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

Press Unit
Unité de la Presse

Press country profile
Fiche pays pour la presse

Last updated: July 2021

Italy

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1955

National Judge: Raffaele Sabato (2019-2028)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Giorgio Balladore Pallieri (1959-1980), Carlo Russo (1981-1998), Benedetto Conforti (1998-2001), Vladimiro Zagrebelsky (2001-2010), Guido Raimondi (2010-2019)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 1,102 applications concerning Italy in 2020, of which 1,080 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 17 judgments* (concerning 22 applications), 14 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2019	2020	2021**
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	1452	1492	726
Communicated to the Government	136	451	196
Applications decided:	2417	1102	510
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	1037	1038	440
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	1364	39	50
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	1	3	3
- Decided by judgment	15	22	17

*During 2020, the Court delivered five judgments against more than one respondent State including Italy.
** January to July 2021
For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the ECHR internet site.
Statistics on interim measures can be found here.

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2021	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	3669
Single Judge	120
Committee (3 Judges)	2726
Chamber (7 Judges)	820
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	3

Italy and ...

The Registry

The task of the Registry is to provide legal and administrative support to the Court in the exercise of its judicial functions. It is composed of lawyers, administrative and technical staff and translators. There are currently **624** Registry staff members.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Cases dealing with inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Saadi v. Italy

28.02.2008

Decision to deport the applicant to Tunisia, where he claimed to have been sentenced in his absence for terrorism.

Violation of Article 3 if the deportation went ahead

Enea v. Italy

17.09.2009

Applicant had been subjected to a special prison regime (under section 41 *bis* § 2 of the Prison Administration Act) then placed in a high supervision unit.

No violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) concerning his right to a court during the period of the special regime

No violation of Article 6 § 1 as regards his right to a court during his placement in the high supervision unit

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for correspondence)

Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy

23.02.2012

The case concerned Somalian and Eritrean migrants travelling from Libya who had been intercepted at sea by the Italian authorities and sent back to Libya.

Violations of Article 3 because the applicants had been exposed to the risk of ill-treatment in Libya and of repatriation to Somalia or Eritrea

Violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsions)

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken in conjunction with Article 3 because the applicants had been unable to lodge their complaints with a competent authority and to obtain a thorough and rigorous assessment of their requests before the removal measure was enforced

Violation of Article 13 taken in conjunction with Article 4 of Protocol No.4 because the remedy under the criminal law against the military personnel on board the ship did not satisfy the criterion of suspensive effect

The Court found that the applicants had fallen within the jurisdiction of Italy for the purposes of Article 1 of the Convention because they had been under the continuous and exclusive control of the Italian authorities.

Cases dealing with Article 6

Right to a fair hearing/trial

Perna v. Italy

06.05.2003

Journalist convicted of aggravated defamation for publishing an article accusing the Chief Public Prosecutor of Palermo (G. Caselli) of abuse of authority, without attempting to prove the veracity of his allegations.

No violation of Articles 6 or 10 (freedom of expression)

Sejdovic v. Italy

01.03.2006

Applicant convicted in his absence without having had the opportunity to present his defence.

Violation of Article 6

Scoppola v. Italy (no. 2)

17.09.2009

Question whether, in convicting the applicant for murder according to the summary procedure, the Italian courts should have applied the most lenient criminal-law provision out of all those in force in the period between the commission of the offence and the final judgment.

Violation of Articles 6 and 7 (no punishment without law)

Right to affair trial within a reasonable time

Scordino v. Italy (no. 1)

29.03.2006

Effectiveness of the "Pinto Act", which introduced the possibility of lodging a complaint with the Italian courts in respect of excessively long proceedings. The case also concerned the right to receive compensation for expropriation.

Violation of Article 6 § 1 and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Cases on Article 7 (no punishment without law)

G.I.E.M. S.r.l. and Others v. Italy

28.06.2018

The cases concerned the confiscation of land as provided for by domestic legislation in the event of unlawful site development. The applicants alleged that this confiscation had an insufficient legal basis.

Violation of Article 7 (no punishment without law) in respect of all the applicant companies

No violation of Article 7 in respect of the applicant Mr Gironda

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) in respect of all the applicants

Violation of Article 6 § 2 (right to be presumed innocent) in respect of Mr Gironda

The Court also said that it did not need to decide whether there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 in respect of the company G.I.E.M. S.r.l. or of Article 13 in respect of the companies G.I.E.M. S.r.l. and Falgest S.r.l.

Finally the Court decided that the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) was not ready for decision and should thus be reserved in its entirety.

Berlusconi v. Italy

27.11.2018

The case concerns the former Prime Minister of Italy, Mr Silvio Berlusconi.

Mr Berlusconi complained in particular that the application of Legislative Decree no. 235/2012, resulting in the invalidation of his election by the Senate after he had been disqualified from standing for election on account of his conviction for tax fraud, had breached Article 7 (no punishment without law) of the Convention, Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections) to the Convention and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

In July 2018, after informing the Court that the applicant no longer intended to pursue his application and asked for it to be struck out of the list of cases, the Court concluded that no special circumstances relating to respect for human rights required it to continue the examination of the application in accordance with Article 37 § 1 and it decided to strike the case out of the list.

Cases concerning the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8)

Guerra and Others v. Italy

19.02.1998

The Italian authorities had not provided the applicants with sufficient information about the risks and about what to do in the case of an accident in a chemical factory with a "high risk" classification.

Violation of Article 8

Parrillo v. Italy

27.08.2015

The case concerned a ban under Italian Law no. 40/2004, preventing Ms Parrillo from donating to scientific research embryos obtained from an *in vitro* fertilisation which were not destined for a pregnancy.

No violation of Article 8

Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy

24.01.2017

The case concerned the placement in social-service care of a nine-month-old child who had been born in Russia following a gestational surrogacy contract, entered into with a Russian woman by an Italian couple who had no biological relationship with the child.

