



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

FIRST SECTION

CASE OF BARBIERI AND OTHERS v. ITALY

*(Applications nos. 76462/12 and 33 others –
see appended list)*

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

23 October 2025

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

In the case of Barbieri and Others v. Italy,

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

Frédéric Krenç, *President*,

Raffaele Sabato,

Alain Chablais, *judges*,

and Liv Tigerstedt, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to:

the applications against the Italian Republic lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by the applicants listed in the appended table (“the applicants”), on the various dates indicated therein;

the decision to give notice of the complaints concerning Article 6 § 1 and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention to the Italian Government (“the Government”), represented by their Agent, Mr L. D’Ascia, and to declare the remainder of the applications inadmissible;

the parties’ observations;

Having deliberated in private on 2 October 2025,

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

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

1. The applications concern the retrospective application of section 32 (5), (6) and (7) of Law no. 183 of 4 November 2010 (“Law no. 183/2010”) to proceedings pending at the domestic level.

2. The applicants had been employed under one or more fixed-term contracts by different employers. Between 1999 and 2009 they initiated domestic proceedings, asking for the conversion *ex tunc* of their fixed-term contracts into permanent ones, their reinstatement and, consequently, an entitlement to remuneration backdated to the time at which the employers had been notified, or had otherwise become aware, of the applicants’ intention and availability to continue fulfilling their obligations within the employment relationship (*mora credendi*).

3. Applying the legislation in force at that time, the domestic courts converted the applicants’ contracts into permanent ones and awarded damages corresponding to lost earnings during the period running from the *mora credendi* until their reinstatement. The amounts awarded were calculated on the basis of the applicants’ last monthly gross salary under their respective fixed-term contracts.

4. While the different sets of domestic proceedings were pending, section 32 (5), (6) and (7) of Law no. 183/2010 introduced a new method for calculating such compensation, providing for the award of a lump sum ranging, in principle, from two-and-a-half to twelve times the last monthly gross salary.

5. Consequently, the domestic courts accepted the applicants' request to have their fixed-term contracts converted into permanent ones but recalculated the amount of damages awarded, in accordance with Law no. 183/2010. Information concerning the relevant domestic decisions is set out in the appended table.

6. By judgment no. 303 of 11 November 2011, the Constitutional Court held that section 32 of Law no. 183/2010 was legitimate and constitutional as it introduced an easier, more precise and more uniform method for calculating compensation, with the aim of guaranteeing legal certainty in employment relationships.

7. Following the adoption of the final domestic decisions, the employers who had already paid the amounts awarded under the previous legislation requested that the applicants reimburse the difference between those sums and the amounts determined in accordance with Law no. 183/2010.

8. On 6 December 2023 the applicant in application no. 70934/17 concluded an agreement with his employer, accepting a sum as settlement of all outstanding claims. Both parties waived all rights related to any previous or subsequent proceedings.

9. The applicants complained that the interference caused by the retrospective application of Law no. 183/2010 to pending proceedings had affected their right to a fair hearing under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention. They also complained that the reduction in the amount of compensation awarded to them, as a result of the new method of calculation introduced by Law no. 183/2010, constituted an interference with the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions within the meaning of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention.

THE COURT'S ASSESSMENT

I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

10. Having regard to the similar subject matter of the applications, the Court finds it appropriate to examine them jointly in a single judgment.

II. APPLICATION No. 70934/17

11. With regard to application no. 70934/17, the Court notes that the applicant concluded a settlement agreement with his employer which satisfies to a large extent his claims formulated under the Convention, and that, in the text of the agreement, both parties explicitly waived all rights related to any previous or subsequent proceedings or outstanding claims not covered by the agreement in question (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Condominio Porta Rufina N. 48 di Benevento v. Italy* (dec.), no. 17528/05, § 19, 7 January 2014). The

Court notes that the applicant is therefore no longer under the obligation to repay the sum awarded to him under the previous legislation.

