



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

THIRD SECTION

CASE OF DRAHOŠ AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA

(Applications nos. 47922/14 and 7 others – see appended list)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

9 January 2018

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

In the case of Drahoš and Others v. Slovakia,

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

Helen Keller, *President*,

Pere Pastor Vilanova,

Alena Poláčková, *judges*,

and Fatoş Aracı, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 12 December 2017,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in eight applications (nos. 47922/14, 49902/14, 55307/14, 76478/14, 13285/15, 34749/15, 9738/16 and 45303/16) against the Slovak Republic lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by eighty-six applicants. The particulars of the applicants and the dates of introduction of the applications appear in Appendices 2 - 9.

2. The applicants Mr W.A. Rauscher-Nachwalger and the applicant organisation Cirkevný zbor Evanjelickej cirkvi Augsburského vyznania na Slovensku Bratislava Staré mesto (hereinafter “the Old Town Evangelical Church”) were represented before the Court by Mr P. Zelenay and Mr M. Kluka, respectively, while the rest of the applicants were represented by Mr J. Brichta. All of these representatives are lawyers practising in Bratislava.

The Government of the Slovak Republic (“the Government”) were represented by their Agent, Ms M. Pirošíková.

3. The applicants complained under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, both alone and in conjunction with Article 14 of the Convention, about restrictions which the rules governing rent control imposed on their right to peacefully enjoy their possessions.

4. The applications were communicated to the Government on 2 February and 18 November 2016 respectively.

5. The applicants and the Government each submitted written observations (Rule 59 § 1) on the admissibility, merits and just satisfaction, and replied in writing to each other’s observations.

6. The Government objected to the examination of the applications by a Committee. Having considered their objection, the Court dismisses it.

7. The applicants are all Slovak nationals, with the exception of Ms J. Formanová, Ms N. Skružná and Ms H. Miňovská, who are Czech nationals, Mr W.A. Nachwalger, who is an Austrian national, and

Mr E. Quastler, Ms I. Taussig and Ms O.F. Quastler, who are Israeli nationals. The Czech and Austrian Governments have been informed of their right to intervene under Article 36 § 1 of the Convention and Rule 44 § 1 (a) of the Rules of Court but did not avail themselves of this right.

THE FACTS

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE

8. The applicants are owners of residential buildings or apartments which were subject to the rent-control scheme. Under the relevant legislation they were obliged to let their flats to tenants while charging no more than the maximum amount of rent fixed by the State. The legislation precluded them from unilaterally terminating the leases or selling the flats in question to anyone other than the respective tenants. The particulars of the flats affected by the rent control are set out in Appendices 10 - 17 (columns A - F).

9. The situation of the applicants is structurally and contextually the same as that of the applicants in *Bittó and Others v. Slovakia* (no. 30255/09, 28 January 2014 (merits) and 7 July 2015 (just satisfaction)), and subsequently decided cases concerning the rent-control scheme in Slovakia (see *Krahulec v. Slovakia*, no. 19294/07; *Bukovčanová and Others v. Slovakia*, no. 23785/07; *Rudolfer v. Slovakia*, no. 38082/07, 5 July 2016; *Riedel and Others v. Slovakia*, nos. 44218/07, 54831/07, 33176/08, 47150/08; and *Mečiar and Others v. Slovakia*, no. 62864/09, 10 January 2017; *Matuschka and Others v. Slovakia* [Committee], nos. 33076/10, 14383/11, *Balan and Others v. Slovakia* [Committee], nos. 51414/11, 46098/12, and *Bajzík and Others v. Slovakia* [Committee], nos. 46609/13, 9892/14, 27 June 2017).

A. Property at 27 Panenská St. and 14 Konventná St. in Bratislava (application no. 34749/15)

10. Two residential building at 27 Panenská St. and 14 Konventná St. in Bratislava were acquired in 2002 by a religious organisation with legal personality, Cirkevný zbor Evanjelickej cirkvi Augsburgského vyznania na Slovensku Bratislava (hereinafter “the Bratislava Evangelical Church”). This body established three other entities with legal personalities, including the applicant organisation the Old Town Evangelical Church.

11. The property in question was conveyed by the Bratislava Evangelical Church to the Old Town Evangelical Church by way of

donation on 6 February 2013. On 15 February 2013 the previous owner ceased legally to exist and was legally succeeded by the Old Town Evangelical Church and the other two entities.

B. Flat no. 11 at 27 Panenská St. in Bratislava (application no. 34749/15)

12. On 22 February 2012 the Old Town Evangelical Church gave formal notices of termination of their lease to the two tenants residing in flat no. 11 situated in the residential building at 27 Panenská St. in Bratislava. By law, these tenants had under certain circumstances the right to claim that the municipality provide them with a substitute flat on the termination of their lease. They did not avail themselves of that right.

13. On 6 August 2013 the Old Town Evangelical Church applied to the Bratislava I District Court for an eviction order against the occupants of this flat who had failed to vacate it by the expiry of the twelve-month notice period. As the occupants eventually vacated the flat on 25 February 2015, the Old Town Evangelical Church withdrew its action and the proceedings in respect of it were discontinued on 9 March 2015. Until the vacation of the flat, the occupants had paid the Old Town Evangelical Church compensation in an amount equal to the regulated rent.

C. Other relevant facts (applications nos. 49902/14 and 76478/14)

14. The tenants residing in flats nos. 1 and 9 on 22 Moyzesova St. in Žilina moved in 2002 into flats nos. 5 and 12 within the same building owing to rebuilding of the original flats. The tenants continued to pay the regulated rent.

In 2003 flat no. 5 was rebuilt and its area was changed from 110.27 sq. m to 59.18 sq. m.

15. A similar situation arose in the residential building on 33 Pražská St. in Bratislava where in 2014 the tenant residing in flat no. 16 moved to flat no. 9, and in the residential building located on 15 Vrbovská cesta St. in Piešťany, where the tenant living in the flat no. 14 moved to flat no. 25.

II. RELEVANT DOMESTIC LAW AND PRACTICE

16. The relevant domestic law and practice governing the rent-control scheme in Slovakia and its historical background are set out in the Court's judgment in the case of *Bittó and Others*, ((merits), cited above, §§ 7-16 and 32-72).

17. On 15 September 2011, the Termination and Settlement of Tenancy (Certain Apartments) Act (Law no. 260/2011) came into force; this legislation was enacted with a view to ending the rent-control scheme by

31 December 2016. The owners of apartments whose rent had been regulated were entitled to increase rent by 20% once a year as of 2011 and to give notice by 31 March 2012 of the termination of a tenancy contract. Such termination of tenancy took effect after a twelve-month notice period. However, if a tenant was exposed to material hardship and applied for a substitute flat with the municipality, he or she would be able to continue to use the apartment while still paying a regulated rent, even after the expiry of the notice period, until a new tenancy contract with a municipality had been set up. Municipalities were obliged to provide a person exposed to material hardship with a municipal apartment at a regulated rent. If a municipality did not comply with that obligation by 31 December 2016, the landlord could claim from the municipality the difference between the free-market rent and the regulated rent.

THE LAW

I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

18. The Court considers that given their common factual and legal background the eight applications should be joined, in accordance with Rule 42 § 1 of the Rules of Court.

II. ADMISSIBILITY

A. Victim status of the Old Town Evangelical Church prior to 6 February 2013 (application no. 34749/15)

19. In their observations of 3 November 2016 on the applicants' claims for just satisfaction, the Government objected to the victim status of the Old Town Evangelical Church prior to 6 February 2013 – the date on which it had acquired the property concerned.

20. By way of a reply, the Old Town Evangelical Church objected that the Government could and should have raised this point earlier and that, as they had failed to do so, they should be prevented from raising it by operation of Rule 55 of the Rules of Court. As to the substance, the Old Town Evangelical Church argued that it had become a victim of the alleged violations already in 2002 when its legal predecessor – the Bratislava Evangelical Church – had acquired the property.

21. The Court reiterates that it is obliged to examine the question of its jurisdiction at every stage of the proceedings and that it is therefore not precluded from considering the compatibility *ratione personae* of the relevant part of the present application with the provisions of the

Convention even on its own motion (see *Blečić v. Croatia* [GC], no. 59532/00, §§ 65-69, ECHR 2006-III).

22. The Court reiterates that in order to be able to lodge an application in accordance with Article 34, the applicant must be able to show that he or she was “directly affected” by the measure complained of (see, among many other authorities, *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, § 96, ECHR 2014).

