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

Press Unit
Unité de la Presse

Press country profile
Fiche pays pour la presse

Last updated: July 2026

Romania

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1994

National Judge: Sebastian Răduleţu (3 July 2023 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judge: Marin Voicu (1996-1998), Corneliu Bîrsan (1998-2013), Iulia Antoanella Motoc (2014-2023)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 3,314 applications concerning Romania in 2025, of which 3,230 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 29 judgments (concerning 84 applications), 20 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2024	2025	2026*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	2520	1961	930
Communicated to the Government	735	302	137
Applications decided:	2848	3314	1308
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	1999	1848	820
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	606	1376	409
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	3	6	4
- Decided by judgment	240	84	75

* January to July 2026
For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the ECHR internet site.
Statistics on interim measures can be found here.

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2026	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	2107
Single Judge	250
Committee (3 Judges)	1611
Chamber (7 Judges)	246
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

Romania and ...

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 **673** Registry staff members.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Danileț v. Romania

15.12.2025

The case concerned the freedom of expression of a judge, who had had a sanction imposed on him by the National Judicial and Legal Service Commission (Consiliul Superior al Magistraturii – CSM) for posting two messages on his publicly accessible Facebook page.

violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Press release available in Romanian

Advisory opinion(no. P16-2024-002) from the High Court of Cassation and Justice of Romania

20.12.2024

The request was made in the context of an appeal pending before the High Court concerning a judge's dismissal from office for failure to attend an expert medical evaluation, which was intended to determine whether she was suffering from a mental illness that would prevent her from performing her duties properly.

The High Court requested that the European Court give an advisory opinion on two questions concerning (i) the applicability of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and (ii) the level of precision required of the domestic law which had served as the legal basis for the dismissal.

Having deliberated on 16 December 2024, the Court decided not to accept the request, considering that it did not concern a question of principle, within the meaning of Article 1 § 1 of Protocol No. 16, which warranted examination by the Grand Chamber.

Advisory opinion (no. P16-2024-001) from High Court of Cassation and Justice of Romania

The request was submitted in the context of an appeal pending before the High Court, concerning the confiscation of a sum of money from a civil servant following an audit of her assets by the National Integrity Agency (Agenția Națională de Integritate – "the ANI"). The Romanian authorities had considered that the civil servant – who belonged to one of the 39 categories of individuals working in the public sector who were required to declare their assets and interests – had been unable to prove the source of the money, which had been confiscated following an audit of her income. The High Court requested the European Court to give an opinion on two questions concerning the interpretation of Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the European Convention.

Having deliberated on 8 April and 18 June 2024, the Court decided not to accept the request for an advisory opinion, considering that it did not concern a question of principle, within the meaning of Article 1 § 1 of Protocol No. 16, warranting examination by the Court's Grand Chamber. It found that the Court's case-law was well developed with regard to the questions asked, and several aspects of that case-law were judiciously cited by the requesting court in its decision to refer the matter to the Court.

Muhammad and Muhammad v. Romania

15.10.2020

The case concerned proceedings as a result of which the applicants, Pakistani nationals living lawfully in Romania, were declared undesirable and deported.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 7 (procedural safeguards relating to expulsion of aliens)

Mihalache v. Romania

08.07.2019

In this case, Mr Mihalache submitted that he had been prosecuted twice for having refused to undergo a blood test in the framework of a police control with a view to determining his alcohol blood level.

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

Nicolae Virgiliu Tănase v. Romania

25.06.2019

The case concerned a judge who had been severely injured in a car accident in 2004. The criminal proceedings, which Mr Tănase had joined as a civil party, were

discontinued eight years later with a decision not to prosecute the other two drivers involved in the accident.
Before the Court, Mr Tănase complained in particular that the criminal investigation had been ineffective and too long and that it had been impossible for him to obtain a decision on his civil claim.
No violation of Article 2 as concerned the investigation into the accident
No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right of access to court)
No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time)

Bărbulescu v. Romania

05.09.2017
The case concerned the decision of a private company to dismiss an employee after monitoring his electronic communications and accessing their contents, and the alleged failure of the domestic courts to protect his right to respect for his private life and correspondence.
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and correspondence)

Lupeni Greek Catholic Parish and Others v. Romania

29.11.2016
The case concerned a request for the restitution of a place of worship that had belonged to the Greek Catholic Church and was transferred during the totalitarian regime to the ownership of the Orthodox Church.
No violation of the Article 6 § 1 in respect of the right of access to a court
Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the breach of the principle of legal certainty
Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the length of the proceedings
No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 6 § 1 in respect of the applicants' right of access to a court in comparison with the Orthodox parish
The Court further held that that it was not necessary to examine separately the complaint under Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 6 § 1 in so far as it concerned an alleged difference of treatment compared with other Greek Catholic parishes.

Gherghina v. Romania

18.09.2015
The case concerned a disabled student's complaint that he was not able to continue his university studies owing to a lack of suitable facilities on the premises of the universities where he attended courses.
Case declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.
The Court, reiterating that those who wish to complain to the European Court against a State have to first use remedies provided for by the national legal system, found that Mr Gherghina's reasons for not pursuing certain legal remedies with regard to his complaints had not been convincing.

Mocanu and Others v. Romania

17.09.2014
The case concerned the investigation and the length of the proceedings which followed the violent crackdown on anti-government demonstrations in Bucharest in June 1990. During the crackdown, Ms Mocanu's husband was killed by gunfire and Mr Stoica was arrested and ill-treated by the police.
Violation of the procedural aspect of Article 2 (right to life - investigation) in respect of Ms Mocanu
Violation of the procedural aspect of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment - investigation) in respect of Mr Stoica
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time) in respect of the Association "21 December 1989"

Centre For Legal Resources On Behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania

17.07.2014
The case concerned the death of a young man of Roma origin – who was HIV positive and suffering from a severe mental disability – in a psychiatric hospital. The application was lodged by a nongovernmental organisation (NGO) on his behalf.
Violation of Article 2 (right to life), in both its substantive and its procedural aspects
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 2
Among other things, the Court found that, in the exceptional circumstances of the case, and bearing in mind the serious nature of the allegations, it was open to the NGO to act as a representative of

Mr Câmpeanu, even though the organisation was not itself a victim of the alleged violations of the Convention.

Sindicatul 'Păstorul cel Bun' v. Romania

09.07.2013

The case concerned the refusal by the Romanian State of an application for registration of a trade union formed by priests of the Romanian Orthodox Church.

No violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association)

The Court held that in refusing to register the applicant union, the State had simply declined to become involved in the organisation and operation of the Romanian Orthodox Church, thereby observing its duty of denominational neutrality under Article 9 of the Convention.

Creangă v. Romania

23.02.2012

The case concerned a police officer's deprivation of liberty in connection with a largescale criminal investigation aimed at dismantling a petroleum-trafficking network.

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) on account of Mr Creangă's deprivation of liberty on 16 July 2003, at least from 12 noon to 10 p.m., and his placement in pre-trial detention on 25 July 2003

No violation of Article 5 § 1 on account of Mr Creangă's deprivation of liberty from 10 p.m. on 16 July 2003 to 10 p.m. on 18 July 2003

Cumpănă and Mazăre v. Romania

17.12.2004

Conviction of journalists for insult and defamation after publishing an article in which they questioned the legality of a contract signed by Constanţa City Council.

Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Brumărescu v. Romania

28.10.1999

Refusal of the Supreme Court of Justice to recognise that the lower courts had jurisdiction to deal with a claim for recovery of possession.

Violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

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

Chamber and Committee

Cases concerning right to life (Article 2)

Violation of Article 2

Pârvu v. Romania

30.08.2022

The case concerned the applicant's allegation of a chaotic police operation in which her husband had been shot in the head after officers had mistaken him for an international fugitive. Her husband died in hospital shortly afterwards.

Andreea-Marusi Dumitru v. Romania

31.03.2020

The case concerned the effectiveness and length of the investigation conducted after the applicant sustained gunshot wounds during a police operation at a goods train depot in November 2005.

