

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

THIRD SECTION

CASE OF DELOPOULOS v. GREECE

(Application no. 33036/16)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

10 July 2025

This judgment is final but it may be subject to editorial revision.



In the case of Delopoulos v. Greece,

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting as a Committee composed of:

Úna Ní Raifeartaigh,
Mateja Đurović,
Vasilka Sancin*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having deliberated in private on 19 June 2025,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in an application against Greece lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ("the Convention") on 2 June 2016.

2. The Greek Government ("the Government") were given notice of the application.

THE FACTS

3. The applicant's details and information relevant to the application are set out in the appended table.

4. The applicant complained of the non-enforcement of a domestic decision given in his favour.

THE LAW

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

5. The applicant complained principally of the delayed enforcement of the domestic decision given in his favour. He relied on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

6. The Court reiterates that the execution of a judgment given by any court must be regarded as an integral part of a "hearing" for the purposes of Article 6. It also refers to its case-law concerning the non-enforcement or delayed enforcement of final domestic judgments (see *Hornsby v. Greece*, no. 18357/91, § 40, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1997-II).

7. In the leading cases of *Kanellopoulos v. Greece,* no. 11325/06, 21 February 2008 and *Bousiou v. Greece,* no. 21455/10, 24 October 2013, the Court already found a violation in respect of issues similar to those in the present case.

8. Having examined all the material submitted to it, the Court has not found any fact or argument capable of persuading it to reach a different conclusion on the admissibility and merits of this complaint. Having regard

to its case-law on the subject, the Court considers that in the instant case the authorities did not deploy all necessary efforts to enforce in due time decision no. 4287/15 of the Court of Auditors (see appended table for further details).

9. This complaint is therefore admissible and discloses a breach of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

II. REMAINING COMPLAINT

10. The applicant also raised another complaint under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention about the non-enforcement of decision no. 3269/2009 of the Court of Auditors.

11. The Court has examined the complaint and considers that, in the light of all the material in its possession and in so far as the matters complained of are within its competence, this complaint either does not meet the admissibility criteria set out in Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention or does not disclose any appearance of a violation of the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Convention or the Protocols thereto.

12. It follows that this part of the application must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 § 4 of the Convention.

III. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

13. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Kanellopoulos,* cited above; and *Bousiou,* cited above), the Court considers it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Declares* the complaint concerning the delayed enforcement of decision no. 4287/15 of the Court of Auditors admissible, and the remainder of the application inadmissible;

2. *Holds* that this complaint discloses a breach of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention concerning the delayed enforcement of decision no. 4287/15 of the Court of Auditors;

3. *Holds*
   (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicant, within three months, the amounts indicated in the appended table;
   (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.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 10 July 2025, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Viktoriya Maradudina Acting Deputy Registrar	Úna Ní Raifeartaigh President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention (non-enforcement or delayed enforcement of domestic decisions)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Name of the court Date of the final judgment	Start date of non-enforcement period	End date of non-enforcement period Total length of non-enforcement	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage (in euros) [1]	Amount awarded for costs and expenses (in euros)[2]
33036/16 02/06/2016	**Michail DELOPOULOS** 1948	Court of Auditors, Decision no. 4287/15; 29/04/2015	11/08/2015	24/11/2016 1 year(s) and 3 month(s) and 14 day(s)	1,000	250

[1] Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant.
[2] Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant.