



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

FOURTH SECTION

CASE OF LOVEČEK AND OTHERS v. SLOVAKIA

(Application no. 11301/03)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

21 December 2010

FINAL

21/03/2011

This judgment has become final under Article 44 § 2 of the Convention. It may be subject to editorial revision.

In the case of Loveček and Others v. Slovakia,

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

Nicolas Bratza, *President*,

Lech Garlicki,

Ljiljana Mijović,

Ján Šikuta,

Mihai Poalelungi,

Nebojša Vučinić,

Vincent A. de Gaetano, *judges*,

and Lawrence Early, *Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 30 November 2010,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in an application (no. 11301/03) against the Slovak Republic lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by thirty-three Slovak nationals, whose particulars appear in the appendix (“the applicants”), on 24 March 2003.

2. The applicants were represented by Mr M. Buzinger, a lawyer practising in Bratislava. The Government of the Slovak Republic (“the Government”) were represented by their Agent, Ms A. Poláčeková, who was subsequently succeeded in that function by Ms M. Pirošíková.

3. On 13 April 2006 the President of the Fourth Section of the Court decided to give notice of the application to the Government. Applying former Article 29 § 3 (currently Article 29 § 1) of the Convention, it decided to rule on the admissibility and merits of the application at the same time.

THE FACTS

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE

A. Background to the case

4. The applicants were clients of a private non-banking investment company, Sun a.s. (“the company”), which was open for investment by the public.

5. Under various types of private-law contracts, the applicants and more than seven hundred other individuals made financial investments in the company, which failed to meet its contractual obligations.

6. In December 1999 and subsequently, several individuals lodged criminal complaints against the management of the company about defaults on payments. In a report of 2 June 2000 the police observed, *inter alia*, that the company's customers were scattered all over the country, and that a relatively high number of criminal complaints could be expected in the matter.

7. On 27 April 2000 a criminal investigation was opened against Š., the owner and chief executive officer of the company. However, on 18 May 2000 the decision was quashed on appeal due to formal shortcomings and lack of evidence.

8. Numerous other criminal complaints in the matter were lodged, *inter alia*, by the applicants and the Supervisory Board and the Board of Directors of the company. They finally resulted in criminal proceedings being taken against Š. (see below).

9. On 25 April 2002 the Bratislava Regional Court dismissed a petition for an insolvency order against the company, on the ground that the value of its estate was not sufficient to cover the costs of the proceedings.

10. The company was consequently wound up and on 14 February 2005 erased from the Register of Companies, whereby it ceased legally to exist.

B. Applicants' criminal complaints and further proceedings

11. In the period between 10 April 2000 and 17 June 2002 four applicants lodged criminal complaints accusing the management of the company of fraud and embezzlement.

12. On 16 August 2000 the Bratislava V District Office of Investigation took a formal decision under Article 160 § 1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to open criminal proceedings against one or more unknown persons, on suspicion that they had committed the offence of embezzlement

within the meaning of Article 248 §§ 1 and 5 of the Criminal Code in connection with the management of the company.

13. Later in 2000 the investigators obtained information from the Police Criminal Forensics Institute, the Police Financial Intelligence Unit, the tax authorities, the National Property Fund, the Bratislava Stock Exchange, the National Employment Authority, the Financial Market Authority and the Slovak Securities Centre.

14. In the course of the proceedings the applicants were interviewed by investigators. They lodged specific quantified claims under Article 43 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for damages in the period between 9 March 2001 and 24 June 2003 (see the appendix).

15. The applicants appointed representatives from among themselves to act on their behalf. In the subsequent period, through their representatives, they complained on numerous occasions to various governmental institutions and the media about the course of the investigation and especially about undue delays.

16. From August 2001 to March 2002 the investigators interviewed several aggrieved parties and witnesses and obtained further information concerning the company, from a sworn expert, the Police Financial Intelligence Unit, the tax authorities and the Securities Centre.

17. On 21 March 2002 the Minister of the Interior ordered the matter to be investigated by a special team. The team was set up and took up the investigation on 1 April 2002.

18. On 2 May 2002 the Bratislava Regional Office of Investigation ruled that, in view of its scale and importance, that office would be responsible for the conduct of the investigation.

