



Judgments and decisions of 26 May 2016

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing three judgments¹ and 26 decisions² :

one Chamber judgment is summarised below;

for one decision, in the case of *Dupré v. France* (application no. 77032/12), a separate press release has been issued;

two Committee judgments, which concern issues which have already been submitted to the Court, and the remaining 25 decisions, can be consulted on [Hudoc](#) and do not appear in this press release.

The judgment below is available only in French.

Just Satisfaction

M.C. and Others v. Italy (no. 5376/11)

The applicants are 162 Italian nationals. The case concerned their inability to obtain an annual adjustment of the supplementary part of a compensation allowance (IIS) paid to them after they were accidentally contaminated as a result of blood transfusions or the administration of blood derivatives.

Relying in particular on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), the applicants complained that the Government, in enacting legislative decree no. 78/2010, had intervened in an area which was the subject of legal debate and which had given rise to numerous cases to which the Government themselves had been a party. Relying on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), they argued that, if not adjusted, the IIS would gradually lose its value. Under Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), taken together with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, they complained that they had been victims of discrimination.

In its judgment on the merits of 3 September 2013 the Court held that there had been a violation of Articles 6 § 1 and 14 and of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 since, in intervening to enact legislation while the judicial proceedings against the Minister of Health were pending, the legislature had interpreted the law in a manner favourable to the Government.

Today's judgment concerns the question of the application of Article 41 (just satisfaction) of the Convention.

Just satisfaction: Taking note of the friendly settlement reached between the Italian Government and the applicants, the Court decided to strike the application out of its list of cases insofar as the Article 41 (just satisfaction) procedure was concerned.

¹ Under Articles 43 and 44 of the Convention, Chamber judgments are not final. During the three-month period following a Chamber judgment's delivery, any party may request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber of the Court. If such a request is made, a panel of five judges considers whether the case deserves further examination. In that event, the Grand Chamber will hear the case and deliver a final judgment. If the referral request is refused, the Chamber judgment will become final on that day. Under Article 28 of the Convention, judgments delivered by a Committee are final.

Once a judgment becomes final, it is transmitted to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe for supervision of its execution. Further information about the execution process can be found here: www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/execution

² Inadmissibility and strike-out decisions are final.

This press release is a document produced by the Registry. It does not bind the Court. Decisions, judgments and further information about the Court can be found on www.echr.coe.int. To receive the Court's press releases, please subscribe here: www.echr.coe.int/RSS/en or follow us on Twitter [@ECHR_Press](https://twitter.com/ECHR_Press).

Press contacts

echrpess@echr.coe.int | tel: +33 3 90 21 42 08

Tracey Turner-Tretz (tel: + 33 3 88 41 35 30)

Nina Salomon (tel: + 33 3 90 21 49 79)

Denis Lambert (tel: + 33 3 90 21 41 09)

Inci Ertekin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 55 30)

The European Court of Human Rights was set up in Strasbourg by the Council of Europe Member States in 1959 to deal with alleged violations of the 1950 European Convention on Human Rights.