



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

FOURTH SECTION

**CASE OF ANAMARIA-LOREDANA ORĂȘANU AND OTHERS
v. ROMANIA**

(Application no. 43629/13 and 74 other applications)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

7 November 2017

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

In the case of Anamaria-Loredana Orășanu and Others v. Romania,
The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting as a
Committee composed of:

Vincent A. De Gaetano, *President*,

Georges Ravarani,

Marko Bošnjak, *judges*,

and Andrea Tamietti, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 17 October 2017,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in 75 applications against Romania lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by Romanian nationals. The applicants’ personal details and the dates of their respective applications are set out in the appended tables.

2. The applicants were represented by Mr I. Matei, a lawyer practising in Bucharest. The Romanian Government (“the Government”) were represented by their Agent, Mrs C. Brumar, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

3. Between 14 February and 10 October 2014 and 10 February and 10 July 2015 the complaints concerning the effectiveness of the criminal investigation, the length of the criminal proceedings and the lack of an effective domestic remedy were communicated to the Government and the remainder of the applications was declared inadmissible pursuant to Rule 54 § 3 of the Rules of Court.

4. As Iulia Antoanella Motoc, the judge elected in respect of Romania, withdrew from sitting in the case (Rule 28 § 3 of the Rules of Court), the President decided to appoint Krzysztof Wojtyczek as an *ad hoc* judge (Rule 29 § 2 of the Rules of Court).

THE FACTS

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE

5. The facts of the case, as submitted by the applicants, are similar to those in *Association “21 December 1989” and Others v. Romania* (nos. 33810/07 and 18817/08, §§ 12-41, 24 May 2011).

6. Between 21 and 27 December 1989 many people including the applicants and/or their close relatives involved in this case took part in the anti-communist demonstrations in Bucharest, Timișoara, Brașov, Reșița and Craiova which led to the fall of the communist regime. They were injured or killed by gunfire during the demonstrations.

7. In 1990 following the overthrow of the communist regime, the military prosecutor's office opened investigations into the armed crackdown on the demonstrations. The main criminal investigation into the use of violence, particularly against civilian demonstrators, during the events of December 1989 in Bucharest and other cities has been contained in file no. 97/P/1990 (current number 11/P/2014).

8. In a number of cases concerning events in Bucharest and Craiova, the prosecutor decided not to initiate a criminal investigation or to discontinue the proceedings. Those decisions were taken between 1990 and 2007. It results from the documents submitted by the parties that, after the adoption of those decisions, the prosecutor continued to examine the circumstances of these cases in the main criminal investigation – object of file no. 97/P/1990 (current number 11/P/2014).

9. To date, the main criminal investigation appears to be still ongoing. The most important procedural steps were summarised in *Association "21 December 1989" and Others* (cited above, §§ 12-41) and *Alecu and Others v. Romania*, nos. 56838/08 and 80 others, §§ 7-13, 27 January 2015. Subsequent developments are as follows.

10. Following the entry into force of the new Code of Criminal Procedure in February 2014, jurisdiction over the case was relinquished in favour of the military prosecutor's office.

11. On 14 October 2015 the prosecutor's office closed the investigation, finding that the applicants' complaints were partly statute-barred, partly subject to an amnesty and partly ill-founded. It also found that some of the facts which had been investigated could not be classified as criminal offences and that some of them were *res judicata*. The parties have not submitted any information on whether there was an appeal against that decision (see *Ecaterina Mirea and Others v. Romania*, nos. 43626/13 and 69 others, § 15, 12 April 2016). However, from the information available on the prosecutor's office website, the investigation is still ongoing and must have therefore been reopened.

II. RELEVANT DOMESTIC LAW

12. The legal provisions in relation to the criminal proceedings in connection with the events of December 1989 and concerning the statutory limitation of criminal liability are detailed in *Association "21 December 1989" and Others* (cited above, §§ 95-100), and

Mocanu and Others v. Romania [GC], nos. 10865/09, 45886/07 and 32431/08, §§ 193-196, ECHR 2014 (extracts).

13. The procedure for making a court challenge to a prosecutor's decision not to initiate a criminal investigation or to discontinue one came into force on 1 July 2003 (see *Rupa v. Romania* (dec.), no. 58478/00, §§ 88–89, 14 December 2004, and *Dumitru Popescu v. Romania* (no. 1), no. 49234/99, §§ 43-45 and 53, 26 April 2007).

14. The status of military prosecutors is regulated by Law no. 303/2004 on the status of judges and prosecutors, and by Law no. 304/2004 on the organisation of the judicial system, both amended by Law no. 255/2013 on the enactment of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which also amended regulatory acts relating to provisions for criminal offences (see *Elena Apostol and Others v. Romania*, no. 24093/14 and 16 other cases, §§ 18-21, 23 February 2016, and *Ecaterina Mirea and Others v. Romania*, cited above, §§ 17-20).