12. In light of the foregoing, the Court considers that the applicant has resolved the dispute at the domestic level through the settlement and can no longer claim to be victim of a violation of his rights under Article 6 § 1 and under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention.

13. It follows that this application is incompatible *ratione personae* with the provisions of the Convention and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention.

III. REMAINING APPLICATIONS

A. Alleged violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention

14. The Court notes that the applicants' complaint concerning the lack of a fair hearing is neither manifestly ill-founded nor inadmissible on any other grounds listed in Article 35 of the Convention. It must therefore be declared admissible.

15. The general principles concerning the enactment of retrospective legislation having the effect of influencing the judicial determination of a dispute have been summarised in *Vegotex International S.A. v. Belgium* ([GC], no. 49812/09, 3 November 2022), *D'Amico v. Italy* (no. 46586/14, 17 February 2022) and *Arras and Others v. Italy* (no. 17972/07, 14 February 2012).

16. The Government contested the existence of any violation. They maintained that the new legislation had not been enacted with the aim of influencing the outcome of pending civil proceedings in favour of any one party, that the enactment of such legislation had not determined the merits of the applicants' respective cases, and that there were compelling general-interest grounds justifying the retrospective application of the new legislation, namely the aim of legal certainty.

17. The Government explained that under the previous legislation, the relevant calculation had depended on a discretionary assessment made by the domestic courts pursuant to Articles 1223, 1224, 1226 and 1227 of the Civil Code, in the light of the specific circumstances of each case. This had created uncertainty over the amounts to be awarded as compensation, as the method for calculating those amounts had given rise to substantial differences in the treatment of individuals in similar or comparable situations. Referring to judgment no. 303/2011 of the Constitutional Court, the Government further noted that the previous legal framework had not clearly determined which date should have been taken as the *dies a quo* for the calculation of damages, or whether the *aliunde perceptum* and the *aliunde percipiendum* (income that had actually or could potentially have been earned from other employment in

the meantime) should have been taken into consideration in the determination of the amount of compensation.

18. The applicants' maintained their claims.

19. In the present case, the retrospective application of Law no. 183/2010 to the applicants' pending proceedings is undisputed. The Court notes that the new legislation had a significant impact on the outcome of the disputes as it modified the method for calculating compensation and resulted in a substantial reduction in the sums awarded to the applicants.

20. As a result of the application of that provision, the applicants were deprived of a substantial part of the compensation initially awarded to them (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Scordino v. Italy (no. 1)* [GC], no. 36813/97, § 129, ECHR 2006-V).

21. The Court observes that only compelling general-interest reasons are capable of justifying such interference by the legislature. Respect for the rule of law and the notion of a fair trial require that any reasons adduced to justify such measures be treated with the greatest possible degree of circumspection (see *Maggio and Others v. Italy*, nos. 46286/09 and 4 others, § 45, 31 May 2011).

22. The Court considers that, even accepting that legislative intervention was necessary to eliminate any inconsistency in the amounts of compensation at issue and the method for their calculation, the Government have not shown that there existed a necessity to apply the legislation retroactively (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Azienda Agricola Silverfunghi S.a.s. and Others v. Italy*, nos. 48357/07 and 3 others, § 82, 24 June 2014).

23. Thus, while the aim of the law, if applied *pro futuro*, may have been legitimate, the Court is not convinced that sufficiently compelling reasons for making it immediately and retrospectively applicable to pending proceedings have been shown to exist. In those circumstances, the Court finds that in the present case the State, without compelling reasons capable of outweighing the dangers inherent in the use of retrospective legislation, enacted and applied legislation which had the effect of influencing the judicial determination of the pending disputes.

24. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

B. Alleged violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention

25. The general principles relating to Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 in relation to legislative intervention affecting the peaceful enjoyment of possessions have been summarised in *Azienda Agricola Silverfunghi S.a.s. and Others* (cited above, §§ 98-104) and *Stefanetti and Others v. Italy* (nos. 21838/10 and 7 others, §§ 48-52, 15 April 2014).

