



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

FOURTH SECTION

CASE OF ANA IONESCU AND OTHERS v. ROMANIA

(Application no. 19788/03 and 18 others)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

26 February 2019

This judgment will become final in the circumstances set out in Article 44 § 2 of the Convention. It may be subject to editorial revision.

In the case of Ana Ionescu and Others v. Romania,

The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting as a Chamber composed of:

Ganna Yudkivska, *President*,

Paulo Pinto de Albuquerque,

Krzysztof Wojtyczek,

Carlo Ranzoni,

Georges Ravarani,

Marko Bošnjak,

Péter Paczolay, *judges*,

and Marialena Tsirli, *Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 22 January 2019,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in applications against Romania lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) mostly by Romanian nationals on the various dates indicated in the appended table.

2. The Romanian Government (“the Government”) were represented by their Agent, Ms C. Brumar, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

3. Notice was given to the Romanian Government of all the applications under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention; notice was also given of some of those applications (nos. 37487/03, 21121/04, 13354/05 and 35547/07), which also raised a complaint under Article 6 of the Convention.

4. Having been informed of their right to submit written observations pursuant to Article 36 § 1 of the Convention, the Governments of France (applications nos. 37487/03 and 7174/04) and Germany (application no. 12838/07) did not express an intention to take part in the proceedings.

5. Mrs Iulia Motoc, the judge elected in respect of Romania, withdrew from sitting in the case (Rule 28 of the Rules of Court). Accordingly, the President decided to appoint Mr Krzysztof Wojtyczek, the judge elected in respect of Poland, to sit as an *ad hoc* judge (Article 26 § 4 of the Convention and Rule 29 § 1).

THE FACTS

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE

6. The list of applicants and the relevant details of the applications are set out in the appended table.

7. The factual and legal circumstances set out in the current applications are similar to those pertaining to the applicants in the case of *Străin and Others v. Romania* (no. 57001/00, §§ 5-18, ECHR 2005-VII), and to the applicants Ms and Mr Rodan in the case of *Preda and Others v. Romania* (nos. 9584/02 and 7 others, §§ 35-41, 29 April 2014).

In short, the applicants obtained final court decisions finding that the nationalisation by the former communist regime of their properties had been unlawful and that they had never ceased to be the legitimate owners of those properties. Despite the fact that their title deeds were not disputed, the applicants were not able to recover possession of their properties, as the latter had already been sold by the State to third parties. The applicants did not receive compensation for those properties.

II. RELEVANT DOMESTIC LAW AND PRACTICE

8. The relevant background domestic law and practice in relation to acknowledged unlawfully nationalised properties sold by the State to third parties have been summarised in the Court's judgments in the cases of *Brumărescu v. Romania* [GC] (no. 28342/95, §§ 34-35, ECHR 1999-VII); *Străin and Others* (cited above, §§ 19-23); *Maria Atanasiu and Others v. Romania* (nos. 30767/05 et 33800/06, §§ 44 et seq., 12 October 2010); *Preda and Others* (cited above, §§ 68-74); and *Dickmann and Gion v. Romania* (nos. 10346/03 and 10893/04, §§ 52-58, 24 October 2017).

THE LAW

I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

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

II. *LOCUS STANDI*

10. The heirs of some of the applicants informed the Court of those applicants' deaths and, as their close relatives, expressed the intention to

pursue the application in their stead. The Government did not object to this. Having regard to the close family ties and the heirs' legitimate interest in pursuing the applications, the Court accepts that the deceased applicants' heirs may pursue the applications in their stead. It will therefore continue to deal with these applications at the heirs' request (see the appended table for details).

III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL NO. 1 TO THE CONVENTION

11. The applicants submitted that their inability to recover possession of their unlawfully nationalised properties or to secure compensation, despite court decisions acknowledging their property rights, amounted to a breach of their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, which reads:

“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.”

A. Admissibility

1. *Applications nos. 20106/04 and 12838/07*

(a) **Application no. 20106/04 (Maria Magdalena Suru)**

12. In 2015 the parties submitted updated information concerning the applicant's claims under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1; this information stated that on 5 March 2014 the applicant had received compensation from the domestic authorities. In particular, pursuant to a decision of 19 June 2012 given by the domestic courts, which had acknowledged once again her entitlement to compensation, the applicant had been asked to choose two properties from a list made available by the authorities. The applicant had made her choice at the time. In view of that, the Government contended that the matter raised by the present application had been resolved.