19. In a letter of 9 May 2002 the Bratislava V District Office of Public Prosecution acknowledged that in the period prior to March 2002 there had been delays in the investigation.

20. Between April and December 2002 the investigators questioned 373 aggrieved persons, seventeen witnesses, numerous other persons and a sworn expert, obtained information from private companies, the land registry authorities, the tax authorities, the Social Security Administration and the Securities Centre, searched a flat and non-residential premises and took various steps, including involving Interpol, with the aim of establishing the whereabouts of Š., who was suspected of having gone abroad.

21. On 27 August 2002 the investigators accused Š. of embezzlement and other economic offences in connection with the insolvency of the company.

22. In October 2002 the investigator applied for a warrant for the arrest of the accused and ordered expert evidence to be taken. An expert report was submitted in January 2003.

23. On 30 October 2002 the Bratislava V District Court issued an arrest warrant.

24. In November 2002 the investigator ordered further expert evidence to be taken and obtained information from various sources.

25. On 5 and 6 February 2003 respectively Š. was arrested and remanded in custody. On 27 February 2003 the Bratislava V District Prosecutor dismissed as unfounded his appeal against the accusations.

26. Later in 2003 the investigators interrogated Š. 9 times, heard 278 aggrieved parties and thirty-nine witnesses, obtained information from several commercial banks, an airline company, the Securities Centre, the Ministry of Economy and the Financial Police, cross-examined the accused and a witness and ordered further expert evidence to be taken. The police carried out a search of a house and non-residential premises.

27. On 12 January 2004 the investigation was transferred to the Organised Crime Unit of the Police Corps.

28. Later in 2004 the investigators cross-examined several witnesses and Š., ordered an examination by a mental health specialist and interviewed eighteen aggrieved persons and three witnesses. In 2005 the investigator interviewed Š., two witnesses and an expert witness and cross-examined Š. and a witness.

29. On 19 July 2006 the Supreme Court ruled, on application by the Prosecutor General, under Article 47 § 3 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, that participation of aggrieved parties in the criminal proceedings was not admissible. Although this decision had no impact on the applicants' standing as aggrieved parties in criminal proceedings within the meaning of Article 46 § 1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the applicants as a result could no longer exercise their rights as aggrieved parties as stipulated in Article 46 §§ 1 and 3 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The Supreme Court noted that there were as many as 707 aggrieved parties, that they had not appointed a common representative, that their claims and demands differed in many aspects and that the assertion of such claims and demands individually in the criminal proceedings would endanger the main purpose and speedy course of the proceedings. The Supreme Court observed that, as its ruling had an impact on the running of the statute of limitations in respect of civil-law claims for damages, the Prosecutor General was to make it public by appropriate means. The Supreme Court's ruling was announced by the Public Prosecution Service on their official web page on 11 August 2006.

30. According to the information available, the criminal proceedings are still pending.

C. Constitutional proceedings

31. On 26 June 2002 the applicants lodged a complaint under Article 127 of the Constitution with the Constitutional Court. They complained that the District Office of Investigation and the District Office of Prosecution had violated their right to a hearing “without unjustified

delay” (Article 48 § 2 of the Constitution) and “within a reasonable time” (Article 6 § 1 of the Convention).

32. On 23 August 2002 the Constitutional Court declared the complaint inadmissible. It observed that the primary aim of criminal proceedings was to detect criminal offences and to punish perpetrators and not to determine aggrieved parties' claims for damages. Aggrieved parties' claims for damages were of a private-law nature and were predominantly to be asserted before the civil courts. The possibility of claiming damages in criminal proceedings was a privilege which did not make the determination of such claims the central issue of the proceedings and was limited by the above main aim of the proceedings. The Constitutional Court concluded that the applicants, being aggrieved parties in the criminal proceedings, did not enjoy the right to have their claims for damages determined “without unjustified delay” and “within a reasonable time”.

II. RELEVANT DOMESTIC LAW AND PRACTICE

A. Code of Criminal Procedure (Law no. 141/1961 Coll., as amended, in force until 31 December 2005)

33. Article 43 §§ 1 and 2 provides, *inter alia*, that a person who has suffered pecuniary or non-pecuniary damage as a result of a criminal offence may claim compensation from the accused and request the court, when convicting the person charged with a criminal offence, to order the latter to pay compensation for the damage. The aggrieved party further has the right to adduce evidence and to comment on it, to inspect the court file, to take part in the hearing and to make submissions.