26. The Court does not find it necessary to examine the Government's objections as to whether the applicants had a "possession" or a legitimate

expectation to have one, since the present complaint is in any event inadmissible for the following reasons.

27. The Court has in previous cases acknowledged that laws with retrospective effect which were found to constitute legislative interference still conformed to the lawfulness requirements of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (see *Azienda Agricola Silverfunghi S.a.s. and Others*, cited above, § 104, and the case-law cited therein). It sees no reason to find otherwise in the present case.

28. As for the aim pursued, the Court reiterates that domestic authorities are in principle better placed to decide what is in the public interest and that they enjoy a certain margin of appreciation. It has previously acknowledged that an aim that does not constitute a compelling public-interest reason capable of justifying an interference by the legislature with the administration of justice may nonetheless be considered a legitimate aim under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (*ibid.*, § 105; see also *Maggio and Others*, cited above, § 60).

29. In the present case, the Court notes that the impact of the new legislation on the applicants was limited to the substantial reduction in the sums awarded to them as compensation. However, the retrospective application of Law no. 183/2010 did not affect the applicants' right to obtain damages, or their right to have their fixed-term contracts converted into permanent ones or to be reinstated. Furthermore, unlike the previous legislation, Law no. 183/2010 provided that employers were always required to pay damages, irrespective of whether the employee found other employment in the meantime or suffered any actual financial loss.

30. The Court therefore accepts that Law no. 183/2010 pursued the aim of legal certainty by eliminating differences in the treatment of individuals in similar situations with regard to the amount of compensation awarded to them and the method used to calculate it.

31. With that in mind, the Court considers that, for the purposes of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, there is nothing to indicate that the State did not reach a fair balance between the demands of the general interest and the interests of the applicants.

32. It follows that the complaint under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 is manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 and 4 of the Convention.

APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

I. DAMAGE

33. The applicants claimed amounts corresponding to the difference between the sums which would have been granted under the previous legislation and the sums awarded in accordance with Law no. 183/2010 (see the appended table).

34. The Government contested the applicants' claims.

35. The Court notes that an award of just satisfaction can only be based on the fact that the applicants did not have the benefit of the guarantees of Article 6 in respect of the fairness of the proceedings. Whilst the Court cannot speculate as to the outcome of the proceedings had the situation been different, it does not find it unreasonable to regard the applicants as having suffered a loss of real opportunities (see *Maggio and Others*, § 80; *Arras and Others*, § 88; and *Azienda Agricola Silverfunghi S.a.s. and Others*, § 112, all cited above). Making its assessment on an equitable basis as required by Article 41, the Court awards the applicants the sums indicated in the appended table in respect of pecuniary damage.

36. To those amounts must be added an award in respect of non-pecuniary damage, which the finding of a violation in this judgment does not suffice to remedy. The Court therefore awards 1,000 euros (EUR) to each of the applicants (except the applicant in application no. 70934/17).

II. COSTS AND EXPENSES

37. The applicants claimed the reimbursement of costs and expenses in respect of legal fees for their representation before the Court. Some applicants also requested the reimbursement of legal fees and other expenses incurred in the domestic proceedings.

38. The Government asked the Court to award costs and expenses only in relation to claims that were substantiated and reasonable as to the quantum.

39. According to the Court's case-law, an applicant is entitled to the reimbursement of costs and expenses only in so far as it has been shown that these have been actually and necessarily incurred and are reasonable as to quantum. In the present case, regard being had to the documents in its possession and the above criteria, the Court finds it reasonable to award the amounts indicated in the appended table.

