



International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Distr.: General
2 December 2013
English
Original: French

Human Rights Committee

Communication No. 1922/2009

Decision adopted by the Committee at its 109th session (14 October–1 November 2013)

<i>Submitted by:</i>	Gilbert Martinez and others (represented by counsel Mr. Alain Garay)
<i>Alleged victim:</i>	The authors
<i>State party:</i>	Algeria
<i>Date of communication:</i>	24 November 2004 (initial submission)
<i>Document reference:</i>	Special Rapporteur's rule 97 decision, transmitted to the State party on 29 December 2009 (not issued in document form)
<i>Date of decision:</i>	28 October 2013
<i>Subject matter:</i>	Dispossession of property following the declaration of the State party's independence
<i>Procedural issues:</i>	Abuse of right; non-exhaustion of domestic remedies; incompatibility with the provisions of the Covenant
<i>Substantive issues:</i>	Right of peoples to freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources; freedom to choose one's residence; arbitrary or illegal interference, slander and prejudice to reputation; violation of minority rights; discrimination with respect to dispossession and property rights
<i>Articles of the Covenant:</i>	Articles 1, 5, 12, 17, 27; 2 (para. 1) and 26, read separately or in conjunction; 26 and 17, read in conjunction
<i>Article of the Optional Protocol:</i>	3

[Annex]

GE.13-49365 (E) 061213 181213



* 1 3 4 9 3 6 5 *

Please recycle 



Annex

Decision of the Human Rights Committee under the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (109th session)

concerning

Communication No. 1922/2009*

Submitted by: Gilbert Martinez and others (represented by counsel Mr. Alain Garay)

Alleged victim: The authors

State party: Algeria

Date of communication: 24 November 2004 (initial submission)

The Human Rights Committee, established under article 28 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,

Meeting on 28 October 2013,

Adopts the following:

Decision concerning admissibility

1.1 The authors of the communication, dated 24 November 2004 and supplemented by additional information submitted in 2005 and 2006, are 590 persons of French nationality. They claim to have been the victims of violations by Algeria of articles 1, 5, 12, 17 and 27; of article 2, paragraph 1, and article 26, read separately or in conjunction; and of articles 26 and 17, read in conjunction. They are represented by counsel. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Optional Protocol entered into force for the State party on 12 December 1989.

1.2 On 10 March 2010, the Committee, acting through its Chairperson, decided that the question of admissibility would be considered separately from the merits.

* The following members of the Committee participated in the consideration of the present communication: Mr. Yadh Ben Achour, Mr. Ahmad Amin Fathalla, Mr. Cornelis Flinterman, Mr. Yuji Iwasawa, Mr. Walter Kälin, Ms. Zonke Zanele Majodina, Mr. Khesoe Parsad Matadeen, Mr. Gerald L. Neuman, Sir Nigel Rodley, Mr. Victor Manuel Rodríguez-Rescia, Mr. Fábian Omar Salvioli, Ms. Anja Seibert-Fohr, Mr. Yuval Shany, Mr. Konstantine Vardzelashvili and Ms. Margo Waterval.

In accordance with rule 90 of the Committee's rules of procedure, Mr. Lazhari Bouzid did not participate in the consideration of the communication.

In accordance with rule 91 of the Committee's rules of procedure, Ms. Christine Chanet did not participate in the consideration of the communication.

The facts as submitted by the authors

2.1 The authors, French citizens who were obliged to leave Algeria when it gained independence in 1962, were dispossessed of property which they had held in that country, contrary to the provisions of the Évian Accords of 18 March 1962.¹ Each author has submitted a copy of the decision of the National Agency for Compensation of French Overseas Nationals (ANIFOM) whereby France granted them compensation for the property that they had held in Algeria. However, they contend that the action taken by France did not provide them with fair compensation for the value of the confiscated property as of 1962, i.e., the year in which Algeria became a sovereign and independent State.

2.2 The authors recount the history of Algerian independence and state that, after this date, the State party could not or would not assume its responsibilities, inter alia, to ensure the safety and protect the moral and material interests of population groups domiciled in Algeria.

2.3 With regard to the measures taken by the State party concerning the property of persons who had left the country, the authors identify several different periods. During the first period, from July to September 1962, the dispossessions had no legal basis. They were the result of isolated acts by individuals or groups of individuals or of unauthorized actions by local officials which elicited no clear response from the State party. Later, an ordinance issued on 24 August 1962² governed the fate of vacant properties (those that had not been used, occupied or enjoyed by their legal owner for at least two months), placing them under prefectural administration. The ordinance was intended to protect the properties and preserve the owners' rights. In most cases, however, what it did was to perpetuate and provide a legal justification for the situation as it stood, as well as paving the way for further dispossessions, with the relevant decisions being left to the discretion of prefects, without any safeguards or prior formalities being required and without any effective avenue of redress. Nevertheless, some restitutions were ordered and actually carried out pursuant to this ordinance. Later on, a decree was issued on 23 October 1962³ that prohibited and annulled all contracts for the sale of vacant property, including sale and rental agreements concluded abroad after 1 July 1962. The properties covered by contracts subject to such annulments were reclassified as vacant within the meaning of the ordinance of 24 August 1962. Subsequently, the decree of 18 March 1963⁴ established conditions and safeguards in respect of declarations of vacancy and provided a legal remedy.⁵ According to the authors, this remedy was not effective because the judges who heard the cases took a long time to issue a decision, and new provisions were issued which invalidated virtually all judicial guarantees. In fact, a decree of 19 May 1963⁶ ruled out any possibility of legal recourse

¹ The authors cite the Évian Accords, particularly the "provisions concerning French citizens of ordinary civil status", which state that: "their property rights will be respected. No measures of dispossession will be taken against them without their being granted fair compensation established in advance. They will receive guarantees appropriate to their particular culture, language and religion. ... A Court of Guarantees, a national institution under Algerian law, will be responsible for ensuring that these rights are respected."

