



REGULAR SELECTIVE INFORMATION FLOW

for the attention of the National Human Rights Structures

Issue#126

[1 - 31 December 2014]

CONTENTS

(click on a title to reach it)

Introduction (p.2)

Index by country (p.3)

PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION (p.4)

§1 - European Court of Human Rights (p.5)

A. Judgments (p.5)

1. *Judgments deemed of particular importance to the NHRs* (p.5)

2. *Other judgments* (p.12)

B. Decisions on admissibility (p.17)

C. Communicated cases (p.18)

§2 - European Committee of Social Rights (p.20)

A. Resolutions & Decisions (p.20)

B. Other information (p.20)

§3 - Recommendations & Resolutions (p.21)

A. Recommendations (p.21)

B. Resolutions (p.21)

§4 - Other information of general importance (p.22)

A. Information from the Committee of Ministers (p.22)

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly (p.22)

C. Information from the Commissioner of Human Rights (p.23)

D. Information from the Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms (p.24)

PART II - INFORMATION BY COUNTRY (p.25)

Information **selected** by the « Versailles St-Quentin Institutions Publiques » research centre
(Versailles St-Quentin-en-Yvelines University, France), under the responsibility of the
Directorate of Human Rights (DG I) of the Council of Europe
For any queries, please contact: eugen.cibotaru@coe.int

Introduction

This Issue is part of the "Regular Selective Information Flow" (RSIF). Its purpose is to keep the National Human Rights Structures permanently updated of Council of Europe norms and activities by way of regular transfer of information, which the Directorate of Human Rights carefully selects and tries to present in a user-friendly manner. The information is sent to the Contact Persons in the NHRs who are kindly asked to dispatch it within their offices.

Each Issue covers one month and is sent by the Directorate of Human Rights (DG I) to the Contact Persons a fortnight after the end of each observation period. This means that all information contained in any given issue is between four to eight weeks old.

The selection of the information included in the Issues is made by the "Versailles-St-Quentin Institutions Publiques" research centre (VIP – University of Versailles-St-Quentin-en-Yvelines, France) under the responsibility of the Directorate of Human Rights. It is based on what is deemed relevant to the work of the NHRs (including Ombudsman Institutions, National Human Rights Commissions and Institutes, Anti-discrimination Bodies). A particular effort is made to render the selection as targeted and short as possible. Readers are expressly encouraged to give any feedback that may allow for the improvement of the format and the contents of this tool.

The preparation of the RSIF has been supported as from 2013 by the "Versailles St-Quentin Institutions Publiques" research centre of the University of Versailles St-Quentin-en-Yvelines. It is entrusted to Léa Guémené, Camille Joly, Alix Motais de Narbonne, Mahaliana Ravaloson, Mariella Sognigbé, Pavlos Aimilios Marinatos, Quentin Michael, Clara Michel, Guillaume Verdier and Manon Wagner, under the supervision of Thibaut Fleury Graff, International Law Professor at Rennes University (France).

Index by Country

Countries followed by a number in bold are concerned by information specific to them.
Click on their name to reach this information

[ANDORRA](#), 26
[ARMENIA](#), 27
[AUSTRIA](#), 25, 28
[AZERBAIJAN](#), 12, 18, 29
[BELGIUM](#), 9, 30
[BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA](#), 31
[BULGARIA](#), 12, 32
CROATIA, 12, 18
[CYPRUS](#), 17, 33
[CZECH REPUBLIC](#), 8, 9, 34
[ESTONIA](#), 35
FINLAND, 17, 25
[FRANCE](#), 1, 2, 5, 6, 36
[GEORGIA](#), 37
[GERMANY](#), 13, 17, 38
GREECE, 13
[HUNGARY](#), 18, 39
[ICELAND](#), 40
[IRELAND](#), 41
[ITALY](#), 11, 42
[KOSOVO](#), 43

[LATVIA](#), 13, 44
[LITHUANIA](#), 14, 45
[MALTA](#), 14, 46
MOLDOVA, 6, 15, 18
[MONACO](#), 47
[MONTENEGRO](#), 48
[NETHERLANDS](#), 25, 49
NORWAY, 14, 25
[POLAND](#), 19, 50
[ROMANIA](#), 14, 19, 53
[RUSSIA](#), 10, 14, 15, 19, 54, 62
[SAN MARINO](#), 55
[SLOVAKIA](#), 15, 56
[SPAIN](#), 25, 57
[SWEDEN](#), 25, 58
[SWITZERLAND](#), 59
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF
MACEDONIA, 18
[TURKEY](#), 9-11, 15, 19, 61, 60
[UKRAINE](#), 16, 62
[UNITED KINGDOM](#), 7, 63

PartOne

GENERAL INFORMATION

This part presents a selection of information of general importance for the National Human Rights Structures.

This information was issued during the period under observation (1 - 31 December 2014) by the European Court of Human Rights, the European Committee of Social Rights, the Committee of Ministers, the Parliamentary Assembly and other Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms.

PartOne

§1 - EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

A. Judgments

1. Judgments deemed of particular interest to the NHRSS

The judgments presented under this heading are the ones for which a separate press release is issued by the Registry of the Court as well as other judgments considered relevant for the work of the NHRSSs. They correspond also to the themes addressed in the Peer-to-Peer Workshops. The judgments are thematically grouped. The information, except for the comments drafted by the Directorate of Human Rights, is based on the [press releases of the Registry of the Court](#).

Some judgments are only available in French.

Please note that the Chamber judgments referred to hereunder become final in the circumstances set out in Article 44 § 2 of the Convention: “a) when the parties declare that they will not request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber; or b) three months after the date of the judgment, if reference of the case to the Grand Chamber has not been requested; or c) when the panel of the Grand Chamber rejects the request to refer under Article 43”.

Note on the Importance Level:

According to the explanation available on the Court’s website, the following importance levels are given by the Court:

1 = High importance, Judgments, which the Court considers, make a significant contribution to the development, clarification or modification of its case law, either generally or in relation to a particular state.

2 = Medium importance, Judgments, which do not make a significant contribution to the case law but nevertheless do not merely apply existing case law.

3 = Low importance, Judgments with little legal interest - those applying existing case-law, friendly settlements and striking out judgments (unless these have any particular point of interest).

Each judgment presented in section 1 and 2 is accompanied by the indication of the importance level.

● Right to liberty and security (Art. 5)

ALI SAMATAR AND OTHERS V. FRANCE ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) (Nos. 17110/10 AND 17301/10) AND HASSAN AND OTHERS V. FRANCE ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) (Nos. 46695/10 AND 54588/10) - Importance 2 - 4 December 2014 - Violation of Article 5 §1 - Domestic authorities’ failure to provide sufficient protection against arbitrary deprivation of liberty - Violation of Article 5 §3 - Domestic authorities’ failure to bring the applicants “promptly” before the competent legal authorities at their arrival in France.

The case concerned nine Somali nationals who had been arrested and held by French army, transferred to France and taken into police custody as they were prosecuted for acts of piracy.

Article 5 §1

In the case of Hassan and Others, the Court first noted that there had been an interference with the applicants’ right under Article 5 as they had undergone a lawful arrest or detention for the purpose of bringing them before the competent legal authority. It then observed that such interference had had a legal basis as a Resolution adopted by the United Nations Security Council authorised States to enter territorial waters of Somalia for the purpose of repressing acts of piracy; and because the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea had defined piracy and seizure of pirate ship.

Nevertheless, it found that the applicable law at the relevant time did not include any rule specifying the conditions of deprivation of liberty that could be imposed on the applicants in order to lead them before the competent legal authority. Therefore, the legal system in force did not provide sufficient protection against arbitrary interference with the right to liberty, in breach of Article 5 §1.

Article 5 §3

In both cases, the Court was prepared to agree with domestic authorities that there had been wholly exceptional circumstances that justified the length of the applicants' detention between their arrest and their arrival in France.

