



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

FOURTH SECTION

CASE OF PICU AND OTHERS v. ROMANIA

(Application no. 74269/16 and 22 other applications)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

30 October 2018

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

WWW.LUMEAJUSTITIEI.RO

In the case of Picu and Others v. Romania,

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

Paulo Pinto de Albuquerque, *President*,

Egidijus Kūris,

Iulia Antoanella Motoc, *judges*,

and Andrea Tamietti, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 9 October 2018,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in 23 applications against Romania lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by Romanian nationals. The applicants’ personal details, the dates of their applications and names of their representatives are set out in the appended tables.

2. The Romanian Government (“the Government”) were represented by their Agent, Ms C. Brumar, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

3. On 18 May 2017 and 12 October 2017 the applications were communicated to the Government.

THE FACTS**I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE**

4. The facts, as submitted by the parties, are similar to those in *Association “21 December 1989” and Others v. Romania* (nos. 33810/07 and 18817/08, §§ 12-41, 24 May 2011).

5. The applicants or their close relatives participated in demonstrations and were injured or killed by gunfire during the events of December 1989 in Bucharest, Slobozia, Târgoviște and Reșița, which led to the fall of the communist regime.

6. In 1990 the military prosecutor’s offices from several cities opened on their own motion criminal investigations into the use of violence against the demonstrators. The applicants’ injury and their close relatives’ deaths were investigated along with most of the cases in a main criminal investigation recorded in file no. 97/P/1990 (current no. 11/P/2014).

7. The most important procedural steps were mentioned in *Association “21 December 1989” and Others* (cited above, §§ 12-41) and

in *Sidea and Others v. Romania* ([Committee] no. 889/15, §§ 8-11, 5 June 2018). Subsequent relevant developments of the criminal investigation are as follows.

8. On 1 November 2016 the military prosecutor ordered the initiation *in rem* of a criminal investigation for the offence of crimes against humanity in respect of the same circumstances of fact. Up to February 2017 further steps were taken in gathering information from domestic authorities, the prosecutor's office contacting 211 civil parties, questioning members of the political party which took over the presidency at the time of events, planning the taking of evidence from military officers and other participants in the events, verifying the activity of the relevant military units and the audio/video recordings broadcast by radio and television.

9. From March 2017 the military prosecutor examined military and civilian archives, including the vast archives of the Romanian Senate. They also viewed and transcribed more than 400 hours of audio/video recordings. They proceeded with the re-examination of several witnesses. They questioned military personnel involved in the December 1989 military operations and fifty-one members of the political party which ruled at the time and of other authorities. They verified the documents indicating the military units' actions from that period.

10. At the date of the latest information communicated by the parties to the Court (29 March 2018), the criminal investigation was still ongoing.

II. RELEVANT DOMESTIC LAW

11. The legal provisions relevant for the criminal proceedings instituted in connection with the events of December 1989 are set out in *Association "21 December 1989" and Others* (cited above, §§ 95-100) and *Mocanu and Others v. Romania* [GC] (nos. 10865/09 and 2 others, §§ 193-96, ECHR 2014 (extracts)).

THE LAW

I. JOINDER OF THE CASES

12. The Court notes that the present cases concern the same factual circumstances and raise similar legal issues. Consequently, it considers it appropriate to order their joinder, in accordance with Rule 42 § 1 of the Rules of the Court.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 2 OF THE CONVENTION

13. The applicants complained that the domestic authorities had not carried out within a reasonable time an effective investigation into the events of December 1989 which occurred in Bucharest, Slobozia, Târgoviște and Reșița, during which they were injured from gunfire or their close relatives were killed. They relied on Article 2 of the Convention. In so far as relevant, this provision reads as follows:

“1. Everyone’s right to life shall be protected by law. No one shall be deprived of his life intentionally ...”

A. Admissibility

14. The Government raised the preliminary objection of lack of victim status in relation to some of the applications listed in Appendix A, because the respective applicants had never been parties in the main criminal investigation since they had not expressed their intention to be included in it.

15. The applicants argued that they had victim status with regard to the absence of an effective criminal investigation in the present case.

