



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

FIRST SECTION

CASE OF ALEKHINA AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA

(Application no. 22519/02)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

13 April 2006

FINAL

13/07/2006

This judgment will become final in the circumstances set out in Article 44 § 2 of the Convention. It may be subject to editorial revision.

In the case of Alekhina and Others v. Russia,

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting as a Chamber composed of:

Mr C.L. ROZAKIS, *President*,

Mr L. LOUCAIDES,

Mrs F. TULKENS,

Mr P. LORENZEN,

Mrs N. VAJIĆ,

Mrs S. BOTOUCHAROVA,

Mr A. KOVLER, *judges*

and Mr S. NIELSEN, *Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 23 March 2006,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in an application (no. 22519/02) against the Russian Federation lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by fifty-eight Russian national listed in appendix 1 on 20 November 2001.

2. The Russian Government (“the Government”) were represented by Mr P. Laptev, Representative of the Russian Federation at the European Court of Human Rights.

3. On 7 October 2003 the Court decided to communicate the application to the Government. Under the provisions of Article 29 § 3 of the Convention, it decided to examine the merits of the application at the same time as its admissibility.

THE FACTS

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE

4. The applicants live in the Voronezh Region.

5. They are in receipt of welfare payments for their children. In 1999 – 2001 the applicants brought separate sets of civil proceedings against a local welfare authority, claiming arrears in those payments.

6. On the dates set out in appendix 1 the domestic courts granted the applicants’ claims and ordered the welfare authority to pay them the

respective amounts. The enforcement proceedings were commenced accordingly.

7. On 26 July 2001 the bailiffs discontinued the enforcement proceedings in respect of the judgments in the applicants' favour and returned them the writs of execution referring to the lack of the debtor's funds.

8. Thereafter the applicants unsuccessfully applied to various public bodies seeking to have the judgments in their favour enforced.

9. In January and February 2004 the applicants were paid the amounts due pursuant to the writs of execution.

II. RELEVANT DOMESTIC LAW

10. Section 9 of the Federal Law on Enforcement Proceedings of 21 July 1997 provides that a bailiff's order on the institution of enforcement proceedings must fix a time-limit for the defendant's voluntary compliance with a writ of execution. The time-limit may not exceed five days. The bailiff must also warn the defendant that coercive action will follow, should the defendant fail to comply with the time-limit.

11. Under Section 13 of the Law, the enforcement proceedings should be completed within two months of the receipt of the writ of enforcement by the bailiff.

THE LAW

I. WITHDRAWAL OF THIRTEEN APPLICANTS

12. On 20 February and 19 March 2004 the Government informed the Court that thirteen of the applicants, namely Ms Lyudmila Ilyinichna Borzykh, Ms Larisa Ivanovna Vysotskaya, Ms Larisa Ivanovna Danilova, Ms Olga Mitrofanovna Kontsova, Ms Lyudmila Dmitriyevna Kryuchkova, Ms Nina Leonidovna Kuznetsova, Mr Nikolay Anatolyevich Popov, Ms Svetlana Alekseyevna Trofimova, Ms Yelena Federovna Khlopova, Ms Valentina Ivanovna Chernyshova, Ms Natalya Yuryevna Chernyshova, Ms Natalya Aleksandrovna Chusova and Ms Nina Anatolyevna Shaderkina, had accepted an offer in settlement of their application and invited the Court, in so far as the complaints of the respective applicants were concerned, to strike the application out of its list of cases under Article 37 § 1 (a) and (b) of the Convention. The Government enclosed copies of friendly settlement agreements dated 11 and 12 February as well

as 12 and 15 March 2004 signed by an official representing the Government and the applicants. Under these agreements the Government undertook to pay the judgment debts and compensation in respect of non-pecuniary damage and legal costs to the applicants, while the latter declared that they did not intend to pursue the proceedings before the Court.

13. By registered letters of 2 September 2005 the Court transmitted copies of the above agreements to the applicants and invited them to affirm formally, before 7 October 2005, that they had accepted the settlement in question and that, therefore, they did not intend to pursue their application. On 3 October 2005 Mr Nikolay Anatolyevich Popov confirmed that he was satisfied with the terms of the friendly settlement agreement and did not insist on the Court's examining his complaints. None of the other twelve applicants replied.

