

SECRETARIAT / SECRETARIAT

SECRETARIAT OF THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS
SECRETARIAT DU COMITÉ DES MINISTRES

COMMITTEE
OF MINISTERS
COMITÉ
DES MINISTRES



Contact: *Ireneusz Kondak*
Tel: *03.90.21.59.86*

Date: 19/03/2026

DH-DD(2026)375

Documents distributed at the request of a Representative shall be under the sole responsibility of the said Representative, without prejudice to the legal or political position of the Committee of Ministers.

Meeting: 1563rd meeting (June 2026) (DH)

Item reference: Action Report (18/03/2026)

Communication from the Republic of Moldova concerning the case of *Vataga v. the Republic of Moldova* (Application No. 15666/18) (Group Cravcenco)

Les documents distribués à la demande d'un/e Représentant/e le sont sous la seule responsabilité dudit/de ladite Représentant/e, sans préjuger de la position juridique ou politique du Comité des Ministres.

Réunion : 1563^e réunion (juin 2026) (DH)

Référence du point : Bilan d'action (18/03/2026)

Communication de la République de Moldova concernant l'affaire *Vataga c. République de Moldova* (requête n° 15666/18) (Groupe Cravcenco)(***anglais uniquement***)



DGI

18 MARS 2026

SERVICE DE L'EXECUTION
DES ARRETS DE LA CEDH

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA GOVERNMENT AGENT

No. 06/2925

Chişinău, 18 March 2026

ACTION REPORT

for the execution of the European Court of Human Rights judgment
in the case of *Vataga v. the Republic of Moldova* (no. 15666/18),
judgment of 09 October 2025

I. CASE DESCRIPTION

1. The present case concerns a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (hereafter “the Convention”) on account of the excessive length of criminal proceedings initiated against the applicant’s son in July 2007, which ended on 29 January 2019. The Court found that the proceedings, lasting for more than 11 years and 6 months before three levels of jurisdiction, in which the applicant participated as the successor of her deceased son, failed to meet the “reasonable time” requirement.

II. INDIVIDUAL MEASURES

Payment of just satisfaction

2. In the present case, the amount awarded by the Court in respect of just satisfaction, namely EUR 1,850, was paid to the applicant in full on 21 November 2025.

Other individual measures

3. As results from the Court’s judgment, the criminal proceedings concerning first the applicant’s son and subsequently the applicant as a successor, ended by the final decision of the Supreme Court of Justice of 29 January 2019.

4. Having regard to the nature of the violation found by the Court, the payment of the just satisfaction constituted the main individual measure required for the execution of this judgment. The Government consider that the violation of the applicant’s right under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention in this case ceased once with the delivery of the final court judgment in the criminal proceedings concerning her late son. Hence, since the impugned court proceedings are no longer pending and having regard to the payment of the just satisfaction awarded by the Court in this case, the applicant has obtained full redress in

respect of her previously violated rights. In these circumstances, no further individual measures are necessary.

III. GENERAL MEASURES

Publication and dissemination

5. The judgment was translated, published on the Government Agent's official website¹ and disseminated to the relevant authorities, including the Supreme Court of Justice, the Superior Council of Magistracy and the National Institute of Justice. In addition, the Supreme Court of Justice published a summary of the judgment on its website. The Superior Council of Magistracy further circulated the judgment to the national courts, with a view to ensuring that judges and other relevant professionals examine and apply the Court's findings.

6. In addition, within the section dedicated to the unification of judicial practice, the Supreme Court of Justice publishes judicial practice reviews and informative notes on specific aspects of civil procedure. Of particular relevance is the informative note entitled "Relations concerning compensation by the State for damage caused by infringement of the right to a trial within a reasonable time or the right to execution of the judgment within a reasonable time". These measures facilitate access to the Court's relevant case-law, including that relating to Article 6 of the Convention, and contribute to the prevention of similar violations in the future.