No violation of Article 8

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Maestri v. Italy

17.02.2004

Disciplinary proceedings against a judge for having been a member of a Masonic lodge.

Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association)

Guiso Gallisay v. Italy

22.12.2009 (judgment on just satisfaction)

Question of the criteria for calculation of just satisfaction in constructive expropriation cases.

The Court changed its criteria and now no longer takes into account the value of public works constructed on expropriated land.

Lautsi v. Italy

18.03.2011

The case concerned the presence of crucifixes in State-school classrooms in Italy.

No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education).

The Court held in particular that the question of religious symbols in classrooms was, in principle, a matter falling within the margin of appreciation of the State - particularly as there was no European consensus as regards that question - provided that decisions in that area did not lead to a form of indoctrination. The fact that crucifixes in State-school classrooms in Italy conferred on the country's majority religion predominant visibility in the school environment was not in itself sufficient to denote a process of indoctrination. Moreover, the presence of crucifixes was not associated with compulsory teaching about Christianity; and there was nothing to suggest that the authorities were intolerant of pupils who believed in other religions, were non-believers or who held non-religious philosophical convictions. Lastly, Ms Lautsi had retained her right as a parent to enlighten and advise her children and to guide them on a path in line with her own philosophical convictions.

Giuliani and Gaggio v. Italy

24.03.2011

Death of demonstrator in clashes between anti-globalisation protesters and law-enforcement officers during 2001 G8 summit in Genoa.

No violation of Article 2 (right to life) concerning four different complaints: use of lethal force; legislative framework governing the use of lethal force / weapons issued to the law-enforcement agencies at the G8; organisation of the policing operations at the G8; alleged lack of an effective investigation.

No violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy). No violation of Article 38 (adversarial examination of the case).

Scoppola v. Italy (n° 3)

22.05.2012

The case concerned the applicant's disenfranchisement following his criminal conviction.

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections)

The Court found that the disenfranchisement of convicted prisoners provided for under Italian law was not like the general, automatic, indiscriminate measure that led it to find a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 in the *Hirst (no. 2) v. the United Kingdom* case. Italian law took care to adapt the measure to the particular circumstances of a case, particularly the length of the sentence.

Centro Europa 7 S.R.L. v. Italy

07.06.2012

The case concerned an Italian TV company's inability to broadcast, despite having a broadcasting licence, because no television frequencies were allocated to it.

Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression and information)

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Khlaifia and Others v. Italy

15.12.2016

The case concerned the holding, in a reception centre on the island of Lampedusa then on ships in Palermo harbour (Sicily), of irregular migrants who arrived in Italy in 2011 following the "Arab Spring" events in their country, and their subsequent removal to Tunisia.

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)

Violation of Article 5 § 2 (right to be informed promptly of the reasons for deprivation of liberty)

Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to a speedy decision on the lawfulness of detention)

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) as regards the conditions in the Lampedusa reception centre

No violation of Article 3 as regards the conditions on the ships in Palermo harbour

No violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 to the Convention (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens)

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken together with Article 3

No violation of Article 13 taken together with Article 4 of Protocol No. 4

de Tommaso v. Italy

23.02.2017

The case concerned preventive measures imposed for a duration of two years on the applicant, who complained of a violation of Article 5 (right to liberty and security),

Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention and Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement) on the Convention.
Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 on account of the lack of foreseeability of the relevant Act
Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the lack of a public hearing in the Bari District Court and Court of Appeal
No violation of Article 6 § 1
No violation of Article 13

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

Cases concerning the right to life (Article 2)

Violation of Article 2

G.N. and Others v. Italy (no. 43134/05)
01.12.2009
Difference in treatment among persons infected by transfusion or administration of blood products.

Maiorano and Others v. Italy
15.12.2009
Applicants' relative was brutally murdered by a repeat offender who had been granted day release.
The Court found that the judicial authorities had been negligent, not having taken due account of the criminal's dangerousness.

Alikaj and Others v. Italy
29.03.2011
Death of a young man who was shot by a police officer when he was being pursued by the police after resisting arrest.

Talpis v. Italy
02.03.2017
The application concerned, in particular, the alleged failure by the Respondent State to provide protection and support to the applicant following violence inflicted by her husband, which ended with the murder of the applicant's son and the attempted murder of the applicant.

Violations of Article 2

No violation of Article 2

Fabris and Parziale v. Italy
19.03.2020
The case concerned the death of a relative of the applicants while in custody in Venice Prison. Mr Fabris was the uncle and Ms Parziale a cousin of the deceased, who, according to an expert assessment, had died after deliberately inhaling gas from canisters provided to prisoners for cooking.

Application inadmissible

Verri v. Italy
19.12.2019
The case concerns the alledged State's failure to protect the life of a man killed by a fugitive and the lack of an effective investigation.
Complaint rejected as manifestly ill-founded.

Cases concerning prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Violation of Article 3

Marcello Viola v. Italy (no. 2)
13.06.2019
The case concerned an irreducible sentence of life imprisonment.
Violation of Article 3

Ben Khemais v. Italy
24.02.2009
Deportation of a Tunisian national suspected of being involved in Islamist terrorism despite the Court's indication to the Italian Government (under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court) that the order should be stayed pending its decision on the merits.

Sulejmanovic v. Italy
16.07.2009
The case concerned prison overcrowding.

Toumi v. Italy
05.04.2011
Removal of a terrorist from Italy to Tunisia notwithstanding the Court's indications and the risk of ill-treatment (see also Grand Chamber judgment Saadi v. Italy).

Torregiani and Others v. Italy
08.01.2013
The case concerned overcrowding in prisons in Italy.
The Court decided to apply the pilot-judgment procedure in view of the growing number of persons potentially concerned in Italy and of the judgments finding a violation liable to result from the applications in question.
Following up on Torregiani case, the Court received more than 4,200 similar applications which were declared inadmissible or struck out.

