



Judgments of 3 March 2020

The European Court of Human Rights has today notified in writing nine judgments¹:

two Chamber judgments are summarised below; separate press releases have been issued for two other Chamber judgments in the cases of *Convertito and Others v. Romania* (applications nos. 30547/14, 30549/14, 30558/14, 30570/14, and 30578/14) and *Baş v. Turkey* (no. 66448/17);

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

The judgments in French below are indicated with an asterisk ().*

Filkin v. Portugal (application no. 69729/12)*

The applicant, Mr Evgeny Filkin, is a Russian national who was born in 1955 and lives in Vienna (Austria).

The case concerned the freezing of the applicant's bank account in criminal proceedings concerning suspected money laundering.

In February 2011 the Central Criminal Investigation and Action Department opened a criminal investigation into suspicious banking transactions possibly linked to money laundering, registered on accounts held with the BANIF bank in Valença. The investigating judge at the Central Court of Criminal Investigation ordered the accounts to be frozen until 2 May 2011. The bank informed Mr Filkin that he could not use his account in accordance with the judge's decision. The measure was extended several times. The steps taken by Mr Filkin and his appeals to lift the freezing order were unsuccessful.

In a decision of 23 July 2014 the investigating authority discontinued the case on the grounds that it was impossible to ascertain the origin of the suspicious funds or to decide whether they were the proceeds of illegal activities. On 24 July 2014 the investigating judge lifted the measure freezing Mr Filkin's account without informing him.

Relying in particular on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant submitted that the freezing of his bank account had breached his right to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Just satisfaction: Mr Filkin did not submit a claim for just satisfaction for non-pecuniary damage. The Court awarded him 5,490 euros (EUR) for costs and expenses.

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

Revision

Ana Ionescu and Others v. Romania (no. 19788/03 and 18 other applications)

The applicants are French, German, and Romanian nationals who were born between 1927 and 1982 respectively who mostly live or used to live in Romania.

The case concerned a request for revision of a judgment on the nationalisation of the applicants' property by the former communist regime.

In its [judgment](#) of 26 February 2019 the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) on account of the applicants' inability to recover possession of their properties despite final court decisions retroactively acknowledging their property rights.

On 30 September 2019 the Government of Romania requested a revision of the judgment, which they had been unable to enforce because one of the applicants, Petru Nicolae Albu (application no. 36384/03, *Albu and Others v. Romania*), had died before the judgment had been adopted.

In its **judgment today** the Court **decided to revise** its judgment of 26 February 2019 in so far as it concerned the claims made under Article 41 of the Convention by Mr Albu.

For details of the sums allocated to the remaining applicants in respect of pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage, as well as costs and expenses, please see the table annexed to the judgment.

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 CEDH](https://twitter.com/ECHR_CEDH).

Press contacts

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

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

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

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

Patrick Lannin (tel: + 33 3 90 21 44 18)

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.