13. In her observations dated 12 January 2015 the applicant argued that she had not been able to take possession of the properties received in compensation.

14. The Court reiterates that, under Article 37 § 1 (b) of the Convention, it may “... at any stage of the proceedings decide to strike an application out

of its list of cases where the circumstances lead to the conclusion that ... the matter has been resolved ...”.

15. The Court takes note of the parties’ submissions and of the fact that the applicant accepted the compensation awarded to her on 5 March 2014. It appears from the case file, including the Government’s observations dated October 2015, that since 16 October 2015 she has enjoyed full possession of the two properties received in compensation.

16. The Court therefore considers that the matter giving rise to the applicant’s complaint under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 has been resolved within the meaning of Article 37 § 1 (b) of the Convention and that respect for human rights, as defined in the Convention and the Protocols thereto, does not require it to continue the examination of the application under Article 37 § 1 *in fine*. Accordingly, the case should be struck out of the list, in so far as it relates to this complaint.

(b) Application no. 12838/07 (Michael and Iohann Ehrmann)

17. The Government submitted, *inter alia*, that the applicants had lodged their restitution claim in 2005 and that they had failed to lodge an appeal against the domestic decision dismissing their action for damages. Consequently, the Government pleaded non-exhaustion of the available domestic remedies.

18. The applicants argued that the authorities should have dealt with their claim for complete reparation (*restitutio in integrum*) under the general provisions governing property as regulated by the Civil Code and not under the special laws concerning the restitution of nationalised properties.

19. The Court notes at the outset that the final court decision in the applicants’ case merely recognised a right to compensation pursuant to the special restitution laws and that in 2005 the applicants chose to file a request for restitution pursuant to the restitution law no. 10/2001. However, they failed to pursue this remedy diligently.

20. In view of the foregoing, the Court finds that the Government’s objection must be upheld and that this complaint must therefore be rejected under Article 35 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

2. The remaining applications

21. The Government submitted that the applicants had failed to exhaust the available domestic remedies and/or that they could not claim to have a possession within the meaning of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, their complaints being therefore incompatible *rationae materiae*.

22. The applicants contested these arguments and submitted that the compensation mechanism put in place by the domestic legislation was not effective.

23. The Court reiterates that it has already considered at length and rejected the same objections concerning the alleged inapplicability of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention to situations identical to those in the current case (see *Strain and Others*, cited above, §§ 30, 31 and 38).

It has further considered and repeatedly rejected the Government's submissions as to the alleged effectiveness of the restitution laws, including Law no. 10/2001 and Law no. 165/2013, in cases where there are concurrent valid title deeds (see *Strain and Others*, cited above, §§ 54-56, *Preda and Others*, cited above, §§ 133 and 141, and *Dickmann and Gion*, cited above, §§ 72 and 78).

It finds that in the instant case the Government have not put forward any new fact or argument capable of persuading it to reach a different conclusion as to the admissibility of this complaint. The Government's objection in this regard must therefore be rejected.

24. The Court further notes that these complaints are not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention, nor are they inadmissible on any other grounds. They must therefore be declared admissible.

B. Merits

25. The applicants argued that the failure to date to recover possession of their properties or to receive compensation if recovery of possession were not to be possible was in breach of their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions.

26. The Government reiterated their objection to admissibility and submitted that the applicants should have pursued the procedures set out in the restitution laws, including Law no. 165/2013.

27. The Court notes that, just like the applicants in the case of *Strain and Others*, cited above, and also like Ms and Mr Rodan in the case of *Preda and Others*, cited above, the applicants in the present case had obtained final decisions acknowledging the unlawfulness of the seizure of their property by the State and their legitimate ownership with retroactive effect over those properties. These decisions have not been challenged or quashed to date. The applicants have not been able, to date, either to recover possession of the properties mentioned in the appended table or to obtain compensation for this deprivation.