16. The Court reiterates that a decision or measure favourable to the applicant is not in principle sufficient to deprive him or her of his or her status as a “victim” unless the national authorities have acknowledged, either expressly or in substance, and then afforded redress for, the breach of the Convention (see *Scordino v. Italy (no. 1)* [GC], no. 36813/97, § 180, ECHR 2006-V). Furthermore, the Court reiterates that in cases where Article 2 of the Convention has been invoked in relation to the death or disappearance of close relatives in circumstances allegedly engaging the responsibility of the State, it has recognised the standing of the victim’s next-of-kin to submit an application even if the next-of-kin was not involved in the domestic procedure (see *Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania* [GC], no. 47848/08, §§ 98-100, ECHR 2014).

17. Turning to the present case, the Court notes that there is no evidence indicating an acknowledgement of the violation claimed by the applicants – ineffectiveness of the criminal investigation, due to its length and the authorities’ failure to involve them in the proceedings – or any redress afforded to them by the domestic authorities in this connection. Moreover, as the investigation had been opened by the authorities of their own motion (see paragraph 6 above), an application by the applicants to join the main investigation should have had no effect on the applicants’ standing (see *Alecu and Others v. Romania*, nos. 56838/08 and 80 others, § 31, 27 January 2015, and *Ecaterina Mirea and Others v. Romania*, nos. 43626/13 and 69 others, §§ 24-30, 12 April 2016).

18. Therefore, the Court dismisses the Government's preliminary objection.

19. The Court notes that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention. It further notes that it is not inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

B. Merits

20. The Government described the steps recently taken by the national authorities in order to complete the criminal investigation into the events of December 1989 and made reference to their previous arguments raised in *Association "21 December 1989" and Others v. Romania* (nos. 33810/07 and 18817/08, §§ 128-132, 24 May 2011) and *Alecu and Others* (cited above, § 34).

21. The Court reiterates that an investigation must be effective in the sense that it is capable of leading to a determination of the circumstances of fact and to the identification and punishment of those responsible. This is not an obligation of result, but of means (see *Kelly and Others v. the United Kingdom*, no. 30054/96, § 96, 4 May 2001, and *Anguelova v. Bulgaria*, no. 38361/97, § 139, ECHR 2002-IV). The State's obligation under Article 2 of the Convention will not be satisfied if the protection afforded by domestic law exists only in theory: above all, it must also operate effectively in practice and that requires a prompt examination of the case without unnecessary delays. Any deficiency in the investigation which undermines its ability to establish the cause of death or the person responsible will risk falling foul of this standard (see *Šilih v. Slovenia* [GC], no. 71463/01, § 195, 9 April 2009; *Varnava and Others v. Turkey* [GC], nos. 16064/90 and 8 others, § 191, ECHR 2009; and *Association "21 December 1989" and Others*, cited above, § 134).

22. In the present case, the Court notes that after December 1989 a criminal investigation was opened by the authorities on their own motion with regard to the armed suppression of the anti-communist demonstrations of December 1989 in Bucharest, Slobozia, Târgoviște and Reșița, with a view to establishing the circumstances of the death or injury of a large number of people.

23. Bearing in mind its *ratione temporis* jurisdiction (see *Association "21 December 1989" and Others*, cited above, §§ 117-18) and regardless of the fact that the investigation was carried out by military prosecutors (see *Elena Apostol and Others v. Romania*, nos. 24093/14 and 16 others, § 34, 23 February 2016), the Court notes that the investigation in the present case was opened more than twenty-eight years ago and it was still ongoing in March 2018 (see paragraph 10 above).

24. The Court has already examined the domestic authorities' conduct of the investigation opened into the violent suppression of the demonstrations during the events of December 1989 and concluded that Article 2 of the Convention had been violated under its procedural limb (see *Association "21 December 1989" and Others*, cited above, §§ 133-45; *Alecu and Others*, cited above, §§ 39-42; and *Ecaterina Mirea and Others*, cited above, §§ 37-44). The Court in particular found the main investigation to be procedurally defective, particularly by reason of its excessive length and long periods of inactivity, as well as because of the lack of involvement of the victims or their relatives, respectively, in the proceedings and of the lack of information to the public about the progress of the inquiry. Identifying similar shortcomings in the present case, the Court cannot therefore depart from its previous approach on the matter.