34. If there is a large number of aggrieved parties, usually more than one hundred, and if the exercise by each individual of his rights would endanger the purpose and speedy course of the proceedings, the participation of the aggrieved parties in the proceedings shall be decided upon by a court pursuant to Article 44 §§ 3 and 5.

35. Articles 47 et seq. provide the opportunity to secure the claim of an aggrieved party for damages by impounding the accused person's property in situations when there is a well-founded suspicion that the payment of the claim would be hindered or frustrated.

B. Code of Criminal Procedure (Law no. 301/2005, in force from 1 January 2006)

36. Persons who have suffered damage to their health or property, have suffered psychological or other damage, or whose legally protected rights or freedoms have been violated or jeopardised as a result of a criminal offence,

are considered aggrieved parties. They have, *inter alia*, the right to claim compensation for the damage they have suffered, to adduce evidence and to comment on it, to inspect the court file, to take part in the hearing, to make submissions, and so on. (Article 46 § 1).

37. An aggrieved party who has a lawful claim against an accused person for compensation in respect of damage resulting from a criminal offence, has the right to propose that a conviction should include an order for compensation. The proposal must be made at the latest at the closure of the investigation and must indicate the ground and scope of the claim (Article 46 § 3) and can only be made if the claim has not already been decided upon in civil or other proceedings (Article 46 § 4).

38. If there is a large number of aggrieved parties, usually meaning more than one hundred, and if the exercise by each individual of his or her rights would endanger the purpose and speedy course of the proceedings, the participation of the aggrieved parties in the proceedings shall be decided upon by a court, following an application by the Prosecutor General, pursuant to Article 47 §§ 3 and 4.

39. Articles 50 et seq. provide for the possibility of securing the claim of an aggrieved party for damages in situations when there is a well-founded suspicion that the payment of the claim would be hindered or frustrated.

40. Pursuant to Article 287 § 1, where a court convicts a person charged with an offence which has caused damage to third persons under Article 46 § 1, it shall, as a rule, order him or her to compensate such damage, provided that the claim has been filed correctly and in due time.

41. Under Article 288 § 1, a court shall refer a person claiming damages to a civil court (or to another authority) when the evidence available is not sufficient to determine that claim or where the taking of further evidence exceeding the scope of the criminal case is required and the criminal proceedings would thereby be unduly prolonged.

C. Code of Civil Procedure

42. Under Article 83, where proceedings have commenced in a specific matter, the matter cannot be made the subject of other judicial proceedings.

43. If a claim for damages is duly lodged in criminal proceedings, it is considered a *litis pendens* from the point of view of Article 83 of the Code of Civil Procedure (Collection of Judicial Decisions and Standpoints of the Supreme Court, No. 22/1979).

D. Civil Code

44. Under Article 112, if creditors make and duly pursue a claim in respect of their rights before a court or another authority, the statute of limitations is stayed from the day the claim is made.

45. This includes the submission of a civil-party claim for damages in criminal proceedings (see, for example, Collection of Judicial Decisions and Standpoints nos. 131/1974 and 29/1985) from the moment when a criminal complaint is lodged (no. III/1967 in Collection of Judicial Decisions and Standpoints).

E. Constitutional Court Practice

46. The Constitutional Court held in its findings (see for example I. ÚS 157/02; III. ÚS 183/05; I. ÚS 18/06 and I. ÚS 67/2010) that an aggrieved party who joined criminal proceedings with a claim for damages has a right to a hearing “without unjustified delay” (Article 48 § 2 of the Constitution) as such a duly lodged claim excludes the possibility of having it decided upon in civil proceedings (Article 83 of the Code of Civil Procedure).