28. The Court reiterates that in the case of *Preda and Others* it found that the applicants' inability to recover possession of their properties despite final court decisions retroactively acknowledging their property rights constituted a deprivation within the meaning of the second sentence of the first paragraph of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and that such a deprivation, combined with a total lack of compensation, imposed on the applicants a disproportionate and excessive burden in breach of their right to the

peaceful enjoyment of possessions as guaranteed by Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (see *Preda and Others*, cited above, §§ 146, 148-49).

It reiterated its above findings in the more recent and similar case of *Dickmann and Gion* (cited above, §§ 103-04).

29. The Court further finds that the Government have not put forward any fact or argument capable of persuading it to reach a different conclusion in the present case. In particular, Law no. 165/2013, which, according to the Court, did not provide an effective remedy for situations similar to those in the present case (see *Preda and Others*, cited above, § 149, *Dickman and Gion*, cited above, §§ 100-02, and paragraph 23 above), has not been amended since the Court's aforementioned judgments. Nor have the Government alleged that the domestic courts' practice has changed since these judgments to interpret Law no. 165/2013 in such a way that it can be considered as providing an effective remedy for the applicants in the present case.

30. The foregoing considerations are sufficient to enable the Court to conclude that there has been a breach of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention.

IV. OTHER ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE CONVENTION

31. All the applicants, with the exception of those in applications nos. 37487/03, 1195/04, 21121/04 and 33435/04, also raised various complaints under Article 6 of the Convention which the Court has carefully examined. In the light of all the material in its possession, and in so far as the matters complained of are within its competence, the Court finds that they do not disclose any appearance of a violation of the rights and freedoms set out in the Convention or its Protocols.

32. It follows that these complaints are manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention.

V. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

33. 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.”

34. The applicants submitted claims for just satisfaction on various dates between 2006 and 2010. In 2015 they updated these claims at the Court's request.

35. The Government made comments in reply to the applicants' original and updated claims for just satisfaction.

36. In support of their claims and submissions in respect of pecuniary damage the applicants and the Government submitted one or more of the following:

a) expert reports prepared by registered experts, either at the Ministry of Justice or members of the National Association of Valuers (ANEVAR), which is an association recognised by the Romanian Government as an association of public interest. The expert reports estimated the market value of the claimed properties after visiting them (applicants' experts), using criteria defined by Government Emergency Ordinance no. 9/2008, which fixes the rent for State properties, the standards and recommendations determined by the National Association of Valuers (ANEVAR), and the International Valuation Standards (IVS). The Government's experts did not visit the properties.

b) administrative decisions pursuant to Law no. 165/2013 awarding compensation calculated according to the criteria established by the said Law or estimated values calculated by the competent administrative bodies (see section 41 of Law no. 165/2013, *Preda and Others*, cited above, § 70).

c) copies of sale contracts indicating the price per square metre for neighbouring properties.

A. Pecuniary damage

37. As the Court has held on a number of occasions, a judgment in which the Court finds a breach imposes on the respondent State a legal obligation to put an end to the breach and make reparation for its consequences in such a way as to restore as far as possible the situation existing before the breach (see *Iatridis v. Greece* (just satisfaction) [GC], no. 31107/96 § 32, ECHR 2000-XI, and *Guiso-Gallisay v. Italy* (just satisfaction) [GC], no. 58858/00, § 90, 22 December 2009).

38. The Court considers, in the circumstances of the case, that the return of the properties in issue would put the applicants as far as possible in a situation equivalent to the one in which they would have been if there had not been a breach of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

39. Failing such restitution by the respondent State, the Court holds that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, in respect of pecuniary damage, an amount corresponding to the current value of their properties (see *Preda and Others*, cited above, § 163).

40. As regards the amount of money claimed in respect of loss of profit or benefit from the applicants' possessions, the Court rejects this claim. To award a sum of money on this basis would be a speculative process, given that profit derived from possession of property depends on several factors (see *Buzatu v. Romania* (just satisfaction), no. 34642/97, § 18, 27 January 2005, and *Preda and Others*, cited above, § 164).

41. The Court notes the disparity between the applicants' estimates of the value of their properties and those advanced by the Government.