² Ordinance No. 62-020 of 24 August 1962 concerns the protection and management of vacant property.

³ Decree No. 62-03 of 23 October 1962 regulates the transaction, sale, rental, lease or concession of movable or immovable property.

⁴ Decree No. 63-88 of 18 March 1963 governs vacant property.

⁵ Within two months, "by suing the Algerian State in the person of the prefect ... before the competent interim relief judge of the prefecture in question". This was a fast, inexpensive procedure, but once again the implementation of the decree fell short of the expectations it had created.

⁶ Decree No. 63-168 of 9 May 1963 concerns the placement under State protection of movable and

other than an appeal before a departmental commission⁷ and, in addition to the classification of vacancy, introduced the broad concept of public order and social peace, thereby giving the authorities nearly absolute power of discretion. From a procedural point of view, the presiding judges of courts seized of interim relief applications filed under the 18 March 1963 decree declared themselves not competent, since the administration of such property fell under new legislation that did not provide for the submission of applications to the interim relief judge. The discretionary appeals commissions provided for in the decree were never set up.

2.4 Since the measures prescribed by these provisions were not time-bound, the actual situation in fact approximates to a disguised type of expropriation, even though, in strictly legal terms, the titular owners did not lose their property rights. Decision No. 16 Z.F., which dealt with the transfer of the proceeds from harvests of crops grown on properties previously owned by French farmers and nationalized by the decree of 1 October 1963,⁸ was the only official compensation measure adopted on behalf of French nationals who had lost their property. The decision provided for the payment of 10 million old francs as compensation to be distributed among farmers and growers. However, negotiations concerning the vacant properties were unsuccessful.⁹

The complaint

3.1 The authors claim that there have been six different kinds of violations: (a) deprivation of members of the French minority of their properties and means of subsistence (article 1 of the Covenant); (b) denial of the right to freely choose one's residence in Algeria (art. 12); (c) unlawful interference with the authors' homes in Algeria, together with attacks on their honour and reputation (art. 17); (d) violation of the authors' rights as members of a minority group with a distinct culture (art. 27); (e) discriminatory measures constituting rights violations involving differential and unjustified treatment by the State with respect to dispossession of property (article 2, paragraph 1, and article 26, read separately or in conjunction, and articles 17 and 26, read in conjunction); and (f) discrimination in respect of property rights (art. 5). The authors consider that rights of individuals acquired under the predecessor State should be safeguarded by the successor State. This principle is part of general international law, and failure to recognize it engages a State's international responsibility. The State party should have upheld and protected the property rights of French nationals repatriated from Algeria, but it has failed to do so.

3.2 In respect of the exhaustion of domestic remedies, the authors are of the view that these remedies have no prospect of success. First, the failure to set up the court of guarantees provided for in the Évian Accords has resulted in a procedural deadlock, since

immovable property whose acquisition, management, development or use might undermine public order or social peace. This decree sets a one-month deadline for appeals against prefectural decisions to place property under State protection and provides that such appeals are to be made before a departmental commission. All previous provisions not in conformity with the decree were repealed.

⁷ The establishment of such a commission is provided for by Decree No. 63-222 of 28 June 1963, which deals with appeals against prefectural decisions to place certain properties under State protection. Under this decree, appeals could be filed with the prefect, who would then refer the application to a departmental commission and, subsequently, to a national commission to be set up within the Ministry of the Interior.

⁸ This decision was published in the Official Gazette of Algeria of 17 March 1964.

⁹ Decree No. 63-64 of 18 February 1963, which set the amounts of compensation to be provided for the occupation of residential business premises considered vacant, explicitly provided that the owners of vacant property would receive no compensation and stated that the relevant rights would be covered in subsequent legislation.

that court was supposed to order investigations, annul laws that are incompatible with the *Déclaration des garanties* (declaration of guarantees) and rule on all compensation measures. Second, certain avenues of redress were opened under the regulations authorizing dispossession but have been closed by other decrees.

3.3 The following remedies were theoretically available to the wronged owners. First, before the Supreme Court,¹⁰ they could: (1) bring annulment proceedings in respect of the decrees under which the vacant property regime was introduced, the decree of 9 May 1963 and that of 1 October 1963; (2) file an appeal against the decisions of the national commission ruling on appeals against measures enforcing the decree of 9 May 1963; (3) file an appeal against prefectural decisions taken pursuant to the decree of 1 October 1963; (4) an appeal against decisions to declare property vacant; (5) file an application for judicial review of appeals court judgements rendered under the procedure established by article 7 of the decree of 18 March 1963; and (6) file an application for judicial review of cases in which the seizure of property was the result of an administrative decision. Secondly, it was possible to appeal to an interim relief judge against any decision to declare property vacant at a future date. Lastly, an administrative appeal could have been filed with the commissions established under the decree of 9 May 1963 against decisions to place property under State protection or to declare property vacant. Three actions were brought before the president of the Algiers *Tribunal de Grande Instance* (court of major jurisdiction) under the decree of 18 March 1963;¹¹ these appeals were successful in the sense that the court either declared the decisions null and void or ordered an expert review that found that the property was not vacant. Encouraged by the outcome of these three cases, many other proceedings were instituted, but the favourable judgements could not be executed. The appeals filed under the decree of 9 May 1963 never came to anything because the commissions were never set up. Two decisions were rendered in May 1964 that set aside the judgement of the president of the court in Algiers and affirmed that the interim relief judge remained competent to hear cases brought under the terms of the 18 March 1963 decree.