40. It dismisses the remainder of the claims for just satisfaction.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Declares* application no. 70934/17 inadmissible;
3. *Declares* the complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention admissible and the complaints under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention inadmissible in the remaining applications;
4. *Holds* that, in the remaining applications, there has been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention;

5. *Holds*

- (a) that the respondent State is to pay the remaining applicants, within three months:
 - (i) the amounts indicated in the appended table, plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicants, in respect of pecuniary damage and costs and expenses;
 - (ii) EUR 1,000 (one thousand euros) each in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus any tax that may be chargeable;
- (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' claims for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 23 October 2025, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Liv Tigerstedt
Deputy Registrar

Frédéric Krenc
President

BARBIERI AND OTHERS v. ITALY JUDGMENT

APPENDIX

List of cases:

No.	Application no. Case name Date lodged	Applicant's name Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Representative's name Location	Domestic decision adopted prior to the enactment of Law no. 183/2010	Final domestic decision applying Law no. 183/2010	Amount requested by the applicant for pecuniary damage (in EUR)	Amount awarded in respect of pecuniary damage (in EUR)	Amount awarded in respect of costs and expenses (in EUR)
1.	76462/12 Barbieri v. Italy 21/11/2012	Annalisa BARBIERI 1977 Grisolia Italian	Valeriano GRECO Diamante	Castrovillari District Court R.G. 1184/2005 Judgment no. 293/2008 19/04/2008	Catanzaro Court of Appeal R.G. 876/2013 Judgment no. 1611/2015 07/01/2016	39,748.51	5,950	-
2.	26318/13 Bianchi v. Italy 04/04/2013	Niky BIANCHI 1977 Ascoli Piceno Italian	Maria Rita PUGLIA Ascoli Piceno	Ascoli Piceno District Court R.G. 937/2007 Judgment no. 376/2008 28/03/2008	Ancona Court of Appeal R.G. 198/2009 Judgment no. 969/2012 16/10/2012	8,184.48	1,250	-
3.	26585/13 Bachetti v. Italy 11/04/2013	Ezio BACHETTI 1971 Folignano Italian	Maria Rita PUGLIA Ascoli Piceno	Ascoli Piceno District Court R.G. 234/2007 Judgment no. 814/2007 29/06/2007	Ancona Court of Appeal R.G. 604/2008 Judgment no. 963/2012 16/10/2012	12,085.81	1,800	-
4.	41123/14 Iosue v. Italy 20/05/2014	Annalisa IOSUE 1975 Fiumicino Italian	Sergio Natale GALLEANO Milan	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 2859/2003 Judgment no. 5212/2005 08/11/2005	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 6693/2011 Judgment no. 8571/2012 20/11/2012	49,992.88	7,500	-
5.	49333/14 Straniero v. Italy 25/06/2014	Marcello STRANIERO 1975 Bari Italian	Sergio Natale GALLEANO Milan	Bari District Court R.G. 363/2005 Judgment no. 13344/2009 28/05/2009	Bari Court of Appeal R.G. 4190/2010 Judgment no. 107/2013 19/02/2013	135,421.38	20,300	-
6.	60707/15	Monica	Sergio Natale	Palermo Court of Appeal	Palermo Court of Appeal	146,370.26	21,950	634.40

BARBIERI AND OTHERS v. ITALY JUDGMENT

	Battaglia and Others v. Italy 04/12/2015	BATTAGLIA 1973 Palermo Italian Elena BRESCIANI 1974 Ficarazzi Italian Marzia CITARDA 1971 Palermo Italian Ilenia DE FELICE 1974 Palermo Italian Cristian MONFORTE 1974 Palermo Italian Barbara RIBAUDO 1979 Palermo Italian Paolo VIVIRITO 1971 Palermo Italian	GALLEANO Milan	R.G. 1689/2009 Judgment no. 844/2010 23/06/2010	R.G. 741/2014 Judgment no. 2273/2014 04/12/2014	(Battaglia)	(Battaglia)	(Battaglia)
						123,734.65 (Bresciani)	18,550 (Bresciani)	634.40 (Bresciani)
						64,901.89 (Citarda)	9,750 (Citarda)	634.40 (Citarda)
						127,150.09 (De Felice)	19,050 (De Felice)	634.40 (De Felice)
						50,366.21 (Monforte)	7,550 (Monforte)	634.40 (Monforte)
						127,150.09 (Ribauda)	19,050 (Ribauda)	634.40 (Ribauda)
						64,901.89 (Vivirito)	9,750 (Vivirito)	534.40 (Vivirito)
7.	5916/16 Berardi v. Italy	Roberta BERARDI 1975	Sergio Natale GALLEANO	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 7002/2005	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 3281/2014	122,962.82	18,450	634.40

