



Italy

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1955

National Judge: Guido Raimondi (President of the European Court of Human Rights)

[Judges' CVs](#) are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Giorgio Balladore Pallieri (1959-1980), Carlo Russo (1981-1998), Benedetto Conforti (1998-2001), Vladimiro Zagrebelsky (2001-2010).

The Court dealt with 4,463 applications concerning Italy in 2015, of which 4,438 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 24 judgments (concerning 25 applications), 20 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2013	2014	2015
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	3180	5490	1935
Communicated to the Government	62	1763	1848
Applications decided:	2950	9769	4463
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	2582	9227	1697
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	132	338	2715
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	158	60	26
- Decided by judgment	78	144	25
Interim measures:	24	32	25
- Granted	0	1	1
- Refused (including out of scope)	24	31	24

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the [ECHR internet site](#).

Applications pending before the court on 01/01/2016	
Total pending applications*	8292
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	7562
Single Judge	204
Committee (3 Judges)	5802
Chamber (7 Judges)	1551
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	5

*including applications for which completed application forms have not yet been received

Italy and ...

Its contribution to the Court's budget

For 2016 the Court's budget amounts to approximately 71 million euros. That budget is financed by contributions from the 47 member States of the Council of Europe in accordance with scales based on population and GDP; the 2016 contribution of Italy to the Council of Europe's (EUR 326 million) budget is **EUR 34,721,576**.

The Registry

The task of the Registry is to provide legal and administrative support to the Court in the exercise of its judicial functions. It is composed of lawyers, administrative and technical staff and translators. There are currently **679** Registry staff members of whom **20** are Italian.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Cases dealing with inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

[Saadi v. Italy](#)

28.02.2008

Decision to deport the applicant to Tunisia, where he claimed to have been sentenced in his absence for terrorism.

[Violation of Article 3 if the deportation went ahead](#)

[Enea v. Italy](#)

17.09.2009

Applicant had been subjected to a special prison regime (under section 41 *bis* § 2 of the Prison Administration Act) then placed in a high supervision unit.

[No violation of Article 3](#)

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 \(right to a fair trial\) concerning his right to a court during the period of the special regime](#)

[No violation of Article 6 § 1 as regards his right to a court during his placement in the high supervision unit](#)

[Violation of Article 8 \(right to respect for correspondence\)](#)

[Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy](#)

23.02.2012

The case concerned Somalian and Eritrean migrants travelling from Libya who had been intercepted at sea by the Italian authorities and sent back to Libya.

[Violations of Article 3 because the applicants had been exposed to the risk of ill-treatment in Libya and of repatriation to Somalia or Eritrea](#)

[Violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 \(prohibition of collective expulsions\)](#)

[Violation of Article 13 \(right to an effective remedy\) taken in conjunction with Article 3 because the applicants had been unable to lodge their complaints with a competent authority and to obtain a thorough and rigorous assessment of their requests before the removal measure was enforced](#)

[Violation of Article 13 taken in conjunction with Article 4 of Protocol No.4 because the remedy under the criminal law against the](#)

[military personnel on board the ship did not satisfy the criterion of suspensive effect](#)

The Court found that the applicants had fallen within the jurisdiction of Italy for the purposes of Article 1 of the Convention because they had been under the continuous and exclusive control of the Italian authorities.

Cases dealing with Article 6

[Right to a fair hearing/trial](#)

[Perna v. Italy](#)

06.05.2003

Journalist convicted of aggravated defamation for publishing an article accusing the Chief Public Prosecutor of Palermo (G. Caselli) of abuse of authority, without attempting to prove the veracity of his allegations.

[No violation of Articles 6 or 10 \(freedom of expression\)](#)

[Sejdivic v. Italy](#)

01.03.2006

Applicant convicted in his absence without having had the opportunity to present his defence.

[Violation of Article 6](#)

[Scoppola v. Italy \(no. 2\)](#)

17.09.2009

Question whether, in convicting the applicant for murder according to the summary procedure, the Italian courts should have applied the most lenient criminal-law provision out of all those in force in the period between the commission of the offence and the final judgment.

