Hope rises after decades of real estate limbo for Turkish Cypriots as the Greek Cypriot government cedes a case in the European Court of Human Rights involving a plaintiff from the northern side of the divided island. Greek Cyprus has agreed to change its law and pay the plaintiff 500,000 euros. People are hoping to use this result as a base for future cases.

Greek Cyprus has admitted its laws governing Turkish Cypriot property rights are against the European Convention on Human Rights and has agreed to pay 84-year-old Nezire Sofi compensation worth 500,000 euros.

The European Court of Human Rights was expected to give its verdict Thursday. Experts said Sofi’s case could be used as a base for other cases waiting for verdicts from the European court.

Officials contacted by the Hürriyet Daily News & Economic Review said the Greek side wanted to prevent setting a precedent in the court for the remaining Turkish Cypriot cases. The court, however, was unlikely to agree to such a demand.

Ten other suits filed with the European court are waiting. “This is a historic week for us,” said Aslı Aksu, a lawyer defending a similar case called the Chakarto case.

The European court has received numerous applications because of violations related to properties on both sides of the divided island. Because of a 1975 Population Exchange Agreement, some 65,000 Turks had to move to the north while some 160,000 Greeks had to move to the south.

The Turkish administration distributed abandoned Greek properties to Turkish immigrants who agreed to file a disclaimer for their real estate in the south. Meanwhile, the Greek administration established a Turkish-Cypriot property management department and forbade all Turks to dispose of their estate until the island is reunited, regardless of whether they renounced their rights.

“The Turkish side asked the Greek side to admit that the custodianship law violates the European Convention on Human Rights. It will be our first victory and a precedent case. It means the complainant will get back control of her properties and receive compensation money,” Aksu told the Daily News.

“A Turkish Cypriot cannot exercise his or her rights until a reliable solution is found. What does it mean? It is too unclear and subjective. It is claimed that income is kept in the bank, but the owner has no right to go to the bank and ask about this money,” Aksu
“Court is not scene to find permanent settlement”

Turkish Cypriot Foreign Minister Hüseyin Özgürgün in a phone interview with the Daily News said: “The Sofi case should not be regarded as a precedent for all Turkish Cypriots because the Greek administration agreed to pay compensation to those who left the island. But it opened the door to the European Court of Human Rights and they will be cornered with follow-up suits,” he said.

Özgürgün, asserting that such cases would make the Cyprus problem much more complicated, said: “As a politician, I don’t believe that the Cyprus quest can be solved in such a manner. Greeks first applied to the court and now we came to this level. Politicians should find a permanent settlement on the table. That’s only way. I call on the Greek government to negotiate and exert sincere efforts for peace.”

Aksu criticized the northern Cyprus administration, which had forced the immigrants to sign a release in order to obtain new properties. “Now only those who rejected the agreement are eligible to sue the Greek administration,” said Aksu, whose has clients living on the island.

Around 1,000 complainants engaged Aksu but 600 of them did not sign the release. “I chose the Chakarto case as a pilot case. Our assessment is a minimum compensation of 7 million euros,” Aksu said.

“I’ve prepared my files. I will sue them in parts in order to reach maximum gain and prevent any total loss. I’m hopeful we’ll win,” Aksau said.

Turkish side pays 480,000 pounds to Greeks

Following the 1998 precedent case of Titina Loizidou, who was the first complainant to receive compensation from Turkey, the European court forced the Turkish administration to set up the Immovable Property Commission to deal with Greek complainants. Only those who cannot find a solution via the commission are able to apply to the European Court of Human Rights. The Greek administration dislikes its citizen applying to an institution in the north, which it regards as illegal. However, 437 Greeks have applied to the commission so far. Eighty-seven have received compensation totaling about 480,000 pounds in total.


****
Orams Decision Could Open Pandora’s Box

Makarios Droushiotis, Cyprus Mail

14 February 2010

The Court of Appeal decision requiring the Orams to demolish their house in occupied northern Cyprus could open Pandora’s Box enabling Turkish Cypriots to demand compensation for the loss of use of their properties and restitution.

Refugee Meletis Apostolides took a risk when he decided to sue David and Linda Orams because they had built villa on his land in Turkish-occupied Lapithos.

His subsequent decision to apply to a British court for the execution of the Cyprus court order and the positive outcome, after the ruling of the European Court of Justice, was greeted as a triumph of justice and the principles of the European Union.