BARBIERI AND OTHERS v. ITALY JUDGMENT

	22/01/2016	Latina Italian	Milan	Judgment no. 1592/2007 18/06/2007	Judgment no. 200/2015 23/01/2015			
8.	8282/16 Campagna v. Italy 02/02/2016	Quirino CAMPAGNA 1966 Carpineto Romano Italian	Maurizio DE STEFANO Rome	Florence Court of Appeal R.G. 1836/2007 Judgment no. 1615/2009 04/12/2009	Perugia Court of Appeal R.G. 260/2013 Judgment no. 84/2015 03/08/2015	50,000	7,500	-
9.	11737/16 D'Aiello v. Italy 26/02/2016	Agata D'AIELLO 1969 Palermo Italian	Sergio Natale GALLEANO Milan	Palermo Court of Appeal R.G. 1540/2007 Judgment no. 2041/2009 11/02/2010	Palermo Court of Appeal R.G. 1307/2014 Judgment no. 261/2015 27/02/2015	87,732.58	13,150	634.40
10.	22143/16 Di Salvo and Santisi v. Italy 15/04/2016	Giuseppa DI SALVO 1962 Carini Italian Anna Maria SANTISI 1963 Palermo Italian	Sergio Natale GALLEANO Milan	Palermo Court of Appeal R.G. 1845/2008 Judgment no. 505/2010 13/04/2010	Palermo Court of Appeal R.G. 1573/2014 Judgment no. 368/2015 17/04/2015	110,972.98 (Di Salvo)	16,650 (Di Salvo)	634.40 (Di Salvo)
						113,863.01 (Santisi)	17,100 (Santisi)	634.40 (Santisi)
11.	66195/16 Gabbianelli and Others v. Italy 11/11/2016	Serena GABBIANELLI 1975 Velletri Italian Lavinia IANNILLI 1977 Rome Italian Raffaella PICCHI 1978 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome District Court R.G. 231719/2001, 235190/2001, 236129/2001, 201720/2001, 236128/2001, 231722/2001, 235185/2001, 231721/2001, 235191/2001 Judgment no. 21846/2004 07/12/2004 (S. Gabbianelli and R. Picchi) Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 7177/2005 Judgment no. 2574/2008	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 4843/2012 Judgment no. 7787/2013 01/10/2013	52,763.58 (Gabbianelli)	7,900 (Gabbianelli)	1,268.80 (Gabbianelli)
						132,875.70 (Iannilli)	19,950 (Iannilli)	1,268.80 (Iannilli)
						48,332.69 (Picchi)	7,250 (Picchi)	- (Picchi)

