



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

**SURVEY OF ACTIVITIES**

**2005**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Historical background, organisation and procedure.....	3
II. Composition of the Court.....	8
III. Subject-matter of judgments delivered by the Court in 2005 .....	9
IV. Judgments and decisions selected for publication.....	27
V. Statistical information .....	30
VI. Statistical tables by State.....	35

*Note:* This survey provides general information and statistics concerning the activities of the Court in 2005. Separate annual activity reports are also available for the Grand Chamber and each of the four Sections.

## **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, ORGANISATION AND PROCEDURE**

### ***Historical background***

#### **The European Convention on Human Rights of 1950**

1. The Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms was drawn up within the Council of Europe. It was opened for signature in Rome on 4 November 1950 and entered into force in September 1953. Taking as their starting point the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the framers of the Convention sought to pursue the aims of the Council of Europe through the maintenance and further realisation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Convention was to represent the first steps for the collective enforcement of certain of the rights set out in the Universal Declaration.

2. In addition to laying down a catalogue of civil and political rights and freedoms, the Convention set up a mechanism for the enforcement of the obligations entered into by Contracting States. Three institutions were entrusted with this responsibility: the European Commission of Human Rights (set up in 1954), the European Court of Human Rights (set up in 1959) and the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, the latter organ being composed of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the member States or their representatives.

3. Under the Convention in its original version, complaints could be brought against Contracting States either by other Contracting States or by individual applicants (individuals, groups of individuals or non-governmental organisations). Recognition of the right of individual application was, however, optional and it could therefore be exercised only against those States which had accepted it (Protocol No. 11 to the Convention was subsequently to make its acceptance compulsory, see paragraph 6 below).

The complaints were first the subject of a preliminary examination by the Commission, which determined their admissibility. Where an application was declared admissible, the Commission placed itself at the parties' disposal with a view to brokering a friendly settlement. If no settlement was forthcoming, it drew up a report establishing the facts and expressing an opinion on the merits of the case. The report was transmitted to the Committee of Ministers.

4. Where the respondent State had accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, the Commission and/or any Contracting State concerned had a period of three months following the transmission of the report to the Committee of Ministers within which to bring the case before the Court for a final, binding adjudication. Individuals were not entitled to bring their cases before the Court.

If a case was not referred to the Court, the Committee of Ministers decided whether there had been a violation of the Convention and, if appropriate, awarded "just satisfaction" to the victim. The Committee of Ministers also had responsibility for supervising the execution of the Court's judgments.

#### **Subsequent developments**

5. Since the Convention's entry into force fourteen Protocols have been adopted. Protocols Nos. 1, 4, 6, 7, 12, and 13 added further rights and liberties to those guaranteed by the Convention, while Protocol No. 2 conferred on the Court the power to give advisory opinions. Protocol No. 9 enabled individual applicants to bring their cases before the Court, subject to ratification by the respondent State and acceptance by a screening panel. It was repealed by Protocol No. 11, which restructured the enforcement machinery (see below). Other Protocols concerned the organisation of and procedure before the Convention institutions. In May 2004, in response to the need for further streamlining, Protocol No. 14 was opened for signature (see below).

6. From 1980 onwards, the steady growth in the number of cases brought before the Convention institutions made it increasingly difficult to keep the length of proceedings within acceptable limits. The

problem was aggravated by the accession of new Contracting States from 1990. The number of applications registered annually with the Commission increased from 404 in 1981 to 4,750 in 1997. By that year, the number of unregistered or provisional files opened each year in the Commission had risen to over 12,000. The Court's statistics reflected a similar story, with the number of cases referred annually rising from 7 in 1981 to 119 in 1997.

The increasing case-load prompted a lengthy debate on the necessity for a reform of the Convention supervisory machinery, resulting in the adoption of Protocol No. 11 to the Convention. The aim was to simplify the structure with a view to shortening the length of proceedings while strengthening the judicial character of the system by making it fully compulsory and abolishing the Committee of Ministers' adjudicative role.

Protocol No. 11, which came into force on 1 November 1998, replaced the existing, part-time Court and Commission by a single, full-time Court. For a transitional period of one year (until 31 October 1999) the Commission continued to deal with the cases which it had previously declared admissible.

7. In the years which followed the entry into force of Protocol No. 11 the Court's case-load grew at an unprecedented rate. The number of new applications rose from 18,200 in 1998 to 44,100 in 2004, an increase of approximately 140%. Concerns about the Court's capacity to deal with the growing volume of cases led to requests for additional resources and speculation about the need for further reform.

Different reform initiatives launched by a Ministerial Conference on Human Rights, held in Rome on 3 and 4 November 2000 to mark the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the opening of the Convention for signature, culminated in the opening for signature of Protocol No. 14 on 13 May 2004. The Protocol will enter into force three months after all the Parties to the Convention have ratified it (see further below).

In addition, in view of doubts as to whether the measures enshrined in Protocol No. 14 would be sufficient to preserve the long-term effectiveness of the Convention machinery, the Council of Europe Third Summit of Heads of State and Government held in Warsaw in May 2005 established a group of Wise Persons to develop a long-term strategy for the Convention system.

### ***The European Court of Human Rights***

#### **A. Organisation of the Court**

8. The European Court of Human Rights set up under the Convention as amended by Protocol No. 11 is composed of a number of judges equal to that of the Contracting States (currently forty-six<sup>1</sup>). There is no restriction on the number of judges of the same nationality. Judges are elected by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe for a term of six years.

Judges sit on the Court in their individual capacity and do not represent any State. They cannot engage in any activity which is incompatible with their independence or impartiality or with the demands of full-time office. Their terms of office expire when they reach the age of seventy.

The Plenary Court elects its President, two Vice-Presidents and Presidents of Section for a period of three years.

9. With effect from 1 March 2006 the Court will be divided into five Sections, whose composition, fixed for three years, is geographically and gender balanced and takes account of the different legal systems of the Contracting States. Two of the Sections are presided over by the Vice-Presidents of the Court; the other Sections are presided over by the Section Presidents. Section Presidents are assisted and where necessary replaced by Section Vice-Presidents, elected by the Sections.

10. Committees of three judges are set up within each Section for twelve-month periods.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Part II for the list of judges.

11. Chambers of seven members are constituted within each Section on the basis of rotation, with the Section President and the judge elected in respect of the State concerned sitting in each case. Where the latter is not a member of the Section, he or she sits as an *ex officio* member of the Chamber. The members of the Section who are not full members of the Chamber sit as substitute members.

12. The Grand Chamber of the Court is composed of seventeen judges, who include, as *ex officio* members, the President, Vice-Presidents and Section Presidents.

## **B. Procedure before the Court**

### *1. General*

13. Any Contracting State (State application) or individual claiming to be a victim of a violation of the Convention (individual application) may lodge directly with the Court in Strasbourg an application alleging a breach by a Contracting State of one of the Convention rights. A notice for the guidance of applicants and forms for making applications may be obtained from the Registry and are to be found on the Court's web site ([www.echr.coe.int](http://www.echr.coe.int)).

14. The procedure before the European Court of Human Rights is adversarial and public. Hearings, which are held only in a minority of cases, are public, unless the Chamber/Grand Chamber decides otherwise on account of exceptional circumstances. Memorials and other documents filed with the Court's Registry by the parties are, in principle, accessible to the public.

15. Individual applicants may present their own cases, but legal representation is recommended, and indeed usually required once an application has been communicated to the respondent Government. The Council of Europe has set up a legal aid scheme for applicants who do not have sufficient means. Legal aid is not available before an application has been communicated to the Government concerned.

16. The official languages of the Court are English and French, but applications may be submitted in one of the official languages of the Contracting States. Once the application has been communicated to the respondent Government, one of the Court's official languages must be used, unless the President of the Chamber/Grand Chamber authorises the continued use of the language of the application.

### *2. Admissibility and merits*

17. Each individual application is assigned to a Section.

18. A Committee of three judges may decide, by unanimous vote, to declare inadmissible or strike out an application where it can do so without further examination.

19. Individual applications which are not declared inadmissible by Committees and State applications are examined by a Chamber of seven judges. Chambers determine both admissibility and the merits. Such applications are communicated to the respondent Governments for their observations, to which the applicant may reply, that reply being in turn transmitted to the Government for a response. If an application is inadmissible, the Chamber will issue a decision to that effect. Where the application is admissible, admissibility and the merits are now frequently dealt with together in the judgment. Separate admissibility decisions are adopted only in the more complex cases.

20. In the course of the exchange of observations the applicant will be invited to submit any claims for compensation arising out of the alleged Convention breach as well as for reimbursement of costs and expenses.

21. Chambers may at any time relinquish jurisdiction in favour of the Grand Chamber where a case raises a serious question of interpretation of the Convention or where there is a risk of departing from existing case-law, unless one of the parties objects to such relinquishment within one month of notification of the intention to relinquish. In the event of relinquishment the procedure followed is the same as that set out below for Chambers.

22. The procedure is generally written. Only in relatively few cases does the Chamber decide to hold a public hearing. Such hearings will usually concern both admissibility and the merits.

23. The President of the Chamber may, in the interests of the proper administration of justice, invite or grant leave to any Contracting State which is not party to the proceedings, or any person concerned who is not the applicant, to submit written comments, and, in exceptional circumstances, to make representations at the hearing. A Contracting State whose national is an applicant in the case is entitled to intervene as of right.

24. During the procedure, negotiations aimed at securing a friendly settlement may be conducted through the Registrar. The negotiations are confidential.

### *3. Judgments*

25. Chambers decide by a majority vote. Any judge who has taken part in the consideration of the case is entitled to append to the judgment a separate opinion, either concurring or dissenting, or a bare statement of dissent.

26. Within three months of delivery of the judgment of a Chamber, any party may request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber if it raises a serious question of interpretation or application or a serious issue of general importance. Such requests are examined by a Grand Chamber panel of five judges composed of the President of the Court, two Section Presidents designated by rotation, and two other judges also selected by rotation. The panel may not include any judge who took part in the consideration of the admissibility or merits of the case before the Chamber.

27. A Chamber's judgment becomes final on expiry of the three-month period or earlier if the parties announce that they have no intention of requesting a referral or after a decision of the panel rejecting a request for referral.

28. If the panel accepts the request, the Grand Chamber renders its decision on the case in the form of a judgment. The Grand Chamber decides by a majority vote and its judgments are final.

29. All final judgments of the Court are binding on the respondent States concerned.

30. Responsibility for supervising the execution of judgments lies with the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe. The Committee of Ministers verifies whether States in respect of which a violation of the Convention is found have taken adequate remedial measures to comply with the specific or general obligations arising out of the Court's judgments.

### *4. Protocol No. 14*

31. Protocol No. 14 must be ratified by all the Contracting States before it enters into force. The main innovations as regards the procedure before the Court are as follows:

(a) A single-judge formation (new Article 26 of the Convention) is introduced with competence to declare applications inadmissible on the same basis as a three-judge committee at present (new Article 27). The single-judge formation will be assisted by non-judicial rapporteurs (new Article 24 § 1), who will fulfil in respect of plainly inadmissible cases the function currently carried out by judge rapporteurs. The single judge may never be the judge elected in respect of the respondent State (Article 26 § 3).

(b) Three-judge committees acquire a new power. In addition to their existing competence to declare cases inadmissible and strike them out, they will be able to declare cases admissible and render judgment in them if the underlying question in the case is already the subject of well-established case-law of the Court (Article 28 § 1 (b), as amended)

(c) A new admissibility criterion is inserted in Article 35. Under Article 35 § 3 (b), the Court will be empowered to declare inadmissible any individual application where the applicant has not suffered a significant disadvantage. However, cases may not be dismissed on this ground if “respect for human rights” requires an examination on the merits or where the case has not been duly examined by a domestic tribunal. In the two years following the entry into force of the Protocol, this criterion may be applied only by Chambers and the Grand Chamber.

(d) The Court’s increasingly frequent practice of dealing with admissibility and the merits together, rather than separately as envisaged in the present Article 29 § 3, is reflected in paragraph 1 of the amended Article 29.

