DH-SYSC-IV(2020)07REV
03/12/2020

STEERING COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

(CDDH)

_____

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE SYSTEM OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

(DH-SYSC)

_____

DRAFTING GROUP ON EFFECTIVE PROCESSING AND RESOLUTION OF CASES RELATING TO INTER-STATE DISPUTES

(DH-SYSC-IV)

_____

Questions regarding the scope of the mandate of the DH-SYSC-IV

Background information

1. At its 92nd meeting (26-29 November 2019) the CDDH gave the following terms of reference to DH-SYSC-IV:

> "In the light, in particular, of the reflections carried out during the elaboration of (i) the Contribution of the CDDH to the evaluation provided for by the Interlaken Declaration [CDDH(2019)R92Addendum2]; (ii) the follow-up given by the CDDH to the relevant paragraphs of the Copenhagen Declaration and (iii) the CDDH Report on the place of the European Convention on Human Rights in the European and international legal order,[CDDH(2019)R92Addendum1] the DH-SYSC Drafting Group on effective processing and resolution of cases relating to inter-State disputes (DH-SYSC-IV) is called upon to elaborate proposals on how to handle more effectively cases related to inter-State disputes, as well as individual applications arising from situations of conflict between States, without thereby limiting the jurisdiction of the Court, taking into account the specific features of these categories of cases, *inter alia* regarding the establishment of facts. In this context and under the supervision of the Committee of Experts on the System of the European Convention on Human Rights (DH-SYSC), the Group is tasked to prepare:

1. a draft CDDH report to be submitted to the forthcoming high-level expert conference on inter-State disputes in the framework of the ECHR system to be held in spring 2021 under the auspices of the German Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers 7 (deadline: 15 October 2020);
2. a draft final activity report of the CDDH for the Committee of Ministers containing the reflections and possible proposals of the Steering Committee in this field (deadline: 15 October 2021)."[1]

2. The DH-SYSC-IV, at its 2nd meeting (9-11 September 2020, via videoconference), discussed paragraphs 8-80 of the draft CDDH report on the effective processing and resolution of cases related to inter-State disputes (hereinafter the draft CDDH Report). A revised version of the draft CDDH Report, which was prepared by the Co-rapporteurs, the Chair and the Vice-Chair with the support of the Secretariat, was distributed after the 2nd meeting of DH-SYSC-IV (document DH-SYC-IV(2020)04Rev). This document included compromise proposals, wherever deemed possible and appropriate, in respect of the comments that were submitted by member States on paragraphs 1-7bis. and 81-168 prior to and during the 2nd meeting of DH-SYSC-IV (these comments appear in document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)05Rev). The revised draft CDDH Report was distributed to DH-SYSC-IV for drafting proposals by 19 October 2020; the drafting proposals and comments received in response appear in document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)06REV.

3. The Bureau of the CDDH, at its 104th meeting (29 October 2020, via videoconference), taking into account, *inter alia*, the existence of some outstanding questions regarding the DH-SYSC-IV's mandate decided to invite the Co-rapporteurs, the Chair and Vice-Chair of DH-SYSC-IV, to formulate concrete questions regarding the interpretation of the mandate of DH-SYSC-IV and refer them to the CDDH for decision at its 93rd meeting (14-16 December 2020). This document responds to this request of the Bureau.

4. The Co-rapporteurs, the Chair and Vice-Chair of DH-SYSC-IV have identified and formulated the questions listed below in the light of discussions of the Drafting Group, and the comments and drafting proposals made by its members in the various steps of the process which have been recorded in documents referenced in paragraph 2. In doing so, their main consideration was to seek guidance from the CDDH regarding issues on which they felt that discussions in the DH-SYSC-IV regarding its mandate had been exhausted without a conclusion that was sufficiently supported by its members and that further discussions on them in the Drafting Group would not be conducive to advancing in its work. The Co-rapporteurs, the Chair and Vice-Chair of DH-SYSC-IV consider the questions listed below as distinct from other substantive questions on which further reflection and debate is necessary in the DH-SYSC-IV during the remaining time of its mandate in order to formulate compromise proposals or at least to present the main views within the Group. The DH-SYSC-IV has endorsed the questions by non-objection. The questions are accompanied with comments in order to help the CDDH contextualise them.