THE LAW

I. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION

47. The applicants complained that the length of the criminal proceedings which they had joined with their claims for damages had been incompatible with the “reasonable time” requirement, laid down in Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, which reads as follows:

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

A. Admissibility

48. The Government, with reference to the decision of the Supreme Court of 19 July 2006, were of the opinion that the applicants had not benefited *ratione materiae* from the procedural guarantees of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention. They argued that from the moment of delivery of the decision of the Supreme Court, which ruled that participation of the aggrieved parties in the criminal proceedings was not admissible, the applicants' civil claims were totally separated from the criminal proceedings and that the Supreme Court ruling was not directly decisive for the applicants' civil claims. The Government supported their argument with the wording of paragraphs 40 and 41 of the Court's judgment delivered in the case of *Krumpel and Krumpelová v. Slovakia* (no. 56195/00, 5 July 2005).

49. The Government further argued that, even assuming that Article 6 § 1 of the Convention was applicable, the complaint was manifestly ill-founded, as the length of the proceedings was reasonable in view of all the circumstances and, in particular, the factual and procedural complexity of the matter. As to the complexity of the case, the Government pointed out that the amount of the alleged damage was approximately 12,200,000 euros (EUR), complex expert evidence had been required, the investigated transactions had a sophisticated corporate background, there were more than 700 victims, more than eighty witnesses had needed to be heard, and the evidence was scattered all over the country. Unlike the accused, the applicants were not responsible for any delays. Although there admittedly had been some delays imputable to the investigators in 2000 and 2001, they had not been significant and had not recurred after the setting up of the special investigative team in 2002. Finally, the Government stated that nothing prevented the applicants from pursuing their property claims by the usual means before the ordinary courts.

50. The applicants submitted that, in so far as the criminal proceedings concerned their claims for damages, they enjoyed the guarantees of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention. The applicants stated that the lodging of a criminal complaint was connected with the obligation of the authorities acting in criminal proceedings to examine it. The evidence available showed that it had already been clear to the authorities in early 2000 that they were dealing with a far-reaching criminal case. However, the authorities had failed to respond appropriately to the exigencies of the situation. The applicants further argued that even after the setting up of the special investigative team there had been several periods of inactivity on the part of the authorities. The applicants also contended that the authorities had acted arbitrarily in that they had done nothing to secure their claims under Article 47 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The applicants submitted that they had decided to claim their damages in the context of the criminal proceedings as they believed that they had a better prospect of actually recovering the compensation than before the civil courts. They argued that once they opted for this remedy, they were entitled to have their claims determined within a reasonable time. Lastly, they submitted that the lengthy proceedings coupled with the eventual exclusion of their claims from the proceedings had placed them in a deadlock, in that the debtor company had ceased to exist in the meantime and they could no longer assert their claims against it.

51. The Court observes that injured parties, who lodged their claims for damages in the context of criminal proceedings, enjoy the guarantees of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention (see *Perez v. France* [GC], no. 47287/99, §§ 67-70, ECHR 2004-I; *Krumpel and Krumpelová*, cited above, §§ 39-41, and *Bíro v. Slovakia*, no. 57678/00, §§ 44-45, 27 June 2006).

52. As far as Slovak cases are concerned, the Court notes that once a criminal complaint is lodged the Slovak law enforcement authorities are under a duty to follow it through (see *Bíro*, cited above, § 44). Once injured parties opt for claiming damages in the context of criminal proceedings, they are entitled to have their claims determined within a reasonable time (see *Krumpel and Krumpelová*, cited above, § 48). The Court further notes that lodging such a claim in the context of criminal proceedings not only constitutes a *litis pendens* but also stays the statute of limitations. It is true that the criminal courts are, in certain circumstances, entitled to decide whether or not an injured party should be allowed to participate in criminal proceedings, and they may refer a party claiming damages to a civil court. Only once the injured parties' participation in criminal proceedings is excluded can they lodge claims for damages with civil courts, when the statute of limitations starts to run again.

53. The Court finds that persons who have correctly lodged a claim for damages in the context of criminal proceedings are entitled to benefit from the guarantees of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention during the period preceding a decision excluding their further participation in such proceedings as injured parties (*ibid.*, § 40). The injured parties' civil claims for damages are a component of the criminal proceedings up to the time of delivery of such a decision. The Court therefore has jurisdiction *ratione materiae* to examine under Article 6 § 1 complaints about delays which occurred while an applicant's civil claim was a component of criminal proceedings, irrespective of any subsequent decision putting an end to such a situation.

