concerns the living conditions of the applicants, who were unaccompanied minors seeking international protection in Greece and were accommodated at the Samos Reception and Identification Centre (“the Samos RIC”) during various periods between February 2019 and May 2020.

**D.F., application no. 65267/19**

2. The applicant is an Afghan national. On 4 February 2019 he arrived in Greece and was placed at the Reception and Identification Centre (RIC) on Samos. He was initially registered as an unaccompanied minor born on 1 January 2004. On 6 February 2019 the Samos RIC sent a referral request to the Public Prosecutor of the Samos First Instance Court for the appointment of a guardian, and a request to the National Centre for Social Solidarity (NCSS/EKKA) to identify suitable accommodation for him as an unaccompanied minor. The Public Prosecutor acted as his temporary guardian.

3. The applicant submitted an application for international protection, which was fully registered on 27 March 2019. His personal interview was initially scheduled for 4 January 2022.

4. According to the applicant, he remained in the makeshift camp in the surrounding area of the RIC (“the Jungle”) until mid-May 2019, when he moved on his own initiative to the minors’ section of the Samos RIC. The Government did not provide information as to the exact date of his transfer to the safe zone.

5. On 27 June 2019 the NCSS informed the Samos RIC that there was an available place for the applicant in a transit facility in Samos. On 4 November 2019, the NCSS cancelled the transfer owing to a bedbug infestation in that facility.

6. On 15 November 2019 the NCSS informed the Samos RIC that a place had become available in the safe zone of the Lagadikia accommodation facility (Thessaloniki), operated by the NGO ARSIS. The transfer and escort of the minor were to be arranged by the NGO METAdrasi.

7. On 23 December 2019 the applicant lodged a request for interim measures before the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, which the Court granted on 24 December 2019, requiring the authorities to transfer the applicant to suitable accommodation for unaccompanied minors.

8. On 15 January 2020 the applicant was transferred to the accommodation facility in Thessaloniki escorted by the NGO METAdrasi. The transfer was delayed pending the completion of medical examinations (chest X-ray) required prior to admission.

9. On 19 October 2020, following an age-assessment procedure, his date of birth was amended from 1 January 2004 to 1 January 2002, rendering him an adult as of 1 January 2020. His asylum interview was subsequently rescheduled for 15 July 2021.

10. The applicant currently resides in Germany (Berlin).

**A.N., application no. 65267/19**

11. The applicant is an Afghan national born in 2003. On 6 June 2019 he arrived in Greece and was placed in the RIC on Samos. Upon arrival, he was accommodated in the safe zone for unaccompanied minors. On the same date the Samos RIC sent a referral request to the Public Prosecutor of the Samos First Instance Court for the appointment of a guardian, and a request to the NCSS to identify suitable accommodation for him as an unaccompanied minor. The Public Prosecutor acted as his temporary guardian.

12. He submitted an application for international protection, which was fully registered on 11 July 2019, and his personal interview was scheduled for 4 January 2022.

13. The National Dublin Unit submitted a take-charge request under the Dublin III Regulation (Regulation (EU) No. 604/2013), seeking family reunification with the applicant's aunt residing in Switzerland.

14. On 23 December 2019 the applicant lodged a request for interim measures before the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, which the Court granted on 24 December 2019, requiring the authorities to transfer the applicant to suitable accommodation for unaccompanied minors.

15. On 31 December 2019 the NCSS informed the Samos RIC that a place had been found for the applicant in the safe zone of Schisto accommodation facility (Attica) operated by the NGO ARSIS. The transfer and escort of the minor were to be arranged by the NGO METAdrasi.

16. On 22 January 2020 the Swiss authorities accepted the family-reunification (take-charge) request.

17. On 27 January 2020 the applicant was transferred to the accommodation facility in Attica escorted by the NGO METAdrasi.

18. On 28 February 2020 the applicant was transferred to Switzerland pursuant to the accepted Dublin III request, where he currently resides under a type F residence permit.

**S.N., application no. 65267/19**

19. The applicant is an Afghan national born in 2004. He arrived in Greece on 4 February 2019 and was placed in the RIC on Samos.

20. According to the applicant, he orally informed the authorities that he was a minor. He was initially registered as an adult.

21. The applicant lodged an application for international protection, which was fully registered on 4 April 2019. His personal interview was scheduled for 4 May 2020.

22. On 17 April 2019 he submitted a request to the Samos RAO to have his date of birth corrected, providing an original identification document.

23. On 23 April 2019 his request was accepted, and he was officially recognised as a minor. On the same date, the Samos RAO sent a referral

request to the Public Prosecutor of the Samos First Instance Court for the appointment of a guardian, and a request to the NCSS to identify suitable accommodation for him as an unaccompanied minor. The Public Prosecutor acted as his temporary guardian

24. According to the applicant, upon arrival he remained in the makeshift camp in the surrounding area of the RIC (“the Jungle”) until mid-May 2019, when he moved on his own initiative to the minors’ section of the Samos RIC. The Government did not provide information as to the exact date of his transfer to the safe zone.

25. On 23 December 2019 the applicant lodged a request for interim measures before the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, which the Court granted on 24 December 2019, requiring the authorities to transfer the applicant to suitable accommodation for unaccompanied minors.

26. On 30 December 2019 the NCSS informed the Samos RAO that a place had been found for the applicant in an accommodation facility in Athens (“Inoi”), operated by the NGO Evropaiki ekfrasi (European Expression). The transfer and escort of the minor were to be arranged by the NGO METAdrasi.

27. On 7 February 2020 the Public Prosecutor approved the transfer, and on 11 February 2020 the applicant was transferred to the accommodation facility in Athens escorted by the NGO METAdrasi.

28. The National Dublin Unit submitted a take-charge request under the Dublin III Regulation (Regulation (EU) No. 604/2013), seeking family reunification with the applicant’s sister residing in the United Kingdom. The UK authorities accepted the take-charge request, and on 20 August 2020 the Piraeus Asylum Office issued a transfer decision.

