

Resolution

Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights Ryabykh group (113 cases) against Russian Federation

*(Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 10 March 2017
at the 1280th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies)*

The Committee of Ministers, under the terms of Article 46, paragraph 2, of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, which provides that the Committee supervises the execution of final judgments of the European Court of Human Rights (hereinafter “the Convention” and “the Court”),

Having regard to the final judgments transmitted by the Court to the Committee in these cases (see Appendix 1) and to the violations established;

Recalling the respondent State's obligation, under Article 46, paragraph 1, of the Convention, to abide by all final judgments in cases to which it has been a party and that this obligation entails, over and above the payment of any sums awarded by the Court, the adoption by the authorities of the respondent State, where required:

- of individual measures to put an end to violations established and erase their consequences so as to achieve as far as possible *restitutio in integrum*; and
- of general measures preventing similar violations;

Having noted that the just satisfaction, where awarded, has been paid by the government of the respondent State;

Noting with satisfaction the measures adopted by the Russian authorities to resolve the problem of the violation of the principle of legal certainty on account of the quashing of final judicial decisions by way of supervisory-review proceedings in civil matters (“nadzor”) (see Appendix 2);

Taking also into consideration the Court's judgments delivered after the adoption of the various legislative reforms, in which the Court examined the conformity of the new supervisory-review procedure with the European Convention;

Having satisfied itself that all the measures required by Article 46, paragraph 1, have been adopted,

DECLARES that it has exercised its functions under Article 46, paragraph 2, of the Convention in these cases and

DECIDES to close the examination thereof.

Appendix 1 List of cases

Application	Case	Judgment of	Final on
52854/99	RYABYKH	24/07/2003	03/12/2003
11227/05	ABDULLAYEV	11/02/2010	11/05/2010
39897/02	AGASARYAN	20/11/2008	20/02/2009
2993/03	AKALINSKIY	07/06/2007	07/09/2007
51380/07	ALEKSEY ZAKHAROV	12/03/2009	12/06/2009
32991/05	ANDREYEV	04/03/2010	04/06/2010
63973/00	ANDROSOV	06/10/2005	15/02/2006
44142/05	ASMAYEV	14/03/2013	14/03/2013
24130/04+	BARANOV AND OTHERS	09/02/2016	09/02/2016
17472/04	BODROV	12/02/2009	12/05/2009
30671/03	BORIS VASILYEV	15/02/2007	15/05/2007
42234/04	BORODKIN	17/09/2009	17/12/2009
14853/03	BORSHCHEVSKIY	21/09/2006	12/02/2007
62866/00	BOYCHENKO AND GERSHKOVICH	28/06/2007	28/09/2007
23795/02	CHEBOTAREV	22/06/2006	22/09/2006
30714/03	CHEKUSHKIN	15/02/2007	15/05/2007
5964/02	CHERNITSYN	06/04/2006	13/09/2006
30686/03	DANILCHENKO	15/02/2007	15/05/2007
7182/03+	DAVLETKHANOV AND OTHER "CHERNOBYL PENSIONERS"	23/09/2010	23/12/2010
18967/07	DAVYDOV	30/10/2014	30/01/2015
3244/04	DEMENTYEV	06/11/2008	06/02/2009
27101/04	DMITRIYEVA	03/04/2008	29/09/2008
18451/04	DOLBIN	19/04/2016	19/04/2016
2999/03	DOVGUCHITS	07/06/2007	07/09/2007
7319/05+	EYDELMAN AND OTHER "EMIGRANT PENSIONERS"	04/11/2010	04/02/2011
12157/06	GARAGULYA	20/05/2010	20/08/2010
30674/03	GAVRILENKO	15/02/2007	15/05/2007
20430/04	GLADYSHEV AND OTHERS	07/02/2008	07/05/2008
42974/07	GORFUNKEL	19/09/2013	19/12/2013
30777/03	GREBENCHENKO	15/02/2007	15/05/2007
13173/03	GUDKOV	22/12/2009	22/03/2010
20023/07	GULYAYEV	12/05/2010	12/08/2010
10277/05	IGNATYEVA	03/04/2008 22/12/2009	03/07/2008 22/03/2010
1752/02	IRINA FEDOTOVA	19/10/2006	19/01/2007
11697/05	IVANOVA	24/04/2008	24/07/2008
19136/04	KALINICHENKO	12/03/2009	12/06/2009
32185/02	KAYKHANIDI	10/10/2013	10/10/2013
14290/03+	KAZAKEVICH AND 9 OTHER "ARMY PENSIONERS" CASES	14/01/2010	14/04/2010
42538/02	KAZMIN	13/01/2011	20/06/2011
2173/04	KHANUSTARANOV	28/05/2014	28/05/2014
27114/04	KHOTULEVA	30/07/2009	06/11/2009
38597/04	KIRILENKO	05/04/2011	05/04/2011
11785/02	KLIMENKO	18/01/2007	18/04/2007
30709/03	KLIMENKO AND OSTAPENKO	23/07/2009	23/10/2009
22419/05+	KLIMOVA AND OTHERS	08/12/2015	08/12/2015
30685/03	KNYAZHICHENKO	15/02/2007	15/05/2007
30711/03	KOBERNIK	11/06/2015	11/06/2015
25965/03	KOKSHAROVA	02/10/2014	02/10/2014
75473/01	KONDRASHOVA	16/11/2006	16/02/2007
24178/05	KOROVINA	25/02/2010	25/05/2010
20887/03	KOT	18/01/2007	18/04/2007
36299/03+	KOVALENKO AND OTHERS	08/12/2015	08/12/2015
34615/02	KRAVCHENKO	02/04/2009	02/07/2009
7306/07+	KRAYNOVA AND KRAYNOV AND 9 OTHER "YAKUT PENSIONERS"	17/12/2009	17/03/2010
14390/05	KUCHEROV AND FROLOVA	11/02/2010	11/05/2010
36495/02	KURINYY	12/06/2008	12/09/2008
68029/01	KUTEPOV AND ANIKEYENKO	25/10/2005	15/02/2006
12100/05+	KUZMIN AND OTHERS	14/06/2016	14/06/2016
15242/04	KUZMINA	02/04/2009	02/07/2009