14. Taking into account the declarations of the aforementioned thirteen applicants, the formal affirmation by Mr Nikolay Anatolyevich Popov, and the fact that the remaining twelve applicants did not submit any comments regarding the friendly settlement, the Court finds that the matter has been resolved and the respective applicants have lost interest in pursuing their application. It finds no reasons of a general character, as defined in Article 37 § 1 *in fine*, which would require the examination of the application by virtue of that Article. Accordingly, in so far as the complaints of the thirteen applicants listed above are concerned, the Court strikes the application out of its list, in accordance with Article 37 § 1 of the Convention (see *Tikhomirov and Tikhomirova v. Russia* (dec.), no. 43172/98, 21 March 2002).

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 OF THE CONVENTION AND ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL NO. 1 TO THE CONVENTION

15. The remaining applicants complained about the prolonged non-enforcement of the judgments in their favour. The Court will examine this complaint under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention. These Articles, in so far as relevant, read as follows:

Article 6 § 1

“In the determination of his civil rights and obligations ..., everyone is entitled to a fair ... hearing ... by [a] ... tribunal ...”

Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

“Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest

and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.

The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.”

A. Admissibility

16. The Government notified the Court that the authorities of the Voronezh Region had attempted to secure a friendly settlement of the case and that the applicants had refused to accept the friendly settlement on the terms proposed by the authorities. By reference to this refusal, the fact that, in any event, the judgments in the applicants’ favour had been enforced, and the admissibility decision in the case of *Aleksentseva and Others v. Russia* (no. 75025/01 *et seq.*, 4 September 2003) the Government invited the Court to strike out the application, in accordance with Article 37 § 1 of the Convention.

17. The applicants disagreed with the Government’s arguments and maintained their complaints. As regards the friendly settlement proposal, the applicants submitted that the terms of the offer which authorities of the Voronezh Region had made to them had been unacceptable.

18. The Court firstly observes that the parties were unable to agree on the terms of a friendly settlement of the case. It notes that whilst under certain circumstances an application may indeed be struck out of its list of cases under Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention on the basis of a unilateral declaration by the respondent Government even if the applicant wishes the examination of the case to be continued (see *Tahsin Acar v. Turkey* [GC], no. 26307/95, § 76, ECHR 2003-...), this procedure is not, as such, intended to circumvent the applicant’s opposition to a friendly settlement.

19. Moreover, a distinction must be drawn between, on one hand, declarations made in the context of strictly confidential friendly settlement proceedings (Article 38 § 2 of the Convention and Rule 62 § 2 of the Rules of Court) and, on the other hand, unilateral declarations made by a respondent Government in public and adversarial proceedings before the Court.

20. On the facts, the Court observes that the Government failed to submit any formal statement capable of falling into that category and offering a sufficient basis for finding that respect for human rights as defined in the Convention does not require the Court to continue its examination of the case (see, by contrast, *Akman v. Turkey* (striking out), no. 37453/97, §§ 23-24, ECHR 2001-VI).

21. As regards the Government's argument that the judgments in question have already been enforced, the Court considers that the mere fact that the authorities complied with the judgments after a substantial delay cannot be viewed in this case as automatically depriving the applicants of their victim status under the Convention. (see, e.g., *Petrushko v. Russia*, no. 36494/02, § 16, 24 February 2005).

22. In the light of the above considerations, the Court rejects the Government's request to strike the application out under Article 37 of the Convention.

23. The Court notes that the application is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 of the Convention. It further notes that it is not inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

B. Merits

24. The Government advanced no arguments on the merits of the application.

25. The applicants maintained their complaint.

26. The Court observes that the judgments in the applicants' favour remained inoperative for several years. No justification was advanced by the Government for the respective delays.

27. The Court has frequently found violations of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 in cases raising issues similar to the ones in the present case (see, among other authorities, *Burdov v. Russia*, no. 59498/00, ECHR 2002-III and, more recently, *Petrushko*, cited above, or *Poznakhirina v. Russia*, no. 25964/02, 24 February 2005).

28. Having examined the material submitted to it, the Court notes that the Government did not put forward any fact or argument capable of persuading it to reach a different conclusion in the present case. Having regard to its case-law on the subject, the Court finds that by failing for years to comply with the enforceable judgments in the applicants' favour the domestic authorities prevented them from receiving the money they could reasonably have expected to receive.

29. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

III. OTHER ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE CONVENTION

30. The applicants also complained that the lengthy non-enforcement of the judgments in their favour violated their rights to effective domestic remedies under Article 13 of the Convention.

31. The Court considers that this complaint is linked to the above issues of non-enforcement to such an extent that it should be declared admissible as well. However, having regard to the finding relating to Article 6 § 1 (see paragraph 29 above), the Court considers that it is not necessary to examine whether, in this case, there has been a violation of Article 13.