***

[1] See document CDDH(2019)R92

Question 1

Do individual applications raising an issue identified in an inter-State case, whether they are lodged before or after the relevant inter-State case is lodged before the Court, but when there is no unanimous consensus amongst the members of DH-SYSC-IV that such individual applications "arise from a situation of conflict between States", fall within the mandate of the DH-SYSC-IV?

Comment

5. This question has arisen in the context of the presentation of statistical information provided by the Court's Registry on pending and finished individual applications relating to inter-State disputes. Please see the first phrase marked in square brackets in section III/1, paragraph 14 and paragraph 19 of the draft CDDH Report (doc DH-SYSC-IV(2020)04Rev).

6. As regards relevant member States' comments see document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)06REV, at pg.16 and 17.

7. The draft CDDH Report reproduces the statistical information on applications linked to inter-State disputes as provided by the Registry which has given the following explanation of the use of terms for statistical purposes:

8. "An inter-State case is an application brought by one State against another in accordance with Article 33 of the Convention.

Applications submitted by individuals, physical persons or legal entities, concerning the issue identified in the inter-state case, irrespective of whether they are directed against the applicant State or respondent State or both, are considered to be related to that "conflict" or "dispute". In particular, they may concern the control of a territory. The degree of the connection required between the inter-state case and the individual applications always depends on particular circumstances surrounding the "conflict" or "dispute" in question and as well as on the relevant general context, and the Court is free in its evaluation of this question. Individual applications that are considered to be linked to the inter-state case can be lodged with the Court both before and after the introduction of the relevant inter-state case.

Such "dispute" situations may exist even if there are no inter-State applications as such where two States have been/will be called upon to answer before the Court for a situation concerning their jurisdiction. In such cases leading cases are identified to deal with these situations.

It is the need to resolve an overarching issue or issues that should determine whether cases are regarded as linked to an inter-State dispute (an analogy can be drawn with pilot-judgment proceedings in this respect)."

9. The Registry's statistical report on applications linked to inter-State disputes as of 1 October 2020, which contains the above-mentioned explanation, appears in Appendix 1 of this document.

Question 2

Do individual applications relating to situations in which no inter-State application has been lodged with the Court and there is no unanimous consensus amongst the members of DH-SYSC-IV that they are linked to an inter-State conflict but when such individual applications are linked to inter-State conflict situations due to the existence of certain other connecting factors fall within the mandate of DH-SYSC-IV? For example, when individual applications concern disputes over the control of a particular territory; or when they relate to situations in which two States have been/will be called upon to answer before the Court for a situation regarding their jurisdiction; or when there is a need to resolve an overarching issue/s in an inter-State case.

Comment

10. This question has also arisen in the context of the presentation of statistical information provided by the Court's Registry on pending and finished individual applications relating to inter-State disputes; please see the last phrase marked in square brackets in section III/1, paragraph 14 and paragraph 19.ter of the draft CDDH Report (doc DH-SYSC-IV(2020)04Rev).

11. As regards relevant member States comments see document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)06REV, at pg.16 and 17.

12. The examples referenced in the question are based on the Registry's explanation quoted in para.8 above as well as on the statistical information appearing in Appendix 1.

Question 3

Should the DH-SYSC-IV analyse the totality of decisions and judgments delivered by the European Commission of Human Rights and the Court on inter-State cases and possibly on related individual cases in the section concerning statistics?

Comment

13. This question has also arisen in the context of the presentation of statistical information provided by the Court's Registry on pending and finished individual applications relating to inter-State disputes (see section III/1, paragraph 14 of the draft CDDH report, doc DH-SYSC-IV(2020)04Rev.

14. As regards member States' comments see document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)06REV, at pg.16 and 17.

15. It should be noted that the decisions and judgments of the European Commission of Human Rights and the Court in inter-State cases are fully covered in the draft CDDH Report whenever this was deemed necessary to analyse the issues addressed by it and present the existing case-law (see for example paragraphs 28-30; 36; 57-58; 94; 98; 103; 111;113;127; 129; and paragraphs 143-157 notably issues related to friendly settlements).

Question 4

Does the mandate of the DH-SYSC-IV allow the Group to consider and possibly submit concrete proposals to amend the existing provisions of the Convention? In particular, does the mandate allow the group to consider and possibly submit concrete proposals to amend existing provisions of the Convention concerning admissibility criteria?