23. In the present case, it is not disputed that the Old Town Evangelical Church acquired the property on 6 February 2013, that prior to that date the property had been owned by the Bratislava Evangelical Church, that that entity was by no means prevented from applying to the Court under Article 34 of the Convention in its own name, which, however, it did not do.

The Court further notes that the Old Town Evangelical Church became directly affected by the rent-control scheme only once it acquired title to that property on the date mentioned and that in its subsequent application to the Court it asserts its Convention complaint in its own name, making no distinction between the time prior to and after that date. In so far as the Old Town Evangelical Church’s argument has been substantiated, the Court has found no material or other interest to justify the Old Town Evangelical Church in asserting its Convention complaint in relation to a period when the property in question was still owned by the Bratislava Evangelical Church (for a summary of the applicable principles, see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], cited above, §§ 96-97; see also *Nassau Verzekering Maatschappij N.V. v. the Netherlands*, no. 57602/09, §§ 19-20, 4 October 2011). Therefore, in so far as its application under Article 34 of the Convention concerns that property while it was still owned by that other entity, it is incompatible *ratione personae* with the provisions of the Convention (see *Petrová and Valo v. Slovakia* (dec.), no. 49103/09, § 44, 5 November 2013).

In this context, the Court wishes to point out that the situation of the Old Town Evangelical Church differs from situations when a person or entity is permitted to continue pursuing an application lodged under Article 34 of the Convention by another person or entity which has died or ceased to exist in the course of the Strasbourg proceedings (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania*, cited above, § 97, and *Bittó and Others v. Slovakia* (merits), no. 30255/09, § 74, 28 January 2014).

24. Accordingly, the part of the application of the Old Town Evangelical Church concerning the application of the rent-control scheme prior to 6 February 2013 must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 § 4 of the Convention.

B. Six-month time-limit in respect of flat no. 11 in the residential building at 27 Panenská St. in Bratislava (application no. 34749/15)

25. The Government further objected that rent control had ceased to apply to flat no. 11 in the residential building at 27 Panenská St. in Bratislava more than six months prior to the introduction of the present application on 13 July 2015. They argued that the Old Town Evangelical Church had given the tenants residing in that flat notices of termination of their lease in February 2012 and that these tenants had accordingly been obliged to vacate the flat within a notice period of twelve months, that is to say before 28 February 2013. As the tenants did not claim a substitute flat from the municipality, the flat concerned had ceased to be subject to rent control on the expiry of the notice period. Thus, in the Government's submission, the relevant part of the application no. 34749/15 was lodged out of time.

26. The Old Town Evangelical Church disagreed, arguing that the occupants of the flat had failed to vacate the flat voluntarily, that it had accordingly been forced to apply for an eviction order, in response to which the occupants had eventually moved out, but for the entire period of their occupation of the flat they had only paid the Old Town Evangelical Church compensation equal to the regulated rent. In sum, the Old Town Evangelical Church considered that the six-month time-limit should be calculated from the date when the tenants had actually moved out of the flat, 25 February 2015, and that accordingly its application to the Court of 13 July 2015 was in time.

27. Under Article 35 § 1 of the Convention, the Court may only deal with a matter "within a period of six months from the date on which the final decision was taken". Where the alleged violation constitutes a continuing situation against which no domestic remedy is available, such as the application of a rent-control scheme in the present case, the six-month period starts to run from the end of the situation concerned (see *Bittó and Others* (merits), cited above, § 75).

28. The Court observes that according to the Government the rent control ceased to apply to the flat concerned on 28 February 2013 as a result of the expiry of the twelve-month notice period, combined with the fact that the occupants had not applied for substitute accommodation, and that after that date the Old Town Evangelical Church could have sought the occupants' eviction and/or charged them market rent. The Court observes that in reply to that argument the Old Town Evangelical Church submitted that the occupants had remained in the flat, paying no more than the equivalent of regulated rent and disrespecting the expiry of the notice period. The Court fails to see how the Old Town Evangelical Church's counter-argument should serve to rebut that of the Government. To the

contrary, the Old Town Evangelical Church's course of action appears rather to support it, in particular in as far as the Old Town Evangelical Church sought an eviction order before the courts. There is nothing to suggest that it was prevented from complementing that action by a claim for damages. In these circumstances, the Court takes it as established that rent control ceased to apply to the flat in question on 28 February 2013.

Accordingly, the relevant part of the application of 13 July 2015 has been introduced out of time and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention.

C. The six-month time-limit in a situation when a tenant has moved to another flat to which rent control continued to apply (applications nos. 49902/14 and 76478/14)

29. The applicants who own the flats mentioned in paragraphs 14-15 above, where the tenants moved to another flat within the same residential building, considered these situations as continuing for the purposes of the calculation of the six-month time-limit.

30. The Government admitted that in certain situations where moving a tenant from one flat to another within the housing facility may be caused by circumstances which could be a reason for the cancellation of rent with the obligation to provide the tenant a substitute flat, and that in such cases the situation might be continuing for the purposes of calculation of six-month time-limit. However, they did not have sufficient information to assess this matter in the present cases.

31. The Court observes that in all situations described above the tenants moved to other flats within the same residential building and that the relevant applicants could still charge them no more than the maximum regulated rent for using those flats. The Court had previously regarded a similar situation as continuing for the purposes of the calculation of the six-month time-limit (see *Bajžík and Others v. Slovakia*, [Committee] nos. 46609/13 and 9892/14, § 25, 27 June 2017) and sees no reason to hold otherwise in the present cases. It therefore considers that the situations described in paragraphs 14-15 above as continuing for the purposes of the calculation of the six-month time-limit.

D. Remainder of the applications

32. The Court notes that the remaining complaints (other than that dealt with under A and B above) are not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 of the Convention. It further notes that they are not inadmissible on any other grounds. They must therefore be declared admissible.

III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL No. 1

33. The applicants complained that their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions had been breached as a result of the implementation of rules governing rent control that applied to their property. They relied on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, which reads as follows:

“Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.

The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.”

34. The applicants argued that the restrictions applied to the use of their property under the rent-control scheme had imposed a disproportionate burden on their ownership rights. They argued that the rent which they had been allowed to charge for letting their property had been disproportionately low compared with similar flats to which the rent-control scheme had not applied and that despite a number of increases in the regulated rent, this had remained much lower than the market rent. The applicants supported their arguments by submitting expert opinions or other evidence showing the difference between the regulated and the market rent. Furthermore, the legislation enacted with a view to eliminating the rent-control scheme did not provide for compensation for persons in their position.

35. The Government conceded that the rent-control scheme had resulted in a restriction on the use of the applicants’ property, but argued that it had been in accordance with the law and had pursued the legitimate aim of protecting tenants against unaffordable increases in rent. As to the requirement of proportionality, they challenged the method used to calculate market rent in the expert opinions submitted by the applicants and argued that the restrictions imposed on the applicants’ property had not been disproportionate. They submitted their own expert opinion, which set out the average monthly market rent for flats comparable to those of the applicants. Lastly, they maintained that the situation had been resolved by the legislation enacted in 2011, which had provided for the elimination of all rent control by the end of 2016.

36. The relevant case-law of the Court is summarised in *Bittó and Others* ((merits), cited above, §§ 94-100).

37. In *Bittó and Others* (merits) and subsequent rent-control cases (see, among other authorities, *Mečiar and Others v. Slovakia*, no. 62864/09, 10 January 2017), the Court found (i) that the rent-control scheme had amounted to an interference with the applicants’ property, (ii) that that interference had constituted a means of State control of the use of their

property to be examined under the second paragraph of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, (iii) that it had been “lawful” within the meaning of that Article, (iv) that it had pursued a legitimate social-policy aim, and (v) that it had been “in accordance with the general interest”, as required by the second paragraph of that Article (see *Bittó and Others* (merits), cited above, §§ 101-04).

38. As to the requirement of proportionality, the Court noted in *Bittó and Others* (merits) and the subsequent rent-control cases that regardless of the difference in the calculation methods on which the parties relied, the evidence submitted by both parties was sufficient to conclude that the regulated rent had remained considerably lower than the market rent, even after several increases in the regulated rent provided for by the relevant legislation (see *Bittó and Others* (merits), cited above, § 113, and *Mečiar and Others v. Slovakia*, cited above, § 26). The Court also took into account the fact that the legislation allowing for gradual increases in the regulated rent did not serve as a basis for obtaining compensation for the use of the property under the rent-control scheme with any retrospective effect (see *Bukovčanová and Others v. Slovakia*, no. 23785/07, § 42, 5 July 2016). The Court concluded that in implementing the rent-control scheme the authorities had failed to strike the requisite fair balance between the general interests of the community and the protection of the applicants’ property rights, as a result of which there had been a violation of their rights under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (see *Bittó and Others* (merits), cited above, § 116).

39. The Court observes that the present cases follow the pattern of *Bittó and Others* and subsequent rent-control cases. The Government voiced the same objections regarding the proportionality of the interference in question as it did in *Bittó and Others* and subsequent rent-control cases, and have not put forward any fact or argument capable of persuading the Court to reach a different conclusion in the present cases. Having regard to its well-established case-law on the subject, the Court considers that there has been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

IV. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONVENTION, TAKEN TOGETHER WITH ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL No. 1

40. The applicants maintained that the restrictions imposed by the rent-control scheme amounted to discriminatory treatment. The Court considers it appropriate to examine this complaint under Article 14 of the Convention, in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1. Article 14 reads as follows:

“The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in [the] Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language,

religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.”

41. The Government disagreed and argued that the applicants’ situation was not similar in any relevant respect to that of owners of buildings to which the rent-control scheme did not apply.

42. The Court dealt with essentially the same complaint in *Bittó and Others* ((merits), cited above, §§ 120-25) and found that in view of its conclusion that there had been a breach of the applicants’ rights under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, no separate issue arose under Article 14 of the Convention. The Court sees no reason to hold otherwise in the present cases. Accordingly, it is not necessary to examine the merits of the applicants’ complaint under those provisions.

V. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

43. Article 41 of the Convention provides:

“If the Court finds that there has been a violation of the Convention or the Protocols thereto, and if the internal law of the High Contracting Party concerned allows only partial reparation to be made, the Court shall, if necessary, afford just satisfaction to the injured party.”

A. Damage

44. The applicants claimed compensation for the pecuniary damage which they had suffered as a result of the obligation to let their flats under the conditions imposed by the rent-control scheme.

45. Most of the applicants submitted expert opinions determining the claimed amounts as the difference between the market rent applicable to similar dwellings and the regulated rent which the applicants had been able to charge under the relevant legislation throughout the period of their ownership of the property in question and the application of the rent-control scheme. Those sums were then increased by the default interest applicable under Slovakian law. The applicant Mr A.W. Rauscher-Nachwalger based the calculation of pecuniary damage on the difference between the regulated rent and the market rent determined by the expert in the expert report submitted by the Government. The Old Town Evangelical Church calculated the pecuniary damage as the difference between the regulated rent paid by the tenants and the market rent based on a rental-price map of the National Association of Real Estate Agencies for a comparable apartment in the relevant year.

As for the scope of the applicants’ claims, the applicants in applications nos. 9738/16 and 45303/06 asserted that the level of award should reflect that in *Bittó and Others v. Slovakia* ((just satisfaction), no. 30255/09, 7 July 2015) and objected that the Court’s awards in the post *Bittó*

judgments had been lower. The applicant's specific individual claims in respect of pecuniary damage are set out in Appendices 10 - 17 (column G).

In addition, the applicants claimed 50,000 euros (EUR) each in respect of non-pecuniary damage, with the exception of the applicant Mr Rauscher-Nachwalger who claimed EUR 40,000.

46. The Government objected to the applicants' claims in respect of pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage as being excessive. They also contested the method by which the applicants had determined the alleged pecuniary damage and the alleged difference in the level of awards in *Bittó* and the subsequent judgments. Besides, the Government argued that claims in respect of pecuniary damage should be rejected with regard to those applicants who had acquired the flats by purchase because they must have been aware of the rent-control scheme and could reflect that limitation in the purchase price.

47. The applicable case-law principles are summarised in *Bittó and Others v. Slovakia* ((just satisfaction), cited above, §§ 20-29). In line with its findings in that case, the Court acknowledges that the applicants must have sustained damage for which they are to be compensated with an aggregate sum covering all heads of damage. As to the scope of the applicants' claim, the Court points out that any such compensation may only be befitting in respect of the part of the application that, having previously been declared admissible, has given rise to a finding of a violation of the applicants' Convention rights.

48. The Court has held in similar cases that the protection provided under the Convention should not be linked to the way applicants acquired their landlords' rights. In any event, the applicants who acquired flats by purchase could have reasonably expected that the rent-control scheme would soon be dismantled in view of the Government's plans and declarations (see *Bittó and Others v. Slovakia* (just satisfaction), cited above, § 26).

49. As regards the scope of the award, the Court refers to the criteria further developed in *Bukovčanová and Others v. Slovakia* (cited above, § 51), where it took into account all the circumstances, including (i) the purpose and the context of the rent control and the level of the awards in *Bittó and Others* (cited above), (ii) the size of the property in question, (iii) the duration of the application of the rent-control scheme in relation to each individual part of the property, (iv) its location, and (v) the ownership shares of the respective applicants in the property. These criteria have subsequently been applied in *Krahulec v. Slovakia*, *Rudolfer v. Slovakia*, *Riedel and Others v. Slovakia*, *Mečiar and Others v. Slovakia*, *Matuschka and Others v. Slovakia* [Committee], *Balan and Others v. Slovakia* [Committee], and *Bajžík and Others v. Slovakia* [Committee] (all cited above), and the Court finds no reasons to depart from the approach taken in those cases.

As regards the situation when a tenant moved to another flat while rent control continued to apply (see paragraph 29 above), the Court will take into account the size of the flat in which the tenant was living at the relevant time (see Appendices 11 and 13). As regards the flat which had been rebuilt during the application of rent control, the Court will take into account the actual size of the flat at the relevant time (see Appendix 11).

50. As to the temporal scope of the applicants' claims, the Court observes that under the Termination and Settlement of Tenancy (Certain Apartments) Act the owners of property which remained subjected to rent control after 31 December 2016 are entitled to claim from the municipality in question the difference between the free-market rent and the regulated rent for that property (see paragraph 17 above). The Court finds that, in such circumstances and in the absence of arguments from the parties to the contrary, there is no scope for just-satisfaction awards for the period subsequent to 31 December 2016 (see *Matuschka and Others* [Committee], nos. 33076/10 and 14383/11, § 44, 27 June 2017).

51. In the light of the above, the Court finds it appropriate to award aggregate sums covering all heads of damage specified in respect of each individual applicant in Appendices 10 - 17 (column H) in a total amount of EUR 3,628,380, plus any tax that may be chargeable in respect of these amounts.

B. Costs and expenses

52. The applicants' claims in respect of costs and expenses and the documents submitted by the applicants to support their claims are listed in separate Appendix 18 (columns A - D).

53. The Government challenged the costs claimed by the applicants as being excessive.

54. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see *Bittó and Others* (just satisfaction), cited above, § 36, and *Mečiar and Others*, cited above, § 45) the Court considers it reasonable to award the sums specified in Appendix 18 (column E). In applications in which expert opinions have been submitted and the applicants claim compensation in respect of their costs, the Court awards 25% of the amounts claimed. The total award in respect of costs of expert opinions in the given application is to be apportioned *pro rata* among the individual applicants concerned according to the respective costs of their individual expert opinions.

The award in respect of costs and expenses therefore totals EUR 197,310, plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants.

C. Default interest

55. The Court considers it appropriate that the default interest rate should be based on the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank, to which should be added three percentage points.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Declares* application no. 34749/15 inadmissible in so far as it concerns the application of the rent-control scheme in respect of the property of the applicant organisation Cirkevný zbor Evanjelickej cirkvi Augsburgského vyznania na Slovensku Bratislava Staré mesto prior to 6 February 2013 and in so far as it concerns flat no. 11 located at 27 Panenská St. in Bratislava;
3. *Declares* the remainder of the applications admissible;
4. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention;
5. *Holds* that it is not necessary to examine the merits of applicants' complaint under Article 14 of the Convention, taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1;
6. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, within three months the following amounts:
 - (i) EUR 3,628,380 (three million six hundred and twenty-eight thousand three hundred and eighty euros), plus any tax that may be chargeable, in respect of pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage (to be distributed among the applicants according to Appendices 10 - 17, column H);
 - (ii) EUR 197,310 (one hundred and ninety-seven thousand three hundred and ten euros), plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants, in respect of costs and expenses (to be distributed among the applicants according to Appendix 18, column E);
 - (b) that from the expiry of the above-mentioned three months until settlement simple interest shall be payable on the above amounts at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points;

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

Done in English, and notified in writing on 9 January 2018, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Fatoş Aracı
Deputy Registrar

Helen Keller
President

APPENDIX 1**List of applications**

1. Application no. 47922/14 - Drahoš and Others v. Slovakia
2. Application no. 49902/14 - Martinovičová and Others v. Slovakia
3. Application no. 55307/14 - Rauscher-Nchwalger v. Slovakia
4. Application no. 76478/14 - Gálfy and Others v. Slovakia
5. Application no. 13285/15 - Mišík and Others v. Slovakia
6. Application no. 34749/15 - Slávik and Others v. Slovakia
7. Application no. 9738/16 - Palinay and Others v. Slovakia
8. Application no. 45303/16 - Pitrunová and Others v. Slovakia

APPENDIX 2**List of applicants
Application no. 47922/14**

The application was lodged on 11 June 2014 by the following twelve applicants.