[Violation of Articles 6 and 7 \(no punishment without law\)](#)

[Right to a fair trial within a reasonable time](#)

[Scordino v. Italy \(no. 1\)](#)

29.03.2006

Effectiveness of the "Pinto Act", which introduced the possibility of lodging a complaint with the Italian courts in respect of excessively long proceedings. The case also concerned the right to receive compensation for expropriation.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

Cases concerning the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8)

Guerra and Others v. Italy

19.02.1998

The Italian authorities had not provided the applicants with sufficient information about the risks and about what to do in the case of an accident in a chemical factory with a "high risk" classification.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

Parrillo v. Italy

27.08.2015

The case concerned a ban under Italian Law no. 40/2004, preventing Ms Parrillo from donating to scientific research embryos obtained from an *in vitro* fertilisation which were not destined for a pregnancy.

[No violation of Article 8](#)

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Maestri v. Italy

17.02.2004

Disciplinary proceedings against a judge for having been a member of a Masonic lodge.
[Violation of Article 11 \(freedom of assembly and association\)](#)

Guiso Gallisay v. Italy

22.12.2009 (judgment on just satisfaction)

Question of the criteria for calculation of just satisfaction in constructive expropriation cases.

[The Court changed its criteria and now no longer takes into account the value of public works constructed on expropriated land.](#)

Lautsi v. Italy

18.03.2011

The case concerned the presence of crucifixes in State-school classrooms in Italy.

[No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 \(right to education\).](#)

The Court held in particular that the question of religious symbols in classrooms was, in principle, a matter falling within the margin of appreciation of the State - particularly as there was no European consensus as regards that question -

provided that decisions in that area did not lead to a form of indoctrination. The fact that crucifixes in State-school classrooms in Italy conferred on the country's majority religion predominant visibility in the school environment was not in itself sufficient to denote a process of indoctrination. Moreover, the presence of crucifixes was not associated with compulsory teaching about Christianity; and there was nothing to suggest that the authorities were intolerant of pupils who believed in other religions, were non-believers or who held non-religious philosophical convictions. Lastly, Ms Lautsi had retained her right as a parent to enlighten and advise her children and to guide them on a path in line with her own philosophical convictions.

Giuliani and Gaggio v. Italy

24.03.2011

Death of demonstrator in clashes between anti-globalisation protesters and law-enforcement officers during 2001 G8 summit in Genoa.

[No violation of Article 2 \(right to life\) concerning four different complaints: use of lethal force; legislative framework governing the use of lethal force / weapons issued to the law-enforcement agencies at the G8; organisation of the policing operations at the G8; alleged lack of an effective investigation.](#)

[No violation of Article 13 \(right to an effective remedy\). No violation of Article 38 \(adversarial examination of the case\).](#)

Scoppola v. Italy (n° 3)

22.05.2012

The case concerned the applicant's disenfranchisement following his criminal conviction.

[No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 \(right to free elections\)](#)

The Court found that the disenfranchisement of convicted prisoners provided for under Italian law was not like the general, automatic, indiscriminate measure that led it to find a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 in the [Hirst \(no. 2\) v. the United Kingdom](#) case. Italian law took care to adapt the measure to the particular circumstances of a case, particularly the length of the sentence.

[Centro Europa 7 S.R.L. v. Italy](#)

07.06.2012

The case concerned an Italian TV company's inability to broadcast, despite having a broadcasting licence, because no television frequencies were allocated to it.

Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression and information)

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

Cases concerning the right to life (Article 2)

Violations of Article 2

[G.N. and Others v. Italy \(no. 43134/05\)](#)

01.12.2009

Difference in treatment among persons infected by transfusion or administration of blood products.

[Maiorano and Others v. Italy](#)

15.12.2009

Applicants' relative was brutally murdered by a repeat offender who had been granted day release.

The Court found that the judicial authorities had been negligent, not having taken due account of the criminal's dangerousness.

[Alikaj and Others v. Italy](#)

29.03.2011

Death of a young man who was shot by a police officer when he was being pursued by the police after resisting arrest.

Cases concerning prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Violations of Article 3

[Ben Khemais v. Italy](#)

24.02.2009

Deportation of a Tunisian national suspected of being involved in Islamist terrorism despite the Court's indication to the Italian Government (under Rule 39 of

the [Rules of Court](#)) that the order should be stayed pending its decision on the merits.

[Sulejmanovic v. Italy](#)

16.07.2009

The case concerned prison overcrowding.

[Toumi v. Italy](#)

05.04.2011

Removal of a terrorist from Italy to Tunisia notwithstanding the Court's indications and the risk of ill-treatment (see also Grand Chamber judgment Saadi v. Italy).

[Torregiani and Others v. Italy](#)

08.01.2013

The case concerned overcrowding in prisons in Italy.

The Court decided to apply the pilot-judgment procedure in view of the growing number of persons potentially concerned in Italy and of the judgments finding a violation liable to result from the applications in question.

Following up on Torregiani case, the Court received more than 4,200 similar applications which were declared inadmissible or struck out.

[Contrada \(No. 2\) v. Italy](#)

11.02.2014

The case concerned the authorities' repeated refusal of a prisoner's requests for a stay of execution of his sentence or for the sentence to be converted to house arrest on account of his numerous health problems.

[Cestaro v. Italy](#)

07.04.2015

The case concerned events which occurred at the end of the G8 summit in Genoa in July 2001, in a school made available by the municipal authorities to be used as a night shelter by demonstrators. An anti-riot police unit entered the building around midnight to carry out a search, leading to acts of violence.

The Court found that there had been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention on account of ill-treatment sustained by Mr Cestaro and of inadequate criminal legislation concerning the punishment of acts of torture which was not an effective deterrent to prevent the repetition of such acts.

After emphasising the structural nature of the problem, the Court pointed out that, as

regards the remedial measures to be taken, the State's positive obligations under Article 3 might include the duty to introduce a properly adapted legal framework, including, in particular, effective criminal-law provisions.

Nasr and Ghali v. Italy

23.02.2016

The case concerned an instance of extrajudicial transfer (or "extraordinary rendition"), namely the abduction by CIA agents, with the cooperation of Italian officials, of the Egyptian imam Abu Omar, who had been granted political asylum in Italy, and his subsequent transfer to Egypt, where he was held in secret for several months.

In the present case the Court held that the legitimate principle of "State secrecy" had clearly been applied by the Italian executive in order to ensure that those responsible did not have to answer for their actions. The investigation and trial had not led to the punishment of those responsible, who had therefore ultimately been granted impunity.

Cases concerning the right to liberty and security (Article 5)

Violation of Article 5

Seferovic v. Italy

08.02.2011

Detention pending deportation of a woman who had recently given birth to a child who died at the hospital, despite the fact that Italian law prohibited the deportation of a woman within six months of giving birth.

Gallardo Sanchez v. Italy

24.03.2015

The case concerned the excessive length of a Venezuelan national's detention in Italy with a view to his extradition to Greece.

Cases concerning Article 6

Right of access to a court

Violations of Article 6 § 1

Guadagnino v. Italy and France

18.01.2011

Italian courts refused to hear industrial disputes concerning an employee of the French school in Rome.

De Luca v. Italy and Pennino v. Italy

24.09.2013

The two cases concerned the impossibility for the applicants to have a final judgment enforced in order to recover money owed to them by a municipal authority which had become insolvent.

Right to a fair hearing/trial

Violations of Article 6 § 1

Cordova v. Italy

30.01.2003

Applicant (former public prosecutor in Sicily) filed criminal complaints against a Senator and an MP, but their alleged offences were covered by parliamentary immunity.

C.G.I.L. and Cofferati v. Italy

(no. 46967/07)

24.02.2009

Inability, for a trade union and its General Secretary, to bring libel proceedings against an MP (parliamentary immunity).

Savino and Others v. Italy

28.04.2009

Question whether the Judicial Committee and Judicial Section for officials of the Chamber of Deputies were independent and impartial tribunals.

Lombardi Vallauri v. Italy

20.10.2009

Refusal by Milan Catholic University to employ a lecturer who was not approved by the Congregation for Catholic Education.

Maggio and Others v. Italy

31.05.2011

Re-adjustment of pensions of Italians who worked abroad.

Agrati and Others v. Italy

07.06.2011

The applicants were 125 Italian nationals who complained about the retrospective application of a new law to ongoing judicial proceedings, on the calculation of their length of service as civil servants.

[Arras and Others v. Italy](#)

14.02.2012

The case concerned legislative amendments which affected pending civil proceedings the applicants had brought concerning their pension adjustments. The applicants were pensioners and former employees of the Banco Di Napoli, a banking group which was originally public and was later privatised.

[M.C. and Others v. Italy \(no. 5376/11\)](#)

03.09.2013 – Pilot judgment¹

The case concerned the fact that it was impossible for 162 Italian nationals to obtain an annual adjustment of the supplementary part of a compensation allowance paid to them following accidental contamination as a result of blood transfusions or the administration of blood derivatives.