However, it observed that the latter had been taken into custody at the arrival, for 48 hours, instead of being immediately brought before an investigating judge. Then, no exceptional circumstances could justify the additional delay in both cases.

Besides, the Court was not convinced by domestic authorities' argument that the applicants' period in police custody had been necessary for the purposes of the investigation because nothing in the Court's case-law could lead to deduce any intention to make available to them a time limit that they could use freely in order to complete the prosecution case. In particular, the purpose of Article 5 §3 was to facilitate the detection of any ill-treatment and to minimise any unjustified interference with the right to liberty for the purpose of protecting individuals.

Accordingly, there had been a violation of Article 5 §3 given that on their arrival in France, the applicants who had already been detained for four days and twenty hours (in the case of Ali Samatar et Others) and six days and sixteen hours (in the case of Hassan and others), had been taken into police custody instead of being brought "promptly" before the competent legal authorities.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that France had to pay to each of the applicants in the case of Hassan and Others EUR 5,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and EUR 7,272.46 to Abdulhai Guelleh Ahmed for costs and expenses. It held that domestic authorities had to pay, in the case of Ali Samatar and Others, EUR 2,000 to each of the applicants in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and for costs and expenses, EUR 9,000 to Abdurahman Ali Samatar, EUR 6,000 jointly to Ismael Ali Samatar, Abdulqader Guled Said, Mohamed Said Hote, Abdullahi Yusuf Hersi and Daher Guled Said, and EUR 3,000 to Abdulqader Guled Said.

- **Right to a fair trial (Art. 6)**

URECHEAN AND PAVLICENCO V. THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA (No. 27756/05 AND 41219/07) - Importance 2 - 2 December 2014 - Violation of Article 6 §1 - Disproportionate restriction of the applicant's right of access to a Court on account of the immunity of the Country's President

The case concerned domestic courts' refusal to examine the applicants' libel action against the President of their country, on account of his immunity

First of all, the Court called the principles established in its previous cases concerning parliamentary immunity to mind. Then, the Court examined whether a fair balance was struck between the competing interests involved, namely between the public's interest in protecting the President's freedom of speech in the exercise of his functions and the applicants' interest in having access to a court. The Court noted that domestic law did not define the limits of the President's immunity, and that domestic courts did not examine whether the impugned statements were made in the exercise of his official duties. As a consequence, the Court considered that the applicants could never sue him for his statement and that the President's immunity was absolute. Furthermore, the applicants did not have other means of countering the accusations against them, the media not giving them airtime to do so.

Therefore, the Court held that there was a breach of Article 6 §1, the President's immunity in this case being a disproportionate restriction on the applicants' right of access to a court.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that the Republic of Moldova was to pay the applicants EUR 3,600 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 5,289.60 for costs and expenses.

HORNCastle AND OTHERS V. THE UNITED KINGDOM (No. 4184/10) - Importance 2 - 16 December 2014
- No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) - No violation of the applicants' defence right despite their inability to cross-examine witnesses

The case concerned four applicants who contested their convictions in two different trials, alleging that the victim's written statement had violated their right to cross-examine witnesses.

The Court first reiterated that domestic law and domestic courts primarily regulate the matter of evidences' admissibility. The Court then underlined that the fairness of the proceeding as a whole has to be considered, combining the right of defence, but also the right of the victims and witnesses.

Applying the principles set out in its previous cases, the Court verified if there was a good reason for the absence of the witness, if the witness statement was "sole or decisive" and if so, whether there were sufficient counterbalancing factors or not.

As to the first two applicants, the Court held that there is no shackle to the testimony admittance, the witness being dead. Then, using the judgments of domestic jurisdictions, the Court held that the witness' statement was decisive but that there had been other incriminating evidences and that they were more significant for the outcome of the case. Lastly, the Court found that there were several counterbalancing factors to compensate the obstacles caused by the statement, such as the option to contest the statement for the applicants or the right appliance of the legal framework by the domestic judge. For all these reasons, the Court concluded that there was no violation of the applicants' defence rights.

As regards the last two applicants, the Court found that the witness, a woman they kidnapped, had a good reason not to attend the hearing. She was indeed too afraid to face again her aggressors.

Furthermore, the Court founded more decisive evidences than the witness statement, such as CCTV footage and phone date. The Court directly concluded that there was no violation of the applicants' defence rights.

Therefore, there was no violation of Article 6 §§1 and 3 (d).

IBRAHIM AND OTHERS V. THE UNITED KINGDOM (Nos. 50541/08, 50571/08, 50573/08, AND 40351/09) - Importance unspecified - 16 December 2014 - No violation of Article 6 §1 and §3 - Fair balance struck by domestic authorities between the importance of the right to legal advice and the urgent need to protect the public

The case concerned the arrest of the applicants, suspected of having directly or indirectly detonated three bombs on the London transport system. They had complained about the delay in providing them access to a lawyer during their interviews and the admission of their statements at trial.

The Court first reiterated that the right to legal advice could be restricted for good cause, referring to compelling reasons. According to the Court, these conditions are met in this case, as there had been an exceptionally serious and imminent threat to public safety.

As regards the first three applicants, the Court observed that domestic law had envisaged the possibility of delayed access in exceptional cases and had struck a fair balance between the importance of the right to legal advice and the urgent need to get information for public protection in such exceptional case. The Court also observed that domestic authorities had carefully applied that legal framework. Indeed, the three applicants had been deprived from access to a lawyer between four and eight hours only while the time limit for delaying legal advice is 48 hours.

In addition, the Court found that there had been other procedural opportunities opened to the applicants in order to challenge the use of their statements and observed that domestic authorities had acted with due diligence while formulating directives to the jury in order to preserve the applicants' right to a fair trial.

Furthermore, those statements were not the unique incriminating evidence against the applicants. Among others, their extremist views; the fact that they had bought enough concentration of hydrogen peroxide to achieve an explosion; and witnesses' statements had constituted other evidence against them.

Concerning the fourth applicant, the Court noted that there was no oppression on him and no coercion as to lead him to incriminate himself. In particular, the latter had attended the police station voluntarily

and had not retracted his statement. Again, the Court found that there had been other incriminating evidence against him, namely videos showing the applicant in the company of one of the bombers and cell site analysis proving that they were in contact.

Then, the Court took those considerations cumulatively and concluded that no undue prejudice had been caused to the applicants' right to a fair trial resulting from the delayed access to a lawyer during their interviews and the admission of their statements at trial.

Therefore, there had been no violation of Article 6 §1 read in conjunction with Article 6 §3 (c) of the Convention.

- **Right to respect for private and family life (Art. 8)**

DUBSKA AND KREJZOVA V. THE CZECH REPUBLIC (Nos. 28859/11 AND 28473/12) - Importance unspecified - 11 December 2014 - No violation of Article 8 - Domestic authorities' wide margin of appreciation in regulation of home births

The case concerned two women who could not give birth at home with the assistance of health professionals because domestic legislation prohibited it.

The Court first observed that there had been an interference with the applicants' right to respect for their private lives because midwives could not assist them to give birth at home. However, the Court found that this interference had been prescribed by domestic law and had served the legitimate aim of health and safety protection for both mother and child. In addition, the Court had to examine the necessity of the interference and held that there was no European consensus on that matter. In fact, given that home birth involve social and economic policy considerations, domestic authorities had a wide margin of appreciation in such circumstances. The Court had been convinced by domestic authorities' position that delivery could lead to unexpected difficulties and, consequently, mothers did not have to tolerate a disproportionate load.

Therefore, there is no violation of Article 8. Nevertheless, the Court underlined the domestic authorities should keep their law on the matter under a constant review.