Contrada (No. 2) v. Italy
11.02.2014
The case concerned the authorities' repeated refusal of a prisoner's requests for a stay of execution of his sentence or for the sentence to be converted to house arrest on account of his numerous health problems.

Cestaro v. Italy
07.04.2015
The case concerned events which occurred at the end of the G8 summit in Genoa in July 2001, in a school made available by the municipal authorities to be used as a night shelter by demonstrators. An anti-riot police unit entered the building around midnight to carry out a search, leading to acts of violence.
The Court found that there had been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention on account of ill-treatment sustained by Mr Cestaro and of inadequate criminal legislation concerning the punishment of acts of torture which was not an effective deterrent to prevent the repetition of such acts.
After emphasising the structural nature of the problem, the Court pointed out that, as regards the remedial measures to be taken, the State's positive obligations under Article 3 might include the duty to introduce a properly adapted legal framework, including, in particular, effective criminal-law provisions.

Nasr and Ghali v. Italy
23.02.2016
The case concerned an instance of extrajudicial transfer (or "extraordinary rendition"), namely the abduction by CIA agents, with the cooperation of Italian officials, of the Egyptian imam Abu Omar, who had been granted political asylum in Italy, and his subsequent transfer to Egypt, where he was held in secret for several months.
In the present case the Court held that the legitimate principle of "State secrecy" had clearly been applied by the Italian executive in order to ensure that those responsible did not have to answer for their actions. The investigation and trial had not led to the punishment of those responsible, who had therefore ultimately been granted impunity.

Bartesaghi Gallo and Others v. Italy
22.06.2017
The case concerned the ill-treatment to which 42 demonstrators were subjected by police officers inside a school, in the context of an anti-globalisation demonstration organised to coincide with the 27th summit of the eight major industrialised countries (G8).

Blair and Others v. Italy
Azzolina and Others v. Italy
26.10.2017
The cases concerned incidents following the G8 Summit in Genoa in 2001, when demonstrators were subjected to violence by law-enforcement officers while in detention. The applicants alleged that they had been subjected to torture and complained that the investigation by the domestic courts had been ineffective, in particular because the statute of limitations had been applied to virtually all the acts committed and because a number of those convicted had been granted a remission of their sentence.

Cirino and Renne v. Italy
26.10.2017
The case concerned the complaint by two detainees that in December 2004 they were ill-treated by prison officers of the Asti Correctional Facility, and that those responsible were not appropriately punished.
The Court held that the ill-treatment inflicted on the applicants – which had been deliberate and carried out in a premeditated and organised manner while they were in the custody of prison officers – had amounted to torture.

V.C. v. Italy (no. 54227/14)
01.02.2018
The case concerned a person who, as a minor suffering from alcohol and drug addiction, had been the victim of a child prostitution ring and gang rape. She complained that the Italian authorities had not taken all the necessary steps to protect her as a minor and the victim of a prostitution ring.

Provenzano v. Italy
25.10.2018
Mr Provenzano was arrested in 2006. He was subsequently convicted of numerous extremely serious offences, and sentenced to several life sentences.
Relying on Article 3, Mr Provenzano complained of inadequate medical care in prison and about the continuation of the special prison regime until his death, despite his ill health.
No violation of Article 3 in respect of the conditions of detention
Violation of Article 3 on account of the renewed application of the special prison regime on 23 March 2016

Knox v. Italy
24.01.2019
The case concerned proceedings leading to the conviction of Amanda Knox for malicious accusation. During a police interview on 6 November 2007 Ms Knox accused a pub manager of killing her flatmate. The man was subsequently found to be innocent and she was sentenced to three years' imprisonment for making a malicious accusation.

Cases concerning the right to liberty and security (Article 5)

Violation of Article 5

Seferovic v. Italy
08.02.2011
Detention pending deportation of a woman who had recently given birth to a child who died at the hospital, despite the fact that Italian law prohibited the deportation of a woman within six months of giving birth.

Gallardo Sanchez v. Italy
24.03.2015
The case concerned the excessive length of a Venezuelan national's detention in Italy with a view to his extradition to Greece.

Richmond Yaw and Others v. Italy
06.10.2016
The case concerned four Ghanaian nationals. They were placed in detention with a view to their removal from the country.

Rizzotto v. Italy
05.09.2019
The case concerned the lawfulness of a pre-trial detention order, and the procedural safeguards secured under Article 5 § 4 (right to speedy review of the lawfulness of detention) of the Convention.

Cases concerning Article 6

Right of access to a court

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Guadagnino v. Italy and France
18.01.2011
Italian courts refused to hear industrial disputes concerning an employee of the French school in Rome.

De Luca v. Italy and Pennino v. Italy
24.09.2013
The two cases concerned the impossibility for the applicants to have a final judgment enforced in order to recover money owed to them by a municipal authority which had become insolvent.

Casa di Cura Valle Fiorita S.r.l. v. Italy
13.12.2018
The case concerned the applicant company being unable to recover possession of a building in Rome that had been occupied since 2012, without any legal title, by a group of housing activists (*movimento lotta per la casa*).

Right to a fair trial

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Cordova v. Italy
30.01.2003
Applicant (former public prosecutor in Sicily) filed criminal complaints against a

Senator and an MP, but their alleged offences were covered by parliamentary immunity.

C.G.I.L. and Cofferati v. Italy (no. 46967/07)

24.02.2009

Inability, for a trade union and its General Secretary, to bring libel proceedings against an MP (parliamentary immunity).

Savino and Others v. Italy

28.04.2009

Question whether the Judicial Committee and Judicial Section for officials of the Chamber of Deputies were independent and impartial tribunals.

Lombardi Vallauri v. Italy

20.10.2009

Refusal by Milan Catholic University to employ a lecturer who was not approved by the Congregation for Catholic Education.

Maggio and Others v. Italy

31.05.2011

Re-adjustment of pensions of Italians who worked abroad.