The Court held that the Government's enactment of the emergency legislative decree, which ruled on the disputed issue of adjustment of the supplementary part of the allowance, had infringed the principle of the rule of law and the applicants' right to a fair hearing, had imposed "an abnormal and excessive burden" on them and, lastly, had disproportionately infringed their property rights.

[Dhahbi v. Italy](#)

08.04.2014

The case concerned the inability of an immigrant worker of Tunisian origin to obtain payment from the Italian public authorities of a family allowance under the association agreement between the European Union (EU) and Tunisia (Euro-Mediterranean Agreement).

¹ Since 2004 and in response to the large number of cases deriving from systemic or structural problems in certain countries the Court has developed a pilot-judgment procedure. This consists in identifying in a single judgment systemic problems underlying a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights and indicating in that judgment the remedial measures required to resolve such situations. The pilot-judgment procedure is not only intended to facilitate effective implementation by respondent states of individual and general measures necessary to comply with the Court's judgments, but also induces the respondent State to resolve large numbers of individual cases arising from the same structural problem at domestic level, thus reinforcing the principle of subsidiarity which underpins the Convention system.

[Azienda Agricola Silverfunghi S.A.S. and Others v. Italy](#)

24.06.2014

The case concerned proceedings before the Italian courts brought by a number of Italian agricultural companies based on their possible entitlement to a two-fold reduction of social security contributions. Pending these proceedings the Italian legislator passed a new retrospective law which determined that their benefits would be calculated alternatively, and not cumulatively.

Right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time

[Grande Stevens and Others v. Italy](#)

04.03.2014

The case concerned the applicants' appeal against the administrative penalty imposed on them by the Italian Companies and Stock Exchange Commission (hereafter "Consob"²) and the criminal proceedings to which they are currently subject after having been accused of market manipulation in the context of a financial operation involving the car manufacturer FIAT.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

No violation of Article 6 § 3 (a) (right to be informed promptly of the accusation) and (c) (right to the assistance of a lawyer) in respect of Mr Grande Stevens

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice)

The Court also held that the respondent State was to ensure that the new criminal proceedings brought against the applicants, in violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7, which, according to the most recent information received, were still pending in respect of Mr Gabietti and Mr Grande Stevens, were closed as rapidly as possible.

² "Consob" is a Commission charged, in particular, with protecting investors and ensuring the transparency and development of the stock markets.

**Excessive length of proceedings,
delay in payment of "Pinto"
compensation**

Simaldone v. Italy

31.03.2009

Delay in payment of compensation awarded under "Pinto Act".

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 \(right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time\) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

The judgment referred to a growing number of applications concerning delayed payment of "Pinto" compensation.

Gaglione and Others v. Italy

21.12.2010

Delay by the Italian authorities in paying compensation in 475 "Pinto" applications (applications lodged to complain of the length of civil proceedings) – a delay of at least 19 months in 65% of the applications.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 \(enforcement of judicial decisions within a reasonable time\); violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

The Court observed a widespread problem relating to the enforcement of Pinto decisions in Italy (at 7 December 2010, more than 3,900 applications concerning, among other things, delays in paying compensation under the Pinto Act were pending before the Court). It found that **general measures were required** to remedy malfunctioning of "Pinto" applications.

It disagreed with the assertion that the applicants had not suffered a significant disadvantage and dismissed for the first time a request for application of the new admissibility criterion introduced by Protocol No. 14 (no significant disadvantage).

**Cases dealing with Article 7 (no
punishment without law)**

Sud fondi Srl and Others v. Italy

20.01.2009

Court-ordered confiscation of property following illegal development on a protected site ("Punta Perrotta"), although the Court of Cassation, in the criminal proceedings, had found the landowners and their representatives to have committed an "inevitable and excusable error".

[Violation of Article 7](#)

Contrada v. Italy (no. 3)

14.04.2015

The case concerned the issue of whether the actions for which the applicant was convicted and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment constituted a criminal offence at the time when they were committed.

[Violation of Article 7](#)

The Court held that the offence of "aiding and abetting a mafia-type organisation from the outside" had resulted from a development in the case-law which had begun toward the end of the 1980s and was consolidated in 1994, and that it was not therefore sufficiently clear and foreseeable for Mr Contrada at the time of the events in respect of which he was charged (1979-1988).

**Cases concerning the right to respect
for private and family life (Article 8)**

[Violations of Article 8](#)

Moretti and Benedetti v. Italy

27.04.2010

Shortcomings in adoption proceedings: failure to respect foster parents' rights.

