

**LIST OF CIVIL LAWSUITS FILED AGAINST CITIZENS BY MINING AND
CONSTRUCTION COMPANIES**

**ALL OF THESE LAWSUITS CONSTITUTE STRATEGIC LAWSUITS AGAINST PUBLIC
PARTICIPATION (SLAPP).**

1. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Levon Galstyan (activist) and the Civilitas Foundation (journalistic organization), involved as a third party

Case No.: ԵԴ/16785/02/18

Commencement Date: 10-08-2018

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements published in his interview with *CivilNet*, on the Facebook page of the *Armenian Environmental Front*, as well as on his personal page, and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation for non-pecuniary damages.

Details: Galstyan stated that the Government of Armenia had adopted decisions in violation of the law, which enabled the approval of Lydian’s projects, calling this *indirect corruption*. He also noted that Lydian transfers large sums of money to foundations managed by officials who influence decision-making regarding the Amulsar project, likewise characterizing this as *indirect corruption*.

Outcome: During the six-year trial, the plaintiff amended its claims approximately five times. On 10.05.2024, the Court of First Instance entirely dismissed the claim. The appeal filed by “Lydian Armenia” CJSC was rejected by the Civil Court of Appeal of the Republic of Armenia as inadmissible, and the subsequent cassation appeal was likewise dismissed. Accordingly, the judgment of the Court of First Instance entered into legal force on 19.12.2024.

2. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Ani Khachatryan (activist)

Case No.: ԿԴ3/1445/02/18

Commencement Date: 16-11-2018

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements published on her personal Facebook page and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. The company also requested that the court oblige the activist, until the conclusion of the case, to refrain from making any further publications regarding the company.

Details: In her Facebook post, Khachatryan stated that Lydian’s Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and expert conclusion contained incomplete data; that the permits had been obtained through corrupt means; that media outlets and experts had been paid to support the company; that fake pages and accounts had been mobilized to slander and insult activists opposing the mine; and that she suspected Lydian of organizing the fire in the Amulsar area. Initially, Khachatryan had not been informed about the court proceedings and only learned of them when the Compulsory Enforcement Service notified

her of the enforcement of a court decision (at the company's request) imposing an attachment on her assets and prohibiting her from publishing anything on Facebook concerning Amulsar. Khachatryan appealed this interim measure.

Outcome: By its ruling of 07.04.2021, the Court of First Instance partially upheld the claim, obliging Ani Khachatryan to retract the disseminated information and ordering Ani Razmik Khachatryan to pay 100,000 AMD to “Lydian Armenia” CJSC as compensation for non-pecuniary damage. By its decision of 24.02.2022, the Civil Court of Appeal annulled the part of the ruling relating to the satisfaction of the claim and remitted the case for a new trial in that part. By its judgment of 09.09.2024, the court dismissed the claim in full.

The plaintiff company appealed the latter ruling. By its decision dated 08.05.2025 and published on 12.05.2025, the Civil Court of Appeal upheld the appeal and decided to annul and amend the judgment, obliging Ani Khachatryan to publicly retract the defamatory factual statements posted on her Facebook page on 21 October 2018 at 11:37 a.m. concerning “Lydian Armenia” CJSC, namely: *“submitted an incomplete EIA, obtained permits through corruption, bought media outlets and expert opinions, uses fake accounts to discredit and insult those fighting for Amulsar, and you are also the organizer of the fire in the Amulsar area.”* The retraction must be published on Ani Khachatryan's Facebook page. In addition, Ani Khachatryan was ordered to pay 100,000 AMD to “Lydian Armenia” CJSC as compensation for non-pecuniary damage. The claim was dismissed in all other parts.

Ani Khachatryan has filed an appeal against this decision of the Civil Court of Appeal, on which no ruling has yet been issued.

The court proceedings have lasted for more than seven (7) years.

3. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Nazeli Vardanyan (lawyer)

Case No.: ԵԴ/30203/02/18

Commencement Date: 21-12-2018

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: At a press conference held on 29 November 2018, Vardanyan stated that Lydian had transferred large sums of money to foundations managed by the son of the head of the Jermuk community, after which the community head's stance on the Amulsar project shifted drastically, and he began supporting the mining project. She posed a rhetorical question: *“What else can be considered corruption?”*

Outcome: On 10.06.2020, the Court of First Instance ordered N. Vardanyan to retract her

statement and to pay 100,000 AMD to “Lydian Armenia” CJSC as compensation for non-pecuniary damage. Vardanyan appealed, and the Court of Appeal partially granted the appeal, dismissing the retraction requirement but ordering her to pay 50,000 AMD to “Lydian Armenia” CJSC as compensation.

The Cassation Court rejected Vardanyan’s cassation appeal. She has applied to the European Court of Human Rights, claiming violations of her rights to freedom of expression and to a fair trial under the European Convention on Human Rights.

The domestic proceedings lasted approximately three (3) years.

4. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Hayk Grigoryan (activist)

Case No.: ԵԴ/2192/02/19

Commencement Date: 31.01.2019

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements published on his personal Facebook page and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: On his personal Facebook page, Grigoryan posted: “*Criminal Lydian continues to buy off state officials put up for sale.*” The post received five likes and was shared once.

Outcome: The Court of First Instance ordered Grigoryan to pay 100,000 AMD to Lydian as compensation, while rejecting the other claims. Upon appeal, the Court of Appeal partially upheld Grigoryan’s complaint, reducing the compensation amount from 100,000 AMD to 50,000 AMD.

5. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Sergey Bagratyan (Member of Parliament)

Case No.: ԵԴ/5106/02/19

Commencement Date: 22-02-2019

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 2,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: On 17 February 2019, during an official parliamentary visit to educational institutions in Jermuk, Bagratyan responded to a fellow MP’s question regarding the Amulsar project. The question was: “*Who guaranteed the risks of investing such a large amount of money in vain?*” Bagratyan replied that the former government had taken money as a bribe and approved the project permits.

Outcome: The court ordered Bagratyan to pay 100,000 AMD as compensation and

dismissed the remaining claims. No party to the proceedings appealed the decision, and it entered into legal force.

6. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Edmon Aghabekyan (resident of Jermuk)

Case No.: ԱՎԴ2/0551/02/19

Commencement Date: 28-03-2019

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: On 22 February 2019, Aghabekyan took part in a press conference where he supported MP Sergey Bagratyan’s statement and declared that he and all activists could confirm that Lydian had obtained its permits through corruption. He added: *“If the company wishes to sue someone over these words, it can sue me as well.”*

Outcome: The Court of First Instance initially dismissed the claim against Aghabekyan. Based on Lydian’s appeal, the judgment was annulled and remitted for a new trial, after which the Court of First Instance partially upheld the claim and obliged Aghabekyan to retract his statements. No party to the proceedings appealed this judgment, and it entered into legal force.

7. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Shirak Buniatyan (resident of Jermuk)

Case No.: ԱՎԴ2/0560/02/19

Commencement Date: 28.03.2019

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements contained in his Facebook comment and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. In addition, the plaintiff requested — and the court ordered — an attachment on Buniatyan’s property until the conclusion of the trial.

Details: On 25 February 2019, Buniatyan commented on a Facebook post by Lika Svasian in the *Maxinfo.am* group. The post had labeled Amulsar activists as “fake environmental activists”. It accused them of failing to speak out about donations made by another mining company (ZCMC) to a foundation led by the Prime Minister’s wife. In response to this accusation, Buniatyan commented that ZCMC is the largest mining company in the country and highly profitable, whereas Lydian has never been profitable; therefore, Lydian’s donation was a form of corruption.

Outcome: The Court of First Instance ordered Buniatyan to pay Lydian 300,000 AMD in compensation, without requiring him to retract his statements. Following Buniatyan’s

appeal, the Court of Appeal overturned the judgment and dismissed the claim in full. The cassation appeal filed by Lydian was not admitted for consideration.

8. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Sergey Bagratyan (Member of Parliament)

Case No.: ԵԴ/31151/02/19

Commencement Date: 24.09.2019

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: On 12 September 2019, Bagratyan delivered a speech in parliament in which he stated that, according to their experts’ calculations, “*Lydian Armenia*” *had exaggerated its reported expenditures by 10–20 times. According to their estimates, the company should not have invested more than USD 20 million, whereas it claims USD 400 million, thereby potentially blackmailing the Government of Armenia with inflated investment figures.*

Outcome: The Court of First Instance upheld the claim, obliging Bagratyan to retract his statements, without imposing any obligation to pay monetary compensation. No party to the proceedings appealed the decision, and it entered into legal force.

9. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Atom Margaryan, *Lragir* online media outlet

Case No.: ԵԴ/31633/02/19

Commencement Date: 27.09.2019

Claim: To invalidate the defamatory information published on the *Lragir.am* website and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. In addition, the plaintiff requested an attachment on Margaryan’s property until the conclusion of the trial, which the court denied.

Details: The specific defamatory content is not indicated on *Datalex.am*. However, it is noted there that Margaryan filed a counterclaim against Lydian Armenia with identical demands.

Outcome: Following the filing of the counterclaim, Lydian Armenia petitioned the court to withdraw its claim, and the proceedings were terminated.

10. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: “Skizb Media Center” LLC (journalistic organization)

Case No.: ԵԴ/33691/02/19

Commencement Date: 11.10.2019

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1 (one) AMD as compensation.

Details: On 19 August 2019, the *lin.am* website published an article titled “*What is the Way Out? Armen Sargsyan Can Change the Situation.*” The article stated that if the previous political regime were to receive a full political and legal assessment, the outcome would undoubtedly affect Lydian’s Amulsar project, which had been approved through corrupt deals; therefore, the current authorities had every reason to annul the project permits.

Outcome: The Court of First Instance fully upheld the claim, obliging the defendant to publicly retract the information contained in the publication and ordering “Skizb Media Center” LLC to pay 1 (one) AMD to “Lydian Armenia” CJSC as compensation for defamation.

11. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Gevorg Safaryan (activist)

Case No.: ԵՂ2/2677/02/19

Commencement Date: 10.12.2019

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. In addition, the plaintiff requested an attachment on Safaryan’s property until the conclusion of the trial, which the court denied.

Details: Safaryan, a member of the “Sasna Tsrer” party, stated in an interview with *Irakanum.am.am* that the Government of Armenia should investigate all corruption cases of the former government, including those related to “Lydian Armenia” and the Amulsar project.

Outcome: The plaintiff withdrew the claim.

12. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Gagik Grigoryan (resident of Gndevaz village)

Case No.: ԱՎԴ3/0004/02/20

Commencement Date: 13.01.2020

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. In addition, the plaintiff requested an attachment on Grigoryan’s property until the conclusion of the trial, which the court granted. Due to this restriction, Grigoryan was unable to, for example, drive his car to neighboring agricultural markets in Georgia.

Details: Grigoryan was required to retract and compensate for statements that another individual had in fact made during an interview with *Past.am* media outlet.

Outcome: The plaintiff withdrew the claim after more than 1.5 years.

13. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Vahagn Avagyan

Case No.: ԵԴ/0654/02/20

Commencement Date: 14.01.2020

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. In addition, the plaintiff requested an attachment on Avagyan’s property and the closure of his Facebook account until the conclusion of the trial; the court denied this request.

Details: The case details are not published on *Datalex.am*.

Outcome: The plaintiff withdrew the claim, and the proceedings were terminated.

14. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Arpine Galfayan (activist)

Case No.: ԵԴ/25255/02/20

Commencement Date: 21.08.2020

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. In addition, the plaintiff requested an attachment on Galfayan’s property, which the court denied.

Details: During a Facebook live broadcast, Galfayan stated that senior officials of Lydian had been seen together with leaders of political parties, which she argued involved a corruption risk.

Outcome: The plaintiff withdrew the claim, and the proceedings were terminated.

15. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Arman Babajanyan (Member of Parliament)

Case No.: ԵԴ/25597/02/20

Commencement Date: 26.08.2020

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. In addition, the plaintiff requested an attachment on Babajanyan’s property, which the court denied.

Outcome: The court returned the claim as incomplete, after which it was not re-filed.

16. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Arman Babajanyan (Member of Parliament)

Case No.: ԵԴ/28112/02/20

Commencement Date: 22-09-2020

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. In addition, the plaintiff requested an attachment on Babajanyan’s property, which the court denied.

Details: The complaint concerned an interview Babajanyan gave to www.factor.am, in which he stated that since 2005, the company’s permits had been mainly obtained through corrupt and criminal means, and that the company’s operations were fully organized through criminal and corrupt chains.

Outcome: The Court of First Instance dismissed the claim due to the expiration of the statute of limitations. No party to the proceedings appealed the decision, and it entered into legal force.

17. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Hakob Sanasaryan (scientist), *News.am* as third party

Case No.: ԿԴ/5112/02/20

Commencement Date: 25.09.2020

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation. In addition, the plaintiff requested an attachment on Sanasaryan’s property, which the court denied.

Details: In an interview given to *News.am*, Sanasaryan stated that Lydian was misleading both the population of Armenia and state officials, and that from the outset the company had created falsified documents which it continued to update.

Outcome: The plaintiff withdrew the claim, and the proceedings were terminated.

18. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Atom Margaryan, *Lragir.am*

Case No.: ԵԴ/6616/02/21

Commencement Date: 19.02.2021

Claim: To condemn the defamatory statements and to pay compensation.

Details: Details are not available.

Outcome: The plaintiff withdrew the claim, and the proceedings were terminated.

19. Plaintiff: “Lydian Armenia” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Tehmineh Yenoqyan (activist and resident of Gndevaz village)

Case No.: ԱՎԴ3/0965/02/18

Commencement Date: [not specified]

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 1,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: For her speech delivered at a rally in Jermuk, during which Yenoqyan declared that Lydian’s actions constituted a crime and that the company was provoking clashes among community members living near the mine. More detailed information is available here: <https://www.panorama.am/am/news/2022/12/08/%D4%BC%D5%AB%D5%A4%D5%AB%D5%A1%D5%B6-%D5%A4%D5%A1%D5%BF%D5%A1%D6%80%D5%A1%D5%B6/2766607>

Outcome: The Court of First Instance partially ruled in favor of Lydian, finding that while Yenoqyan might not have been aware of the legal implications of using the word “crime”—since she was not a lawyer—she was nevertheless obliged to retract her statement, without being required to pay compensation. Both Yenoqyan and the company appealed the ruling. The Court of Appeal overturned the judgment, granting only Lydian’s appeal and issuing a much stricter decision, obliging Yenoqyan to retract her statement and to pay 1.3 million AMD as compensation for damage to the company’s reputation, as well as court costs. The Court of Cassation refused to admit Yenoqyan’s cassation appeal.

This ruling set the highest compensation amount ever imposed in Armenia in defamation cases of this type. It is noteworthy that Hayk Grigoryan (case No. 5 in this list) had published the same statement, but the court had ordered him to pay only 100,000 AMD, 13 times less than Yenoqyan.

On this basis, Yenoqyan applied to the European Court of Human Rights, arguing that her rights to freedom of expression and to a fair trial guaranteed under the Convention had been violated.

Lawsuits Filed by “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” CJSC

1. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Tehmineh Yenoqyan (activist)

Case No.: ԵԴ/1629/02/23

Commencement Date: 13.02.2023

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 6,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: For a Facebook status in which she shared information published by Kapan residents concerning environmental pollution caused by the Combine.

Outcome: The case is still under examination. The Court of First Instance applied the statute of limitations to part of the claim and dismissed it on that ground; the proceedings on the remaining part of the claim are ongoing.

2. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Armenian Environmental Front Voluntary Civic Initiative

Case No.: ԵԴ2/24597/02/23

Commencement Date: 27.11.2023

Claim: To condemn the defamatory statements and to pay compensation.