Agrati and Others v. Italy

07.06.2011

The applicants were 125 Italian nationals who complained about the retrospective application of a new law to ongoing judicial proceedings, on the calculation of their length of service as civil servants.

Arras and Others v. Italy

14.02.2012

The case concerned legislative amendments which affected pending civil proceedings the applicants had brought concerning their pension adjustments. The applicants were pensioners and former employees of the Banco Di Napoli, a banking group which was originally public and was later privatised.

M.C. and Others v. Italy (no. 5376/11)

03.09.2013 – Pilot judgment[1]

The case concerned the fact that it was impossible for 162 Italian nationals to obtain an annual adjustment of the supplementary part of a compensation allowance paid to them following accidental contamination as a result of blood transfusions or the administration of blood derivatives.

The Court held that the Government's enactment of the emergency legislative decree, which ruled on the disputed issue of adjustment of the supplementary part of the allowance, had infringed the principle of the rule of law and the applicants' right to a fair hearing, had imposed "an abnormal and excessive burden" on them and, lastly, had disproportionately infringed their property rights.

Dhahbi v. Italy

08.04.2014

The case concerned the inability of an immigrant worker of Tunisian origin to obtain payment from the Italian public authorities of a family allowance under the association agreement between the European Union (EU) and Tunisia (Euro-Mediterranean Agreement).

Azienda Agricola Silverfunghi S.A.S. and Others v. Italy

24.06.2014

The case concerned proceedings before the Italian courts brought by a number of Italian agricultural companies based on their possible entitlement to a two-fold reduction of social security contributions. Pending these proceedings the Italian legislator passed a new retrospective law which determined that their benefits would be calculated alternatively, and not cumulatively.

Lorefice v. Italy

29.06.2017

The case concerned Mr Lorefice's complaint concerning the fairness of criminal proceedings which had resulted in his conviction by a court of appeal.

[1] Since 2004 and in response to the large number of cases deriving from systemic or structural problems in certain countries the Court has developed a pilot-judgment procedure. This consists in identifying in a single judgment systemic problems underlying a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights and indicating in that judgment the remedial measures required to resolve such situations. The pilot-judgment procedure is not only intended to facilitate effective implementation by respondent states of individual and general measures necessary to comply with the Court's judgments, but also induces the respondent State to resolve large numbers of individual cases arising from the same structural problem at domestic level, thus reinforcing the principle of subsidiarity which underpins the Convention system.

Felloni v. Italy
06.02.2020
The case concerned criminal proceedings which led to Mr Felloni's conviction for driving while unfit through drink. Mr Felloni alleged that his prison sentence was the result of the retrospective application of harsher criminal legislation. In particular, he complained that he had not been granted the benefit of mitigating circumstances, in accordance with the law in force at the time of the facts and subsequently amended. He also complained about a lack of reasoning in the judgment of the Court of Cassation before which he had raised this defence.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Beg S.p.a. v. Italy
20.05.2021
The case concerned the arbitration of a dispute involving a hydroelectric-power agreement for power generation in Albania involving the applicant company and ENELPOWER, a company which had been spun off from ENEL, the former State power company. It related to, in particular, the impartiality of the arbitration panel, as one of its members (N.I.) had been on the board of ENEL and had worked as that company's lawyer.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

Edizioni Del Roma Societa Cooperativa A.R.L. and Edizioni del Roma S.R.L. v. Italy
10.12.2020
These two cases concerned the financial penalties imposed by the Italian Communications Regulatory Authority (Autorità per le garanzie nelle comunicazioni – "AGCOM") on the applicant companies, which operated in the publishing field. As a result of these penalties, the companies lost the public funding on which they had relied, which led to the collapse of one of them.

Trevisanato v. Italy
15.09.2016
The case concerned the inadmissibility of an appeal to the Court of Cassation for failure to formulate a point of law (*quesito di diritto*) in a satisfactory and appropriate manner.

Right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time

Grande Stevens and Others v. Italy
04.03.2014
The case concerned the applicants' appeal against the administrative penalty imposed on them by the Italian Companies and Stock Exchange Commission (hereafter "Consob[2]") and the criminal proceedings to which they are currently subject after having been accused of market manipulation in the context of a financial operation involving the car manufacturer FIAT.
Violation of Article 6 § 1
No violation of Article 6 § 3 (a) (right to be informed promptly of the accusation) and (c) (right to the assistance of a lawyer) in respect of Mr Grande Stevens
No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)
Violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice)
The Court also held that the respondent State was to ensure that the new criminal proceedings brought against the applicants, in violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7, which, according to the most recent information received, were still pending in respect of Mr Gabietti and Mr Grande Stevens, were closed as rapidly as possible.

Cafagna v. Italy
12.10.2017
The case concerned the applicant's conviction on the basis of a statement made by an individual who claimed to have been assaulted by him but who did not give evidence at the hearing.
Violation of Article 6 § 1
Violation of Article 6 § 3 (d) (right to examine witnesses)

Cipolletta v. Italy
11.01.2018
The case concerned the length of "administrative liquidation" proceedings.
Violation of Article 6 § 1
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

[2] "Consob" is a Commission charged, in particular, with protecting investors and ensuring the transparency and development of the stock markets.

Petrella v. Italy
18.03.2021
The case concerned the length of the preliminary investigations in the context of criminal proceedings brought on the basis of a complaint by the applicant for defamation, the lack of an effective remedy in respect of the length of the proceedings and the discontinuance of those proceedings because the charges became time-barred.
Violation of Article 6
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Right to the assistance of an interpreter

Knox v. Italy
24.01.2019
The case concerned proceedings leading to the conviction of Amanda Knox for malicious accusation. During a police interview on 6 November 2007 Ms Knox accused a pub manager of killing her flatmate. The man was subsequently found to be innocent and she was sentenced to three years' imprisonment for making a malicious accusation.