3.4 All proceedings that could reasonably be brought were instituted. The Algerian courts either declared themselves not competent, referred the case to the administrative commission provided for by the decree of 9 May 1963 (which was never set up) or granted the appeal, but in these latter cases, the decisions were not enforced. As for appeals to the Supreme Court, applications for judicial review of administrative decisions stand no chance of success in practice. Given that no French citizen exiled from Algeria has obtained satisfaction for his or her dispossession, the burden of proof falls on the State party.

3.5 In view of the impossibility of obtaining justice in the State party, a number of French citizens exiled from Algeria turned to France: the Conseil d'État rejected 74 appeals on 25 November 1988, 17 February 1999 and 7 April 1999 (the *Teytaud and others* cases¹²). They subsequently turned to the European Court of Human Rights.¹³ The Court

¹⁰ Established by Act No. 63-218 of 18 June 1963.

¹¹ However, the decrees nationalizing agricultural property, tobacco plantations, flour mills, semolina factories, transport firms, cinemas, etc., did not provide for any amicable settlement procedure or form of litigation. Only administrative appeals were possible.

¹² In a ruling concerning an appeal filed against the decisions rendered on 11 July 1996 by the Paris Administrative Appeal Court, on 17 February 1999 the Conseil d'État found that the State of France bore no responsibility in the matter, since the Évian Accords included no clauses or undertakings guaranteeing French citizens residing in Algeria that, if they were deprived of their property by the State of Algeria, the French Government would compensate them for their loss.

¹³ See applications Nos. 48754/99, 49720/99, 49721/99, 49723/99, 49724–30/99, *Teytaud and others v. France*, inadmissibility decision of 25 January 2001; and applications Nos. 52240/99 to 52296/99,

found that the applicants had been dispossessed of their property by the Algerian State, which was not a party to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

3.6 With regard to the admissibility of the communication, the authors argue that it has been submitted by individuals who, when the violation of the Covenant first occurred, were subject to the State party's jurisdiction; that they are personally the victims of violations that have continued since 1962; and that the matter is not being examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

3.7 With regard to the Committee's jurisdiction *ratione temporis*, the effects of the alleged violations of rights enshrined in the Covenant are continuing and lasting. While in principle the Committee has no jurisdiction *ratione temporis* over acts committed by a State party prior to its ratification of the Optional Protocol, the Committee becomes competent if the acts in question continue to have effects after the entry into force of the Protocol and continue to violate the Covenant or have effects that in themselves constitute a violation of the Covenant.

3.8 While it is true that the authors were obliged to wait until 2004 to submit their case to the Committee, inasmuch as the Covenant and the Optional Protocol set no time limits on submissions, the submission of the communications in 2004 in no way constitutes an abuse of the right of submission and is in keeping with the Committee's jurisprudence. In the first place, the appeals submitted to national courts in Algeria since 1962 have been unsuccessful. Second, Algeria did not ratify the Covenant and its Protocol until 1989. Third, after that, the authors, as French nationals and by reason of their nationality and culture, naturally turned to the French authorities rather than challenging a foreign State. Fourth, their recourse to French and European proceedings (from 1970 to 2001) accounts for the time elapsed between 1962 and 2004. Fifth, in August 2001, the authors, as applicants before the European Court of Human Rights, were informed by their counsel that the Court's decisions put a definitive end to all the proceedings instituted. It was not until January 2004 that the authors' current counsel was asked to look into the case and submit it to the Committee. Sixth, on 5 December 2002, the President of the French Republic announced the adoption of a fourth piece of legislation providing for national contributions to benefit repatriated French citizens, which raised hopes for a definitive and comprehensive solution. However, bill No. 1499 of 10 March 2004 did not include a mechanism for providing compensation for confiscated property.

3.9 With respect to the alleged violation of article 1, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, the authors contend that, because they belong to the community of French citizens exiled from Algeria, they have witnessed a serious infringement of their right as individuals to exercise collective rights (in particular because of their inability to dispose freely of their natural wealth and resources), which include the right to own property and the right to work.

3.10 With regard to the alleged violation of article 12, the authors consider that the conditions under which they fled from Algeria are comparable to exile. Because of the nature of Algerian laws on vacant property and confiscations, the authors were unable to establish residence in Algeria or remain there. They were unable to choose their residence freely and yet were never officially notified of any restrictions of the kind provided for in article 12, paragraph 3. The deprivation of the authors' freedom to choose their residence is incompatible with the rights enshrined in the Covenant.

3.11 With regard to the alleged violation of article 17, the authors submit that the dispossession measures were not legal. The regime instituted by the State of Algeria did not

Amsellem and others v. France, inadmissibility decision of 10 July 2001.

uphold the principle of lawfulness within the meaning of article 17. The interference with the authors' privacy, family and home had no basis in Algerian law. The State had no legal authority to proceed as it did purely on the basis of administrative regulations and did not provide legal protection of any sort to prevent the authors from being exiled.

3.12 Regarding the alleged violation of article 27, the authors identify themselves as members of a minority whose right to enjoy their own culture in community with other members of their group was denied in 1962. The authors have been deprived of their rights as a result of the failure to provide effective safeguards for the French minority. Having been forced into exile, they have been prevented from exercising their right to live in Algeria within their own cultural and linguistic milieu.

3.13 Concerning the alleged violation of article 2, paragraph 1, and article 26, read separately or in conjunction, and of articles 26 and 17, read in conjunction, the authors are victims of the continuing confiscation of their property based on discriminatory legislation that has impeded the exercise of their property rights without any objective, reasonable justification. The Algerian law of 26 July 1963¹⁴ concerning confiscated property established the general principle, which has been applied in a selective and discriminatory manner, that property that had belonged to "agents of colonization" became the property of the State. Under certain conditions, nationalized property was then returned to people whose land had been nationalized, but only if they were "individuals of Algerian nationality",¹⁵ in contravention of the guarantees provided under the Covenant and the Committee's jurisprudence.