THE LAW

I. THE JOINDER OF THE CASES

15. The Court notes that the present applications concern the same factual circumstances and raise similar legal issues. Consequently, it considers it appropriate to order their joinder, in accordance with Rule 42 § 1 of the Rules of Court.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 2 OF THE CONVENTION

16. The applicants complained of the lack of an effective, impartial and thorough investigation carried out within a reasonable time and capable of leading to the identification and punishment of those responsible for the violent crackdown on the demonstrations of December 1989 in Bucharest, Timișoara, Brașov, Reșița and Craiova, when they had been shot or their close relatives had been killed by gunfire. They relied on Article 2 of the Convention.

17. Having regard to the facts, the Court considers that the complaints concerning the injuring of the applicants or their relatives' death by gunfire must be examined under the procedural limb of Article 2 of the Convention (see *Șandru and Others v. Romania*, no. 22465/03, §§ 51-54, 8 December 2009, and *Dobre and Others v. Romania*, no. 34160/09, §§ 37-39, 17 March 2015). In so far as relevant, this provision reads as follows:

Article 2

“1. Everyone’s right to life shall be protected by law. No one shall be deprived of his life intentionally ...”

A. Admissibility

18. The Government made preliminary objections in relation to some of the applications (see Appendix A).

1. The Government’s objection of incompatibility ratione temporis

19. The Government argued that the events in question and the opening of the investigations had occurred prior to the ratification of the Convention by Romania on 20 June 1994 and that in several applications the criminal investigation had been terminated by the prosecutor before that date.

20. The applicants argued that the Court should examine the entire period owing to the investigators’ failure to conduct an investigation with due diligence.

21. The Court has already defined its jurisdiction *ratione temporis* in similar cases (see *Association “21 December 1989” and Others v. Romania*, nos. 33810/07 and 18817/08, §§ 114-118, 24 May 2011; and *Mocanu and Others v. Romania* [GC], nos. 10865/09 and 2 others, §§ 207–211, ECHR 2014 (extracts)), concluding that it was competent to examine complaints relating to the ineffectiveness of the criminal investigations into the events of December 1989 when the majority of the proceedings and the most important procedural measures were carried out after the Convention’s entry into force in respect of Romania.

22. Having examined all the material submitted to it, the Court considers that the Government have not put forward any fact or argument capable of persuading it to reach a different conclusion in the present case and it dismisses the objection.

2. The Government’s objection that some applications were lodged out of time

23. The Government submitted that the applications specifically listed in Appendix A were outside the six-month time-limit. They calculated the period as running from the date of prosecutors’ decisions taken between 1990 and 2007 not to initiate criminal investigations or to discontinue proceedings (see paragraph 8 above). Depending on the circumstances of the case, they also calculated the period as running from the date of the communication of the prosecutors’ decisions.

24. The applicants contested the Government’s submissions by referring to the shortcomings of the main criminal investigation, which was still ongoing.

25. The Court notes that where an applicant avails himself of an apparently existing remedy and only subsequently becomes aware of circumstances which render the remedy ineffective, it may be appropriate for the purposes of Article 35 § 1 to take the start of the six-month period from the date when the applicant first became or ought to have become aware of those circumstances (see *Mocanu and Others*, cited above, § 260).

26. In the present case, the Court notes that, although due notification is a pre-requisite set by law, no evidence in the file indicates that the prosecutors' decisions were duly communicated to the applicants or that the applicants who received them could have challenged them under the law in force at the time (see paragraph 13 above). Moreover, after the adoption of these decisions, the prosecutor pursued the investigation into the circumstances concerning the applicants and/or their close relatives in the main criminal investigation into the events of December 1989 which appears to be still ongoing (see paragraph 11 *in fine* above).

27. Having regard to the developments in the investigation, its scope and its complexity, as well as the exceptional circumstances at issue, the Court considers that the applicants could have legitimately believed that the investigation also concerned their particular situation. The applicants acted reasonably in awaiting an outcome as long as there was a realistic possibility that investigative measures were moving forward (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Mocanu and Others*, cited above, §§ 275 and 280, and *Melnichuk and Others v. Romania*, nos. 35279/10 and 34782/10, § 89, 5 May 2015).

28. Under these circumstances, the Court cannot conclude that, by introducing their applications on the dates indicated in appendix A, the applicant failed to comply with the six-month time-limit set forth in Article 35 § 1 of the Convention. It therefore rejects the Government's preliminary objection.

3. The Government's objection of abuse of right of individual application

29. The Government submitted that the applications specified in Appendix A should be rejected as being an abuse of the right of individual application, within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 of the Convention, because the applicants had failed to inform the Court that there had been decisions relating to the events in which their close relatives had died (see paragraph 8 above).