Excessive length of proceedings, delay in payment of "Pinto" compensation

Simaldone v. Italy
31.03.2009
Delay in payment of compensation awarded under "Pinto Act".
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)
The judgment referred to a growing number of applications concerning delayed payment of "Pinto" compensation.

Gaglione and Others v. Italy
21.12.2010
Delay by the Italian authorities in paying compensation in 475 "Pinto" applications (applications lodged to complain of the length of civil proceedings) – a delay of at least 19 months in 65% of the applications.
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (enforcement of judicial decisions within a reasonable time); violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)
The Court observed a widespread problem relating to the enforcement of Pinto decisions in Italy (at 7 December 2010, more than 3,900 applications concerning, among other things, delays in paying compensation under the Pinto Act were pending before the Court). It found that **general measures were required** to remedy malfunctioning of "Pinto" applications.
It disagreed with the assertion that the applicants had not suffered a significant disadvantage and dismissed for the first time a request for application of the new admissibility criterion introduced by Protocol No. 14 (no significant disadvantage).

Cases dealing with Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Sud fondi Srl and Others v. Italy
20.01.2009
Court-ordered confiscation of property following illegal development on a protected site ("Punta Perrotta"), although the Court of Cassation, in the criminal proceedings, had found the landowners and their representatives to have committed an "inevitable and excusable error".
Violation of Article 7

Contrada v. Italy (no. 3)
14.04.2015
The case concerned the issue of whether the actions for which the applicant was convicted and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment constituted a criminal offence at the time when they were committed.
Violation of Article 7
The Court held that the offence of "aiding and abetting a mafia-type organisation from the outside" had resulted from a development in the case-law which had begun toward the end of the 1980s and was consolidated in 1994, and that it was not therefore sufficiently clear and foreseeable for Mr Contrada at the time of the events in respect of which he was charged (1979-1988).

Felloni v. Italy
06.02.2020
The case concerned criminal proceedings which led to Mr Felloni's conviction for driving while unfit through drink. Mr Felloni alleged that his prison sentence was the

result of the retrospective application of harsher criminal legislation. In particular, he complained that he had not been granted the benefit of mitigating circumstances, in accordance with the law in force at the time of the facts and subsequently amended. He also complained about a lack of reasoning in the judgment of the Court of Cassation before which he had raised this defence.
No violation of Article 7

Miniscalco v. Italy
17.06.2021
The applicant (Marcello Miniscalco) complained that he had been barred from standing as a candidate in the 2013 regional elections on account of a previous conviction for abuse of authority, which had become final in 2011. This disqualification arose from the entry into force, in January 2013, of Legislative Decree no. 235/2012.
Complaint under Article 7 (no punishment without law) inadmissible
No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

Inadmissible application

Galan v. Italy
17.06.2021
The case concerned the applicant's forfeiture of his electoral seat as a member of parliament on account of a finding by Parliament that there was a ground of ineligibility following a conviction for corruption.
Application declared inadmissible.

Private and family life (Article 8)

Violation of Article 8

Di Sarno and Others v. Italy
10.01.2012
The case concerned the state of emergency (from 11 February 1994 to 31 December 2009) in relation to waste collection, treatment and disposal in the Campania region of Italy where the applicants lived and/or worked, including a period of five months in which rubbish piled up in the streets.

V.C. v. Italy (no. 54227/14)
01.02.2018
The case concerned a person who, as a minor suffering from alcohol and drug addiction, had been the victim of a child prostitution ring and gang rape. She complained that the Italian authorities had not taken all the necessary steps to protect her as a minor and the victim of a prostitution ring.

Cordella and Others v. Italy
24.01.2019
In this case, 180 applicants complained about the effects of toxic emissions from the Ilva steelworks in Taranto on the environment and on their health, and about the ineffectiveness of the domestic remedies.

J.L. v. Italy
27.05.2021
The case concerned criminal proceedings against seven men who had been charged with the gang rape of the applicant and had been acquitted by the Italian courts.

No violation of Article 8

Narjis v. Italy
14.02.2019
The case concerned the Italian authorities' refusal to renew the residence permit of a Moroccan national (Mr Narjis) who had lived in Italy for 20 years, on the grounds that he posed a danger to society, and his expulsion to Morocco.

Parental rights (Article 8)

Violation of Article 8

Moretti and Benedetti v. Italy
27.04.2010
Shortcomings in adoption proceedings: failure to respect foster parents' rights.

Piazzi v. Italy
02.11.2010
The case concerned the applicant's inability, for more than seven years, to exercise his right of access in respect of his son, under the conditions laid down by the courts, on account of the alleged failure by the social services to take the necessary measures.

Costa and Pavan v. Italy
28.08.2012
The case concerned an Italian couple who are healthy carriers of cystic fibrosis and wanted, with the help of medically-assisted procreation and genetic screening, to avoid transmitting the disease to their offspring.

Zhou v. Italy
21.01.2014
The case concerned the placement of the applicant's third child, a toddler, with a foster family with a view to adoption and the fact that Ms. Zhou had not had any contact with her child for ten months.

Manuello and Nevi v. Italy
20.01.2015
The case concerned the applicants' inability to see their granddaughter, firstly because of the non-enforcement of court decisions authorising meetings and secondly on account of a court decision suspending those meetings.

Bondavalli v. Italy
17.11.2015
The case concerned the Mr Bondavalli's inability to exercise fully his right of contact with his son on account of negative reports by the Scandiano social services, with which the mother had professional links.

Giorgioni v. Italy
15.09.2016
The case concerned the effectiveness of the measures taken by the Italian authorities to ensure that a father could exercise fully his contact rights in respect of his son despite a situation of conflict with the child's mother.

Barnea and Căldăraru v. Italy
22,06,2017
The case concerned the removal of a 28-month-old girl (C.) from her birth family for a period of seven years and her placement in a foster family with a view to her adoption.