The court decision recognised the right to ownership and put the brakes on the continuing development of Greek Cypriot properties in the north. The legal value of the decision is significant, but if it is not utilised rationally, it could turn into the nightmare of the Cyprus problem.

Recently, the Cyprus Republic settled a case that had been brought before the European Court of Human Rights by Turkish Cypriot Sofi Nezire. It agreed to pay her €500,000 as damages for loss if use of one-and-a-half houses (she is co-owner in the second) in Larnaca in which Greek Cypriot refugees are living. This settlement has opened Pandora’s Box with regard to Turkish Cypriot properties in the areas controlled by the Republic.

After 1974, the Republic put all Turkish Cypriot properties under the guardianship of the Interior Minister, who prohibits their sale, exchange and transfer because of the state of emergency. So far so good. However, without following proper expropriation procedures, the Republic took large expanses of Turkish Cypriot-owned land for development projects and for refugee estates.

The whole of the old Larnaca Airport and a part of the new one were built on Turkish Cypriot land. The owner of the land is a citizen of the Republic lives in Larnaca and has a Cyprus passport and ID card. The government has been paying him a handsome monthly allowance as part of its efforts to persuade him not to claim his property in the courts.

What would happen if he applies to a Cyprus court demanding the demolition of the old Larnaca Airport? How can the court reject such an application, given its decision in the Orams case?
Like Apostolides, the man is a Cypriot citizen. And what would happen if Turkish Cypriots come to our courts en masse, demanding compensation for loss of use of their properties and restitution? Will our government demolish the refugee estates? Will it expropriate all the Turkish Cypriot land now? The amounts involved would be prohibitive and the political consequences devastating.

Until now, the Republic had the Law of the Guardian which froze all transactions of Turkish Cypriot-owned properties and prohibited restitution. But part of the settlement reached with Sofi Nezire, includes the written undertaking by the Cyprus Republic for the amendment of the Guardian Law so as to allow all Turkish Cypriots living outside Cyprus or in the unoccupied areas, to take back their properties.

At least 100,000 Turkish Cypriots are registered citizens of the Republic. A large number of them live in the UK but should we be surprised if more and more of them decided to move back to the island to take back ownership of their properties which could be worth millions of euro at today’s prices? The financial incentive cannot be underestimated.

This is not just idle speculation or alarmism. After the government’s undertaking at the ECHR it is a very real possibility. This would not be the only unpleasant development. Soon, the ECHR is expected to refer the thousands of recourses filed by Greek Cypriots against Turkey to the compensation commission in the north. In other words, while the Greek Cypriots would have to apply to the commission of a nonrecognised entity and receive peanuts as compensation for their properties, Turkish Cypriots would apply to the Republic’s courts and be given back their properties.

The only thing that could spare us from this scenario would be a political solution, even though prospects for this are not very rosy. Resorting to the law as tool for securing a better solution might be useful, but the idea that the legalistic approach could supplant political negotiations is now totally discredited.

http://www.news.cyprus-property-buyers.com/2010/02/14/orams-decision-could-open-pandoras-box/id=003919
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The vexing issue of property rights in an occupied territory, especially where the occupation has lasted many decades, is the subject of a very recent admissibility decision by the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights.

Demopoulos et al., issued on 1 March 2010, concerns property claims by Greek Cypriots whose land was taken as a result of the Turkish invasion in 1974. Turkey objected to their applications on the grounds that they had not filed their claims with the Immovable Property Commission set up under the laws of the “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus,” which is a pseudo-State without international recognition. The applicants replied that they could not be expected to make claims to the institution of an illegal occupying power. The Grand Chamber declared the case inadmissible, in effect rejecting the claims of the Greek Cypriots and telling them to exhaust their domestic remedies by using the mechanisms set up in northern Cyprus to adjudicate property claims and award compensation.

The Grand Chamber said it was “not persuaded that the acknowledgement of the existence of a domestic remedy runs counter to the interests of those claiming to be victims of violations.” It said it “acknowledges the strength of feeling expressed by some of the applicants. However, the argument that it would be galling to have recourse to authorities in northern Cyprus cannot be given decisive weight against the background of conflict and hostility, similar argument might be raised in respect of any official body or authority on the Turkish mainland, or indeed by any victim of a violation who is faced with the prospect of asking for redress from a State which has been responsible for the injury suffered” (para. 98).