42. Having regard to the information at its disposal concerning real estate prices on the local market, including the documents submitted by the parties, and to its established case-law in respect of similar cases (see *Maria Atanasiu and Others*, cited above, § 253; *Preda and Others*, cited above, § 164; and *Dickmann and Gion*, cited above, §§ 113-18), the Court considers it reasonable and equitable, as required by Article 41, to award the applicants the amounts indicated in the appended table in respect of pecuniary damage.

B. Non-pecuniary damage

43. The Court considers that the serious interference with the applicants' right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions cannot be adequately compensated for by the simple finding of a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1. Making an assessment on an equitable basis, as required by Article 41 of the Convention, the Court awards the applicants the amounts indicated in the appended table in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

C. Costs and expenses

44. Some applicants have either not submitted any claims for costs and expenses or have failed to substantiate them. Accordingly, the Court finds no reason to award them any sum on that account (see appended table).

45. As concerns the claims submitted by the remaining applicants, regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law, the Court considers it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table covering costs under all heads.

D. Default interest

46. 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. *Decides* to strike out the complaint in respect of Article 1 of Protocol no. 1 to the Convention in application no. 20106/04;

3. *Declares* the complaints concerning Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 admissible, with the exception of the complaint raised in application no. 12838/07, and the remainder of the applications inadmissible;
4. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention;
5. *Holds*,
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, within three months from the date on which the judgment becomes final in accordance with Article 44 § 2 of the Convention, the amounts indicated in the appended table, plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants, to be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable at the date of settlement;
 - (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;
6. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claims for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 26 February 2019, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Marialena Tsirli
Registrar

Ganna Yudkivska
President

APPENDIX

List of cases

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name nationality date of birth place of residence	Represented by	Identification of property	Domestic decision acknowledging the applicants' title to property	Domestic decision confirming the validity of the third parties' title to property	Amounts proposed /application for A) pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage B) costs and expenses in euros (EUR)
1.	19788/03 23/05/2003	Ana IONESCU Romanian b: 27/10/1917 d: 28/11/2012 pursued by heir Adrian IANCU German and Italian 14/02/1954 Rome	Cesare Massimo BIANCA	Apartment no. 9 and the non-returned portion of the land of 1,183 sq m located at 16, Unirii Street, Arad	Final judgment of 10 September 2001 of the Timișoara Court of Appeal	Final judgment of 10 September 2001 of the Timișoara Court of Appeal Final judgment of 21 November 2002 of the Timișoara Court of Appeal (apartment no. 9)	207,500 (202,500+5,000) 2,700
2.	29240/03 28/08/2003	Rodica TĂNASE Romanian 20/03/1947 Deva		112.20 sq m of the ground floor of a building located at 6, Iuliu Maniu Street (Libertății Street), Deva	Final judgment of 18 March 2003 of the Timișoara Court of Appeal	Final judgment of 18 March 2003 of the Timișoara Court of Appeal	61,900 (56,900 + 5,000) -
3.	29286/03 08/08/2003	Sandu BART Romanian 26/04/1930 Iași proceeding in his own name and in his capacity		House and land of 1,050 sq m located at 39, Calea Națională, Ripiceni	Final judgment of 9 July 2002 of the Suceava Court of Appeal	Final judgment of 9 July 2002 of the Suceava Court of Appeal	13,570 (8,570+5,000) -

		as heir of applicant Ana Bart Ana BART Romanian b: 06/10/1906 d: 18/10/2004					
4.	36384/03 06/08/2003	Petru Nicolae ALBU Romanian 15/10/1939 Sibiu Mariana Silvia ALBU Romanian b: 15/10/1939 d: 03/02/2006 pursued by heir Daniela ŞANDRU US national 19/07/1960 Miami Traian Petru MIHĂILĂ Romanian 02/10/1940 Deva proceeding in his own name and in his capacity as heir of applicant Sanda Zoe Mihăilă Ileana Viorica OANCEA Romanian 20/03/1934 Bucharest	Apartment no. 3 located at 3, Oituz Street, Sibiu	Final judgment of 3 February 1999 of the Alba Iulia Court of Appeal	Final judgment of 11 October 2002 of the Alba Iulia Court of Appeal	48,200 (43,200 + 5,000) -	