IV. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

32. 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

33. The applicants claimed amounts set out in appendix 2 for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage. The respective amounts included the judgment debts index-linked to the inflation rate of 50 % for the default period as well as penalty payments at a rate of 1 % per day.

34. The Government contested the applicants' claims as wholly excessive and unjustified. As regards the pecuniary damage, they pointed out that under national law it was open to the applicants to file a court claim, seeking interest for the delayed payment of their judgment debts, and that the domestic courts would calculate such interest on the basis of a statutory rate which was currently equal to 14 %. Therefore, in the Government's view, the interest accrued by the applicants should amount to 52 % of their judgment debts. As to the non-pecuniary damage, the Government considered that should the Court find a violation in this case that would in itself constitute sufficient just satisfaction.

35. Having regard to the materials in its possession, the Court accepts the Government's argument and awards the applicants the respective amounts set out in appendix 2, plus any tax that may be chargeable.

36. In so far as the compensation of non-pecuniary damage is concerned, the Court would not exclude that the applicants might have suffered distress and frustration resulting from the State authorities' failure to enforce the judgment in their favour. However, making its assessment on an equitable basis, the Court considers that the finding of a violation constitutes in itself sufficient just satisfaction for any non-pecuniary damage sustained by the applicants (see, in a similar context, *Poznakhirina*, cited above, § 35, *Mikhaylova and others v. Russia*, no. 22534/02, § 41, 17 November 2005, or *Bobrova v. Russia*, no. 24654/03, § 37, 17 November 2005).

B. Costs and expenses

37. The applicants did not claim reimbursement of their costs and expenses incurred before the domestic authorities and the Court. Accordingly, the Court considers that there is no call to award them any sum on that account.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT UNANIMOUSLY

1. *Decides* to strike the application out of its list in so far as the complaints of Ms Lyudmila Ilyinichna Borzykh, Ms Larisa Ivanovna Vysotskaya, Ms Larisa Ivanovna Danilova, Ms Olga Mitrofanovna Kontsova, Ms Lyudmila Dmitriyevna Kryuchkova, Ms Nina Leonidovna Kuznetsova, Mr Nikolay Anatolyevich Popov, Ms Svetlana Alekseyevna Trofimova, Ms Yelena Federovna Khlopova, Ms Valentina Ivanovna Chernyshova, Ms Natalya Yuryevna Chernyshova, Ms Natalya Aleksandrovna Chusova and Ms Nina Anatolyevna Shaderkina are concerned;
2. *Declares* the application admissible in so far as the complaints of the remaining applicants are concerned;
3. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 6 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention;
4. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the complaint under Article 13 of the Convention;
5. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay each of the applicants, within three months from the date on which the judgment becomes final in accordance with Article 44 § 2 of the Convention, the respective amounts set out in appendix 2 in respect of pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable;
 - (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. *Holds* that the finding of a violation constitutes in itself sufficient just satisfaction for any non-pecuniary damage sustained by the applicants;

7. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claim for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 13 April 2006, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Søren NIELSEN
Registrar