29. On 20 November 2020 the applicant was transferred to the United Kingdom pursuant to the accepted request under Dublin III Regulation, where he currently resides under refugee status.

**A.A., application no. 65267/19**

30. The applicant is an Afghan national born in 2004. On 13 September 2019 he arrived in Greece and was placed in the RIC on Samos. Upon arrival, he remained in the makeshift camp in the surrounding area of the RIC (“the Jungle”).

31. The applicant lodged an application for international protection, which was fully registered on 29 November 2019. His personal interview was scheduled for 25 October 2022.

32. On 23 December 2019 the applicant lodged a request for interim measures before the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, which the Court granted on 24 December 2019, requiring the authorities to transfer the applicant to suitable accommodation for unaccompanied minors.

33. On 30 December 2019 the Samos RAO sent a referral request to the Public Prosecutor of the Samos First Instance Court for the appointment of a

guardian, and a request to the NCSS to identify suitable accommodation for him as an unaccompanied minor. The Public Prosecutor acted as his temporary guardian.

34. On 31 December 2019, the NCSS informed the Samos RAO that a place had been found for the applicant in the safe zone of the Schisto accommodation facility (Attica) operated by the NGO ARSIS. The transfer and escort of the minor were to be arranged by the NGO METAdrasi.

35. On 24 January 2020 the Public Prosecutor approved the transfer, and on 28 January 2020 the applicant was transferred to the accommodation facility.

36. On 29 October 2020 he voluntarily left the facility.

37. From 9 to 13 November 2020 the applicant was held in protective custody at the Igoumenitsa Police Station.

38. On 11 November 2020 the NCSS informed the authorities that a place had been found for the applicant in a temporary accommodation facility in Kozani (Elimeia Hotel), operated by the International Organization for Migration (IOM). On 13 November 2020 he was transferred to that facility.

39. On 18 February 2021, by order of the Public Prosecutor, the applicant was transferred to an accommodation facility in Alexandria to complete the Best Interests Assessment (BIA) conducted by the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) and to explore the possibility of relocation to another European Union Member State. The applicant was subsequently relocated to Switzerland, where he resides under a type F residence permit.

**M.H., application no. 65267/19**

40. The applicant is an Afghan national. He arrived in Greece on 3 March 2019 and was placed in the RIC on Samos. His date of birth was initially recorded as 1 January 2002. He lodged an application for international protection, which was fully registered on 28 March 2019.

41. On 4 March 2019 the Samos RIC sent a referral request to the Public Prosecutor of the Samos First Instance Court for the appointment of a guardian, and a request to the NCSS/EKKA to identify suitable accommodation for him as an unaccompanied minor. The Public Prosecutor acted as his temporary guardian.

42. According to the applicant, upon arrival he was accommodated in the makeshift camp in the surrounding area of the RIC (“the Jungle”), where he remained until mid-April 2019, when he moved on his own initiative to the minors’ section of the RIC. The Government did not specify the exact date of his transfer to the safe zone.

43. On 14 November 2019 the applicant submitted a request to the Samos RAO to correct his date of birth, providing an original identification document. On 22 November 2019, following acceptance of that request, his

date of birth was amended from 1 January 2002 to 1 January 2004. His asylum interview was scheduled for 7 April 2022.

44. On 23 December 2019 the applicant lodged a request for interim measures before the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court. On 24 December 2019, the Court indicated interim measures, requiring the authorities to transfer the applicant to suitable accommodation for unaccompanied minors.

45. On 31 December 2019 the NCSS informed the Samos RAO that a place had been found for the applicant in the Schisto safe zone (Attica) operated by the NGO ARSIS, with the transfer and escort to be arranged by the NGO METAdrasi.

46. The applicant alleged that in early January 2020, the Minors' Section of the RIC informed him that he was considered to have reached majority and required him to leave the section. The Government did not address this allegation.

47. On 23 January 2020 METAdrasi informed the authorities that the transfer would take place on 27 January 2020. On 24 January 2020 the Public Prosecutor approved the transfer, and on 28 January 2020 the applicant was transferred to the facility escorted by the NGO METAdrasi.

48. The National Dublin Unit submitted a take-charge request under the Dublin III Regulation (Regulation (EU) No. 604/2013), seeking family reunification with the applicant's aunt residing in Switzerland, but that the request was rejected by the Swedish authorities.

49. The Greek authorities subsequently examined the possibility of his relocation to another European Union Member State within the EU Relocation Scheme, and on 10 August 2021, the applicant was transferred to Portugal under the Relocation scheme, where he currently resides.

#### **A.N., application no. 13892/20**

50. The applicant is an Afghan national born in 2004. On 24 July 2019, he arrived in Greece and was placed in the RIC on Samos.

51. According to the applicant, he orally informed the authorities that he was a minor. He was initially registered as an adult born in 1993.

52. Between 14 and 19 October 2019, while still registered as an adult, the applicant was arrested and detained at the Vathy Police Station in connection with a brawl and disturbance of the peace under Articles 189 and 313 of the Criminal Code. Following his appearance before the Samos Investigating Judge, he was released without conditions.

53. On 5 November 2019 he submitted a request to the Samos RAO to correct his date of birth, providing an original identification document. On 7 November 2019 his request was accepted and he was officially recognised as a minor, born on 1 January 2004.

54. On 17 February 2020 the applicant was transferred to the Vathy Police Station after a suicide attempt.

55. On 24 February 2020, pursuant to a prosecutor's order, he was taken to the General Hospital of Samos, where doctors recommended psychiatric hospitalisation.

56. On 26 February 2020, by a new prosecutor's order, he was transferred to the Municipal Centre for Mental Health of Children and Adolescents on Lesbos.