Ioniță v. Romania

10.01.2017

The case concerned the death of the applicants' four-year-old son following an operation. The applicants complained that the authorities had failed to effectively investigate the incident, despite their repeated claims that it had been caused by the negligence of medical staff.

Crăiniceanu and Frumușanu v. Romania

24.04.2012

Deaths of two people who were shot on 25 September 1991 during rioting in front of the Government building in Bucharest and the subsequent investigation (not completed 20 years after the events).

Panaitescu v. Romania

10.04.2012

The case concerned the applicant's complaint about the Romanian authorities' failure to provide him with specific anti-cancerous medication for free.

Predică v. Romania

07.06.2011

The case concerned the official explanation for the violent death of a 20 year old man in prison.

Iorga and Others v. Romania
25.01.2011
Death in prison, after being assaulted by fellow inmates, of the applicants' relative, who had been given a short sentence for not paying a fine of about 20 euros and who was an alcoholic.

Carabulea v. Romania
13.07.2010
The case concerned a Roma robbery suspect who was tortured in police custody and refused contact with his family. He died in intensive care.

Lazăr v. Romania
16.02.2010
Case concerning the forensic medical reports in the investigation into a young man's death in hospital.

Velcea and Mazăre v. Romania
01.12.2009
Refusal of the domestic courts to declare a murderer unworthy of inheriting, because he had committed suicide and had therefore never actually been convicted.

Ştefan-Gabriel Mocanu and Others v. Romania
12.12.2023
The case concerned allegations made by the victims or the heirs of victims of the repression of anti-government protests held in Bucharest in June 1990 as to the lack of an effective investigation.

No Violation of Article 2

A et B c. Roumanie (n° 48442/16)
02.06.2020

Cases concerning the 1989 anti-communist demonstrations

Alecu and Others v. Romania
27.01.2015
The applicants are the victims or heirs of victims of the armed crackdown on demonstrations against the communist dictatorship, beginning on 21 December 1989 in Bucharest and in other cities in the country, which led to the collapse of the regime. The case concerns the investigation into those events.
Violation of Article 2 (investigation)
Violation of Article 3 (investigation)

Association "21 December 1989" and Others v. Romania
24.05.2011
The case concerned the crackdown on anti-government demonstrations in Romania in December 1989.
Violation of Article 2 on account of the lack of an effective investigation into the death of the son of applicants; violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life and correspondence) on account of secret surveillance measures
The Court noted that its finding of a violation of Article 2 related to a wide-scale problem, given that many hundreds of people were involved as injured parties in the impugned criminal proceedings. It added that general measures at domestic level would unquestionably be necessary in the context of the execution of this judgment.

In the 3 cases below, the Court found a violation of Article 2 (lack of an effective remedy)

Lăpuşan and Others v. Romania
08.03.2011
Proceedings brought by nine applicants seeking compensation for violence suffered during the repression of anti-communist demonstrations in Cluj-Napoca in 1989.

Şandru and Others v. Romania
08.12.2009
Investigations into injuries and deaths related to the 1989 anti-communist demonstrations in Timişoara.

Agache and Others v. Romania
20.10.2009
Investigation into the death of an officer killed in the anti-communist demonstrations in Târgu-Secuiesc on 22 December 1989.

Right to life and prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment (Articles 2 and 3)

Attacks on Roma villages and destruction of houses and possessions

Costică Moldovan and Others v. Romania
15.02.2011
This application concerned difficulties with the execution of Moldovan (no. 2) and

Others v. Romania, judgment of 12 July 2005 (see below).
The Court declared the application inadmissible.
See also **Moldovan and Others v. Romania**, inadmissibility decision of 17 April 2012.

Gergely v. Romania and Kalanyos and Others v. Romania

26.04.2007
These cases concerned the burning of houses belonging to Roma villagers by local population, the poor living conditions of the victims and the authorities' failure to prevent the attack and to carry out an adequate criminal investigation, depriving the applicants of their right to bring a civil action to establish liability and recover damages.
The Court decided to strike the applications out of its list of cases following a unilateral declaration by the Romanian Government.
See also **Tănase and Others v. Romania**, judgment (striking out) of 26 May 2009.

Moldovan (no. 2) and Others v. Romania

12.07.2005
In September 1993 three Roma men were attacked in the village of Hădăreni by a large crowd of non-Roma villagers, including the local police commander and several officers: one burnt to death, the other two were beaten to death by the crowd. The applicants alleged that the police then encouraged the crowd to destroy other Roma properties: in total 13 Roma houses in the village were completely destroyed. Hounded from their village and homes, the applicants were then obliged to live in crowded and unsuitable conditions – cellars, hen-houses, stables. Following criminal complaints brought by the applicants, some were awarded damages ten years later.
Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life and home)
No violation of Article 6 § 1 (access to court) of the Convention
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention on account of the length of the proceedings
Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with Articles 6 § 1 and 8.
See also **Moldovan (no. 1) and Others v. Romania**, judgment (friendly settlement) of 5 July 2005, and **Lăcătuş and Others v. Romania**, judgment of 13 November 2012.

Cases concerning inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Violation of Article 3

D. and Others v. Romania (no. 75953/16)

14.01.2020
The case concerned an order for the expulsion to Iraq of an Iraqi national following his conviction in Romania for having facilitated the entry to Romania of persons involved in terrorist activities (a migrant smuggling offence).
The Court held that there would not be a violation of Article 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention if the order to expel the applicant to Iraq were implemented.

Buturugă v. Romania

10.02.2020
The case concerned allegations of domestic violence and of violation of the confidentiality of electronic correspondence by the former husband of the applicant, Ms Buturugă, who complained of shortcomings in the system for protecting victims of this type of violence.

Bădoiu v. Romania

25.06.2019
The case concerned allegations of police violence and the ensuing investigation.

E.B. v. Romania (no. 49089/10)

19.03.2019
The case concerned the applicant's complaint that her accusations of rape had not been properly investigated and that she had been deprived of her procedural rights.

Al Nashiri v. Romania

31.05.2018
The case concerned the applicant's allegations that Romania had let the United States Central Intelligence Agency (the CIA) transport him under the secret

extraordinary rendition programme onto its territory and had allowed him to be subjected to ill-treatment and arbitrary detention in a CIA detention "black site". He also complained that Romania had failed to carry out an effective investigation into his allegations.

Dorneanu v. Romania

28.11.2017

The case concerned the living conditions and care provided to a prisoner, Mr Dorneanu, who was suffering from terminal metastatic prostate cancer. He died after eight months in detention.

D.M.D. v. Romania (no. 23022/13)

03.10.2017

The case concerned the proceedings brought by a son against his father for domestic abuse. The proceedings lasted over eight years and ended in the father's conviction of physically and mentally abusing his child. D.M.D., the applicant, complained that those proceedings had been ineffective and that he had not been awarded damages. In particular, the domestic courts had found at last instance that they did not have to examine the issue of compensation as neither he nor the prosecutor had made such a request before the lower courts.

The Court recalled in particular that Member States should strive to protect children's dignity and that, in practice, this required an adequate legal framework to protect children against domestic violence.

Alexandru Enache v. Romania

03.10.2017

The case concerned, on the one hand, a prisoner's complaint about his conditions of detention and, on the other, his complaint about discrimination on grounds of sex stemming from the fact that under Romanian legislation, only convicted mothers of children under the age of one can obtain a stay of execution of their prison sentences until their child's first birthday.

Bălșan v. Romania

23.05.2017

The case concerned an allegation of domestic abuse.

Ms Bălșan alleged that the authorities had failed to protect her from her husband's violent behaviour and to hold him accountable, despite her numerous complaints.

I.C. v. Romania (no. 36934/08)

24.05.2016

The case concerned a complaint about the inadequacy of the investigation into a 14-year old girl's allegation of rape.

M.C. and A.C. v. Romania (no. 64602/12)

12.04.2016

The case concerned the applicants' complaint that they had been attacked on their way home from a gay march and that the ensuing investigation had been inadequate.