Application	Case	Judgment of	Final on
16076/06+	LENCHENKOV AND OTHERS	21/10/2010	21/02/2011
3548/04	LUCHKINA	10/04/2008	10/07/2008
42981/06	MALIKOV AND OSHCHEPKOV	12/11/2015	12/11/2015
22156/04	MIKHAYLOV	22/10/2009	22/01/2010
5941/06+	MISHURA AND GAYEVA	29/10/2015	29/10/2015
3447/05+	MOLODYKA AND OTHERS	23/07/2009	23/10/2009
7944/05	MORDACHEV	25/02/2010	25/05/2010
26338/06	MURTAZIN	27/03/2008	27/06/2008
45017/04	NEKHOROSHEV	10/04/2008	10/07/2008
14502/04	NELYUBIN	02/11/2006	26/03/2007
3447/06	NIKOLAY ZAYTSEV	18/02/2010	18/05/2010
38103/04	NIKOLENKO	26/03/2009	26/06/2009
9549/05	PANASENKO	01/04/2010	01/07/2010
44543/04	PAROLOV	14/06/2007	30/01/2008
7061/02	PETROV	21/12/2006	21/03/2007
4874/03	PITELIN AND OTHERS	14/06/2007	14/09/2007
24247/04	PRISYAZHNIKOVA AND DOLGOPOLOV	28/09/2006	28/12/2006
30422/03	PSHENICHNYY	14/02/2008	07/07/2008
31799/08+	PUGACH AND OTHERS	04/11/2010	04/02/2011
60974/00	ROSELTRANS	21/07/2005	21/10/2005
15037/05	SAKHAROVA	02/05/2013	02/05/2013
47388/06	SAMAROV	28/05/2014	28/05/2014
32865/06+	SENCHENKO AND OTHERS AND 35 OTHER "YAKUT PENSIONERS" CASES	28/05/2009	06/11/2009
30731/03	SEPTA	15/02/2007	15/05/2007
12793/02	SEREGINA	30/11/2006	28/02/2007
1861/05	SERGEY PETROV	10/05/2007	10/08/2007
28309/03+	SERGEYEV AND OTHERS	06/03/2012	06/03/2012
21834/05	SHANOVY	07/02/2012	07/02/2012
34248/05+	SHAPKIN AND OTHERS	15/03/2016	15/03/2016
40713/04	SHCHUROV	29/03/2011	29/06/2011
7873/09+	SHEYMAN	26/06/2016	26/06/2016
2982/05+	SHURYGINA AND OTHERS	15/03/2016	15/03/2016
55531/00	SITKOV	18/01/2007	18/04/2007
38585/04+	SIZINTSEVA AND OTHERS	08/04/2010	08/07/2010
73203/01	SMARYGIN	01/12/2005	01/03/2006
30672/03+	SOBELIN AND OTHERS	03/05/2007	03/08/2007
8564/02	STANISLAS VOLKOV	15/03/2007	15/06/2007
878/03	STETSENKO AND STETSENKO	05/10/2006	05/01/2007
8269/02	SUTYAZHNIK	23/07/2009	10/12/2009
24559/04	TALYSHEVA	22/12/2009	22/03/2010
11093/07+	TARNOPOLSKAYA AND OTHERS	09/07/2009	28/06/2010
4596/02	TAYANKO	02/09/2010	02/12/2010
22551/06	TKACHEV	11/12/2008	11/03/2009
43327/02	TSAREVA	01/04/2010	01/07/2010
66543/01	VASILYEV	13/10/2005	12/04/2006
48758/99	VOLKOVA	05/04/2005	05/07/2005
44381/04	VOTINTSEVA	11/02/2010	11/05/2010
43166/04	YAKOVLEVA	10/07/2014	10/07/2014
21594/05	YELISEYEV	28/05/2014	28/05/2014
69341/01	YURIY ROMANOV	25/10/2005	15/02/2006
23333/05	ZALEVSKAYA	11/02/2010	28/06/2010
67051/01	ZASURTSEV	27/04/2006	27/07/2006
14805/02	ZELENKEVICH AND OTHERS	20/06/2013	20/06/2013
25448/06	ZVEZDIN	14/06/2007	14/09/2007