		proceeding in her own name and in her capacity as heir of applicant Sanda Zoe Mihăilă Sanda Zoe MIHĂILĂ Romanian b: 12/04/1937 d: 08/01/2004					
5.	37487/03 03/10/2003	Nicolae VENIAMIN French, Romanian 08/04/1946 Boulogne Lascăr VENIAMIN French, Romanian 08/04/1946 Paris	Adrian VASILIU	Buildings and land of 2,337.4 sq m located at 10, Oituz Street (formerly 6, Oituz Street), Bacău	Final judgment of 10 April 2003 the Supreme Court of Justice	Final judgment of 10 April 2003 the Supreme Court of Justice	574,521 (569,521+5,000) -
6.	1195/04 26/11/2003	Marta BERLING Romanian 19/07/1935 Cluj	Mikolt Krisztina KAPCZA	Apartment no. 12-13 (774/2/S/XII, 774/2/S/XIII) located at 34, Republicii Street, Turda	Final judgment of 11 March 1998 of the Turda Court	Final judgment of 3 June 2003 of the Braşov Court of Appeal	77,000 (72,000 + 5,000) 3,300
7.	2676/04 24/11/2003	Ştefan NUŢĂ Romanian 28/05/1946 Palaja	Nicoleta Tatiana POPESCU	Apartment no. 37, 63 sq m, bl. D/3, located at 18, Târgu Neamţ Street, Bucharest, Sector 6	Final judgment of 16 September 1994 of the Court of Bucharest – Sector 6	Final judgment of 2 June 2003 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	74,300 (69,300 + 5,000) 299.43
8.	7174/04 02/12/2003	Silvia ALEVRA French 18/09/1940 Paris Eugenia ALEVRA Romanian 26/09/1959 Bucharest		House 232 sq m and land of 1,400 sq m located at 208, Nicolae Bălcescu Street (202, Nicolae Bălcescu Street / 178, Calea Domnească), Târgovişte	Final judgment of 14 November 2001 of the Supreme Court of Justice	Final judgment of 10 June 2003 of the Ploieşti Court of Appeal	257,000 (252,000 + 5,000) 1,800

		<p>Ioana ALEVRA Romanian 01/03/1982 Bucharest</p> <p>Constantin ALEVRA French b: 18/01/1926 d: 28/12/2004</p> <p>pursued by heir George ALEVRA Aurel Romanian 25/01/1957 Torrance</p>					
9.	8647/04 13/01/2004	<p>Irinel BĂJENARU Maria Romanian 04/03/1976 Oradea</p> <p>Gabriela RUSU Romanian 14/11/1948 Oradea</p> <p>Ioana POENARU Romanian 04/03/1976 Bucharest</p>	Gabriela RUSU	<p>Building and land of 1,726 sq m located at 10, Vânători Street, Borsec;</p> <p>2 annexes to a building and land of 737 sq m, located at 210, Calea Domnească, Galați</p>	<p>Final judgment of 15 October 2003 the Galați Court of Appeal</p> <p>Decision of 15 July 2005 of the Mayor of Galați</p>	<p>Final judgment of 15 October 2003 the Galați Court of Appeal</p>	<p>111,970 (106,970 +5,000)</p> <p>2,275</p>
10.	20106/04 29/03/2004	<p>Maria-Magdalena SURU Romanian 30/09/1931 Bucharest</p>	Georgeta ANDREI TSAKIRI	House with appurtenant land located at 15, Iacob Negruzzi Street, Bucharest, Sector 1	Final judgment of 1 October 2003 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	Final judgment of 1 October 2003 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	<p>–</p> <p>–</p>