BARBIERI AND OTHERS v. ITALY JUDGMENT

				23/12/2009 (L. Iannilli)				
12.	70328/16 Lapacciana v. Italy 23/11/2016	Eliana LAPACCIANA 1974 Viterbo Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 6125/2008 Judgment no. 5775/2010 25/06/2010	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 5818/2014 Judgment no. 3206/2016 07/06/2016	55,799.22	8,350	900
13.	70398/16 Martinelli v. Italy 22/11/2016	Gianluca MARTINELLI 1971 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 6125/2008 Judgment no. 5775/2010 25/06/2010	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 5818/2014 Judgment no. 3206/2016 07/06/2016	31,894.66	4,800	1,268.80
14.	70407/16 Fondi v. Italy 23/11/2016	Teresa FONDI 1969 Soriano nel Cimino Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 6125/08 Judgment no. 5775/2010 25/06/2010	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 5818/2014 Judgment no. 3206/2016 07/06/2016	33,954.46	5,100	1,268.80
15.	74130/16 Cirasella v. Italy 02/12/2016	Annamaria CIRASELLA 1969 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 6125/2008 Judgment no. 5775/2010 25/06/2010	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 5818/2014 Judgment no. 3206/2016 07/06/2016	32,165.68	4,800	500
16.	12673/17 Annessi and Others v. Italy 08/02/2017	Flavio ANNESSI 1972 Rome Italian Francesca BRANDIZZI 1972 Rome Italian Barbara DILETTI 1970 Rome Italian	Sergio Natale GALLEANO Milan	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 6040/2008 Judgment no. 8234/2009 26/02/2010	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 2928/2014 Judgment no. 4890/2015 27/08/2015	135,910.80 (Annessi) 113,363.46 (Brandizzi) 136,713.81 (Diletti)	20,400 (Annessi) 17,000 (Brandizzi) 20,500 (Diletti)	- (Annessi) 634.40 (Brandizzi) - (Diletti)

BARBIERI AND OTHERS v. ITALY JUDGMENT

17.	30066/17 Montecchi v. Italy 13/04/2017	Manuela MONTECCHI 1953 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome District Court R.G. 223061/2004 Judgment no. 22067/2005 07/12/2005	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 3129/2015 Judgment no. 4907/2016 24/10/2016	24,078.59	3,600	-
18.	30067/17 Del Buono v. Italy 13/04/2017	Elisabetta DEL BUONO 1969 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome District Court R.G. 21870/2003 Judgment no. 15825/2004 22/09/2004	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 3293/2015 Judgment no. 4885/2016 21/10/2016	17,647.33	2,650	2,537.60
19.	30069/17 Serangeli v. Italy 13/04/2017	Gabriele SERANGELI 1974 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 7299/2005 Judgment no. 2880/2007 21/09/2007	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 3643/2014 Judgment no. 8524/2015 18/12/2015	67,523.01	10,150	1,350
20.	39636/17 Lugustiano v. Italy 29/05/2017	Eleonora LUGUSTIANO 1966 Civitavecchia Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome District Court R.G. 203162/2004 Judgment no. 3029/2005 03/02/2005	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 4111/2015 Judgment no. 5671/2016 05/12/2015	24,261.40	3,650	-
21.	39722/17 Crispiani v. Italy 29/05/2017	Virginia CRISPIANI 1973 Civitanova Marche Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 9538/2007 Judgment no. 161/2010 15/03/2011	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 4793/2014 Judgment no. 8632/2015 10/12/2015	98,082.26	14,700	1,348.80
22.	39727/17 Vitagliano v. Italy 29/05/2017	Alessandro VITAGLIANO 1975 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 814/2007 Judgment no. 1106/2010 06/04/2010	Rome Court of Appeal R.G.1510/2015 Judgment no. 5816/2016 14/12/2016	25,842.68	3,900	1,268.80
23.	55846/17 Grasso v. Italy 28/07/2017	Daniela GRASSO 1959 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 2166/2005 Judgment no. 983/2008 25/07/2008	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 4109/2015 Judgment no. 4991/2016 15/02/2016	81,694.87	12,250	1,350