HANZELKOVI V. THE CZECH REPUBLIC (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 43643/10) - Importance 2 - 11 December 2014 - Violation of Article 8 - Disproportionate interference with the applicants' right on account of domestic authorities' unilateral decision to return a new-born baby to hospital - Violation of Article 13 - Applicants' inability to obtain the annulment of domestic authorities' decision

The case concerned a domestic authorities' interim measure requiring the return of a new-born baby to the hospital immediately after the applicants had gone home, and their inability to challenge it.

Article 8

The Court observed that the return of the applicants' child to hospital after birth, and following a procedure which did not involve one of the parents, had amounted to an interference with their right to a private and family life. Indeed, according to the Court, removing a baby from the care of its mother without her agreement had been an extremely harsh measure. However, the Court admitted that this interference had had a legal basis and had pursued the legitimate aim of protecting the health and rights of others.

Then, it noted that although domestic authorities had a wide margin of appreciation in such issue, they had to establish the risks incurred by the child and had to make sure that his health could be protected by less intrusive measures, before adopting such a measure, but failed to do so. Therefore, the domestic authorities' reasoning set out in the interim measure order had been laconic and only referred to a general risk for the new-born's health instead of giving any specific elements.

The Court also found that domestic authorities had not shown that the parents could not have been consulted beforehand, for example in order to be informed of the possible risks or to sign a declaration refusing care. Besides, no re-assessment of the situation could take place after the doctor's finding that the child was healthy.

As a consequence, it was not convinced that domestic authorities had established the existence of extraordinarily compelling reasons justifying the removal of the baby from the care of his mother, against the wishes of the latter. It then concluded that this serious interference with the applicants'

family life had had disproportionate effects and had overstepped domestic authorities' margin of appreciation.

So, it held that this interference was not necessary in a democratic society, in breach of Article 8.

Article 13

The Court agreed with the applicants that there was no prospect of any possible application for the annulment of the interim measure to be considered prior to the leaving of the hospital.

It then observed that while the applicants went before the Ministry of Justice to obtain reparation, their application had been rejected as premature. Furthermore, regardless of the question of prescription, the application would have been rejected because the interim measure had not been judged as being irregular. Then, in these particular circumstances, the Court considered that even if the application had been introduced on the right time, there had been no prospect of success so that there was no effective remedy, in breach of Article 13.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that the Czech Republic had to pay the applicants EUR 3,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

CHBIHI LOUDOUDI AND OTHERS V. BELGIUM ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) (No. 52265/10) - Importance 2 - 16 December 2014 - No violation of Article 8 – Domestic authorities' legitimate decision to refuse to grant adoption and unlimited residency permit

The case concerned domestic authorities' refusal to grant an application for adoption and for a residence permit of unlimited duration of the applicants' niece.

Concerning the refusal to grant adoption of the applicants' niece, the Court examined whether the child's « best interests » had been taken into consideration. It found that this refusal had been prescribed by domestic law and had pursued the aim of preventing any improper use of adoption and respecting private and family life. The Court was convinced by the domestic authorities' argument that such refusal to grant adoption was in the child's best interests because she would not have the same personal status in both countries and because they still could use the unofficial guardianship procedure. In addition, the applicants failed to explain the disadvantages resulting from that refusal.

Therefore, there is no breach of Article 8.

Concerning the resident status of the applicants' niece, the Court verified whether the procedure had disproportionate consequences on her private life. The Court found that, despite she was deprived of a residence permit for seven months, she appeared to be perfectly integrated and was free to leave the country during her holidays; and that the only obstacle that she faced was her inability to take part in a school trip. In conclusion, Article 8 had not been violated.

- **Freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Art. 9)**

GULER AND UĞUR V. TURKEY ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) - Importance 2 - 2 December 2014 - Violation of Article 9 - Lack of precision and foreseeability of domestic law concerning terrorism propaganda

The case concerned the participation by the applicants to a religious service in their political party's premises, in memory of three members of the PKK, an illegal armed organisation. They were prosecuted for terrorism propaganda thereafter and were sentenced to ten months' imprisonment.

First, the Court held that the applicants' imprisonment was an interference with their rights to freedom to manifest their religion. Then, the Court pointed out that one could not deduct that participation at a religious service would fall within the scope of domestic law about terrorism. Therefore, the interference was not determined by domestic law because it had not met the requirements of foreseeability and clarity. The Court concluded that there was a violation of Article 9.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Turkey was to pay the applicants EUR 7,500 each in respect of non-pecuniary damages.

- **Freedom of assembly and association (Art. 11)**

NAVALNYY AND YASHIN V. RUSSIA (No. 76204/11) - Importance 2 - 4 December 2014 - Violation of Article 11 – Unnecessary and disproportionate police forceful intervention - Violation of Article 6 §1 - Domestic courts’ refusal to examine other evidences than police officers’ testimony - Violation of Article 5 § 1 - Unlawful and arbitrary detention - Violation of Article 3 in conjunction with Article 13 - Inhuman and degrading conditions of detention

The case concerned the arrest, detention and conviction of two political activists known for their opposition to the government, during a protest march.

Article 11 (in the light of Article 10)

The Court first noticed that there was clearly a link between the applicants’ arrest and their participation in the protest and, consequently, an interference with their rights to freedom of assembly and association. The Court recognised that this arrest aimed to maintain public order because the two applicants were not allowed to keep protesting. However, their march being short and peaceful, the Court considered that the police’s forceful intervention was unnecessary and disproportionate, such as their punishment of fifteen days administrative detention.

Therefore, the Court concluded that there had been a violation of Article 11.

Article 6§1

The Court first reiterated that domestic law and domestic courts primarily regulate the matter of evidences admissibility. The Court then underlined that the fairness of the proceeding as a whole has to be considered. In this case, the Court noticed that the domestic courts only based their judgments on police officers’ incriminating testimonies without verifying their statements by calling other witnesses. In addition, the Court held that the domestic courts limited the scope of the case to the applicants’ alleged disobedience, omitting to consider the legality of the police order. Therefore, the Court concluded that there was a breach of Article 6.

Article 5§1

The Court took cognisance of the fact that the applicants’ transfers between several police stations and detention were excessively long. Considering that there was no justification to such delay, the Court found that the applicants’ arrest and detention had been unlawful and arbitrary. In conclusion, Article 5 was violated.

Article 3 in conjunction with Article 13

The Court was aware that the applicants bore bad conditions of detention mainly because of the lack of food during their transfers and the lack of comfort in their cell. The Court considered that it had caused them distress and diminished their dignity. Moreover, the applicants did not have any legal solution to complain about those conditions. The Court found that there had been a violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 3.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Russia had to pay each of the applicants EUR 26,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damages and EUR 2,500 to one of the applicant in respect of costs and expenses.

- **Prohibition of discrimination (Art. 14)**

EMEL BOYRAZ V. TURKEY (No. 61960/08) - Importance 2 - 2 December 2014 - Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8 – Unjustified difference of treatment on grounds of sex regarding access to public sector employment - Violation of Article 6 – Excessive length of proceedings and unfair trial

The case concerned the dismissal of the applicant from public sector, owing to the fact that she did not fulfil the requirements of « being a man » and « having completed military service ». Moreover, the applicant complained that the proceedings in her case had been too long and unfair.

Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8

First, the Court was not convinced by domestic authorities' argument that the right to become a public servant was not guaranteed by the Convention, because this denial has some effects on a person's identity, self-perception and self-respect and consequently, on her private life.

Then the Court observed that such dismissal was an interference with the applicant's right within Article 8. It found that the reasons on which the dismissal was decided had amounted to a clear "difference in treatment" of persons in comparable situation, on grounds of sex. Even if domestic authorities had argued that a woman is not suitable for this post, the Court held that such arguments did not justify enough any difference of treatment between men and women. Consequently, the Court found this interference had not pursued a legitimate aim and constituted discrimination on grounds of sex.

Therefore, there was a breach of Article 14, in conjunction with Article 8.