11.	21121/04 17/03/2004	Roxana Isabella Lya GHIAȚĂ Romanian 09/01/1936 Madrid	Mirela CHELARU	Apartment with appurtenant land, 2nd floor, 141 sq m, located at 22, Atena Street (formerly Aleea Zoe), Bucharest, Sector 1	Final judgment of 6 May 1999 of the Bucharest Tribunal	Final judgment of 21 October 2003 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	126,500 (121,500+5,000) –
12.	33435/04 13/12/2003	Mihai Sorin RĂDULESCU Romanian 04/01/1946 Bucharest Radu Florin RĂDULESCU Romanian 10/09/1947 Bucharest	Mihai Sorin RĂDULESCU	Immovable property located at 61, Dr. Lister Street, Bucharest (apartments nos. 1 and 3, with appurtenant garage and land of 226.55 sq m)	Final judgment of 13 March 2001 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	Final judgment of 16 December 2003 of the Supreme Court of Justice	653,773 (648,773+5,000) –
13.	13354/05 23/03/2005	Eva Margareta CURTICEAN Romanian b:11/04/1936 d:30/11/2006 pursued by heir Sonia CURTICEAN Romanian 27/03/1958 Arad		Apartment no. 4 (134 sq m) and apartment no. 5 (84 sq m), located at 5A, Filimon Sârbu Street (6, Catedralei Street), Arad	Final judgment of 8 October 1998 of the Arad Court	Final judgment of 1 October 2004 of the Timișoara Court of Appeal (apartment no. 5 – formerly no. 6) Final judgment of 25 January 2005 of the Timișoara Court of Appeal (apartment no. 4)	161,749 (156,749 + 5,000) –
14.	15652/05 21/04/2005	Doina Eugenia VARNA Romanian 22/06/1927 Cluj-Napoca	Diana Alexandra ANDRAȘONI	Apartment no. 13b located at 4, Horea Street, Cluj- Napoca	Final judgment of 29 October 2004 of the Cluj Court of Appeal	Final judgment of 29 October 2004 of the Cluj Court of Appeal	39,000 (34,000 + 5,000) 2,175

15.	6947/07 20/12/2006	Jenica GURAN Romanian b: 01/02/1926 d: 10/09/2010 pursued by heirs: 1) Dumitru Dan GURAN Romanian 04/10/1956 Bucharest 2) Cristian Mihail GURAN Romanian 08/11/1951 Bucharest Aurelia IONESCU Romanian 23/07/1933 Bucharest	Dumitru Dan GURAN	Apartments nos. 4 and 5 located at 224, Șerban Vodă Street, Bucharest, Sector 4	Final judgment of 5 July 2006 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	Final judgment of 5 July 2006 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	90,000 (85,000 + 5,000) -
16.	12838/07 21/02/2007	Michael EHRMANN German 15/11/1963 Töging am Inn Iohann ERHMANN German 22/01/1962 Töging am Inn	Cezariana Ileana BOGOS	House and land of 824 sq m located at 126, Victoriei Street, Valea Lungă (CF 777/b Valea Lungă, nr. topo. 272, 273)	Judgment of 3 October 2006 of the Alba Iulia Court of Appeal acknowledging right to compensation	Final judgment of 3 October 2006 of the Alba Iulia Court of Appeal	- -
17.	35547/07 14/08/2007	Nicolae SIMIZEANU Romanian b: 11/07/1940 d: 26/04/2008		Apartment and annex located at 83, Ion Lahovari Street, Constanța	Final judgment of 26 February 2007 of the High Court of Cassation and Justice	Final judgment of 26 February 2007 of the High Court of Cassation and Justice	83,000 (78,000 + 5,000) 2,150

		<p>pursued by heirs</p> <p>1) Simona Maria CIOBANU Romanian 25/04/1968 Techirghiol</p> <p>2) Nina Vivance Gabriela SIMIZEANU Romanian b: 17/08/1946 d: 02/06/2016</p> <p>3) Radu Marius SIMIZEANU Romanian 28/10/1969 Techirghiol</p>					
18.	45689/07 17/07/2007	Șerban Vlad BĂRCĂNESCU Romanian 06/07/1949 Bucharest		Apartment no. 2 located at 83, Tunari Street, Bucharest, Sector 2	Final judgment of 13 May 1998 of the Court of Bucharest - Sector 2	Final judgment of 5 March 2007 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	50,000 (45,000 + 5,000) 1,950
19.	50994/08 20/10/2008	Marin MOISE Romanian 22/11/1951 Bucharest		Apartment no. 15 located at 5, Lutherană Street, Bucharest, Sector 1	Final judgment of 26 May 2008 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	Final judgment of 26 May 2008 of the Bucharest Court of Appeal	85,000 (80,000 + 5,000) -