(e) As far as the execution process is concerned, two new possibilities are created for the Committee of Ministers. Firstly, where its supervision of execution is hindered by a problem of interpretation it may refer the matter to the Court for a ruling (new Article 46 § 3). Secondly, where a respondent State refuses to abide by a final judgment, the Committee of Ministers may institute proceedings before the Court to determine whether the State has, or has not, fulfilled its execution obligations (new Article 46 §§ 4 and 5).

32. As regards the judges, the main change is the introduction of single nine-year term of office to replace the present renewable six-year term (Article 23 § 1 as amended). In addition, *ad hoc* judges replacing elected judges who are unable to sit as a national judge in a particular case will, under Protocol No. 14, be chosen by the President of the Court from a list submitted in advance, rather than simply being appointed by the respondent State as now (new Article 26 § 4).

33. Finally, Article 59 is amended to provide in a new paragraph 2 that the European Union may accede to the Convention.

#### *5. Advisory opinions*

34. The Court may, at the request of the Committee of Ministers, give advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation of the Convention and Protocols.

Decisions of the Committee of Ministers to request an advisory opinion are taken by a majority vote.

35. Advisory opinions are given by the Grand Chamber and adopted by a majority vote. Any judge may attach to the advisory opinion, a separate opinion or a bare statement of dissent.

## II. COMPOSITION OF THE COURT (as at 31 December 2005)<sup>1</sup>

(in order of precedence)

Mr Luzius WILDHABER, President	(Swiss)
Mr Christos ROZAKIS, Vice-President	(Greek)
Mr Jean-Paul COSTA, Vice-President	(French)
Sir Nicolas BRATZA, Section President	(British)
Mr Boštjan ZUPANČIČ	(Slovenian)
Mr Giovanni BONELLO	(Maltese)
Mr Lucius CAFLISCH	(Swiss) <sup>2</sup>
Mr Loukis LOUCAIDES	(Cypriot)
Mr Ireneu CABRAL BARRETO	(Portuguese)
Mr Rıza TÜRMEK	(Turkish)
Ms Françoise TULKENS	(Belgian)
Mr Corneliu BÎRSAN	(Romanian)
Mr Peer LORENZEN	(Danish)
Mr Karel JUNGWIERT	(Czech)
Mr Volodymyr BUTKEVYCH	(Ukrainian)
Mr Josep CASADEVALL	(Andorran)
Ms Nina VAJIĆ	(Croatian)
Mr John HEDIGAN	(Irish)
Mr Matti PELLONPÄÄ	(Finnish)
Ms Margarita TSATSA-NIKOLOVSKA	(citizen of "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia")
Mr András BAKA	(Hungarian)
Mr Rait MARUSTE	(Estonian)
Mr Kristaq TRAJA	(Albanian)
Ms Snežana BOTOCHAROVA	(Bulgarian)
Mr Mindia UGREKHELIDZE	(Georgian)
Mr Anatoly KOVLER	(Russian)
Mr Vladimiro ZAGREBELSKY	(Italian)
Ms Antonella MULARONI	(San Marinese)
Ms Elisabeth STEINER	(Austrian)
Mr Stanislav PAVLOVSKI	(Moldovan)
Mr Lech GARLICKI	(Polish)
Mr Javier BORRERO BORRERO	(Spanish)
Ms Elisabet FURA-SANDSTRÖM	(Swedish)
Ms Alvina GYULUMYAN	(Armenian)
Mr Khanlar HAJIYEV	(Azerbaijani)
Ms Ljiljana MIJOVIĆ	(citizen of Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Mr Dean SPIELMANN	(Luxemburger)
Ms Renate JAEGER	(German)
Mr Egbert MYJER	(Netherlands)
Mr Sverre JEBENS	(Norwegian)
Mr David Thór BJÖRGVINSSON	(Icelandic)
Ms Danutė JOČIENĖ	(Lithuanian)
Mr Ján ŠIKUTA	(Slovakian)
Mr Dragoljub POPOVIĆ	(citizen of Serbia and Montenegro)
Mrs Ineta ZIEMELE	(Latvian)
Mr Erik FRIBERGH, Registrar	(Swedish)

<sup>1</sup> The seat of the judge in respect of Monaco is currently vacant.

<sup>2</sup> Elected as the judge in respect of Liechtenstein.



### III. SUBJECT-MATTER OF JUDGMENTS DELIVERED IN 2005

#### (a) Subject-matter of selected judgments, by Convention Article

##### Article 2      *Cases concerning the right to life*

- disappearances and effectiveness of investigations (*Türkoğlu v. Turkey*, no. 34506/97, *Mevlûde Akdeniz v. Turkey*, no. 25165/94, *Toğcu v. Turkey*, no. 27601/95, *Taniş and others v. Turkey*, no. 65899/01, *Özgen and others v. Turkey*, no. 38607/97, *Nesibe Haran v. Turkey*, no. 28299/95)
- abduction and killing of applicant's brother and effectiveness of investigation (*Koku v. Turkey*, no. 27305/95)
- killing of applicant's husband by unidentified perpetrators after having been in custody and effectiveness of investigation (*Süheyla Aydın v. Turkey*, no. 25660/94, *Çelikkilek v. Turkey*, no. 27693/95, *Yasin Ateş v. Turkey*, no. 30949/96)
- failure to prevent murder of Member of Parliament's son in precincts of parliamentary accommodation and effectiveness of investigation (*Güngör v. Turkey*, no. 28290/95)
- shooting by military police of two unarmed Roma conscripts who had escaped from detention imposed for being absent without leave, and lack of effective investigation (*Nachova and others v. Bulgaria*, nos. 43577/98 and 43579/98 [GC])
- fatal shootings by police and effectiveness of investigations (*Bubbins v. United Kingdom*, no. 50196/99, *Ramsahai and others v. the Netherlands*, no. 52391/99)
- shooting of demonstrators by the police and effectiveness of investigation (*Şimşek and others v. Turkey*, nos. 35072/97 and 37194/97)
- shooting of Greek-Cypriot by Turkish soldiers in buffer zone and effectiveness of investigation (*Kakoulli v. Turkey*, no. 38595/97)
- killing of applicant's husband in northern Cyprus, allegedly by Turkish and/or "TRNC" agents, and effectiveness of the investigation (*Adali v. Turkey*, no. 38187/97)
- shooting of detainee accompanying police to home of another suspect (*Gezici v. Turkey*, no. 34594/97)
- killing of applicants' relatives following an attack on the civilian vehicle in which they were being transported under police guard, and effectiveness of investigation (*Beliza Kaya and others v. Turkey*, nos. 33420/96 and 36206/97)
- killings by security forces and effectiveness of investigations (*Menteşe and others v. Turkey*, no. 36217/97, *Fatma Kacar v. Turkey*, no. 35838/97, *Dündar v. Turkey*, no. 26972/95)
- killing of applicants' relatives and wounding of two applicants by village guards, and effectiveness of investigation (*Acar and others v. Turkey*, nos. 36088/97 and 38417/97)
- death of relatives of applicants during military operation (*Akkum and others v. Turkey*, no. 21894/93)
- killing of applicants' relatives during police operation and effectiveness of investigation (*Hamiyet Kaplan and others v. Turkey*, no. 36749/97)

- killings by soldiers (*Khashiyev and Akayeva v. Russia*, nos. 57942/00 and 57945/00), bombing of civilian convoy (*Isayeva and others v. Russia*, nos. 57947/00, 57948/00 and 57949/00) and bombing of village (*Isayeva v. Russia*, no. 57950/00), all in Chechnya
- effectiveness of investigation into death of applicant's brother in clash between PKK and security forces (*Kanlibaş v. Turkey*, no. 32444/96)
- failure of authorities to protect the life of a journalist, and effectiveness of investigation (*Gongadze v. Ukraine*, no. 34056/02)
- suicide of conscript with history of depression (*Kilinç and others v. Turkey*, no. 40145/98)
- suicide in prison and effectiveness of investigation (*Trubnikov v. Russia*, no. 49790/99)
- death in custody and effectiveness of investigation (*Kişmir v. Turkey*, no. 27306/95, *H.Y. and Hü.Y. v. Turkey*, no. 40262/98, *Akdoğan v. Turkey*, no. 46747/99)
- death of detainee during transfer to another prison following disturbance and effectiveness of investigation (*Ceyhan Demir and others v. Turkey*, no. 34491/97)
- threat of implementation of the death penalty (*Öçalan v. Turkey*, no. 46221/99 [GC])

### Article 3      *Cases concerning physical integrity*

- imposition of death penalty following an unfair trial, and threat of implementation of death penalty (*Öçalan v. Turkey*, no. 46221/99 [GC])
- abduction and ill-treatment, allegedly by State agents or with their collusion, and effectiveness of investigation (*Ay v. Turkey*, no. 30951/96)
- ill-treatment of two Roma on arrest and in custody (*Bekos and Koutropoulos v. Greece*, no. 15250/02)
- ill-treatment in custody (*Sunal v. Turkey*, no. 43918/98, *Biyan v. Turkey*, no. 56363/00, *Gültekin and others v. Turkey*, no. 52941/99, *Dalan v. Turkey*, no. 38585/97, *Hasan Kılıç v. Turkey*, no. 35044/97, *Karakaş and Yeşilirmak v. Turkey*, no. 43925/98, *S.B. and H.T. v. Turkey*, no. 54430/00, *Soner Önder v. Turkey*, no. 39813/98, *Dizman v. Turkey*, no. 27309/95, *Frik v. Turkey*, no. 45443/99, *Sevgin and Ince v. Turkey*, no. 46262/99, *Baltaş v. Turkey*, no. 50988/99, *Karayiğit v. Turkey*, no. 63181/00, *Cangöz v. Turkey*, no. 28039/95, *Günaydin v. Turkey*, no. 27526/95, *Orhan Aslan v. Turkey*, no. 48063/99, *Hüsniye Tekin v. Turkey*, no. 50971/99, *Afanasyev v. Ukraine*, no. 38722/02)
- ill-treatment and conditions of detention in transit area of an airport (*Mogoş v. Romania*, no. 20420/02)
- ill-treatment of detainees prior to court hearing on their complaints about earlier ill-treatment in custody (*Zülcihan Şahin and others v. Turkey*, no. 53147/99)
- solitary confinement of convicted terrorist for over eight years (*Ramirez Sanchez v. France*, no. 59450/00) [the case is now pending before the Grand Chamber]
- solitary confinement for over 11 months during detention on remand (*Rohde v. Denmark*, no. 69332/01)
- conditions of detention on remand (*Kehayov v. Bulgaria*, no. 41035/98, *Mayzit v. Russia*, no. 63378/00, *Novoselov v. Russia*, no. 66460/01, *Labzov v. Russia*, no. 62208/00, *Fedotov v. Russia*,

no. 5140/02, *Khudoyorov v. Russia*, no. 6847/02, *Becciev v. Moldova*, no. 9190/03, *Alver v. Estonia*, no. 64812/01)

- conditions of detention (*Karalevičius v. Lithuania*, no. 53254/99, *Ostrovar v. Moldova*, no. 35207/03, *I.I. v. Bulgaria*, no. 44082/98, *Georgiev v. Bulgaria*, no. 47823/99)

- conditions of detention, force-feeding of detainee on hunger-strike and adequacy of medical treatment provided (*Nevmerzhitsky v. Ukraine*, no. 54825/00)

- conditions of detention – detention in allegedly unsanitary conditions, solitary confinement and unwillingness to transfer to suitable detention facilities, lack of protection against weather and climate, difficulty of obtaining fresh air and exercise – and alleged use of physical force and denial of medical care (*Mathew v. the Netherlands*, no. 24919/03)

- conditions of detention in psychiatric institution (*Romanov v. Russia*, no. 63993/00)

- inadequacy of medical assistance during detention on remand (*Sarban v. Moldova*, no. 3456/05)