Appendix 2

Information about the measures to comply with the judgments in the *Ryabykh* group of cases against Russian Federation

I. CASE DESCRIPTION

The *Ryabykh* group (113 cases) concerns the violation of the principle of legal certainty on account of the quashing of final judicial decisions in the applicants' favour by way of the supervisory-review procedure ("nadzor") provided for by the Code of Civil Proceedings (Article 6 § 1) and the violation of the applicants' right to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1), in various regions of the Russian Federation before 2012.

In the cases concerning events prior to 2003, the European Court found the violations on account of the quashing of final and binding judicial decisions by a higher court via supervisory-review on an application made by a State official whose power to lodge such an application was not subject to any time-limit.

In the cases concerning events after 2003, the Court found that, although limited to only the parties in the case and subjected to a one-year time-limit, the supervisory-review procedure remained an extraordinary means of reopening proceedings, as the time-limit introduced was rendered nugatory in practice by the existence of multiple levels of review and the maintaining, at each level, of the court presidents' unfettered powers to reopen the case even after that time-limit had expired. Further, the Court criticised the procedural deficiencies, such as the failure to exhaust the ordinary avenues of appeal.

In 20 of these cases, the Court also found other violations, as follows: violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the excessive length of civil proceedings (this issue is being examined in the *Kormacheva* group of cases); violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the delays in the enforcement of judicial decisions concerning the State's monetary obligations (this issue is being examined in the *Timofeyev* group of cases); and violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 on account of the quashing of final judicial decisions regarding pension rights on the basis of newly discovered circumstances (this issue is being examined in the *Pravednaya* group of cases).

II. INDIVIDUAL MEASURES

In all cases in which the European Court granted a just satisfaction, the relevant amounts (including default interest) have been paid (see Appendix 3). In eight cases there were short and insignificant delays in the payment of just satisfaction. The amounts of interest in these cases are very low and to date the applicants have neither objected to the delay in the payment nor requested the payment of interest.

Further, it is important to note that in all the cases in which the applicants made well-grounded claims for pecuniary damage in respect of the sums which they had legitimately expected to receive before the final judgments in their favour were quashed, the European Court awarded it. As regards claims in respect of future pecuniary loss in cases which concerned regular payments by the State, the European Court held that it could not restore the power of the quashed judicial decisions nor assume the role of the national authorities in awarding social benefits for the future (*Tarnopolskaya and Others v. Russian Federation*, Nos. 11093/07 and seq., § 51, 7 July 2009; *Streltsov and Others v. Russian Federation*, Nos. 8549/06 and seq., § 91, 29 July 2010; *Baturlova v. Russian Federation*, No. 33188/08, § 61, 19 April 2011). In addition, the Court did not examine the legal soundness of the judicial decisions subsequently quashed. In this situation, while it has been open to the applicants to request a re-opening of the domestic proceedings and restoration of the power of the quashed judicial decisions, such reopening does not appear to be required.

For the same reasons, a re-opening of the domestic proceedings is also not required in the cases which additionally concern the recalculation of pension rights since the European Court granted the pecuniary claims where lodged by the applicants (see the case description).

As to the cases concerning excessively lengthy civil proceedings, it appears from the relevant judgments of the European Court that the proceedings had already been terminated when the European Court issued its judgments.

The cases concerning lengthy non-enforcement of the domestic judicial decisions concerned monetary awards against the State. In those cases in which the domestic judicial decision had not been enforced prior to the quashing, or where the applicant had to pay back the money following the quashing, the European Court either ordered the enforcement of the domestic judicial decision at issue or awarded the applicants the relevant amounts by way of pecuniary damages. In all the cases in which the European Court ordered the enforcement of the domestic judicial decisions, these decisions have been enforced. In the other cases, the domestic judicial decisions can be considered enforced via the payment of the just satisfaction.

Against the above background, no further individual measures are required in this group of cases.