57. On 27 February 2020 he was returned to the Samos RIC and was placed in the safe zone for unaccompanied minors.

58. On 16 March 2020 the Court indicated interim measures under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, requiring the authorities to provide the applicant with adequate accommodation and care appropriate to his age and condition.

59. On 26 March 2020 the Samos RAO sent a referral request to the Public Prosecutor of the Samos First Instance Court for the appointment of a guardian, and a request to the NCSS/EKKA to identify suitable accommodation for him as an unaccompanied minor. The Public Prosecutor acted as his temporary guardian.

60. On 31 March 2020 the psychosocial unit of the Samos RIC classified the applicant as a victim of psychological violence, granting him priority status in the accommodation referral system.

61. On 13 May 2020, the NCSS informed the authorities that a place had been found in an accommodation facility in Aspropyrgos (Attika region) operated by the NGO Kentro Simparastasis Pallinostountwn kai Mentanastwn (Centre for the Support of Repatriated Persons and Migrants). On 19 May 2020 the NGO METAdrasi confirmed that the transfer would take place on 21 May 2020.

62. On 21 May 2020 the applicant was transferred to the accommodation facility escorted by the NGO METAdrasi.

63. On 17 September 2020 he was transferred to another facility in Makrinita operated by the NGO ARSIS by an oral order of the Public Prosecutor.

64. On 6 October 2020 he left that facility voluntarily.

65. On 7 May 2021 the Special Secretariat for Unaccompanied Minors submitted a relocation request to the French authorities, and on 9 September 2021, the applicant was relocated to France.

#### **A.M., application no. 18958/20**

66. The applicant is an Afghan national born in 2005. On 13 September 2019 he arrived in Greece and was placed in the RIC on Samos, where he was registered as an unaccompanied minor. On the same date, the Samos RIC sent a referral request to the Public Prosecutor of the Samos First Instance Court

for the appointment of a guardian, and a request to the NCSS/EKKA to identify suitable accommodation for him as an unaccompanied minor. The Public Prosecutor acted as his temporary guardian.

67. On 3 December 2019 the applicant lodged an application for international protection.

68. On 4 June 2020 the applicant was transferred to the safe area. He was placed in Dormitory C2, measuring 22 sq. m and divided into two four-bed sections, with a total capacity of eight persons. At that time, eleven other unaccompanied minors were accommodated in the same container.

69. On 16 June 2020 following action taken by the Special Secretary for Unaccompanied Minors the National Dublin Unit submitted a relocation request to Finland, which was accepted on 19 June 2020.

70. On 22 June 2020, the applicant was transferred to the mainland to a temporary accommodation facility (Hotel ALMA) operated by IOM.

71. On 8 July 2020 the applicant was relocated to Finland, where he currently resides.

## I. THE APPLICANTS' VERSION OF THE LIVING CONDITIONS IN THE SAMOS RIC

### A. General situation

72. The applicants submitted that, at the material time, the Samos RIC and its surrounding area were severely overcrowded and unsanitary. The official facility, designed to accommodate 648 persons, in practice hosted several thousand, including families, single men and unaccompanied minors. As a result, a vast informal settlement—commonly referred to as “the Jungle”—had developed on the hillside adjacent to the RIC, consisting of tents, makeshift shacks and improvised shelters. The applicants contended that most new arrivals, including unaccompanied minors, were compelled to reside in this informal area, as no space was available inside the official RIC. The area lacked electricity, running water, toilets and waste disposal. According to the applicants, sanitation facilities within the official RIC were severely inadequate for the number of residents.

73. Medical and psychosocial support was, in the applicants' account, extremely limited. One doctor and a small number of nurses were reportedly responsible for thousands of residents. The applicants maintained that even unaccompanied minors who had reported trauma, illness or self-harming behaviour did not receive timely or adequate treatment.

74. The applicants further submitted that the capacity of the “safe zone” for unaccompanied minors was manifestly insufficient, accommodating fewer than one hundred minors at any given time, while several hundred others, including very young children, remained in the informal settlement. The “safe zone” was fenced and guarded but often lacked heating, sufficient

bedding and privacy. The containers were overcrowded, and minors shared confined spaces with little supervision or access to educational or recreational activities. As to guardianship, the applicants stated that the prosecutors formally acting as temporary guardians under domestic law lacked the capacity to perform such duties in practice, leaving minors effectively unrepresented in administrative or judicial proceedings. Requests for transfer to the mainland or to appropriate shelters were routinely delayed for months, and interim measures granted by the Court in several cases were not implemented promptly.

75. In their view, the situation on Samos was not the result of a temporary crisis but reflected structural deficiencies and a lack of effective coordination between the competent authorities.

### **B. The applicants' individual circumstances**

76. The applicants submitted that their individual experiences reflected the structural shortcomings of the Samos RIC. They maintained that, although identified or declared as unaccompanied minors upon arrival, they were left for prolonged periods in overcrowded and insanitary conditions, without adequate supervision, psychological support or legal guardianship.

77. In particular, the applicants argued that the authorities had failed to ensure their prompt transfer to age-appropriate accommodation. The applicants in applications nos. 65267/19 and 13892/20 stressed that, despite the Court's interim measures requiring their transfer to suitable accommodation, the authorities had not acted with the requisite urgency, leaving them for extended periods in the same conditions.

78. The applicants alleged that they had been accommodated on the ground or on wooden pallets covered with plastic sheeting, without mattresses, heating or adequate protection against the elements. They had no regular access to sanitation, showers or laundry facilities and were required to queue for long periods to receive insufficient and poor-quality food. They further complained of exposure to violence, theft and intimidation by adults in the camp, in the absence of effective protective measures by the authorities. Owing to the lack of an operational guardianship system, they remained without legal representation or access to appropriate assistance, receiving only *ad hoc* support from non-governmental organisations. They maintained that they had remained in these conditions for several months — ranging from four to ten — before being transferred to the mainland or to suitable shelters, despite the authorities' awareness of their minor status and vulnerability.