Comment

16. This question has arisen in the context of Chapter IV 'Questions regarding the parallel processing of related inter-State and individual applications, section 3' Procedural questions' of the draft CDDH Report (see doc DH-SYSC-IV(2020)04Rev).

17. As regards relevant member States' comments see document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)05Rev, at pg. 16-17; 21-23. For example, it has been proposed to "introduce a new condition and new admissibility criterion for inter-State applications" lodged under Article 33 of the Convention. "In particular, an inter-State application may be lodged only under the condition that the applicant State has reasonably explained why the affected individuals or legal entities cannot apply to the Court independently. Practical implementation of this condition may include a requirement for the applicant State to provide written statements from the affected persons containing a request to apply to the Court in their interests and an explanatory report as to why these persons cannot apply themselves." Furthermore, it has been proposed "[a]s regards the new admissibility criterion, an inter-State application or a part thereof must be declared inadmissible if at least one similar application from a concrete affected person is pending before the Court.".

18. Also, please see other relevant comments in document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)05Rev, at pg. 26, where it is suggested that Article 41 of the Convention could be reformulated with a view to clarifying its applicability to inter-State applications, to determining the exact timing for the submission of just satisfaction claims (i.e. excluding the admissibility stage), as well as to stipulating that the Court should further clarify its just satisfaction award (rendering its reasoning in a more explicit manner).

Question 5

Does the theme of the application of international law on state responsibility fall within the mandate of the DH-SYSC-IV? Do the Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts fall within the mandate of the DH-SYSC-IV?

Comment

19. This question has arisen after the 2nd meeting of the DH-SYSC-IV (9-11 September 2020).

20. See relevant member State proposals at document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)06REV, at pages 18 and 25.

21. It should be borne in mind that the DH-SYSC-IV has been instructed to complete its tasks in the light, in particular, of the reflections carried out during the elaboration of, *inter alia*, the CDDH Report on the place of the European Convention on Human Rights in the European and international legal order (document CDDH(2019)R92Addendum1).

Question 6

Is the use of terms “the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict”, the “Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh” (the “NKR”) and “the line of contact between Azerbaijan and the “Nagorno-Karabakh Republic”(“NKR”) in line with the mandate of the of DH-SYSC-IV?

Comment

22. This question, which focuses on the use of terminology in compliance with the mandate of DH-SYSC-IV rather than its scope, has also arisen in the context of the presentation of statistical information provided by the Court’s Registry on pending and finished individual applications relating to inter-State disputes (see second phrase marked in square brackets in section III/1, paragraphs 14 and 20, second phrase marked in square brackets in footnote 24 and first phrase marked in square brackets in footnote 25 of the draft CDDH Report (doc DH-SYSC-IV(2020)04Rev).

23. As regards relevant member States’ comments see document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)05Rev, at pg. 3-4; and document DH-SYSC-IV(2020)06REV, at pg.3 - 6.

24. It should be noted that the term “the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict” is used by the Court in its jurisprudence (see *Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan* no. 40167/06, §§ 116, 117; *Chiragov and Others v. Armenia* (no. 13216/05), §§ 172; 180; 186). The term “the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict” has also been used in the CDDH Report on the place of the European Convention on Human Rights in the European and international legal order (document CDDH(2019)R92Addendum1) see § 138).

25. The terms the “Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh” (the “NKR”) and the “NKR” are also used by the Court in its jurisprudence (see *Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan* no. 40167/06, §§ 19; 134, 136; 142; *Chiragov and Others v. Armenia* (no. 13216/05) §§ 17; 172-187). The terms “Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh” (the “NKR”) and the “NKR” have also been used in the CDDH Report on the place of the European Convention on Human Rights in the European and international legal order (document CDDH(2019)R92Addendum1) see §§ 138; 245).

26. The term “the line of contact between Azerbaijan and the “NKR””, as used in the above-referenced paragraphs of the draft CDDH Report, is in line with the terminology used by the Registry in its statistical report (see Appendix 1). The Chair, the Vice-Chair and the two Co-rapporteurs note that the delegation of Azerbaijan objected to the use of the term “the line of contact between Azerbaijan and the “NKR”” in paragraph 26 of this document because according to this delegation this term is not accurate as it does not stem from the Court judgments or any other authoritative source.