III. GENERAL MEASURES

A. Interim resolution of the Committee of Ministers

Interim Resolution ResDH(2006)1 concerning violations of the principle of legal certainty through the supervisory-review procedure (“nadzor”) in civil matters in the Russian Federation, adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 8 February 2006, reads, in its relevant parts, as follows:

“The Committee of Ministers, under the terms of Article 46, paragraph 2, of the Convention [..];

Welcoming the reforms of the supervisory review (“nadzor”) procedure introduced by the new Code of Civil Procedure entered into force on 1 February 2003;

Noting with satisfaction, in particular, that some of the problems at the basis of the violations found in these cases have thus been remedied [..];

Stressing that a binding and enforceable judgment should be only altered in exceptional circumstances, while under the current “nadzor” procedure such a judgment may be quashed for any material or procedural violation;

Emphasising that in an efficient judicial system, errors and shortcomings in court decisions should primarily be addressed through ordinary appeal and/or cassation proceedings before the judgment becomes binding and enforceable, thus avoiding the subsequent risk of frustrating parties' right to rely on binding judicial decisions;

Considering therefore that restricting the supervisory review of binding and enforceable judgments to exceptional circumstances must go hand-in-hand with improvement of the court structure and of the quality of justice, so as to limit the need for correcting judicial errors currently achieved through the “nadzor” procedure [..];

CALLS UPON the Russian authorities to give priority to the reform of civil procedure with a view to ensuring full respect for the principle of legal certainty established in the Convention, as interpreted by the Court's judgments;

ENCOURAGES the authorities to ensure through this reform that judicial errors are corrected in the course of the ordinary appeal and/or cassation proceedings before judgments become final [..];

ENCOURAGES the authorities, pending the adoption of this comprehensive reform, to consider adoption of interim measures limiting as far as possible the risk of new violations of the Convention of the same kind, and in particular:

- continue to restrict progressively the use of the “nadzor” procedure, in particular through stricter time-limits for nadzor applications and limitation of permissible grounds for this procedure so as to encompass only the most serious violations of the law [..];
- to limit as much as possible the number of successive applications for supervisory review that may be lodged in the same case;

- to discourage frivolous and abusive applications for supervisory review which amount to a further disguised appeal motivated by a disagreement with the assessment made by the lower courts within their competences and in accordance with the law;
- to adopt measures inducing the parties adequately to use, as much as possible, the presently available cassation appeal to ensure rectification of judicial errors before judgments become final and enforceable;”.

B. Position of the Constitutional Court

In a judgment of 5 February 2007 (No. 2-П), the Constitutional Court found that the supervisory-review procedure governed by the Code of Civil Proceedings at the material time gave rise to a number of issues with regard to the principle of legal certainty enshrined in the Convention, as interpreted by the European Court. The court explicitly refrained from declaring these shortcomings unconstitutional to avoid a procedural vacuum that would undermine the effective administration of justice. It upheld nonetheless the obligation of the legislator to reform the supervisory-review procedure so as to make it compatible with the principle of legal certainty, taking account of the case law of the European Court and the Committee of Ministers' Resolution ResDH(2006)1 of 8 February 2006.

C. Legislative reforms

Since the *Ryabykh* judgment, the supervisory-review procedure has been reformed on three occasions, in 2003, 2008 and 2012. Following the 2003 and 2008 reforms, only the parties to the proceedings could initiate a supervisory-review. Such initiatives could be made only within a certain time-limit and only after the available regular avenues of appeal had been exhausted. The time-limit could be waived (restored) only in exceptional circumstances and only if such circumstances arose within one year of the contested judgment's becoming binding.

The subsequent reform of 2012 converted the first two (of three) levels of supervisory review (namely the presidia of the regional courts and the Civil Chamber of the Supreme Court) into cassation procedures, while limiting the supervisory-review procedure to the Presidium of the Supreme Court (the former third level of supervisory-review).

D. Position of the Supreme Court

On 12 February 2008, the legislative reform was supplemented by a decree of the Plenum of the Supreme Court (Decree no. 2) in which it provided guidelines to the lower courts, with a special emphasis on the need to comply with Convention requirements and in particular with the principle of legal certainty.

E. Publication and dissemination

The government undertook various publication and dissemination measures to ensure that various State authorities are aware of the Convention standards concerning the principle of legal certainty. The relevant judgments of the European Court were disseminated, in particular to the Constitutional Court, the Supreme Court, the Prosecutor General's Office and the regional courts of the respective regions. The judgments were also translated and published.

F. Assessment by the European Court

The question whether the supervisory-review procedure in force prior to 2008 violated the principle of legal certainty was considered by the European Court in a number of judgments in this group of cases. In these judgments, the European Court presumed that the quashing of final judgments via such a procedure violated the principle of legal certainty unless such quashing stemmed from a fundamental defect in the prior proceedings (see, among many others, *Kot v. Russian Federation*, No. 20887/03, § 29, 18 January 2007). Accordingly, in a few judgments the Court found no violation because the presumption was rebutted by the findings of “fundamental defects” in the proceedings before the lower courts, such as a failure to notify the defendant of the proceedings (see, for example, *Tishkevich v. Russian Federation*, No. 2202/05, judgment of 04/12/2008, final on 06/04/2009).

The question whether the supervisory-review procedure in force between 2008 and 2012 violated the principle of legal certainty in specific cases was considered by the European Court in the judgment of *Trapeznikov and Others v. Russian Federation* (No. 5623/09, judgment of 05/04/2016, final on 05/07/2016).

