



San Marino

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1989

National Judge: Gilberto Felici

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

Previous Judges: Federico Bigi (1991-1996), Luigi Ferrari Bravo (1998-2001), Antonella Mularoni (2001-2008), Kristina Pardalos (2009-2018)

[List of judges of the Court since 1959](#)

The Court dealt with 8 applications concerning San Marino in 2018, which were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered no judgment.

Applications processed in	2017	2018	2019*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	11	4	2
Communicated to the Government	6	4	0
Applications decided:	11	8	6
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	4	3	3
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	1	2	0
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	5	3	0
- Decided by judgment	1	0	3

* January to July 2019

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 01/07/2019	
Total pending applications*	7
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	6
Single Judge	0
Committee (3 Judges)	0
Chamber (7 Judges)	6
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

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

San Marino 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 **643** Registry staff members.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

[Buscarini and others v. San Marino](#)

18.02.1999

Obligation for Members of Parliament to take their oath of office on the Gospels, on pain of forfeiting their seats.

Violation of Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion)

Chamber

Inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

[Podeschi v. San Marino](#)

13.04.2017

The case concerned criminal proceedings brought against a politician for money laundering and his related pre-trial detention.

No violation of Article 3

No violation of Article 5 § 3 (entitlement to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial)

No violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court)

Right to liberty and security cases (Article 5)

[Toniolo v. San Marino and Italy](#)

19.11.2012

Mr Toniolo, an Italian national resident in San Marino, complained about his preventive detention in August 2009 and his subsequent extradition to Italy about a month later. Relying on Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security), Mr Toniolo alleged that both San Marino and Italy had been responsible for procedural irregularities in his extradition and, in particular, that his preventive detention in San Marino had been unlawful.

Violation of Article 5 § 1

Cases dealing with Article 6

[Pasquini v. San Marino](#)

02.05.2019

The case concerned a series of proceedings over a debt which the applicant's financial company was found to owe to an individual. No violation of Article 6 § 1 in relation to three admissible complaints, which concerned the lawfulness of a tribunal, a judge's alleged lack of impartiality, and access to a court owing to the amount of litigation fees

The Court rejected the applicant's complaint on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) as out of time.

Right to a fair trial

[Dondarini v. San Marino](#)

06.07.2004

No public hearing during the appeal proceedings.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

[Tierce and others v. San Marino](#)

25.07.2000

A judge dealt with the judicial investigation and trial at first instance, then again with the investigation for the appeal hearing. Impossibility for the applicants to be heard in person by the appeal court.

Violations of Article 6

Right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time

[Beneficio Cappella Paolini v. San Marino](#)

13.07.2004

Long proceedings, in the course of which the national courts failed to rule on the question submitted to them.

Violations of Article 6 § 1

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

Cases on article 7 (no punishment without law)

[Berardi and Mularoni v. San Marino](#)

10.01.2019

The case concerned criminal proceedings for bribery, the first of their kind in San Marino. It involved two Government officials who had allegedly received money

in return for not carrying out their professional duties with respect to safety on construction sites, and the legitimacy of their subsequent conviction and imprisonment.

[No violation of Article 7](#)

**Cases dealing with Article 8
(right to respect of private
and family life)**

[M.N. and Others v. San Marino](#)

07.07.2015

The case concerned the search and seizure of documents relating to banking and fiduciary relationships.

The applicants, four Italian nationals, notably complained about a decision by the San Marino judicial authorities ordering the seizure of banking documents related to them. The decision was made at the request of the Italian prosecution authorities in the context of an on-going criminal investigation – not involving the applicants – into money laundering in Italy.

[Violation of Article 8 in respect of one of the applicants, M.N.](#)

[Diamante and Pelliccioni v. San Marino](#)

27.09.2011

The case concerned the care and custody proceedings before the San Marinense courts concerning a small child whose mother is Italian and whose father is San Marinense.

[No violation of Article 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\)](#)

[No violation of Article 2 of Protocol N° 4 \(freedom of movement\)](#)

Noteworthy pending cases

Staiano c. San Marino (no. 75201/16)

Case [communicated](#) to the Government in June 2017

Ms Staiano complains, under Article 7 of the Convention, that she had been found guilty of an offence (“self-laundering”) not provided by the domestic law at the time of the facts. She argues that at the material time, the relevant provision on money laundering was not applicable in the case of “aiding and abetting”, thus the perpetrator of the predicate offence which had given origin to the assets which were eventually laundered could not be found guilty of such laundering.

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