3.14 Moreover, the compensation mechanism of 17 March 1964¹⁶ benefits only one particular population group (farmers), thus constituting a form of discrimination. The mechanism unjustifiably established an arbitrary distinction in treatment that benefited farmers alone. Yet the obligation to compensate without discrimination is the corollary of the right to nationalize. There has therefore been a violation of article 2, paragraph 1, and article 26, read separately or in conjunction, and of articles 26 and 17, read in conjunction.

3.15 The alleged violation of article 5 of the Covenant stems from the denial of the authors' rights and freedoms in 1962. The scope of article 5, paragraph 2, also provides grounds for raising the question of the implementation of article 17 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Given the alleged violations mentioned above, there has also been a violation of article 5.

3.16 In view of the mental pain and anguish that they have suffered, the authors expressly ask the Committee to acknowledge that the State party, which is in breach of its obligations under the Covenant and under its national laws, is obligated to remedy this series of violations. Satisfaction in this case would constitute an appropriate form of compensation for the non-material damage suffered. There would be a degree of satisfaction in receiving an acknowledgement of the fact that the communication stands on its own merits. The authors do not, however, lose sight of the need for reparation in the form of just and equitable financial compensation for their confiscated property in Algeria.

¹⁴ Act No. 63-276 of 26 July 1963 concerns property confiscated and retained by the colonial administration.

¹⁵ Article 3, Ordinance No. 95-26 of 25 September 1995, amending and supplementing Act No. 90-25 of 18 November 1990 concerning land planning, with reference to Act No. 62-20 of 24 August 1962.

¹⁶ Decision No. 16 Z.F., published 17 March 1964, which dealt only with French farmers whose property had been nationalized.

State party's observations on admissibility

4.1 On 28 February 2010, the State party contested the admissibility of the communication. It points out that on 1 November 2006 the Committee declared a similar communication, submitted by Armand Anton, to be inadmissible. This decision was based on the non-retroactivity of the implementation of the Covenant and on the fact that the Covenant did not cover property rights. The Government of Algeria wishes to know why the Committee has not, despite the aforementioned precedent, declared all these communications to be inadmissible on the grounds that they are an abuse of the right of submission under article 3 of the Optional Protocol.

4.2 Additionally, the State party argues that the authors have not exhausted all domestic remedies. The Évian Accords provided safeguards for French citizens wishing to remain in Algeria. The authors or their heirs, however, voluntarily left Algerian territory, leaving their property "vacant". This led the Government to take measures to safeguard public order and security.

4.3 A United Nations body cannot agree to consider a communication of this nature because doing so would infringe the Charter of the United Nations, which establishes that the right to self-determination of peoples under foreign domination must be respected. The Committee should have considered these communications to be incompatible with article 1 of the Covenant. In the State party's view, the acceptance or consideration of such a communication would be tantamount to a legitimization of colonization and a reversal of the law, with the colonizers asking to be compensated by the colonized country, which itself has been the victim of colonial dispossession.

Authors' comments on the State party's observations

5.1 In letters dated 10 May 2010 and 3 January 2012, the authors submitted comments on the State party's observations. With regard to the exhaustion of domestic remedies, the authors reiterate their claims about the lack of effective remedies and ask the State party to effectively demonstrate which forms of appeal are open to them. The authors cite Ordinance 10-01 of 26 August 2012 containing the Supplementary Act on Finance for 2010, article 42 of which states: "Any transaction carried out by the original owners, inside or outside the country, involving immovable property whose ownership has been returned to the State following nationalization, establishment of State control or abandonment by the owners is null and void. Restitution of property whose ownership has been transferred by the State is also prohibited."

5.2 The authors deny the State party's claim that they "voluntarily" left Algeria. The State party states the "facts" without providing the least bit of documentary or detailed evidence. The authors also reject the State party's assertions concerning the right of self-determination.

5.3 With regard to the continuing nature of the violation, making a distinction between a non-recurring illicit act with continuing effects and a continuing illicit act requires a subtle analysis of the facts and the law. The deciding body will have jurisdiction if the dispute between the parties (claims and responses) arises after the relevant instrument's entry into force, even if the disputed events or the situation that led to the dispute occurred earlier. If, however, the reason for the claim (or the source of the dispute) is a set of facts or events subsequent to the critical date, the deciding body will have jurisdiction even if the illicit nature of the acts stems from the modification of or failure to maintain a situation created earlier. The effect of time-based considerations therefore necessitates a close study of the facts and the law, and the question should be addressed as part of the examination of the merits.

Issues and proceedings before the Committee

6.1 Before considering any claim contained in a communication, the Human Rights Committee must decide, in accordance with rule 93 of its rules of procedure, whether the communication is admissible under the Optional Protocol to the Covenant.

6.2 The Committee takes note of the 15-year delay between the ratification of the Optional Protocol by the State party in 1989 and the submission of this communication in 2004. It observes that there are no explicit time limits for submission of communications under the Optional Protocol. However, in certain circumstances, the Committee is entitled to expect a reasonable explanation for such a delay. In the present case, the Committee notes counsel's various arguments, which, in his view, explain why the authors were obliged to wait until 2004 to submit the communication to the Committee (see para. 3.8). With regard to the argument that the State party did not ratify the Covenant and the Optional Protocol until 1989, counsel does not explain why the authors did not initiate proceedings in the State party at that stage. The Committee notes that the authors benefited from compensatory measures introduced by France¹⁷ and that the authors decided to file a case against the State party, not with its national courts or administrative agencies, but directly with the Committee, only after becoming aware that the French bill No. 1499 of 10 March 2004¹⁸ did not include a reparation mechanism that provided for further compensation for property confiscated in Algeria. The Committee is of the view that the authors could have had recourse to proceedings against the State party once the latter had acceded to the Covenant and the Optional Protocol and that the proceedings pursued in France did not prevent them from lodging a complaint against Algeria with the Committee. The authors have not provided any convincing explanation to justify their decision to wait until 2004 to submit their communication to the Committee. In the absence of such an explanation, the Committee considers that submitting the communication after so long a delay amounts to an abuse of the right of submission and finds the communication inadmissible under article 3 of the Optional Protocol.¹⁹

7. The Human Rights Committee therefore decides:

(a) That the communication is inadmissible under article 3 of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(b) That this decision shall be transmitted to the State party and to the authors.