The European Court found that in the cases at issue the supervisory-review had been initiated by the parties to the proceedings, within the defined time-limit, and only after the available regular avenues of appeal had been exhausted, which was sufficient to conclude that “the supervisory review as applied in the particular circumstances of these cases was not incompatible with the principle of legal certainty” (§§ 36, 37). The European Court additionally observed that, in these particular cases, the supervisory-review had been necessary to correct grave mistakes and to ensure a uniform application of the domestic case law (§ 38).

G. Statistics

The 2012 reform limiting the supervisory-review procedure to the Presidium of the Supreme Court has entailed that the supervisory-review procedure is now very seldom used in civil cases. Thus, in 2013, one case was examined on the merits using this procedure, with no cases examined in 2014 and two cases in 2015.

H. Other violations found

The general measures in response to the other violations found by the European Court in these cases are examined within the context of the relevant groups, as indicated in the case description (see above).

IV. CONCLUSIONS OF THE RESPONDENT STATE

The Convention requirements concerning the principle of legal certainty, as interpreted by the European Court, have been incorporated in the reformed legislation. In particular, the supervisory-review procedure can now only be initiated by the parties to the proceedings, within a well-defined time-limit and only after the regular avenues of appeal had been exhausted. In addition, the supervisory-review procedure has been limited to the Presidium of the Supreme Court. It is expected that these legislative reforms, correctly implemented as clarified by the Supreme Court, will prevent further violations of the principle of legal certainty.

The government considers that the measures adopted have fully remedied the consequences of the violations of the Convention found by the European Court in these cases, and will prevent similar violations and that the Russian Federation has, therefore, complied with its obligations under Article 46, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

Appendix 3: List of payment of just satisfaction and of internal debt

No.	Case	Judgment final on	Sums awarded by the Court (in EUR, unless specified otherwise)			Payment deadline	Date of payment of the sums awarded by the Court	Payment of default interest	Payment of internal debt, as ordered by the Court
			Pecuniary damage	Non-pecuniary damage	Costs and expenses				
11227/05	ABDULLAYEV	11/05/2010	-	-	-	11/08/2010	-	-	
39897/02	AGASYAN	20/02/2009	750,00	2 000,00	-	20/05/2009	15/04/2009	-	
2993/03	AKALINSKIY	07/09/2007	-	1 500,00	-	07/12/2007	06/12/2007	-	
51380/07	ALEKSEY ZAKHAROV	12/06/2009	5 100,00	2 000,00	250,00	12/09/2009	11/09/2009	-	
32991/05	ANDREYEV	04/06/2010	1 470,00	1 500,00	142,00	04/09/2010	19/07/2010	-	
63973/00	ANDROSOV	15/02/2006	853,00	1 500,00	50,00	15/05/2006	07/06/2006	Paid	
44142/05	ASMAYEV	14/03/2013	6 795,00	2 000,00	-		19/06/2013	Paid	
24130/04	BARANOV AND OTHERS		95,000		1 783,00	09/05/2016	Between 24/03/2016 and 22/09/2016 to some applicants; 20/04/2016 (date of last invitation to submit bank account details to the heir of Mr Kuzmin); 10/05/2016 (date of last invitation to submit bank account details to the heir of Mr Zaytsev)	Paid where required; in some cases n/a (the applicants' heirs have failed to submit their bank account details to date)	-
17472/04	BODROV	12/05/2009	341,00	2 000,00	-	12/08/2009	19/10/2009	n/a (the applicant provided his bank account details after the payment deadline)	Paid
30671/03	BORIS VASILYEV	15/05/2007	-	-	-	15/08/2007	-	-	
42234/04	BORODKIN	17/12/2009	3 382,00	2 000,00	-	17/03/2010	18/01/2010	-	
14853/03	BORSHCHEVSKIY	12/02/2007	160 600,00	3 000,00	-	12/05/2007	19/04/2007	-	
62866/00	BOYCHENKO AND GERSHKOVICH	28/09/2007	-	4 000,00	-	28/12/2007	05/12/2007	-	
23795/02	CHEBOTAREV	22/09/2006	-	4 500,00	-	22/12/2006	12/12/2006	-	
30714/03	CHEKUSHKIN	15/02/2007	-	-	-	15/05/2007	-	-	
5964/02	CHERNITSYN	13/09/2006	-	2 000,00	200,00	13/12/2006	08/12/2006	-	
30686/03	DANILCHENKO	15/05/2007	-	-	-	15/08/2007	-	-	
7182/03	DAVLETKHANOV AND OTHER "CHERNOBYL PENSIONERS"	23/12/2010	5 060,00	12 000,00	210,00	23/03/2011	07/06/2011	Paid	
18967/07	DAVYDOV	30/01/2015	-	2 000,00	-	30/04/2015	18/03/2015	-	
3244/04	DEMENTYEV	06/02/2009	RUR 200 745,00	2 000,00	RUR 10000,00	06/05/2009	07/05/2009	Not significant (EUR 2.20 not paid)	Paid
27101/04	DMITRIYEVA	29/09/2008	4 100,00	3 500,00	-		19/07/2016	-	
18451/04	DOLBIN	19/04/2016	-	5 000,00	-			23/06/2016	
2999/03	DOVGUCHITS	07/09/2007	-	2 000,00	-	07/12/2007	13/11/2007	-	
7319/05	EYDELMAN AND OTHER 'EMIGRANT PENSIONERS'	04/02/2011	26 138,00	36 000,00	-	04/05/2011	16/05/2011	Paid	