- detention and/or threatened recall to prison of person suffering from Wernicke-Korsakoff syndrome (*Uyan v. Turkey*, no. 7454/04, *Sinan Eren v. Turkey*, no. 8062/04, *Tekin Yildiz v. Turkey*, no. 22913/04, *Kuruçay v. Turkey*, no. 24040/04, *Gürbüz v. Turkey*, no. 26050/04, and *Balyemez v. Turkey*, no. 32495/03; three judgments striking out applications raising this issue were also delivered)

- living conditions of Roma families following destruction of their homes by a mob, and racist remarks by authorities dealing with their claims (*Moldovan and others v. Romania* (no. 2), nos. 41138/98 and 64320/01; see also *Moldovan and others v. Romania* (no. 1) (friendly settlement))

- extradition to Uzbekistan (*Mamatkulov and Abdurasulovic v. Turkey*, no. 46827/99 [GC]; the case also raised the issue of the Turkish Government's failure to comply with an interim measure applied by the Court)

- extradition or threatened extradition from Georgia to the Russian Federation and ill-treatment of certain applicants in detention (*Shamayev and others v. Georgia and Russia*, no. 36378/02)

- threatened expulsion to Eritrea (*Said v. the Netherlands*, no. 2345/02)

- threatened expulsion to Syria, where the applicant has been sentenced to death (*Bader and others v. Sweden*, no. 13284/04)

- threatened expulsion to Iraq, and absence of social and financial assistance for refugee (*Müslim v. Turkey*, no. 53566/99)

- threatened expulsion to the Democratic Republic of Congo (*N. v. Finland*, no. 38885/02)

#### Article 4      *Cases concerning the prohibition of slavery and forced labour*

- adequacy of legal provisions aimed at preventing “domestic slavery” (*Siliadin v. France*, no. 73316/01)

Article 5      *Cases concerning the right to liberty and security*

- detention of soldier on the basis of disciplinary punishment imposed by his superior officer (*A.D. v. Turkey*, no. 29986/96)
- lawfulness of continuing detention on basis of conviction *in absentia*, following refusal to reopen the proceedings, and lack of possibility of contesting the lawfulness of the detention (*Stoichkov v. Bulgaria*, no. 9808/02)
- lawfulness of arrest and detention by Turkish security forces in Kenya and absence of possibility of obtaining review of lawfulness of detention (*Öçalan v. Turkey*, no. 46221/99)
- arrest and detention for 19 hours following refusal to leave site of a prohibited gathering (*Epple v. Germany*, no. 77909/01)
- continued detention after expiry of statutory maximum period and delay in implementing order to release from detention (*Picaro v Italy*, no. 42644/02)
- 63-day delay in release from detention (*Asenov v. Bulgaria*, no. 42026/98)
- authorisation by judges of return of detainees to police station for questioning after ordering detention on remand, and absence of possibility of seeking review (*Emrullah Karagöz v. Turkey*, no. 78027/01, *Dağ and Yaşar v. Turkey*, no. 4080/02)
- compulsory isolation of HIV-infected person on ground of risk of transmitting the virus to others (*Enhorn v. Sweden*, no. 56529/00)
- lawfulness of confinement in private psychiatric clinic (*Storck v. Germany*, no. 61603/00)
- lawfulness of detention in psychiatric institution (*Schenkel v. the Netherlands*, no. 62015/00)
- continued psychiatric detention due to practical impossibility of fulfilling conditions imposed for conditional release (*Kolanis v. United Kingdom*, no. 517/02)
- lawfulness and length of detention with a view to extradition (*Bordovskiy v. Russia*, no. 49491/99)
- lawfulness of detention with a view to expulsion, despite quashing of expulsion order (*Zečiri v. Italy*, no. 55764/00)
- length of detention pending expulsion and length of time taken to decide on requests for release (*Singh v. the Czech Republic*, no. 60538/00)
- role of prosecutor in ordering/confirming detention (*Salov v. Ukraine*, no. 65518/01)
- absence of possibility to apply for release from psychiatric detention (*Gorshkov v. Ukraine*, no. 67531/01)
- lack of public hearing in proceedings relating to pre-trial detention (*Reinprecht v. Austria*, no. 67175/01)

Article 6      *Cases concerning the right to a fair trial*

- unavailability of legal aid to defend defamation action (*Steel and Morris v. the United Kingdom*, no. 68416/01)
- exclusion of claims against the State for injuries sustained during military service (*Roche v. the United Kingdom*, no. 32555/96 [GC])
- parliamentary immunity attaching to defamatory statements by Member of Parliament (*Ielo v. Italy*, no. 23053/02)
- access to court to challenge seizure and confiscation of CDs recorded by right-wing bands (*Linnekogel v. Switzerland*, no. 43874/98)
- lack of access to court due to high level of court fees (*Podbielski and PPU Polpure v. Poland*, no. 39199/98, *Kniat v. Poland*, 71731/01, *Jedamski and Jedamska v. Poland*, no. 73547/01)
- effectiveness of access to court to challenge application of increased security measures to prisoners (*Musumeci v. Italy*, no. 33695/96, *Bifulco v. Italy*, no. 60915/00, *Gallico v. Italy*, no. 53723/00, *Salvatore v. Italy*, no. 42285/98)
- dismissal of appeal by Supreme Court on basis of date of service of appeal court's judgment different from that indicated by lower court (*Mikulová v. Slovakia*, no. 64001/00) and dismissal of appeal as out of time, although it had been sent by registered mail prior to expiry of the time limit (*Hornáček v. Slovakia*, no. 65575/01)
- refusal to allow third party to join administrative proceedings (*Budmet Sp. Z O. O. v. Poland*, no. 31445/96)
- application to pending court proceedings of new legislation precluding parents from claiming certain damages in respect of disabilities not detected during pregnancy, due to negligence (*Draon v. France*, no. 1513/03 [GC], and *Maurice v. France*, no. 11810/03 [GC])
- quashing of final and binding judgments (*Roșca v. Moldova*, no. 6267/02, *Popov v. Moldova* (no. 2), no. 19960/04) and power of Prosecutor General to intervene in civil proceedings (*Asito v. Moldova*, no. 40663/98)
- arbitrary interpretation by the courts of provisions relating to restitution of property, lack of oral hearing before the Constitutional Court and lack of sufficient time to prepare arguments, and excessive burden of proof (*Blücher v. the Czech Republic*, no. 58580/00)
- failure to ensure proper notification of decision to stay civil proceedings indefinitely (*Sukhorubchenko v. Russia*, no. 69315/01)
- denial of possibility for party to attend hearing in civil proceedings, as a result of late service of summons (*Yakovlev v. Russia*, no. 72701/01)
- dismissal of cassation appeal on account of failure to notify absent parties, resident abroad, within 90-day time-limit (*Kaufmann v. Italy*, no. 14021/02)
- fairness of criminal proceedings and of parallel proceedings which the applicant joined as a party seeking damages, in particular the refusal to deal with them together (*Berkouche v. France*, no. 71047/01)
- impossibility for unrepresented civil party to criminal proceedings to have access to the file during the preliminary investigation, access being limited to lawyers (*Frangy v. France*, no. 42270/98, *Menet v. France*, no. 39553/02)

- absence of accused from appeal hearing, notification sent to him in prison not having been translated (*Hermi v. Italy*, no. 18114/02) [the case is now pending before the Grand Chamber]
- conviction for drug dealing as a result of police stratagem, and supervisory review of conviction effected in absence of applicant and counsel (*Vanyan v. Russia*, no. 53203/99)
- imposition of fine on owner of car for providing incomplete information when required to disclose who was driving when car exceeded speed limit (*Rieg v. Austria*, no. 63207/00)
- self-incrimination – obligation to answer questions put by financial investigator (*Shannon v. the United Kingdom*, no. 6563/03)
- failure to hear accused before their criminal conviction (*Iliescu and Chiforec v. Romania*, no. 77364/01)
- non-disclosure to appellant in criminal proceedings of a letter submitted to the Court of Appeal by his wife, retracting a previous statement (*M.S. v. Finland*, no. 46601/99)
- non-disclosure to party of submissions made to Constitutional Court by lower court and by the other party (*Milatová and others v. the Czech Republic*, no. 61811/00)
- absence of opportunity for accused to be represented during medical examination of victim (*Cottin v. Belgium*, no. 48386/99)
- refusal to try applicant in summary procedure, resulting in deprivation of remission of one third of sentence (*Fera v. Italy*, no. 45057/98)
- conviction for robbery with violence without any distinction between co-accused who used violence and those who did not (*Goktepe v. Belgium*, no. 50372/99)
- conviction on appeal of mother of child who died as a result of abuse by one or both parents, the father having previously been acquitted by the trial court (*Guillemot v. France*, no. 21922/03)
- refusal of oral hearing in administrative proceedings in which the case was examined at only one instance (*Miller v. Sweden*, no. 55853/00)
- absence of public hearing in disciplinary proceedings against lawyer (*Hurter v. Switzerland*, no. 53146/99)
- lack of procedural rules governing examination by Court of Cassation of criminal charges against Government Ministers and absence of legal basis for examination by Court of Cassation of criminal charges against accused who were not Government Ministers (*Claes and others v. Belgium*, nos. 46825/99, 47132/99, 47502/99, 49010/99, 49104/99, 49195/99 and 49716/99)
- failure of authorities to comply with court decisions ordering cessation of operations at three thermal power plants on account of effect on environment (*Ahmet Okay and others v. Turkey*, no. 36220/97)
- delay by authorities in complying with court decision concerning restitution of property (*Užkurėlienė and others v. Lithuania*, no. 62988/00)
- failure of authorities to pay sums awarded by final and binding court judgment (*Tunç v. Turkey*, no. 54040/00)
- non-enforcement of judgments ordering payment of compensation by State authorities (*Makrakhidze v. Georgia*, no. 28537/02, “*Amat-G*” *Ltd. and Mebagishvili v. Georgia*, no. 2507/03)

- prolonged non-enforcement of eviction order on account of refusal to grant police assistance (*Matheus v. France*, no. 62740/00)
- prolonged failure of Bar Association to designate location for applicant's practice, notwithstanding repeated annulment of its decision by Supreme Administrative Court (*Turczanik v. Poland*, no. 38064/97)
- repeated refusal of employer to comply with binding court judgments (*Fociac v. Romania*, no. 2577/02)
- adequacy of measures taken by authorities to secure enforcement of court decision ordering private person to conclude contract (*Ghibusi v. Romania*, no. 7893/02)
- independence and impartiality of maritime chambers (*Brudnicka and others v. Poland*, no. 54723/00)
- impartiality of lay assessors nominated respectively by medical associations and social insurance boards to sit on Regional Appeals Commission (*Thaler v. Austria*, no. 58141/00)
- impartiality of appeal court judge against whom accused had brought separate civil proceedings (*Chmeliř v. the Czech Republic*, no. 64935/01)
- impartiality of judge who had been involved 10 years earlier in an action arising out of the same facts (*Indra v. Slovakia*, no. 46845/99)
- impartiality of Constitutional Court judge who was a partner in a law firm with a judge of the Administrative Court (*Steck-Risch and others v. Liechtenstein*, no. 63151/00)
- impartiality of Constitutional Court judge who had acted as legal representative of the opposing party earlier in the proceedings (*Mežnarić v. Croatia*, no. 71615/01)
- impartiality of trial judge who had previously taken several decisions concerning pre-trial detention (*Jasiński v. Poland*, no. 30865/96)
- lack of impartiality of court imposing sanction of detention on lawyer for contempt of court (*Kyprianou v. Cyprus*, no. 73797/01 [GC])
- refusal of courts to institute criminal proceedings for defamation, on the ground that the applicant had committed offences in question, although he had previously been acquitted or proceedings were still pending (*Diamantides v. Greece (no. 2)*, no. 71563/01)
- refusal of compensation for detention on remand, following discontinuation of criminal proceedings, on ground of failure to provide proof of innocence (*Capeau v. Belgium*, no. 42914/98)
- refusal of compensation for detention on remand, following discontinuation of criminal proceedings, on the ground of remaining suspicion (*A.L. v. Germany*, no. 72758/01)
- conviction *in absentia* (*R.R. v. Italy*, no. 42191/02)
- conviction *in absentia* and without any legal representation of accused serving a prison sentence abroad (*Mariani v. France*, no. 43640/98)
- impossibility for lawyer to represent accused who had been deported and was prohibited from returning (*Harizi v. France*, no. 59480/00)