79. Several applicants further reported having suffered severe psychological distress and physical illness during their stay on Samos. In particular, one applicant (A.N., application no. 13892/20) attempted suicide, while others developed skin infections, respiratory problems, and symptoms consistent with post-traumatic stress. According to their submissions,

requests for medical or psychosocial assistance were either ignored or subject to significant delay.

## II. THE GOVERNMENT'S VERSION OF THE LIVING CONDITIONS IN THE SAMOS RIC

### A. General context

80. The Government submitted that, at the material time, the Samos RIC was an open-type facility operating under the responsibility of the Ministry for Migration and Asylum. Within its official perimeter there were prefabricated housing units and tents, a medical and psychosocial support unit, and thirty-five communal toilets and showers. Residents were provided with three meals per day, access to drinking water, and a monetary allowance under the national reception scheme.

81. The Government acknowledged that, at the relevant period, the population of the Samos RIC had significantly exceeded its official capacity of 648 persons owing to sustained migratory arrivals on the island. In this context, a number of residents had erected temporary or makeshift shelters on adjoining land, forming what became known as the “informal settlement” or “Jungle.” They emphasised that this area lay outside the official perimeter of the RIC and had not been authorised by the administration; rather, it had developed spontaneously due to overcrowding and residents’ preference for independent living. Many of those who stayed in the informal settlement continued to have daily access to the RIC for food distribution, medical assistance and water supply.

82. The Government further explained that a separate “safe zone” had been established within the RIC for unaccompanied minors (UAMs). This was a demarcated and supervised area composed of prefabricated containers, situated apart from the general population and staffed by a multidisciplinary team including a psychologist and a social worker. The operation of the safe zone was carried out in cooperation with civil-society organisations and was designed to ensure the protection and daily monitoring of UAMs.

83. The Government further acknowledged that, due to limited capacity, not all minors could be accommodated in the safe zone immediately upon arrival. Temporary housing within the general RIC area was therefore arranged until a place became available, with priority given to younger or medically vulnerable minors.

84. The Government stressed that, during the period under review, Greece had been confronted with a renewed migration crisis and exceptional humanitarian pressures. According to official data, 2,369 unaccompanied minors had arrived in 2018 and 3,852 in 2019. Between 2016 and 2021, the NCSS/EKKA had recorded 34,062 referrals for the accommodation of unaccompanied minors. This situation, they argued, placed an extraordinary

burden on the reception infrastructure, particularly on the North Aegean islands, including Samos. The Government added that the situation had been further aggravated by the COVID-19 pandemic, which imposed public-health restrictions, limited staff rotations and reduced mobility, thereby hampering transfers and administrative processing.

85. They maintained that the authorities had undertaken sustained efforts to address overcrowding and to strengthen protection for vulnerable persons. In particular, they referred to the gradual expansion of accommodation capacity, the establishment of the Special Secretariat for Unaccompanied Minors in March 2020, and the implementation of an EU-funded relocation scheme for unaccompanied minors in cooperation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), IOM and non-governmental organisations. A transitional guardianship programme operated by NCSS/EKKA in partnership with the NGO METAdrasi was also in place, providing temporary legal representation and psychosocial support to unaccompanied minors pending the appointment of a permanent guardian.

86. According to data from NCSS/EKKA, the total number of long-term and temporary accommodation places for unaccompanied minors increased markedly during 2020–2021: from 1,579 long-term and 769 temporary places in February 2020, to 1,876 and 1,628 respectively in November 2020, and to 1,961 and 1,535 in January 2021. Between January and June 2020 alone, 17,764 transfers from the islands to the mainland were carried out, including 2,386 from Samos. These measures, together with the EU relocation programme, were presented as part of a comprehensive decongestion strategy.

## **B. The applicants' individual circumstances**

87. The Government maintained that each of the applicants had access to the RIC's basic services, including food, drinking water, and medical care. Medical screening and psychosocial assessments were reportedly carried out by the competent unit within the RIC shortly after their arrival.

88. The authorities acknowledged that, owing to overcrowding, certain applicants had initially remained in the informal settlement or in tents within the general RIC area before being transferred to the safe zone or to appropriate accommodation on the mainland.

89. The Government pointed out that all the applicants were progressively transferred to suitable accommodation, either in safe zones or mainland facilities, in accordance with availability and prioritisation criteria based on age, health condition, and vulnerability. Any deficiencies in material conditions were, in their submission, of a temporary nature.

90. They further indicated that no incidents of abuse or ill-treatment had been reported during the applicants' stay on Samos and that the authorities had continuously monitored their situation.

### III. THE THIRD-PARTY INTERVENERS

91. Leave to intervene was granted to the Association for Legal Studies on Immigration (ASGI), together with the Law Clinic in Human Rights and Migration Law of the International University College of Turin (IUC), the Law Clinic for Human Rights of the University of Palermo (CLEDU) and the National Coordination of Italian Legal Clinics (CCLI).

92. The interveners submitted that, throughout the relevant period, the Samos RIC and the adjoining informal settlement were persistently characterised by overcrowding and inadequate provision of shelter, hygiene and sanitation, food and water, and medical and psychosocial care. They noted that many new arrivals, including unaccompanied minors, were accommodated in makeshift tents and shacks outside the official perimeter, without electricity or proper washing facilities, and that seasonal weather repeatedly caused flooding of tents and exposure to cold.

93. They further observed that the “safe zone” for unaccompanied minors had insufficient capacity in relation to needs and that access to it was irregular or delayed. According to the interveners, minors frequently remained for prolonged periods in the general population or in the informal settlement, without effective guardianship, and with limited or no access to activities, education, or regular psychological support.