30. The Court reiterates that an application may be rejected as an abuse of the right of individual application under Article 35 § 3 of the Convention if, among other reasons, it was knowingly based on untrue facts (see *Varbanov v. Bulgaria*, no. 31365/96, § 36, ECHR 2000-X; *Rehak v. Czech Republic* (dec.), no. 67208/01, 18 May 2004; *Popov v. Moldova (no. 1)*, no. 74153/01, § 48, 18 January 2005; and

Kerechashvili v. Georgia (dec.), no. 5667/02, 2 May 2006). Incomplete and therefore misleading information may also amount to an abuse of the right of application, especially if the information concerns the very core of the case and no sufficient explanation is given for the failure to disclose that information (see *Hüttner v. Germany* (dec.), no. 23130/04, 9 June 2006; *Poznanski and Others v. Germany* (dec.), no. 25101/05, 3 July 2007; *Predescu v. Romania*, no. 21447/03, §§ 25-26, 2 December 2008; and *Kowal v. Poland* (dec.), no. 2912/11, 18 September 2012).

31. In the present case, the Government's argument does not actually concern "untrue facts" allegedly adduced by the applicants. The Court notes that whilst the applicants did not, indeed, inform the Court about all the decisions concerning the events in which their close relatives had died, the main criminal investigation opened in respect of the events of December 1989 appears to be still ongoing (see paragraph 11 *in fine* above). It follows that the decisions mentioned by the Government cannot be regarded as "concerning the very core of the case" in the light of Article 35 § 3 of the Convention.

32. The preliminary objection is therefore dismissed.

4. *The Government's objection of lack of victim status*

33. The Government argued that the applicants specified in Appendix A lacked victim status. This was because they had joined the proceedings at a later stage; or, because they had never been parties in the main criminal investigation since they had not expressed their intention to be included in it or their cases had been finalised by a prosecutor's decision.

34. The applicants argued that they had victim status given the absence of an effective investigation in the present case.

35. The Court reiterates that a decision or measure favourable to the applicants is not in principle sufficient to deprive them of their status as a "victim" unless the national authorities have acknowledged, either expressly or in substance, and then afforded redress for, the breach of the Convention (see, for example, *Scordino v. Italy (no. 1)* [GC], no. 36813/97, § 180, ECHR 2006-V).

36. Turning to the present case, the Court notes that there is no evidence indicating an acknowledgement of the violation claimed by the applicants – ineffectiveness of the criminal investigation – or a redress afforded to them by the domestic authorities in this respect.

37. Moreover, as the investigation had been opened by the authorities of their own motion (see paragraph 7 above), a request of the applicants to join the main investigation later in the proceedings or the absence of a separate complaint, according to the circumstances of each case, could have no effect on the applicants' standing (see *Alecu and Others v. Romania*, nos. 56838/08 and 80 others, § 31, 27 January 2015, and

Ecaterina Mirea and Others v. Romania, nos. 43626/13 and 69 others, §§ 28-30, 12 April 2016).

38. The sum of the above considerations leads the Court to reject the Government's preliminary objection.

5. *The Government's objection of non-exhaustion of domestic remedies*

39. The Government argued that some of the applicants had not exhausted domestic remedies as they had not challenged the prosecutors' decisions not to initiate a criminal investigation or to discontinue proceedings.

40. The applicants contested that argument by saying that those decisions had not been communicated to them. Further, they criticised the passivity of the authorities during the criminal investigation.

41. The Court notes that the question is whether the applicants should have challenged the prosecutors' decision in their cases in order to join the main criminal investigation, as contended by the Government, although they maintained – and the Government did not contest that argument in all cases – that they had not been informed of the outcome of the investigation or the reasons why they had not been joined to the main criminal investigation.

42. The Court emphasises that the application of the rule of exhaustion of domestic remedies must make due allowance for the fact that it is being applied in the context of machinery for the protection of human rights that the Contracting States have agreed to set up. Accordingly, it has recognised that Article 35 § 1 must be applied with some degree of flexibility and without excessive formalism. It has further recognised that the rule of exhaustion is neither absolute nor capable of being applied automatically; for the purposes of reviewing whether it has been observed, it is essential to have regard to the circumstances of the individual case. This means, in particular, that the Court must take realistic account not only of the existence of formal remedies in the legal system of the Contracting State concerned but also of the general context in which they operate. It must then examine whether, in all the circumstances of the case, the applicant did everything that could reasonably be expected of him or her to exhaust domestic remedies (see *İlhan v. Turkey* [GC], no. 22277/93, § 59, ECHR 2000-VII, with further references).

