

respect of the non-enforcement complaint. Dates of the judgments, their entry into force and their full enforcement are set out in the appendix.

In the wake of the pilot judgment, on various dates in late 2014 the applications were communicated to the Government (see *Gerasimov and Others*, cited above, §§ 230-31, and point 13 of the operative part).

On the dates specified in the appendix the Government submitted unilateral declarations with a view to resolving the issues raised by the applications.

In their declarations they acknowledged, in each case, the lengthy enforcement of the judgment in the applicant's favour. The unilateral declarations further contained, in each case, the dates of the judgment at issue, its entry into force and its full enforcement, as well as an overall enforcement delay.

The authorities stated their readiness to pay to the applicants the sums listed in the appendix as just satisfaction. The payments were to cover any pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage as well as costs and expenses, and would be free of any taxes that may be applicable. They would be payable within three months from the date of notification of the decision taken by the Court. In the event of failure to pay the sums within the said period, the Government undertook to pay simple interest on them, from expiry of that period until settlement, at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points. The payments would constitute the final resolution of the cases.

In their letters received on the dates indicated in the appendix, the applicants informed the Court that they agreed to the terms of the Government's declarations.

THE LAW

Having regard to the similarity of the main issues under the Convention in the above cases, the Court decides to join the applications and examine them in a single decision.

The Court attaches particular weight to the applicants' express agreement to the terms of the declarations made by the Government. It finds that such agreement shall be considered as a friendly settlement between the parties (see *Cēsnieks v. Latvia* (dec.), no. 9278/06, § 34, 6 March 2012, and *Bakal and Others v. Turkey* (dec.), no. 8243/08, 5 June 2012).

The Court therefore takes formal note of the friendly settlement reached between the parties. The Court further considers that the settlement is based on respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and its Protocols (Article 37 § 1 in fine of the Convention and Rule 62 § 3 of the Rules of Court).