1. Mr Jiří Drahoš, who was born in 1957 and lives in Bratislava,
2. Ms Eva Peciarová, who was born in 1954 and lives in Bratislava,
3. Mr Milan Kováč, who was born in 1950 and lives in Trenčín,
4. Mr Jozef Kováč, who was born in 1954 and lives in Bratislava,
5. Ms Viera Jungová, who was born in 1939 and lives in Bratislava,
6. Mr Ľubomír Ščasný, who was born in 1960 and lives in Bratislava,
7. Mr Ľudovít Labík, who was born in 1957 and lives in Bratislava,
8. Ms Beata Labíková, who was born in 1960 and lives in Bratislava,
9. Ms Emília Balážová, who was born in 1946 and lives in Piešťany,
10. AKJ s. r. o. , a company with limited liability, with its registered office in Bratislava,
11. PRIVÉEFINA s. r. o. , a company with limited liability, with its registered office in Bratislava,
12. PERFEKT a. s., a joint-stock company with its registered office in Bratislava.

APPENDIX 3**Application no. 49902/14****List of applicants**

The application was lodged on 30 June 2014 by the following twenty-seven applicants.

1. Ms Jana Martinovičová, who was born in 1959 and lives in Bratislava,
2. Ms Eva Čerovská, who was born in 1959 and lives in Bratislava,
3. Ms Jana Formanová, who was born in 1943 and lives in Brno, the Czech Republic,
4. Ms Nadežda Skružná, who was born in 1948 and lives in Prague, the Czech Republic,
5. Mr Július Vaňura, who was born in 1990 and lives in Bratislava,
6. Mr Ján Vaňura, who was born in 1992 and lives in Bratislava,
7. Mr Ján Bienik, who was born in 1951 and lives in Bratislava,
8. Ms Anna Bieniková, who was born in 1949 and lives in Bratislava,
9. Ms Renáta Vongrejová, who was born in 1937 and lives in Bratislava,
10. Ms Jaroslava Ededyová, who was born in 1949 and lives in Bratislava,
11. Ms Katarína Muráňová, who was born in 1982 and lives in Bratislava,
12. Ms Anna Lalkovičová, who was born in 1954 and lives in Zvolen,
13. Mr Ferdinand Lalkovič, who was born in 1949 and lives in Zvolen,
14. Ms Anna Sopkovčíková, who was born in 1978 and lives in Bratislava,
15. Mr Boris Štefánek, who was born in 1954 and lives in Zázrivá,
16. Ms Viera Štefánková, who was born in 1961 and lives in Zázrivá,
17. Ms Eleonóra Žideková, who was born in 1959 and lives in Bratislava,
18. Ms Katarína Písařčíková, who was born in 1962 and lives in Zlaté Klasy,
19. Mr Stanislav Pavúk, who was born in 1942 and lives in Modra,
20. Ms Eva Némethová, who was born in 1937 and lives in Bratislava,
21. Ms Lýdia Michalčeková, who was born in 1935 and lives in Nitra,
22. Ms Helena Miňovská, who was born in 1949 and lives in Prague, the Czech Republic,
23. Ms Helena Wagnerová, who was born in 1944 and lives in Bratislava,
24. Ms Štefánia Koporcová, who was born in 1943 and lives in Láb,
25. Mr Pavel Koporec, who was born in 1962 and lives in Láb,

26. Ms Milena Zálesňáková, who was born in 1963 and lives in Láb,
27. Kongregácia sestier Najsvätejšieho Spasiteľa, Slovenská provincia,
a religious organisation with its registered office in Bratislava.

APPENDIX 4**Application no. 55307/14****List of applicants**

The application was lodged on 31 July 2014 by the following applicant.

1. Alexander Rauscher-Nachwalger, who was born in 1959 and lives in Vienna, Austria.

APPENDIX 5**Application no. 76478/14****List of applicants**

The application was lodged on 28 November 2014 by the following fourteen applicants.

1. Mr Peter Gálfy, who was born in 1954 and lives in Bratislava,
2. Mr Ivan Kováč, who was born in 1958 and lives in Bratislava,
3. Mr Vladimír Slavomír Frťala, who was born in 1956 and lives in Bratislava,
4. Mr Dušan Badal, who was born in 1941 and lives in Prague, Czech Republic,
5. Mr Eyal Quastler, who was born in 1956 and lives in Granville, Ohio, USA,
6. Ms Iris Taussig, who was born in 1953 and lives in Herzelyia, Israel,
7. Ms Orly Froydental Quastler, who was born in 1967 and lives in Tel Aviv, Israel,
8. Ms Eva Gáliková, who was born in 1951 and lives in Pezinok,
9. Ms Anna Marková, who was born in 1949 and lives in Šamorín,
10. Ms Vlasta Večeríková, who was born in 1954 and lives in Bratislava,
11. Mr Jozef Rezek, who was born in 1956 and lives in Bratislava,
12. NESTVEST, s. r. o., a company with limited liability, with its registered office in Bratislava, succeeded by Stepreal s.r.o., a company with limited liability with its registered seat in Bratislava,
13. IVOS - spol. s. r. o., a company with limited liability, with its registered office in Nitra,
14. STAVEBNÁ SPOLOČNOSŤ RAVING, a.s., a joint-stock company, with is registered office in Piešťany.

APPENDIX 6**Application no. 13285/15****List of applicants**

The application was lodged on 10 March 2015 by the following thirteen applicants.

1. Mr Peter Mišík, who was born in 1946 and lives in Kremnica,
2. Mr Branislav Mišík, who was born in 1972 and lives in Bratislava,
3. Mr Radovan Mišík, who was born in 1984 and lives in Bratislava,
4. Ms Mária Soukupová, who was born in 1941 and lives in Bratislava,
5. Ms Eva Sofková, who was born in 1947 and lives in Bratislava,
6. Mr Tomáš Plank, who was born in 1956 and lives in Bratislava,
7. Ms Ingrid Planková, who was born in 1956 and lives in Bratislava,
8. Mr Dušan Pohovej, who was born in 1951 and lives in Bratislava,
9. Ms Soňa Pohovejová, who was born in 1957 and lives in Bratislava,
10. NOE, s. r. o., a company with limited liability, with its registered seat in Dunajská Streda,
11. DANY 20, s. r. o., a company with limited liability, with its registered seat in Hlohovec,
12. Konventná Apartments, s. r. o., a company with limited liability, with its registered seat in Bratislava, succeeded by Feiglerov dom a.s., a joint-stock company with its registered seat in Bratislava,
13. W.O.C.H. REAL a. s., a joint-stock company, with its registered seat in Bratislava.

APPENDIX 7**Application no. 34749/15****List of applicants**

The application was lodged on 13 July 2015 by the following six applicants.

1. Mr Pavol Slávik, who was born in 1949 and lives in Bratislava,
2. APOLLO spa & living, s. r. o., a company with limited liability, with its registered office in Piešťany,
3. OTP BUILDINGS, s. r. o., a company with limited liability, with its registered office in Bratislava,
4. Židovská náboženská obec Bratislava, a religious organization, with its registered office in Bratislava,
5. Evanjelická cirkev Augsburgského vyznania na Slovensku, a religious organization, with its registered office in Bratislava,
6. Cirkevný zbor Evanjelickej cirkvi Augsburgského vyznania na Slovensku Bratislava Staré mesto, a religious organization, with its registered office in Bratislava.

APPENDIX 8**List of applicants
Application no. 9738/16**

The application was lodged on 12 February 2016 by the following six applicants.

1. Mr Ladislav Palinay who was born on 11 August 1951 and lives in Banská Bystrica,
2. Ms Marcela Hudecová who was born on 10 May 1947 and lives in Banská Bystrica,
3. Ms Libuša Palinayová who was born on 11 June 1955 and lives in Banská Bystrica,
4. Mr Milan Hudec who was born on 1 March 1947 and lives in Banská Bystrica,
5. Ms Edita Lammová who was born on 22 June 1946 and lives in Nitra,
6. Sk Centre a. s., a joint-stock company with its registered seat in Bratislava.

