

# CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i> .....	xi
Introduction .....	1
Chapter 1.	
The Pilot Judgment Procedure. Responding to states' failure to resolve systemic human rights violations .....	9
1.1. The origins of the procedure: The Court's backlog and states' failure to implement Court judgments .....	9
1.2. The purpose of the pilot judgment procedure and the defining elements of a pilot judgment .....	13
1.2.1. The first tier: 'Full' Pilot Judgments .....	15
1.2.1.1. <i>Broniowski v Poland</i> .....	16
1.2.1.2. <i>Hutten-Czapska v Poland</i> .....	18
1.2.1.3. <i>Burdov v Russia (No. 2)</i> .....	18
1.2.1.4. <i>Olaru and others v Moldova</i> .....	19
1.2.1.5. <i>Yuriy Nikolayevich Ivanov v Ukraine</i> .....	20
1.2.1.6. <i>Suljagić v Bosnia and Herzegovina</i> .....	21
1.2.1.7. The common characteristics of 'full' pilot judgments ...	22
1.2.2. The second tier: 'Quasi-Pilot' Judgments .....	24
1.2.3. The third tier: other judgments addressing systemic issues .....	26
1.2.4. Questions arising from the initial application of the pilot judgment procedure .....	28
1.3. Securing states' compliance with the European Convention .....	32
1.4. The mechanics of the pilot judgment procedure .....	34
How are cases chosen for the application of the pilot judgment procedure – a question of selective justice? .....	34
Chapter 2.	
Poland: The 'Homeland' of Pilot Judgments? .....	41
2.1. Introduction .....	41
2.1.1. The status of the Convention with respect to domestic law .....	41
2.1.2. Poland's track record in responding to Strasbourg .....	43

2.1.2.1.	The problem of ensuring effective parliamentary engagement in the implementation process .....	46
2.1.2.2.	The failure of the legislature and the executive to respond to Constitutional Court judgments .....	47
2.1.2.3.	'Full' Pilot Judgments: Broniowski and Hutten-Czapska. ....	48
2.2.	Compensation for expropriated property ( <i>Broniowski</i> ) .....	49
2.2.1.	Evaluation of the effectiveness of the 'Broniowski law' .....	51
2.2.2.	Amendments to the Broniowski law.....	55
2.3.	State rent-control and subsidisation for property renovation ( <i>Hutten-Czapska</i> ) .....	56
	Evaluation of the effectiveness of the 'rent mirror scheme' and the law on renovation and thermo-modernization.....	58
2.4.	'Quasi-pilot' judgments and 'third tier' judgments .....	59
2.4.1.	Excessive length of proceedings ( <i>Kudła</i> ).....	60
	Evaluation of the impact of the <i>Kudła</i> judgment on domestic law .....	62
2.4.2.	Excessive length of pre-trial detention ( <i>Kauczor</i> ).....	64
	Evaluation of the impact of the <i>Kauczor</i> judgment on domestic law .....	65
2.4.3.	Poor prison conditions and inhuman treatment ( <i>Sławomir Musiał</i> ) .....	67
	Evaluation of the impact of the <i>Sławomir Musiał</i> judgment on domestic law .....	67
2.5.	Evaluation of the monitoring of the implementation of Strasbourg judgments .....	68
2.6.	Conclusion .....	71
2.6.1.	What factors have led the Court to apply the pilot judgment procedure? .....	72
2.6.1.1.	The Role of Individuals.....	72
2.6.1.2.	Collaboration between the Polish Constitutional and European Courts .....	73

### Chapter 3.

The Slovenian Experience of 'Quasi-Pilot' Judgments. Has the Court over-reached its powers in length of proceedings cases?..... 75

3.1.	Introduction .....	75
3.1.1.	The status and application of the European Convention in domestic law .....	75
3.1.2.	Slovenia's track record in responding to Strasbourg .....	76
3.1.2.1.	The Executive .....	76
3.1.2.2.	The Legislature .....	77

3.2.	The causes of the excessive length of legal proceedings in Slovenia . . . . .	79
	The particular problem in Celje . . . . .	83
3.3.	Excessive length of proceedings: the cases of <i>Belinger &amp; Lukenda</i> . . . . .	85
3.3.1.	The ‘quasi-pilot’ judgment of <i>Lukenda v Slovenia</i> . . . . .	86
3.3.1.1.	The impact of <i>Lukenda</i> on domestic law . . . . .	87
3.3.1.2.	Changes in the law to make administrative procedures in courts more efficient . . . . .	89
3.3.1.3.	Alternative means of dispute resolution . . . . .	89
3.3.1.4.	How effective was the application of the pilot judgment procedure in the case of <i>Lukenda</i> ? . . . . .	90
3.4.	The sequel to <i>Lukenda</i> : the <i>Robert Lesjak</i> judgment . . . . .	94
	The 2009 amendments to the 2006 Law . . . . .	95
3.5.	‘Third tier’ Judgments – the cases of <i>Matko</i> and <i>Šilih</i> . . . . .	96
3.5.1.	Investigation into claims of police brutality: <i>Matko</i> . . . . .	97
	The effect of the <i>Matko</i> judgment on domestic law . . . . .	98
3.5.2.	Investigation of medical malpractice: <i>Šilih v Slovenia</i> . . . . .	98
	The effect of the <i>Šilih</i> judgment on domestic law . . . . .	99
3.6.	Evaluating how the implementation of Strasbourg judgments is monitored . . . . .	100
3.7.	Conclusions . . . . .	101
3.7.1.	What factors led the Court to issue ‘quasi-pilot’ and ‘third tier’ judgments against Slovenia? . . . . .	101
	Cooperation between the Slovenian Constitutional Court and the European Court . . . . .	102
3.7.2.	The efficacy of the ‘quasi-pilot’ judgment in <i>Lukenda</i> . . . . .	103
3.7.3.	The <i>erga omnes</i> implications of <i>Lukenda</i> . . . . .	104
Chapter 4.		
	Italy: Pinto, Azzolini and the Elevation of the Status of the European Convention in Domestic Law . . . . .	105
4.1.	Introduction . . . . .	105
4.1.1.	The status of the Convention with respect to national law . . . . .	105
4.1.2.	Italy’s track record in responding to Strasbourg . . . . .	107
4.1.2.1.	Implementation of Constitutional Court judgments . . . . .	109
4.1.2.2.	The implementation of Strasbourg judgments – the roles of the executive and legislature . . . . .	109
4.2.	‘Quasi-pilot’ judgments in Italian cases . . . . .	111
4.2.1.	The right to a fair trial (Article 6) . . . . .	111
4.2.1.1.	<i>Sejdović v Italy</i> . . . . .	112
4.2.1.2.	<i>R.R. v Italy</i> . . . . .	113
4.2.2.	Compensation for expropriated property (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1) . . . . .	115