[Adopted in French (original version), English and Spanish. Subsequently to be issued also in Arabic, Chinese and Russian as part of the Committee's annual report to the General Assembly.]

¹⁷ Act No. 87-549 of 16 July 1987 relating to the payment of compensation to repatriated persons was intended to provide a final settlement of all cases of lost or "confiscated" overseas property.

¹⁸ Act No. 2005-158 deals with national recognition and compensation for repatriated French nationals and was adopted on 23 February 2005. It primarily concerns two categories of persons: repatriated persons and *harkis*. In the case of repatriated persons, the Act provides for the reimbursement of the amounts that were deducted from compensation paid to them in the 1970s as repayment for resettlement loans. These loans had been granted to those who wished to start businesses in France. In the case of *harkis*, the law provides for an *allocation de reconnaissance* (gratitude payments).

¹⁹ See communication No. 787/1997, *Gobin v. Mauritius*, decision on admissibility adopted on 16 July 2001, para. 6.3, and communication No. 1434/2005, *Fillacier v. France*, decision on admissibility adopted on 27 March 2006, para. 4.3.

Appendix

List of authors

1. Acquaviva Valero, Dolores
2. Adragna, Rose
3. Aguado, Antoine
4. Alberola, Marie
5. Albouy, Maryse (née Jurado)
6. Allione, Régine
7. Amador, Germaine
8. Amate, Henry – Marius
9. Amate, Henry
10. Amate, Henry-Marius
11. Amate, Maryse
12. Amate, Pierre
13. Anahory, Ambroise
14. Andreo, Emma
15. Andreo, Jean Joel
16. Anglade, Gérard
17. Anglade, Marcel
18. Anglade, Roleine
19. Aracil, Alain
20. Aracil, Lucie
21. Arnaud, Alain
22. Arnaud, Janine
23. Arnaud, Maryse
24. Arnaud, Rene
25. Asnar, Marie-Louise (née Castano)
26. Asnar, Michelle (née Brotons)
27. Astier, Nelly
28. Audisio, Danielle (née Faes)
29. Audouy, Marie (née Toustou)
30. Auzias, Monique
31. Averseng, Michel
32. Azorin, Rene
33. Azzopardi, Charles
34. Ballester, Jacqueline
35. Baltazar, Bernadette
36. Bandet, Huguette
37. Banon, Philippe
38. Barbaud, Francoise
39. Barbaud, Paul-Robert
40. Barcelo, Marcel
41. Barret, Carmen (née Garcia)
42. Barret, Jean-Louis
43. Barriere, Denise
44. Bartolo, Eliette
45. Bayard, Denise
46. Bayard, Serge
47. Bellier, Helene
48. Bellier, Paul
49. Belzer, Jacques
50. Bernad, Jean-Jacques
51. Bernad, Jean-Pierre
52. Bernad, Lucienne
53. Bernard, Olga
54. Billard, Andre
55. Billard, Marie
56. Billuart, Adele
57. Birebent, Danielle (née Garcia)
58. Birebent, Paul
59. Blandin, Marie-Claude
60. Blandin, Norbert
61. Bobbia, Jean-Charles
62. Bobbia, Marie-Claude
63. Bobbia, Renee
64. Bobbia, Marie-Yvonne
65. Boned, Claudine
66. Boronad, Vincent
67. Borrás, Andre
68. Borrás, Felicie
69. Borrás, Gabriel
70. Borrás, Jacques

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| 71. Borrás, Jacques Pierre | 111. Cassagne, Pierre |
| 72. Bosc, Jean-Pierre | 112. Castet, Suzanne |
| 73. Bossert, Georges | 113. Cazaux, Armand |
| 74. Bossert, Luc | 114. Cazenave, Georges |
| 75. Boubay, Marie-Helene (née Dubuche) | 115. Chamuel, Michele |
| 76. Boucherat, Helyette | 116. Charrin, Georges |
| 77. Boucherat, Rollande | 117. Charrin, Jean-Claude |
| 78. Bouie, Jacqueline (épouse Mas) | 118. Charrin, Pierre Yves |
| 79. Bourgeois, Alain | 119. Cheymol, Edmond |
| 80. Bourgeois, Jean-Michel | 120. Chieze, Jean |
| 81. Bourgeois, Micheline (née Sala) | 121. Ciomei, Pierre |
| 82. Bourrel, Annie | 122. Clavenad, Sylviane (née Malisson) |
| 83. Boutin, Georges | 123. Cohen SOLAL, Fernand |
| 84. Brevard, Marcelle | 124. Colin, Robert |
| 85. Cabanie, Alfred | 125. Colino, Mathieu |
| 86. Cabanie, Simone (née Goillot) | 126. Combes, Jacqueline (née Fernet) |
| 87. Cabot, Jacques | 127. Combes, Philippe |
| 88. Cabot, Jean-Louis | 128. Comte, Chantal (née Serres) |
| 89. Cabot, Suzanne | 129. Comte, Pierre-Yves |
| 90. Cachia, Henri | 130. Conte, Anne |
| 91. Calleja, Herve | 131. Corbalan, Vincent |
| 92. Calmels, Renee | 132. Cordina, Francis |
| 93. Cambos, Lydie (née Cannova) | 133. Cornus, Lydia |
| 94. Camelis, Jean-Michel | 134. Cortes, Renee |
| 95. Campila LOUIS, Nicole | 135. Coutelier, Andre |
| 96. Camprubi, Josette | 136. Crivello, Marcel |
| 97. Camps, Albert | 137. Crombet, Michelle (née Birebent) |
| 98. Camps, Nicole | 138. Cros, Claude |
| 99. Cantineau, Paule (née Cardona) | 139. Cros, Guy |
| 100. Caravaca, Joseph | 140. Cros, Jean Felix |
| 101. Cardenti, Alain | 141. Cros, Renee |
| 102. Cardi, Edouard | 142. Cuba, Francoise (épouse Bernardo) |
| 103. Cardi, Ignace | 143. Danet, Eliane |
| 104. Cardis, Hippolyte | 144. Daries, Jean-Marie |
| 105. Carriere, Jean | 145. David, Alain |
| 106. Casa, Marie-Therese | 146. David, Angele (née Lledo) |
| 107. Casanova, Yves | 147. David, Guy |
| 108. Casavecchia, Fernande | 148. Davin, Nicole (épouse Bobbia) |
| 109. Casin, Charlette | 149. Daymand, Paulette |
| 110. Cassagne, Jean-Marie | 150. Debono, Louis |