M. G. C. v. Romania (no. 61495/11)

15.03.2016

The case concerned an allegation of defective legislation for the prosecution of rape and/or sexual abuse of children in Romania.

Grămadă v. Romania

11.02.2014

The case concerned the shooting of Mr Grămadă by a police officer during the arrest of a man who was on the run and took refuge in Mr Grămadă's home.

C.A.S. and C.S. v. Romania (no. 26692/05)

20.03.2012

The case concerned a seven-year-old's complaint that it had taken the authorities five years to investigate his repeated rape by a man, eventually acquitted, who had forced his way into the family flat when the boy had come home alone from school in a period from January to April 1998.

Parascineti v. Romania

13.03.2012

Placement of applicant in psychiatric institution.

M. and C. v. Romania (no. 29032/04)

27.09.2011

Allegations that a three-year old boy was sexually abused amidst acrimonious proceedings between his parents over custody and contact rights.

Archip v. Romania

27.09.2011

Applicant's allegation that he had been taken to his local police station and

handcuffed to a tree for nearly three hours for complaining about a reduction in his sickness benefit.

Jiga v. Romania

16.03.2010

The case concerned the obligation for a defendant (Director General of the Economic and Budgetary Directorate at the Ministry of Agriculture and Food) to wear prison clothing in court, the prolongation of his pre-trial detention and his conditions in detention.

Stoica v. Romania

04.03.2008

Clash between police officers and people of Roma origin outside a bar during which the 14-year-old applicant was ill-treated by the police.

Cobzaru v. Romania

26.07.2007

The case concerned the applicant's alleged ill-treatment by the police.

Pantea v. Romania

03.06.2003

Former public prosecutor remanded in custody.

No violation of Article 3

D and Others v. Romania (no. 75953/16)

14.01.2020

The case concerned an order for the expulsion to Iraq of an Iraqi national following his conviction in Romania for having facilitated the entry to Romania of persons involved in terrorist activities (a migrant smuggling offence).

The Court held that there would not be a violation of Article 2 (right to life) and 3 if the order to expel the applicant to Iraq were implemented

The Court also held that there had been a violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken together with Articles 2 and 3.

Examples of cases concerning conditions of detention

Kanalas v. Romania

06.12.2016

The case concerned the conditions in which Mr Kanalas was held in the prisons of Oradea and Rahova, and the rejection by the prison administration of his request for leave in order to attend his mother's funeral.

Violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

The Court found – as it had already found in respect of the same prisons – that the conditions of the applicant's detention breached Article 3 of the Convention.

Apostu v. Romania

03.02.2015

The case concerned the pre-trial detention conditions of a former mayor accused of corruption and his allegation that part of the case file was leaked to the media.

Violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and the correspondence)

Florin Andrei v. Romania

15.04.2014

The case concerned the physical conditions of the applicant's detention in a cell at Constanţa police station for two months in 2005, in particular overcrowding, poor sanitary conditions and lack of access to a toilet.

Violation of Article 3

Remus Tudor v. Romania

15.04.2014

The case concerned the applicant's conditions of detention, in particular overcrowding and poor hygiene, when serving his sentence in Jilava Prison from April 2009 to November 2011.

Violation of Article 3

Stanciu v. Romania

24.07.2012

The case concerned the applicant's conditions of detention in several Romanian prisons, in particular overcrowding, bad hygiene conditions and inadequate medical treatment.

Violation of Article 3

Noting that there were 80 similar applications against Romania concerning this issue pending before the Court, the Court pointed out that this case reflected a common problem in Romanian prisons and that, despite efforts to improve the situation, Romania had to take further steps, including a compensation scheme.

Ciupercescu v. Romania

15.06.2010

The applicant, in pre-trial detention, objected that he had been placed under the detention regime for dangerous prisoners involving, in particular unannounced body searches on a weekly basis and whenever he left the prison.

No violation of Article 3 as regards the applicant's classification as a dangerous prisoner

Two violations of Article 3 as regards the applicant's detention regime following his classification as a dangerous prisoner and the conditions of his detention in Bucharest-Jilava Prison (overcrowding)

Brânduşe v. Romania

07.04.2009

Conditions of detention and detrimental effect on private life of offensive smells produced by a city-run refuse site 20 metres from the prison.

Violation of Article 3

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Applications inadmissible

925 applications regarding conditions of detention in Romania

29.01.2026

In the 17 decisions, the Court found that all the applicants had access to the preventive remedy validated in the case of *Văscăuţanu v. Romania* but had failed to lodge complaints. Failure to do so led to the applications being declared inadmissible for not having used all the legal avenues at national level, in accordance with Article 35 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention.

Press release in Romanian

Văscăuţanu v. Romania

04.12.2025

The case concerned the effectiveness of a preventive remedy, namely an application to a post-sentencing judge under Article 56 of Law no. 254/2013 on the execution of sentences and detention measures ordered by the judicial authorities in the context of criminal proceedings. The purpose of the remedy was to put an end to situations breaching rights under Article 3 of the European Convention where prisoners had alleged poor conditions of detention while serving their prison terms.

Application declared inadmissible

Press release available in Romanian.

Vlad v. Romania

08.12.2022

The application concerned the conditions of detention of a former prisoner in Bucharest-Rahova Prison.

Application declared inadmissible

Dîrjan and Ştefan v. Romania

28.05.2020

The case concerned two complaints about unsatisfactory conditions of detention.

Application declared inadmissible

The Court noted that the applicants had both been granted a reduction of their prison sentence by way of compensation for the poor conditions of detention, pursuant to Romanian Law no. 169/2017. They had consequently benefited from early release.

The Court held, in particular, that the application of this law demonstrated, in essence, the national authorities' acknowledgment of a violation of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

The Court also found that the compensation mechanism implemented, consisting in a reduction of sentence, was adequate and appropriate.

Cases concerning medical care in detention

Gavriliţă v. Romania

22.06.2010

Alleged failure of authorities to provide sick prisoner with medical care.

No violation of Article 3

Also see Gagiu v. Romania (24.02.2009) and Petrea v. Romania (29.04.2008)

Cases concerning non-smokers in detention

Elefteriadis v. Romania

25.01.2011

Applicant's exposure to fellow prisoners' tobacco smoke in shared cells, while being transported to court and in the waiting areas before his court appearances.
Violation of Article 3

Florea v. Romania

14.09.2010

Overcrowding and poor hygiene conditions in detention, including subjection to passive smoking.
Violation of Article 3

Right to liberty and security cases (Article 5)

Matthews and Johnson v. Romania
Lazăr v. Romania

09.04.2024

The case concerned the applicants' detention and the Romanian courts' ordering their extradition to the United States in March 2021. All three applicants were wanted for, among other charges, racketeering, drugs and money-laundering offences.
No violation of Article 5 § 1 (f)
The Court declared the complaint under Article 3 inadmissible.

Cîrstea v. Romania

23.07.2019

The case concerned the applicant's placement in pre-trial detention in the proceedings which followed a dramatic fire in a neonatal intensive-care ward where she was responsible for monitoring care.
Violation of Article 5 § 3 (justification of pre-trial detention)
No violation of Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 (right to a speedy review of the lawfulness of detention)

Al Nashiri v. Romania

31.05.2018

The case concerned the applicant's allegations that Romania had let the United States Central Intelligence Agency (the CIA) transport him under the secret extraordinary rendition programme onto its territory and had allowed him to be subjected to ill-treatment and arbitrary detention in a CIA detention "black site". He also complained that Romania had failed to carry out an effective investigation into his allegations.
Violations of Article 5 (right to liberty and security), Article 8 (right to respect for private life), and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Articles 3, 5 and 8

N. v. Romania (no. 59152/08)

28.11.2017

The case concerned the detention of a person suffering from psychiatric disorders.
Violation of Article 5 § 1
Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to speedy review of the lawfulness of detention)
Under Article 46 (binding force and execution of judgments), the Court held, firstly, that the authorities should implement without delay the County Court's judgment of 21 February 2017 ordering N.'s release in conditions meeting his needs; and secondly, that the deficiencies identified in his case were likely to give rise to other well-founded applications.