The ruling bears on many historic claims concerning human rights abuses. It is also relevant to the law governing occupied territories. As in the past, the Court made no reference to the relevant instruments governing the law of armed conflict, and in particular the fourth Geneva Convention. According to the Grand Chamber:

“Thus, the Court finds itself faced with cases burdened with a political, historical and factual complexity flowing from a problem that should have been resolved by all parties assuming full responsibility for finding a solution on a political level. This reality, as well as the passage of time and the continuing evolution of the broader political dispute must inform the Court’s interpretation and application of the Convention which cannot, if it is to be coherent and meaningful, be either static or blind to concrete factual circumstances” (para. 85).
One important issue is whether those who lands were taken by the occupation are entitled to recover them or only to receive financial compensation. According to the Grand Chamber:

“At the present point, many decades after the loss of possession by the then owners, property has in many cases changed hands, by gift, succession or otherwise; those claiming title may have never seen, or ever used the property in question. The issue arises to what extent the notion of legal title, and the expectation of enjoying the full benefits of that title, is realistic in practice. The losses thus claimed become increasingly speculative and hypothetical. There has, it may be recalled, always been a strong legal and factual link between ownership and possession...This is not to say that the applicants in these cases have lost their ownership in any formal sense; the Court would eschew any notion that military occupation should be regarded as a form of adverse possession by which title can be legally transferred to the invading power. Yet it would be unrealistic to expect that as a result of these cases the Court should, or could, directly order the Turkish Government to ensure that these applicants obtain access to, and full possession of, their properties, irrespective of who is now living there or whether the property is allegedly in a militarily sensitive zone or used for vital public purposes” (paras. 111–12).

Furthermore:

116. The Court must also remark that some thirty-five years after the applicants, or their predecessors in title, left their property, it would risk being arbitrary and injudicious for it to attempt to impose an obligation on the respondent State to effect restitution in all cases, or even in all cases save those in which there is material impossibility, a suggested condition put forward by the applicants and intervening Government [that] discounts all legal and practical difficulties barring the permanent loss or destruction of the property. It cannot agree that the respondent State should be prohibited from taking into account other considerations, in particular the position of third parties. It cannot be within this Court’s task in interpreting and applying the provisions of the Convention to impose an unconditional obligation on a Government to embark on the forcible eviction and rehousing of potentially large numbers of men, women and children even with the aim of vindicating the rights of victims of violations of the Convention.

117. It is evident from the Court’s case-law that while restitution laws implemented to mitigate the consequences of mass infringements of property rights caused, for example, by communist regimes, may have been found to pursue a legitimate aim, the Court has stated that it is still necessary to ensure that the redress applied to those old injuries does not create disproportionate new wrongs.

Greek Cypriots Urged to Set up Parallel Property Commission

Cyprus News Organisation

17 March 2010

Speakers at a seminar in the House of Lords today urged Greek Cypriots to set up a parallel property commission in South Cyprus to help solve one of the most complex aspects of the Cyprus conflict. The call follows the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) landmark Demopoulos ruling on 5 March, which recognised the Immovable Property Commission (IPC) in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) was a valid local remedy for Greek Cypriot refugees.

Human rights lawyer Emine Erk told members of the British Upper Chamber that the Demopoulos vs. Turkey ruling had made legal history. For the first time, Europe’s highest court had recognised that the rights of original owners of property in the TRNC have to be balanced with the human rights of the current owners. She explained the ECHR, caught up in the new battleground for the Cyprus conflict where “Law-fare had overtaken warfare”, accepted that institutions of the politically unrecognised TRNC exist separately from the Republic of (South) Cyprus, and that the “IPC offers a fair, just and effective legal remedy that can bring closure for Greek Cypriot refugees and a chance to move on.”

Answering questions from Baroness Sarah Ludford, Ms. Erk said the ECHR and European Court of Justice (ECJ) did contradict themselves over the Cyprus property problem, and the ECJ would need to reconcile itself to the Demopoulos ruling. She believed the ECHR provided a strong defence to future Orams type challenges and added that the Orams couple themselves had applied to the ECHR following the decision of the South Nicosia court for its lack of “proportionality” following the order for demolition and huge compensation, and its failure to respect their rights as innocent third parties.