Luzi v. Italy
5.12.2019
The case concerned the applicant not being able to exercise his right of access to his child on account of the mother's opposition.

Terna v. Italy
14.01.2021
The applicant in this case, Ms Terna, complained of the removal and placement in care of her granddaughter (who had resided with her since birth), and of her inability to exercise her right of access as granted by the domestic courts. She considered that that situation had resulted from stigmatisation of the child's family and was connected with their Roma ethnicity.

A.I. v. Italy
01.04.2021
The case concerned the inability of the applicant, a Nigerian refugee the mother of two children who had been a victim of trafficking and was in a vulnerable position, to enjoy access rights owing to a court-ordered prohibition on contact, in a situation where the proceedings concerning the children's eligibility for adoption had remained pending for over three years.

No violation of Article 8

Jessica Marchi v. Italy
27.05.2021
The case concerned the decision of the Juvenile Court to terminate the pre-adoption placement of a child that the applicant had temporarily fostered. The decision had been taken following the arrest of her husband on charges of child pornography and sexual abuse of minors.

Inadmissible application

S.L. and A.L. v. Italy (no. 896/16)
04.06.2020
The case concerned child custody proceedings between parents of different nationalities (Italian and Romanian).
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Children's rights (Article 8)

Godelli v. Italy (no. 33783/09)
25.09.2012
The case concerned the confidentiality of information concerning a child's birth and the inability of a person abandoned by her mother to find out about her origins.
Violation of Article 8

Rights for same-sex couples (Article 8)

Oliari and Others v. Italy
21.07.2015
The case concerned the complaint by three homosexual couples that under Italian legislation they do not have the possibility to get married or enter into any other type of civil union.
Violation of Article 8

Taddeucci and McCall v. Italy
30.06.2016
The case concerned a refusal by the Italian authorities to grant a residence permit to a gay couple on family grounds.
Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 8

Orlandi and Others v. Italy
14.12.2017
The case concerned a complaint by six same-sex couples that they had been unable to have their marriages, which they had contracted abroad, registered or recognised in any form as a union in Italy. They alleged, among other things, discrimination on the grounds of their sexuality.
Violation of Article 8

S.V. v. Italy (no. 55216/08)
11.10.2018
The case concerned the Italian authorities' refusal to authorise a transgender person with a female appearance to change her male forename, on the grounds that no final judicial ruling had been given confirming gender reassignment.
Violation of Article 8

Freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 9)

Sessa v. Italy
03.04.2012
The case concerned the judicial authority's refusal to adjourn a hearing listed on the date of a Jewish holiday.
No violation of Article 9

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Magosso and Brindani v. Italy
16.01.2020
The case concerned the conviction for defamation of two applicants, a journalist and a publishing director, following the publication of an article concerning the murder of the journalist Walter Tobagi in 1980 by a terrorist group close to the Red Brigades.
Violation of Article 10

Sallusti v. Italy
07.03.2019
The case concerned a journalist, Alessandro Sallusti, who was found guilty of defamation, fined and given a prison sentence, part of which he served under house arrest. The national courts found that articles published under his control had falsely reported that a 13-year old girl had been forced to have an abortion by her parents and a guardianship judge, despite clarifications in the press the day before that the girl had wanted the abortion.
Violation of Article 10

Brambilla and Others v. Italy
23.06.2016
The case concerned the conviction of three journalists who intercepted radio communications between *carabinieri* in order to arrive quickly at crime scenes and report on them for their local newspaper.
No violation of Article 10

Ricci v. Italy
08.10.2013
The case concerned the conviction and sentencing of the presenter/producer of a satirical television programme for disclosing confidential images that had been recorded for the internal use of a public television station (the RAI).
Violation of Article 10

Peruzzi v. Italy
30.06.2015
The case concerned the criminal conviction of Mr Peruzzi, a lawyer, for having defamed an investigating judge (Judge X) in the context of proceedings regarding the division of an estate in which he had been acting for two clients.
No violation of Article 10

Protection of property (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Valle Pierimpiè Società Agricola S.p.a v. Italy
23.09.2014
The case concerned a declaration to the effect that a part of the Venice lagoon known as Valle Pierimpiè, which the applicant company had purchased and had

been using for fish farming, belonged to the public maritime domain.

Messana v. Italy

09.02.2017

The case concerned the deprivation of the property of landowners via indirect expropriation following the occupation of the land by the municipal authorities, with a view to building low-rent housing (HLM).

Education
(Article 2 of Protocol No. 1)

G.L. v. Italy (no. 59751/15)

10.09.2020

The case concerned the inability for a young girl suffering from nonverbal autism (G.L.) to receive specialised learning support during her first two years of primary education (between 2010 and 2012) even though the support was provided for by law. The Government relied, in particular, on a lack of financial resources.

Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 2 of Protocol No. 1

Tarantino and Others v. Italy

02.04.2013

The case concerned eight students' complaints about the restrictions imposed on them by Italian legislation aimed at limiting access to universities, following their unsuccessful attempts to obtain a place in the faculties of medicine and dentistry.

No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1

For the first time the Court had to assess the compatibility with the right to education in the tertiary sector of the operation of a numerus clausus (the maximum number of candidates allowed to enter a university) coupled with an entrance examination.

Right to free elections
(Article 3 of Protocol No. 1)

Miniscalco v. Italy

17.06.2021

The applicant (Marcello Miniscalco) complained that he had been barred from standing as a candidate in the 2013 regional elections on account of a previous conviction for abuse of authority, which had become final in 2011. This disqualification arose from the entry into force, in January 2013, of Legislative Decree no. 235/2012.

Complaint under Article 7 (no punishment without law) inadmissible

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

Inadmissible application

Galan v. Italy

17.06.2021

The case concerned the applicant's forfeiture of his electoral seat as a member of parliament on account of a finding by Parliament that there was a ground of ineligibility following a conviction for corruption.