C.B. v. Romania (no. 21207/03)

20.04.2010

Psychiatric detention of a man charged with maliciously accusing a police officer.
Violation of Article 5 §§ 1 (e) and 4

Application inadmissible

Terheş v. Romania

20.05.2021

The case concerned the lockdown which was ordered by the Romanian government from 24 March to 14 May 2020 to tackle the COVID-19 pandemic and which entailed restrictions on leaving one's home.
Application declared inadmissible.

Boldea v. Romania

04.02.2021

The case concerned the pre-trial detention in the applicant's organised-crime trial.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

B.A.A. v. Romania (no. 70621/16)

18.04.2019

The case concerned the applicant's complaint about an arrest order issued by the Romanian authorities.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Cases concerning Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Violation of Article 6

Manolache v. Romania

03.06.2025

The case concerned the fairness of criminal proceedings against the applicant, a police officer.

Press release in Romanian.

Spasov v. Romania

06.12.2022

The case concerned a Romanian court judgment convicting Mr Spasov, the owner and captain of a Bulgarian-flagged vessel, of illegal fishing inside Romania's exclusive economic zone in the Black Sea.

Kövesi v. Romania

05.05.2020

The case concerned the applicant's removal as the chief prosecutor of the National Anticorruption Directorate before the end of her second term following her criticism of legislative reforms in the area of corruption. She alleged that she had also been unable to challenge that decision in court.

Link to press release in Romanian

Ovidiu Cristian Stoica v. Romania

24.04.2018

The case concerned Mr Stoica's conviction by an appeal court of the dissemination of obscene images (sexual intercourse between him and his former partner) without a renewed hearing of the witnesses and on the basis of the same evidence which had been deemed insufficient by the firstinstance court having acquitted him.

S.C. Uzinexport S.A. v. Romania

31.03.2015

The case concerned the dismissal of a claim by a company seeking to obtain default interest for late payment in respect of a sum owed to it by the State.

Roşiianu v. Romania

24.06.2014

The case concerned the refusal by the mayor of Baia Mare to disclose information about the use of public money by the municipal administration to a journalist who had submitted a request to that effect. The mayor had also refused to comply with court decisions ordering him to hand over the information.

S.C. Raisa M. Shipping. S.R.L. v. Roumanie

08.07.2013

The case concerned proceedings brought by the applicant company against the Galați River Administration of the Lower Danube Galați regarding river tax billing.

In this case, the Court focused on the application of the legislation in force at the relevant time (currently amended) concerning summoning by way of posting.

Popa and Tănăsescu v. Romania

10.04.2012

The case concerned the applicants' complaint that the last instance national court deciding in a criminal case against them convicted them without giving them the possibility to defend themselves in person and to submit evidence.

Ştefănică and Others v. Romania

02.11.2010

Case concerning the compensation granted for dismissal to 18 former employees of a former State-owned bank, which was involved in a restructuring process in 1998 and 1999 which entailed hundreds of dismissals. The applicants complained that the domestic courts' decisions with regard to the granting of compensation for dismissal had been inconsistent, even though the claims had been brought by people in similar situations and had involved similar legal issues.

Albert v. Romania

16.02.2010

Proceedings against a mayor for removing the Romanian flag from his town hall and translating the town's name into Hungarian.

Tudor Tudor v. Romania

24.03.2009

Action for recovery of possession of a flat bought from the State

Beian v. Romania

06.12.2007

The case concerned proceedings relating to social benefits for forced labour during the applicant's military service.

Lupas and Others v. Romania

14.12.2006

Dismissal of the applicants' actions to recover confiscated property by the Court of Cassation pursuant to the unanimity rule, which did not allow undivided property to be claimed without the participation of all the joint owners.

No violation of Article 6

Păcurar v. Romania

24.06.2025

The case concerned the confiscation of assets belonging to Mr Păcurar on the basis of legal provisions aimed at preserving integrity in the exercise of public office, as the provenance of the assets was "unexplained".
Press release in Romanian.

Vasile Pruteanu and Others v. Romania

14.01.2025

The case concerned proceedings brought against a couple and their son, who owned three massage parlours in Romania, for pimping and human trafficking. They alleged that their convictions had not been fair because key witnesses – women they had recruited in the Republic of Moldova – had never been examined directly in the Romanian courts.
Press release available in Romanian

Miron v. Romania

05.11.2024

The case concerned the fairness of criminal proceedings. The applicant alleged that the trial court which had convicted her had not taken evidence directly from either the witnesses or her co-defendants.
Communiqué de presse disponible en roumain.

Severin v. Romania

08.10.2024

The case concerned the fairness of criminal proceedings against Mr Severin for allegedly taking bribes while he was a Member of the European Parliament (MEP). The proceedings, which saw him receive a four-year prison sentence, were initiated following the publication of an article by two British *Sunday Times* journalists, who had posed as lobbyists and had offered the applicant money in exchange for his support for certain legislative amendments submitted to the European Parliament.
Press release available in Romanian.

Cotora v. Romania

17.01.2023

The case concerned disciplinary proceedings against the applicant, a judge and – at the time – President of a Court of Appeal, which had resulted in a disciplinary sanction in the form of a salary reduction.

Marilena-Carmen Popa v. Romania

18.02.2020

The case concerned criminal proceedings against the applicant for forgery.

Alexandru Marian Iancu v. Romania

04.02.2020

The case concerned the applicant's allegation that a judge who had been involved in convicting him in two sets of connected proceedings could not be impartial.

Bivolaru v. Romania (no. 2)

02.10.2018

The case concerned criminal proceedings in which Mr Bivolaru – leader of a movement known as the "Movement for spiritual integration in the absolute" ("MISA") – was sentenced to six years' imprisonment for sexual relations with a minor.

Telbis and Viziteu v. Romania

26.06.2018

The case concerned the seizure of cash and property from the applicants on the suspicion that they had benefited from bribes taken by a close relative, a doctor who made decisions on work capacity in a pensions office. He later admitted to the charges and was sentenced to three years in prison.

Dragoș Ioan Rusu v. Romania

31.10.2017

The case concerned a university researcher's conviction for trafficking Diazepam via his local post office. Mr Rusu, the applicant, alleged in particular that his conviction had been unfair because it was based on unlawfully obtained evidence, namely envelopes seized by the prosecuting authorities at the post office without the approval of a court.

Albu and Others v. Romania

10.05.2012

The case concerned the complaints of 64 civil servants that their claims for salary-related benefits were wrongfully dismissed in an unfair trial, notably alleging that the national courts had not taken into consideration other rulings on similar claims brought by their fellow civil servants across the country in which such benefits had been granted.

See also cases in which the Court applied its case-law following the Court's judgment in the case *Albu*:

Frimu and Others v. Romania

Tunaru v. Romania

13.11.2012 (decision on the admissibility)

Neghea and Others v. Romania

Radu and Others v. Romania

11.09.2012 (decision on the admissibility)

Applications inadmissible

Secară v. Romania

20.02.2025

The case concerned the fairness of criminal proceedings which had led to the applicant's conviction, on appeal, for dissipation of assets and money-laundering.

Application declared inadmissible

Press release in Romanian

Ceort v. Romania

04.07.2024

The case concerned the criminal conviction of a public prosecutor at the High Court of Cassation and Justice, for soliciting a bribe. Relying on Article 6, the applicant complained that the criminal proceedings against him had been unfair.

Application declared inadmissible

Camelia Bogdan v. Romania

20.10.2022

The case concerned disciplinary proceedings against a judge which had resulted in her being barred from office.

Application declared inadmissible

Năstase v. Romania

29.09.2022

The case concerned criminal proceedings against Ms Daniela Năstase and Mr Adrian Năstase, who were accused of illegally importing goods to Romania for their own use, between 2002 and 2004, through the intermediary of companies run by high-ranking officials in the government at the time when Mr Năstase was leading it as Prime Minister.