94. As regards health care, the interveners pointed to limited on-site medical staffing and significant waiting times, which, in their view, impeded timely access to treatment for acute and chronic conditions and to specialised child and adolescent mental-health services. They also referred to deficits in protection from violence and exploitation, particularly in the informal areas.

### IV. RELEVANT REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS CONCERNING THE SITUATION AT THE SAMOS CAMP

95. As regards the relevant reports and documents drawn up during the material period concerning the situation at the Samos camp, the Court refers to its judgment in *A.D. v. Greece* ([Committee], no. 55363/19, §§ 17-20, 4 April 2023).

### V. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

96. Having regard to the similar subject matter of the applications, the Court finds it appropriate to examine them jointly in a single judgment.

VI. AS REGARDS D.F., ONE OF THE APPLICANTS IN APPLICATION  
NO. 65267/19

97. The Court observes that, in application no. 65267/19, the applicant D.F. lodged an application before the Court claiming to be an unaccompanied minor. However, according to the documents subsequently submitted by the Government, an age-assessment procedure conducted on 19 October 2020 determined that he had in fact reached majority at the relevant time. The applicant has not contested those findings.

98. In these circumstances, and having regard to the fact that the application was introduced and pursued on the basis of false information concerning the applicant's age, the Court concludes that nothing justifies further examination of the case. The Court notes that the conditions set out in Article 37 § 1 of the Convention for striking out this part of the application are fulfilled. Furthermore, it finds no special circumstances regarding respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and its Protocols which require the continuation of the examination. Accordingly, this part of the application must be struck out of the Court's list of cases.

VII. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 3 OF THE CONVENTION  
ON ACCOUNT OF LIVING CONDITIONS

**A. Admissibility**

99. The Government argued that the applicants had failed to exhaust domestic remedies. In particular, they referred to (i) an appeal against administrative omission or refusal under Article 63 of the Code of Administrative Procedure (CAP), enabling review of an authority's failure or refusal to act (ii) the availability of interim protection, either by way of precautionary measures under Articles 682-683 of the Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) or through a request for "provisional settlement of the situation" under Article 210 of the CAP. In support of their arguments, they referred to domestic case-law, notably judgment no. 1294/2019 of the Athens Administrative Court of First Instance and judgment no. 15/2020 of the Mytilene Administrative Court of First Instance, which, in their view, demonstrated that the administrative courts had the competence to provide protection in similar situations concerning the reception and accommodation of asylum-seeker.

100. The Government further maintained that some of the applicants had failed to duly notify their age, had provided misleading information, or had absconded from shelters. Accordingly, they could not claim to be victims of the alleged violations and had, moreover, abused the right of individual application within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention.

101. In addition, the applicants submitted that the remedies cited by the Government were, in any event, purely theoretical in their situation. They argued that an appeal for administrative omission under Article 63 CAP was not available, as no enforceable administrative act existed and the placement of unaccompanied minors was ordered by the Public Prosecutor, a judicial authority whose decisions were not subject to administrative review. They further maintained that interim measures under Articles 682-683 CCP and Article 210 CAP could not have secured their immediate transfer to appropriate accommodation, given the limits of those procedures and the consistent domestic case-law restricting their scope. Finally, they contended that *ad hoc* legal assistance provided by NGOs could not remedy the absence of an operational guardianship system or ensure effective access to judicial protection.

102. The Court reiterates that the Government alleging non-exhaustion must show that the remedy relied upon was effective in theory and practice at the relevant time, accessible, capable of providing redress for the applicant's complaint, and offered reasonable prospects of success (see *Selmouni v. France* [GC], no. 25803/94, §§ 76-77, ECHR 1999-V, and *Sejdovic v. Italy* [GC], no. 56581/00, § 46, ECHR 2006-II).

103. As regards accessibility, the Court observes that the applicants were unaccompanied minors and, under domestic law (Article 1603 of the Civil Code), could only be represented in judicial proceedings by a guardian. The Government did not demonstrate that a guardian had been effectively appointed in the present cases, or that public prosecutors acting *ex lege* had, in practice, exercised representation in comparable situations to pursue the remedies relied upon. Nor did they submit any domestic case-law indicating that courts had entertained remedies lodged by unaccompanied minors in their own name. The Court notes, in this respect, that judgment no. 1294/2019 of the Athens Administrative Court of First Instance concerned an adult applicant, while judgment no. 15/2020 of the Mytilene Administrative Court of First Instance related to a minor who was represented by a lawyer duly authorised by the Public Prosecutor. The Court considers, however, that unaccompanied minors, by definition, are not in a position to identify and instruct legal counsel on their own initiative. On the contrary, the material before the Court includes decisions rejecting actions brought by unaccompanied minors for lack of standing.

104. As regards the nature of the remedies relied upon, the Court observes that the Government have not shown that an appeal under Article 63 CAP was available in the circumstances of the present cases (applications nos. 65267/19, 13892/20, 18958/20), which were characterised by the absence of an enforceable administrative act and by the fact that decisions on the placement of unaccompanied minors were taken by the Public Prosecutor, acting in a judicial capacity. The three-month waiting period under Article 63 § 2 CAP further undermines the timeliness of the remedy in

relation to complaints under Article 3. With respect to interim protection, the Government have likewise failed to demonstrate that the civil courts had jurisdiction under Articles 682-683 CCP to issue provisional measures in public-law disputes of this kind, or that Article 210 CAP—subsidiary to a main action and incapable of affording full satisfaction—could have secured the applicants’ immediate transfer to suitable accommodation. No domestic case-law was cited showing that either remedy had been used effectively for the placement of unaccompanied minors.

105. The Government’s objection of non-exhaustion should therefore be dismissed.

106. To the extent that the Government raised arguments concerning victim status and abuse of the right of application linked to absconding, the Court notes that these matters are re closely bound up with those it will have to consider when examining the complaint under Article 3 of the Convention. They should therefore be examined together with the merits of those complaints.