- denial of access to lawyer during initial period of custody, supervision of subsequent consultations with lawyers and restrictions on visits by lawyers, and restrictions on access to file (*Öçalan v. Turkey*, no. 46221/99 [GC])
- holding of certain trial hearings and examination of witnesses in absence of accused's lawyer (*Balliu v. Albania*, no. 74727/01)
- refusal to rehear witnesses following replacement of a judge (*Graviano v. Italy (no. 2)*, no. 10075/02)
- use at trial of incriminatory statements obtained from applicant during interrogation and in absence of lawyer, and lack of procedural guarantees to contest the reliability of those statements at trial (*Kolu v. Turkey*, no. 35811/97)
- absence of opportunity to question victim of alleged sexual abuse in a prison cell or a third cell-mate (*Mayali v. France*, no. 69116/01)
- refusal to allow defence counsel to examine witnesses against accused during trial, on grounds of their age and the nature of their testimony, relating to charges of sexual assault and acts of indecency on children (*Bocos-Cuesta v. the Netherlands*, no. 54789/00)
- refusal to allow accused to examine witnesses against him during his trial (*Taal v. Estonia*, no. 13249/02)
- conviction on the basis of witness statements that accused had no opportunity to challenge (*Mild and Virtanen v. Finland*, nos. 39481/98 and 40227/98)
- absence of opportunity for accused to examine a witness against him during his trial (*Bracci v. Italy*, no. 36822/02)

Article 8      *Cases concerning the right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence*

- legislation precluding parents from claiming certain damages in respect of disabilities not detected during pregnancy, due to negligence (*Draon v. France*, no. 1513/03 [GC], and *Maurice v. France*, no. 11810/03 [GC])
- administration of medical treatment without consent during psychiatric confinement (*Storck v. Germany*, no. 61603/00)
- absence of effective procedure for obtaining disclosure of information about tests carried out on servicemen (*Roche v. the United Kingdom*, no. 32555/96 [GC])
- failure of authorities to take adequate measures to protect applicant from effects of severe pollution in vicinity of steelworks (*Fadeyeva v. Russia*, no. 55723/00)
- conviction for sadomasochistic acts (*K.A. and A.D. v. Belgium*, nos. 42758/98 and 45558/99)
- confiscation of passport and refusal to return it during lengthy criminal proceedings (*Iletmiş v. Turkey*, no. 29871/96)
- absence of legal basis for taking photograph of person placed under house arrest and making available to the press for publication (*Sciacca v. Italy*, no. 50774/99)
- adequacy of legal basis for security checks (*Antunes Rocha v. Portugal*, no. 64330/01)



- absence of legal basis for interception of conversation by means of listening device installed on private property (*Vetter v. France*, no. 59842/00)
- adequacy of legal basis for interception of telephone calls (*Ağaoğlu v. Turkey*, no. 27310/95)
- absence of legal basis for interception and recording of conversations between detainee and members of his family (*Wisse v. France*, no. 71611/01)
- use in criminal proceedings of transcripts of telephone conversations recorded in context of separate criminal proceedings (*Matheron v. France*, no. 57752/00)
- refusal of courts to establish paternity of still-born child and change surname and patronym from that of mother's former husband (*Znamenskaya v. Russia*, no. 77785/01)
- impossibility of refuting paternity after expiry of one-year time-limit from date of registration, notwithstanding evidence of DNA testing (*Shofman v. Russia*, no. 74826/01)
- prolonged refusal of authorities to regularise family's stay in Latvia, notwithstanding length of time spent there and close links with the country (*Sisojeva v. Latvia*, no. 60654/00) [the case is now pending before the Grand Chamber]
- failure of courts to decide on request for deprivation of parental rights and request for adoption (*Z.M. and K.P. v. Slovakia*, no. 50232/99)
- suspension of right of access to child (*Süss v. Germany*, no. 40324/98)
- adequacy of measures taken by Romanian authorities to secure return of child to father, who had joint custody (*Monory v. Romania and Hungary*, no. 71099/01)
- adequacy of measures taken by Croatian authorities to return child to mother in Germany (*Karadžić v. Croatia*, no. 35030/04)
- adequacy of measures taken to enforce fathers' right of access to children (*Zawadka v. Poland*, no. 48542/99, *Siemianowski v. Poland*, no. 45972/99, *Bove v. Italy*, no. 30595/02, *Reigado Ramos v. Portugal*, no. 73229/01) and to enforce court decisions ordering return of children to father (*H.N. v. Poland*, no. 77710/01)
- denial of visits to prisoner by mother and brother (*Bagiński v. Poland*, no. 37444/97)
- refusal to allow prisoner to visit sick parent (*Schemkamper v. France*, no. 75833/01)
- expulsion of foreigner following convictions, resulting in separation from wife and children (*Üner v. the Netherlands*, no. 46410/99) [the case is now pending before the Grand Chamber]
- expulsion of foreign national after lengthy period of residence (*Keles v. Germany*, no. 32231/02)
- refusal to allow daughter to join parent in country where latter was legally resident (*Tuquabo-Tekle and others v. the Netherlands*, no. 60665/00)
- denial of access to home in northern Cyprus (*Xenides-Arestis v. Turkey*, no. 46347/99)
- failure of authorities to ensure adequate living conditions for Roma families whose homes were burned in 1993 by a mob including police officers (*Moldovan and others v. Romania (no. 2)*, nos. 41138/98 and 64320/01; see also *Moldovan and others v. Romania (no. 1) (friendly settlement)*)
- adequacy of measures taken to return flat to tenants after unlawful occupation by third party during their absence (*Novoseletskiy v. Ukraine*, no. 47148/99)

- lawfulness of search of home (*L.M. v. Italy*, no. 60033/00)
- search of lawyer's office and seizure of privileged material (*Sallinen and others v. Finland*, no. 50882/99)
- search of business premises and home and seizure of documents in context of proceedings against applicant's son for a speeding offence (*Buck v. Germany*, no. 41604/98)

#### Article 9      *Cases concerning freedom of religion and belief*

- prohibition on wearing of Muslim head covering in university (*Leyla Şahin v. Turkey*, no 44774/98 [GC])

#### Article 10      *Cases concerning freedom of expression*

- conviction of union members for making statement to the press without prior authorisation (*Karademirci and others v. Turkey*, nos. 37096/97 and 37101/97)
- imposition of sanction of five days' imprisonment on lawyer for contempt of court (*Kyprianou v. Cyprus*, no. 73797/01 [GC])
- awards of damages for defamation of the President (*Pakdemirli v. Turkey*, no. 35839/97) and of a Government Minister (*Turhan v. Turkey*, no. 48176/99) and conviction for insulting Government Ministers in a speech (*Birol v. Turkey*, no. 44104/98)
- awards of damages against newspaper in respect of articles defaming politicians (*Ukrainian Media Group v. Ukraine*, no. 72713/01)
- award of damages for defamation of regional governor in newspaper (*Grinberg v. Russia*, no. 23472/03)
- conviction for defamation (*Sokolowski v. Poland*, no. 75955/01)
- conviction for disseminating false information about presidential candidate prior to election (*Salov v. Ukraine*, no. 65518/01)
- award of damages against journalist for defamation of police officer (*Savitchi v. Moldova*, no. 11039/02)
- conviction of journalist for defamation of another journalist (*Urbino Rodrigues v. Portugal*, no. 75088/01)
- high level of damages awarded for defamation (*Independent News and Media and Independent Newspapers Ireland Limited v. Ireland*, no. 55120/00)
- conviction of publisher in respect of novel found to be insulting to Islam (*İ.A. v. Turkey*, no. 42571/98)
- award of damages against a Jehovah's Witness for defamation of another religious association (*Paturel v. France*, no. 54968/00)
- seizure of publication and order for publishing house to pay compensation to politician in respect of remarks published in book review (*Wirtschafts-Trend Zeitschriftenverlags GmbH v. Austria*, no. 58547/00)

- conviction and award of damages for defamation, and injunction against magazine for publishing story on cohabitee of indicted politician (*Wirtschafts-Trend Zeitschriftenverlags GmbH v. Austria*, nos. 66298/01 and 15653/02)
- conviction of journalists for publishing extracts from court file during investigation (*Tourancheau and July v. France*, no. 53886/00)

#### Article 11      *Cases concerning freedom of association*

- refusal to register a Communist party (*Partidul Comunistilor (Nepeceristi) and Ungureanu v. Romania*, no. 46626/99)
- incitement of public by local officials to attack offices of a political party of Macedonian minority, and failure of police to intervene (*Ouranio Toxo and others v. Greece*, no. 74989/01)
- refusal to authorise representatives of a political party to visit area under state of emergency (*Güneri and others v. Turkey*, nos. 42853/98, 43609/98 and 44291/98)
- transfer of civil servants, allegedly on account of trade union activities (*Ertas Aydin and others v. Turkey*, no. 43672/98, *Bulga and others v. Turkey*, no. 43974/98, *Akat v. Turkey*, no. 45050/98)
- interference with attempts to hold political rallies and events, and failure to respect positive obligation to allow freedom of assembly (*United Macedonian Organisation Ilinden and Ivanov v. Bulgaria*, no. 44079/98), and prohibition of political rally (*Ivanov v. Bulgaria*, no. 46336/99)
- dissolution of association as unconstitutional (*United Macedonian Organisation Ilinden and Pirin and others v. Bulgaria*, no. 59489/00)
- dissolution of association on grounds of threat to State (*IPSD and others v. Turkey*, no. 35832/97)

#### Article 12      *Cases concerning the right to marry and found a family*

- prohibition on marriage between father-in-law and daughter-in-law while either of their former spouses still alive (*B. and L. v. the United Kingdom*, no. 36536/02)

#### Article 14      *Cases concerning the prohibition of discrimination*

- failure to investigate possible racist motives for shooting (*Nachova and others v. Bulgaria*, nos. 43577/98 and 43579/98 [GC])
- failure to investigate possible racist motives behind ill-treatment (*Bekos and Koutropoulos v. Greece*, no. 15250/02)
- dismissal of former KGB officers from employment in the private sector and exclusion from employment in certain private sector spheres (*Rainys and Gasparavicius v. Lithuania*, nos. 70665/01 and 74345/01)
- discrimination, on account of Roma origins, in dealing with claims (*Moldovan and others v. Romania (no. 2)*, nos. 41138/98 and 64320/01, and see also *Moldovan and others v. Romania (no. 1) (friendly settlement)*)
- denial of child benefit to foreigners not in possession of unlimited residence permits (*Niedzwiecki v. Germany*, no. 58453/00, *Okpiz v. Germany*, no. 59140/00)

- discrimination on account of Chechen origin (*Timishev v. Russia*, nos. 55762/00 and 55974/00)
- unavailability of tax relief on maintenance payments made by unmarried father to his child (*P.M. v. the United Kingdom*, no. 6638/03)

Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 *Cases concerning the right of property*