Article 6

The Court found that the eight-year-proceedings in the applicant's case had been excessively long. In addition, the Court held that domestic jurisdiction's reasoning was inadequate and did not satisfy the conditions of a fair hearing in the applicant's case. Therefore, Article 6 had been violated.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Turkey had to pay the applicant EUR 10,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

● **Article 2 of Protocol No. 4**

BATTISTA V. ITALY ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) (No. 43978/09) - Importance unspecified - 2 December 2014 - Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 - Domestic authorities' failure to examine the proportionality of an automatic and indefinite measure

The case concerned the applicant's inability to obtain a passport or identity card for travel abroad.

The Court first noted that the applicant had been refused a passport or an identity card valid for foreign travel since 2008 given that he had failed to make the maintenance payments ordered by domestic authorities at the time of his divorce.

It then observed that domestic authorities had automatically taken into account the property interests of the applicant's ex-wife and children without considering his personal situation and his ability to pay the ordered amounts.

Moreover, according to the Court, even if the latter went abroad, there were legal means of recovering debts outside national borders. Therefore, the imposition of such indefinite measure was not necessary in a democratic society, in breach of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 of the Convention.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Italy had to pay the applicant EUR 5,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

2. Other judgments issues in the period under observation

You will find in the column “Key Words” of the table below a short description of the topics dealt with in the judgment¹.

For more detailed information, please refer to the cases.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	IMP.	CONCLUSION	KEY WORDS
AZERBAIJAN	18 December 2014	EFENDIYEV (No. 27304/07)	3	Violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d)	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the domestic authorities' failure to ensure the attendance of the key witness whose testimony had been used for the applicant's conviction thus depriving him of the opportunity to have him questioned
BULGARIA	16 December 2014	DIMITCHO DIMITOV (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 57123/08)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (unjustified use of handcuffs)
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment
				Violation of Art. 8	Monitoring of the applicant's correspondence
				No violation of Art. 34	No refusal of the domestic authorities to provide the applicant's representatives with documents relating to his immobilisation
CROATIA	4 December 2014	LONIC (No. 8067/12) POZAIĆ (No. 5901/13)	3	Violation of Art. 13 in conjunction with Art. 3 (concerning the first applicant)	Lack of an effective remedy concerning the applicant's complaint of inadequate conditions of detention
				Violation of Art. 3 (substantive) (concerning the first applicant)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)
				No violation of Art. 3 (concerning the second applicant)	Despite the size of the cells where the applicant had been placed, which had not always been adequate, the conditions of the applicant's detention did not reach the threshold of severity required under Art. 3
				Violation of Art. 6 § 1 (concerning the first applicant)	Unfairness of proceedings resulting from the failure to forward the opinion of the domestic prosecutor to the applicant
				Violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (concerning the first applicant)	Domestic supreme court's failure to ensure the applicant's presence at the appeal hearing

¹ The “Key Words” in the various tables of the RSIF are elaborated under the sole responsibility of the Directorate of Human Rights

GERMANY	18 December 2014	SCHOLER (No. 14212/10)	3	No violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d)	Fairness of proceedings despite the applicant's impossibility to cross-examine the key witnesses in person considering the counterbalancing factors such as the opportunity given to him to submit questions in writing and the cautious evaluation of the reliability of the evidence by the domestic courts
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Fairness of the criminal proceedings given that the police had acted in an essentially passive manner and had not incited the applicant to commit drug offences he would not have committed otherwise
GREECE	11 December 2014	AL.K. (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 63542/11)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, lack of hygiene)
				Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Applicant's living conditions after his release had amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment
		MOHAMAD (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 70586/11)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, lack of hygiene)
				Violation of Art. 3 taken together with Art. 13	Lack of an effective remedy concerning the applicant's complaint of inadequate conditions of detention
LATVIA	2 December 2014	TARANEKS (No. 3082/06)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the domestic courts' failure to properly examine the applicant's plea of entrapment
				Violation of Art. 8	Unlawful interference with the applicant's right to respect for private life concerning the recording of his conversations and the search of his office
	16 December 2014	DMITRIJEVS (No. 49037/09)	3	No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Applicant's imprisonment for 18 days under a more stringent regime without any lawful basis did not reach the threshold of severity required under Art. 3
				Violation of Art. 13	Lack of an effective remedy concerning the applicant's allegation that he had unlawfully served his sentence under a stricter prison regime than the one he was entitled to

LITHUANIA	2 December 2014	ROMANKEVIC (No. 25747/07)	3	No violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	No failure of the domestic authorities to strike a fair balance between the protection of the applicant's possessions and the requirements of the public interest as, after discovering that the property had been transferred erroneously to the applicant, they acted promptly in correcting their mistake
MALTA	11 December 2014	ANTHONY AQUILINA (No. 3851/12)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Domestic authorities' failure to strike a fair balance between the general interests of the community and the protection of the applicant's right of property as the latter was requested to bear most of the social and financial costs of supplying housing accommodation to tenants (lack of procedural safeguards in domestic law achieving a balance between the interests of the tenants and those of the owners)
NORWAY	18 December 2014	N.A. (No. 27473/11)	2	No violation of Art. 6 § 2	Domestic court's reasoning did not contain any statement suggesting expressly or in substance that the applicant's liability to pay compensation could be viewed as amounting to the establishment of criminal guilt on her part as, despite her acquittal on the criminal charges, it was legally feasible to award compensation
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1	No failure of the domestic court to give sufficient reasoning for its decision ordering the applicant to pay compensation
ROMANIA	2 December 2014	COZIANU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 29101/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, poor hygiene)
		CUTEAN (No. 53150/12)	3	Violation of Art. 6	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the domestic courts' failure to hear the applicant and the witnesses directly
RUSSIA	4 December 2014	ALEKSANDR VALERYEVICH KAZAKOV (No. 16412/06)	3	Violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d)	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the domestic authorities' failure to ensure the attendance of the key witness whose testimony had been used for the applicant's conviction thus depriving him of the opportunity to have him questioned
	4 December 2014	KRIKUNOV (No. 13991/05)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Extension of applicant's pre-trial detention on insufficient grounds
	11 December 2014	HROMADKA AND HROMADKOVA (No. 22909/10)	2	Violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities' failure to take the necessary measures in order to enable the applicants to maintain and develop family life with each other

RUSSIA (CONTINUED)	11 December 2014	KHISMATULLIN (No. 33469/06)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill- treatment
				No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Absence of sufficient evidence to confirm the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment in police custody
		FOZIL NAZAROV (No. 74759/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Real risk of ill-treatment in case of the applicant's removal to his country of origin
	18 December 2014	BELENKO (No. 25435/06)	3	No violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	No failure of the relevant State to comply with its substantive positive obligation to safeguard the applicant's daughter's right to life as, in matters such as error of judgment on the part of a health professional or negligent coordination among health professionals in the treatment of a patient, a State cannot be held accountable from the standpoint of its positive obligations under Art. 2
				Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an adequate investigation in order to determine the cause of death of the applicant's daughter in the care of the medical profession
SLOVAKIA	2 December 2014	PETROV (No. 64195/10)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant (absence of legal grounds)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Extension of applicant's pre-trial detention on insufficient grounds
				No violation of Art. 5 § 4	Domestic court's failure to hear the applicant in person had not breached the procedural guarantees inherent to Art. 5 § 4 given that the applicant's complaint relied on similar arguments as those raised in his application for release, that the time between the first decision and its review was relatively short (22 days), that the basis for the applicant's detention remained unchanged and that the examination was made in the absence of both the applicant and the domestic public prosecutor
THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA	16 December 2014	BUZADJI (No. 23755/07)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Extension of applicant's pre-trial detention on insufficient grounds
TURKEY	16 December 2014	MEHMET FIDAN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 64969/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Lack of a prompt and effective criminal investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill- treatment during his arrest and detention in police custody