151. Delenseigne, Anny
152. Deleuze, Madeleine
153. Delzenne, Marie-France (née Borrás)
154. Deom, Reine (née Dross)
155. Devaux, Jean-Marcel
156. Di Maio, Andre
157. Di Maio, Bernadette
158. Di Maio, Jean-Paul
159. Di Maio, Pierre
160. Dianoux, Adrienne
161. Dimech, Marcelle
162. Distinguin, Cyril
163. Doll, France
164. Doll, Veronique
165. Donnadiou, Jean-Marie
166. Doumens, Jean
167. Dubouch, Alain
168. Dubouch, Bernard
169. Dubouch, Roger
170. Dudognon, Jacqueline (née Noris)
171. Dumont, Georgette
172. Dupeux, Pierre
173. Duplan, Armand
174. Dupont, Arlette (née Gonzalez)
175. Dupont, Rene
176. Dupont, Suzanne
177. Dupuy, Jacques
178. Duvergey, Lisette (née Kientzler)
179. Dye, Jean-Marie
180. Espinera, Camille
181. Espinosa, Manuel
182. Eymard, Denise
183. Eymard, Monique
184. Fa, Odile
185. Fabrer, Bernard
186. Faur, Monique
187. Fedoul, Dris
188. Fenollar, Rene
189. Fernandez, Gilbert
190. Fernandez, Jose
191. Ferrer, Bernadette
192. Ferrer, Lucienne
193. Fieschi, Jacques
194. Fieschi, Marie-Jose
195. Fillacier, Claude
196. Fillacier, Monique
197. Flamant, Nelly (née Pitavin)
198. Flinois, Claude
199. Flouttard, Jean-Pierre
200. Flouttard, Suzanne (née Cotte)
201. Foissier, Gislaine (née Perles)
202. Fontaine, Christian
203. Fonti, Reine
204. Fort, Rolland
205. Fortesa, Louis
206. Fouilleron, Armande
207. Fouilleron, Jeanine (née Jandrieu)
208. Fouilleron, Jean-Pierre
209. Fouilleron, Monique
210. Fouilleron, Philippe
211. Fouroux, Lucien
212. Fraizier, Jean-Marc
213. Fraizier, Josette (née Puig)
214. Francois, Michel
215. Fuget, Marie-Laure
216. Fuget, Robert
217. Gadea, Vincent
218. Gadea, Vincent
219. Galves, Emmanuel
220. Galves, Michelle
221. Galvez, Emilie
222. Gandolphe, Leonce
223. Gandolphe, Leonce
224. Garcia, Arlette
225. Garcia, Carmen
226. Garcia, Clorinde
227. Garcia, Electre (née Fernandez)
228. Garcia, Gabriel
229. Garcia, Joseph
230. Garcin, Georges

-
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 231. Gasso, Jean-Claude | 271. Honnorat, Christiane |
| 232. Gasso, Jeanne | 272. Houdou, Anne-Marie |
| 233. Gasso, Michel | 273. Humbert, Yvon |
| 234. Gaubert, Maurice | 274. Huntzinger, Marcelle (née Chieze) |
| 235. Gauci, Charles | 275. Huot, Viviane |
| 236. Gauci, Colette | 276. Iacono, Claude |
| 237. Gaudichon, Bernard | 277. Infantes, Antoine |
| 238. Genthial, Gerald | 278. Inzaina, Claudine |
| 239. Gigandet, Albert | 279. Jacomo, Huguette |
| 240. Gigon, Paule | 280. Jaen, Jean-Claude |
| 241. Giovannone, Alice | 281. Juan, Antoine |
| 242. Giovannone, Christiane | 282. Julien, Cyrille |
| 243. Goillot, Gaston | 283. Julien, Gautier |
| 244. Gonera, Florence (née Henri) | 284. Jurado, Louise |
| 245. Goubeyre, Claude | 285. Karsenty, Menahim |
| 246. Granjon, Chantal | 286. Kientzker, Charles |
| 247. Grima, Gladys (née Federigi) | 287. Kientzler, Rene |
| 248. Grima, Jean | 288. Klock, Chantal |
| 249. Grima, Paulette | 289. Kraft, Suzanne |
| 250. Guareschi, Fernand | 290. La Casa, Didier |
| 251. Guareschi, Marie (née Nocerino) | 291. Lacrampe, Yvette |
| 252. Guerry, Anne-Marie | 292. Laemmel, Claude |
| 253. Guiauchain, Jacques | 293. Lafforgue, Cecile (née Croze) |
| 254. Guichard, Georges | 294. Lagarde, Georges |
| 255. Guillaume, Maryvonne | 295. Lamirault Marie, Chantal (née Louis) |
| 256. Guiraud, Jean-Francois | 296. Lancry, Denise (née Cherki) |
| 257. Guisset, Colette | 297. Lancry, Roger |
| 258. Guitoneau, Michelle | 298. Laniel, Jean-Pierre |
| 259. Guttierrez, Francis | 299. Lardeaux, Aristide |
| 260. Guy, Roger | 300. Large, Jean-Pierre |
| 261. Hamelin, Albert | 301. Lartigue, Josiane |
| 262. Hamelin, Odette | 302. Lasserre, Josee |
| 263. Haudricourt, Marlene | 303. Laurent, Daniel |
| 264. Haudricourt, Paul | 304. Laurent, Odile |
| 265. Henri, Celine | 305. Lavaysse, Bernard |
| 266. Henri, Claude | 306. Lavaysse, Philippe |
| 267. Henri, Edmond | 307. Leclercq, Regine |
| 268. Henri, Jean Marc | 308. Lescombes, Germain |
| 269. Henri, Marc | 309. Lescombes, Raymond |
| 270. Herault, Astride (née Kientzler) | 310. Lissare, Dolores |