Striking facts from academic Dr. Erol Kaymak’s recent attitudes survey for Cyprus 2015, concluded in November 2009, included that of 1,000 Greek Cypriots polled, 50% would not return to their original homes even if there was a comprehensive solution, with many citing they did not want to restart their lives. Most Turkish Cypriots polled were open to a mixture of restitution, exchange and compensation as acceptable remedies to the property problem, with compensation the most preferred remedy. 90% of Greek Cypriots however preferred restitution, even where Turkish Cypriots and other third parties lived or used that land for their livelihood. Yet 61% of those desiring restitution would not move back to North Cyprus if it remained under Turkish administration. Dr Kaymak says the findings indicated a serious contradiction between the South’s commitment to bizonality and their understanding of how they would resolve the property problem. The Cyprus 2015 research also showed people on both sides were
increasingly skeptical that a comprehensive settlement was likely and most people are more inclined to vote No in a future referendum on a federal solution.

Stephen Day, the former British MP and current vice chair of the British Resident’s Society in the TRNC, spoke out against accusations that British owners of property in North Cyprus are “carpetbaggers.” He said similar problems existed in the south of the island, where thousands of Britons had also bought properties in good faith, but were left without deeds as many had been built on Turkish title. He claimed the Greek Cypriot authorities were better at “hiding the problem” and called on them to set up a parallel commission to help bring closure to the property issue.

Political strategist and former undersecretary to President Denktaş Ergün Olgun argued that a fair and equitable solution to the property issue is central to finding a comprehensive settlement. He explained this needs to be “a win-win solution; it must work for people on both sides of the Green Line, of whatever nationality they are. A fair balance needs to be struck between the rights of original owners of land in the North and the current owners of land in the North, who have acted in good faith.”

Mr. Ergun also added that many Turkish Cypriots were experiencing huge problems reclaiming their land rights in the South. He echoed Stephen Day’s call in urging the authorities in South Cyprus to put in place a system similar to that endorsed by the ECHR in the North, thus giving a quick, inexpensive and fair remedy to people on both sides of the divide. “If this could be achieved, it would herald an era of new-thinking that really could bring about the lasting settlement that fair minded people across the island dream of.”

The event was organised by human rights group Embargoed!, and was hosted by Lord Wallace of Saltaire, the deputy leader of the Liberal Democrat Peers and Foreign Affairs Spokesperson, and chaired by BBC Global News presenter Alex Ritson. It formed one leg of a series of seminars titled “Solving the Cyprus Property Conundrum,” with a public event at the London School of Economics later the same day, and a legal roundtable meeting planned for the following day.


****

Demopoulos and Others v. Turkey

Robert Ellis, Hüriyet Daily News

18 March 2010
The nonadmissibility decision a fortnight ago by the European Court of Human Rights was welcomed as “historic” by the Turkish press and Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu, but it might be premature to pop the champagne corks. In fact, it is probably former Turkish Ambassador Tulay Uluçevik who struck the right note when he described the Court’s ruling as “a Pyrrhic victory.”

Apart from the issue of security, that of property can be considered a major stumbling block for a solution to the Cyprus question, and the Annan Plan did little to assuage Greek Cypriot concerns. The right to restitution and return was effectively limited by a number of restrictions so that the majority of displaced Greek Cypriots were faced with compensation in the form of what Tassos Papadopoulos called “dubious paper.”

The Property Board that the Annan Plan envisaged, which would have settled claims from both sides, would for the most part have been funded by the Greek Cypriots, so it would have been the merchant from Kayseri who fed his donkey with its own tail all over again.

However, the Immovable Property Commission, or IPC, which “the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus” (TRNC) established in December 2005 to deal with Greek Cypriot property claims, will in effect be funded by Turkey, as the TRNC has the status of “a subordinate local administration” under Turkish jurisdiction.

The legal status of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which was proclaimed in 1983, has been a bone of contention for previous property cases appearing before the European court, but it has been established in admissibility decisions (for example, Loizidou v. Turkey in 1995 and Xenides-Arestis v. Turkey in 2005) that Turkey is the respondent state.