Applications declared inadmissible

Corbu v. Romania

03.02.2022

The case concerned the length of the criminal proceedings against the applicant, which had begun with an investigation in February 2012 that had led to her acquittal in a judgment delivered in May 2018 by the High Court of Cassation. At the relevant time, Ms Corbu was a judge of the High Court of Cassation. She has been President of the latter court since September 2019.

Application struck out of the list of Court's cases

Rarinca v. Romania

04.02.2021

The case concerned the court proceedings in a trial for the blackmail of the president of highest court in Romania.

Application declared inadmissible.

Ilinca v. Romania

24.10.2019

The case concerned the withdrawal of a permit authorising the possession of firearms.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Ilie v. Romania

26.09.2019

The case concerned the alleged lack of impartiality of judges in a dispute over property rights.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Right to a fair trial within a reasonable time

Violation of Article 6

Bivolaru v. Romania (no. 2)

02.10.2018

The case concerned criminal proceedings in which Mr Bivolaru – leader of a movement known as the "Movement for spiritual integration in the absolute" ("MISA") – was sentenced to six years' imprisonment for sexual relations with a minor.

Al Nashiri v. Romania

31.05.2018

The case concerned the applicant's allegations that Romania had let the United

States Central Intelligence Agency (the CIA) transport him under the secret extraordinary rendition programme onto its territory and had allowed him to be subjected to ill-treatment and arbitrary detention in a CIA detention "black site". He also complained that Romania had failed to carry out an effective investigation into his allegations.

Vlad and Others v. Romania

26.11.2013

The case concerned the length of legal proceedings that the three applicants had been involved in before the Romanian courts, and the remedy available for their excessive length.

Due to there being 500 similar cases against Romania currently pending before the European Court concerning excessive length of criminal and civil proceedings, the Court held that there was a systemic problem which required further reforms of the legal system in order for the right to a fair trial within a reasonable time to be secured in Romania.

Codarcea v. Romania

02.06.2009

Length of proceedings in a case of medical negligence and applicant's inability to obtain the compensation awarded to her by a court because of the doctor's insolvency. The domestic courts refused to recognize the liability of the hospital.

Abramiuc v. Roumania

24.02.2009

Non execution of a final decision ordering the payment of royalties to the applicant for the period of time his invention had been used; length of two sets of proceedings and the applicant's impossibility to complain of that length under Romanian law.

Right of access to Court

Violation of Article 6

Reformed Church Foundation for Student Housing and Stanomirescu v. Romania

07.01.2014

These cases concerned the systemic issue of the non-execution by the Romanian authorities of binding and enforceable domestic decisions given against State authorities and in favour of an NGO and an individual applicant.

Weissman and Others v. Romania

24.05.2006

Large stamp duty required to initiate proceedings (EUR 323,264).

Presumption of innocence

Neagoe v. Romania

21.07.2015

The case concerned a statement made by the spokesperson of the Court of Appeal before the latter had conducted its deliberations, encouraging the public to consider the applicant, Mr Neagoe, guilty of – among other things – manslaughter.

Violation of Article 6 § 2

Case on Article 7
(no punishment without law)

Macovei v. Romania

26.02.2026

The case concerned proceedings brought by a politician, Ms Macovei, to challenge sanctions imposed on her for having violated the rules on election financing during her 2014 presidential campaign.

Application declared inadmissible

Press release in Romanian

Bădescu and Others v. Romania

15.04.2025

The case concerned a lack of foreseeability in the criminal law alleged by the applicants, who were judges who had been convicted of abuse of office.

No violation of Article 7

Press release available in Romanian.

Plechkov v. Romania

16.09.2014

The case concerned the sentencing of Mr Plechkov to a suspended prison term together with the confiscation of his boat (including the installations, tools and cargo on board) for allegedly fishing illegally within the Romanian "exclusive economic zone" in the Black Sea.

Violation of Article 7

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

Cases concerning private and family life (Article 8)

Violation of Article 8

M.Ș.D. v. Romania (no. 28935/21)
03.12.2024
The case concerned events following the breakup of a relationship in 2016, when M.Ș.D. was 18 years of age. Her ex-boyfriend, V.C.A., among other allegations, sent intimate pictures of her to family members and others, and posted the pictures, along with her personal details, on escort websites.
Press release available in English.

Zăicescu and Fălticineanu v. Romania
23.04.2024
The case concerned the retrial and acquittal of two army officers in the 1990s who had been convicted in the 1950s of war crimes and crimes against humanity for their involvement in, among other crimes, the persecution of Romanian Jews in 1941, in particular the Iași pogrom, which Mr Zăicescu had survived, and the placement of a high number of Jews in ghettos, which was the case for both applicants.
Press release also available in Romanian.

C. v. Romania (no. 47358/20)
30.08.2022
The case concerned allegations of sexual harassment in the workplace following a criminal complaint lodged by the applicant, a cleaning lady in a railway station, against the railway station manager, accusing him of repeatedly trying to force himself on her, and the State's alleged failure to deal with the matter.

Tusă v. Romania
30.08.2022
The concerned an applicant who had undergone breast removal surgery on the basis of a mistaken cancer diagnosis. She complained of the consequences of the surgery and of the outcome of the proceedings which she had instituted in the national courts.

X and Y v. Romania
19.01.2021
The case concerned the situation of two transgender persons whose requests for recognition of their gender identity and for the relevant administrative corrections to be made were refused on the grounds that persons making such requests had to furnish proof that they had undergone gender reassignment surgery.

Marina v. Romania
26.05.2020
The case concerned a radio programme during which a letter was read out containing personal information about Mr Marina and his ex-wife, without their knowledge and on the initiative of the applicant's sister.

Convertito and Others v. Romania
03.03.2020
The case concerned the annulment, owing to administrative flaws, of State degrees in dentistry obtained by the applicants in Romania.

Buturugă v. Romania
10.02.2020
The case concerned allegations of domestic violence and of violation of the confidentiality of electronic correspondence by the former husband of the applicant, Ms Buturugă, who complained of shortcomings in the system for protecting victims of this type of violence.

Dragoș Ioan Rusu v. Romania
31.10.2017
The case concerned a university researcher's conviction for trafficking Diazepam via his local post office. Mr Rusu, the applicant, alleged in particular that his conviction had been unfair because it was based on unlawfully obtained evidence, namely envelopes seized by the prosecuting authorities at the post office without the approval of a court.

Georgel and Georgeta Stoicescu v. Romania
26.07.2011
71-year-old woman, who was left disabled after being attacked by a pack of stray dogs.
Press release in Romanian

Geleri v. Romania
15.02.2011
Expulsion of a political refugee on the grounds of national security, under an order that did not set out reasons.

Băcilă v. Romania

30.03.2010

Effects on the applicant's health and living environment of the pollution generated by a plant producing lead and zinc.

Haralambie v. Romania

27.10.2009

Obstacles encountered by the applicant to access to the personal file created on him by the former secret services of the Communist Regime (the *Securitate*).

Tătar v. Romania

27.01.2009

Pollution generated by a technological process used by a company to exploit the Baia Mare gold mine.

Petrina v. Romania

14.10.2008

Allegations that the applicant was a member of the former Secret Services of the Communist Regime - the *Securitate*.

Dumitru Popescu v. Romania

26.04.2007

Use of telephone tapping in the course of an investigation.

No violation of Article 8

Regional Air Services S.R.L. and Ivascu v. Romania

22.02.2022

The case concerned the rejection of a civil action that the applicants had brought for the protection of their reputation against a number of journalists, on account of statements made in 2014 during several television programmes and in a newspaper article. The applications were lodged by the company Regional Air Services S.R.L, which is responsible for the management of Tuzla Airport in Romania, and by Mr Ivaşcu, who is, through another company, one of its two shareholders.

No violation of Article 8 in respect of Mr Ivaşcu's complaint

Applicant company's complaint declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

Naidin v. Romania

21.10.2014

The case concerned the barring of a one-time informer of the Romanian political police from employment in the public service.