Details: For a Facebook post criticizing the *Golden Apricot* Film Festival, where ZCMC was advertised as a sponsor, while ZCMC was described as a major polluter.

Outcome: The court admitted the case. The Armenian Environmental Front civic group is not a registered organization. It is unclear who the actual defendant is, as no one was notified of the court proceedings. Nevertheless, the court ruled to uphold the claim and obliged a non-existent organization to issue a retraction.

3. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Oragir Media LLC (journalistic organization)

Case No.: ԵԴ2/34340/02/23

Commencement Date: 27.11.2023

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay compensation.

Details: The publication stated that many locals were left unemployed, while “ZCMC’s current Russian owner, Geopromining, together with the Government of Armenia, is expanding production volumes. On the one hand, the Russians are increasing production, and on the other hand, Russian journalists are complaining about environmental problems. Both are working for our sworn enemy.”

Outcome: The court upheld the claim, ordering the media outlet to retract the statements in the publication and ordering “Oragir Media” LLC to pay 200,000 AMD to the plaintiff, “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” CJSC, as compensation for non-pecuniary damage. No party to the proceedings appealed, and the judgment entered into legal force.

4. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Datablog LLC (journalistic organization)

Case No.: ԵԴ2/1040/02/24

Filing Date: 08.02.2024

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 6,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: The publication concerned an ecological disaster, for which ZCMC was identified as responsible, and stated that “citizens demand only one thing — compensation for the damage caused to their health.”

Outcome: The court partially upheld the claim, ordering the defendant to retract the publication and ordering “Datablog” LLC to pay 300,000 AMD to “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” CJSC as compensation for defamation. No party to the proceedings appealed, and the judgment entered into legal force.

5. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Datablog LLC (journalistic organization)

Case No.: ԵԴ2/0915/02/24

Trial Commencement Date: 13.02.2024

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay compensation.

Details: Related to media publications.

Outcome: The court partially upheld the claim, ordering the defendant to retract the publication and ordering “Datablog” LLC to pay 500,000 AMD to “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” CJSC as compensation for defamation.

**6. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company
(mining company)**

Defendant: Datablog LLC (journalistic organization)

Case No.: ԵԴ2/1115/02/24

Filing Date: 08.02.2024

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 6,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: Related to media publications.

Outcome: The court partially upheld the claim, ordering the defendant to retract the publication and ordering “Datablog” LLC to pay 300,000 AMD to “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” CJSC as compensation for defamation. No party to the proceedings appealed, and the judgment entered into legal force.

**7. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company
(mining company)**

Defendant: Datablog LLC (journalistic organization)

Case No.: ԵԴ2/1350/02/24

Filing Date: 25.02.2024

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 6,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: Related to media publications.

Outcome: The court partially upheld the claim, ordering the defendant to retract the publication and ordering “Datablog” LLC to pay 300,000 AMD to “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” CJSC as compensation for defamation. No appeal was filed, and the judgment entered into legal force.

**8. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company
(mining company)**

Defendant: Tert.am (journalistic organization)

Case No.: ԵԴ2/1354/02/24

Filing Date: 25.02.2024

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 2,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: Related to media publications.

Outcome: The Court of First Instance dismissed the claim; however, the Court of Appeal overturned the judgment and remitted the case to the Court of First Instance for a new trial. The proceedings are currently ongoing.

9. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Oleg Dulgaryan (NGO leader)

Case No.: ԵԴ2/1371/02/24

Filing Date: 25.02.2024

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 6,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: For comments made in a press interview on 24 January 2024 regarding potential environmental risks and damages connected to ZCMC’s “Artsvanik” tailings dam.

Outcome: The court returned the case. The deadline for re-filing expired, and the claim was not resubmitted.

10. Plaintiff: “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” Closed Joint-Stock Company (mining company)

Defendant: Datablog LLC (journalistic organization)

Case No.: ԵԴ2/1503/02/24

Filing Date: 29.02.2024

Claim: To retract the defamatory statements and to pay 3,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: Related to media publications.