107. The Court notes that this 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**

108. The general principles concerning the burden and standard of proof in migration and asylum-related proceedings — including cases involving vulnerable applicants and allegations of ill-treatment — have been summarised in *Ukraine and the Netherlands v. Russia* (dec.) [GC], nos. 8019/16 and 2 others, §§ 435-439, 30 November 2022; *El-Masri v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* [GC], no. 39630/09, § 151, ECHR 2012; and *N.D. and N.T. v. Spain* [GC], nos. 8675/15 and 8697/15, § 85, 13 February 2020.

109. As a general principle, the initial burden of proof in relation to an allegation rests upon the party which makes that allegation (*affirmanti incumbit probatio*). The Court has, however, recognised that a strict application of this principle is not always appropriate. Where the respondent State alone has access to information capable of corroborating or refuting the applicant’s allegations, but fails to provide a satisfactory and convincing explanation in respect of events lying wholly, or in large part, within the exclusive knowledge of its authorities, the Court may draw inferences that are unfavourable to that Government. Before doing so, there must nonetheless be sufficiently concordant elements supporting the applicant’s account (see *Ukraine and the Netherlands v. Russia*, cited above, § 436).

110. The level of persuasion necessary for reaching a particular conclusion and the distribution of the burden of proof are intrinsically linked

to the specificity of the facts, the nature of the allegations made and the Convention right at stake (*ibid.*, § 439).

111. There are no procedural barriers to the admissibility of evidence or predetermined formulae for its assessment. The Court enjoys complete freedom in assessing the admissibility, relevance and probative value of each item of evidence before it. It adopts those conclusions of fact which are, in its view, supported by the free evaluation of all the material before it, irrespective of its origin, including such inferences as may flow from the facts and the parties' submissions and conduct. Proof may follow from "the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar unrebutted presumptions of fact" (*El-Masri*, cited above, § 151).

112. In cases where the absence of individual identification or personalised treatment by the authorities is at the very core of an applicant's complaint, the Court must ascertain whether the applicant has furnished *prima facie* evidence supporting his or her version of events. Once such a showing is made, the burden of proof shifts to the Government (see *N.D. and N.T. v. Spain*, cited above, § 85; *Shahzad v. Hungary*, no. 12625/17, § 35, 8 July 2021; *M.H. and Others v. Croatia*, nos. 15670/18 and 43115/18, § 268, 18 November 2021; *A.A. and Others v. North Macedonia*, nos. 55798/16 and 4 others, § 54, 5 April 2022; and *M.A. and Z.R. v. Cyprus*, no. 39090/20, §§ 83-86, 8 October 2024).

113. The applicants must, in any event, provide a detailed, specific and consistent account of the relevant events, as well as such evidence as they may reasonably be expected to be able to furnish in the circumstances, or give a satisfactory explanation for not being able to do so (see *M.H. and Others v. Croatia*, cited above, §§ 269-273; *A.A. and Others v. North Macedonia*, cited above § 55; and *M.A. and Z.R. v. Cyprus*, cited above, §§ 83-84).

114. The Court notes that establishing the facts in cases concerning alleged ill-treatment, conditions of detention or deficiencies in reception facilities may present particular evidential difficulties, especially where the events take place under the exclusive control of the authorities. It is therefore incumbent on the respondent Government to cooperate fully with the Court and to furnish all relevant information.

115. The standard of proof applied by the Court is "proof beyond reasonable doubt", which may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar unrebutted presumptions of fact (see *El-Masri*, cited above, § 151).

116. In *A.R.E. v. Greece* (no. 15783/21, §§ 298-301, 7 January 2025), the Court held that, while recognising the inherent difficulty of producing direct evidence in such contexts, the applicant had failed to submit precise and concordant material establishing the alleged violations beyond reasonable doubt. Similarly, in *G.R.J. v. Greece* [(dec.), no. 15067/21, §§ 217 and 223, 3 December 2024), the Court found that the applicant had not adduced a

sufficient body of evidence to substantiate his presence in Greece or his alleged return to Türkiye.

117. The Court observes, however, that the circumstances of the present applications differ materially from those examined in *A.R.E. v. Greece* and *G.R.J. v. Greece*, both cited above. In those cases, the applicants' accounts concerned alleged *refoulement* operations and the very fact of their presence on Greek territory, which the Court found had not been established beyond reasonable doubt owing to the absence of precise and concordant evidence. By contrast, the present cases concern applicants whose identity, arrival in Greece and registration at the Samos Reception and Identification Centre are not in dispute and are corroborated by official documentation produced by the authorities themselves. The factual controversy before the Court therefore relates not to the applicants' presence in Greece but to the conditions and adequacy of their reception and protection as unaccompanied minors within the State's jurisdiction.

118. Turning to the circumstances of the present case, the Court observes at the outset that the essential facts giving rise to the applicants' complaints are not in dispute. The factual disagreement between the parties concerns the adequacy and timeliness of the measures taken by the authorities to provide appropriate reception conditions, as well as the applicants' living situation in and around the RIC prior to their transfer.

119. The Court notes that the applicants have provided a coherent, detailed and mutually consistent account of their situation on Samos, corroborated by contemporaneous documentation and by the authorities' own records. Their allegations are further corroborated by numerous independent reports from international and national bodies describing similar conditions at the Samos RIC during the relevant period (see paragraph 95 above). The Government, for their part, did not contest the applicants' identity, age or presence in the RIC but argued that adequate arrangements had been made through the NCSS/EKKA and that any shortcomings in accommodation stemmed from temporary overcrowding and logistical constraints rather than administrative inaction.

120. Having regard to the material before it, the Court finds that the applicants have produced *prima facie* evidence of prolonged exposure to conditions incompatible with their age and vulnerability as unaccompanied minors. The consistency of their statements, supported by official correspondence between the RIC, the prosecutor's office and EKKA, as well as by independent sources, is sufficient to shift the evidential burden to the Government.