Applications inadmissible

Piperea v. Romania

01.09.2022

The case concerned Mr Piperea's complaint against measures put in place by the government of Romania under a state of alert declared on 18 May 2020, following a state of emergency declared on 16 March 2020, during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The application felled to be rejected pursuant to Article 35 § 4 of the Convention.

Man and Others v. Romania

12.12.2019

The applicants, Mr Man, his wife and their media companies, brought multiple complaints under the Convention, essentially connected to the search-and-seizure operation at their home and newspaper premises as well as the freezing of their assets and bank accounts during the criminal proceedings over the blackmail network.

Complaint under Article 8 declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Children's rights (Article 8)

Violation of Article 8

I.V.Ţ. v. Romania (no. 35582/15)

01.03.2022

The case concerned a television interview of a minor, without parental consent or adequate measures to protect her identity. The interview, which concerned the death of a schoolmate, had resulted in her being bullied and had caused her emotional stress.

M. G. C. v. Romania (no. 61495/11)

15.03.2016

The case concerned an allegation of defective legislation for the prosecution of rape and/or sexual abuse of children in Romania.

Zaieţ v. Romania

24.03.2015

The case concerned the annulment of a woman's adoption, at the instigation of her adoptive sister, 31 years after it had been approved and 18 years after the death of their adoptive mother.

This was the first occasion on which the Court had to consider the annulment of an

adoption order in a context where the adoptive parent was dead and the adopted child had long reached adulthood.

No violation of Article 8

Stoian v. Romania

25.06.2019

The case concerned complaints by the applicants, a disabled son and his mother, that the authorities had failed to provided suitable access to education for him.

No violation of Article 8, taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education), taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14

Pini and Bertani & Manera and Atripaldi v. Romania

22.06.2004

Refusal of institution for orphaned and abandoned children to hand Romanian children adopted by the applicants (four Italian nationals).

Parental rights cases (Article 8)

Violation of Article 8

Cînța v. Romania

18.02.2020

The case concerned court-ordered restrictions on the applicant's contact with his daughter.

O.C.I. and Others v. Romania (no. 49450/17)

21.05.2019

The case concerned the interpretation of "grave risk" under international law in a child custody dispute.

R. I. and Others v. Romania (no. 57077/16)

04.12.2018

The case concerned a woman who was given custody of her two children but who was not able to enforce the orders, which left the children with the father.

Ostace v. Romania

25.02.2014

The case concerned Mr Ostace's inability to obtain the revision of a judgment establishing his paternity in spite of an extra-judicial forensic examination proving the contrary. The request was rejected on the ground that the document in question did not exist at the time of the initial proceedings.

Hulea v. Romania

02.10.2012

The case concerned the refusal of the Defence Ministry to grant Mr Hulea parental leave on the grounds that by law such leave was granted only to female personnel.

Romanian translation of this judgment

Karrer v. Romania

21.02.2012

The case concerned a complaint by a father and his daughter about international child abduction proceedings before the Romanian courts.

A.M.M. v. Romania (no. 2151/10)

14.02.2012

The case concerned paternity proceedings brought by the mother of a minor with disabilities, who was herself severely disabled.

No violation of Article 8

Achim v. Romania

24.10.2017

The case concerned the placement in care of Ms and Mr Achim's seven children on the grounds that the couple had not been fulfilling their parental duties and obligations.

Knecht v. Romania

02.10.2012

The applicant complained that she had been prevented from becoming a mother by means of *in vitro* fertilisation due to the State's refusal to transfer embryos she had deposited with a private clinic and which, when the clinic came under criminal investigation, had been seized and deposited at the Institute of Forensic Medicine, which had not been authorised to function as a genetic bank.

Droits des personnes de même sexe

Violation of Article 8

Buhuceanu and Others v. Romania
23.05.2023
The applicants are all same-sex couples. The case concerned access to legal recognition for the applicants' relationships.

Freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 9)

Violation of Article 9

Neagu v. Romania
10.11.2020
The case concerned a prisoner who had converted to Islam while in detention. He complained of the refusal of the Romanian authorities to provide him with pork-free meals, in accordance with the precepts of his religion, unless he furnished proof that he was an adherent of that religion.

Saran v. Romania
10.11.2020
The case concerned the provision to a prisoner of meals compatible with the precepts of Islam.

No violation of Article 9

Constantin-Lucian Spînu v. Romania
11.10.2022
The case concerned a refusal by the national authorities, on grounds of measures taken during the COVID-19 pandemic, to let a prisoner attend religious services outside Jilava Prison.

Erlich and Kastro v. Romania
09.06.2020
The case concerned the provision of kosher meals to two Israeli prisoners of Jewish faith detained in a Romanian prison. The applicants complained of the failure of the Rahova Prison authorities to provide them with meals complying with the precepts of their religion.

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Violation of Article 10

Alexandru Pătrașcu v. Romania
07.01.2025
The case concerned the applicant's liability for his statements and the comments published on his Facebook page.

Ponta v. Romania
14.06.2022
The case concerned an award of damages against Mr Ponta, a former politician and Prime Minister, for posting comments directed at another person on his Facebook page, which the domestic courts found to be defamatory.

Bumbeș v. Romania
03.05.2022
The case concerned the fining of Mr Bumbeș for taking part in a protest against proposed gold- and silver-mining activity in the Roșia Montană area. He along with three others had handcuffed themselves to one of the entrance barriers of the main Government building and displayed signs.
Violation of Article 10 interpreted in the light of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association)

Tőkés v. Romania
27.04.2021
The case concerned a Romanian national, László Tőkés, who belongs to the Hungarian minority in Romania and who was elected as a member of the European Parliament in respect of Hungary. The Romanian authorities imposed sanctions on Mr Tőkés for flying the flags of Szeklerland and the Partium (Részek) territory on the building housing his office in Oradea.
Violation of Article 10

Gheorghe-Florin Popescu v. Romania
12.01.2021
The case concerned the domestic authorities' decision to order the applicant, a journalist, to pay damages for having published five blog posts criticising L.B., another journalist who was the editor-inchief of a newspaper in the Desteptarea media group and producer for a local television channel belonging to the same group.

Macovei v. Romania
28.07.2020
The case concerned the applicant being found liable for defaming another politician.

Petro Carbo Chem S.E. v. Romania

30.06.2020

The case concerned a civil court order issued to the applicant company to pay symbolic compensation to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Oltchim company (which was the largest chemicals factory in Romania) for criticising the CEO's management of the company in the context of a media conflict.

Kövesi v. Romania

05.05.2020

The case concerned the applicant's removal as the chief prosecutor of the National Anticorruption Directorate before the end of her second term following her criticism of legislative reforms in the area of corruption. She alleged that she had also been unable to challenge that decision in court.
Link to press release in Romanian

Brisc v. Romania

11.12.2018

The case concerned a chief prosecutor's dismissal for breaching the secrecy of a criminal investigation when he made statements to the press. He was sanctioned following a judge's complaint that his press release and interview with a television channel had allowed the media to identify her as being implicated in a money scam.

Gîrleanu v. Romania

26.06.2018

The case concerned the arrest and conviction of a journalist for possessing and trying to verify classified information on national security, namely documents belonging to a Romanian military unit based in Afghanistan.

Bucur and Toma v. Romania

08.01.2013

Agent of the intelligence-gathering services (Mr Bucur) sentenced in criminal proceedings for having communicated to the media audio tapes involving politicians and journalists.

Frăsilă and Ciocîrlan v. Romania

10.05.2012

The case concerned the enforcement of a court decision giving journalists the right of access to the premises of a local radio station where they worked.

Andreescu v. Romania

08.06.2010

Conviction of a well-known human rights activist for remarks concerning the agency managing the intelligence service's archives (the "CNSAS": the National Council for the Study of the Archives of the *Securitate,* the Romanian intelligence service under the former regime).

No violation of Article 10

Pretorian v. Romania

24.05.2022

The case concerned a civil judgment against the applicant, editor-in-chief of a regional weekly newspaper, for publishing two articles in which he criticised a well-known local politician.