25. The foregoing considerations are sufficient to enable the Court to conclude that the applicants were deprived of an effective investigation into their cases.

There has accordingly been a violation of Article 2 of the Convention, under its procedural limb.

III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 § 1 AND ARTICLE 13 OF THE CONVENTION

26. The applicants complained under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention about the length of the criminal proceedings concerning the events of December 1989. Some of the applicants listed in Appendix A also complained, under Article 13 of the Convention, of the absence of an effective domestic remedy to enable their claims to be determined.

27. In the light of the finding relating to Article 2 (see paragraph 25 above), the Court considers that it is not necessary to examine the admissibility and merits of the complaints under Articles 6 § 1 and/or 13 of the Convention (see, among other authorities, *Association "21 December 1989" and Others*, cited above, § 181).

IV. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

28. Article 41 of the Convention provides:

"If the Court finds that there has been a violation of the Convention or the Protocols thereto, and if the internal law of the High Contracting Party concerned allows only partial reparation to be made, the Court shall, if necessary, afford just satisfaction to the injured party."

A. Damage

29. The applicants claimed the amounts set out in Appendix A in respect of pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage.

30. The Government submitted that the claims were unsubstantiated by evidence and excessive.

31. The Court considers on the one hand that the applicants have failed to demonstrate the existence of a causal link between the violation found and the pecuniary damage alleged; it therefore rejects those claims. On the other hand, the Court considers that the violation of Article 2 of the Convention, under its procedural limb, has caused the applicants substantial non-pecuniary damage, such as distress and frustration. Ruling on an equitable basis, it awards them the amounts set out in Appendix B, plus any tax that may be chargeable.

B. Costs and expenses

32. Some of the applicants also claimed costs and expenses, as well as the respective lawyer's fees incurred before the Court in the amounts indicated in Appendix A.

33. The Government contested the amounts as unsubstantiated.

34. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law, the Court rejects the claim for costs and expenses and the lawyer's fees, owing to lack of any relevant documentation.

C. Default interest

35. The Court considers it appropriate that the default interest rate should be based on the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank, to which should be added three percentage points.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Declares* the complaint concerning Article 2 of the Convention admissible;
3. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 2 of the Convention under its procedural limb;

4. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the admissibility and the merits of the complaints under Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the Convention;
5. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicants, within three months, the amounts set out in Appendix B, plus any tax that may be chargeable, in respect of non-pecuniary damage, to be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable at the date of settlement;
 - (b) that from the expiry of the above-mentioned three months until settlement simple interest shall be payable on the above amounts at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points;
6. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claim for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 30 October 2018, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Andrea Tamietti
Deputy Registrar