Appendix 1[2]

Statistical report on applications linked to inter-State disputes

Explanation of terms for statistical purposes

An inter-State case is an application brought by one State against another in accordance with Article 33 of the Convention.

Applications submitted by individuals, physical persons or legal entities, concerning the issue identified in the inter-state case, irrespective of whether they are directed against the applicant State or respondent State or both, are considered to be related to that "conflict" or "dispute". In particular, they may concern the control of a territory. The degree of the connection required between the inter-state case and the individual applications always depends on particular circumstances surrounding the "conflict" or "dispute" in question and as well as on the relevant general context, and the Court is free in its evaluation of this question. Individual applications that are considered to be linked to the inter-state case can be lodged with the Court both before and after the introduction of the relevant inter-state case.

Such "dispute" situations may exist even if there are no inter-State applications as such where two States have been/will be called upon to answer before the Court for a situation concerning their jurisdiction. In such cases leading cases are identified to deal with these situations.

It is the need to resolve an overarching issue or issues that should determine whether cases are regarded as linked to an inter-State dispute (an analogy can be drawn with pilot-judgment proceedings in this respect).

I. Individual applications linked to the hostilities in "South Ossetia" and "Abkhazia"[3]

A. Pending applications

In total, 3,416 applications were lodged before the Court with relation to "South Ossetia" (3,216 against Georgia, 178 against Russia and 22 against both States). 19 applications were lodged with relation to "Abkhazia".

1. **Concerning the applications related to hostilities between Georgia and Russia in "South Ossetia" at the beginning of August 2008:** there is currently one pending inter-State case *Georgia v. Russia* (II) (no. 38263/08). Out of 579 pending applications[4], 383 are pending against Georgia, 174 are pending against Russia and 22 are pending against both States. Out of these pending applications, 180 were communicated to the respondent Governments.

2. **As to the applications lodged concerning various issues in the region of "Abkhazia"**, 16 individual applications are pending: 3 against Russia, 1 against Georgia and 12 against both States. 11 of these were communicated to the respondent Governments.

In addition to that, one pending inter-State case *Georgia v. Russia* (IV) (no. 39611/18) relates to the alleged recent deterioration of the human rights situation along the administrative boundary lines between Georgian-controlled territory and "Abkhazia" and "South Ossetia".

[2] This report has been provided by the Registry of the Court. It contains information as of 1 October 2020.

[3] The terms "South Ossetia" and "Abkhazia" refer to the regions of Georgia which are beyond the *de facto* control of the Georgian Government.

[4] The applicants alleged breaches of their Convention rights resulting principally from the hostilities and the absence of adequate investigations by the state authorities.

The case was communicated to the respondent Government and then adjourned pending the delivery of the judgment in *Georgia v. Russia* (II).

B. Finished applications

1. **Concerning the applications related to hostilities between Georgia and Russia in "South Ossetia" at the beginning of August 2008:** 1,554 applications[5] were struck out of the Court's list in 2010. Furthermore, three leading cases[6] were decided by a Chamber in November 2018, resulting in six applications being declared inadmissible and one application being communicated to the Government. These leading decisions served the basis for subsequent inadmissibility decisions. In total, the Court declared inadmissible 1,282 applications and struck out 1,555 applications out of 3,416 applications lodged.

2. **As to the applications lodged concerning various issues in the region of "Abkhazia"**, three applications were declared inadmissible.

3. There were also 10 applications lodged concerning essentially the alleged existence of an administrative practice involving the **arrest, detention and collective expulsion of Georgian nationals from Russia** in autumn 2006. They were all follow-up cases to the leading case *Georgia v. Russia (I)* [GC] (no. 13255/07)[7]. All 10 applications were decided: 9 resulted in judgments and one was struck out for a friendly settlement.