43. The Court further recalls that cases regarding the authorities' obligation to provide an effective investigation into the death caused by, *inter alios*, the security forces of the State might imply situations where the initiative must rest on the State for the practical reason that the victim is deceased and the circumstances of the death may be largely confined within the knowledge of State officials (*İlhan*, cited above, § 91). The authorities must act of their own motion once the matter has come to their attention. They cannot leave it to the initiative of the next-of-kin either to lodge a formal complaint or to take responsibility for the conduct of any

investigative procedures (*McKerr v. the United Kingdom*, no. 28883/95, § 111, ECHR 2001-III).

44. In addition, the Court has also found in respect of the main criminal investigation that the domestic authorities had failed to comply with their obligation to involve victims' close relatives in the procedure (see *Alecu and Others*, cited above, § 39). From this perspective, the Court is not persuaded that the criminal-law remedies nominally indicated by the Government as available to the applicants would have been capable of altering to any significant extent the course of the investigation that was made (see *Alecu and Others*, cited above, § 41; see also, *mutatis mutandis*, *Tanrikulu v. Turkey* [GC], no. 23763/94, § 110, ECHR 1999-IV). Moreover, the Court notes that the criminal investigation is still ongoing after 27 years, and that the applicants' complaints focus, *inter alia*, on the duration, in their view excessive, of that investigation. The Government have not alleged, let alone shown, that any of the internal remedies could have brought to a substantial acceleration of the domestic proceedings.

45. In the light of the above considerations, the Court dismisses the Government's objection of non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

6. Other reasons for inadmissibility

46. The Court notes that the complaints raised in the applications are not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention. It further notes that they are not inadmissible on any other grounds. They must therefore be declared admissible.

B. Merits

47. The Government made reference to the facts and progress of the criminal investigation, as exposed in their observations submitted in *Association "21 December 1989" and Others* (cited above) and *Alecu and Others* (cited above). In addition, they argued that the military prosecutors who had carried out the criminal investigation had been independent and impartial in their judicial decisions.

48. The Court reiterates that an investigation must be effective in the sense that it is capable of leading to a determination of the circumstances of fact and to the identification and punishment of those responsible. This is not an obligation of result, but of means (see *Kelly and Others v. the United Kingdom*, no. 30054/96, § 96, 4 May 2001, and *Anguelova v. Bulgaria*, no. 38361/97, § 139, ECHR 2002-IV). The State's obligation under Article 2 of the Convention will not be satisfied if the protection afforded by domestic law exists only in theory: above all, it must also operate effectively in practice and that requires a prompt examination of the case without unnecessary delays. Any deficiency in the investigation which undermines its ability to establish the cause of death or the person

responsible will risk falling foul of this standard (see *Šilih v. Slovenia* [GC], no. 71463/01, § 195, 9 April 2009; *Varnava and Others v. Turkey* [GC], nos. 16064/90, 16065/90, 16066/90, 16068/90, 16069/90, 16070/90, 16071/90, 16072/90 and 16073/90, § 191, ECHR 2009; and *Association “21 December 1989” and Others*, cited above, § 134).

49. In the present case, the Court notes that in 1990 a criminal investigation was opened by the authorities of their own motion with regard to the armed suppression of the anti-communist demonstrations of December 1989 in Bucharest, Timișoara, Brașov, Reșița and Craiova, with a view to establishing the circumstances of the death or injury of a large number of people.

50. In view of its jurisdiction *ratione temporis*, the Court can only take into consideration the period after 20 June 1994, when the Convention entered into force in respect of Romania (see paragraph 21 above).

51. In 1994 the case was still in the hands of the military prosecutor’s office. In the present case, the investigation carried out by the military prosecutors does not, of itself, raise questions under the procedural limb of Article 2; however, regard must be had as to exactly how the investigation was carried out, and whether it can be qualified as effective within the meaning of Article 2 of the Convention (see *Ecaterina Mirea and Others*, cited above, §§ 36-37).

52. The Court has already examined the domestic authorities’ conduct of the investigation opened into the violent suppression of the demonstrations during the events of December 1989 and concluded that Article 2 of the Convention had been violated under its procedural limb (see *Association “21 December 1989” and Others*, cited above, §§ 133-145 and §§ 152-154, and *Alecu and Others*, cited above, § 39; see also *Elena Apostol and Others*, cited above, and *Ecaterina Mirea and Others*, cited above). The Court notably found the main investigation to be procedurally defective, notably by reason of its excessive length and long periods of inactivity, as well as because of the lack of involvement of the victims or their relatives, respectively, in the proceedings and of the lack of information to the public about the progress of the inquiry.

53. Noting that similar shortcomings are discernible in the present case, the Court sees no reason to depart from its previous findings and holds that there has been a violation of Article 2 of the Convention under its procedural limb.

III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLES 6 AND 13 OF THE CONVENTION

54. All applicants complained of the length of the criminal proceedings into the events of December 1989. They also complained that they did not have at their disposal an effective remedy in respect of the determination of

their claims. They relied in that connection on Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the Convention.