- annulment by Supreme Court of right of former officers in the Yugoslav army to purchase housing at a reduced rate (*Veselinski v. "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"*, no. 45658/99 *Djidrovski v. "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"*, no. 46447/99)
- successive rent control schemes resulting in rent levels insufficient to cover landlords' obligation to maintain their property (*Hutten-Czapska v. Poland*, no. 35014/97) [the case is now pending before the Grand Chamber]
- obligation on applicants who had inherited land to reassign it to tax authorities without compensation (*Jahn and others v. Germany*, nos. 46720/99, 72203/01 and 72552/01 [GC])
- impoundment of aircraft leased from Yugoslav Airlines, by virtue of EC regulation implementing UN sanctions against former Yugoslavia (*Bosphorus Hava Yollari Turizm ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Ireland*, no. 45036/98 [GC])
- imposition of restrictions on fishing (*Alatulkkila and others v. Finland*, no. 33538/96)
- withdrawal of business licences by customs authorities (*Rosenzweig and Bonded Warehouses Ltd. v. Poland*, no. 51728/99)
- lack of sufficient safeguards in procedure leading to revocation of bank licence (*Capital Bank AD v. Bulgaria*, no. 49429/99)
- refusal of court to annul sale of unlawfully nationalised property to third party during restitution proceedings (*Străin and others v. Romania*, no. 57001/00)
- annulment of registration as practising lawyer (*Buzescu v. Romania*, no. 61302/00)
- refusal to register car purchased at auction organised by local tax office, on ground of unknown origin (*Sildedzis v. Poland*, no. 45214/99)
- annulment of title to property situated on foreshore and demolition of hotel being constructed there, without compensation (*N.A. and others v. Turkey*, no. 37451/97)
- demolition of illegally built storage facility (*Saliba v. Malta*, no. 4251/02)
- cancellation of registration of trade mark on basis of treaty entered into after initial registration request (*Anheuser Busch Inc. v. Portugal*, no. 73049/01)
- failure or lengthy delay by authorities in fulfilling obligation to provide flats in compensation for expropriation (*Kirilova v. Bulgaria*, no. 42908/98)
- failure of authorities to comply with court judgment awarding payment of sums (*Tütüncü and others v. Turkey*, no. 74405/01)
- regular late payment of monthly pension, resulting in loss of value due to inflation (*Solodyuk v. Russia*, no. 67099/01)

- denial of statutory benefits as result of retroactive application of legislation (*Kechko v. Ukraine*, no. 63134/00)
- lack of legal basis for forfeiture of applicant's car in connection with her husband's conviction for fraud (*Frizen v. Russia*, no. 58254/00) and lack of legal basis for forfeiture of money smuggled into Russia on behalf of the applicant by a third person (*Baklanov v. Russia*, no. 68443/01)
- loss of ownership of land as a result of adverse possession (*J.A. Pye (Oxford) Ltd. v. United Kingdom*, no. 44302/02)
- deprivation of property following sale to third parties of property which had previously been nationalised (*Paduraru v. Romania*, no. 63252/00)
- lengthy delay in fixing and paying compensation for expropriation (*Mason and others v. Italy*, no. 43663/98, *Capone v. Italy*, no. 62592/00)

#### Article 2 of Protocol No. 1

- suspension of student from university on account of refusal to remove Muslim head covering for lectures (*Leyla Şahin v. Turkey*, no 44774/98 [GC])

#### Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 *Cases concerning the right to free elections*

- requirement of 10 years' residence in New Caledonia in order to be registered to vote in elections for its Congress (*Py v. France*, no. 66289/01)
- disenfranchisement of convicted prisoners (*Hirst v. United Kingdom*, no. 74025/01 [GC])

#### Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 *Cases concerning principally freedom of movement*

- lengthy prohibition on leaving place of residence without permission during criminal proceedings (*Fedorov and Fedorova v. Russia*, no. 31008/02, *Antonenkov and others v. Ukraine*, no. 14183/02)
- refusal to allow applicants to cross from one region of the Russian Federation to another, on account of their Chechen origin (*Timishev v. Russia*, nos. 55762/00 and 55974/00, *Gartukayev v. Russia*, no. 71933/01)

#### Article 2 of Protocol No. 7 *Cases concerning principally the right to appeal in criminal matters*

- absence of possibility to appeal against administrative sanction imposed for contempt of court (*Gurepka v. Ukraine*, no. 61406/00)

**(b) Judgments dealing exclusively with issues already examined by the Court**

- **219** cases concerned the length of civil or administrative proceedings in: Greece (84 judgments<sup>1</sup>, including one striking out judgment), Slovakia (22 judgments), Turkey (17 judgments<sup>2</sup>), Poland (15 judgments<sup>3</sup>), the Czech Republic and Hungary (13 judgments each), Croatia and Russia (ten judgments each<sup>4</sup>), Austria and France (six judgments), Belgium (four judgments, including one friendly settlement), Ukraine (four judgments), Germany (three judgments, including one striking out judgment), Bulgaria and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (two judgments each), Finland, Luxembourg, Romania, Slovenia and Sweden (one judgment each<sup>5</sup>), the Netherlands (one striking out judgment), Denmark and the United Kingdom (one friendly settlement each)
- **55** cases concerned the length of criminal proceedings in: France (six judgments<sup>6</sup>), Turkey (six judgments, including one friendly settlement), Greece and Finland (five judgments<sup>7</sup>), Austria and the Czech Republic (four judgments each, including one friendly settlement each), Belgium (four judgments<sup>8</sup>), Poland (three judgments), Germany, Hungary, Portugal, Romania and the United Kingdom (two judgments each<sup>9</sup>), Bulgaria, Croatia, Ireland, Slovakia, Switzerland and Ukraine (one judgment each<sup>10</sup>), Denmark and Lithuania (one striking out judgment each)
- **156** cases concerned the non-enforcement of court decisions in: Ukraine (100 judgments<sup>11</sup>), Russia (37 judgments<sup>12</sup>), Romania (eight judgments, including one friendly settlement, Greece (six judgments), and Moldova (five judgments)
- **63** cases concerned delays in payment of compensation for expropriations in Turkey (cf. the leading judgment of *Akkus v. Turkey*, judgment of 9 July 1997)
- **42** cases concerned the lack of independence and impartiality of State Security Courts in Turkey<sup>13</sup> (cf. the leading judgments of *Incal v. Turkey*, judgment of 9 June 1998, and *Çiraklar v. Turkey*, judgment of 28 October 1998); the same issue also arose in numerous judgments dealing with freedom of expression (see below), as well as in eighteen other judgments
- **26** cases (including one friendly settlement) concerned both the lack of independence and impartiality of State Security Courts in Turkey and convictions for dissemination of separatist propaganda and/or incitement to hatred and hostility<sup>14</sup>; Article 10 alone was at issue in a further **seven** cases (including one friendly settlement)

---

<sup>1</sup> In two judgments, no violation was found.

<sup>2</sup> In two judgments, no violation was found.

<sup>3</sup> In one judgment, no violation was found.

<sup>4</sup> In one of the judgments concerning Croatia, no violation was found.

<sup>5</sup> In the judgment concerning Romania, no violation was found.

<sup>6</sup> Three of the judgments concerned the effect of the length with regard to civil parties (*parties civiles*).

<sup>7</sup> In one judgment concerning Finland, no violation was found; in one judgment concerning Greece, which concerned the effect of the length with regard to the civil party, no violation was found.

<sup>8</sup> Two of the judgments concerned the effect of the length with regard to civil parties (*parties civiles*).

<sup>9</sup> In the judgment concerning Germany, no violation was found. Both judgments concerning Portugal concerned the effect of the length with regard to civil parties (*assistente*).

<sup>10</sup> The judgment concerning Ukraine concerned the effect of the length with regard to the civil party.

<sup>11</sup> In 42 judgments, violations of both Article 6 § 1 and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 were found, in 23 judgments a violation of Article 6 § 1 alone was found, in sixteen judgments violations of Articles 6 § 1 and 13 were found, in three judgments a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 alone was found and in sixteen judgments violations of all three provisions were found.

<sup>12</sup> In all of these judgments, violations of both Article 6 § 1 and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 were found, either separately or together. However, in one judgments, there was a partial finding of no violation. Violations were also found in two further judgments which did not deal exclusively with this issue.

<sup>13</sup> In two of these, the length of the proceedings was also at issue.

<sup>14</sup> Violations of both Article 6 and Article 10 were found in all but one of case, in which the conviction of a publisher on account of his membership of an illegal organisation was found not to have been in violation of the latter provision. In one case, a violation was also found on account of the length of the criminal proceedings.

- **37** cases (including two striking out judgments) concerned the validation of the unlawful occupation of property on the basis of a principle of “indirect expropriation” (cf. *Carbonara and Ventura v. Italy*, judgment of 30 May 2000)
- **17** cases concerned the length of detention on remand (seven concerning Poland, six concerning Turkey, two concerning France, one concerning the Czech Republic and one friendly settlement concerning Estonia); this issue also arose in a further nine judgments concerning Turkey, seven judgments concerning Bulgaria, five judgments each concerning Poland and Russia and one judgment each concerning Estonia, Germany, Malta and Ukraine
- **16** cases (including seven friendly settlements) concerned the impossibility for landlords in Italy to recover possession of their properties, on account of the system of staggering police assistance to enforce evictions (cf. the leading judgment of *Immobiliare Saffi v. Italy*, judgment of 28 July 1999)
- **17** cases concerned various aspects of the right to an adversarial procedure and equality of arms in proceedings before the Court of Cassation and the *Conseil d’Etat* in France, in particular the non-disclosure of the report of the *conseiller rapporteur* (cf. the leading judgments of *Reinhardt and Slimane-Kaïd v. France*, judgment of 31 March 1998, *Slimane-Kaïd v. France*, judgment of 25 January 2000, *Kress v. France*, judgment of 7 June 2000, and *Meftah v. France*, judgment of 26 July 2002)
- **13** cases (including one friendly settlement) concerned the staying of civil proceedings relating to claims for compensation for damage caused by terrorism or by the armed forces or police during the war in Croatia (cf. the leading judgments of *Kutić v. Croatia*, judgment of 1 March 2002, and *Multiplex v. Croatia*, judgment of 10 July 2003)
- **nine** cases concerned supervisory review of final and binding court decisions, six in Russia (see the leading judgment of *Ryabykh v. Russia*, judgment of 24 July 2003) and three in Ukraine (see *Tregubenko v. Ukraine*, judgment of 2 November 2004); the issue also arose in two further judgment cases
- **five** cases concerned access to the Constitutional Court in the Czech Republic (cf. *Zvolský and Zvolská v. the Czech Republic*, and *Běleš v. the Czech Republic*, judgments of 12 November 2002)
- **three** cases concerned the age of consent for homosexual acts between adults and adolescents (see the leading judgments of *L. and V. v. Austria* and *S.L. v. Austria*, judgments of 9 January 2003)
- **three** cases (including one striking out judgment) concerned the annulment of final decisions ordering the restitution of property in Romania and/or the exclusion of the jurisdiction of the courts in the matter (cf. the leading judgment of *Brumărescu v. Romania*, judgment of 28 October 1999)
- **two** cases concerned the lack of an oral hearing before the Administrative Court in Austria (cf. *Stallinger and Kuso v. Austria*, judgment of 23 April 1997)
- **two** cases concerned the effect of the excessive length of bankruptcy proceedings in Italy on property rights and restrictions on the receipt of correspondence and the freedom of movement of persons declared bankrupt (see the leading judgment of *Luordo v. Italy*, judgment of 17 July 2003)<sup>1</sup>
- **two** cases (both friendly settlements) concerned detention for failure to pay a community charge and absence of legal aid in the United Kingdom (cf. *Benham v. the United Kingdom*, judgment of 10 June 1996); two further cases raised similar issues in connection with non-payment of local taxes and court-imposed fines
- **two** cases concerning the dissolution of political parties in Turkey (cf. *United Communist Party and others v. Turkey*, judgment of 30 January 1998, and *Socialist Party and others v. Turkey*, judgment of 25 May 1998)

---

<sup>1</sup> In a further case, *Sgattoni v. Italy*, the Court found no violation (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1).