Paulo Pinto de Albuquerque
President

WWW.LUMEAJUSTITIEI.RO

APPENDIX A

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Communicated complaints	Government's preliminary objections	Amount claimed by the applicants under Article 41 of the Convention
1.	74269/16 28/11/2016	Adriana Laura PICU 25/07/1972 Târgoviște	Art. 2, 6 § 1	Lack of victim status	EUR 20,000 as non-pecuniary damage; EUR 150 as costs and expenses and EUR 3,500 as lawyer's fee, jointly for applicants from positions nos. 1-5 and 8.
2.	74276/16 28/11/2016	Maria DUMITRESCU 18/06/1952 Târgoviște	Art. 2, 6 § 1	None	EUR 20,000 as non-pecuniary damage; EUR 150 as costs and expenses and EUR 3,500 as lawyer's fee, jointly for applicants from positions nos. 1-5 and 8.
3.	74301/16 28/11/2016	Daniel-Ciprian DUMITRESCU 10/10/1978 Târgoviște	Art. 2, 6 § 1	Lack of victim status	EUR 20,000 as non-pecuniary damage; EUR 150 as costs and expenses and EUR 3,500 as lawyer's fee, jointly for applicants from positions nos. 1-5 and 8.
4.	76016/16 05/12/2016	Marioara ZĂRNESCU 19/01/1955 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1	None	EUR 20,000 as non-pecuniary damage; EUR 150 as costs and expenses and EUR 3,500 as lawyer's fee, jointly for applicants from positions nos. 1-5 and 8.
5.	76018/16 05/12/2016	Florin ZĂRNESCU 02/11/1972 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1	None	EUR 20,000 as non-pecuniary damage; EUR 150 as costs and expenses and EUR 3,500 as lawyer's fee, jointly for applicants from positions nos. 1-5 and 8.
6.	23375/17 20/03/2017	Constantin FILIP 29/01/1976 Măgurele, Ilfov County	Art. 2, 6 § 1	Lack of victim status	EUR 50,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
7.	23704/17 20/03/2017	Steluța TARȚA 03/09/1968 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1	None	EUR 50,000 as non-pecuniary damage.

8.	24299/17 21/03/2017	Nicolae ZĂRNESCU 05/08/1979 Torrejon de Ardoz, Spain	Art. 2, 6 § 1	Lack of victim status	EUR 20,000 as non-pecuniary damage; EUR 150 as costs and expenses and EUR 3,500 as lawyer's fee, jointly for applicants from positions nos. 1-5 and 8.
9.	32410/17 14/04/2017	Dragoș ZAMFIRESCU 25/09/1970 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	Lack of victim status	EUR 370,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
10.	33879/17 26/04/2017	Valentina STAN 15/08/1976 Slobozia	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	Lack of victim status	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
11.	33895/17 26/04/2017	Ștefan-Valentin RĂUȚI 05/05/1988 Reșița	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	Lack of victim status	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
12.	33899/17 26/04/2017	Gherlinde RĂUȚI 16/03/1967 Reșița	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	None	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
13.	33902/17 26/04/2017	Ioana MIRCEA 18/06/1944 Reșița	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	None	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
14.	33907/17 26/04/2017	Ana BRÂNZEI 13/08/1956 Reșița	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	None	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
15.	33909/17 26/04/2017	Vintilă IONESCU 30/03/1939 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	Lack of victim status	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
16.	33916/17 26/04/2017	Gheorghe-Mihail POSTOLACHE 17/07/1949 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	None	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.

17.	33961/17 26/04/2017	Nicolae CIUCIUNĂ 01/06/1952 Zorlențu Mare, Caraș- Severin County	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	None	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
18.	33962/17 26/04/2017	Gina PITICU 14/10/1979 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	Lack of victim status	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
19.	33965/17 26/04/2017	Safta STAN 18/02/1960 Slobozia	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	None	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
20.	33966/17 26/04/2017	Ramona-Loredana MITU 06/05/1979 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	Lack of victim status	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
21.	33968/17 26/04/2017	Ana BĂDOI 06/09/1963 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	None	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
22.	33970/17 26/04/2017	Olivia BĂDOI 07/07/1985 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	Lack of victim status	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.
23.	33971/17 26/04/2017	Antonia-Georgiana ONOFREI 20/03/2001 Bucharest	Art. 2, 6 § 1, 13	Lack of victim status	EUR 15,000 as pecuniary damage; EUR 15,000 as non-pecuniary damage.