No.	Case	Judgment final on	Sums awarded by the Court (in EUR, unless specified otherwise)			Payment deadline	Date of payment of the sums awarded by the Court	Payment of default interest	Payment of internal debt, as ordered by the Court
			Pecuniary damage	Non-pecuniary damage	Costs and expenses				
12157/06	GARAGULYA	20/08/2010	-	3 000,00	1 000,00	20/11/2010	02/12/2010	Paid	-
30674/03	GAVRILENKO	15/05/2007	-	-	-	15/08/2007	-	-	-
20430/04	GLADYSHEV AND OTHERS	07/05/2008	-	4 000,00	-	07/08/2008	04/08/2008 (Mr Gladyshev); 11/09/2008 (Mr Mogilnikov)	n/a (Mr Mogilnikov provided his bank account details after the payment deadline)	Paid
42974/07	GORFUNKEL	19/12/2013	3 717,00	3 000,00	-	19/03/2014	25/12/2014	Paid	-
30777/03	GREBENCHENKO	15/05/2007	-	-	-	15/08/2007	-	-	-
13173/03	GUDKOV	22/03/2010	-	-	-	22/06/2010	-	-	-
20023/07	GULYAYEV	12/08/2010	-	3 000,00	500,00	12/11/2010	17/11/2010	Paid	-
10277/05	IGNATYEVA	03/07/2008 22/03/2010	3 500,00	3 000,00	-	22/06/2010	14/07/2010	Paid	-
1752/02	IRINA FEDOTOVA	19/01/2007	-	2 000,00	10,00	19/04/2007	30/03/2007	-	-
11697/05	IVANOVA	24/07/2008	4 100,00	2 000,00	150,00	24/10/2008	27/11/2008	Not significant (EUR 40.92 not paid)	-
19136/04	KALINICHENKO	12/06/2009	7 750,00	2 000,00	240,00	12/09/2009	19/10/2009	Paid	Paid
32185/02	KAYKHANIDI	10/10/2013	-	2 000,00	177	10/01/2014	11/12/2013	-	-
14290/03	KAZAKEVICH AND 9 OTHER "ARMY PENSIONERS" CASES	14/04/2010	19 225,00	30 000,00	1 375,00	14/07/2010	30/06/2011	Paid	-
42538/02	KAZMIN	20/06/2011	225,00	3 000,00	-	20/09/2011	05/10/2011	n/a (the applicant provided his bank account details after the payment deadline)	-
2173/04	KHANUSTARANOV	28/05/2014	2 274,00	-	3 000,00	28/08/2014	13/08/2014	-	-
27114/04	KHOTULEVA	06/11/2009	-	3 000,00	-	06/02/2010	18/03/2010	Paid	-
38597/04	KIRILENKO	05/04/2011	1 585,00	3 000,00	350,00	05/07/2011	14/07/2011	Paid	-
11785/02	KLIMENKO	18/04/2007	-	500,00	500,00	18/07/2007	03/08/2007	Paid	-
30709/03	KLIMENKO AND OSTAPENKO	23/10/2009	-	6 000,00	-	23/01/2010	30/11/2009	-	-
22419/05	KLIMOVA AND OTHERS	08/12/2015	15 000,00		150,00	08/03/2016	Between 09/03/2016 and 11/03/2016 to some applicants; 21/03/2016 (date of last invitation to submit bank account details to Ms Sevidova)	Not significant (EUR 9.04 not paid) in some cases; n/a in the case of Ms Sevidova	-
30685/03	KNYAZHICHENKO	15/05/2007	-	-	-	15/08/2007	-	-	-
30711/03	KOBERNIK	11/06/2015	1 370,00	2 000,00	-	11/09/2015	14/08/2015	-	-
25965/03	KOKSHAROVA	02/10/2014	-	-	-	02/01/2015	-	-	-
75473/01	KONDRASHOVA	16/02/2007	-	500,00	-	16/05/2007	30/03/2007	-	-
24178/05	KOROVINA	25/05/2010	-	-	-	25/08/2010	-	-	-
20887/03	KOT	18/04/2007	22 000,00	2 000,00	940,00	18/07/2007	27/07/2007	Paid	-