Application declared inadmissible.

Freedom of movement
(Article 2 of Protocol No. 4)

Battista v. Italy

02.12.2014

The case concerned the fact that it was impossible for Mr Battista to obtain a passport or an identity card valid for travel abroad on account of his failure to pay maintenance for his children.

Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4

Inadmissible application

Torresi v. Italy

16.01.2020

The case concerned the fact that the applicant was unable to obtain a passport for over six months because of his failure to make the maintenance payments which he owed.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

"Dublin Regulation"[3]

Mohammed Hussein v. the Netherlands and Italy

02.04.2013

[3] The "Dublin" system serves to determine which European Union (EU) Member State is responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national.
The Dublin Regulation establishes the principle that only one Member State is responsible for examining an asylum application. The objective is to avoid asylum seekers from being sent from one country to another, and also to prevent abuse of the system by the submission of several applications for asylum by one person.

The case concerned a Somali asylum seeker who claimed in particular that she and her two young children would be subjected to ill-treatment if transferred from the Netherlands to Italy under the Dublin Regulation.
Application declared inadmissibile as manifestly ill-founded.
The Court found in particular that, if returned to Italy, the future prospects of Ms Mohammed Hussein and her two children did not disclose a sufficiently real and imminent risk of hardship severe enough to fall within the scope of Article 3.

Sharifi and Others v. Italy and Greece
21.10.2014
The case concerned 32 Afghan nationals, two Sudanese nationals and one Eritrean national, who alleged, in particular that they had entered Italy illegally from Greece and been returned to that country immediately, with the fear of subsequent deportation to their respective countries of origin, where they faced the risk of death, torture or inhuman or degrading treatment.
The Court held, **concerning four of the applicants, Reza Karimi, Yasir Zaidi, Mozamil Azimi and Najeeb Heideri (also known as Nagib Haidari)**, who had maintained regular contact with their lawyer in the proceedings before the Court, that there had been:
a violation by Greece of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) combined with Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or regarding treatment) on account of the lack of access to the asylum procedure for the above-named applicants and the risk of deportation to Afghanistan, where they were likely to be subjected to ill-treatment
a violation by Italy of Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens)
a violation by Italy of Article 3, as the Italian authorities, by returning these applicants to Greece had exposed them to the risks arising from the shortcomings in that country's asylum procedure;
a violation by Italy of Article 13 combined with Article 3 of the Convention and Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 on account of the lack of access to the asylum procedure or to any other remedy in the port of Ancona

See factsheet "Dublin cases".

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Ada Rossi and Others v. Italy
22.12.2008
Authorisation to discontinue artificial nutrition and hydration of a person in a persistent vegetative state.
Applications declared inadmissible as the applicants could not claim to be "victims" of the alleged violations

Sommer v. Italy
23.03.2010
Belated opening of proceedings against a former SS officer, convicted for killing civilians during the Second World War. Difficulty of collecting evidence in his favour 60 years after the events.
Application declared inadmissible: incompatible *ratione temporis* and *ratione materiae* and manifestly ill-founded

Achille Occhetto v. Italy
12.11.2013
The application concerned the quashing by the Consiglio di Stato of a decision by the Italian Electoral Commission in 2006 announcing Mr Occhetto's election to the European Parliament. The applicant alleged, in particular, a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections).
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

Riina v. Italy
11.03.2014
The application concerned the constant monitoring of Mr Riina in prison by means of a video surveillance system.
Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies

X and Y v. Italy
16.09.2014
Under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, both applicants complain that their embryos have been wrongly implanted in another woman's uterus due to a medical mistake.
Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies

Stella v. Italy and 10 other applications and Rexhepi v. Italy and seven other applications

25.09.2014

The applications concerned the issue of prison overcrowding in Italy following the application of the pilot judgment procedure in Torreggiani and Others v. Italy, delivered by the Court on 8 January 2013.

Applications declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies

Sciabica v. Italy and Germany

21.10.2014

The applicant was convicted in Germany of intentional homicide and was subsequently transferred to Italy.

Complaint against Italy declared inadmissible as the application was lodged outside the six-month time-limit

Complaint against Germany declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

Viviani and Others v. Italy

24.03.2015

The case concerned the risks attached to a potential eruption of Vesuvius and the measures taken by the authorities to combat those risks.

Application declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies

Smaltini v. Italy

16.04.2015

The case concerned Ms Smaltini's allegations of a causal link between the polluting emissions from the Ilva factory located near her home and the leukaemia that led to her death.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

Mauriello v. Italy

06.10.2016

The case concerned the fact that the retirement pension contributions paid by Ms Mauriello during her ten-year career were not reimbursed, since she did not qualify for a civil servant's pension because she had not paid contributions for 15 years as required under domestic law.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

Cacciato v. Italy and Guiso and Consiglio v. Italy

08.02.2018

These applications concerned the expropriation of land by municipal authorities and in particular the tax of 20% that the applicants had to pay on the compensation they received. They complained under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

Applications declared inadmissible

Mediani v. Italy

01.10.2020

The case concerned the length of proceedings relating to a special appeal to the President of the Republic (ricorso straordinario al Presidente della Repubblica).

Application declared inadmissible

Noteworthy pending cases

Article 2
(right to life)

Alosa and Others v. Italy and Germany

Case communicated to the Government on 3 November 2019

The case concerns the lack of enforcement of a conviction for homicide.

Following an accident at a German-owned plant in Italy, the Italian courts found the company's management guilty of involuntary manslaughter. Two of the executives, who are German nationals (Mr G.P. and Mr H.E.), were sentenced to six and nine years of detention respectively. The Italian authorities located them in Germany and issued a European arrest warrant.