- **two** cases concerned the lengthy delay in the fixing and payment of compensation in respect of the occupation of land in the context of nationalisation (cf. *Almeida Garrett, Mascarenhas Falcão and others v. Portugal*, judgment of 11 January 2000)
- **one** case concerned the striking out of a cassation appeal on the ground of the appellant's failure to implement the judgment appealed against (cf. *Annoni di Gussola and others v. France*, judgment of 14 November 2000)
- **one** case concerned a presumption of benefit accruing from expropriation (cf. *Katkaridis and others v. Greece*, judgment of 15 November 1996)
- **one** case concerned the independence and impartiality of prison governors acting as the the adjudicating body in prison disciplinary proceedings, and the refusal to allow legal representation in such proceedings (cf. *Ezeh and Connors v. the United Kingdom*, judgment of 15 July 2002)
- **one** case concerned non-communication of the submissions of the Principal Public Prosecutor to the Court of Cassation (cf. *Göç v. Turkey*, judgment of 11 July 2002); the same issue arose in three further cases
- **one** case concerned the continuation of detention on remand in Poland by virtue of a practice without any legal basis (cf. the leading judgment of *Baranowski v. Poland*, judgment of 28 March 2000)

In addition, a number of cases dealt at least in part with issues in respect of which the Court has already established clear principles in its case-law: eighteen judgments concerning the failure to bring detainees promptly before a judge in Turkey, ten judgments concerning the scope of review of the lawfulness of detention and/or equality of arms in proceedings relating to such review in Bulgaria, ten judgments concerning censorship of prisoners' correspondence (four in respect of Italy, three in respect of Poland, two in respect of Lithuania, and one in respect of Moldova), eight judgments concerning the role of investigators and prosecutors in ordering detention in Bulgaria<sup>1</sup>, three judgments concerning failure to give reasons for refusal of compensation for detention on remand in Greece<sup>2</sup>, and two judgments concerning the ordering of detention on remand by prosecutors in Poland<sup>3</sup>.

### (c) Friendly settlement judgments

In addition to the friendly settlement judgments mentioned above, friendly settlements were reached in cases concerning the following issues:

- deprivation of property on account of annulment of gift of land (*Netolická and Netolocká v. the Czech Republic*, no. 55727/00)
- absence of public delivery of judgment by higher courts (*Šoller v. the Czech Republic*, no. 48577/99)
- lawfulness of detention on remand and statements made by police officer allegedly in breach of the presumption of innocence (*Florică v. Romania*, no. 49781/99)
- ill-treatment in detention (*Constantin v. Romania*, no. 49145/99, and *Bozkurt v. Turkey*, no. 35851/97)
- confiscation of copies of a newspaper (*Taniyan v. Turkey*, no. 29910/96)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Nikolova v. Bulgaria*, judgment of 25 March 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Georgiadis v. Greece*, judgment of 29 May 1997.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Niedbala v. Poland*, judgment of 4 July 2000.



- lack of access to court in connection with pension rights (*Toimi v. Sweden*, no. 55164/00)
- fairness of civil proceedings and adequacy of compensation for expropriation (*Viaropoulos v. Greece*, no. 19437/02)
- lack of access to court to contest a decision of the Civil Aviation Authority, classification of the applicant as a security risk and withdrawal of his access card for sensitive areas of an airport (*Jonasson v. Sweden*, no. 59403/00)
- lack of access to court to bring action for damages in respect of contamination with hepatitis C (*Quillevere v. France*, no. 61104/00)
- failure of authorities to prevent death of applicant's son in drowning accident, and contradictory conclusions of courts in similar cases (*Cruz da Silva Coelho v. Portugal*, no. 9388/02)
- ill-treatment by police, lawfulness of detention and failure to bring detainee promptly before a judge (*Velcea v. Romania*, no. 60957/00)
- refusal to allow delegation of a local branch of a political party to visit area under state of emergency (*Abdulkadir Aydin and others v. Turkey*, no. 53909/00)

#### **(d) Judgments striking applications out of the list of cases**

In addition to strike-out judgments mentioned above, cases concerning the following issue were struck out of the list:

- threatened expulsion to Iran (*Razaghi v. Sweden*, no. 64599/01)
- lawfulness of expulsion (*Szyszkowski v. San Marino*, no. 76966/01)
- failure to review lawfulness of detention (*Falkovich v. Ukraine*, 64200/00)
- length of time taken to decide on request for release from psychiatric detention (*Duveau v. France*, no. 77403/01)
- *exequatur* of foreign judgment granting divorce on basis of unilateral repudiation by husband (*D.D. v. France*, no. 3/02)
- refusal of court to call witness requested by accused (*Ivanoff v. Finland*, no. 48999/99)
- refusal of residence permit on account of conviction for minor offence, residence permits having been granted to the applicant's husband and children (*Mohammed Yuusuf v. the Netherlands*, no. 42620/02)
- opening of detainee's correspondence, including correspondence with his lawyer and the Court (*Meriakri v. Moldova*, no. 53487/99)

#### **(e) Other judgments**

**Eight** judgments concerning just satisfaction (three concerning Romania, including one striking out judgment, and one each concerning Germany, Greece, Poland, Slovakia and Turkey, the judgments concerning Germany, Poland and Slovakia being friendly settlement judgments) and **two** judgments concerning revision (one concerning Austria and one concerning Germany) were delivered.

*Notes:*

1. The foregoing summaries are intended to highlight the issues raised in cases and do not indicate the Court's conclusion. Thus, a statement such as "ill-treatment in custody..." covers cases in which no violation was found or in which a friendly settlement was reached as well as cases in which a violation was found.

2. The length of court proceedings was at issue in a total of 272 judgments, in 221 of which it was the sole issue, while in a further 53 the only additional issue was the availability of an effective remedy under Article 13. Violations were found in all but fifteen of the cases in which the merits were addressed.

3. Almost 600 out of the 1105 judgments delivered (over 54%) concerned five groups of cases dealing exclusively with the following issues: the length of court proceedings (including the question of effective remedies), the non-enforcement of binding court decisions, delays in payment of compensation for expropriation in Turkey, the independence and impartiality of State Security Courts in Turkey (alone or in combination with infringements of the right to freedom of expression), and the use of "indirect expropriation" in Italy. Compared to 2004, the first, third and fourth categories continued to generate large numbers of judgments, while the second and fifth categories showed significant increases; conversely, the numbers relating to two previous high-count groups of cases – *Immobiliare Saffi* and *Kutić*-type cases – fell in 2005.

The judgments referred to under (b), (c), (d) and (e) above, totalling **734**, account for over 66% of those delivered in 2005.

4. The highest numbers of judgments concerned the following States:

Turkey	290 (26.24%)
Ukraine	120 (10.86%)
Greece	105 (9.5%)
Russia	83 (7.5%)
Italy	79 (7.15%)

The figures in brackets indicate the percentage of the total number of judgments delivered in 2005. These five States accounted for over 60% of the judgments.

5. All judgments and admissibility decisions (other than those taken by the committees) are available in full text in the Court's case-law database (HUDOC), which is accessible via the Court's internet site: <http://www.echr.coe.int>.

#### IV. JUDGMENTS AND DECISIONS SELECTED FOR PUBLICATION

The following judgments and decisions delivered or adopted in 2005 have been selected by the Court's Publications Committee for publication in *Reports of Judgments and Decisions*. Grand Chamber judgments and decisions are indicated by an asterisk. The composition of the volumes has not yet been confirmed.

(judgments)

66289/01	PY v. France (extracts)
50774/99	SCIACCA v. Italy
42914/98	CAPEAU v. Belgium
56529/00	ENHORN v. Sweden
37096/97)	KARADEMIRCI and others v. Turkey
37101/97)	
46626/99	PARTIDUL COMUNISILOR v. Romania (extracts)
68416/01	STEEL and MORRIS v. the United Kingdom
46827/99	MAMATKULOV and ASKAROV v. Turkey*
46221/99	OÇALAN v. Turkey*
47148/99	NOVOSELETSKIY v. Ukraine (extracts)
54723/00	BRUDNICKA and others v. Poland
50196/99	BUBBINS v. the United Kingdom (extracts)
21894/93	AKKUM and others v Turkey (extracts)
54825/00	NEVMERZHITSKIY v. Ukraine (extracts)
36378/02	SHAMAYEV and others v. Georgia and Russia
41604/98	BUCK v. Germany
46720/99)	JAHN and others v. Germany*
72203/01)	
72552/01)	
45036/98	BOSPHORUS HAVA YOLLARI TURİZM VE TİCARET ANONİM ŞİRKETİ v. Ireland*
64663/01	LO TUFO v. Italy
64935/01	CHMELÍŘ v. the Czech Republic
55723/00	FADEYEVA v. Russia
61444/00	KRASUSKI v. Poland (extracts)
55120/00	INDEPENDENT NEWS AND MEDIA and INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPERS IRELAND LIMITED v. Ireland (extracts)
61603/00	STORCK v. Germany
61811/00	MILATOVÁ and others v. the Czech Republic (extracts)
517/02	KOLANIS v. the United Kingdom
43577/98)	NACHOVA and others v. Bulgaria*
43579/98)	
11810/03	MAURICE v. France*
74025/01	HIRST v. the United Kingdom (no. 2)*
31443/96	BRONIOWSKI v. Poland (just satisfaction - friendly settlement)*
38064/97	TURCZANIK v. Poland
2345/02	SAID v. the Netherlands
31302/02	MALINOVSKIY v. Russia
36220/97	AHMET OKYAY and others v. Turkey
73316/01	SILIADIN v. France
57001/00	STRĂIN and others v. Romania
65518/01	SALOV v. Ukraine (not final)
77517/01)	STOIANOVA and NEDELICU v. Romania
77722/01)	
65899/01	TANIŞ v. Turkey
42571/98	İ.A.v. Turkey (not final)

2507/03 AMAT-G Ltd. and MEBAGISHVILI v. Georgia (not final)  
 24919/03 MATHEW v. the Netherlands (not final)  
 5149/03 VAN HOUTEN v. the Netherlands (not final)

(decisions)

14462/03 PENTIACOVA and others v. Moldova  
 35753/03 PHULL v. France  
 59638/00 BASTONE v. Italy (extracts)  
 30598/02 ACCARDI and others v. Italy  
 71916/01) MALTZAN and others v. Germany\*  
 71917/01)  
 10260/02)  
 26775/02 SOTTANI v. Italy (extracts)  
 18913/03 HUSAIN v. Italy  
 22860/02 WOS v. Poland  
 15212/03 CHARZYŃSKI v. Poland  
 60861/00 MANOILESCU and DOBRESCU v. Romania  
 24790/04 FAIRFIELD and others v. the United Kingdom  
 38704/03 VEERMAE v. Finland  
 62116/00 MATTICK v. Germany  
 67723/01 PÕDER and others v. Estonia  
 35242/04 M.A. v. the United Kingdom  
 11215/02 RATAJCZYK v. Poland  
 18670/03 BERISHA and HALJITI v. “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (extracts)  
 65731/01) STEC and others v. the United Kingdom\*  
 65900/01)  
 28743/03 MELNYCHUK v. Ukraine  
 23695/02 CLARKE v. the United Kingdom  
 68953/01 CEYLAN v. Turkey  
 63512/00) LEVEAU and FILLON v. France  
 63513/00)  
 18624/03 IVANCIUC v. Romania  
 75255/01 GOUDSWAARD-VAN DER LANS v. the Netherlands

### **Proposals not yet examined**

(judgments)

32555/96 ROCHE v. the United Kingdom\*  
 41138/98) MOLDOVAN and others v. Romania (no. 2)  
 64320/01)  
 67099/01 SOLODYUK v. Russia  
 23032/02 LUKENDA v. Slovenia  
 77132/01 SGATTONI v. Italy  
 6563/03 SHANNON v. the United Kingdom  
 73049/01 ANHEUSER-BUSCH INC. v. Portugal  
 37451/97 N.A and others v. Turkey  
 52690/99 MAJEWSKI v. Poland  
 20420/02 MOGOŞ v. Romania  
 75307/01 SIDDIK ASLAN v. Turkey  
 74989/01 OURANIO TOXO and others v. Greece (extracts)  
 5140/02 FEDOTOV v. Russia  
 34056/02 GONGADZE v. Ukraine  
 6847/02 KHUDOYOROV v. Russia  
 78027/01 KARAGOZ v. Turkey  
 13284/04 BADER and others v. Sweden