UKRAINE	11 December 2014	KUSHNIR (No. 42184/09)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, poor hygiene, poor ventilation)
				Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Inadequate medical treatment
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful and unacknowledged detention of the applicant

B. The decision on admissibility

Those decisions are published with a slight delay of two to three weeks on the Court's website. Therefore the decisions listed below cover the period from 1st to 31st of October. Those decisions are selected to provide the NHRs with potentially useful information on the reasons of the inadmissibility of certain applications addressed to the Court and/or on the friendly settlements reached.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	ALLEGED VIOLATION	DECISION
FINLAND	21 October 2014	V.J. v. Finland (No. 14491/13)	Art. 2 and 3 (If expelled to Angola, the life of the applicant would be endangered as no proper treatment would be available for him)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded on Art. 3
CYPRUS	14 October 2014	Tziliivaki and others v. Cyprus (No. 23082/07)	Art. 2 and 8 (Procrastination of the authorities to proceed to the exhumation of the bodies and to give sufficient information to the relatives of the victims), Art. 6 in conjunction with Art. 13 (Lack of an effective remedy)	Partly inadmissible as partly incompatible <i>ratione temporae</i> (concerning claims under Art. 2), misinterpretation (for the claims under Art. 8) and no arguable complaints for the remainder of the complaining (Art. 6 in conjunction with Art. 13)
GERMANY	7 October 2014	Loy v. Germany (No. 15069/08)	Art. 8 and 12 (Inability for the applicant to exercise his right to private life effectively if expelled)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning both the Articles 8 and 12).

C. The communicated cases

The European Court of Human Rights publishes on a weekly basis a list of the communicated cases on its website. These are cases concerning individual applications which are pending before the Court. They are communicated by the Court to the respondent State's Government with a statement of facts, the applicant's complaints and the questions put by the Court to the Government concerned. The decision to communicate a case lies with one of the Court's Chamber which is in charge of the case. A **selection** of those cases is proposed below.

NB: The statements of facts and complaints have been prepared by the Registry (solely in one of the official languages) on the basis of the applicant's submissions. The Court cannot be held responsible for the veracity of the information contained therein.

STATE	DATE OF DECISION TO COMMUNICATE	CASE TITLE	KEY WORDS OF QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE PARTIES
AZERBAIJAN	19 May 2014	<u>HAJIBEYLI</u> (No. 5231/1)	The applicants complain that they were arrested and prosecuted for participating or attempting to participate in peaceful demonstrations while this was their constitutional right and not a criminal offence.
CROATIA	28 May 2014	<u>LJASKAJ</u> (No. 58630/11)	The applicant claims that his house which had been awarded in satisfaction of the creditors' claim was sold for less than 1/5 of its value, which had not been sufficient to satisfy the creditors.
		<u>RADOBULJAC</u> (No. 51000/11)	An advocate claims that his freedom of expression has been violated because he has been fined for contempt of court after expressing his dissatisfaction with a judge's decision.
HUNGARY	21 May 2014	<u>ERMÉNYI</u> (No. 22254/14)	The applicant's mandate of President of the Supreme Court was prematurely terminated upon the entry into force of a law, apparently as a reaction to his criticism and publicly expressed views on judicial reforms. The domestic authorities rejected the applicant's complaint, with the participation of a former Member of Parliament who, before being elected judge of the Constitutional Court, had voted for the impugned law and had taken part in its preparation as the head of the competent Parliamentary Committee.
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	28 May 2014	<u>NEŠKOSKA</u> (No. 60333/13)	The applicant complains about the investigation into her son's death because the judicial authorities didn't investigate all aspects of the incident or attach responsibility to all of the persons concerned.
THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA	19 May 2014	<u>POPOVSKI</u> (No. 58455/13)	Disproportionality of the decision to withdraw the applicant's parental authority on the ground of one unusual event. Failure of the domestic authorities to make efforts to secure the applicant's right to live with her child.

POLAND	26 May 2014	GNIADK (No. 73311/12)	The applicant complains that the doctors responsible for the death of her husband were not punished, because the proceedings before the courts lasted seven years, which led to prescription of the offences.
		KOBIZ (No. 13571/10)	The applicant complains that the preventive measures because of tax fraud have been imposed on him for a too long time, which amounted to a violation of his right to freedom of movement.
ROMANIA	19 May 2014	VOINEA (No. 64020/09)	The applicant was convicted for drug trafficking whereas before the undercover agent asked him to buy drugs, no previous, on-going or envisaged criminal activity in the field of drug trafficking had been suspected.
	20 May 2015	BISERICA EVANGHELICA ROMANA - PAROHIA POENARII BURCHII (No. 44040/06)	The domestic authorities did not acknowledge the applicant's right to use as a burial place a plot of land within the village cemetery because of religious conflicts.
RUSSIA	19 May 2014	V.V. (No. 13817/14)	Discrimination on account of the applicant's health status in the determination of his application for a residence permit.
TURKEY	26 May 2014	MENTES (No. 57818/10)	The applicants complain that despite the fact that they worked 24 hour shifts, only 14 hours of the work was remunerated, which amounted to forced or compulsory labour.

PartOne

§2 - EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF SOCIAL RIGHTS

A. Reclamations and Decisions

1. Reclamations

[No work deemed relevant for the NHRs for the period under observation]

2. Decisions

[No work deemed relevant for the NHRs for the period under observation]

B. Other information

■ Participation of CoE representatives in the Fundamental Rights Conference 2014 focused on migration (08.12.2014)

The EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) dedicated its annual flagship event, the Fundamental Rights Conference (FRC), to the importance of a fundamental rights-based approach to EU migration policy. ([Programme](#) - [Conference Conclusions](#))

§3 - RECOMMENDATIONS & RESOLUTIONS

A. Recommendations

[No work deemed relevant for the NHRs for the period under observation]

B. Resolutions

[No work deemed relevant for the NHRs for the period under observation]

PartOne

§4 - OTHER INFORMATION OF GENERAL IMPORTANCE

A. Information from the Committee of Ministers

[No work deemed relevant for the NHRs for the period under observation]

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly

■ Ensuring comprehensive treatment for children with attention problems (02.12.2014)

In a draft resolution, the PACE's Social Affairs Committee called on Council of Europe member states to address the risk of misdiagnosis of ADHD, by ensuring healthcare professionals are adequately trained in the proper diagnosis and they fully comply with the diagnostic procedures laid down in national and international guidelines. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted draft resolution](#))

■ Protecting the rights to organise, to bargain collectively and to strike (02.12.2014)

In an adopted Resolution, the PACE committee called on Council of Europe member states to take measures to uphold the highest standards of democracy and good governance in the socio-economic sphere. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted draft text](#))

■ Budgetary cuts should not be equality blind (04.12.2014)

Parliamentarians, through an adopted report, called on European governments to promote the participation of vulnerable categories of persons in recovery planning, to step up efforts to combat gender-based discrimination on the labour market, to ensure adequate funding to assistance and protection services for victims of domestic or sexual violence and to give more attention in combating youth unemployment and social exclusion of young people. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted Report](#))

■ Tackling intolerance in Europe with a special focus on Christians (04.12.2014)

In an adopted report, the committee called for measures to ensure the effective enjoyment of the protection of freedom of religion or belief afforded to every individual in Europe. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted Report](#)).