Outcome: The court partially upheld the claim, ordering the defendant to retract the publication and ordering “Datablog” LLC to pay 300,000 AMD to “Zangezur Copper Molybdenum Combine” CJSC as compensation for defamation. No appeal was filed, and the judgment entered into legal force.

Lawsuits Filed by “Ratko” LLC (construction company)

1. Plaintiff: “Ratko” LLC (construction company)

Defendant: Seda Grigoryan (resident of Yerevan’s Fizgorodok district)

Case No.: ԵԴ/61615/02/22

Filing Date: 24.11.2022

Claim: To retract the defamatory information and to pay 2,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: The case concerned a post made on the Facebook page of a civic initiative dedicated to saving a residential neighborhood from new construction. The actual author of the post, or the person who published it on behalf of the initiative, could not be identified. However, the construction company filed a lawsuit personally against Seda Grigoryan, claiming that the allegations in the post about construction delays were baseless, and further arguing that construction was carried out by a subcontractor, for which they were not responsible. Ratko LLC also requested the court to impose an attachment of 4,000,000 AMD on Grigoryan's assets as an interim measure, which the court denied.

Outcome: The Court of First Instance partially upheld the claim, obliging Seda Grigoryan to publicly issue an apology titled *"Apology to Ratko LLC for offensive statements"* on her personal Facebook page for at least two months, or, if impossible, to publish the apology in a print newspaper with at least 5,000 copies in circulation across the Republic of Armenia. Additionally, the court ordered Seda Smbati Grigoryan to pay 100,000 AMD to Ratko LLC as compensation for defamation. The appeal lodged by Grigoryan was denied.

2. Plaintiff: "Ratko" LLC (construction company)

Defendant: Seda Grigoryan (resident of Yerevan's Fizgorodok district)

Case No.: ԵԴ/11310/02/22

Filing Date: 15.03.2022

Claim: To issue a public apology for offensive and defamatory information and to pay compensation.

Details: Ratko LLC also requested the court to impose an attachment on Grigoryan's bank accounts as an interim measure, which the court denied.

Outcome: The Court of First Instance dismissed the claim. The company filed an appeal, which was granted; the judgment was overturned, and the case remitted to the Court of First Instance for a new trial. The proceedings are ongoing.

3. Plaintiff: "Ratko" LLC (construction company)

Defendant: Seda Grigoryan

Case No.: ԵԴ/44225/02/21

Filing Date: 30.09.2021

Claim: To retract the defamatory information and to pay 2,000,000 AMD as compensation.

Details: During a protest, Seda Grigoryan gave an interview to *News.am* (which participated in the proceedings as a third party), in which she asserted that before and during construction, Ratko LLC had carried out illegal actions in the process of obtaining building

permits, and that the entire process of land privatization had an unlawful background.

Outcome: The court partially upheld the claim, obliging Seda Smbati Grigoryan to publicly retract the defamatory factual statements by publishing a video under the heading “Retraction” for at least one month, and ordering her to pay 100,000 AMD to Ratko LLC as compensation for defamation.

4. Seda Grigoryan (fourth case) **Criminal Investigation**

Criminal Investigation

Claim: The construction company Ratko filed a complaint with the police alleging damage to its property and requested a criminal investigation. The alleged damage was graffiti reading “Free Gorodok” painted on the construction site fence, which, according to the company, had been done by Seda Grigoryan.

Details: Grigoryan learned about the criminal investigation when two male investigators knocked on her door, presented a search warrant (allegedly for red spray paint), and searched her entire apartment, leaving it in chaos. Civil society organizations and citizens signed a petition demanding that law enforcement authorities stop the harassment of resident and documentarian Seda Grigoryan and instead investigate the illegal construction carried out by developer Ratko. See more details in the statement: [Hetq article](#). Additional context on the case and the construction company’s actions is available in *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*’s English-language coverage: [RFE/RL article](#).

Outcome: The police terminated the investigation.