121. It was therefore incumbent on the Government to demonstrate, by specific and persuasive evidence, that the measures adopted had been timely and adequate to ensure living conditions compatible with Article 3 of the Convention, or to cast doubt on the applicants' account of events. However, no such substantiating material was produced.

122. In these circumstances, the Court accepts the applicants' account of the conditions and duration of their stay in and around the Samos RIC as established for the purposes of its assessment under Article 3 of the Convention.

123. The general principles concerning the living conditions of asylum seekers have been summarised in *M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece* ([GC], no. 30696/09, ECHR 2011) and *Khlaifia and Others v. Italy* ([GC], no. 16483/12, 15 December 2016), and in *Tarakhel v. Switzerland* ([GC], no. 29217/12, ECHR 2014 (extracts)), in respect of unaccompanied minors. According to the Court's well-established case-law, ill-treatment must attain a minimum level of severity if it is to fall within the scope of Article 3. The assessment of that level is relative and depends on all the circumstances of the case, principally the duration of the treatment, its physical or mental effects and, in some cases, the sex, age and state of health of the victim.

124. The Court has also emphasised that the situation of vulnerable persons, and particularly unaccompanied minors, requires special protection. Children have specific needs inherent in their age and lack of independence, and the extreme vulnerability of a child is decisive and takes precedence over considerations of the child's status under immigration law (see *Rahimi v. Greece*, no. 8687/08, § 87, 5 April 2011; *Popov v. France*, nos. 39472/07 and 39474/07, § 91, 19 January 2012; *Mubilanzila Mayeka and Kaniki Mitunga v. Belgium*, no. 13178/03, § 55, ECHR 2006-XI; and *Khan v. France*, no. 12267/16, §§ 71-73, 28 February 2019). The reception and care arrangements for such persons must be adapted to their age, and any failure to provide for their basic needs—material, physical or emotional—may in itself constitute degrading treatment within the meaning of Article 3.

125. The Court has already had occasion to note that the States which form the external borders of the European Union are experiencing considerable difficulties in coping with the increasing influx of migrants and asylum-seekers. It does not underestimate the burden and pressure this situation places on the States concerned (see *M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece*, cited above, § 223; *J.R. and Others v. Greece*, no. 22696/16, § 121, 25 January 2018; and *Kaak and Others v. Greece*, no. 34215/16, § 93, 3 October 2019). In addition, the Court is aware of the complexity of the task faced by the domestic authorities, particularly given the number of unaccompanied minors who were entering the country at the material time. However, given the absolute nature of Article 3, this cannot absolve a State from its obligations under that provision (see *N.H. and Others v. France*, nos. 28820/13 and 2 others, § 157, 2 July 2020, cited above, § 157, and *O.R. v. Greece*, no. 24650/19, § 62, 23 January 2024).

126. The applicants maintained that the living conditions in and around the Samos RIC were incompatible with human dignity and exceeded the level of hardship inherent in situations of irregular migration (see paragraphs 72-79 above). They submitted that the authorities' inaction reflected a systemic

failure to comply with the State's obligations under domestic and international law. In their view, these shortcomings amounted to a breach of the State's positive obligations under Article 3 of the Convention to protect individuals, and in particular vulnerable children, from inhuman and degrading treatment.

127. The Government argued that the reception system had been placed under extreme and unprecedented pressure owing to large-scale arrivals and referred to the operational constraints imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic (see paragraphs 81, 83 and 84 above). They pointed to the measures adopted to improve conditions, including the expansion of accommodation capacity, the establishment of a safe zone for minors within the Samos RIC, the implementation of a guardianship programme, and the introduction of a relocation scheme for unaccompanied minors (see paragraphs 85 and 86 above). In their view, any shortcomings in the applicants' accommodation were temporary, resulted from logistical constraints rather than administrative inaction, and did not reach the threshold of severity required by Article 3. The applicants' situation had become adequate within a short time after their transfer to appropriate accommodation, and the facts did not disclose any violation of the Convention see paragraphs 87-90 above).

128. The Court recalls that it has previously examined the living conditions prevailing in the Samos RIC, both for adults and for unaccompanied minors, whether accommodated within the general population or in the designated safe zone. In a series of judgments (see *T.A. and Others v. Greece* [Committee], nos. 15293/20 and three others, 3 October 2024; *A.D. v. Greece* [Committee], no. 55363/19, §§ 14-20, 4 April 2023; and *A.R. and Others v. Greece* [Committee], nos. 59841/19 and two others, § 11, 18 April 2024), it found that the material conditions in and around the Samos RIC were characterised by persistent overcrowding, inadequate sanitation, and exposure to health and safety risks. Having regard to the evidence before it, including the parties' submissions and the reports cited above, the Court finds no indication that the situation prevailing at the Samos RIC during the material period differed in any material respect from that described in its previous judgments concerning the same facility.

129. Turning to the circumstances of the present cases, the factual details concerning the individual applicants are set out above (see paragraphs 2-71 above). In summary, each of them remained in or around the Samos RIC—either in the makeshift camp or in the safe zone—for periods ranging from four to eleven months after being identified or recognised as unaccompanied minors, and for several weeks following the indication of interim measures by the Court. The Court further notes that on 24 December 2019, in application no. 65267/19, it indicated interim measures under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, requesting the Government to transfer the applicants to suitable accommodation for unaccompanied minors and to ensure that their reception conditions were compatible with Article 3 of the Convention. On

16 March 2020, in application no. 13892/20, the Court again indicated interim measures, requiring the authorities to transfer the applicant to appropriate accommodation, to secure access to medical treatment, to appoint a guardian and to prioritise the assessment of his vulnerability.