According to the applicants, Germany refused to hand Mr G.P. and Mr H.E over to the Italian authorities, but agreed to enforce the sentence passed by Italy; however, that enforcement has still not taken place. According to the applicants, Italy was 10 months late in sending information requested by the German courts following their refusal to execute the European warrant arrest. Furthermore, the applicants allege that the Italian authorities did not actively seek a solution to the problem of the lack of enforcement, whether by using political or diplomatic means, or by using legal measures, in

particular infringement proceedings against Germany at the Court of Justice of the European Union.
Relying on Article 2 of the Convention, the applicants complain of the Italian and German authorities' omissions and delays in enforcing the sentence. The applicants also complain of a violation of Article 13 of the Convention as they have not had access to a court or an effective remedy to challenge the delays and omissions in the case.

Article 2, Article 3, Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 10 (right to information), and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Di Caprio and Others v. Italy (no. 39742/14)

Case communicated to the Government on 5 February 2019
The case concerns the depositing of dangerous waste on the land known as the Terra dei Fuochi. The applicants are associations and individuals.
The polluting of the land in question, in the region around Naples and which is known as the "Terra dei Fuochi phenomenon", has been caused by the inappropriate depositing of waste which is legal in formal terms, illegal waste, fly-tipping and other types of pollution. Furthermore, the burying of waste often affects the groundwater, which causes drinking water pollution and exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and dioxin.
The applicants have complained under various Articles of the Convention.

Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and/or degrading treatment)

McCallum v. Italy (no. 20863/21)

Case communicated to the Government on 28 May 2021
The case concerns the applicant's extradition to the United States of America, where she is wanted as a suspect in the death of her then husband and the burning of his corpse.
Relying on Article 3, the applicant complains that if extradited to the United States, she faces a real risk of life imprisonment without parole.

Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and/or degrading treatment) and 5 (right to liberty and security)

Cioffi v. Italy (no. 17710/15)

Case communicated au gouvernement le 21 janvier 2016
This case concerns the treatment of the applicant after a clash between protesters and the police during the Global Forum on Reinventing Government in Naples in March 2001. Mr Cioffi alleges that he was ill-treated while he was detained at Virgilio Raniero police station.
Relying on Articles 3 and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention, the applicant complains, among other things, that the people responsible for his ill-treatment were prosecuted for offences which were barred as time-limited during the criminal proceedings, and that Italian criminal law as a whole does not guarantee adequate punishment for acts of that type. The applicant also complains of the incompatibility of his detention with Article 5 of the Convention.

Articles 3 and 7 (no punishment without law)

Dell'Utri v. Italy (no. 3800/15)

Case communicated to the Government on 16 November 2017
The application concerns, *inter alia*, the question of: (1) whether at the time the applicant was charged, domestic law provided a sufficiently clear and foreseeable definition of the offence of external participation in a mafia-type association (*concorso esterno in associazione di stampo Mafioso*) provided for by Article 416bis of the Criminal Code; (2) whether the criminal procedure was fair; (3) whether the principle of *ne bis in idem* was respected; and (4) whether keeping the applicant in detention is compatible with the state of his health.

Articles 3 and 8
(right to family life)

Darboe and Camara v. Italy
(no. 5797/17)
Sadio v. Italy (no. 3571/17), Jahid and Others v. Italy (no. 3610/17), and Fofana v. Italy (no. 3963/17)

Cases communicated to the parties in February 2017

The applicants in these cases, with the exception of Mr Sadio, who is of full age, are unaccompanied minors who have sought asylum. They were all accommodated in the Cona (Venice) reception centre for asylum-seekers, which is intended solely for adults.

In the case of *Darboe and Camara v. Italy,* the applicants complain that they were placed in this facility for adults although they had stated that they were minors. They allege that the procedure for determining their age was conducted in breach of national and international law.

The applicants allege that the Cona reception centre, which has a capacity of approximately 500, was home to around 1,400 people at the relevant time. The dormitory measured 360 sq. m. and accommodated 250 people. Owing to the overcrowding, the communal areas were taken up with beds. The number of toilets was inadequate for the number of people; among other things, the occupants had to form long queues outside, even in winter, in order to have a shower. There was no supervision of the distribution of food, which was frequently insufficient to meet the demand. In addition, the space set aside for eating meals was completely taken up by the serving staff.

The applicants further claim that the centre was not supervised by law-enforcement officials, and that knives and drugs were in circulation. They also allege instances of prostitution.

Relying on Article 3 of the Convention (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), Mr Sadio complains of being exposed to inhuman and degrading treatment on account of the living conditions in the Cona reception centre.

Under Article 3 of the Convention, the applicants who are minors allege that they were subjected to inhuman and degrading treatment on account of their placement in the Cona centre until 15 January 2016.

Lastly, from the standpoint of Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention, the applicant minors complain that the competent authorities failed to take any protective measures in view of their status as unaccompanied minors.

In the case of *Sadio v. Italy and two other applications*, the applicants lodged a request with the Court in January 2017 asking it to apply Rule 39 of the Rules of Court in order to indicate to the Italian Government that the applicants should be transferred to a reception facility for unaccompanied minors. The Court decided to adjourn examination of the Rule 39 request pending the receipt of information from the Italian Government. In February 2017 the Court found, with regard to the applicants who were minors, that the request for interim measures had become devoid of purpose as they had been transferred to centres for unaccompanied minors. In the case of Mr Sadio, it decided not to apply the interim measure requested.

In the case of *Darboe and Camara v. Italy*, the applicants requested the Court to apply Rule 39 of the Rules of Court with a view to their transfer to a reception facility suitable for minors. The same month, the Court granted the applicants' request and indicated to the Government that the applicants should be transferred to appropriate facilities affording living conditions compatible with the standards of domestic and international law regarding the protection of unaccompanied minors.

In both these cases the Court decided, under Rule 41 of the Rules of Court, to give the applications priority treatment.

See also the case of *Dansu and Others v. Italy* (no. 16030/17), which was communicated to the parties in March 2017.

ECHR Press Unit Contact:
+ 33 (0)3 90 21 42 08