Panioglu v. Romania

08.12.2020

The case concerned professional penalties suffered by a judge, in particular concerning promotion, for an article she had written in the press. The article had severely criticised the President of the Court of Cassation's activities as a prosecutor under the repressive communist regime.

Gafiuc v. Romania

13.10.2010

The case concerned the withdrawal of the accreditation granted to a journalist to study the archives of the Securitate in order to conduct research into sports activities under the communist regime. In June and July 2009 the journalist published several articles in which he disclosed information about certain well-known sports figures.

Catalan v. Romania

09.01.2018

The case concerned the dismissal of a civil servant (Mr Catalan), who worked for the National Council for the Study of *Securitate* Archives (CNSAS), for disclosing information for the publication of an article claiming that a religious leader had collaborated with the *Securitate* (the former political police under the communist regime).

Application inadmissible

Man and Others v. Romania

12.12.2019

The applicants, Mr Man, his wife and their media companies, brought multiple complaints under the Convention, essentially connected to the search-and-seizure operation at their home and newspaper premises as well as the freezing of their assets and bank accounts during the criminal proceedings over the blackmail network.

Complaint under Article 10 declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Case dealing with freedom of assembly and association (Article 11)

Csiszer and Csibi v. Romania

05.05.2020

The case concerned the imposition of an administrative fine on the applicants for organising a gathering on 1 December 2010, the day of the Romanian national holiday, to commemorate the founding of the *Székely* battalion. On 1 December 1918, in Cluj-Napoca, Hungarian military units had joined forces to form the *Székely* battalion to fight the Romanian army, which had entered Transylvania. In April 1919 the battalion surrendered to the Romanian army.

No violation of Article 11

Manole and "Romanian Farmers Direct" v. Romania

16.06.2015

The case concerned the refusal to register the union of self-employed farmers which Mr Manole wished to set up.

No violation of Article 11

Effective remedy rights (Article 13)

Brudan v. Romania

10.04.2018

The case concerned the length of the criminal proceedings brought against the applicant, which began on 23 March 2000 and ended on 18 June 2014.

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time)

Cases concerning Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Association ACCEPT and Others v. Romania

01.06.2021

The case concerned a demonstration that had occurred at a screening of a film involving a same-sex family during the applicant association's LGBT History Month in February 2013. The other five applicants had attended the screening. Although the police had provided some protection, the cinema had been invaded by protestors, allegedly carrying far-right paraphernalia. Cinemagoers had been verbally abused.

Violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) in respect of the individual applicants

Violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association)

Cînța v. Romania

18.02.2020

The case concerned court-ordered restrictions on the applicant's contact with his daughter.

Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Lingurar v. Romania

16.04.2019

The case concerned a raid in 2011 by 85 police and gendarmes on the Roma community in Vâlcele (Romania).

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) as concerned the ill-treatment of the applicant family during the raid

Two violations of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 3 because the raid had been racially motivated and the related investigation had been ineffective

Lingurar and Others v. Romania

16.10.2018

The case concerned two police operations in the Roma community of Pata Rât to locate individuals suspected of theft.

Violation of both the substantive and procedural aspects of Article 3

No violation of the substantive aspect of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 3

Violation of the procedural aspect of Article 14 taken together with Article 3

Cernea v. Romania

27.02.2018

The case concerned the rejection of the candidature of Mr Cernea – the Executive President of the ecologist party *Partidul Verde* at the time – for 17 January 2010 by-elections on the grounds that he was not standing for a party represented in Parliament. The decision was made under a law which had been amended less than a year before the by-elections under an organic law.

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections)

Lupeni Greek Catholic Parish and Others v. Romania

29.11.2016

The case concerned a request for the restitution of a place of worship that had belonged to the Greek Catholic Church and was transferred during the totalitarian regime to the ownership of the Orthodox Church.

No violation of the Article 6 § 1 in respect of the right of access to a court

Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the breach of the principle of legal certainty

Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the length of the proceedings

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 6 § 1 in respect of the applicants' right of access to a court in comparison with the Orthodox parish

The Court further held that that it was not necessary to examine separately the complaint under Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 6 § 1 in so far as it concerned an alleged difference of treatment compared with other Greek Catholic parishes.

See also Moldovan (no. 2) and Others v. Romania, judgment of 12 July 2005.

Property issues (Article 1 of Protocol no. 1)

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol no. 1

Associations of Communally-owned Forestry Proprietors "Porceni Plesa" and "Piciorul Bătrân Banciu" (Obștea de Pădure Porceni Plesa si Composesoratul Piciorul Bătrân Banciu) v. Romania

28.11.2023

The case concerned two associations of forestry proprietors who complained that, in spite of a legally recognised right, they had not received compensation for the fact that they were unable to make use of their forests, since the forests in question had been designated as protected natural areas for the purposes of the European "Natura 2000" network.

Văleanu and Others v. Romania

08.11.2022

The case concerned restitution of property, which had been nationalised by the communist regime, under the new Law no. 165/2013.

There are currently over 300 similar applications pending before the Court. It will notify to the Government those applications that have not been declared inadmissible or struck out at the outset.

Catholic Archdiocese of Alba Iulia v. Romania

25.09.2012

The case concerned a Catholic religious community which wished to recuperate, under an emergency order enacted in 1998, ownership of assets confiscated by the Romanian authorities during the communist period.

Radovici and Stănescu v. Romania

02.11.2006

Prolonged inability of the applicants to enjoy the use of formerly confiscated property that had been legally returned to them, because of the impossibility of evicting a tenant occupying the flat.

Non-violation of Article 1 of Protocol no. 1

Yaşar v. Romania

26.11.2019

The case concerned the confiscation of Mr Yaşar's vessel because it had been used for illegal fishing in the Black Sea.

Application inadmissible

Alexandru-Mihai Pop and Others v. Romania

25.04.2019

The case concerned the requirement for the applicants to pay a pollution tax based on an emergency ordinance (OUG no. 50/2008), for the purposes of registering in Romania the second-hand vehicles they had bought in other European Union countries.

Applications declared inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies.

Right to education (Article 2 of Protocol No. 1)

Moraru v. Romania

08.11.2022

The case concerned an allegation of discrimination in the admission process to become a military doctor.

violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 2 of Protocol No. 1

Right to free elections (Article 3 of Protocol no. 1)

Violation of Article 3 of Protocol no. 1

Cegolea v. Romania

24.03.2020

In this case Ms Cegolea alleged that she had been subjected to discrimination with regard to her right to stand in the parliamentary elections of 9 December 2012 on behalf of a foundation representing the Italian minority in Romania.

Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) read in conjunction with Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections)

Danis and Association of Ethnic Turks v. Romania

21.04.2015

The case concerned the applicant association's inability to meet the requirements for standing in the 2008 parliamentary elections following the entry into force of a new electoral law only seven months before the elections. The new law required national minority organisations not represented in Parliament to have been granted charitable status in order to be able to stand for election.

Grosaru v. Romania

02.03.2010

Refusal to allocate a seat as Member of Parliament under an electoral law.

No-violation of Article 3 of Protocol no. 1

Cernea v. Romania

27.02.2018

The case concerned the rejection of the candidature of Mr Cernea – the Executive President of the ecologist party *Partidul Verde* at the time – for 17 January 2010 by-elections on the grounds that he was not standing for a party represented in Parliament. The decision was made under a law which had been amended less than a year before the by-elections under an organic law.

Application inadmissible

Călin Georgescu v. Romania

06.03.2025

The case concerned the annulment by the Constitutional Court of Romania of the presidential elections of 2024, for which Mr Georgescu was a candidate.

Application declared inadmissible

Press release available in Romanian

Procedural safeguards relating to expulsion of aliens (Article 1 of Protocol no. 7)

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol no. 7

Hassine v. Romania

09.03.2021

The case concerned administrative proceedings following which the applicant was expelled from Romania on national-security grounds.