APPENDIX 9**List of applicants
Application no. 45303/16**

The application was lodged on 27 July 2016 by the following seven applicants.

1. Ms Barbora Pitrunová who was born on 29 March 1982 and lives in Bratislava,
2. Mr Ladislav Bodický who was born on 10 August 1941 and lives in Bratislava,
3. Mr Michal Ruttkay who was born on 30 December 1955 and lives in Bratislava,
4. Mr Matej Ruttkay who was born on 6 July 1961 and lives in Nitra,
5. Mr Juraj Ruttkay who was born on 29 August 1984 and lives in Bratislava,
6. Ms Zuzana Ruttkayová who was born on 4 October 1987 and lives in Bratislava,
7. Mr Vlastimil Mareš who was born on 23 January 1961 and lives in Pezinok.

APPENDIX 10

Application no. 47922/14

A. Applicant	B. Residential building address	C. Flat no.	D. Area [m ²]	E. Period of application of rent control	F. Ownership share	G. Pecuniary damage claimed [€]	H. Just satisfaction awarded [€]
Jiří DRAHOŠ	Jakubovo nám. 17, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	49.09	26/02/1998 -	1/1	1,377,659.63	62,300
		2	49.09	26/02/1998 -			
		3	87.66	26/02/1998 -			
Jiří DRAHOŠ	Jakubovo nám. 19, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	2	49.09	26/02/1998 -	1/1		45,800
		3	87.66	26/02/1998 -			
Eva PECIAROVÁ	Špitálska 37, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	3	115.73	19/06/1991 - 29/11/2016	1/2: 19/6/1991 - 17/4/2000 1/4: 18/4/2000 - 18/11/2010 1/2: 19/11/2010 -	935,410.80	58,200
		5	97.82	19/06/1991 -			
		6	115.73	19/06/1991 -			
Milan KOVÁČ	Špitálska 37, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	3	115.73	19/06/1991 - 29/11/2016	1/4	609,555.88	36,800
		5	97.82	19/06/1991 -			
		6	115.73	19/06/1991 -			
Jozef KOVÁČ	Špitálska 37, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	3	115.73	19/06/1991 - 29/11/2016	1/4	609,555.88	36,800
		5	97.82	19/06/1991 -			
		6	115.73	19/06/1991 -			
Viera JUNGOVÁ	Čajakova 36, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	75.11	18/03/1992 -	2/3: 18/3/1992 - 30/12/1994 1/1: 31/12/1994 -	313,088.72	32,600

Ľubomír ŠČASNÝ	Heydukova 19, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	107.38	10/12/2010 -	1/6: 10/12/2010 - 22/11/2011 1/3: 23/11/2011 - 04/2/2016 2/3: 5/2/2016 -	103,616.57	26,500
		2	94.22	10/12/2010 -			
		3	27.84	10/12/2010 -			
		4	51.26	10/12/2010 -			
		7	103.61	10/12/2010 -			
		12	99.74	10/12/2010 -			
		14	54.44	10/12/2010 - 14/08/2014			
		10	27.01	10/12/2010 - 01/05/2014			
		11	99.60	10/12/2010 - 01/05/2014			
Ľudovít LABÍK Beata LABÍKOVÁ	Šancová 76, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	7	41.11	08/03/2001 -	1/2*	106,999.98	21,600*
		8	32.45	08/03/2001 -			
		9	48.65	08/03/2001 -			
		11	32.00	08/03/2001 -			
PRIVÉEFINA s.r.o.	Šancová 76, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	7	41.11	31/12/2010 -	1/2	36,183.98	8,700
		8	32.45	31/12/2010 -			
		9	48.65	31/12/2010 -			
		11	32.00	31/12/2010 -			
Emília BALÁŽOVÁ	Šancová 102, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	11	68.56	31/05/1991 -	1/3: 31/5/1991 - 12/11/2013 1/1: 13/11/2013 -	1,217,429.82	48,900
		12	86.59	31/05/1991 - 19/10/2016			
		14	86.64	31/05/1991 -			
		15	20.74	31/05/1991 -			
AKJ s.r.o.	Žilinská 2, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	3	33.55	29/04/2009 - 14/12/2014	1/1	64,808.12	9,900
		10	72.00	29/04/2009 - 14/12/2014			
PERFEKT a.s.	Karpatská 7, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	72.11	25/04/1995 - 10/02/2016	1/1	280,753.50	28,200
Total							416,300

* joint marital ownership

APPENDIX 11

Application no. 49902/14

A. Applicant	B. Residential building address	C. Flat no.	D. Area [m ²]	E. Period of application of rent control	F. Ownership share	G. Pecuniary damage claimed [€]	H. Just satisfaction awarded [€]
Jana MARTINOVIČOVÁ	Štefánikova 16, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1 4 7	38.41 72.29 113.42	27/09/1991 - 27/09/1991 - 27/09/1991- 31/12/2013	1/2	502,492.59	46,900
Eva ČEŘOVSKÁ	Štefánikova 16, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1 4 7	38.41 72.29 113.42	27/09/1991 - 27/09/1991 - 27/09/1991- 31/12/2013	1/2	502,492.59	46,900
Jana FORMANOVÁ	Grösslingová 43, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	3 5 6 9	155.3 126.14 127.05 74.33	15/11/1991 - 15/11/1991 - 15/11/1991 - 15/11/1991 -	1/4	549,169.63	54,900
Nadežda SKRUŽNÁ	Grösslingová 43, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	3 5 6 9	155.3 126.14 127.05 74.33	15/11/1991 - 15/11/1991 - 15/11/1991 - 15/11/1991 -	1/4	549,169.63	54,900
Július VAŇURA	Trenčianska 15, Bratislava II	8	72.57	13/11/2012 -	1/4	4,820.96	1,400
Ján VAŇURA	Trenčianska 15, Bratislava II	8	72.57	13/11/2012 -	1/4	4,820.96	1,400

Ján BIENIK	Budyšínska 2, Bratislava - Nové Mesto	5 6 9 10 13 15 16 18+1 9	45.75 63.65 49.64 59.72 33.79 49.46 56.72 65.17	25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 30/05/2016 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 -	7/42: 25/9/2009 - 20/1/2013 19/42:21/1/2013 - 3/2/2014 11/42: 4/2/2014 -	58,068.58	13,000
Anna BIENIKOVÁ	Budyšínska 2, Bratislava - Nové Mesto	5 6 9 10 13 15 16 18+1 9	45.75 63.65 49.64 59.72 33.79 49.46 56.72 65.17	25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 30/05/2016 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 -	5/42: 25/9/2009 - 3/2/2014 11/42: 4/2/2014 -	39,369.83	8,900
Renáta VONGREJOVÁ	Budyšínska 2, Bratislava - Nové Mesto	5 6 9 10 13 15 16 18+1 9	45.75 63.65 49.64 59.72 33.79 49.46 56.72 65.17	25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 30/05/2016 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 -	2/21	24,015.63	5,300

Jaroslava EDEDYOVÁ	Budyšínska 2, Bratislava - Nové Mesto	5 6 9 10 13 15 16 18+1 9	45.75 63.65 49.64 59.72 33.79 49.46 56.72 65.17	25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 30/05/2016 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 -	1/21	12,007.82	2,700
Katarína MURÁŇOVÁ	Budyšínska 2, Bratislava - Nové Mesto	5 6 9 10 13 15 16 18+1 9	45.75 63.65 49.64 59.72 33.79 49.46 56.72 65.17	25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 30/05/2016 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 -	1/21	12,007.82	2,700
Anna LALKOVIČOVÁ	Budyšínska 2, Bratislava - Nové Mesto	5 6 9 10 13 15 16 18+1 9	45.75 63.65 49.64 59.72 33.79 49.46 56.72 65.17	25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 30/05/2016 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 -	5/42	30,019.53	6,600

Ferdinand LALKOVIČ	Budyšínska 2, Bratislava - Nové Mesto	5 6 9 10 13 15 16 18+1 9	45.75 63.65 49.64 59.72 33.79 49.46 56.72 65.17	25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 30/05/2016 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 -	5/42	30,019.53	6,600
Anna SOPKOVČÍKOVÁ	Budyšínska 2, Bratislava - Nové Mesto	5 6 9 10 13 15 16 18+1 9	45.75 63.65 49.64 59.72 33.79 49.46 56.72 65.17	25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 30/05/2016 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 - 25/09/2009 -	6/21: 25/9/2009 - 20/1/2013 2/42: 4/2/2014 -	46,655.28	9,800
Boris ŠTEFÁNEK	Moyzesova 22 (ul. 1. mája 18), Žilina	1 → 5 ¹ 5 ² 11 9 → 12 ¹	85.15 110.27 59.18 96.08 96.08 32.51	19/08/2000 - 31/05/2002 01/06/2002 - 31/12/2003 01/01/2004 - 12/11/2016 19/08/2000 - 19/08/2000 - 31/01/2002 01/02/2002 - 02/04/2014	1/2	138,654.22	27,800

¹ The tenant moved to another flat in the same residential building while the regulated rent continued to apply.