Piazzini v. Italy

02.11.2010

The case concerned the applicant's inability, for more than seven years, to exercise his right of access in respect of his son, under the conditions laid down by the courts, on account of the alleged failure by the social services to take the necessary measures.

Di Sarno and Others v. Italy

10.01.2012

The case concerned the state of emergency (from 11 February 1994 to 31 December 2009) in relation to waste collection, treatment and disposal in the Campania region of Italy where the applicants lived and/or worked, including a period of five months in which rubbish piled up in the streets.

Costa and Pavan v. Italy

28.08.2012

The case concerned an Italian couple who are healthy carriers of cystic fibrosis and wanted, with the help of medically-assisted procreation and genetic screening, to avoid transmitting the disease to their offspring.

[Godelli v. Italy \(no. 33783/09\)](#)

25.09.2012

The case concerned the confidentiality of information concerning a child's birth and the inability of a person abandoned by her mother to find out about her origins.

[Zhou v. Italy](#)

21.01.2014

The case concerned the placement of the applicant's third child, a toddler, with a foster family with a view to adoption and the fact that Ms. Zhou had not had any contact with her child for ten months.

[Manuello and Nevi v. Italy](#)

20.01.2015

The case concerned the applicants' inability to see their granddaughter, firstly because of the non-enforcement of court decisions authorising meetings and secondly on account of a court decision suspending those meetings.

[Oliari and Others v. Italy](#)

21.07.2015

The case concerned the complaint by three homosexual couples that under Italian legislation they do not have the possibility to get married or enter into any other type of civil union.

[Bondavalli v. Italy](#)

17.11.2015

The case concerned the Mr Bondavalli's inability to exercise fully his right of contact with his son on account of negative reports by the Scandiano social services, with which the mother had professional links.

**Cases on freedom of expression
(Article 10)**

[Ricci v. Italy](#)

08.10.2013

The case concerned the conviction and sentencing of the presenter/producer of a satirical television programme for disclosing confidential images that had been recorded for the internal use of a public television station (the RAI).

[Violation of Article 10](#)

[Peruzzi v. Italy](#)

30.06.2015

The case concerned the criminal conviction of Mr Peruzzi, a lawyer, for having defamed an investigating judge (Judge X) in the

context of proceedings regarding the division of an estate in which he had been acting for two clients.

[No violation of Article 10](#)

**Other noteworthy cases,
judgments delivered**

Chamber

[Sessa v. Italy](#)

03.04.2012

The case concerned the judicial authority's refusal to adjourn a hearing listed on the date of a Jewish holiday.

[No violation of Article 9 \(right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion\)](#)

[Tarantino and Others v. Italy](#)

02.04.2013

The case concerned eight students' complaints about the restrictions imposed on them by Italian legislation aimed at limiting access to universities, following their unsuccessful attempts to obtain a place in the faculties of medicine and dentistry.

[No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 \(right to education\)](#)

For the first time the Court has had to assess the compatibility with the right to education in the tertiary sector of the operation of a numerus clausus (the maximum number of candidates allowed to enter a university) coupled with an entrance examination. The Court concluded that the State had not exceeded its wide discretion to decide on such a matter as regulating access to education. It essentially found that there existed a right to access education only in so far as a university had the capacity and resources and in so far as society had a need for a particular profession, unemployment representing further expenditure for society at large.

[Valle Pierimpiè Società Agricola S.p.a v. Italy](#)

23.09.2014

The case concerned a declaration to the effect that a part of the Venice lagoon known as Valle Pierimpiè, which the applicant company had purchased and had been using for fish farming, belonged to the public maritime domain.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Battista v. Italy

02.12.2014

The case concerned the fact that it was impossible for Mr Battista to obtain a passport or an identity card valid for travel abroad on account of his failure to pay maintenance for his children.

Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement)

“Dublin Regulation”³

Mohammed Hussein v. the Netherlands and Italy

02.04.2013

The case concerned a Somali asylum seeker who claimed in particular that she and her two young children would be subjected to ill-treatment if transferred from the Netherlands to Italy under the Dublin Regulation.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

The Court found in particular that, if returned to Italy, the future prospects of Ms Mohammed Hussein and her two children did not disclose a sufficiently real and imminent risk of hardship severe enough to fall within the scope of Article 3.