311. Llacer, Frederic
312. Lellbach, Gérald
313. Lleu, Juliette
314. Lleu, Michel
315. Llorca, Jacqueline (née Magliozzi)
316. Lobell, Angèle
317. Lopez, Huguette
318. Lopez, Marie-Dolores (née Martinez)
319. Lopinto, Arlette
320. Lorenz Falzon, Andree
321. Lortie, Rolande
322. Louis, Christian
323. Louis, Edmonde (née Lucci)
324. Louis, Marie-France
325. Louvier, Ignace
326. Louvier, Sylviane
327. Lubrano, Alexandre
328. Lubrano, Lucie
329. Lucci, Alain
330. Lucci, Gilbert
331. Lucci, Louis
332. Lucci, Vincent
333. Lupisgich, Nieves (née Vixcaino)
334. Macalluso, Arlette
335. Maigues, Raymond
336. Marce, Solange
337. Marechal, Colette (née Ros)
338. Marguerite, Michele
339. Mari, Jean
340. Marin, Marie-Claire
341. Martin, Georges
342. Martin, Micheline (née Fabre)
343. Martin, Nicolas
344. Martinez, Alberta
345. Martinez, André
346. Martinez, Antoine
347. Martinez, Christian
348. Martinez, Denise
349. Martinez, Edmonde (née Vicente)
350. Martinez, Gilbert
351. Martinez, Guy
352. Martinez, Jean-Claude
353. Martinez, Jofrette
354. Martinez, Joseph
355. Martinez, Marcel
356. Marty, Anne-Marie
357. Marty, Simone (née Roux)
358. Mas, Jacqueline (née Bouie)
359. Masquefa, Antoinette
360. Masquefa, Hubert
361. Mathieu, Michele
362. Maurange, Janine (née Riquelme)
363. Mauranges, Claude
364. Medina, Victor
365. Mene, Gabriel
366. Mercuri, Monique
367. Merleng, Rose
368. Mestre, Edgar
369. Micaléff, Pierre
370. Mirbelle, Louis
371. Moatti, William
372. Mollar, Jean-Pierre
373. Mommeja, Alain
374. Mommeja, Helene (née Berthet)
375. Mommeja, Laurent
376. Mommeja, Marc
377. Mommeja, Marie-Jose
378. Mommeja, Michel
379. Mommeja, Regine
380. Monmirel, Janie (née Vial)
381. Monreal, Henri
382. Morales, Armand
383. Morand de la Genevraye, Jacqueline
384. Morel, Pierre
385. Moretti, Genevieve (née Cardi)
386. Moulis, Jean-Claude
387. Moulis, Roberte (née Moulis)
388. Muller, Georges
389. Naud, Claude
390. Naud, Elisabeth (née Lleu)

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 391. Naud, Henri | 431. Pichot, Jean |
| 392. Naud, Jean | 432. Picone, Brigitte (née Bussutil) |
| 393. Naud, Robert | 433. Picone, Didier |
| 394. Navarro, Antoinette | 434. Picone, Jean-Jacques |
| 395. Navarro, Germaine | 435. Picone, Marie-Therese |
| 396. Navarro, Joachim | 436. Pierre, Juliette |
| 397. Navarro, Marie (épouse Mucci) | 437. Pignodel, Hermine |
| 398. Nebot, Daniel | 438. Pina, Jeanine |
| 399. Nebot, Didier | 439. Piro, Joseph |
| 400. Nebot, Evelyne | 440. Podesta, Helene |
| 401. Nogaret, Robert | 441. Podesta, Jean |
| 402. Noiret, Jean Germain | 442. Poletti, Jean-Pierre |
| 403. Nougaro, Lydia | 443. Pons, Colette |
| 404. Nuncie, Genevieve (née Lavaysse) | 444. Pons, Jocelyne (née Seyler) |
| 405. Olibe, Louise | 445. Pont, Achille |
| 406. Olivieri, Andre | 446. Pont, Huguette (née Martinez) |
| 407. Olivieri, Charly | 447. Pont, Louis |
| 408. Olivieri, Louis | 448. Pont, Lucette |
| 409. Papalia, Anne | 449. Porcedo, Aline (née Giroud) |
| 410. Papalia, Dominique | 450. Portelli, Christian |
| 411. Papalia, Francoise | 451. Portelli, Jean-Pierre |
| 412. Papalia, Michele | 452. Portelli, Michele |
| 413. Parini, Louis | 453. Portigliatti, Arielle (née Calleja) |
| 414. Pastor, Jeanne (née Lucci) | 454. Pouyet, Raphaelle (née Thyl) |
| 415. Pastor, Jeanne (née Lucci) | 455. Poveda, Antoine |
| 416. Pauly, Elizabeth (Granjon) | 456. Pra, Marc |
| 417. Paya, André | 457. Pradel, Andre |
| 418. Payet, Marie-Jane (née Devesa) | 458. Pradel, Didier |
| 419. Pellissier, Andre | 459. Pradel, Henri |
| 420. Perez, Alain | 460. Pradel, Suzanne (née Tissot) |
| 421. Perez, Marie | 461. Praly, Herve |
| 422. Perles, Ginette | 462. Puidebat, Rene |
| 423. Perles, Marcelle | 463. Quintard, Marie-Paule (née Morin) |
| 424. Perles, Serge | 464. Ramade, Jacques |
| 425. Petit, Robert | 465. Ramade, Marie-Helene (née Troussard) |
| 426. Petrequin, Paul | 466. Ramirez, Huguette (née Gimenez) |
| 427. Petro, Marlyse (née Olivieri) | 467. Rapin, Marie |
| 428. Peyre, Jacques | 468. Rapin, Yves |
| 429. Peyrot, Jacqueline (née Di Napoli) | 469. Ravot, Berthe |
| 430. Philippe, Chantal | 470. Ravot, Gilbert |