² The flat was rebuilt in 2003.

Boris ŠTEFÁNEK Viera ŠTEFÁNKOVÁ	Moyzesova 22 (ul. 1. mája 18), Žilina	5 5 ² 11 12	110.27 59.18 96.08 32.51	27/03/2003 - 31/12/2003 01/01/2004 - 12/11/2016 27/03/2003 - 27/03/2003 - 02/04/2014	1/2*	104,034.62	21,300*
Eleonóra ŽIDEKOVÁ	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	16/04/2002 -	20/360: 16/4/2002 - 17/6/2008 30/360: 18/6/2008 -	13,527	1,600
Katarína PISARČÍKOVÁ	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	16/04/2002 -	20/360: 16/4/2002 - 17/6/2008 30/360: 18/6/2008 -	13,527	1,600
Stanislav PAVÚK	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	26/12/1991 -	30/360	35,915.08	3,200
Eva NÉMETHOVÁ	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	26/12/1991 -	30/360	35,915.08	3,200
Lýdia MICHALČEKOVÁ	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	01/03/1991 -	15/360	17,957.48	1,600
Helena MIŇOVSKÁ	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	18/03/2004 -	15/360	6,817.94	800
Helena WAGNEROVÁ	Sasinkova 1, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	3 4	72.23 99.41	17/12/1997 - 17/12/1997 -	16/240:17/12/1997 - 29/12/1998 1/1: 30/12/1998 -	491,600.01	57,700
Štefánia KOPORCOVÁ	Trenčianska 11, Bratislava - Nivy	2 4 6	54.32 54.32 54.32	13/05/1992 - 24/11/2016 13/05/1992 - 13/05/1992 -	1/2: 13/5/1992 - 21/5/1997 1/1: 22/5/1997 - 21/3/2013 1/2: 22/3/2013 -	745,202.15	60,700

Milena ZÁLESŇÁKOVÁ	Trenčianska 11, Bratislava - Nivy	2	54.32	22/03/2013 - 24/11/2016	1/4	7,159.72	2,300
		4	54.32	22/03/2013 -			
		6	54.32	22/03/2013 -			
Pavel KOPOREC	Trenčianska 11, Bratislava - Nivy	2	54.32	22/03/2013 - 24/11/2016	1/4	1,378,983.77	207,700
		4	54.32	22/03/2013 -			
		6	54.32	22/03/2013 -			
Pavel KOPOREC	Moravská 1, Bratislava - Nové mesto	002	86.35	25/05/2004 -	1/1	1,378,983.77	207,700
		101	75.03	25/05/2004 -			
		201	77.23	25/05/2004 - 10/07/2014			
		202	42.25	25/05/2004 -			
		203	65.35	25/05/2004 -			
		204	42.72	25/05/2004 -			
		303	64.83	25/05/2004 -			
		304	42.63	25/05/2004 - 31/08/2014			
		401	72.52	25/05/2004 -			
		402	89.08	25/05/2004 -			
		403	63.42	25/05/2004 -			
		501	76.22	25/05/2004 -			
		502	87.26	25/05/2004 -			
503	65.33	25/05/2004 -					
Kongregácia sestier Najsvätejšieho Spasiteľa, Slovenská provincia		1	76.74	19/07/1990 -	1/1	3,855,017.69	343,400
		2	115.37	19/07/1990 -			
		4	84.35	19/07/1990 -			
		5	76.74	19/07/1990 -			
		7	70.68	19/07/1990 -			
		8	69.9	19/07/1990 -			
		10	110.9	19/07/1990 -			
		12	44.36	19/07/1990 -			

		13 14	50.99 73.4	19/07/1990 - 31/07/2014 19/07/1990 -			
Total							997,200

* joint marital ownership

APPENDIX 12**Application no. 55307/14**

A. Applicant	B. Residential building address	C. Flat no.	D. Area [m²]	E. Period of application of rent control	F. Ownership share	G. Pecuniary damage claimed [€]	H. Just satisfaction awarded [€]
Alexander RAUSCHER- NACHWALGER	Ul. 29. augusta 19, Bratislava	6 10 12 14	75.60 65.30 65.30 44.90	11/02/2011 - 28/09/2015 11/02/2011 - 26/06/2015 11/02/2011 - 28/09/2015 11/02/2011 - 09/02/2017	9/10: 11/2/2011 - 12/12/2012 1/1: 13/12/2012 - 09/2/2017	136,000	19,100

APPENDIX 13

Application no. 76478/14

A. Applicant	B. Residential building address	C. Flat no.	D. Area [m ²]	E. Period of application of rent control	F. Ownership share	G. Pecuniary damage claimed [€]	H. Just satisfaction awarded [€]
Peter GÁLFY	Lešková 9, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	66.54	03/06/2005 -	6/24	25,026.44	3,500
Ivan KOVÁČ	Lešková 9, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	66.54	28/03/1984 -	4/24: 18/3/1992 - 19/8/1996 6/24: 20/8/1996 - 6/10/2002 8/24: 7/10/2002 -	80,768.47	8,500
Vladimír Slavomír FRŤALA	Beskydská 6, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	6 10	142.25 78.45	03/02/2000 - 21/09/1999 -	1/1	558,562.87	67,200
Dušan BADAL	Šancová 102, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1 17	62.47 87.17	31/05/1991 - 31/05/1991 -	1/3: 30/5/1991 - 12/11/2013 1/1: 13/11/2013 -	966,943.84	27,900
Eyal QUASTLER	Šancová 2, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	4 5	60.37 100.83	27/04/2007 - 27/04/2007 - 26/01/2015	8/144: 27/4/2007 - 9/12/2013 18/144: 10/12/2013 -	157,231	24,200
Iris TAUSSIG	Šancová 2, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	6 8 9	63.17 121.16 77.52	27/04/2007 - 27/04/2007 - 27/04/2007 -	8/144: 27/4/2007 - 18/9/2013 38/144: 19/9/2013 - 9/12/2013 18/144: 10/12/2013 -	165,331.92	26,400
Orly Froydental QUASTLER	Šancová 2, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	10 11 12 13	87.32 144.68 132.35 56.39	27/04/2007 - 27/04/2007 - 27/04/2007 - 27/04/2007 -	8/144: 27/4/2007 - 9/12/2013 18/144: 10/12/2013 -	157,231	24,200

		14	60.37	27/04/2007 -			
		15	47.26	27/04/2007 -			
		16	89.05	27/04/2007 -			
		17	132.5	27/04/2007 -			
		18	71.23	27/04/2007 -			
		19	137.16	27/04/2007 -			
		20	136.66	27/04/2007 -			
		21	147.35	27/04/2007 -			
		22	132.35	27/04/2007 -			
		23	49.84	27/04/2007 -			
Eva GÁLIKOVÁ	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	12/06/2000 -	15/1440	2,509.39	270
Anna MARKOVÁ	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	12/06/2000 -	15/1440	2,509.39	270
Vlasta VEČERÍKOVÁ	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	12/06/2000 -	15/1440	2,509.39	270
Jozef REZEK	Obchodná 50, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	85.10	12/06/2000 -	15/1440	2,509.39	270
NESTVEST, s.r.o. / Stepreal s.r.o.	Galandova 3, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	152.76	06/06/2000 -	1/1	398,973.16	45,500
IVOS - spol. s.r.o.	Pražská 33, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	5	66.60	27/02/2009 -	1/1	404,682.43	68,500
		12	71.40	27/02/2009 - 30/10/2015			
		14	70.50	27/02/2009 -			
		17	71.40	27/02/2009 -			
		19	70.50	27/02/2009 -			
		23	51.51	27/02/2009 -			
		8	69.80	27/02/2009 - 31/08/2014			

		16→ 9 ¹	89.50 70.50	19/07/2010 - 31/08/2014 01/09/2014 -			
STAVEBNÁ SPOLOČNOSŤ RAVING, a.s.	Vrbovská cesta 15, Piešťany	14 → 25 ¹ 21 22 24 27 28 32 33 34	60.27 84.30 54.60 59.84 84.10 61.20 54.60 66.70 41.40 31.24	27/07/1998 - 31/07/2014 01/08/2014 - 27/07/1998 - 27/07/1998 - 27/07/1998 - 27/07/1998 - 27/07/1998 - 27/07/1998 - 27/07/1998 - 27/07/1998 - 27/07/1998 -	1/1	813,248.83	148,800
Total							445,780

¹ The tenant moved to another flat in the same residential building while the regulated rent continued to apply.