Sharifi and Others v. Italy and Greece

21.10.2014

The case concerned 32 Afghan nationals, two Sudanese nationals and one Eritrean national, who alleged, in particular that they had entered Italy illegally from Greece and been returned to that country immediately, with the fear of subsequent deportation to their respective countries of origin, where they faced the risk of death, torture or inhuman or degrading treatment.

The Court held, concerning four of the applicants, **Reza Karimi, Yasir Zaidi, Mozamil Azimi and Najeeb Heideri**

³ The “Dublin” system serves to determine which European Union (EU) Member State is responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national.

The Dublin Regulation establishes the principle that only one Member State is responsible for examining an asylum application. The objective is to avoid asylum seekers from being sent from one country to another, and also to prevent abuse of the system by the submission of several applications for asylum by one person.

(also known as Nagib Haidari), who had maintained regular contact with their lawyer in the proceedings before the Court, that there had been:

a violation by Greece of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) combined with Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or regarding treatment) on account of the lack of access to the asylum procedure for the above-named applicants and the risk of deportation to Afghanistan, where they were likely to be subjected to ill-treatment
a violation by Italy of Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens)

a violation by Italy of Article 3, as the Italian authorities, by returning these applicants to Greece had exposed them to the risks arising from the shortcomings in that country’s asylum procedure;

a violation by Italy of Article 13 combined with Article 3 of the Convention and Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 on account of the lack of access to the asylum procedure or to any other remedy in the port of Ancona

See factsheet “Dublin cases”.

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Ada Rossi and Others v. Italy

22.12.2008

Authorisation to discontinue artificial nutrition and hydration of a person in a persistent vegetative state.

Applications declared inadmissible as the applicants could not claim to be “victims” of the alleged violations.

Sommer v. Italy

23.03.2010

Belated opening of proceedings against a former SS officer, convicted for killing civilians during the Second World War. Difficulty of collecting evidence in his favour 60 years after the events.

Application declared inadmissible: incompatible *ratione temporis* and *ratione materiae* and manifestly ill-founded.

Achille Occhetto v. Italy

12.11.2013

The application concerned the quashing by the Consiglio di Stato of a decision by the Italian Electoral Commission in 2006

announcing Mr Occhetto's election to the European Parliament. The applicant alleged, in particular, a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections). [Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.](#)

Riina v. Italy

11.03.2014

The application concerned the constant monitoring of Mr Riina in prison by means of a video surveillance system.

[Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.](#)

X and Y v. Italy

16.09.2014

Under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, both applicants complain that their embryos have been wrongly implanted in another woman's uterus due to a medical mistake.

[Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.](#)

Stella v. Italy and 10 other applications and Rexhepi v. Italy and seven other applications

25.09.2014

The applications concerned the issue of prison overcrowding in Italy following the application of the pilot judgment procedure in [Torreggiani and Others v. Italy](#), delivered by the Court on 8 January 2013.

[Applications declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.](#)

Sciabica v. Italy and Germany

21.10.2014

The applicant was convicted in Germany of intentional homicide and was subsequently transferred to Italy.

[Complaint against Italy declared inadmissible as the application was lodged outside the six-month time-limit](#)

[Complaint against Germany declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded](#)

Viviani and Others v. Italy

24.03.2015

The case concerned the risks attached to a potential eruption of Vesuvius and the measures taken by the authorities to combat those risks.

[Application declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies.](#)

Smaltini v. Italy

16.04.2015

The case concerned Ms Smaltini's allegations of a causal link between the polluting emissions from the Ilva factory located near her home and the leukaemia that led to her death.

[Application declared inadmissible as being manifestly ill-founded.](#)

Noteworthy pending cases

Grand Chamber

Khlaifia and Others v. Italy (no. 16483/12)

Detention in a reception centre on Lampedusa and subsequently on ships moored in Palermo harbour, as well as the return to Tunisia, of clandestine migrants who had landed on the Italian coast in 2011 during the events linked to the "Arab Spring".

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 1 September 2015, the Court held, unanimously, that there had been a violation of Article 5 §§ 1 (right to liberty and security), 2 (right to be promptly informed of the reasons for deprivation of liberty) and 4 (right to a decision on the lawfulness of detention) of the Convention, finding that the applicants had been deprived of their liberty without a sufficient legal basis, that they had not been duly informed of the reasons for the measure, and that they had been unable to challenge it.