Christos ROZAKIS
President

APPENDIX 1

NAME OF APPLICANT	FINAL JUDGMENT TO BE ENFORCED Date/Decision Body	AWARDED AMOUNT (RUR)
1. Ella Vladimirovna Alekhina	3 April 2000 / the Leninskiy District Court of Voronezh	1,142
2. Lyubov Vasilyevna Aseyeva	13 March 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	4,841.63
3. Margarita Ivanovna Belyayeva	18 January 2000 / the Levoberezhny District Court of Voronezh	4,262.61
4. Irina Ivanovna Bondareva	5 January 2000 / the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	10,189.07
5. Lyudmila Ilyinichna Borzykh	23 October 2000 / the Tsentralny District Court of Voronezh	2,199.16
6. Tamara Yakovlevna Buneyeva	10 April and 23 May 2000 / the Zheleznodorozny District Court of Voronezh	2,696.23
7. Nadezhda Vasilyevna Buneyeva	5 April 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	4,025.36
8. Svetlana Yakovlevna Butkova	28 April 2000 / the Vorobyevka Town Court of the Voronezh Region	4,935.83
9. Nina Yevgenyevna Bykova	13 January 2000 / the Tsentralny District Court of Voronezh	3,833.46
10. Larisa Ivanovna Vysotskaya	7 April 2000 / the Levoberezhny District Court of Voronezh	5,717.6
11. Tatyana Nikolayevna Garmysheva	5 June 2000 / the Levoberezhny District Court of Voronezh	2,030.12
12. Natalya Viktorovna Gladysheva	22 May 2000/the Zheleznodorozhny District Court of Voronezh	4,480.13
13. Marina Vasilyevna Gunkina	14 July 2000 / the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	3,402.29
14. Larisa Ivanovna Danilova	1 September 2000 / the Tsentralny District Court of Voronezh	6,628.5
15. Olga Gennadyevna Dvoretzkaya	31 October 2000 / the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	2,540.98
16. Lyudmila Pavlovna Zhidkova	11 October 2000 / the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	8,179.31
17. Raisa Aleksandrovna Izmaylova	20 April 2000 / the Tsentralny District Court of Voronezh	3,720.99
18. Lyubov Alekseyevna Karabutova	20 January 2000 / the Levoberezhny District Court of Voronezh	3,857.86
19. Svetlana Leonidovna Kozhokina	29 September 2000 / the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	4,906.46
20. Olga Mitrofanovna Kontsova	18 January 2000 / the Leninskiy District Court of Voronezh	3,666.32
21. Lyudmila Pavlovna Kopylova	11 January 2001 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	4,029.48
22. Lyudmila Dmitriyevna Kryuchkova	5 June 2000 / the Zheleznodorozhny District Court of Voronezh	6,449.5
23. Nina Leonidovna Kuznetsova	5 June 2000 / the Zheleznodorozhny District Court of Voronezh	5,275.43

24. Tamara Semenovna Kuznetsova	17 April 2000 / the Tsentralny District Court of Voronezh	6,052.56
25. Larisa Vasilyevna Maltseva	6 May 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	4,122
26. Larisa Arkadyevna Milyayeva	12 January 2000 / the Tsentralny District Court of Voronezh	2,831.99
27. Lidiya Viktorovna Nemtsova	7 October 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	3,009.41
28. Lyudmila Aleksandrovna Neupokoyeva	7 June 2000 / the Levoberezhny District Court of Voronezh	3,224.75
29. Yelena Viktorovna Pavlova	21 March 2000 / the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	2,822.51
30. Svetlana Grigoryevna Polishchuk	16 October 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	3,835.93
31. Nikolay Anatolyevich Popov	29 December 2000 / the Levoberezhny District Court of Voronezh	2,407.09
32. Tatyana Mikhaylovna Poritskaya	3 April 2000 / the Leninskiy District Court of Voronezh	3,964
33. Mariya Sergeyevna Reshetnikova	17 March 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	6,944.79
34. Irina Yegorovna Roshchupkina	29 January 2001 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	5,343.56
35. Nadezhda Vasilyevna Rychkova	5 July 2000 / the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	1,609.01
36. Galina Mikhaylovna Ryazantseva	23 February 2001 / the Levoberezhny District Court of Voronezh	5,192.15
37. Galina Gennadyevna Sanina	4 August and 29 September 2000 / the Zheleznodorozhny District Court of Voronezh	4,101.6
38. Lyudmila Alekseyevna Semchenko	29 May 2000, 27 October 2000 and 15 January 2001 / the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	14,019.52
39. Antonina Viktorovna Sergeyeva	24 March 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	6,035.17
40. Vera Mitrofanovna Serikova	16 October 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	2,163.94
41. Tatyana Ivanovna Sirotenko	16 May 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	14,207.77
42. Aleftina Aleksandrovna Skomorokhova	8 December 1999 / the Leninskiy District Court of Voronezh	3,518
43. Natalya Valeryanovna Solovyeva	19 June 2001/the Zheleznodorozhny District Court of Voronezh	12,451.31
44. Vladimir Yuzikovich Talko	20 September 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	2,163.94
45. Nina Ivanovna Tolkacheva	25 September 2000 / the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	6,149.64
46. Svetlana Alekseyevna Trofimova	30 November 2000 / the Levoberezhny District Court of Voronezh	2,889.48
47. Vera Yefimovna Trukhacheva	1 December 1999 / the Novovoronezh Town Court of the Voronezh Region	2,893
48. Yelena Fedorovna Khlopova	2 October 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	2,146.2