■ Media freedom: some member states do not respect their obligations (04.12.2014)

PACE President called for the end to crimes against journalists who pay with their lives and sacrifice their safety to guarantee us access to information. ([Read more](#) - [Announcement of the Conference](#))

■ PACE committee called for increased student mobility (05.12.2014)

In an adopted report, the PACE Culture Committee called on member states to increase the availability of student funding with a view to increasing student mobility. Furthermore, the committee also called for the improved recognition of learning outcomes. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted Report](#))

■ The suspension of the food aid programme for Syrian refugees is a disaster (05.12.2014)

Following the suspension of the UN food Programme to Syrian refugees, a PACE rapporteur called on the international community to support this programme so it can continue to be financed. ([Read more](#))

■ Memorandum of understanding between Council of Europe and EU: review of implementation (08.12.2014)

In a draft resolution, the PACE Political Affairs committee called on all parties to act speedily and constructively to conclude negotiations and complete the ratification process to enable the EU's rapid accession to the European Convention on Human Rights. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted Report](#))

■ We must redouble our efforts to eliminate corruption, said Anne Brasseur (09.12.2014)

PACE President called on member states to carry out far-reaching reforms so as to address the shortcomings and vulnerability of existing anti-corruption systems. ([Read more](#))

■ Upholding human rights: a national task as well as one for the Strasbourg Court (10.12.2014)

In a draft Resolution, the PACE committee has congratulated the European Court of Human Rights on reducing its backlog of cases and becoming more efficient, but urged states to match this progress by “reinforcing the principle of subsidiarity”. Thus, the PACE committee called on national parliaments to use their potential to oversee Convention standards by screening new laws for human rights compatibility and by pressing governments to abide by the Court’s ruling. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted Report](#)).

■ Threats to the rule of law in Council of Europe member states (10.12.2014)

In a draft Resolution, the committee urged member, observer and applicant states to ensure that the judiciary is fully independent to resist politically-motivated prosecutions. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted Report](#))

■ “Stop using language which discriminates against migrants” (17.12. 2014)

PACE President called on member states to display more solidarity with front-line countries and to work together towards immigrants’ integration and inclusion. Moreover, PACE President expressed her willingness to support the PICUM campaign ‘words matter’ and called on member states to use more accurate and neutral terms when referring to immigrants. ([Read more](#))

■ Let’s overcome hurdles to ensure EU accedes to the Human Rights Convention (18.12.2014)

The CJEU made public in its opinion that the proposed arrangements for the EU’s accession to the European Convention on Human Rights are not compatible with the EU law. Thus, the PACE President called on the negotiators to study this opinion and set to work to overcome the legal hurdles identified by the Court of Justice of the EU. ([Read more](#))

C. Information for the Commissioner for Human Rights

■ Do not switch human rights off (08.12.2014)

The Commissioner released a report on the application of the rule of law to the internet and the wider digital world. He recalled that content restrictions on the internet can take place only on the basis of clear, precise, accessible and foreseeable legal rules and with thorough judicial oversight. Furthermore, he called on states to have their data routed and stored solely through local routers, cables and clouds. ([Read more](#) - [The rule of law on the Internet and in the wider digital world](#))

■ Roma inclusion is mission possible (10.12.2014)

The Commissioner, in a human rights comment, called on national and local authorities to foster a more positive image of the Roma and develop constructive, long-term and Roma-led initiatives to end their exclusion. ([Read more](#))

D. Information from the monitoring mechanisms

■ ECRI: “Sami - the People, their Culture and Languages and the Council of Europe” (04.12.2014)

Members of the ECRI, the Advisory Committee on the FCNM and the Committee of Experts of the ECRML brought their expertise together in Inari (Finland) to discuss together with Sami representatives from Finland, Norway, Sweden how the Council of Europe human rights monitoring mechanisms can address the question of “Sami – the People, their Culture and Languages and the Council of Europe” ([More](#) - [Programme](#)).

■ GRETA: Re-election of two GRETA members and other decisions taken by the Committee of the Parties (05.12.2014)

At its 15th meeting (5 December 2014), the Committee of the Parties to the Convention re-elected two members of the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA) for a second term of office: Mr Helmut Sax (Austria) and Mr Jan van Dijk (Netherlands). Their new term of office will run from 1 January 2015 to 31 December 2018 ([More](#)).

■ FCNM: Advisory Committee, adoption of three opinions and election of the new bureau (04.12.2014)

The Advisory Committee on the FCNM adopted three country-specific opinions under the implementation of this convention in States Parties. Fourth cycle Opinions on Spain and the Slovak Republic were adopted on 3 December 2014, and the third cycle Opinion on Portugal was adopted on 4 December 2014. The new bureau of the Advisory Committee is as follows: Mr Francesco PALERMO, President, Ms Petra ROTER, 1st Vice-President, Ms Ivana JELIĆ, 2nd Vice-President.

■ GRECO: Statement by Marin Mrčela, President of the Group of States against Corruption, on the occasion of International Anti-corruption Day (09.12.2014)

"Rarely a day goes by without a corruption scandal hitting the headlines in one of our 49 member states. Ordinary citizens of both our old and no longer so young democracies often face corruption in their daily lives, falling victim to graft and abuse of position in their contacts with public services, including health and education professionals and even judges and prosecutors" ([Read more](#)).

PartTwo

INFORMATION BY COUNTRY

This part presents a selection of information, which is deemed to be mainly relevant for only one country.

Please, refer to the index above (p.3) to find the country you are interested in. Only countries concerned by at least one piece of information issued during the period under observation are listed below.

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Recommendation of the Committee of the Parties (05.12.2014)

[Read the Recommendation.](#)

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ FCNM: State Report, 4th cycle (02.12.2014)

[Read the State Report.](#)

■ GRECO: Second Compliance Report (16.12.2014)

[Read the report.](#)

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Committee's second evaluation visit to Austria (15.12.2014)

A delegation of the GRETA carried out an evaluation visit to Austria from 9 to 12 December 2014. The visit provided an opportunity to assess progress in the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings since the first evaluation by GRETA in 2010. ([GRETA report on Austria](#)) ([More](#))

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ PACE: Deep concern at the detention of Azerbaijani journalist Khadija Ismayilova (05.12.2014)

PACE President called on the authorities of Azerbaijan to ensure that the standards of the Convention are respected in any judicial and legal proceedings against Ms Ismayilova as well as against other human rights activists. ([Read more](#))

■ PACE: Pressure on Ilgar Mammadov's lawyer was unacceptable (10.12.2014)

PACE President deplored the fact that the lawyer of Azerbaijani civil society activist, Ilgar Mammadov, has had his license to practice suspended. Thus, the PACE President called on the Azerbaijan authorities to free Mr Mammadov without further delay and to refrain from targeting civil rights activists and their lawyers. ([Read more](#))

Belgium

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Firoz Muneer (No. 56005/10)	11 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)255	Examination closed
M.D. (No. 56028/10)	14 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)255	Examination closed
M.S.S. (No. 30696/09)	21 January 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)272	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

Bosnia and Herzegovina

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ MONEYVAL: The Committee issued a revised public statement on Bosnia and Herzegovina (12.12.2014)

The Council of Europe's anti-money laundering body MONEYVAL considered progress by Bosnia and Herzegovina under Step 3 of its Compliance Enhancing Procedures at its 46th plenary meeting (8-12 December). MONEYVAL conducted its 4th assessment visit to Bosnia and Herzegovina from 18 to 29 November 2014. Exceptionally, the emerging findings of the assessment team were shared with the 46th plenary. The evaluation report will now be prepared, with a view to its adoption in September 2015 ([Read the statement](#)).

Bulgaria

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Zaharievi (No. 22627/03)	26 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)256	Examination closed
Zhelyazkov (No.11332/04)	9 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)257	Examination closed
Petrov (No. 15197/02)	22 August 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Dimitar Vasilev (No. 10302/05)	10 April 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Koriyski (No. 19257/03)	26 February 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Mondeshki (No. 36801/03)	22 January 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Oreshkov (No. 11932/04)	6 June 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Petkov (No. 1399/04)	9 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Popov Konstantin (No. 15035/03)	25 June 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Radkov (No. 27795/03)	22 April 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Tsonev Tsonyo (No. 33726/03)	1 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Vuldzev (No. 6113/08)	18 December 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)258	Examination closed
Aliykov (No. 333/04)	3 March 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)259	Examination closed
Stoyanov (No. 39206/07)	30 April 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)259	Examination closed
Ivan Stoyanov Vasilev (No. 7963/05)	4 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)260	Examination closed
Petko Petkov (No. 2834/06)	19 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)261	Examination closed
Nicolay Dimitrov (No.2) (No. 30544/06)	8 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)286	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ CPT: Publication of a report on Cyprus (09.12.2014)

The CPT has published the report on its sixth visit to Cyprus, which took place in September/October 2013, together with the response of the Cypriot authorities ([Read more](#)).