3/02	D.D. v. France (striking out)
44302/02	J.A. PYE (OXFORD) LTD. v. the United Kingdom
67175/01	REINPRECHT v. Austria
52391/99	RAMSAHAI and others v. the Netherlands
49429/99	CAPITAL BANK AD v. Bulgaria
74826/01	SHOFMAN v. Russia
38595/97	KAKOULLI v. Turkey
37038/97	NURI KURT v. Turkey (extracts)
44774/98	LEYLA ŞAHİN v. Turkey*
29871/96	ILETMIŞ v. Turkey
55762/00)	TIMISHEV v. Russia
55974/00)	
15250/02	BEKOS and KOUTROPOULOS v. Greece
35030/04	KARADŽIĆ v. Croatia
73797/01	KYPRIANOU v. Cyprus*
54730/00	P.D. v. France
46347/99	XENIDES-ARESTIS v. Turkey

(decisions)

344/04	PAPON v. France
41812/04	MANCINI v. Italy
6778/05	MPP GOLUB v. Ukraine
50018/99	ADEN ROBLEH v. France
5446/03	PERRIN v. the United Kingdom
6223/04	BANFIELD v. the United Kingdom
68890/01	BLAKE v. the United Kingdom (extracts)
2428/05	WYPYCH v. Poland
39203/02	NAGULA v. Estonia
60559/00	EEG-SLACHTHUIS VERBIST v. Belgium
171/03	REVEL and MORA v. France
41183/02	JELIČIĆ v. Bosnia-Herzegovina (extracts)
59624/00	LEININGEN ZU v. Germany
73047/01	HAAS v. Germany
16153/03	LAZAREV v. Russia
74766/01	VÉRITÉS SANTÉ PRATIQUE v. France
61093/00	SCEA FERME DE FRESNOV v. France (extracts)
40485/02	NORDISK FILM & TV A/S v. Denmark
74762/01	MAHDID and HADDAR v. Austria (extracts)
14600/05	ESKINAZI and CHELOUCHE v. Turkey
17120/04	BERGAUER and others v. the Czech Republic
73661/01	NILSSON v. Sweden
72098/01	MALAVIOLLE v. France

*Note:* The publication of non-final Section judgments is normally subject to the judgment becoming final (Article 44 § 2 of the Convention).

## V. STATISTICAL INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>

<b>Judgments delivered</b>	<b>2005</b>
Grand Chamber	12(16)
Section I	294(304)
Section II	377(392)
Section III	194(205)
Section IV	196(247)
Sections in former compositions	32(34)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1105(1198)</b>

<b>Judgments delivered in 2005<sup>2</sup></b>					
	Merits/Fond	Friendly settlements/ Règlements amiables	Struck out/ Radiation	Other/autres	Total
Grand Chamber	11(15)	0	0	1	12(16)
former Section I	5	0	0	1	6
former Section II	7(8)	1(2)	0	0	8(10)
former Section III	14	0	3	1	18
former Section IV	0	0	0	0	0
Section I	284(294)	7	2	1	294(304)
Section II	358(372)	13(14)	5	1	377(392)
Section III	173(184)	12	5	4	194(205)
Section IV	188(239)	4	3	1	196(247)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1040(1131)</b>	<b>37(39)</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1105(1198)</b>

<sup>1</sup> A judgment or decision may concern more than one application: when both figures are given, the number of applications is shown in brackets. The statistical information provided in this and the following section is provisional. For a number of reasons (in particular, different methods of calculation of unjoined applications dealt with in a single decision), discrepancies may arise between the different tables in the Survey.

<sup>2</sup> The heading “former Sections” refers to Sections in their composition prior to 1 November 2004.

# JUDGMENTS 2005

<i>Etat en cause / State concerned</i>	<i>Affaires ayant donné lieu à un constat de / Cases which gave rise to a finding of</i>		<i>Affaires n'ayant pas donné lieu à un constat sur le fond / Cases which gave rise to no finding on the merits</i>		<i>Satisfaction équitable / Just satisfaction</i>	<i>Révision</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
	<i>Au moins une violation / At least one violation</i>	<i>Non violation / No violation</i>	<i>Règlement amiable / Friendly settlement</i>	<i>Rayée du rôle / Striking out</i>			
<i>Albanie / Albania</i>	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
<i>Andorre / Andorra</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Arménie / Armenia</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Autriche / Austria</i>	18	2	1	-	-	1	22
<i>Azerbaïdjan / Azerbaijan</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Belgique / Belgium</i>	12	1	1	-	-	-	14
<i>Bosnie-Herzégovine / Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Bulgarie / Bulgaria</i>	23	-	-	-	-	-	23
<i>Croatie / Croatia</i>	24	1	1	-	-	-	26
<i>Chypre / Cyprus</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
<i>République tchèque / Czech Republic</i>	28	1	4	-	-	-	33
<i>Danemark / Denmark</i>	-	1	1	1	-	-	3
<i>Estonie / Estonia</i>	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
<i>Finlande / Finland</i>	10	2	1	-	-	-	13
<i>France</i>	51	6	1	2	-	-	60
<i>Géorgie / Georgia</i>	3	-	-	-	-	-	3
<i>Allemagne / Germany</i>	10	3	-	1	1 <sup>1</sup>	1	16
<i>Grèce / Greece</i>	100	2	1	1	1	-	105
<i>Hongrie / Hungary</i>	17	-	-	-	-	-	17
<i>Islande / Iceland</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Irlande / Ireland</i>	1	2	-	-	-	-	3
<i>Italie / Italy</i>	67	3	7	2	-	-	79
<i>Lettonie / Latvia</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
<i>Liechtenstein</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
<i>Lituanie / Lithuania</i>	3	1	-	1	-	-	5
<i>Luxembourg</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
<i>Ex-République yougoslave de Macédoine / Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i>	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
<i>Malte / Malta</i>	1	1	-	-	-	-	2
<i>Moldova</i>	13	-	-	1	-	-	14
<i>Pays-Bas / Netherlands</i>	7	1	-	2	-	-	10
<i>Norvège / Norway</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Pologne / Poland</i>	44	4	-	-	1 <sup>1</sup>	-	49
<i>Portugal</i>	6	1	3	-	-	-	10
<i>Roumanie / Romania</i>	21	3	5	1	3	0	33 <sup>2</sup>
<i>Fédération de Russie / Russian Federation</i>	81	2	-	-	-	-	83
<i>Saint-Marin / San Marino</i>	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
<i>Slovaquie / Slovakia</i>	28	-	-	-	1 <sup>1</sup>	-	29
<i>Slovénie / Slovenia</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
<i>Espagne / Spain</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Serbie-Monténégro / Serbia and Montenegro</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Suède / Sweden</i>	4	-	2	1	-	-	7
<i>Suisse / Switzerland</i>	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
<i>Turquie / Turkey</i>	270	10	6	3	1	-	290
<i>Ukraine</i>	119	-	-	1	-	-	120
<i>Royaume-Uni / United Kingdom</i>	15	-	3	-	-	-	18
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>994<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>48</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1107<sup>3</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> Friendly settlement.

<sup>2</sup> Two judgments (one merits and one friendly settlement) concerned the same application.

<sup>3</sup> Two judgments related to two respondent States (Georgia/Russian Federation, and Hungary/Romania).

<b>Decisions adopted</b>		<b>2005</b>
<b>I. Applications declared admissible</b>		
Grand Chamber		1(2)
Section I		300(307)
Section II		335(350)
Section III*		205(214)
Section IV		159(163)
<b>Total</b>		<b>1000(1036)</b>
<b>II. Applications declared inadmissible</b>		
Grand Chamber		1(3)
Section I	- Chamber	72(73)
	- Committee	6811
Section II	- Chamber	105(106)
	- Committee	5968
Section III*	- Chamber	151
	- Committee	5284
Section IV	- Chamber	164(167)
	- Committee	8297
<b>Total</b>		<b>26852(26860)</b>
<b>III. Applications struck off</b>		
Section I	- Chamber	64
	- Committee	67
Section II	- Chamber	128
	- Committee	110
Section III*	- Chamber	68(91)
	- Committee	121
Section IV	- Chamber	52(53)
	- Committee	118
<b>Total</b>		<b>728(752)</b>
<b>Total number of decisions<sup>1</sup></b>		<b>28581(28648)</b>

\* including decisions taken in its former composition.

<sup>1</sup> not including partial decisions.

<b>Applications communicated</b>		<b>2005</b>
Section I		614
Section II		1039
Section III		575
Section IV		614
<b>Total number of applications communicated</b>		<b>2842</b>



**Evolution du nombre de requêtes individuelles introduites devant la Cour (anciennement la Commission) /  
Development in the number of individual applications lodged with the Court (formerly the Commission)**

	1955 - 1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	TOTAL
Requêtes introduites <i>Applications lodged</i>	54401	6104	6456	9759	10335	11236	12704	14166	18164	22617	30069	31228	34509	38810	44128	41510 (prov./ prov.)	386196
Requêtes attribuées à un organe décisionnel <i>Applications allocated to a decision body</i>	17568	1648	1861	2037	2944	3481	4758	4750	5981	8400	10482	13845	28214	27189	32512	35402	201072
Décisions rendues <i>Decisions taken</i>	15465	1659	1704	1765	2372	2990	3400	3777	4420	4251	7862	9728	18450	18034	21181	28648	145706
Requêtes déclarées irrecevables ou rayées du rôle <i>Applications declared inadmissible or struck off the list</i>	14636	1441	1515	1547	1789	2182	2776	3073	3658	3520	6776	8989	17868	17272	20350	27612	135004
Requêtes déclarées recevables <i>Applications declared admissible</i>	821	217	189	218	582	807	624	703	762	731	1086	739	578	753	830	1036	10676
Requêtes terminées par une décision de rejet en cours d'examen au fond <i>Applications terminated by a decision to reject in the course of the examination of the merits</i>	8	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	19
Arrêts rendus par la Cour <i>Judgments delivered by the Court</i>	235	72	81	60	50	56	72	106	105	177	695	889	844	703	718	1105	5968

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

## EVOLUTION DES AFFAIRES (1/3) EVOLUTION OF CASES (1/3)

Etat  <i>State</i>	Requêtes introduites (prov.)  <i>Applications lodged (prov.)</i>			Requêtes attribuées à un organe décisionnel  <i>Applications allocated to a decision body</i>			Requêtes déclarées irrecevables ou rayées du rôle  <i>Applications declared inadmissible or struck off</i>			Requêtes communiquées au Gouvernement  <i>Applications referred to Government</i>			Requêtes déclarées recevables  <i>Applications declared admissible</i>		
	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005
Albania/ <i>Albanie</i>	24	28	52	17	13	40	11	12	17	1	-	11	1	1	-
Andorra/ <i>Andorre</i>	2	3	8	2	1	5	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-
Armenia/ <i>Arménie</i>	89	122	340	67	96	110	28	24	62	1	2	21	-	-	1
Austria/ <i>Autriche</i>	445	421	418	324	304	301	401	253	208	71	7	31	19	21	29
Azerbaijan/ <i>Azerbaïdjan</i>	266	251	172	238	151	175	45	200	120	3	15	5	-	-	3
Belgium/ <i>Belgique</i>	216	247	283	117	125	169	118	135	192	11	19	18	12	11	9
Bosnia and Herzegovina/ <i>Bosnie-Hezégovine</i>	94	221	212	59	137	210	-	46	70	-	5	1	-	-	1
Bulgaria/ <i>Bulgarie</i>	700	986	927	517	739	821	293	298	344	37	57	73	26	34	30
Croatia/ <i>Croatie</i>	878	696	685	664	697	553	349	580	477	38	59	39	25	13	24
Cyprus/ <i>Chypre</i>	44	65	72	36	47	66	11	2	49	5	2	16	4	-	8
Czech Republic/ <i>République Tchèque</i>	941	1406	1369	629	1064	1264	280	399	420	16	91	141	7	41	30
Denmark/ <i>Danemark</i>	142	129	94	73	86	72	65	88	86	4	8	9	6	-	2
Estonia/ <i>Estonie</i>	178	186	204	131	138	164	138	70	82	5	4	5	1	4	-
Finland/ <i>Finlande</i>	285	313	270	260	244	244	97	191	256	11	27	23	12	15	11
France/ <i>France</i>	2904	3025	2826	1481	1737	1827	1451	1678	1441	89	105	192	89	70	60
Georgia/ <i>Georgie</i>	44	60	91	35	47	72	24	17	48	6	7	9	1	1	5
Germany/ <i>Allemagne</i>	1935	2562	2164	998	1527	1582	461	914	1386	17	16	22	10	10	4
Greece/ <i>Grèce</i>	480	405	425	354	274	369	171	253	349	72	96	54	26	34	93
Hungary/ <i>Hongrie</i>	499	589	635	330	397	647	293	337	220	25	12	50	15	15	16
Iceland/ <i>Islande</i>	17	10	7	10	6	6	5	6	9	-	-	1	1	-	-
Ireland/ <i>Irlande</i>	76	64	62	29	32	45	31	16	36	2	1	3	2	-	1
Italy/ <i>Italie</i>	1848	1867	1186	1351	1480	848	1009	1178	839	89	228	146	16	95	39
Latvia/ <i>Lettonie</i>	312	332	318	133	195	234	152	115	92	10	14	9	7	5	-