4.2.2.1. <i>Scordino v Italy</i> (No. 1) . . . . .	116
4.2.2.2. <i>Scordino v Italy</i> (No. 3) . . . . .	118
4.2.2.3. <i>Guiso-Gallisy</i> . . . . .	119
4.2.2.4. Prohibition of building on land for expropriation . . . . .	120
4.2.3. Right to trial within a reasonable time (Article 6(1)) . . . . .	121
<i>Scordino v Italy</i> (No.1) and the ineffectiveness of the Pinto Law . . . . .	122
4.3. The effect of pilot judgments on the status of the European Convention on Human Rights in domestic law: Constitutional Court judgments 348 & 349 . . . . .	124
4.4. Monitoring Implementation of Strasbourg Judgments. . . . .	128
The ‘Azzolini Law’ . . . . .	128
4.4.1. Report on the Pinto Law . . . . .	129
4.4.2. Report on the rendition of terrorist suspects: <i>Saadi v Italy</i> . . . . .	130
4.5. Conclusion . . . . .	131
 Chapter 5.	
Expanding the Scope of the Pilot Judgment Procedure. The experience of Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Turkey, Georgia and the United Kingdom . . . . .	133
5.1. Introduction . . . . .	133
5.2. The failure to implement domestic court judgments. . . . .	134
5.2.1. <i>Burdov v Russia</i> . . . . .	134
5.2.1.1. <i>Burdov v Russia</i> (No. 2). . . . .	137
5.2.1.2. The response to <i>Burdov</i> (No. 2) from the executive, the judiciary and the legislature. . . . .	141
5.2.2. <i>Yuriy Nikolayevich Ivanov v Ukraine</i> . . . . .	145
5.2.3. <i>Olaru and others v Moldova</i> . . . . .	150
The ‘forces’ within the state ‘in favour’ of the pilot judgment procedure . . . . .	152
5.3. Compensation for lost foreign currency savings after the break-up of Yugoslavia: <i>Suljagić v Bosnia and Herzegovina</i> . . . . .	153
5.4. Quasi-pilot judgments & communicated cases. . . . .	156
5.4.1. <i>Xenides-Arestis v Turkey</i> . . . . .	156
The effectiveness of the 2005 Law . . . . .	158
5.4.2. <i>Manole and others v Moldova</i> . . . . .	160
5.4.3. <i>Bekoyeva v Georgia</i> . . . . .	163
5.4.4. <i>O’Donoghue v United Kingdom</i> . . . . .	164
5.5. Conclusion . . . . .	166
5.5.1. The response of the executive to the pilot judgment procedure . . . . .	166

5.5.2. Differing domestic pressures in favour of Article 46 judgments.....	167
5.5.3. The efficacy of the Pilot Judgment Procedure.....	168
Chapter 6.	
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	171
6.1. The Origins and objectives of the pilot judgment procedure .....	171
6.2. Defining pilot judgments, quasi-pilot judgments and other systemic cases .....	171
6.2.1. (i) ‘Full’ pilot judgments.....	172
6.2.2. (ii) ‘Quasi-pilot’ judgments.....	173
6.2.3. (iii) Other judgments addressing systemic issues .....	173
6.3. The selection of cases for the application of the pilot judgment procedure.....	173
6.4. The practice and procedure of the Court in pilot judgment cases.....	174
6.5. Questions arising from the application by the Court of the pilot judgment procedure .....	175
6.6. The effectiveness of the pilot judgment procedure.....	177
6.7. How states respond to pilot judgments.....	178
6.7.1. Poland.....	179
6.7.2. Slovenia.....	180
6.7.3. Italy .....	181
6.8. The contribution of other Council of Europe entities.....	182
6.9. Recommendations .....	183
6.9.1. Contracting States .....	183
6.9.2. Civil Society.....	184
6.9.3. Council of Europe .....	184
<i>List of Cases</i> .....	187
<i>Bibliography</i> .....	191
<i>About the Authors</i> .....	207