[Referred to the Grand Chamber on 1 February 2016](#)

[Grand Chamber hearing on 22 June 2016](#)

Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy (no. 25358/12)

The case concerns the placement in social-service care of a nine-month-old child who had been born in Russia following a gestational surrogacy contract entered into by a couple; it subsequently transpired that they had no biological relationship with the child

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicants complain, in particular, about the child's removal from them, and about the refusal to acknowledge the parent-child relationship established abroad by

registering the child's birth certificate in Italy.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 27 January 2015, the Court held, by five votes to two, that there had been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention.

[Referred to the Grand Chamber on 1 June 2015](#)

[Grand Chamber hearing on 9 December 2015](#)

[De Tomasso v. Italy \(no. 43395/09\)](#)

The case concerns the applicant, who was considered to be a dangerous person, being put under house arrest and special surveillance for a period of two years.

The applicant alleges violations of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement) to the Convention and 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention.

[The Chamber relinquished jurisdiction in favour of the Grand Chamber on 25 November 2014](#)

[Grand Chamber hearing on 20 May 2015](#)

[G.I.E.M s.r.l. v. Italy \(no. 1828/06\)](#) **[Hotel Promotion Bureau s.r.l. and Rita Sarda s.r.l. v. Italy \(no. 34163/07\)](#)** **[Falgest s.r.l. and Girona v. Italy \(no. 19029/11\)](#)**

The cases concern the confiscation of land, as provided for by law in the event of unlawful site development. The applicants rely on Article 7 (no punishment without law), Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

[In these cases, the Chamber relinquished jurisdiction in favour of the Grand Chamber on 17 February 2015](#)

[Grand Chamber hearing on 2 September 2015](#)

Chamber

Length of proceedings cases following delay in payment of "Pinto" compensation

Around 5,000 cases are pending before the Court where applicants are complaining about one or both aspects related to length and issues linked to the Pinto procedure. Around 3,680 cases have not been communicated yet and more than 1,300 are pending after communication.

Taddeucci v. Italy (no. 51362/09)

[Communicated](#) to the parties in September 2009
Inability of the applicants, a same-sex couple one of whom is an Italian and the other a New Zealand national, to live together in Italy on account of the Italian authorities' refusal to issue the second applicant with a residence permit because the national immigration legislation does not allow unmarried partners to obtain a family member's residence permit.

Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, the applicants allege discrimination based on their sexual orientation on the grounds that the second applicant was refused a family residence permit and that they have no other means of living together as a couple in Italy.

[Azzolina and Others v. Italy and Kutschkau and Others v. Italy \(nos. 28923/09 and 67599/10\)](#)

[Communicated](#) to the parties in December 2012
In these three cases, the applicants allege that they were subjected to ill-treatment in the context of clashes at the G8 Summit held in Genoa in 2001. They rely in particular on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

Orlandi and Others v. Italy (no. 26431/12)

[Communicated](#) to the parties in December 2013
The case concerns the refusal by the Italian authorities to recognise the applicants' marriages, which were entered into abroad. It also relates to the lack of any other form of recognition for same-sex couples in the Italian legal system. The applicants rely on Articles 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 12 (right to marry) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention.

Richmond Yaw and Others v. Italy (nos. 3342/11, 3391/11, 3408/11 and 3447/11)

[Communicated](#) to the parties in March 2015
The applications concern the detention of the applicants, who are Guinean nationals, with a view to executing a removal order. The applicants reply on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), Article 5 § 4 (right

to speedy review of the lawfulness of detention) and Article 5 § 5 (right to liberty and security) of the Convention.

Talpis v. Italy (no. 41237/14)

[Communicated](#) to the parties in August 2015

The application concerns, in particular, the alleged failure by the Respondent State to provide protection and support to the applicant following violence inflicted by her husband, which ended with the murder of the applicant's son and the attempted murder of the applicant.

The applicant relies on Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention.

Cirino v. Italy (no. 2539/13) and Renne v. Italy (no.4705/13)

[Communicated](#) to the parties in September 2015

The applicants complain of the ill-treatment to which they were allegedly subjected during their detention, amounting, in their view, to torture. In particular, they complain that they were subjected to acts of violence and were deprived of food and sleep. They also allege that, given that the offence of torture does not exist in Italian criminal law, the perpetrators of the alleged ill-treatment were prosecuted for less serious offences, which became time-barred during the criminal proceedings.

The applicants rely on Articles 3 (prohibition of torture) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

**ECHR Press Unit Contact:
+ 33 (0)3 90 21 42 08**