471. Redon, Marius
472. Reinold, Eveline (née Font)
473. Rey, Roselys (née Reichert)
474. Ribas, Antoine
475. Ribas, Jose
476. Ribas, Maria
477. Ribas, Vincent
478. Rico, Zahrie
479. Rieu, Marcel
480. Riviere, Gisele (née Martinez)
481. Robert, Fernand
482. Romaggi, Georges
483. Romaggi, Paulette
484. Romera, Mathilde
485. Rongeat, Georges
486. Ros, Antoine
487. Ros, Suzel (née Troussard)
488. Roseplatt, Marlene (épouse Haudricourt)
489. Rosenzweig, Guy
490. Rosenzweig, Jeannine
491. Roucoules, Guy
492. Roucoules, Josette
493. Roucoules, Maurice
494. Roucoules, Paul
495. Roucoules, Renée
496. Roux, Marie-Ange (née Valenti)
497. Roux, Rene
498. Rullier, Marie-Madeleine (née Wasmer)
499. Saiman, Alain
500. Saiman, Bernard
501. Saiman, Divine
502. Saiman, Janine (née Lellouche)
503. Sajous, Francine (née Male)
504. Sala, Jacqueline
505. Sala, Jean Claude
506. Sala, Renee (née Cazaux)
507. Salas, Pierre Louis
508. Sallan, Maryse
509. Salvat, Jean Pierre
510. Salvat, Joseph
511. Samtmann, Armand
512. Sanchez, Roger
513. Sancho, Laure (née Bernabeu)
514. Santana, Michel
515. Sanz, Henriette
516. Saves, Simone (née Jaubert)
517. Schreyeck, Huguette
518. Schwal, Jean-Michel
519. Schwal, Michèle (née Pierre)
520. Schwal, Stephane
521. Scotti, Jean-Claude
522. Scotto, Jean-Pierre
523. Segui, Jean-Luc
524. Segui, Martine
525. Segui, Paule
526. Segui, Paule (née Bosch)
527. Selles, Angele
528. Sempere, Marcel
529. Sempol, Emile
530. Sepet, Nicole
531. Serres, Helene
532. Severac, Louis
533. Seyler, Jean-Paul
534. Socias, Sebastien
535. Soler, Antoinette
536. Soler, Danielle (née Saramite)
537. Soler, Philippe
538. Soulier, Robert
539. Streit, Albert
540. Such, Odile
541. Such, Patrick
542. Tari, Emmanuelle (née Vidal Aveillan)
543. Tenza, Joseph
544. Teppet, Danielle
545. Teppet, Guy
546. Teppet, Marie-Jeanne (née Dross)
547. Thiebeaud, Jean-Paul
548. Tochon, Claude
549. Torra, Suzanne

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 550. Torregrosa, Jean-Pierre | 571. Vigier, Yvette |
| 551. Torres, Fernand | 572. Vignau, Andre |
| 552. Toussaint, Edmee (née Acolas) | 573. Vignau, Danielle |
| 553. Traverse, Paule (née Fromental) | 574. Vitiello, Jackie |
| 554. Tristan, Mathilde | 575. Vitiello, Michele (née Nachtripp) |
| 555. Troussard, Gabriel | 576. Vitiello, Pierre |
| 556. Truchi, Marcel | 577. Viudes, Andre |
| 557. Valat, Marie-Rose (née Fuget) | 578. Viudes, Fabienne |
| 558. Valverde, Louisette | 579. Viudes, Frederic |
| 559. Valverde, Marc | 580. Vuillaume, Claude |
| 560. Valverde, Marie Christine (née Garcia) | 581. Vuillaume, Rose |
| 561. Veillon, Christian | 582. Vuillaume, Yves |
| 562. Vela, Claude | 583. Waas, Michel |
| 563. Vella, Therese | 584. Wagner, Georges |
| 564. Verdoux, Agnes | 585. Wagner, Sylviane (née Morin) |
| 565. Verdoux, Christian | 586. Warisse, Marie-France |
| 566. Verdoux, Gerard | 587. Warisse, Roger |
| 567. Verdoux, Sebastien | 588. Wietrich, Gislaine (née Fleddermann) |
| 568. Vial, Jean | 589. Wimet, Paulette (née Fullana) |
| 569. Vidal, Martine (née Pierre) | 590. Zammit, Charley |
| 570. Vigier, Jean-Gilles | |
-