APPENDIX 14

Application no. 13285/15

A. Applicant	B. Residential building address	C. Flat no.	D. Area [m ²]	E. Period of application of rent control	F. Ownership share	G. Pecuniary damage claimed [€]	H. Just satisfaction awarded [€]
Peter MIŠÍK	Zochová 18, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	5	113.27	17/06/1992 -	10/120: 17/6/1992 - 25/8/2008 13043/120000: 26/8/2008 -	44,505.97	4,700
Branislav MIŠÍK	Zochová 18, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	5	113.27	17/06/1992 -	6/120: 17/6/1992 - 9/7/2008 12/120: 10/7/2008 - 25/8/2008 15656/120000: 26/8/2008 -	33,611.18	4,000
Radovan MIŠÍK	Zochová 18, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	5	113.27	23/06/2009 -	13043/120000	9,593.21	1,700
Mária SOUKUPOVÁ	Zochová 18, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	5	113.27	10/03/1992 -	15/120: 10/3/1992 - 21/10/2003 20/120: 22/10/2003 - 25/8/2008 26086/120000: 26/8/2008 -	77,423.97	8,400
Eva SOFKOVÁ	Zochová 18, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	5	113.27	10/03/1992 -	15/120: 10/3/1992 - 21/10/2003 20/120: 22/10/2003 - 25/8/2008 26086/120000: 26/8/2008 -	77,423.97	8,400
Tomáš PLANK Ingrid PLANKOVÁ	Námestie Slobody 10, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1 4 5	52.54 64.18 44.05	16/08/1995 - 16/08/1995 - 16/08/1995 -	1/2*	298,187.3	31,400*
Dušan POHOVEJ Soňa POHOVEJOVÁ	Námestie Slobody 10, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1 4 5	52.54 64.18 44.05	16/08/1995 - 16/08/1995 - 16/08/1995 -	1/2*	298,187.3	31,400*

NOE, s. r. o.	Konventná 3, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	A5 A6 B1 B2	86.41 58.93 81.20 80.90	27/07/2004 - 27/07/2004 - 27/07/2004 - 27/07/2004 -	1/1	525,257.36	68,700
DANY 20, s. r. o.	Cukrová 6, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1 2 4 10 11 12 13 14	58.51 42.81 68.51 68.51 42.89 75.27 42.54 75.27	31/01/2014 - 09/06/2016 31/01/2014 - 09/06/2016 31/01/2014 - 31/08/2015 31/01/2014 - 09/06/2016 31/01/2014 - 09/06/2016 31/01/2014 - 09/06/2016 31/01/2014 - 09/06/2016 31/01/2014 - 09/06/2016	1/1	77,223.39	5,000
Konventná Apartments, s. r. o. / Feiglerov dom a. s.	Konventná 5, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1 2a 2b 3a 3b 4 5 6a 6b 8	22.64 30.27 75.12 44.80 91.47 44.56 74.67 112.26 47.00 86.27	14/03/2007 - 14/03/2007 - 14/03/2007 - 14/03/2007 - 14/03/2007 - 14/03/2007 - 14/03/2007 - 14/03/2007 - 14/03/2007 - 31/05/2015 14/03/2007 -	18/48: 14/3/2007 - 22/5/2007 34/48: 23/5/2007 - 5/8/2013 1/1: 6/8/2013 -	600,880.55	84,700
W.O.C.H. REAL a. s.	Račianska 20, Bratislava - Nové Mesto	2 3 4 5 6 7	69.85 78.59 78.65 71.66 69.85 78.59	27/09/2009 - 05/04/2016 27/09/2009 - 04/05/2016 27/09/2009 - 22/07/2016 27/09/2009 - 15/04/2016 27/09/2009 - 27/09/2009 - 05/04/2016	1/1	718,538.41	124,100

		9	71.66	27/09/2009 - 01/07/2016				
		10	69.85	27/09/2009 - 15/12/2015				
		11	78.59	27/09/2009 - 28/04/2016				
		12	78.65	27/09/2009 - 17/12/2015				
		15	71.66	27/09/2009 - 22/07/2016				
		17	37.60	27/09/2009 - 04/04/2016				
		18	31.85	27/09/2009 -				
		19	31.85	27/09/2009 -				
		21	55.37	27/09/2009 - 30/06/2016				
							Total	372,500

* joint marital ownership

APPENDIX 15

Application no. 34749/15

A. Applicant	B. Residential building address	C. Flat no.	D. Area [m ²]	E. Period of application of rent control	F. Ownership share	G. Pecuniary damage claimed [€]	H. Just satisfaction awarded [€]
Pavol SLÁVIK	Štefánikova 31, Bratislava – Staré Mesto	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 13 14 17 18 20 21	34.25 150.58 171.69 119.41 148.57 154.50 119.29 83.57 140.97 76.28 79.74 86.90 56.85	30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 - 30/04/2007 -	32/80	837,110.56	95,300
APOLLO spa & living, s. r. o.	Nitrianska 1, Piešťany	1	77.50	22/02/2013 -	1/1	8,303.24	3,800
OTP BUILDINGS, s. r. o.	Špitálska 61, Bratislava – Staré Mesto	41 42 52	74.05 61.50 112.12	06/07/2005 - 06/07/2005 - 06/07/2005 -	1/1	805,520.72	101,900

		53	83.83	06/07/2005 -				
		56	84.99	06/07/2005 -				
		61	81.23	06/07/2005 -				
Židovská náboženská obec Bratislava	Kupeľná 5, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	3	32.79	20/07/1994 -	1/1	3,932,091.55	102,500	
		4	69.11	20/07/1994 -				
		5	39.76	20/07/1994 -				
		6	39.76	20/07/1994 -				
		10	68.97	20/07/1994 -				
	Svoradova 5, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	102.26	20/07/1994 -	1/1	3,932,091.55	86,200	
		7	108.30	20/07/1994 -				
	Panenská 4, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	6	146.47	20/07/1994 -	1/1			60,000
	Palisády 42, Bratislava - Staré mesto	2	144.24	07/06/1996 - 26/10/2015	1/1			110,500
		5	168.42	07/06/1996 - 26/10/2015				
Evanjelická cirkev Augsburgského vyznania na Slovensku	Svoradova 3, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	2	56.85	14/01/1997 -	1/1	4,959,207.41	55,000	
		6	98.67	14/01/1997 -				
	Palisády 46, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	16	125.45	18/03/1992 -	1/1		76,100	
		23	44.87	18/03/1992 -				
	Palisády 48, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	64.51	18/03/1992 -	1/1		198,000	
		6	151.49	18/03/1992 -				
		8	117.65	18/03/1992 - 22/06/2015				
		10	114.71	18/03/1992 -				
Panenská 25, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	2	67.08	19/05/2004 -	1/1	139,800			
	3	58.60	19/05/2004 -					
	4	95.47	19/05/2004 -					
	5	92.12	19/05/2004 -					
	6	55.48	19/05/2004 -					
		7	87.25	19/05/2004 -				

		8	92.99	19/05/2004 -				
		9	76.97	19/05/2004 -				
Cirkevný zbor Evanjelickej cirkvi Augsburského vyznania na Slovensku Bratislava Staré mesto	Panenská 27, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	74.50	06/02/2013 -	1/1	599,062.23	19,500	
		5	46.50	06/02/2013-				
		6	29.33	06/02/2013-				
		7	43.00	06/02/2013-				
		9	66.26	06/02/2013-				
		10	40.13	06/02/2013-				
			12	49.08	06/02/2013-			
	Konventná 14, Bratislava - Staré Mesto	1	76.20	06/02/2013-	1/1	973,888.50	44,900	
		3	105.50	06/02/2013-				
		4	69.30	06/02/2013-				
		5	70.70	06/02/2013-				
		6	69.80	06/02/2013-				
		9	48.00	06/02/2013-				
		11	83.70	06/02/2013-				
		12	75.20	06/02/2013-				
		14	67.60	06/02/2013-				
		15	43.60	06/02/2013-				
			16	93.50	06/02/2013-			
							Total	1,093,500

APPENDIX 16

Application no. 9738/16

A. Applicant	B. Residential building address	C. Flat no.	D. Area [m ²]	E. Period of application of rent control	F. Ownership share	G. Pecuniary damage claimed [€]	H. Just satisfaction awarded [€]
Ladislav PALINAY	Dolná 13, Banská Bystrica	3	89.54	02/09/1991 - 20/09/2015	1/4	36,781.16	9,100
Marcela HUDECOVÁ	Dolná 13, Banská Bystrica	3	89.54	02/09/1991 - 20/09/2015	1/4	36,781.16	9,100
Ladislav PALINAY Libuša PALINAYOVÁ	Dolná 13, Banská Bystrica	3	89.54	15/07/1992 - 20/09/2015	14/50*	41,194.86	10,100*
Milan HUDEC Marcela HUDECOVÁ	Dolná 13, Banská Bystrica	3	89.54	15/07/1992 - 20/09/2015	11/50*	32,367.33	8,000*
Edita LAMMOVÁ	Štefánikova 31, Bratislava – Staré mesto	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 13 14	34.25 150.58 171.69 119.41 148.57 154.50 119.29 83.57 140.97	10/11/1997 -	14/80	1,012,601.20	88,400

		17	81.74				
		18	79.74				
		20	86.90				
		21	56.85				
SK Centre a. s.	Dunajská 7, Bratislava – Staré mesto	B1	25.92	07/10/2008 -			
		B2	76.44	07/10/2008 -			
		B3	51.20	07/10/2008 -			
		B5	51.20	07/10/2008 -			
		B6	76.44	07/10/2008 -	1/1	471,301.48	77,000
		B7	51.20	07/10/2008 -			
		B8	76.44	07/10/2008 - 31/12/2015			
		B10	76.44	07/10/2008 - 31/10/2015			
		B11	51.20	07/10/2008 -			
						Total	201,700

* joint marital ownership

APPENDIX 17**Application no. 45303/16**

A. Applicant	B. Residential building address	C. Flat no.	D. Area [m²]	E. Period of application of rent control	F. Ownership share	G. Pecuniary damage claimed [€]	H. Just satisfaction awarded [€]
Barbora PITRUNOVÁ	Moravská 3, Bratislava	8	75.11	10/01/2011 -	1/1	33,872.31	7,000
Ladislav BODICKÝ	Nám. Sv. Anny 32, Trenčín	13	71.49	17/02/1992 - 22/02/2016	1/6	281,296.31	19,900
		15	69.10	17/02/1992 - 13/06/2016			
		17	72.87	17/02/1992 - 28/01/2016			
18		70.65	17/02/1992 - 12/04/2016				
Nám. Sv. Anny 34, Trenčín	8	93.48	17/02/1992 - 22/02/2016	1/6	6,200		
	10	61.72	17/02/1992 - 15/04/2015				
	12	99.14	17/02/1992 -				
Michal RUTTKAY	Nám. Sv. Anny 32, Trenčín	13	71.49	20/08/2005 - 22/02/2016	1/18	29,568.13	3,100
		15	69.10	20/08/2005 - 13/06/2016			
17		72.87	20/08/2005 - 28/01/2016				
18		70.65	20/08/2005 - 12/04/2016				
Nám. Sv. Anny 34, Trenčín	8	93.48	20/08/2005 - 22/02/2016	1/18	2,700		
	10	61.72	20/08/2005 - 15/04/2015				
	12	99.14	20/08/2005 -				

	Nám. Sv. Anny 36, Trenčín	5	87.88	20/08/2005 - 15/02/2016	1/18		1,000
Matej RUTTKAY	Nám. Sv. Anny 32, Trenčín	13	71.49	20/08/2005 - 22/02/2016	1/18	29,568.13	3,100
		15	69.10	20/08/2005 - 13/06/2016			
		17	72.87	20/08/2005 - 28/01/2016			
		18	70.65	20/08/2005 - 12/04/2016			
Nám. Sv. Anny 34, Trenčín	8	93.48	20/08/2005 - 22/02/2016	1/18	2,700		
	10	61.72	20/08/2005 - 15/04/2015				
	12	99.14	20/08/2005 -				
Nám. Sv. Anny 36, Trenčín	5	87.88	20/08/2005 - 15/02/2016	1/18	1,000		
Juraj RUTTKAY	Nám. Sv. Anny 32, Trenčín	13	71.49	20/08/2005 - 22/02/2016	1/36	14,695.23	1,600
		15	69.10	20/08/2005 - 13/06/2016			
		17	72.87	20/08/2005 - 28/01/2016			
		18	70.65	20/08/2005 - 12/04/2016			
Nám. Sv. Anny 34, Trenčín	8	93.48	20/08/2005 - 22/02/2016	1/36	1,400		
	10	61.72	20/08/2005 - 15/04/2015				
	12	99.14	20/08/2005 -				
Nám. Sv. Anny 36, Trenčín	5	87.88	20/08/2005 - 15/02/2016	1/36	500		
Zuzana RUTTKAYOVÁ	Nám. Sv. Anny 32, Trenčín	13	71.49	20/08/2005 - 22/02/2016	1/36	14,695.23	1,600
		15	69.10	20/08/2005 - 13/06/2016			
		17	72.87	20/08/2005 - 28/01/2016			
		18	70.65	20/08/2005 - 12/04/2016			
Nám. Sv. Anny 34, Trenčín	8	93.48	20/08/2005 - 22/02/2016	1/36	1,400		
	10	61.72	20/08/2005 - 15/04/2015				
	12	99.14	20/08/2005 -				
Nám. Sv. Anny 36, Trenčín	5	87.88	20/08/2005 - 15/02/2016	1/36	500		

	Trenčín						
Vlastimil MAREŠ	Nám. Sv. Anny 32, Trenčín	13	71.49	15/02/2010 - 22/02/2016	1/6	34,342.21	5,000
		15	69.10	15/02/2010 - 13/06/2016			
		17	72.87	15/02/2010 - 28/01/2016			
		18	70.65	15/02/2010 - 12/04/2016			
	Nám. Sv. Anny 34, Trenčín	8	93.48	15/02/2010 - 22/02/2016	1/6		4,300
		10	61.72	15/02/2010 - 15/04/2015			
		12	99.14	15/02/2010 -			
Nám. Sv. Anny 36, Trenčín	5	87.88	15/02/2010 - 15/02/2016	1/6	1,600		
						Total	82,300

APPENDIX 18**Costs and expenses**

A. Application no.	B. Costs and expenses	C. Documents submitted	D. Costs and expenses claimed [€]	E. Costs and expenses awarded [€]
47922/14	Legal costs incurred before the Court	- legal assistance contracts - declarations on obligation to pay	34,254.45	12,000
	Expert opinions	- invoices - declarations on obligation to pay	70,929.79	17,733*
	Translation costs	- invoice	780	780
49902/14	Legal costs incurred before the Court	- legal assistance contracts - declarations on obligation to pay	70,106.13	27,000
	Expert opinions	- invoices - declarations on obligation to pay	91,948.17	22,987*
	Translation costs	- invoice	270	270
55307/14	Legal costs incurred before the Court	- invoice	3,750	3,000
	Translation costs	- invoice	108	108
76478/14	Legal costs incurred before the Court	- legal assistance contracts - declarations on obligation to pay	34,846.26	14,000
	Expert opinions	- invoices - declarations on obligation to pay	73,210.35	18,303*
	Translation costs	- invoice	210	210
13285/15	Legal costs incurred before the Court	- legal assistance contracts	28,676.85	13,000

		- declarations on obligation to pay		
	Expert opinions	- invoices - declarations on obligation to pay	41,413.89	10,353*
34749/15	<i>Cirkevný zbor Evanjelickej cirkvi Augsburského vyznania na Slovensku Bratislava Staré mesto:</i>			
	Legal costs incurred before the Court	- invoice - payment confirmation	9,864	8,000
	Expenses for drawing up the price maps by the National Association of the Estate Agencies	- invoice - payment confirmation	720	720
	<i>Other applicants:</i>			
	Legal costs incurred before the Court	- legal assistance contracts - declarations on obligation to pay	41,058.75	5,000
	Expert opinions	- invoices - declarations on obligation to pay	75,264.97	18,816*
9738/16	Legal costs incurred before the Court	- legal assistance contracts - declarations on obligation to pay	15,127.62	6,000
	Expert opinions	- invoices - declarations on obligation to pay	22,360.67	5,590*
45303/16	Legal costs incurred before the Court	- legal assistance contracts - declarations on obligation to pay	12,403.29	7,000
	Expert opinions	- invoices - declarations on obligation to pay	25,758.25	6,440*
Total				197,310

* The award to be apportioned *pro rata* among the applicants concerned according to the respective costs of the individual expert opinions that they submitted.