No.	Case	Judgment final on	Sums awarded by the Court (in EUR, unless specified otherwise)			Payment deadline	Date of payment of the sums awarded by the Court	Payment of default interest	Payment of internal debt, as ordered by the Court
			Pecuniary damage	Non-pecuniary damage	Costs and expenses				
36299/03	KOVALENKO AND OTHERS	08/12/2015	25 000,00		RUR 8 150,00	08/03/2016	31/03/2016	Paid	-
34615/02	KRAVCHENKO	02/07/2009	-	2 000,00	-	02/10/2009	19/10/2009	Paid	Paid
7306/07	KRAYNOVA AND KRAYNOV AND 9 OTHER "YAKUT PENSIONERS"	17/03/2010	48,000			17/06/2010	15/07/2010	Paid	-
14390/05	KUCHEROV AND FROLOVA	11/05/2010	3 335,00	6 000,00	2 770,00	11/08/2010	19/07/2010	-	-
36495/02	KURINNY	12/09/2008	-	-	-	12/12/2008	-	-	-
68029/01	KUTEPOV AND ANIKEYENKO	15/02/2006	-	-	-	15/05/2006	-	-	-
12100/05	KUZMIN AND OTHERS	14/06/2016	-	1 500,00	600,00	14/09/2016	16/09/2016 (Mr Prokopyev); 10/10/2016 (Mr Kuzmin -date of last invitation to the applicant to submit his bank account details)	Not significant in the case of Mr Prokopyev (EUR 1.04 not paid); n/a in the case of Mr Kuzmin	-
15242/04	KUZMINA	02/07/2009	5 890,00	2 000,00	240,00	02/10/2009	19/10/2009	Not significant (EUR 17.99 and RUR 767.79 not paid)	Paid
16076/06	LENCHENKOV AND OTHERS	21/02/2011	2 821,00	12 000,00	-	21/05/2011	16/05/2011	-	-
3548/04	LUCHKINA	10/07/2008	160,00	2 000,00	2 051,20	10/10/2008	10/11/2008	n/a (the applicant provided his bank account details after the payment deadline)	-
42981/06	MALIKOV AND OSHCHEPKOV	12/11/2015	-	4 000,00	-	12/02/2016	04/03/2016	Paid	-
22156/04	MIKHAYLOV	22/01/2010	-	3 500,00	-	22/04/2010	22/03/2010	-	-
5941/06	MISHURA AND GAYEVA	29/10/2015	49 215,00	4 000,00	GBP 1 342,00	29/01/2016	17/03/2016 (Ms Gayeva); 05/04/2016 (Mr Mishura -date of last invitation to the applicant to submit his bank account details)	N/a (the applicants either submitted their bank account details after the payment deadline or have failed to submit them)	-
3447/05	MOLODYKA	23/10/2009	-	-	-	23/01/2010	-	-	-
7944/05	MORDACHEV	25/05/2010	4 640,00	3 000,00	68,00	25/08/2010	19/07/2010	-	-
26338/06	MURTAZIN	27/06/2008	7 300,00	4 700,00	-	27/09/2008	04/09/2008	-	-
45017/04	NEKHOROSHEV	10/07/2008	950,00	-	-	10/10/2008	02/10/2008	-	-
14502/04	NELYUBIN	26/03/2007	RUR 145 836,00	-	-	26/06/2007	13/07/2007	Paid	-
3447/06	NIKOLAY ZAYTSEV	18/05/2010	-	2 000,00	8,00	18/08/2010	19/07/2010	-	-
38103/04	NIKOLENKO	26/06/2009	-	3 000,00	1 500,00	26/09/2009	11/09/2009	-	-
9549/05	PANASENKO	01/07/2010	-	3 000,00	-	01/10/2010	22/10/2010	Paid	-
44543/04	PAROLOV	30/01/2008	-	2 000,00	-	30/04/2008	19/03/2008	-	-