Right not to be tried or punished twice (Article 4 of Protocol no. 7)

Application inadmissible

Prina v. Romania

01.10.2020

The case concerned two penalties imposed on the applicant for acts allegedly

committed in his capacity as head of the city's technical department: an administrative fine and a suspended prison sentence.
Application declared inadmissible

General prohibition on discrimination (Article 1 of Protocol No. 12)

No-violation of Article 1 of Protocol no. 12

Napotnik v. Romania
20.10.2020
The case concerned a diplomat's allegation that she had been recalled from her post in the Romanian Embassy in Ljubljana because she was pregnant.

Ádám and Others v. Romania
13.10.2020
The case concerned complaints by the applicants about discrimination against them as members of the Hungarian minority in the taking of final school exams — they had to take more exams than ethnic Romanians (two Hungarian tests) over the same number of days, and the Romanian exams had been difficult for them as non-native speakers.

Pilot judgment procedure[1]

Rezmives and Others v. Romania
25.04.2017 (pilot judgment)[2]
The case concerned the conditions of detention in Romanian prisons and in detention facilities attached to police stations.
The applicants complained, among other things, of overcrowding in their cells, inadequate sanitary facilities, lack of hygiene, poor-quality food, dilapidated equipment and the presence of rats and insects in the cells.
Under Article 3, the Court held in particular that the conditions of the applicants' detention, also taking into account the length of their incarceration, had subjected them to hardship going beyond the unavoidable level of suffering inherent in detention.
Under Article 46 (binding force and execution of judgments), the Court decided to apply the pilot-judgment procedure, finding that the applicants' situation was part of a general problem originating in a structural dysfunction specific to the Romanian prison system.
The Court held that the State should introduce: (1) measures to reduce overcrowding and improve the material conditions of detention; and (2) remedies (a preventive remedy and a specific compensatory remedy).
The Court decided to adjourn the examination of similar applications that had not yet been communicated to the Romanian Government and to continue its examination of applications that had already been communicated. Within six months from the date on which the judgment became final, the Romanian Government had to provide, in cooperation with the Committee of Ministers, a precise timetable for the implementation of the general measures.

Case examined by the Court following the pilot judgment procedure conducted in the case Rezmiveș and Others v. Romania

Polgar v. Romania
20.07.2021
The case concerned the conditions of detention in Romanian prisons and the effectiveness of the domestic remedies, particularly the civil-law remedy of an action in tort.
There are currently about 5,000 similar cases pending before the Court.
Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) having regard to Mr Polgar's material conditions of detention in Deva Prison (from 27 February 2014 to 29 April 2015 and from 14 May 2015 to 25 May 2015)
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken together with Article 3
Under Article 46 (binding force and execution of judgments) of the Convention, the Court welcomed the steps taken by the national authorities since its pilot judgment in order to reduce prison overcrowding.

[1] The pilot judgment procedure was developed as a technique of identifying the structural problems underlying repetitive cases against many countries and imposing an obligation on States to address those problems.
[2] The pilot judgment procedure was developed as a technique of identifying the structural problems underlying repetitive cases against many countries and imposing an obligation on States to address those problems.

Maria Atanasiu and Others v. Romania

12.10.2010

Cases concerning the restitution of properties nationalised under communism. The Court has already found over 150 violations in cases of this kind[3], and several hundred similar cases are pending before it.

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) - concerning Mrs Atanasiu and Mrs Poenaru

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) – concerning the three applicants

In this pilot judgment, the Court adjourned the cases concerning properties nationalised during the communist era in Romania pending general measures at national level. A new extension of time-limit for implementation of general measures to resolve shortcomings in the system of restitution or compensation in respect of properties nationalised by the Romanian State has been granted to the Romanian Government. On 7 May 2013, the Court decided that the adjournment of its examination of all applications stemming from the same general problem would remain in force until the adoption of one or several lead decisions on the action taken by the Government in response to the *Maria Atanasiu and Others* pilot judgment.

Case examined by the Court following the pilot judgment procedure conducted in the case Maria Atanasiu and Others v. Romania

Preda and Others v. Romania

29.04.2014

The case concerned administrative and/or judicial proceedings for compensation or restitution in respect of property confiscated or nationalised by the communist regime, in accordance with laws passed by Romania after the fall of the regime in December 1989.

The Court held unanimously that the complaint under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) should be rejected for failure to exhaust domestic remedies as regards seven of the applications.

As regards application no. 3736/03, the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

The Court also concluded that, bearing in mind the margin of appreciation enjoyed by the Romanian State, the law enacted by the Romanian Parliament provided in principle – except in situations where there were multiple documents of title for the same building – an accessible and effective framework of redress for alleged violations of the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions, and that it was up to the claimants concerned to make use of that framework.

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Voiculescu v. Romania and Camelia Rodica Voiculescu and Others v. Romania

17.03.2022

The cases concerned the trial of Dan Voiculescu – a prominent businessman and former politician – for money laundering and the seizing of assets held to have been the proceeds of crime from his daughters and companies he owned.

Applications declared inadmissible

Mariș v. Romania

22.10.2020

The case concerned the refusal of the Romanian authorities to amend, upon a mere declaration by Mr Mariş, the entry giving his religion in the register of Miercurea-Ciuc prison.

Application declared inadmissible (manifestly ill-founded)

Nastase v. Romania

18.11.2014

The case concerned the conviction of Adrian Nastase, former Prime Minister and former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania, by the High Court of Cassation and Justice, for using his influence as chairman of a political party in order to obtain financing for his 2004 election campaign.

Application declared inadmissible (manifestly ill-founded)

Merschdorf v. Romania

21.05.2013

The case concerned the refusal of the Romanian authorities to allow foreign

[3] For example Viaşu v. Romania (09.12.2008), Katz v. Romania (20.01. 2009) and Faimblat v. Romania (13.04.2009)

citizens to recover the property rights of assets their parents owned in Romania, which assets were confiscated under the communist regime.
Application declared inadmissible (manifestly ill-founded)

Dumitru and Others v. Romania

19.09.2012
The case concerned the decision to pay allowances awarded by judicial decisions to members of the civil service (judges) in instalments.
Application declared inadmissible (paying in instalments of allowances was not unreasonable)

Ioviţoni and others v. Romania

07.05.2012
Applicants charged a pollution tax subsequently held to be in breach of European Union law.
Application declared inadmissible (the applicants' rights under the Convention were not violated)

Tripon v. Romania

06.03.2012
Dismissal of a customs officer for extended absence from work on account of his pre-trial detention.
Application declared inadmissible (no breach of the applicant's human rights)

Mihăieş v. Romania and Senteş v. Romania

02.03.2012
The applicants complained of 25% salary cuts for a period of six months in application of a law introducing measures to balance the State's budget.
Applications declared inadmissible (no breach of the applicants' human rights)

Zelca and Others v. Romania

29.09.2011
Complaint by Romanian civil servants concerning unpaid salary.
Application declared inadmissible
Press release in Romanian

Farcaș v. Romania

30.09.2010
Physically handicapped applicant who complained that he could not access certain buildings and in particular, that civil cases he wished to bring before the courts could not be examined as he could not access court buildings.
Application declared inadmissible (neither the right of access to a court nor the right of individual petition had been hindered by insurmountable obstacles preventing the applicant from bringing proceedings)

First application by the Court of the new admissibility criterion introduced by Protocol No. 14

Adrian Mihai Ionescu v. Romania

28.06.2010
Since the entry into force of Protocol No. 14 to the Convention on 1 June 2010, a new admissibility criterion is applicable: an application is inadmissible where "the applicant has not suffered a significant disadvantage, unless respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and the Protocols thereto requires an examination of the application on the merits and provided that no case may be rejected on this ground which has not been duly considered by a domestic tribunal".
In Mr Ionescu's case the three conditions of the new inadmissibility test were satisfied: the applicant had not suffered any significant disadvantage (the alleged financial loss was limited), respect for human rights did not require an examination of the application on the merits (the relevant legal provisions had been repealed) and the case had been "duly considered" on the merits by the Bucharest District Court.

Noteworthy pending cases

Toth and Crișan v. Romania (no. 45430/19)

Case communicated to the Government on 13 February 2023

Press contact:
+33 (0) 3 90 21 42 08