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

## EVOLUTION DES AFFAIRES (1/3) EVOLUTION OF CASES (1/3)

Etat  <i>State</i>	Requêtes introduites (prov.)  <i>Applications lodged (prov.)</i>			Requêtes attribuées à un organe décisionnel  <i>Applications allocated to a decision body</i>			Requêtes déclarées irrecevables ou rayées du rôle  <i>Applications declared inadmissible or struck off</i>			Requêtes communiquées au Gouvernement  <i>Applications referred to Government</i>			Requêtes déclarées recevables  <i>Applications declared admissible</i>		
	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005
Liechtenstein/ <i>Liechtenstein</i>	5	5	2	3	5	3	3	2	6	-	-	1	1	1	-
Lithuania/ <i>Lituanie</i>	485	465	266	355	451	266	199	586	444	21	6	27	5	3	13
Luxemburg/ <i>Luxembourg</i>	58	40	50	21	12	28	28	3	16	5	2	5	2	1	2
Malta/ <i>Malte</i>	19	14	11	4	8	13	-	4	12	3	3	6	1	3	3
Moldova/ <i>Moldovie</i>	357	441	583	238	344	594	105	79	302	64	53	46	2	38	12
Monaco/ <i>Monaco</i>	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands/ <i>Pays-Bas</i>	451	553	511	278	350	412	235	339	440	19	58	23	7	11	7
Norway/ <i>Norvège</i>	74	110	73	51	82	57	62	44	53	3	3	13	1	-	-
Poland/ <i>Pologne</i>	5359	5796	4744	3658	4321	4571	1702	2344	6466	123	66	190	83	54	37
Portugal/ <i>Portugal</i>	243	175	287	148	115	221	252	102	117	8	18	19	5	10	7
Romania/ <i>Roumanie</i>	4282	3988	3820	2165	3225	3110	700	1200	2036	57	65	158	22	22	43
Russia/ <i>Russie</i>	6062	7855	8781	4738	5835	8088	3206	3704	5262	169	232	341	15	64	110
San Marino/ <i>Saint-Marin</i>	2	5	2	2	-	4	2	5	2	2	1	-	3	1	-
Serbia and Montenegro/ <i>Serbie-Monténégro</i>	101	615	629	-	452	660	-	-	384	-	1	5	-	-	-
Slovak Republic/ <i>Republique Slovaque</i>	539	484	478	349	403	444	277	353	283	8	63	59	28	12	24
Slovenia/ <i>Slovénie</i>	265	303	347	251	271	347	60	198	131	86	128	43	3	2	1
Spain/ <i>Espagne</i>	604	690	634	455	423	493	377	204	426	12	8	7	6	3	2
Sweden/ <i>Suède</i>	436	524	587	257	398	448	303	366	391	13	25	38	5	8	5
Switzerland/ <i>Suisse</i>	273	311	296	162	203	232	108	170	178	6	15	10	1	4	6
FYRO Macedonia/ <i>ERY Macédoine</i>	148	148	234	98	115	220	57	51	62	1	11	15	-	-	6
Turkey/ <i>Turquie</i>	2944	3930	2244	3558	3679	2489	1632	1817	1366	357	740	538	142	172	241
Ukraine/ <i>Ukraine</i>	2287	2265	2457	1858	1538	1870	1665	1246	1698	158	141	269	6	31	133
United Kingdom/ <i>Royaume-Uni</i>	1396	1423	1652	685	745	1007	865	721	732	86	25	150	134	20	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>38810</b>	<b>44128</b>	<b>41510</b>	<b>27189</b>	<b>32512</b>	<b>35402</b>	<b>17272</b>	<b>20350</b>	<b>27612</b>	<b>1714</b>	<b>2439</b>	<b>2842</b>	<b>753</b>	<b>830</b>	<b>1036</b>

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

**EVOLUTION DES AFFAIRES (2/3) - ARRÊTS (1/2)**  
**EVOLUTION OF CASES (2/3) - JUDGMENTS (1/2)**

Etat	Arrêts (Chambre et Grande Chambre)			Arrêts (définitif - après renvoi devant la Grande Chambre)			Arrêts (règlement amiable)			Arrêts (radiation)		
<i>State</i>	<i>Judgments (Chamber and Grand Chamber)</i>			<i>Judgments (final - after referral to Grand Chamber)</i>			<i>Judgments (friendly settlements)</i>			<i>Judgments (striking out)</i>		
	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005
Albania/ <i>Albanie</i>	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Andorra/ <i>Andorre</i>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Armenia/ <i>Arménie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Austria/ <i>Autriche</i>	17	14	20	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	1	-
Azerbaijan/ <i>Azerbaïdjan</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belgium/ <i>Belgique</i>	7	11	13	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	3	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina/ <i>Bosnie-Hezégovine</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bulgaria/ <i>Bulgarie</i>	11	26	22	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
Croatia/ <i>Croatie</i>	6	12	25	-	-	-	-	21	1	-	-	-
Cyprus/ <i>Chypre</i>	2	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Czech Republic/ <i>République Tchèque</i>	5	27	29	-	-	-	1	1	4	-	-	-
Denmark/ <i>Danemark</i>	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1
Estonia/ <i>Estonie</i>	3	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Finland/ <i>Finlande</i>	3	12	12	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-
France/ <i>France</i>	83	70	57	-	-	-	7	4	1	-	-	2
Georgia/ <i>Georgie</i>	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Germany/ <i>Allemagne</i>	9	6	12	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1
Greece/ <i>Grèce</i>	23	35	102	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	1
Hungary/ <i>Hongrie</i>	13	20	16	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-
Iceland/ <i>Islande</i>	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ireland/ <i>Irlande</i>	2	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy/ <i>Italie</i>	107	37	70	1	-	-	29	7	7	4	-	2
Latvia/ <i>Lettonie</i>	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**EVOLUTION DES AFFAIRES (2/3) - ARRÊTS (1/2)**  
**EVOLUTION OF CASES (2/3) - JUDGMENTS (1/2)**

Etat  <i>State</i>	Arrêts (Chambre et Grande Chambre)  <i>Judgments (Chamber and Grand Chamber)</i>			Arrêts (définitif - après renvoi devant la Grande Chambre)  <i>Judgments (final - after referral to Grand Chamber)</i>			Arrêts (règlement amiable)  <i>Judgments (friendly settlements)</i>			Arrêts (radiation)  <i>Judgments (striking out)</i>		
	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005
Liechtenstein/ <i>Liechtenstein</i>	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lithuania/ <i>Lituanie</i>	3	1	4	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
Luxemburg/ <i>Luxembourg</i>	4	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malta/ <i>Malte</i>	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moldova/ <i>Moldovie</i>	-	10	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Monaco/ <i>Monaco</i>			-			-			-			-
Netherlands/ <i>Pays-Bas</i>	7	9	8	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2
Norway/ <i>Norvège</i>	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poland/ <i>Pologne</i>	43	74	48	-	1	-	22	4	-	2	-	-
Portugal/ <i>Portugal</i>	16	5	7	-	-	-	1	2	3	-	-	-
Romania/ <i>Roumanie</i>	25	11	24	-	1	-	-	3	5	3	-	1
Russia/ <i>Russie</i>	5	15	82	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Marino/ <i>Saint-Marin</i>	3	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Serbia and Montenegro/ <i>Serbie-Monténégro</i>	-	-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-
Slovak Republic/ <i>Republique Slovaque</i>	19	12	28	-	1	-	8	1	-	-	-	-
Slovenia/ <i>Slovénie</i>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain/ <i>Espagne</i>	9	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden/ <i>Suède</i>	3	1	4	-	-	-	-	5	2	-	-	1
Switzerland/ <i>Suisse</i>	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FYRO Macedonia/ <i>ERY Macédoine</i>	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turkey/ <i>Turquie</i>	76	156	276	1	2	3	44	10	6	1	3	3
Ukraine/ <i>Ukraine</i>	6	14	119	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
United Kingdom/ <i>Royaume-Uni</i>	20	18	14	2	1	1	3	4	3	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>621</b>	<b>1032</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>

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

**EVOLUTION DES AFFAIRES (3/3) - ARRÊTS (2/2)**  
**EVOLUTION OF CASES (3/3) - JUDGMENTS (2/2)**

Etat	Arrêts (satisfaction équitable)			Arrêts (exceptions préliminaires)			Arrêts (interprétation)			Arrêts (révision)		
<i>State</i>	<i>Judgments (just satisfaction)</i>			<i>Judgments (preliminary objections)</i>			<i>Judgments (interpretation)</i>			<i>Judgments (revision)</i>		
	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005
Albania/ <i>Albanie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Andorra/ <i>Andorre</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Armenia/ <i>Arménie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Austria/ <i>Autriche</i>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Azerbaijan/ <i>Azerbaïdjan</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belgium/ <i>Belgique</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina/ <i>Bosnie-Hezégovine</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bulgaria/ <i>Bulgarie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Croatia/ <i>Croatie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus/ <i>Chypre</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Czech Republic/ <i>République Tchèque</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denmark/ <i>Danemark</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Estonia/ <i>Estonie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Finland/ <i>Finlande</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
France/ <i>France</i>	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-
Georgia/ <i>Georgie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Germany/ <i>Allemagne</i>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Greece/ <i>Grèce</i>	2	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Hungary/ <i>Hongrie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iceland/ <i>Islande</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ireland/ <i>Irlande</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy/ <i>Italie</i>	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-
Latvia/ <i>Lettonie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

## EVOLUTION DES AFFAIRES (3/3) - ARRÊTS (2/2) EVOLUTION OF CASES (3/3) - JUDGMENTS (2/2)

Etat  <i>State</i>	Arrêts (satisfaction équitable)  <i>Judgments (just satisfaction)</i>			Arrêts (exceptions préliminaires)  <i>Judgments (preliminary objections)</i>			Arrêts (interprétation)  <i>Judgments (interpretation)</i>			Arrêts (révision)  <i>Judgments (revision)</i>		
	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005
Liechtenstein/ <i>Liechtenstein</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lithuania/ <i>Lituanie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Luxemburg/ <i>Luxembourg</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malta/ <i>Malte</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moldova/ <i>Moldovie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monaco/ <i>Monaco</i>			-			-			-			-
Netherlands/ <i>Pays-Bas</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norway/ <i>Norvège</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poland/ <i>Pologne</i>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal/ <i>Portugal</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Romania/ <i>Roumanie</i>	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Russia/ <i>Russie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Marino/ <i>Saint-Marin</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Serbia and Montenegro/ <i>Serbie-Monténégro</i>	-	-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-
Slovak Republic/ <i>Republique Slovaque</i>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Slovenia/ <i>Slovénie</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain/ <i>Espagne</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden/ <i>Suède</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Switzerland/ <i>Suisse</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FYRO Macedonia/ <i>ERY Macédoine</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turkey/ <i>Turquie</i>	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ukraine/ <i>Ukraine</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United Kingdom/ <i>Royaume-Uni</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>