55. Having regard to the finding relating to Article 2 (see paragraph 53 above), the Court considers that it is not necessary to examine the admissibility and merits of the complaints under Article 6 § 1 and/or Article 13 of the Convention (see, among other authorities, *Association "21 December 1989" and Others*, cited above, § 181).

IV. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

56. 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

57. The applicants claimed amounts between 100,000 euros (EUR) and 300,000 euros (EUR) in respect of pecuniary damage and the same range of amounts in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

58. The Government contested those claims as excessive.

59. The Court considers on the one hand that the applicants have failed to demonstrate the existence of a causal link between the violation found and the pecuniary damage alleged and it therefore rejects those claims. On the other hand, the Court considers that the violation of the procedural limb of Article 2 has caused the applicants substantial non-pecuniary damage, such as distress and frustration. Ruling on an equitable basis, it awards them the amounts set out in Appendix B, plus any tax that may be chargeable.

B. Costs and expenses

60. The applicants did not submit claims for costs and expenses. The Court is therefore not called to make an award in this respect.

C. Default interest

61. 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* the applications in respect of the complaints under Article 2 of the Convention admissible;
3. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 2 of the Convention under its procedural limb;
4. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the admissibility and the merits of the complaints under Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the Convention;
5. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, within three months, the amounts set out in Appendix B, plus any tax that may be chargeable, in respect of non-pecuniary damage, 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' claim for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 7 November 2017, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Andrea Tamietti
Deputy Registrar

Vincent A. De Gaetano
President

APPENDIX A

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
1.	43629/13 28/06/2013	Anamaria-Loredana ORĂȘANU 30/10/1988 Craiova	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
2.	43637/13 28/06/2013	Veronica ORĂȘANU 10/07/1968 Craiova	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
3.	43766/13 28/06/2013	Ecaterina AMBRUS 21/06/1937 Craiova	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
4.	43870/13 28/06/2013	Virgil-Ștefan ORĂȘANU 27/12/1989 Craiova	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
5.	43871/13 28/06/2013	Lucian Daniel ORĂȘANU 07/11/1987 London, United Kingdom	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
6.	43937/13 28/06/2013	Maria DRAGU 11/03/1968 Craiova	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
7.	64626/13 08/10/2013	Dorina BUCUR 28/04/1961 Popești-Leordeni	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
8.	64637/13 08/10/2013	Florica ILIE 20/04/1958 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
9.	64642/13 08/10/2013	Alexandru-Georgian ILIE 24/09/1989 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
10.	64655/13 08/10/2013	Niculae IONESCU 02/04/1932 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
11.	64663/13 08/10/2013	Roxana-Adina TOPĂRCEANU 12/02/1983 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
12.	64667/13 08/10/2013	Doina IONESCU-POSEA 06/11/1984 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
13.	64674/13 08/10/2013	Monica-Mihaela BENI 03/07/1979 Villalbilla, Spain	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
14.	64697/13 08/10/2013	Marius BUTNARU 15/08/1970 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
15.	64701/13 08/10/2013	Zoica-Adriana BĂLĂLĂU 27/05/1955 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
16.	64702/13 08/10/2013	Maria BUTNARU 30/10/1944 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
17.	64704/13 08/10/2013	Constantina IONESCU 14/12/1938 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
18.	64709/13 08/10/2013	Andreea-Georgeta BĂLĂLĂU 21/09/1983 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
19.	64710/13 08/10/2013	Bogdan-Costin BĂLĂLĂU 02/12/1988 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
20.	64716/13 08/10/2013	Alexandru MICU 21/04/1987 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
21.	64720/13 08/10/2013	Floarea CREȘTEAZĂ 29/03/1936 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
22.	64733/13 08/10/2013	Onița OLARU 01/06/1956 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
23.	64738/13 08/10/2013	Camelia-Raluca OLARU 30/12/1983 Coslada, Spain	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
24.	64742/13 08/10/2013	Iuliana-Cristina CREȘTEAZĂ 14/10/1984 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
25.	64756/13 08/10/2013	Elena-Carmen RĂDUȚĂ 30/05/1987 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
26.	64757/13 08/10/2013	Maria MĂNICA 30/07/1956 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
27.	24092/14 21/03/2014	Cristian-Mihai APOSTOL 04/11/1971 Bucharest	Lack of victim status