54. The Government's objection relating to applicability of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention must therefore be dismissed.

55. The Court considers that the applicants, as aggrieved parties, had the right to have their claims determined within a reasonable time from the moment they correctly lodged their claims for damages (see appendix) in the context of the criminal proceedings in issue (see *Krumpel and Krumpelová*, cited above, §§ 39-48) until 19 July 2006, when the Supreme Court ruled that the participation of aggrieved parties in those criminal proceedings was not admissible.

56. In view of the above, the period to be taken into consideration lasted in respect of the individual applicants between three years and over one month to six years and over three months, during which the proceedings were at their pre-trial stage. The Court notes that this complaint 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

57. The Court reiterates that the reasonableness of the length of proceedings must be assessed in the light of the circumstances of the case and with reference to the following criteria: the complexity of the case, the conduct of the applicants and the relevant authorities and what was at stake for the applicants in the dispute (see, among many other authorities, *Frydlender v. France* [GC], no. 30979/96, § 43, ECHR 2000-VII, or *Pfleger v. the Czech Republic*, no. 58116/00, § 50, 27 July 2004).

58. The Court has frequently found violations of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention in cases raising issues similar to the one in the present case (see *Frydlender*, cited above).

59. Having examined all the material submitted to it, the Court considers that the Government have not put forward any fact or argument capable of persuading it to reach a different conclusion in the present case. Although the length of the criminal proceedings, in the context of which the applicants' claims were to be determined, has been due to the complexity of the case, the Court cannot disregard the fact that it took over two years and three months to set up a special investigation unit. Delays in the period prior to March 2002 were also acknowledged by the Bratislava V District Office of Public Prosecution. Having regard to its case-law on the subject, the Court considers that in the instant case the length of the proceedings was excessive and failed to meet the "reasonable time" requirement.

60. There has accordingly been a breach of Article 6 § 1.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 13 OF THE CONVENTION

61. In their observations of 5 March 2007 in reply to the observations of the Government on the admissibility and merits of the case, the applicants raised an additional complaint under Article 13 of the Convention.

62. The Government argued that Article 13 of the Convention was not applicable in the present case.

63. The Court observes that the applicants' participation in criminal proceedings came to an end on 19 July 2006 when the Supreme Court delivered its decision. The prosecution service made this decision public by announcing it on its official web page on 11 August 2006.

64. The complaint under Article 13 of the Convention was introduced on 5 March 2007, that is outside the six-month time-limit laid down in Article 35 § 1 of the Convention. It follows that it has been introduced out of time and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention.

III. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

65. 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

66. The applicants claimed jointly 30,000,000 Slovakian korunas (SKK) (the equivalent of 995,817.60 euros (EUR)) in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

67. The Government considered the claim exaggerated.

68. Ruling on an equitable basis, and having regard to the number of applicants (see *Arvanitaki-Roboti and Others v. Greece* [GC], no. 27278/03, § 29, ECHR 2008-...), the Court decides to award the applicants EUR 56,150 in respect of non-pecuniary damage. The amount is to be distributed among the applicants as indicated in the appendix.

B. Costs and expenses

69. The applicants claimed jointly SKK 251,658 (the equivalent of EUR 8,353.50) for lawyer's fees incurred before the Constitutional Court and SKK 353,875.50 (the equivalent of EUR 11,746.60) for lawyers' fees incurred before the Court and SKK 1,914 (the equivalent of EUR 63.50) for administrative expenses.

70. The Government contested the amount of these claims and invited the Court to determine the amount of the award in accordance with its case-law. They had no objection to the sums claimed in respect of administrative expenses.

71. According to the Court's case-law, the applicants are entitled to reimbursement of their costs and expenses only in so far as it has been shown that these have been actually and necessarily incurred and are reasonable as to quantum. In letters of 3 October 2006 and 25 January 2007 the applicants were requested to submit quantified claims, together with supporting documents such as the necessary vouchers (bills of costs). Although the applicants itemised their claims for lawyers' fees with reference to Regulation no. 240/1990 Coll. of the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic, which governs remuneration of advocates for the provision of legal services, they failed to show that they had actually paid, or were under a contractual obligation to pay, the sums claimed. In the absence of any documents supporting the applicants' claims for lawyers' fees, the Court makes no award in this respect. On the other hand, having

regard to the documents submitted, it awards the full sum claimed, namely EUR 63.50 in respect of the administrative expenses.