■ GRETA: Committee's second evaluation round visit to Cyprus (15.12.2014)

A delegation of the Council of Europe's Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA) carried out an evaluation visit to Cyprus from 8 to 11 December 2014. The visit provided an opportunity to assess progress in the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings since the first evaluation visit by GRETA in 2010 ([GRETA report on Cyprus](#)) ([Read more](#)).

■ FCNM: Visit of the Advisory Committee on the FCNM (15.12.2014)

A delegation of the FCNM visited Cyprus from 15-17 December 2014 in the context of the monitoring of the monitoring of the implementation of this Convention ([More](#)).

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ ECRI: Preparation of a report on Czech Republic (02.12.2014)

A delegation of the ECRI visited the Czech Republic from 24 to 28 November 2014 as the first step in the preparation of a monitoring report. During its visit, ECRI's delegation gathered information on legislation, hate speech, violence, integration policies, LGBT issues and other topics ([Read more](#)).

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
<u>Streltsov</u> (No. 25662/10)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)262</u>	Examination closed
<u>Saarekallas Oü</u> (No. 11548/04)	8 February 2008	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)287</u>	Examination closed
<u>Missenjoy</u> (No. 43276/06)	29 April 2009	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)287</u>	Examination closed
<u>Raudsepp</u> (No. 54191/07)	8 February 2012	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)287</u>	Examination closed
<u>Kiisa</u> (No. 16587/10+)	13 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)287</u>	Examination closed
<u>Kiisa</u> (No. 72999/10)	13 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)287</u>	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Vassis and Others (No.62736/09)	27 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)288	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ PACE: 'The Council of Europe is more important than ever', said Anne Brasseur (11.12.2014)

At the end of her three-day visit to France, the PACE President called for broad mobilisation of all democratic political forces and all players in society, in response to the rise in populism and intolerance. Furthermore, the PACE President called on France and all member states to continue providing the Council of Europe with the political and financial support which organisation needs so that it can perform its tasks effectively and ensure compliance with Council of Europe standards in all member states. ([Read more](#) - [Announcement of the visit](#))

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Zviad Mazmishvili (No. 35220/09)	24 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)263	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ PACE: PACE monitor called for further reforms in Georgia (10.12.2014)

Monitoring co-rapporteur for Georgia, expressed satisfaction at the reform of the judiciary in the country, but called for comprehensive reforms of the Prosecution Service and law enforcement agencies. ([Read more](#))

■ CPT: Committee's visit to Georgia (16.12.2014)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a visit to Georgia from 1 to 11 December 2014. The visit was part of the CPT's programme of periodic visits for 2014 ([Read more](#)).

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Schüth (No. 1620/03)	28 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)264	Examination closed
Gäfigen (No. 22978/05)	1 June 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)289	Examination closed
M. (No. 19359/04)	10 May 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
B. (No. 61272/09)	19 July 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
G. (No. 65210/09)	7 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
Glien (No. 7345/12)	28 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
Haidn (No. 6587/09)	13 April 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
Jendrowiak (No. 30060/04)	14 July 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
K. (No. 61827/09)	7 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
Kallweit (No. 17792/07)	13 April 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
Kronfeldner (No. 21906/09)	19 April 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
Mautes (No. 20008/07)	13 April 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
O.H. (No. 4646/08)	24 February 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
S. (No. 3300/10)	28 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed
Schummer (I and II) (No. 27360/04+)	13 April 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)290	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ Commissioner: Progress needed on media freedom, anti-discrimination measures and migrants' rights in Hungary (16.12.2014)

The Commissioner released a report based on the findings of his July visit to Hungary. He called on Hungarian authorities to ensure media freedom, to combat widespread intolerance and discrimination, and to improve the protection of the human rights of migrants. ([Read more](#) - [Read the report on the visit to Hungary](#) - [Read the response of Hungarian Authorities to the report](#))

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Recommendation of the Committee of the Parties (05.12.2014)

[Read the Recommendation.](#)

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
A, B and C (No. 25579/05)	16 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)273	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Recommendation of the Committee of the Parties (05.12.2014)

[Read the Recommendation.](#)

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ PACE: Rapporteur called to follow up on PACE and Council of Europe recommendations (10.12.2014)

A PACE rapporteur on the situation in Kosovo, called on the Kosovo authorities to actively implement PACE resolutions and to follow up on the recommendations made by Council of Europe monitoring bodies. ([Read more](#) - [PACE Resolution 1912](#) - [Recommendation 2006](#) - [Committee of Ministers Reply](#))

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Round-table to support anti-trafficking efforts in Latvia (10.12.2014)

A round-table meeting on the follow-up to be given to GRETA's first report and the Committee of the Parties' recommendation on the implementation of the Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Latvia took place in Riga on 10 December 2014 ([More - GRETA's Report and the Committee of the Parties Recommendation](#)).

Lithuania

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Sulcas (No. 35624/04)	5 April 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Aleksa (No. 27576/05)	21 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Balciunas and Zuravliovas (No. 34575/05)	26 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Butkevicius (No. 23369/06)	17 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Cetvertakas and Others (No. 16013/02)	20 April 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Igarienė and Petrauskienė (No. 26892/05)	21 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Impar LTD. (No. 13102/04)	5 April 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Kravtas (No. 12717/06)	18 April 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Maneikis (No. 21987/07)	18 January 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Naugzemys (No. 17997/04)	16 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Padalevicius (No. 12278/03)	7 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Rikoma LTD (No. 9668/06)	18 January 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Stasevicius (No. 43222/04)	18 January 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Vorona and Voronov (No. 22906/04)	7 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed
Zabulėnas (No. 44438/04)	18 January 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)291	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
<u>M.D. and Others</u> (No. 64791/10)	17 October 2012	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)265</u>	Examination closed
<u>Bezzina Wettinger and Others</u> (No. 15091/06)	8 July 2008	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)292</u>	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Navone and Others (No. 62880/11+)	24 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)266	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ PACE: The committee proposed closing the monitoring procedure for Montenegro and engaging in post-monitoring dialogue (11.12.2014)

The parliamentarians underlined that Montenegro has “made great progress in fulfilling its commitments and obligations” and shown willingness to continue the reform process in the context of the EU accession negotiations. Nevertheless, the committee called on the authorities to complete a series of reforms concerning the electoral process, the independence of the judiciary, the fight against corruption and organised crime, and the situation of the media. ([Read more](#) - [Draft Resolution adopted](#))

Netherlands

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
G.R. (No. 22251/07)	10 April 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)293	Examination closed
Morsink (No. 48865/99)	10 November 2004	CM/ResDH(2014)294	Examination closed
Brand (No. 49902/99)	10 November 2004	CM/ResDH(2014)294	Examination closed
Nelissen (No. 6051/07)	5 July 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)294	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ GRECO: Addendum to the Second Compliance report (15.12.2014)

[Read more.](#)

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Chuchla (No. 41950/11)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Cyran (No. 37476/04)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Dabek (No. 31175/04)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Drzewieccy (No. 19974/12)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Dudek (No. 42956/04)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Geszeke (No. 65626/10)	9 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Gumna (No. 17901/05)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Jasek (No. 28861/04)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Kielb (No. 28958/05)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Kielb (No. 43110/04)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Kipa (No. 40175/04)	9 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Kostur (No. 37814/04)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Krempa (No. 10844/05)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Krol (No. 38252/05)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Kurczyk (No. 3721/05)	9 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Lizewska (No. 32612/05)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed
Marszalek (No. 32137/04)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)267	Examination closed