In the latter case, an attempt was made to avoid a judgment against Turkey by establishing an “Immovable Property Determination, Evaluation and Compensation Commission” in July 2003, so as to provide a domestic remedy that should be exhausted. Nevertheless, this only provided for compensation but not restitution, and as there were doubts about the impartiality of the Commission, the remedy was found to be neither effective nor adequate.

So, seen in those terms, the IPC must be considered an improved model as its provisions provide for restitution, exchange or compensation in return for rights over the immovable property and compensation for loss of use if claimed. Furthermore, two of the IPC’s five to seven members are independent international members, and persons who occupy Greek-Cypriot property are expressly excluded.

Consequently, on the basis of the 85 cases concluded by last November, the Court found that the IPC provides an accessible and effective framework of redress for property issues “in the current situation of occupation that it is beyond this Court’s competence to resolve.”
In view of the redress offered by the Annan Plan, it must be a disappointment for Greek Cypriots that the Court maintains its view that “it must leave the choice of implementation of redress for breaches of property rights to Contracting States” and that, from a Convention perspective, “property is a material commodity which can be valued and compensated for in monetary terms.” In fact, in more than 70 cases claimants opted for compensation.

A further bone of contention in the current talks between Dimitris Christofias and Mehmet Ali Talat is whether it is the legal or the current owner of the property who should decide whether redress should be in the form of restitution, exchange or compensation.

On this issue, the Court states, “It is still necessary to ensure that the redress applied to those old injuries does not create disproportionate new wrongs.” Finally, the Court concludes that this decision is not to be interpreted as requiring that applicants make use of the IPC. They may choose not to do so and await a political settlement, but in the meantime the Court’s decision provides a legal basis.

Davutoglu believes the Court’s decision has boosted the international legitimacy of the TRNC, in which case he has neglected to read the small print. “The Court maintains its opinion that allowing the respondent State to correct wrongs imputable to it does not amount to an indirect legitimization of a regime unlawful under international law.”

Furthermore, “Accepting the functional reality of remedies is not tantamount to holding that Turkey wields internationally recognized sovereignty over northern Cyprus.” The European Parliament has, in a resolution, called on Turkey to immediately start to withdraw its troops from Cyprus and address the issue of the settlement of Turkish citizens as well as enable the return of the sealed-off section of Famagusta to its lawful inhabitants.

Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan has indicated he is willing to withdraw Turkish troops in the event of a solution, but his chief EU negotiator Egemen Bagis, has boasted that Turkey has not withdrawn a single soldier or given away territory.

Considering that not only the future of Cyprus but also Turkey’s prospects of EU membership hang in the balance, that kind of attitude is singularly unhelpful.

Robert Ellis is a regular commentator on Turkish affairs in the Danish and international press.

This article appeared in today’s print edition of the Hürriyet Daily News. Reportedly, its editor-in-chief David Judson had it removed from their website. The article is available on-line at: http://europenews.dk/en/node/30643
Takis Demopoulos, Sofi Nezire, Linda and David Orams

Leslie Hardy, Wellington Estates

1 April 2010

The dust has not settled on the implications of the UK Court of Appeal ruling in favour of Meletis Apostolides and against Linda and David Orams when the legal convolutions of Cyprus herald a new era for the settlement of claims by dispossessed persons. On 5 March 2010, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) ruled in favour of the Turkish proposal that that Greek Cypriots should first resort to the legal remedies available in the Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (TRNC), prior to submitting a claim to the ECHR.

The ECHR considered the case of Takis Demopoulos and 7 other similar claims. It ruled that the TRNC Immovable Property Commission (IPC) was an effective, fair and appropriate body to adjudicate on these and similar claims.

The IPC was established in response to claims brought to the ECHR by Greek Cypriots, and was viewed favourably by the ECHR during the Myra Xenides-Arestis case, even though the case was not transferred to the Immovable Property Commission.

This means that the backlog of some 1,500 cases lodged by Greek Cypriots at the ECHR for compensation due to the alleged loss of their land in North Cyprus have been removed from the lists of the ECHR. From now on, applications will only be entertained by the ECHR if the applicant can demonstrate that local remedies have been explored and found unsatisfactory.

Comments:

1. This ruling is welcomed by the TRNC as recognition of the Immovable Property Commission is viewed as a stepping stone towards international recognition of the TRNC as a legally constituted and separate state from the (Greek) Republic of Cyprus. However, the ruling was made in favour of Turkey, and not the TRNC.