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
28.	24094/14 21/03/2014	Vasile Marius APOSTOL 08/04/1974 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
29.	24095/14 21/03/2014	Marilena BEJINAR 20/09/1968 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
30.	24098/14 21/03/2014	Liviu BÂLC 03/06/1970 Sînanđrei, Timiș County	None
31.	24100/14 21/03/2014	Ion-Cătălin BOERESCU 05/10/1987 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
32.	24101/14 21/03/2014	Daniela BALDOVIN 16/03/1989 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
33.	24102/14 21/03/2014	Cristina-Antoaneta BĂLAȘA 18/03/1974 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
34.	24103/14 21/03/2014	Elisabeta BARBU 01/09/1933 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
35.	24105/14 21/03/2014	Ioan BEJINAR 25/07/1990 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
36.	24118/14 21/03/2014	Ionela-Gina DRULEA 04/11/1973 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
37.	24125/14 21/03/2014	Elena ION 05/02/1955 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
38.	24129/14 21/03/2014	Alexandru-Eduard-Ionuț IVAN 16/02/1988 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
39.	24130/14 21/03/2014	Andreea-Elena ION 27/07/1989 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
40.	24133/14 21/03/2014	Grigore-Cristian CÎRLOVA 04/02/1972 Bucharest	Out of six months/ Lack of victim status
41.	24136/14 21/03/2014	Georgeta-Cristina IVAN 17/06/1970 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
42.	24140/14 21/03/2014	Aisa-Anastasia CARP 20/08/1988 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
43.	24141/14 21/03/2014	Marius-Constantin ION 30/11/1973 Nuci, Ilfov County	Lack of victim status Abuse of right to individual application Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
44.	24146/14 21/03/2014	Dan FILIP-FÎNTÎNARU 01/05/1975 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
45.	24152/14 21/03/2014	Gabriel-Laurențiu GHEORGHE 19/12/1978 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
46.	24155/14 21/03/2014	Andreea JULEA 14/01/1989 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
47.	24156/14 21/03/2014	Valentin-Mirel GHEORGHE 28/06/1972 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
48.	24158/14 21/03/2014	Liliana JULEA 12/07/1987 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
49.	24165/14 21/03/2014	Victorița KOPICUC 28/03/1969 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
50.	24174/14 21/03/2014	Voica HARALAMBIE 01/05/1937 Bucharest	Lack of victim status

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
51.	24180/14 21/03/2014	George LACHE 30/04/1972 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
52.	24192/14 21/03/2014	Daniel-Adrian LAZĂR 02/03/1980 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
53.	24194/14 21/03/2014	Viorel-Marius LAZĂR 21/05/1977 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
54.	24196/14 21/03/2014	Ion LOVIN 16/06/1985 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
55.	24200/14 21/03/2014	Manuel-Virgil LOVIN 10/03/1983 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
56.	24223/14 21/03/2014	Mircea NEDELCIU 01/02/1949 Bucharest	Out of six months/Lack of victim status
57.	24227/14 21/03/2014	Emilia PAȘAN 28/06/1977 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
58.	24230/14 21/03/2014	Elena POPESCU 04/08/1954 Bucharest	Lack of victim status

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
59.	24236/14 21/03/2014	Mihai-Andrei POPESCU 04/10/1980 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
60.	24240/14 21/03/2014	Ana-Mădălina POPESCU 28/06/1988 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
61.	24242/14 21/03/2014	Ioana-Valentina POSTELNICU (married ZAHARIA) 03/09/1984 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
62.	24245/14 21/03/2014	Georgiana-Mădălina POSTELNICU 01/09/1983 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
63.	24247/14 21/03/2014	Viorica STOICA 31/07/1931 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
64.	24248/14 21/03/2014	Cristinela POSTELNICU 29/03/1965 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
65.	24250/14 21/03/2014	Oana-Andreea ȘTEFĂNESCU 08/12/1975 Bucharest	Lack of victim status

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
66.	24251/14 21/03/2014	Alexandra Daniela ROȘCA 07/12/1981 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
67.	24254/14 21/03/2014	Marius-Cristian TEODORASC 15/08/1990 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
68.	24258/14 21/03/2014	Elena Iulia UDUP 23/08/1980 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
69.	24259/14 21/03/2014	Florica ROȘCA 24/08/1961 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
70.	24260/14 21/03/2014	Irina-Maria VITAN 04/03/1975 Bucharest	Lack of victim status
71.	24263/14 21/03/2014	Maria-Mădălina ROȘCA 26/07/1988 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
72.	24266/14 21/03/2014	Liviu-Tit STOICA 17/12/1928 Bucharest	Lack of victim status Out of six months Non-exhaustion of domestic remedies Incompatibility <i>ratione temporis</i>
73.	45723/14 30/05/2014	Elena BĂNCILĂ 14/08/1944 Bucharest	None

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Government's preliminary objections
74.	45726/14 30/05/2014	Cristian BÎRBORĂ 02/04/1984 Reșița	Lack of victim status
75.	45728/14 30/05/2014	Matilda BÎRBORĂ 29/07/1940 Crivina	Lack of victim status