7. The National Institute of Justice, acting within its statutory mandate in the field of initial and continuous judicial training, includes Convention-based standards and the relevant case-law of the European Court of Human Rights in the professional training of judges and prosecutors. In particular, the continuous training framework is designed to strengthen the capacity of legal professionals to identify, at domestic level, situations giving rise to issues under Article 6 of the Convention, including those relating to the excessive length of proceedings and the requirement of effective judicial case-management².

8. The Government submit that the dissemination of the Court's relevant case-law, the availability of Convention materials, the continuous training of legal professionals and the development of consistent domestic judicial practice constitute important safeguards for ensuring compliance with Convention standards and for strengthening the domestic capacity to identify, prevent and remedy undue delays in judicial proceedings, thereby reducing the risk of similar violations in the future.

Other general measures

9. The Government have previously reported to the Committee of Ministers, in the framework of the group of cases *Cravenco v. the Republic of Moldova* (no. 13012/02), in

¹ <https://agent.gov.md/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/hotararea-Vataga-v.-MDA-traducere-RO.pdf>

² <https://www.inj.md/sites/default/files/new/23/planuri/2023-sem1-plan-modular-jud-si-proc.pdf?utm>

its [Action Report](#) submitted on 30 November 2022, other general measures tackling the excessive length of court proceedings.

10. In this regard, the Government recall the domestic remedy introduced following the pilot judgment *Olaru and Others v. Moldova* (no. 476/07+, judgment of 28 July 2009) under Law No. 87, which entered into force on 1 July 2011. This Law introduced a compensatory remedy for violations of the right to have a case examined or a final judgment enforced within a reasonable time. The law allows individuals to seek both acknowledgment of the breach and compensation for the damage caused, before the domestic courts. It is based on Convention standards and the relevant case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, and requires domestic courts to determine such claims in accordance with the criteria developed under Article 6 of the Convention.

11. The remedy introduced by Law No. 87/2011 has proved effective in the domestic legal order, both in civil and criminal matters. Domestic courts examine claims lodged under that Law in the light of the criteria developed in the Court's case-law, including the complexity of the case, the conduct of the parties and of the authorities, and the overall length of the proceedings. The remedy is capable of providing acknowledgment of the breach and compensation for the damage caused by excessively lengthy proceedings. Accordingly, the Government consider that this remedy is available both in law and in practice and is capable of affording adequate redress in cases concerning the excessive length of proceedings.

12. In addition to the compensatory mechanism, in 2011, the Code of Criminal Procedure was amended by introducing an acceleratory remedy in criminal matters. This mechanism allows participants in criminal proceedings to request the acceleration of the proceedings where there is a risk of a breach of the reasonable time requirement. Such requests are examined promptly and may result in binding procedural measures aimed at expediting the proceedings, thereby ensuring rapid intervention with a view to preventing unjustified delays in pending criminal cases. For instance, Article 331/1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure now details the procedure on requesting and obtaining the acceleration of criminal proceedings before the court of law.

13. The Government also recall the other general measures previously reported within the *Cravenco* group of cases, which determined the Committee of Ministers to end the supervision thereof under its Resolution [CM/ResDH\(2022\)400](#) of 14 December 2022. Since the period concerned in this case overlaps with the period previously referred to by the Government in the *Cravenco* group of cases, the Government consider that no other general measures are necessary for the purpose of avoiding similar violations from happening in the future.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

14. The Government invite the Committee of Ministers to take note of the full implementation of individual measures, as well as of the general measures described above and previously reported to the Committee of Ministers, aimed at preventing similar violations from happening in the future.

15. In view of the measures adopted and the payments effected, the Government consider that the violation found by the Court in the present case has been adequately remedied and that the general measures implemented are capable of preventing similar shortcomings in the future.

16. In these circumstances, the Government consider that no further individual or general measures are required in the present case, and that the measures already adopted at domestic level are sufficient to conclude that the Republic of Moldova has complied with its obligations under Article 46 § 1 of the Convention. Accordingly, the Government invite the Committee of Ministers to close the supervision of this case.



Doina MAIMESCU
Acting Government Agent