

13 May 2021

Ms. Catalina Radulescu  
On behalf of Bankwatch Romania

Dear Ms. Radulescu,

**Re: Communication to the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee concerning compliance by Romania with article 6 and 9 of the Convention with respect to the extension of lignite quarries in Gorj County (ACCC/C/2016/140)**

With respect to the communicant's allegation that court proceedings in environmental matters in the Party concerned do not meet the requirement in article 9(4) to be timely, annex 3 to the communication contains a table listing the duration of a number of court proceedings.

At the time of the submission of the communication, the final judgments in some of the listed proceedings had not yet been issued. To this end, the Committee would be grateful if you would provide your reply to the **enclosed** question regarding the dates these judgments were subsequently issued.

Given the brevity of the question, the Committee looks forward to receive your reply by **Thursday, 20 May 2021**.

Please send your reply to [aarhus.compliance@un.org](mailto:aarhus.compliance@un.org), copying the Party concerned. The Party concerned will have one week from the receipt of your answer to provide the Committee with any comments it wishes to make on your reply.

Please do not hesitate to contact the secretariat if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely,



---

Fiona Marshall  
Secretary to the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee

Cc: Permanent Mission of Romania to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva  
Ms. Dorina Mocanu and Ms. Daniela Pineta, Ministry of Environment, Romania

Enc: Question from the Committee to the communicant

**Question from the Committee to the communicant:**

For each of the annulment cases listed below, please specify:

- (i) The date of which the court of first instance issued its judgment;
  - (ii) The date the court of appeal issued its judgment;
  - (iii) If any subsequent judgments concerning that annulment proceeding have since been issued, the date of each subsequent judgment;
  - (iv) If any subsequent proceedings are still ongoing.
- 
- (a) Case 3867/3/2014 seeking the annulment of the deforestation decision for Tismana II;
  - (b) Case 4059/3/2014 seeking the annulment of the deforestation decision for Rosiuta;
  - (c) Case 3875/3/2014 seeking the annulment of the deforestation decision for Jilt Nord (initially before the Bucharest Tribunal, but then referred to another court);
  - (d) Case 27187/3/2015 seeking the annulment of the deforestation decision for Jilt Sud;
  - (e) Case 34491/3/2013 seeking the annulment of the environmental permit for Pinoasa;
  - (f) Case 34489/3/2013 seeking the annulment of the environmental permit for Tismana II.
- 
-