APPENDIX B

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
1.	43629/13 28/06/2013 43637/13 28/06/2013 43870/13 28/06/2013	Anamaria-Loredana ORĂȘANU 30/10/1988 Craiova Veronica ORĂȘANU 10/07/1968 Craiova Virgil-Ștefan ORĂȘANU 27/12/1989 Craiova	Daughter, widow and son of a victim killed by gunshots in Craiova on 26/27 December 1989. The mother, pregnant with the third applicant, born on the same night with severe disability, was also injured by gunshots on the same circumstances. Parties in domestic file no.11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
2.	43871/13 28/06/2013	Lucian Daniel ORĂȘANU 07/11/1987 London, United Kingdom	Son of a victim killed by gunshots in Craiova on 26/27 December 1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
3.	43766/13 28/06/2013	Ecaterina AMBRUS 21/06/1937 Craiova	Mother of a victim killed by gunshots in Craiova on 24 December 1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
4.	43937/13 28/06/2013	Maria DRAGU 11/03/1968 Craiova	Daughter of a victim shot in Craiova on 23 December 1989 and deceased on 24 December 1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
5.	64626/13 08/10/2013	Dorina BUCUR 28/04/1961 Popești-Leordeni	Widow of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 22 December 1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
6.	64637/13 08/10/2013 64642/13 08/10/2013	Florica ILIE 20/04/1958 Bucharest Alexandru-Georgian ILIE 24/09/1989 Bucharest	Widow and son of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 25.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
7.	64655/13 08/10/2013 64667/13 08/10/2013 64704/13 08/10/2013	Niculae IONESCU 02/04/1932 Bucharest Doina IONESCU-POSEA 06/11/1984 Bucharest Constantina IONESCU 14/12/1938 Bucharest	Father, daughter and mother of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
8.	64663/13 08/10/2013	Roxana-Adina TOPĂRCEANU 12/02/1983 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
9.	64674/13 08/10/2013	Monica-Mihaela BENI 03/07/1979 Villalbilla, Spain	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshots Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
10.	64697/13 08/10/2013 64702/13 08/10/2013	Marius BUTNARU 15/08/1970 Bucharest Maria BUTNARU 30/10/1944 Bucharest	Son and widow of a victim killed by gunshots Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).97/P/1990	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
11.	64701/13 08/10/2013 64709/13 08/10/2013 64710/13 08/10/2013	Zoica-Adriana BĂLĂLĂU 27/05/1955 Bucharest Andreea-Georgeta BĂLĂLĂU 21/09/1983 Bucharest Bogdan-Costin BĂLĂLĂU 02/12/1988 Bucharest	Widow, daughter and son of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
12.	64716/13 08/10/2013	Alexandru MICU 21/04/1987 Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 24.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
13.	64720/13 08/10/2013	Floarea CRESTEAZĂ 29/03/1936 Bucharest	Mother of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 25.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
14.	64733/13 08/10/2013	Onița OLARU 01/06/1956 Bucharest	Widow of a victim killed by gunshots Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
15.	64738/13 08/10/2013	Camelia-Raluca OLARU 30/12/1983 Coslada, Spain	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshots Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
16.	64742/13 08/10/2013	Iuliana-Cristina CRESTEAZĂ 14/10/1984 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 25.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
17.	64756/13 08/10/2013	Elena-Carmen RĂDUȚĂ 30/05/1987 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 22.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
18.	64757/13 08/10/2013	Maria MĂNICA 30/07/1956 Bucharest	Widow of a victim killed by gunshots in Bucharest on 22.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
19.	24092/14 21/03/2014	Cristian-Mihai APOSTOL 04/11/1971 Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 24.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
20.	24094/14 21/03/2014	Vasile Marius APOSTOL 08/04/1974 Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 24.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
21.	24095/14 21/03/2014 24105/14 21/03/2014	Marilena BEJINAR 20/09/1968 Bucharest Ioan BEJINAR 25/07/1990 Bucharest	Widow and son of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 24.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
22.	24098/14 21/03/2014	Liviu BĂLC 03/06/1970 Sinandrei, Timiș County	Injured by gunshot in Timișoara on 22.12.1989, with supporting medical evidence. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
23.	24100/14 21/03/2014	Ion-Cătălin BOERESCU 05/10/1987 Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 24.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
24.	24101/14 21/03/2014	Daniela BALDOVIN 16/03/1989 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 21.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
25.	24102/14 21/03/2014	Cristina-Antoaneta BĂLAȘA 18/03/1974 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