2. This means that settlements agreed by applicants and the IPC will have international legal validity. So, if an applicant accepts compensation or alternative land then he has surrendered all rights to the claimed property.

3. The ruling is curious in that the European Court of Justice advised the UK Court of Appeal that the Apostolides vs Orams case was essentially a commercial matter between two private parties, and that there was no public policy dimension. This devalued if not made void the validity and currency of TRNC issued property title deeds.
The ECHR ruling moves in the opposite direction and confers legitimacy on the IPC, despite the fact that the Greek Republic of Cyprus does not recognise the body.

The implications of this development within the context of the Linda and David Orams case are intriguing. The Orams case is considered draconian in so far as a Greek Cypriot can bring a case against the “current user” of a North Cyprus property, albeit with the benefit of TRNC title deeds, and should the Greek Republic of Cyprus court in South Nicosia rule in his favour, then the claimant can immediately seek to register and subsequently enforce the judgment in any other EU jurisdiction. As the Orams have assets in the UK, then the applicant, Meletis Apostolides, sought to register the judgment in the UK, and was successful.

In the Orams case, there were few arguments of weight which their lawyers, including Cherie Blair, could use to counter the application for registration of the judgment in the UK. However, the Demopoulos case provides a powerful counter argument. As the ECHR has ruled that applications should be channeled to the IPC, an applicant who ignores this directive will not be heard by the ECHR and, by implication, should not be granted judgment by any other inferior court in the EU.

So, even if an applicant succeeds in persuading a Greek Cypriot court in South Nicosia to grant judgment against a UK owner / current user of lost land in North Cyprus, it is by no means certain that a UK court will be prepared to register the judgment on a summary basis. A UK court will be mindful of the Demopoulos ruling and will probably recommend any applicant to consider the same.

It is therefore highly unlikely that any other UK purchaser of North Cyprus property will be subjected to the nightmare experience which Linda and David Orams have endured since 2004.

Sofi Nezire

Ms. Sofi Nezire is an 85-year-old Turkish Cypriot who does not live in Cyprus and applied to the ECHR for compensation in respect of loss of access and use of her property in the Greek Republic of Cyprus. The case is similar to the landmark Titina Loizidou v. Turkey case, apart from the fact that Sofi Nezire is a Turkish Cypriot who was making a claim against the Greek Republic of Cyprus.

The case was settled by the Greek Republic of Cyprus prior to the ECHR making a ruling. The settlement will pay Sofi Nezire EU 500,000 for the loss of use of one and a half houses in Larnaca in which Greek Cypriots are living. Equally significant was a pledge by the Greek Republic of Cyprus to amend the law which allowed the government to administer the properties and lands of dispossessed Turkish Cypriots.

Comments:
1. The Guardian Law has frozen the assets of all Turkish Cypriots and prohibited dealings in that property. A promise was made that the Guardian Law would be amended so that Turkish Cypriots living away from Cyprus, or residing not in the north, but in the south, could return to and regain control and use of their property and land. Sofi Nezire will benefit from this amendment.

2. There are many examples of land in South Cyprus in public or private use, but remains administered by the Guardian Law, which recognises Turkish Cypriot ownership. The most famous is the entire site of the old Larnaca Airport and a good part of the new airport. The Turkish Cypriot owner apparently lives in Larnaca and is allegedly receiving a generous monthly “rent” from the Greek Republic of Cyprus, lest he seeks to reclaim his lost land.

3. The implications of this could be far reaching. However, it should be noted that the exemption from the law does not apply to Turkish Cypriots living in the TRNC. There are, nonetheless, a large number who live in the UK, and these could now seek to reclaim their property in South Cyprus.

4. The situation is anomalous in that dispossessed Greek Cypriots are directed to apply to the Immovable Property Commission, and may fail to gain restitution, whereas dispossessed Turkish Cypriots are supposedly guaranteed restitution in South Cyprus upon presentation of documents demonstrating legal title.

http://www.wellestates.com/demopoulos_nezire_orams.htm

Links to judgments:

Takis Demopoulos and Others v Turkey
http://law.huji.ac.il/upload/ECtHR_judgment_north_cyprus.doc

Myra Xenides-Arestis v. Turkey


Titina Loizidou v. Turkey http://www.hic-mena.org/documents/Loizidou.doc