BARBIERI AND OTHERS v. ITALY JUDGMENT

24.	70934/17 Batetta v. Italy 20/09/2017	Pietro BATETTA 1966 Pula Italian	Sergio Natale GALLEANO Milan	Cagliari Court of Appeal R.G. 101/2010 Judgment no. 158/2011 02/03/2011	Cagliari Court of Appeal R.G. 357/2017 Judgment no. 108/2019 06/06/2019	-	-	-
25.	24084/18 Sclocchini v. Italy 21/05/2018	Antonina SCLOCCHINI 1977 Sant'Egidio alla Vibrata Italian	Paolo TRAVAGLINI Ascoli Piceno	Ascoli Piceno District Court R.G. 554/2008 Judgment no. 603/2010 25/06/2010	Ancona Court of Appeal R.G. 289/2011 Judgment no. 19/2012 17/03/2012	42,758.52	6,400	3,000
26.	29312/18 Quaranta v. Italy 18/06/2018	Monica QUARANTA 1975 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 11245/2003 Judgment no. 1628/2005 21/04/2005	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 1859/2015 Judgment no. 5813/2017 28/12/2017	42,746.82	6,400	700
27.	30394/18 Bernardini v. Italy 25/06/2018	Baldo BERNARDINI 1979 Rome Italian	Roberto RIZZO Rome	Rome District Court R.G. 218035/2004 Judgment no. 15508/2006 22/08/2006	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 3710/2016 Judgment no. 30/2018 15/01/2018	41,821.57	6,250	1,380
28.	32990/18 Petroni v. Italy 03/07/2018	Carlo PETRONI 1953 Rome Italian	Bruno COSSU Rome	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 7009/2004 Judgment no. 3864/2008 05/06/2009	Rome Court of Appeal R.G. 958/2015 Judgment no. 5933/2016 03/01/2017	170,368.69	25,550	-
29.	43109/18 Sclocchini v. Italy 06/09/2018	Alessandro SCLOCCHINI 1976 Castel di Lama (AP) Italian	Paolo TRAVAGLINI Ascoli Piceno	Ascoli Piceno District Court R.G. 982/2006 Judgment no. 1102/2007 02/11/2007	Ancona Court of Appeal R.G. 863/2008 Judgment no. 946/2012 16/10/2012	11,659.39	1,750	2,674.19
30.	16052/19 Todisco v. Italy 20/03/2019	Gennaro TODISCO 1968 Monopoli Italian	Vincenzo Enrico DE MICHELE Foggia	Bari District Court R.G. 15449/2004 Judgment no. 13387/2010 02/11/2010	Bari Court of Appeal R.G. 4161/2011 Judgment no. 1989/2014 19/09/2014	163,000	24,450	3,000
31.	22011/19 D'Angelo v. Italy	Maria D'ANGELO 1960	Carmine FRANCIA	Proceedings instituted but no decision taken prior to the	Naples Court of Appeal R.G. 6754/2013	505,297.64	4,900	3,000

BARBIERI AND OTHERS v. ITALY JUDGMENT

	15/04/2019	Capaccio Paestum Italian	Capaccio Paestum	enactment	Judgment no. 309/2017 18/01/2017			
32.	39865/19 Chiavetta v. Italy 23/07/2019	Elena CHIAVETTA 1966 Colonnella Italian	Sergio Natale GALLEANO Milan	L'Aquila Court of Appeal R.G. 425/2009 Judgment no. 867/2010 23/06/2010	L'Aquila Court of Appeal R.G. 219/2018 Judgment no. 37/2019 24/01/2019	132,308.26	19,850	2,926.10
33.	47850/19 Mari v. Italy 31/08/2019	Stefania MARI 1963 Scorzè Italian	Simonetta ROTTIN Udine	Proceedings instituted but no decision taken prior to enactment	Venice Court of Appeal R.G. 1583/2012 Judgment no. 132/2016 12/07/2016	166,289.73	9,300	3,000
34.	15996/20 Calabrese v. Italy 30/03/2020	Donato CALABRESE 1979 Foggia Italian	Vincenzo Enrico DE MICHELE Foggia	Bari Court of Appeal 12/08/2010	Bari Court of Appeal R.G. 196/2019 Judgment no. 1976/2019 08/10/2019	48,896.67	7,350	3,000