II. Individual applications linked to the conflict in Eastern Ukraine and Crimea

A. Pending applications

At present **9,928 applications were lodged with the Court concerning the events in Eastern Ukraine and Crimea**, out of which 7,561 are still pending. 215 of pending applications were communicated. These cases are linked to the pending inter-State cases of *Ukraine v. Russia* (re Crimea), no. 20958/14, and *Ukraine v. Russia* (re eastern Ukraine), no. 8019/16. There are another three inter-State applications lodged by Ukraine against Russia pending before the Court: *Ukraine v. Russia* (II) (no. 43800/14), *Ukraine v. Russia* (VII) (no. 38334/18) and *Ukraine v. Russia* (VIII) (no. 55855/18). There is also an inter-State application lodged by the Government of the Netherlands against Russia (no. 28525/20). For details, please see the ECHR factsheet on Armed conflicts (p. 15-18) and the Q & A on Inter-State Cases.

6,561 pending applications concern Eastern Ukraine. 5,728 of these were lodged against Ukraine, 49 were lodged against Russia and 784 were lodged against both States. In this group, eight applications relate to the destruction of Malaysia Airlines commercial flight MH17 over the territory of Eastern Ukraine on 17 July 2014 (6 applications, out of 8 pending, lodged by 384 applicants were communicated[8]).

The remaining **1,000 pending applications concern Crimea**. 880 of these were lodged against Russia, 10 were lodged against Ukraine and 110 were lodged against both States.

---

[5] See *Abayeva and Others v. Georgia* (dec.), nos. 52196/08, 52200/08, 49671/08, 46657/08 and 53894/08, 23 March 2010; *Khetagurova and Others v. Georgia* (dec.), no. 43253/08 and 1548 applications, 14 December 2010.

[6] See *Dzhioyeva and Others v. Georgia* (dec.), nos. 24964/09, 20548/09 and 22469/09; *Kudukhova and Kudukhova v. Georgia* (dec.), nos. 8274/09 and 8275/09; *Naniyeva and Bagayev v. Georgia* (dec.), nos. 2256/09 and 2260/09.

[7] See *Georgia v. Russia* (I) [GC] *(merits)*, 3 July 2014; and the subsequent judgment on just satisfaction of 29 January 2019.

[8] See *Ioppa and Others v. Ukraine* and *Ayley and Others v. Russia and Angline and Others v. Russia*.

B. Finished applications

An inadmissibility decision was adopted in the leading case of *Lisnyy v. Ukraine and Russia*[9], in which the Court declared inadmissible for complete lack of evidence the applicants' various complaints concerning, *inter alia*, the shelling of their homes during the hostilities in Eastern Ukraine from the beginning of April 2014 onwards.

Concerning issues in Eastern Ukraine, 1,677 applications were declared inadmissible and 348 were struck out of the list of cases.

Concerning issues in Crimea, 320 applications were declared inadmissible and 26 were struck out of the list of cases.

In total, the Court decided 2,371 applications out of 9,928 applications lodged.

III. Individual applications linked to the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh

A. Pending applications

Out of 2,207 applications lodged, there are 1,710 applications pending before the Court, which relate to the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh (in particular, concerning acts committed in the "Nagorno-Karabakh Republic" ("NKR")): 1,062 against Armenia and 648 against Azerbaijan.

1. **Displaced persons' continued inability to return to their homes and property from which they fled in the years 1988-93**: there are 1,120 pending follow-up *Chiragov*- and *Sargsyan*[10]-type applications with similar complaints – 618 against Armenia and 502 against Azerbaijan.

2. **"Four-day war" in April 2016**: shelling along the line of contact between Azerbaijan and the "NKR" has led to 1,085 applications lodged, out of which 590 are still pending, divided into two groups:

a) 562 applications in this group are still pending (439 against Armenia and 123 against Azerbaijan) with complaints by civilians on both sides, predominantly regarding damage and destruction of property but a handful of cases also involve the killing of civilians. Of these, 5 applications were communicated to the respondent Governments.
b) Another 28 pending applications (5 against Armenia and 23 against Azerbaijan) concern mutilation of dead (mostly) soldiers' bodies. All the applications were communicated to the respondent Governments.

3. There are also 7 pending applications against Azerbaijan concerning the detention and alleged torture/killing of Armenian citizens in Azerbaijan. All of them were communicated to the respondent Government.

B. Finished applications

1. Displaced persons' continued inability to return to their homes and property from which they fled in the years 1988-93: two leading cases were examined and decided by a Grand Chamber (see *Chiragov and Others v. Armenia* and *Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan*, cited above). For further details, see Guide on Article 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights (p. 23) and the ECHR factsheet on Armed conflicts (p. 6-7).