26.	24103/14 21/03/2014	Elisabeta BARBU 01/09/1933 Bucharest Deceased on 18/07/2014 – Heirs : - Petre POSTELNICU 27/12/1957 Amaru, Buzău County - Georgeta POPA 17/02/1962 Bucharest - Georgiana-Mădălina POSTELNICU 01/09/1983 Bucharest - Ioana-Valentina POSTELNICU (married ZAHARIA) 03/09/1984 Bucharest	Mother of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly to the heirs
27.	24118/14 21/03/2014	Ionela-Gina DRULEA 04/11/1973 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
28.	24125/14 21/03/2014 24130/14 21/03/2014 24141/14 21/03/2014	Elena ION 05/02/1955 Bucharest Andreea-Elena ION 27/07/1989 Bucharest Marius-Constantin ION 30/11/1973 Nuci, Ilfov County	Widow, daughter and son of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 21.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
29.	24129/14 21/03/2014	Alexandru-Eduard-Ionuț IVAN 16/02/1988 Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunshot in Brașov on 23.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
30.	24133/14 21/03/2014	Grigore-Cristian CÎRLOVA 04/02/1972 Bucharest	Injured by gunshot in Bucharest on 24.12.1989, with supporting medical evidence. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
31.	24136/14 21/03/2014	Georgeta-Cristina IVAN 17/06/1970 Bucharest	Widow of a victim killed by gunshot in Brașov on 23.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
32.	24140/14 21/03/2014 24247/14 21/03/2014 24266/14 21/03/2014	Aisa-Anastasia CARP 20/08/1988 Bucharest Viorica STOICA 31/07/1931 Bucharest Liviu-Tit STOICA 17/12/1928 Bucharest	Daughter and parents of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 22.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
33.	24146/14 21/03/2014	Dan FILIP-FÎNTÎNARU 01/05/1975 Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 24.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
34.	24152/14 21/03/2014	Gabriel-Laurențiu GHEORGHE 19/12/1978 Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
35.	24155/14 21/03/2014 24158/14 21/03/2014	Andreea JULEA 14/01/1989 Bucharest Liliana JULEA 12/07/1987 Bucharest	Daughters of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 25.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
36.	24156/14 21/03/2014	Valentin-Mirel GHEORGHE 28/06/1972 Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
37.	24165/14 21/03/2014	Victorița KOPICUC 28/03/1969 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 22.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
38.	24174/14 21/03/2014	Voica HARALAMBIE 01/05/1937 Bucharest	Mother of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 25 .12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
39.	24180/14 21/03/2014 24227/14 21/03/2014	George LACHE 30/04/1972 Bucharest Emilia PAȘAN 28/06/1977 Bucharest	Son and daughter of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
40.	24192/14 21/03/2014 24194/14 21/03/2014	Daniel-Adrian LAZĂR 02/03/1980 Bucharest Viorel-Marius LAZĂR 21/05/1977 Bucharest	Sons of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
41.	24196/14 21/03/2014 24200/14 21/03/2014	Ion LOVIN 16/06/1985 Bucharest Manuel-Virgil LOVIN 10/03/1983 Bucharest	Sons of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 24.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
42.	24223/14 21/03/2014	Mircea NEDELICIU 01/02/1949 Bucharest	Injured by gunshot in Bucharest on 23.12.1989, with supporting medical evidence. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
43.	24230/14 21/03/2014 24236/14 21/03/2014 24240/14 21/03/2014	Elena POPESCU 04/08/1954 Bucharest Mihai-Andrei POPESCU 04/10/1980 Bucharest Ana-Mădălina POPESCU 28/06/1988 Bucharest	Widow, son and daughter of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
44.	24242/14 21/03/2014 24245/14 21/03/2014 24248/14 21/03/2014	Ioana-Valentina POSTELNICU (married ZAHARIA) 03/09/1984 Bucharest Georgiana-Mădălina POSTELNICU 01/09/1983 Bucharest Cristinela POSTELNICU 29/03/1965 Bucharest	Daughters and widow of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
45.	24250/14 21/03/2014	Oana-Andreea ȘTEFĂNESCU 08/12/1975 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 26.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
46.	24251/14 21/03/2014 24259/14 21/03/2014 24263/14 21/03/2014	Alexandra Daniela ROȘCA 07/12/1981 Bucharest Florica ROȘCA 24/08/1961 Bucharest Maria-Mădălina ROȘCA 26/07/1988 Bucharest	Widow and daughters of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Parties in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly
47.	24254/14 21/03/2014	Marius-Cristian TEODORASC 15/08/1990 Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
48.	24258/14 21/03/2014	Elena Iulia UDUP 23/08/1980 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
49.	24260/14 21/03/2014	Irina-Maria VITAN 04/03/1975 Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 23.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
50.	45723/14 30/05/2014	Elena BĂNCILĂ 14/08/1944 Bucharest	Mother of a victim killed by gunshot in Bucharest on 24.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
51.	45726/14 30/05/2014	Cristian BÎRBORĂ 02/04/1984 Reșița	Son of a victim killed by gunshot in Reșița on 24.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
52.	45728/14 30/05/2014	Matilda BÎRBORĂ 29/07/1940 Crivina	Mother of a victim killed by gunshot in Reșița on 24.12.1989. Party in domestic file no. 11/P/2014 (former 97/P/1990).	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)