



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

Published on 9 March 2026

FIFTH SECTION

Application no. 7256/25
Makarios DROUSIOTIS
against Cyprus
lodged on 28 February 2025
communicated on 16 February 2026

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

The applicant is a journalist and author of several books, some of which concern alleged corruption scandals involving high-ranking politicians in Cyprus. He claims that the State authorities interfere with his electronic devices and that he is subject to secret surveillance. It appears that following complaints made by the applicant, the police investigated the matter without however reaching concrete conclusions. The police had further asked him to hand over his mobile phone to conduct further screenings.

Relying on Article 8 the applicant alleges that the Cypriot legal regime (specifically Laws 75(I)/2016 and 92(I)/1996) allows secret surveillance and does not meet the quality of the law requirement. Relying on Article 10 he claims that his surveillance is used to deter him from carrying out investigative journalism and that the authorities obtained access to sensitive information concerning his investigations. He further complains under Article 13 that he has no effective domestic remedies at his disposal for raising the above grievances.

QUESTIONS TO THE PARTIES

1. Can the applicant claim to be a victim of a breach of Article 8 of the Convention and that there has been an interference with his rights under that provision (see *Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], no. 47143/06, §§ 170-172, ECHR 2015; *Szabó and Vissy v. Hungary*, no. 37138/14, §§ 32-36, 12 January 2016 and *Klass and Others v. Germany*, 6 September 1978, §§ 33-36, Series A no. 28)?

2. If the answer to the first question is affirmative, was this interference “in accordance with the law” and “necessary in a democratic society” within the meaning of Article 8 § 2 of the Convention?

In answering this question, the parties are requested to address specific legal provisions they consider relevant and comment on whether such provisions, as applied in practice, ensure effective compliance with the minimum safeguards flowing from the Court’s case-law in this domain (see *Roman Zakharov*, §§ 231-234 and *Szabó and Vissy*, §§ 56-57, both cited above).

3. If there has been an interference with the applicant’s rights under Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention, was such an interference “prescribed by law”, and “necessary in a democratic society” in the pursuit of a legitimate aim, within the meaning of Article 10 of the Convention (see the principles set out in *Big Brother Watch and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], nos. 58170/13 and 2 others, §§ 442-446, 25 May 2021; *Sanoma Uitgevers B.V. v. the Netherlands* [GC], no. 38224/03, §§ 50-51, 14 September 2010; *Nagla v. Latvia*, no. 73469/10, § 82, 16 July 2013; *Telegraaf Media Nederland Landelijke Media B.V. and Others v. the Netherlands*, no. 39315/06, §§ 86-87, 22 November 2012; *Financial Times Ltd and Others v. the United Kingdom*, no. 821/03, § 59 15 December 2009; *Nordisk Film & TV A/S v. Denmark* (dec.), no. 40485/02, 8 December 2005)?

4. Does the applicant have at his disposal effective domestic remedies with respect to the alleged breach of his rights under Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention, as required by Article 13 of the Convention?