CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

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

Comité de filtrage/Screening Panel

AFFAIRE PANTANO c. ITALIE

CASE OF PANTANO v. ITALY

(101/1997/885/1097)

DECISION

STRASBOURG

12 mars/March 1998

In the case of Pantano v. Italy[1],

The Screening Panel of the European Court of Human Rights, constituted in accordance with Article 48 § 2 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ("the Convention") and Rule 26 of Rules of Court B[2],

Sitting in private at Strasbourg on 23 February 1998, and composed of the following judges:

Mrs E. PALM, *Chairwoman*,
Mr C. RUSSO,
Mr R. PEKKANEN,

and also of Mr H. PETZOLD, *Registrar*,

Having regard to the application against the Italian Republic lodged with the Court on 29 October 1997 by an American national, Mr Giacomo Pantano, within the three-month period laid down by Article 32 § 1 and Article 47 of the Convention;

Whereas Italy has recognised the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court (Article 46 of the Convention) and ratified Protocol No. 9 to the Convention, Article 5 of which amends Article 48 of the Convention so as to enable a person, non-governmental organisation or group of individuals having lodged a complaint with the European Commission of Human Rights ("the Commission") to refer the case to the Court;

Noting that the present case has not been referred to the Court by either the Government of the respondent State or the Commission under Article 48 § 1 (a) or (d) of the Convention;

Having regard to the Commission's report of 10 September 1997 on the application (no. 20251/92) lodged with the Commission by Mr Pantano on 31 January 1992;

Whereas the applicant complained of an infringement of his right to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions and relied on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1;

Whereas the applicant, in specifying the object of his application, as required by Rule 34 § 1 (a) of Rules of Court B, stated that he sought a decision by the Court holding that there had been a breach of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and ordering the respondent State to pay him compensation for the damage he had allegedly sustained and to reimburse the costs and expenses he had allegedly incurred on account of the national authorities' conduct;

Notes by the Registrar

1. The case is numbered 101/1997/885/1097. The first number is the case's position on the list of cases referred to the Court in the relevant year (second number). The last two numbers indicate the case's position on the list of cases referred to the Court since its creation and on the list of the corresponding originating applications to the Commission.

2. Rules of Court B, which came into force on 2 October 1994, apply to all cases concerning States bound by Protocol No. 9.

Having regard to Article 48 of the Convention and Rule 34 §§ 1 (a), 3 and 4 of Rules of Court B,

1. *Finds* that
   (a) the case raises no serious question affecting the interpretation or application of the Convention, as the Court has already established case-law on the right to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions within the meaning of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1; and
   (b) the case does not, for any other reason, warrant consideration by the Court as, in the event of a finding that there has been a breach of Protocol No. 1, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe can award the applicant compensation, having regard to any proposals made by the Commission;

2. *Decides*, therefore, unanimously, that the case will not be considered by the Court.

Done in English and in French, and notified in writing on 12 March 1998 pursuant to Rule 34 § 4 of Rules of Court B.

Signed: Elisabeth PALM
Chairwoman

Signed: Herbert PETZOLD
Registrar