130. The Court finds it necessary to begin by addressing the Government's argument that due account should be taken of the context in which the events in question occurred. In this connection, the Court cannot but take note of the difficult operational circumstances in which the Greek authorities were required to act, characterised by a renewed migration crisis and compounded by the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. It further considers that, during the period under review, the authorities adopted a series of structural measures intended to strengthen the reception framework for unaccompanied minors.

131. That being said, the Court can only reiterate its well-established case-law to the effect that, having regard to the absolute character of Article 3, an increasing influx of migrants cannot absolve a State of its obligations under that provision (see *M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece*, cited above, § 223; see also *Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy* [GC], no. 27765/09, §§ 122 and 176, ECHR 2012). While the constraints inherent in such conditions cannot, in themselves, be used to justify a breach of Article 3, the Court is of the view that it would certainly be artificial to examine the facts of the case without considering the general context in which those facts arose.

132. While acknowledging these initiatives and the ongoing decongestion efforts, the Court notes that they were primarily designed to improve the overall system, rather than to address, with immediate effect, the situation of minors already present in the overcrowded island facilities. Notwithstanding the adoption of such measures, the material conditions in the Samos RIC during the relevant period remained substantially unchanged and continued to fall below the standards required by Article 3 of the Convention.

133. The evidence before the Court shows that the applicants remained for prolonged periods in conditions characterised by overcrowding, inadequate sanitation and the absence of age-appropriate accommodation. The material submitted by both parties, together with independent reports from international and national bodies, confirms that the facilities in and around the Samos RIC at the material time were manifestly insufficient to meet the basic needs of unaccompanied minors, including access to hygiene, nutrition, medical and psychosocial care, effective guardianship, and protection from violence or exploitation.

134. Having regard to the applicants' age and particular vulnerability as unaccompanied minors, the Court concludes that the reception conditions to which they were subjected in and around the Samos RIC amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment within the meaning of Article 3 of the Convention.

135. Accordingly, the Court dismisses the Government's preliminary objection alleging a lack of victim status and finds that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention in the present case.

#### VIII. REMAINING COMPLAINTS

136. The applicants S.N., A.A. and H.M. in application no. 65267/19 also alleged a violation of Article 8 on account of the length of asylum proceedings. They subsequently withdrew these complaints in their observations. In the light of the foregoing, the Court concludes that the applicants may be regarded as no longer wishing to pursue that part of the application (Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention). Furthermore, in accordance with Article 37 § 1 *in fine*, the Court finds no special circumstances regarding respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and the Protocols thereto which require the continued examination of that part of the application. Accordingly, this part of the application should be struck out of the list.

137. The applicants A.N., S.N., A.A. and H.M. also complained under Article 13 of the Convention. Having regard to the facts of the case, the submissions of the parties, and its findings above, the Court considers that it has dealt with the main legal questions raised by the case and that there is no need to examine the remaining complaints (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, § 156, ECHR 2014).

138. In application no. 13892/20, the applicant also raised complaints under Articles 3 and 5 of the Convention. The Court has examined that part of the applications 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.

139. It follows that this part of the applications must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 § 4 of the Convention.

140. The measures indicated to the Government under Rule 39, as set out in the appended table, cease to have any basis.

#### APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

141. All applicants claimed 10,000 euros (EUR) in respect of non-pecuniary damage caused by a violation of Articles 3 and 8. In application no. 65267/19, A.N., S.N., A.A. and M.H. claimed that amount in respect of damage flowing additionally from a violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Articles 3 and 8. D.F. in application no. 65267/19 claimed EUR 12,000 under the same heads. A.N. in application no. 13892/20, also

claimed an additional EUR 3,000 for damage resulting from the violation of Article 5.

142. The Government contested these claims.

143. The Court considers it reasonable to award applicants A.N., S.N., A.A., and H.M. in application no. 65267/19, A.N. in 13892/20 and A.M. in 18958/20 EUR 1,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable.

144. Since no claims have been made for costs and expenses, the Court does not award any sum in this regard.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Dismisses* the Government's objection as to non-exhaustion and joins to the merits the Government's objections concerning the applicants' loss of victim status;
3. *Declares* the complaints concerning Articles 3, 8 (applications nos. 65267/19, 13892/20, 18958/20) and 13 admissible (application no. 65267/19);
4. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention;
5. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the admissibility and merits of the complaints under Article 13, in conjunction with Articles 3 and 8;
6. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the admissibility and merits of the complaint under Article 8 of the Convention;
7. *Declares* the complaints concerning Article 3 (detention conditions) and Article 5 § 1 (lawfulness of detention) in application no. 13892/20 inadmissible;
8. *Decides* to strike out the part of the application concerning Article 8 (the length of asylum proceedings) in respect of the applicants S.N., A.A. and H.M.;
9. *Decides* to strike application no. 65267/19 out in so far as applicant D.F. is concerned;
10. *Holds*

- (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants A.N., S.N., A.A., and H.M. in application no. 65267/19, A.N. in 13892/20 and A.M. in 18958/20 EUR 1,000 (one thousand euros), plus any tax that may be chargeable, within three months, in respect of non-pecuniary damage;
- (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;

11. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claim for just satisfaction.

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

Sophie Piquet  
Acting Deputy Registrar

María Elósegui  
President

A.N. AND OTHERS v. GREECE JUDGMENT

APPENDIX

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Nationality	Represented by
1.	65267/19	A.N. and Others v. Greece	23/12/2019	<b>A. N.</b> 2003 Afghan  <b>S. N.</b> 2004 Afghan  <b>A. A.</b> 2004 Afghan  <b>M. H.</b> 2004 Afghan  <b>D. F. (strike-out)</b> 2004 Afghan	Alexandros KONSTANTINOU
2.	13892/20	A.N. v. Greece	16/03/2020	<b>A. N.</b> 2004 Afghan	Jenny FLEISCHER
3.	18958/20	A.M. v. Greece	08/05/2020	<b>A. M.</b> 2004 Afghan	Jenny FLEISCHER