<u>Marzec</u> (No. 37495/04)	9 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Maziarz</u> (No. 37833/04)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Milos</u> (No. 21671/05)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Orlowski</u> (No. 2559/11)	4 February 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Osmola</u> (No. 26578/05)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Pawlowski</u> (No. 5724/11)	9 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Piecuch</u> (No. 61730/10)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Pieta</u> (No. 15218/05)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Pikul</u> (No. 7398/05)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Podkanski</u> (No. 70142/10)	9 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Pogoda</u> (No. 22167/05)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Przepiora</u> (No. 41233/05)	9 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Rademacher</u> (No. 54075/11)	18 June 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Rafacz</u> (No. 43802/09)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Ryniewicz</u> (No. 3772/05)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Seweryn</u> (No. 39453/09)	21 May 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Stecyk</u> (No. 43607/04)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Suchecki</u> (No. 26389/12)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Wojcik</u> (No. 27703/05)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Zaremba</u> (No. 44317/04)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Zawadzka</u> (No. 29183/06)	2 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Zielinski</u> (No. 24810/11)	21 May 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed

<u>Ziobro</u> (No. 8594/05)	9 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)267</u>	Examination closed
<u>Trzaska Group</u> (No. 25792/94)	11 July 2000	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)268</u>	Examination closed
<u>Pawlik</u> (No. 11638/02)	19 September 2007	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)295</u>	Examination closed
<u>P.P.</u> (No. 8677/03)	8 April 2008	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)295</u>	Examination closed
<u>Stochlak</u> (No. 38273/02)	22 December 2009	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)295</u>	Examination closed
<u>Dabrowska</u> (No. 34568/08)	2 May 2010	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)295</u>	Examination closed
<u>Z.</u> (No. 34694/06)	20 July 2010	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)295</u>	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
<u>Draculet and 84 other cases</u> (No. 20294/02)	5 May 2009	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)274</u>	Examination closed
<u>Irinel Popa and Others</u> (No. 6289/03+)	1 March 2010	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)296</u>	Examination closed
<u>Cioinea</u> (No. 17009/03)	14 February 2012	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)296</u>	Examination closed
<u>Hermeziu</u> (No. 13859/03)	17 April 2012	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)296</u>	Examination closed
<u>Emelian-George Igna</u> (No. 21249/05)	26 February 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)296</u>	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

Russian Federation

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ PACE: Harassment of PACE Human Rights Prize winner needed urgent investigation (16.12.2014)

The Chair of the PACE Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights denounced the latest intimidation and harassment of prominent human rights defenders in Chechnya. In this connection, he called upon the Russian authorities to ensure a prompt, full and effective investigation into these incidents. ([Read more](#))

■ CPT: Committee's visit to the Russian Federation (03.12.2014)

A delegation of the CPT carried out an ad hoc visit to the Russian Federation from 24 November to 1 December 2014 ([Read more](#)).

■ FCNM: State Report, 4th cycle (due on 01.12.2014)

No more information available

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ CPT: Publication of a report on San Marino (11.12.2014)

The CPT published the report on its January/February 2013 visit to San Marino, together with the response of the San Marino authorities.

During the visit, the CPT delegation paid particular attention to conditions of detention at San Marino Prison, safeguards for persons detained by law enforcement agencies and psychiatric patients subjected to “compulsory medical treatment” (TSO). The delegation also visited two homes for the elderly ([Read more](#)).

■ FCNM: State Report, 4th cycle (due on 01.12.2014)

No more information available

Slovak Republic

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Committee's second evaluation visit to the Slovak Republic (01.12.2014)

A delegation of the GRETA carried out a second evaluation visit to the Slovak Republic from 25 to 28 November 2014 ([More](#)).

■ FCNM: Advisory Committee Opinion, 4th cycle (03.12.2014)

Restricted

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ FCNM: Advisory Committee Opinion, 4th cycle (03.12.2014)

Restricted

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ GRECO: Interim Compliance report (15.12.2014)

[Read the report.](#)

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Nada (No. 10593/08)	12 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)297	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
<u>Akgün</u> (No. 35595/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Altunkara</u> (No. 10321/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Anli</u> (No. 2125/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Bay</u> (No. 45429/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Bircan</u> (No. 36983/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Boyras</u> (No. 13701/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Camdere</u> (No. 6227/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Cankurt</u> (No. 9590/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Colak</u> (No. 2431/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Demirci</u> (No. 9344/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Erdal</u> (No. 32852/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Erkenci</u> (No. 12602/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Izzettin Hedekoglu</u> (No. 62876/12)	15 April 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Ince</u> (No. 24352/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Kurnaz</u> (No. 9583/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Kuyumcu</u> (No. 21884/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Metin</u> (No. 13602/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Tasdelen</u> (No. 15245/12)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed
<u>Ugur</u> (No. 44400/09)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)269</u>	Examination closed

Yesilirmak (No. 45504/12)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)269	Examination closed
Oguz Yildirim (No. 14061/12)	15 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)269	Examination closed
Yilmaz (No. 13592/12)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)269	Examination closed
Ormanci and Others (No. 43647/98)	21 March 2005	CM/ResDH(2014)298	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ PACE Rapporteur expressed concern after the wave of arrests in Turkey (17.12.2014)

PACE Rapporteur on post-monitoring dialogue with Turkey expressed her “profound concern” after the wave of arrests that took place in Turkey, including arrests of journalists. Thus, the PACE rapporteur called on the Minister for Justice to ensure respect for the rule of law and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of the press. ([Read more - Information note by the rapporteur](#))

■ Commissioner for Human Rights concerned about arrest of journalists in Turkey (15.12.2014)

The Commissioner called on the authorities to stop the crackdown on press freedom and to act in compliance with the rule of law and human rights. ([Read more](#))

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Novoseletskiy (No. 47148/99)	22 May 2005	CM/ResDH(2014)270	Examination closed
Oleksandr Volkov (No. 21722/11)	27 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)275	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

■ PACE: Conditions in the separatist-controlled areas made return of refugees to Ukraine impossible (11.12.2014)

The rapporteur for the PACE on the humanitarian situation of Ukrainian refugees and displaced persons recalled that the humanitarian situation, whether in Ukraine or in Russia, cannot be resolved without a complete, durable ceasefire. ([Read more](#) - [PACE Rapporteur](#))

■ Commissioner: Conflict in eastern Ukraine has dire impact on human rights (08.12.2014)

The Commissioner expressed his serious concern at the apparent devastating effects of the armed conflict in eastern Ukraine on the human rights of the population. He underlined that effective investigations should be conducted and he called on the Ukrainian authorities to cooperate fully with the international Advisory Panel. Moreover, the Commissioner called on the national authorities to develop a detailed plan for the implementation of the new IDP law. Finally, the Commissioner encouraged the Ukrainian authorities to adopt a flexible approach in paying pensions to persons travelling from the conflict areas and to work in close cooperation with international organisations and humanitarian groups to find a solution and to reach people in need. ([Read More](#))

■ Commissioner: eastern Ukraine - the humanity behind the headlines (18.12.2014)

The Commissioner called on the government in Kyiv, aid organisations and the international community to work together in order to address the humanitarian crisis created by the fighting in the east. ([Read more](#) - [Visit to Ukraine by Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights](#))

■ GRETA: Recommendation of the Committee of the Parties (05.12.2014)

[Read the recommendation.](#)

United Kingdom

A. Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Al-Jedda (No. 27021/08)	7 July 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)271	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]

C. Other information

[No work deemed relevant for NHRs during the period under observation]