[9] See *Lisnyy v. Ukraine and Russia* (dec.), nos. 5355/15, 44913/15 and 50853/15, 5 July 2016.

[10] See *Chiragov and Others v. Armenia* [GC], no. 13216/05[10], ECHR 2015; and *Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan* [GC], no. 40167/06, ECHR 2015; both judgments on merits in June 2015 and on just satisfaction in December 2017.

2. "Four-day war" in April 2016:

Two leading applications, one against Armenia and the other against Azerbaijan, were rejected as unsubstantiated[11]. Furthermore, 493 applications (256 against Armenia and 239 against Azerbaijan) were subsequently declared inadmissible.

In total, the Court declared inadmissible 495 applications out of 1,085 applications lodged under this head.

IV. Individual applications related to Transdniestria

A. Pending applications

Out of 152 applications lodged concerning acts committed in the "Moldovan Republic of Transdniestria" ("MRT") 43 applications are still pending: 5 against Russia, 1 against the Republic of Moldova, 34 against the Republic of Moldova and Russia and 3 against the Republic of Moldova, Russia and Ukraine.

20 out of 43 applications were communicated to the respondent Governments and another one resulted in a judgment on merits[12].

B. Finished applications

Two leading cases, concerning 4 applications, were examined and decided by a Grand Chamber[13]. The first case concerned the complaint by children and parents from the Moldovan community in Transdniestria about the effects of a language policy adopted in 1992 and 1994 by the separatist regime forbidding the use of the Latin alphabet in schools and the subsequent measures taken to enforce the policy. The second case concerned conditions of detention of a man suspected of fraud, as ordered by the courts of the self-proclaimed "Moldavian Republic of Transdniestria" (the "MRT"). For more information, see Guide on Article 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights (p. 22-23).

In total, the Court decided 109 applications out of 152 applications lodged: 62 applications resulted in judgments, 43 applications were declared inadmissible and 4 were struck out of the list of cases.

V. Individual applications related to northern Cyprus

A. Pending applications

The inter-State case *Cyprus v. Turkey*[14] examined by a Grand Chamber concerned the situation that existed in northern Cyprus since the conduct of military operations there by Turkey in July and August 1974 and the continuing division of the territory of Cyprus[15]. For more information, see Guide on Article 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights (p. 20-21) and the ECHR factsheet on Armed conflicts (p. 1-3).

---

[11] See *Amrahov v. Armenia* (dec.), no. 49169/16, 26 February 2019; and *Khudunts v. Azerbaijan*, no. 74628/16, 26 February 2019.

[12] The application is still pending (see *Babchin v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia* (merits)[Committee], no. 55698/14, 17 September 2019).

[13] See *Catan and Others v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia* [GC], nos. 43370/04 and 2 others, ECHR 2012 (extracts), 19 October 2012; and *Mozer v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia* [GC], no. 11138/10, 23 February 2016.

[14] See *Cyprus v. Turkey* [GC], no. 25781/94, 10 May 2001; and on just satisfaction of 12 May 2014.

[15] See also *Loizidou v. Turkey* (preliminary objections), 23 March 1995, Series A no. 310; *Loizidou v. Turkey (merits)*, 18 December 1996, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1996 VI; *Loizidou v. Turkey (Article 50)*, 28 July 1998, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1998 IV.

Out of 1,808 applications lodged concerning Cypriot property issues 92 applications are still pending, including 2 applications communicated to the Government of Turkey.

B. Finished applications

Three judgments concerning Cypriot property issues were delivered by the Court. 1,699 applications were declared inadmissible, including a leading post-*Loizidou* case[16]. 14 applications were struck out of the list of cases, including one struck out for a friendly settlement.

In total 1,716 applications were decided by the Court out of 1,808 lodged.

REFERENCES

https://echr.coe.int/Documents/Stats_understanding_ENG.pdf

https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/

https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Guide_Art_1_ENG.pdf

https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/fs_armed_conflicts_eng.pdf

https://echr.coe.int/Documents/Press_Q_A_Inter-State_cases_ENG.pdf

[16] See *Demopoulos and Others v. Turkey* [GC] (dec.), no. 46113/99 and 7 others, 1 March 2010.