49. Yelena Nikolayevna Chernikova	14 March 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	1,561.97
50. Lyudmila Aleksandrovna Chernykh	8 September 2000 / the Sovetskiy District Court of Voronezh	4,464.52
51. Valentina Ivanovna Chernyshova	21 August 2000 / the Khokholskiy Town Court of the Voronezh Region	8,171.66
52. Natalya Yuryevna Chernyshova	30 May 2000/the Zheleznodorozhny District Court of Voronezh	7,138.3
53. Natalya Aleksandrovna Chusova	22 May 2000/the Zheleznodorozhny District Court of Voronezh	2,188.4
54. Nina Anatolyevna Shaderkina	24 November 2000 / the Levoberezhny District Court of Voronezh	4,445.9
55. Valentina Vasilyevna Yakovleva	28 April 2001 / the Zheleznodorozhny District Court of Voronezh	4,117.63
56. Svetlana Leonidovna Yakovtseva	9 March 1999/ the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	3,620.85
57. Nadezhda Gennadyevna Yakushchenko	12 April 2000/ the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	1,753.07
58. Emma Ivanovna Yakushchenko	13 April 2000/ the Kominternovskiy District Court of Voronezh	3,912.23

APPENDIX 2

NAME OF APPLICANT	CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE (RUR)	AMOUNT TO BE PAID FOR PECUNIARY DAMAGE (RUR)
1. Ella Vladimirovna Alekhina	62,865.95	593.84
2. Lyubov Vasilyevna Aseyeva	309,205.17	2,517.64
3. Margarita Ivanovna Belyayeva	289,503.68	2,216.55
4. Irina Ivanovna Bondareva	661,240.02	5,298.31
5. Tamara Yakovlevna Buneyeva	203,001.76	1,402.03
6. Nadezhda Vasilyevna Buneyeva	245,953.66	2,093.18
7. Svetlana Yakovlevna Butkova	292,639.85	2,566.63
8. Nina Yevgenyevna Bykova	278,481.28	1,993.39
9. Tatyana Nikolayevna Garmysheva	118,682.79	1,055.66
10. Natalya Viktorovna Gladysheva	283,393.7	2,392.66
11. Marina Vasilyevna Gunkina	207,882.42	1,769.19
12. Olga Gennadyevna Dvoretzkaya	128,708.93	1,321.3
13. Lyudmila Pavlovna Zhidkova	545,437.19	4,253.24
14. Raisa Aleksandrovna Izmaylova	216,922.49	1,934.91
15. Lyubov Alekseyevna Karabutova	281,795.51	2,006.08
16. Svetlana Leonidovna Kozhokina	285,847.06	2,551.35
17. Lyudmila Pavlovna Kopylova	233,794.43	2,095.32
18. Tamara Semenovna Kuznetsova	353,814.42	3,147.33
19. Larisa Vasilyevna Maltseva	367,010.89	2,143.44
20. Larisa Arkadyevna Milyayeva	161,358.24	1,472.63
21. Lidiya Viktorovna Nemtsova	175,042.26	1,564.89
22. Lyudmila Aleksandrovna Neupokoyeva	204,258.86	1,676.87
23. Yelena Viktorovna Pavlova	Not submitted	None
24. Svetlana Grigoryevna Polishchuk	246,592.75	1,474.68
25. Tatyana Mikhaylovna Poritskaya	257,161.79	2,061.28
26. Mariya Sergeyevna Reshetnikova	450,084.87	3,611.29
27. Irina Yegorovna Roshchupkina	281,716.58	2,778.65
28. Nadezhda Vasilyevna Rychkova	99,257.33	836.68
29. Galina Mikhaylovna Ryazantseva	351,451.5	2,699.91
30. Galina Gennadyevna Sanina	244,478.56	2,132.83
31. Lyudmila Alekseyevna Semchenko	884,732.53	7,290.15
32. Antonina Viktorovna Sergeyeva	274,509.26	3,138.28
33. Vera Mitrofanovna Serikova	125,865.52	1,125.24
34. Tatyana Ivanovna Sirotenko	911,780.86	7,388.04
35. Alefina Aleksandrovna Skomorokhova	424,462.36	1,829.36
36. Natalya Valeryanovna Solovyeva	870,109.98	6,474.68
37. Vladimir Yuzikovich Talko	110,894.09	1,125.24
38. Nina Ivanovna Tolkacheva	312,801.4	3,197.81
39. Vera Yefimovna Trukhacheva	203,889.92	1,504.36
40. Yelena Nikolayevna Chernikova	93,863.31	812.22
41. Lyudmila Aleksandrovna Chernykh	230,067.33	2,321.55
42. Valentina Vasilyevna Yakovleva	241,280.7	2,141.16
43. Svetlana Leonidovna Yakovtseva	228,458.16	1,882.84
44. Nadezhda Gennadyevna Yakushchenko	97,186.72	911.59
45. Emma Ivanovna Yakushchenko	289,587.76	2,034.35