C. Default interest

72. The Court considers it appropriate that the default interest should be based on the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank, to which should be added three percentage points.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT UNANIMOUSLY

1. *Declares* the complaint concerning the excessive length of the proceedings admissible and the remainder of the application inadmissible;
2. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention;
3. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, within three months of the date on which the judgment becomes final in accordance with Article 44 § 2 of the Convention, the following amounts:
 - (i) EUR 56,150 (fifty six thousand one hundred and fifty euros) jointly to all the applicants (to be distributed according to the appendix), plus any tax that may be chargeable, in respect of non-pecuniary damage;
 - (ii) EUR 63.50 (sixty three euros and fifty cents), plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants, in respect of costs and expenses;
 - (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;
4. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claim for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 21 December 2010, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Lawrence Early
Registrar

Nicolas Bratza
President

APPENDIX

Name	Born	Place of residence	Date of claiming damages in the context of the criminal proceedings	Just satisfaction in EUR
1. Mr Zdeněk Loveček	1934	Pezinok	20/11/02	2,200
2. Ms Helena Lovečková	1940		20/11/02	jointly as the applicants are spouses
3. Mr Ladislav Családi	1957	Bratislava	09/09/02	2,300
4. Ms Veronika Családiová	1957		24/06/03	jointly as the applicants are spouses
5. Mr Ján Tomeček	1948	Bratislava	26/07/02	2,400
6. Ms Oľga Tomečková	1945		30/05/03	jointly as the applicants are spouses
7. Mr Alojz Krajčovič	1937	Bratislava	18/07/02	2,400
8. Ms Rozália Krajčovičová	1940		23/06/03	jointly as the applicants are spouses
9. Mr Ján Čepka	1939	Plavecký Štvrtok	12/11/02	2,200
10. Ms Viera Čepková	1943		12/11/02	jointly as the applicants are spouses
11. Mr Július Meňhart, succeeded by his wife, applicant no. 12	1947	Nitra	04/02/03	2,050
12. Ms Alžbeta Meňhartová	1955		04/02/03	jointly as the applicants are spouses
13. Mr Ladislav Čepílek	1954	Výčapy-Opatovce	18/11/02	2,200
14. Ms Mária Čepíliková	1956		18/11/02	jointly as the applicants are spouses
15. Mr Alojz Čurgali	1931	Nitra-Lužianky	25/04/03	1,950
16. Ms Jozefa Čurgaliová	1948		25/04/03	jointly as the applicants are spouses
17. Mr Ľudovít Gábor	1949	Šaľa	25/04/02	2,550
18. Ms Katarína Gáborová	1955		04/04/03	jointly as the applicants are spouses
19. Ms Katarína Gáborová	1978	Šaľa	22/05/03	1,900
20. Mr Ján Švigár	1933	Bratislava	02/08/02	2,400
21. Mr Pavel Kováč	1952	Bratislava	18/07/02	2,400
22. Mr Bohumil Petrík	1958	Nitra	11/11/02	2,200
23. Mr Vasiľ Kmit'	1931	Bratislava	26/06/02	2,450
24. Ms Veronika Gombošová	1939	Nitra	11/11/02	2,200
25. Mr Dalibor Ječínsky, represented by Mr Vladimír Ječínsky	1926	Bratislava	18/12/02	2,150
26. Mr Milan Petrucha	1944	Bratislava	24/07/02	2,400
27. Ms Júlia Prochádzková	1948	Bratislava	29/07/02	2,400
28. Mr Dušan Rakytiak	1966	Bratislava	25/07/02	2,400

29. Mr Branislav Ivan	1972	Bratislava	09/03/01	3,200
30. Mr Ladislav Rutrle	1951	Bratislava	25/07/02	2,400
31. Ms Jana Mikešová	1969	Bratislava	15/05/02	2,500
32. Ms Zuzana Matulová	1963	Bratislava	27/08/02	2,350
33. Mr Anton Buben, succeeded by his son Mr Branislav Buben	1950	Bratislava	02/05/02	2,550