No.	Case	Judgment final on	Sums awarded by the Court (in EUR, unless specified otherwise)			Payment deadline	Date of payment of the sums awarded by the Court	Payment of default interest	Payment of internal debt, as ordered by the Court
			Pecuniary damage	Non-pecuniary damage	Costs and expenses				
7061/02	PETROV	21/03/2007	-	-	-	21/06/2007	-	-	
4874/03	PITELIN AND OTHERS	14/09/2007	-	8 000,00	-	14/12/2007	31/10/2007	-	
24247/04	PRISYAZHNIKOVA AND DOLGOPOLOV	28/12/2006	-	4 800,00	-	28/03/2007	20/02/2007	-	
30422/03	PSHENICHNYY	07/07/2008	8 443,00	2 000,00	-	07/10/2008	22/07/2008	-	
31799/08	PUGACH AND OTHERS	04/02/2011	-	24 000,00	-	04/05/2011	16/05/2011	Paid	
60974/00	ROSELTRANS	21/10/2005	-	-	-	21/01/2006	-	-	
52854/99	RYABYKH	03/12/2003	-	-	-	03/03/2004	-	-	
15037/05	SAKHAROVA	02/05/2013	-	-	-	02/08/2013	-	-	
47388/06	SAMAROV	28/05/2014	-	2 000,00	-	28/08/2014	27/07/2014	-	
32865/06	SENCHENKO AND OTHERS AND 35 OTHER "YAKUT PENSIONERS" CASES	06/11/2009	178,000			06/02/2010	Between 16/12/2009 and 21/12/2009 to some applicants; 18/03/2010 (Mr Kim); 19/07/2010 (Ms Ananyeva)	Paid where required; n/a in the case of Ms Ananyeva (the applicant submitted her bank account details after the payment deadline)	-
30731/03	SEPTA	15/05/2007	-	-	-	15/08/2007	-	-	
12793/02	SEREGINA	28/02/2007	70 000,00	1 400,00	300,00	28/05/2007	11/05/2007	-	
1861/05	SERGEY PETROV	10/08/2007	2 500,00	2 000,00	-	10/11/2007	19/11/2007	Not significant (EUR 9.04 not paid)	
28309/03	SERGEYEV AND OTHERS	06/03/2012	255 206,00	36 000,00	1 737,00	06/06/2012	01/10/2012	Paid	
21834/05	SHANOVY	07/02/2012	4 750,00	3 000,00	100,00	07/05/2012	30/05/2012	Paid	
34248/05	SHAPKIN AND OTHERS	15/03/2016	5 000,00			15/06/2016	01/06/2016 (Mr Kulnev -date of last invitation to the applicant to submit his bank account details)	-	
40713/04	SHCHUROV	29/06/2011	-	3 000,00	-	29/09/2011	05/09/2011	-	
7873/09	SHEYMAN	21/06/2016	36 337,00	6 000,00	-	21/09/2016	28/09/2016	Not significant (EUR 7.59 not paid)	
2982/05	SHURYGINA AND OTHERS	15/03/2016	10 000,00			15/06/2016	Between 21/09/2016 and 22/09/2016	Paid	
55531/00	SITKOV	18/04/2007	-	-	-	18/07/2007	16/07/2007	-	
38585/04	SIZINTSEVA	08/07/2010	16 891,00	15 000,00	99,00	08/10/2010	22/10/2010	Paid	
73203/01	SMARYGIN	01/03/2006	-	-	1 000,00	01/06/2006	18/05/2006	-	
30672/03	SOBELIN AND OTHERS	03/08/2007	-	-	-	03/11/2007	-	-	
8564/02	STANISLAV VOLKOV	15/06/2007	-	-	2 000,00	15/09/2007	10/09/2007	-	
878/03	STETSENKO	05/01/2007	1 700,00	4 000,00	185,00	05/04/2007	30/03/2007	-	
8269/02	SUTYAZHNIK	10/12/2009	-	500,00	-	10/03/2010	25/03/2010	Not significant (EUR 0.98 not paid)	
24559/04	TALYSHEVA	22/03/2010	-	3 000,00	-	22/06/2010	24/01/2011	n/a (the applicant provided his bank account details after the payment)	

No.	Case	Judgment final on	Sums awarded by the Court (in EUR, unless specified otherwise)			Payment deadline	Date of payment of the sums awarded by the Court	Payment of default interest	Payment of internal debt, as ordered by the Court
			Pecuniary damage	Non-pecuniary damage	Costs and expenses				
								deadline)	
11093/07	TARNOPOLSKAYA	28/06/2010	102 828,00	-	60 000,00	28/09/2010	17/11/2010	Paid	-
4596/02	TAYANKO	02/12/2010	2 328,00	3 000,00	300,00	02/03/2011	07/06/2011	Paid	-
22551/06	TKACHEV	11/03/2009	-	3 000,00	-	11/06/2009	01/06/2009	-	-
43327/02	TSAREVA	01/07/2010	-	3 000,00	-	01/10/2010	22/10/2010	Paid	-
66543/01	VASILYEV	12/04/2006	230,00	500,00	-	12/07/2006	06/06/2006	-	-
48758/99	VOLKOVA	05/07/2005	-	3 000,00	744,00	05/10/2005	01/09/2005	-	-
44381/04	VOTINTSEVA	11/05/2010	-	3 000,00	-	11/08/2010	15/09/2010	Paid	-
43166/04	YAKOVLEVA	10/07/2014	-	2 000,00	-	10/10/2014	07/10/2015	-	-
21594/05	YELISEYEV	28/05/2014	-	2 000,00	-	28/08/2014	17/12/2014	n/a (the applicant provided his bank account details after the payment deadline)	-
69341/01	YURIY ROMANOV	15/02/2006	160,00	500,00	-	15/05/2006	02/05/2006	-	-
23333/05	ZALEVSKAYA	28/06/2010	-	3 000,00	484,47	28/09/2010	15/09/2010	-	-
67051/01	ZASURTSEV	27/07/2006	-	-	RUR 23,280	27/10/2006	23/10/2006	-	-
14805/02	ZELENKEVICH AND OTHERS	20/06/2013	-	-	-	20/09/2013	-	-	-
25448/06	ZVEZDIN	14/09/2007	-	4 300,00	-	14/12/2007	07/11/2007	-	-