APPENDIX B

No.	Application no. and date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of birth Place of residence	Applicant's representative	Particular circumstances of the application	Amount to be paid by the respondent State under Article 41 of the Convention
1.	74269/16 28/11/2016	Adriana Laura PICU 25/07/1972 Târgoviște	Vasile TUDOR Codlea	Daughter of a victim killed by gunfire on 24 December 1989 in Târgoviște.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
2.	74276/16 28/11/2016	Maria DUMITRESCU 18/06/1952 Târgoviște	Vasile TUDOR Codlea	Widow of a victim killed by gunfire on 24 December 1989 in Târgoviște.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
3.	74301/16 28/11/2016	Daniel-Ciprian DUMITRESCU 10/10/1978 Târgoviște	Vasile TUDOR Codlea	Son of a victim killed by gunfire on 24 December 1989 in Târgoviște.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
4.	76016/16 05/12/2016	Marioara ZĂRNESCU 19/01/1955 Bucharest	Vasile TUDOR Codlea	Widow of a victim injured by gunfire on 23 December 1989 and dead on 25 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly with application no. 76018/16
5.	76018/16 05/12/2016	Florin ZĂRNESCU 02/11/1972 Bucharest	Vasile TUDOR Codlea	Son of a victim injured by gunfire on 23 December 1989 and dead on 25 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly with application no. 76016/16
6.	23375/17 20/03/2017	Constantin FILIP 29/01/1976 Măgurele, Ilfov County	Costel TOROIMAN Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunfire on 25 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

7.	23704/17 20/03/2017	Steluța TARȚA 03/09/1968 Bucharest	Costel TOROIMAN Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunfire on 25 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
8.	24299/17 21/03/2017	Nicolae ZĂRNESCU 05/08/1979 Torrejon de Ardoz, Spain	Vasile TUDOR Codlea	Son of a victim injured by gunfire on 23 December 1989 and dead on 25 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
9.	32410/17 14/04/2017	Dragoș ZAMFIRESCU 25/09/1970 Bucharest	Ștefan Octavian POPESCU Bucharest	Brother of a victim killed by gunfire on 21 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
10.	33879/17 26/04/2017	Valentina STAN 15/08/1976 Slobozia	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Daughter of a victim killed by gunfire on 23/24 December 1989 in Slobozia.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
11.	33895/17 26/04/2017	Ștefan-Valentin RĂUȚI 05/05/1988 Reșița	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunfire on 24 December 1989 in Reșița.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly with application no. 33899/17
12.	33899/17 26/04/2017	Gherlinde RĂUȚI 16/03/1967 Reșița	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Widow of a victim killed by gunfire on 24 December 1989 in Reșița.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly with application no. 33895/17
13.	33902/17 26/04/2017	Ioana MIRCEA 18/06/1944 Reșița	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Widow of a victim killed by gunfire on 24 December 1989 in Reșița.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
14.	33907/17 26/04/2017	Ana BRÂNZEI 13/08/1956 Reșița	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Injured by gunfire on 24 December 1989 in Reșița.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
15.	33909/17 26/04/2017	Vintilă IONESCU 30/03/1939 Bucharest	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Father of a victim killed by gunfire and compression by a military vehicle on 21 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)

16.	33916/17 26/04/2017	Gheorghe-Mihail POSTOLACHE 17/07/1949 Bucharest	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Son of a victim killed by gunfire on 23 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
17.	33961/17 26/04/2017	Nicolae CIUCIUNĂ 01/06/1952 Zorlențu Mare, Caraș-Severin County	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Injured by gunfire on 24 December 1989 in Reșița.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
18.	33962/17 26/04/2017	Gina PITICU 14/10/1979 Bucharest	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Daughter of victim killed by gunfire on 23/24 December 1989 in Slobozia.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
19.	33965/17 26/04/2017	Safta STAN 18/02/1960 Slobozia	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Widow of victim killed by gunfire on 23/24 December 1989 in Slobozia.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
20.	33966/17 26/04/2017	Ramona-Loredana MITU 06/05/1979 Bucharest	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Daughter of victim killed by gunfire on 21 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)
21.	33968/17 26/04/2017	Ana BĂDOI 06/09/1963 Bucharest	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Widow of victim killed by compression by a military vehicle on 21 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly with application no. 33970/17
22.	33970/17 26/04/2017	Olivia BĂDOI 07/07/1985 Bucharest	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Daughter of victim killed by compression by a military vehicle on 21 December 1989 in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) jointly with application no. 33968/17
23.	33971/17 26/04/2017	Antonia-Georgiana ONOFREI 20/03/2001 Bucharest	Ionuț MATEI Bucharest	Daughter of victim injured by gunfire on 25 December 1989, who died on 17 September 2005, in Bucharest.	EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros)