



REGULAR SELECTIVE INFORMATION FLOW

for the attention of the National Human Rights Structures

Issue#130

[1 – 30 May 2015]

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.13)

B. Decisions on admissibility (p.18)

C. Communicated cases (p.18)

§2 - European Committee of Social Rights (p.21)

A. Resolutions & Decisions (p.21)

B. Other information (p.21)

§3 - Recommendations & Resolutions (p.22)

A. Recommendations (p.22)

B. Resolutions (p.22)

§4 - Other information of general importance (p.24)

A. Information from the Committee of Ministers (p.24)

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly (p.24)

C. Information from the Commissioner of Human Rights (p.25)

D. Information from the Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms (p.25)

PART II - INFORMATION BY COUNTRY (p.26)

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 Valentine Decoen, Léa Guémené, Camille Joly, Pavlos Aimilios Marinatos, Quentin Michael, Clara Michel, Guillaume Verdier and Manon Wagner under the supervision of Laure Clément-Wilz, Ph.D, European Law Associate Professor.

Index by Country

ALBANIA, 15	MOLDOVA, 38
AZERBAIJAN, 3, 4, 24	MONTENEGRO, 39
BELGIUM, 8	NORWAY, 40
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, 25	POLAND, 15, 41
BULGARIA, 11, 15, 26 , 27	ROMANIA, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 42
CROATIA, 8, 15, 28 , 29	RUSSIA, 12, 17, 44
CYPRUS, 30	SERBIA, 45
CZECH REPUBLIC, 31	SLOVAK REPUBLIC, 46
FINLAND, 32	SLOVENIA, 5, 6, 13
FRANCE, 1, 2, 8, 33	SPAIN, 13
GEORGIA, 4, 5, 9, 34	SWITZERLAND, 47
GERMANY, 35	THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA, 13, 48
GREECE, 18	TURKEY, 14, 20, 49
HUNGARY, 16, 36	UKRAINE, 51
ITALY, 37	UNITED KINGDOM, 14, 17, 52
LATVIA, 16	

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 (1-30 May 2015) 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 NHRs

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 NHRs. 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.

- **III-treatment / Conditions of detention / Deportation (Art. 3)**

[EMIN HUSEYNOV V. AZERBAIJAN](#) (No. 59135/09) – Importance 2 – 7 May 2015 – Violation of Article 3 – Domestic authorities’ liability for inhuman or degrading treatment during the applicant’s detention – Violation of Article 5 § 1 – Unlawful detention of the applicant – Violation of Article 11 – Unlawful breaking up of a gathering

The case concerned the applicant’s complaint about the condition of his arrest and detention after he attended a private party in a café to celebrate Che Guevara’s birthday, together with a lack of investigation concerning this detention. The applicant alleged that he had been ill-treated, threatened and later admitted to hospital. The domestic authorities refused to institute criminal proceedings, putting forward the fact that there was no proof to his allegations. When he became aware of this decision nine months later, the applicant lodged a criminal complaint, which was dismissed.

Article 3

The Court recalled that when an individual was in good health when taken into police custody but injured at the time of release, the domestic authorities needed to offer a plausible explanation of how the injuries had occurred.

In this case, the forensic medical expert made a different diagnosis to the doctor who had admitted the applicant to hospital, with no explanation neither concerning this difference nor concerning the applicant's unconscious state. Moreover, the expert was part of the same police station where the facts took place, which led the Court to have doubt about the impartiality of the domestic authorities' investigation.

The Court therefore concluded that there had been no effective investigation of the applicant's allegation of ill-treatment, in further violation of article 3.

Article 5 §1

The applicant who was a journalist was arrested while he was attending a gathering in a café. He had neither committed an offence nor had been arrested to prevent him from committing an offence. The domestic authorities claimed that the applicant was taken to the police station to confirm his identity but could not produce any proof that he failed to disclose his identity at the café.

Therefore the Court found that the applicant's arrest and detention had been arbitrary and unlawful, in violation of Article 5 § 1.

Article 11

The domestic authorities claimed that the police had gone to the café following a complaint from neighbours but failed to produce any evidence or proof that the police had received a complaint. The domestic law states that no official authorisation is required for a gathering in a private establishment. However, the domestic authorities intervened to interrupt an unauthorised gathering and identify its participants.

The Court found that there had been no legal basis for the breaking up of a peaceful event in a privately owned café and consequently held that the police dispersal of the party had been unjustified, in violation of Article 11.

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The Court held that Azerbaijan was to pay the applicant EUR 15,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 5,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

IDENTOBA AND OTHERS V. GEORGIA (No. 73235/12) - Importance 2 - 12 May 2015 - Violation of Article 3 in conjunction with Article 14 - Domestic authorities' failure to protect participants to a demonstration against Homophobia - Violation of Article 11 in conjunction with Article 14 - Domestic authorities' failure to guarantee a peaceful demonstration

The case concerned the violence perpetrated by private individuals during a peaceful demonstration to mark the International Day against Homophobia. The applicants, composed of the NGO that organised the march and some of the participants especially pointed out the lack of police protection during the demonstration and domestic authorities' failure to investigate the incident.

Article 3 in conjunction with Article 14

First, the Court took the view that domestic authorities' duty to prevent hatred-motivated violence, as well as to investigate the existence of a possible link between a discriminatory motive and the act of violence can fall under the procedural aspect of Article 3 of the Convention, but may also be seen to form part of the authorities' positive responsibilities under Article 14 of the Convention to secure the fundamental value enshrined in Article 3 without discrimination.

Then, the Court examined whether the attack on the applicants reached the minimum threshold of severity under Article 3. It reiterated that the assessment of this minimum depends on all the circumstances of the case. Bearing in mind the various reports on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people in this country, the Court acknowledged that the community finds itself in a precarious position. The Court noted that the homophobic connotation of the counter-demonstrators in this case had been evident, due to their speech, their acts of destruction of LGBT flags and posters and their attempt to threaten the applicants and other demonstrators with serious harm. The Court thus considered that the applicants must have felt fear and insecurity severe enough to reach the threshold to fall within the remit of Article 3.

Then, it examined whether domestic authorities provided due protection to the applicants. The Court observed that the municipal and police authorities had been informed well in advance of the LGBT community's intention to hold a march and that they had been specifically requested to protect the marchers against foreseeable protests by people with homophobic views. In the Court's view, the authorities thus knew or ought to have known of the risks surrounding that event, and they had therefore been under an obligation to provide protection. However, only a limited number of police officers had initially been deployed and they did not focus on restraining the most aggressive counter-demonstrators with the aim of allowing the peaceful demonstration to proceed. The Court therefore considered that the authorities had failed to provide adequate protection to the applicants.

As regards the investigation into those events, the Court noted that domestic authorities had inexplicably narrowed the scope of the investigation and had opened two separate cases concerning only the physical injuries inflicted on two of the applicants. Even in those cases no significant progress had been made for over two years. More importantly, the domestic criminal legislation directly provided that discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation should be treated as an aggravating circumstance in the commission of an offence. The Court therefore considered that it was essential for domestic authorities to conduct the investigation in that specific context.

In the light of these considerations, the Court concluded that there had been a violation of Article 3 in conjunction with Article 14.

Article 11 in conjunction with Article 14

Given that the facts of the present case fall within the ambit of Article 11 of the Convention, and the applicants' claim that the breach of their right to freedom of peaceful assembly had discriminatory overtones, the Court considered that Article 14 is similarly applicable in the present case.

The Court noted that it was undisputed between the parties that the disruption of the peaceful march had constituted an interference with the applicants' rights under Article 11. Taking into account domestic authorities' lack of preparation that the Court observed previously, it considered that domestic authorities had failed to ensure that the march to mark the International Day against Homophobia could be held peacefully by sufficiently containing homophobic and violent counter-demonstrators. There had accordingly been a violation of Article 11 in conjunction with Article 14.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Georgia was to pay to the 13 applicants who had participated in the march between EUR 2,000 and EUR 4,000 each, and to the NGO Identoba EUR 1,500 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

Y. v. SLOVENIA (No 41107/10) - Importance 1 - 28 May 2015 - Violation of Article 3 - Domestic authorities' failure to provide an adequate delay of the proceedings - Violation of Article 8 - Domestic authorities' failure to strike a fair balance between the interests of the defence and the respect of the applicant's personal integrity

The case concerned the applicant's complaint about the criminal proceedings brought against a family friend, whom she accused of repeatedly sexually assaulting her while she was a minor. She particularly complained that the judicial proceedings had been unreasonably delayed - having lasted seven years between the lodging of her complaint and the pronouncement of the first-instance judgment -, and that it contributed to a breach of her personal integrity because she had been

traumatised by having been cross-examined by the defendant himself during two of the hearings in her case.

Article 3

The Court first recalled that member states have a positive obligation to investigate and prosecute cases of sexual abuse. As regards the Convention requirements relating to the effectiveness of an investigation, the Court held that the member state should in principle be capable of leading to the establishment of the facts of the case and to the identification and punishment of those responsible. The Court also considered that the promptness of domestic authorities' reaction to the complaints was an important factor. In this case, the Court noted with concern that the proceedings were marked by a number of longer periods of complete inactivity and that there were several adjournments before the first hearing. While it was impossible to speculate whether the length of the proceedings had prejudiced its outcome, the Court found that such a delay could not be reconciled with the requirements of promptness. There had accordingly been a violation of domestic authorities' procedural obligations under Article 3.

Article 8

Having regard to the fact that the applicant's testimony at the trial constituted the only direct evidence in the case and the fact that the other evidence was conflicting, it was in the interest of a fair trial that the defence be provided with an opportunity to cross-examine the applicant, who was moreover an adult at the time of the hearings. Nevertheless the Court had to determine whether a fair balance had been struck between her personal integrity and the rights of the defence.

First, the Court held that a direct confrontation in this case involved a risk of further traumatising on the victim. The Court also noted that her questioning had stretched over four hearings, held over seven months. It also observed the nature of the cross-examination and noted that some of the defendant's questions and remarks had aimed not only to challenge her credibility but also to degrade her character. In the Court's view, such offensive insinuations exceeded the limits of what could be tolerated for the purpose of mounting an effective defence.

Then, as the applicant asserted that she had previously consulted the defendant's lawyer, the Court held that the information the lawyer might have received from her should not have been used to benefit a person with adverse interests in the proceedings. As under domestic law there were no statutory grounds for dismissing a legal representative in the situation at hand, the Court therefore found that it did not take sufficient account of the applicant's interests.

Finally, as regards the gynaecological consultation conducted in the course of the investigation, the Court observed that the doctor had exceeded the scope of his task.

Taking into account the cumulative effects of the shortcomings of the investigation and the trial, the Court found that domestic authorities had failed to provide the applicant with the necessary protection. There had accordingly been a violation of Article 8.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Slovenia was to pay the applicant EUR 9,500) in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 4,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

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

GREEK-CATHOLIC PARISH OF LUPENI AND OTHERS V. ROMANIA ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) No. 76943/11 – Importance 2 – 19 May 2015 – No Violation of Article 6 §1 (right to a fair hearing) – No evidence that the application of the special law obstructed the applicants' right to a fair hearing – Violation of article 6 §1 (length of proceedings) – Domestic authorities' liability for the slowness of the procedure – No violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 6 §1 – Proportionate decision to adopt the relevant criterion

The case concerned the restitution of places of worship belonging to the Greek-Catholic Church which were transferred to the Orthodox Church under the totalitarian regime, and more specifically the question of the application of a special law to determine the legal status of such property.

After being dissolved and re-established, the applicant's parish claimed for the restitution of his place of worship. The applicants filed applications before several domestic courts but were dismissed on the grounds of a legislation specifying that the legal status of property which had belonged to the Greek-Catholic Church (the "special law") would be determined by joint commissions made up of representatives of both denominations, who were to take account of the "wishes of the adherents of the communities in possession of these properties".

Article 6 §1

The applicants argued that the criterion of the "wishes of the adherents of the communities in possession of these properties" imposed a precedence order, which undermined their right of access to a court. However, the Court observed that the domestic court had justified the application of this criterion laid down in the special law. Moreover, the examination of the case had been complete and careful. The mere fact that the applicants considered the criterion laid down in the special law unfair was insufficient to render their right of access to a court ineffective.

The Court therefore concluded that there had been no violation of Article 6 §1 on that account.

The applicants complained of the lack of foreseeability in the application of the criterion laid down in the special law in the context of an action for recovery of possession. Nevertheless the Court found that the domestic highest court had a specific position on whether or not to apply the special law.

The Court therefore concluded that there had been no violation of Article 6 §1 in this respect.

The applicants complained of the length of the procedure, which lasted more than ten years. The Court noted that this slowness was not on account of the applicants, but because of the domestic procedural rules.

The Court therefore held that there had been a violation of Article 6 §1 in respect of the length of the proceedings.

Article 14 in conjunction with Article 6 §1

The Court reaffirmed the principle laid in its previous rulings according to which the Article 14 does not forbid the domestic authorities to treat groups in differentiated manner, in order to correct "factual inequalities" between these groups.

In this case, the Court took into consideration the fact that the highest domestic court and the county domestic court had weighed up the interests at stake and had emphasised the need to protect the freedom of religious denominations and the freedom of others, while having due regard to the historical background to the case, so the adoption of the relevant criterion within the special law was justified.

There had therefore been no violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 6 § 1.

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The Court held that Romania was to pay EUR 2,400 to the applicants jointly in respect of non-pecuniary damage and, in respect of costs and expenses, EUR 2,202 and EUR 2,456 to the applicants' respective lawyers and EUR 300 to the Association for the Defence of Human Rights in Romania – Helsinki Committee (APADOR-CH) – which had undertaken to meet the necessary secretarial expenses to support the applicants' application to the Court.

LHERMITTE V. BELGIUM ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) - No 34238/09 - Importance 2 - 26 May 2015 - No violation of Article 6 §1 - Sufficient safeguards in order to understand the decision as to the applicant's guilt and sentence

The case concerned the alleged lack of reasoning for the jury verdict as to the applicant's guilt and for the Assise Court decision on her sentence to life imprisonment, for the premeditated murders of her five children. Indeed, the applicant alleged that she did not understand the points that had been taken into account in the conclusion that she was criminally responsible for her actions.

The Court first held that it was necessary to look at the proceedings as a whole and at the subsequent court decisions. Thus, it observed that the Court of Cassation had expressly indicated the reasons why the Assise Court had dismissed the applicant's defence based on a lack of criminal responsibility, naming that she had perpetrated her crimes in cold blood and with determination. Furthermore, the Court noted the reasoning for the jury verdict had been provided subsequently in the sentencing judgment of the Assise Court. Consequently, the Court held that a combined reading of the judgments of the Assise Court and of the Court of Cassation should have enabled the applicant to understand the reasons why her defence arguments had been rejected and why the jury had found her guilty.

- **Right to an effective remedy (Art. 13)**

YENGO V. FRANCE ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) - No. 50494/12 - Importance 2 - 21 May 2015 - Violation of article 13 - Domestic authorities' failure to provide with an effective remedy to improve the applicant's conditions of detention

The case concerned the applicant's complaint of the conditions of detention he had endured in prison, together with the lack of effective remedy in that connection. Indeed, despite, the "urgent" recommendations issued by the inspector general of detention facilities following his visit to the prison, the applicant's several applications for release were rejected by domestic courts, which found that there were insufficient allegations specific to his personal situation and nothing serious enough to put his physical or mental health at risk.

Based on the principles laid down in its previous cases, the Court recalled that a preventive remedy in matters of detention conditions had to enable the complainant to obtain the termination of the alleged violation or an improvement in the physical conditions in question.

In this case, the Court noted the difficulties for the applicant to prove his allegation of "personal" suffering, and the delay of five months between his request for release and the judgement of the domestic court.

Therefore it found that the request for release submitted by the applicant could not be regarded as an effective remedy within the meaning of Article 13 of the Convention. Moreover, the Court considered that domestic authorities had failed to prove that the administrative complaint or the urgent administrative procedure for the protection of a fundamental freedom (référé-liberté) were effective remedy within the meaning of Article 13.

The Court thus found that at the relevant time domestic law had not provided the applicant with any preventive remedy by which he could have promptly obtained an improvement in his conditions of detention. There had therefore been a violation of Article 13 of the Convention.

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The Court held that France was to pay the applicant EUR 4,000 euros in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 4,500 for costs and expenses.

- **Article 1 of Protocol No. 1**

[S.L. AND J.L. V. CROATIA](#) (No. 13712/11) – Importance 2 – 7 May 2015 – Violation of Article 1 of Protocol 1 – Domestic authorities' failure to safeguard the proprietary interests of the applicants, minors at that time.

The case concerned a deal to swap a seaside villa for a less valuable flat. The Social Welfare Centre had to give its consent to the deal as the owners of the villa, the two applicants, were minors. The Social Welfare Centre agreed to the proposed swap without rigorously examining the particular circumstances of the case or the family. The lawyer acting on behalf of the children's parents also happened to be the son-in-law of the original owner of the flat. The subsequent efforts by the girls and second applicant's father – both girls' legal guardian – to challenge the legality of the deal in court was rejected as they had not challenged the decision during the administrative proceedings even though at the time the girls had been minors, the second applicant's father had been in detention, the mother was a drug-addict with financial difficulties, and their lawyer had a conflict of interests.

The Court observed that under Article 1 of Protocol 1, the domestic authorities must provide judicial procedures that offer the necessary procedural guarantees and therefore enable the domestic courts and tribunals to adjudicate effectively and fairly any cases concerning property matters.

The Court held that the domestic authorities had to take the necessary measures to safeguard the interests of the children. In this case, the domestic authorities did not take into account the facts that the legal guardian was in prison at the moment of the swap and that only the mother of the applicants, who was addicted to drugs, was informed of the swap. In these circumstances, the Court found that the Centre did not assess adequately the applicants' family situation and the possible adverse impact of the impugned real estate swap agreement on their rights and that the domestic civil courts had failed to appreciate the reasons linked to family context which had prevented the Centre's decision being challenged.

The Court thus found that the domestic authorities failed to take the necessary measures to safeguard the proprietary interests of the applicants, as children, in the impugned real estate swap agreement and to afford them a reasonable opportunity to effectively challenge the measures interfering with their rights guaranteed by Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The Court did not give a ruling on the application of this article, leaving a delay of three months for the parties to submit their observations and to try to reach an agreement.

GOGITDZE AND OTHERS V. GEORGIA (No. 36862/05) - Importance 2 - 12 May 2015 - No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 - No failure of domestic authorities to strike a fair balance between the means employed for forfeiture of the applicants' assets and the general interest in combatting corruption in the public service

The case concerned the proceedings for forfeiture of property that were initiated against the four applicants and in particular against the former Minister of the Interior. The confiscation of their property was linked to the prior existence of a criminal charge and aimed at the recovery of assets wrongfully or inexplicably accumulated by the public officials concerned and their close entourage.

The Court first observed that the forfeiture order concerning the applicant's' assets had amounted to interference with their right to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions.

The Court then observed that the forfeiture of their property had been ordered on the basis of domestic law. Furthermore, the Court held that member states could control the use of property via new retrospective provision. Therefore, the forfeiture of the applicant's' property had been lawful.

The Court then held that the aim pursued was legitimate, as it formed an essential part of a larger legislative package aimed at intensifying the fight against corruption in the public service.

The Court then turned to the question of the proportionality of the interference and whether a fair balance had been struck between the means employed for forfeiture of the applicants' assets and the general interest in combatting corruption in the public service. Considering that it was on the basis of those internationally acclaimed standards for combatting serious offences which entail unjust enrichment and that member states had to be given a wide margin of appreciation when choosing how

to deal with proceeds of crime, the Court found that the administrative confiscation proceedings in the applicants' case could not be considered as arbitrary.

It also considered that the applicants were afforded a reasonable opportunity of putting their arguments before the domestic court.

Accordingly, there had been no violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

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 judgment.

For more detailed information, please refer to the cases.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	IMP.	CONCLUSION	KEY WORDS
BULGARIA	19 May 2015	PETKOV AND PARNAROV (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 59273/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Ill-treatment of the applicants while in police custody
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the applicants' allegations of ill-treatment while in police custody
ROMANIA	5 May 2015	DOICIU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 1454/09)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Ill-treatment of the applicant while in police custody
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment while in police custody
	19 May 2015	MELNICHUK AND OTHERS (Nos. 35279/10 AND 34782/10)	2	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation in order to identify those responsible for the applicants' injuries and the death of their relative
ANTON (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 57365/12)				3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)
	Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the applicants' allegations of ill-treatment while in police custody			

ROMANIA (CONTINUED)	19 May 2015	FALIE (No. 23257/04)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Domestic court's dismissal of the applicant's civil action without an analysis of its merits deprived him of his right of access to a court
	7 May 2015	ALEKSANDR DMITRIYEV (No. 12993/05)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Extension of applicant's pre-trial detention on insufficient grounds for a period of more than 1 year and 4 months while alternative preventive measures were not considered
RUSSIA	21 May 2015	MUKHITDINOV (No. 20999/14)	2	Violation of Art. 3	Real risk of ill-treatment in case of the applicant's removal to his country of origin
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Domestic authorities can be held accountable for the applicant's disappearance and their failure to carry out an effective investigation into the incident
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant (the maximum period of detention set by domestic law was exceeded)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a prompt and adequate judicial review of the applicant's detention
				Violation of Art. 34	Domestic authorities' failure to respect the interim measure indicated by the Court under Rule 39 as they did not take the necessary measures capable of preventing the applicant's disappearance and possible transfer to his country of origin and did not

					effectively investigate that possibility thus depriving him from the protection afforded by the Convention
SLOVENIA	21 May 2015	ZAVODNIK (No. 53723/13)	2	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the domestic authorities' failure to properly inform the applicant of the hearing which deprived him of the opportunity of taking part in the proceedings and prevented him from vindicating his right to obtain a higher percentage of his claim for unpaid wages
				Violation of Art. 6 § 1 and 13	Excessive length of proceedings and ineffectiveness of remedies in this respect
SPAIN	5 May 2015	ARRATIBEL GARCIA (In French only) (No. 58488/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to conduct an effective investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment while held incommunicado in police custody
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	7 May 2015	LIEVSKA (No. 20136/11)	2	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Ill-treatment of the applicant on account of the unjustified use of handcuffs during her transfer to a hospital

TURKEY	26 May 2015	DOGAN ALTUN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 7152/08)	2	Violation of Art. 11	Unnecessary interference with the applicant's right to freedom of assembly and association on account of the imposition of a disciplinary sanction to him for holding a referendum without applying for prior authorisation from his employer
				Violation of Art. 13	Lack of remedies allowing the applicant to challenge the warning issued to him
	26 May 2015	IPSEFTEL (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 18638/05)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Expropriation of the applicant's plot of land without compensation
		SONGUL INCE AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (Nos. 25595/08 AND 34252/10)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	Excessive and disproportionate use of force by the domestic authorities
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the circumstances of the operation which killed and injured numerous prisoners
UNITED KINGDOM	12 May 2015	MAGEE AND OTHERS (No. 26289/12, 29062 and 29891/12)	2	No violation of Art. 5 § 3	Applicants' impossibility to obtain conditional release during the period of their detention did not give rise to a violation under the Art. 5 § 3 of the Convention

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 1 to 28 February 2015**. 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
POLAND	17 February 2015	Konopacka v. Poland	Art. 2 of the Convention (no effective protection of the applicant's son's life to prevent his suicide)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (all the medical measures were put in place)
ROMANIA	17 February 2015	Niculescu v. Romania	Art. 6 §1 of the Convention (length of the proceedings)	Inadmissible as incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the Convention

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 **covering the period from 1 to 31 March** 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
ALBANIA	12 March 2015	SELAMI AND OTHERS DURDAJ AND HAZIZAJ (Nos 46707/13 AND 46714/13)	The applicants complain that the authorities' decision to allow the operation of the munitions facility, instead of carrying out demilitarisation activities in facilities put their lives at serious risk.
BULGARIA	16 March 2015	TOMOV AND NIKOLOVA (No. 50506/09)	The applicants complain that when they bought their property there was nothing to alert them that could be the subject of a restitution claim.
CROATIA	24 March 2015	JURIŠIĆ (No. 29555/11)	The applicant complains about the adverse effects of his dismissal from military service to his private and professional life.

HUNGARY	4 March 2015	<u>FALUDY-KOVÁCS</u> (No. 20487/13)	The applicant complains that the refusal to grant her compensation for the publication of offensive statements infringed her right to reputation.
	25 March 2015	<u>A.T.</u> (No. 73986/14) <u>T.P.</u> (No. 37871/14)	The applicant complains that the fact that he can be eligible for parole only after 40 years of imprisonment amounts to inhuman and degrading treatment.
LATVIA	16 March 2015	<u>DUPATE</u> (No. 18068/11)	The applicant contends that the domestic courts have not given sufficient protection against publication of photos taken without her consent and published by the tabloid press.
	25 March 2015	<u>ĒCIS</u> (No. 12879/09)	The applicant complains about discrimination of male inmates in prison.
	27 March 2015	<u>ĀPŠA</u> (No. 1634/12)	The applicant complains that she was not granted leave from prison to attend her mother's funeral.
ROMANIA	9 March 2015	<u>CENTRE FOR LEGAL RESOURCES ON BEHALF OF MIORITA MALACU AND OTHERS</u> (No 55093/09)	The applicants complain that the authorities failed to put in place an effective mechanism to safeguard their right to life in spite of the awareness about the high mortality rate in the hospital.
	9 March 2015	<u>FADI FAWZI TAHA</u> (No. 261/14)	The applicant complains that there is no place for him to pray because the prison administration threatens him.

RUSSIA	4 March 2015	<u>ORTSUYEVA AND OTHERS</u> <u>RUSSIA AND MAGOMEDOVA AND OTHERS</u> (Nos 3340/08 AND 24689/10)	The applicants submit that the unacknowledged detention of their relatives referred to as “abducted persons” and complain about the severe mental distress they suffer due to the indifference of the national authorities.
	5 March 2015	<u>KRAPIVIN</u> (No. 45142/14)	The applicant complains that he was denied the right to visit his child because of his mental illness and his profession requiring him to make long business trips.
	11 March 2015	<u>MAKAROV</u> (No. 19129/13)	The applicant complains that her involuntary placement to a psychiatric facility was unlawful due to the failure to meet the requirements for involuntary hospitalisation.
	24 March 2015	<u>SAAKYAN</u> (No. 78386/14)	The applicant complains that he continues to be detained “with a view to deportation”, although no State is ready to accept him.
THE UNITED KINGDOM	17 March 2015	<u>TIMES NEWSPAPERS LIMITED AND KENNEDY</u> (No. 64367/14)	The applicants complain about the application of the absolute exemption under an Act which did not require an assessment of whether denial of access to information was appropriate and necessary
	31 March 2015	<u>HARKINS</u> (No. 71537/14)	The applicant complains about his intended extradition because if he is convicted of first-degree murder he is likely to be imposed a sentence of life imprisonment without parole.

PartOne

§2 - EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF SOCIAL RIGHTS

A. Reclamations and Decisions

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

STATE	COMPLAINANT	RECLAMATION NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
GREECE	Greek General Confederation of Labour (GSEE)	No. 111/2014	The GSEE alleges that the situation in Greece is in breach of Articles 1, 2, 4, 7, 30 and 31 of the 1961 Charter and Article 3§1 of the 1988 Additional Protocol because of the legislation adopted between 2010 and 2014 in response to the economic and financial crisis.	Admissibility

B. Other information

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

PartOne

§3 - RECOMMENDATIONS & RESOLUTIONS

A. Recommendations

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

B. Resolutions

AUTHOR	DATE	TEXT NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
PACE	22 May 2015	Resolution 2056	The inclusion of children's rights in national constitutions as an essential component of effective national child policies	PACE called on member states to analyse current constitutional provisions in the light of international standards and regard children as "autonomous rights-holders". Furthermore, PACE recommended developing "accessible enforcement mechanisms for children" and setting up independent human rights institutions for children in order to guarantee that children's rights are effectively implemented. (Read the Report)
PACE	22 May 2015	Resolution 2057	Cultural heritage in crisis and post-crisis situations	PACE stated that the restoration of damaged cultural heritage sites could play an important role in post-conflict reconciliation. PACE called for such reconstruction to be "de-politicised", so that technical experts could work without pressure from political or religious authorities, and for local people to be involved in repair projects, where appropriate. (Read the Report)

<p>PACE</p>	<p>22 May 2015</p>	<p>Resolution 2058</p>	<p>The allocation of seats in the Parliamentary Assembly with respect to Turkey</p>	<p>PACE decided it was “entirely justified and fair” to increase the number of seats, given that Turkey now has the third-largest population in Europe. Furthermore, PACE also voiced its support for the introduction of Turkish as a working language in the Assembly but said this would be dependent on it receiving additional funds in its budget to cover the extra cost. (Read the Report)</p>
<p>PACE</p>	<p>22 May 2015</p>	<p>Resolution 2059</p>	<p>Criminalisation of irregular migrants: a crime without a victim</p>	<p>PACE called on member states to adopt a more objective approach towards migrants and to observe fundamental rights standards, in particular by combating disinformation and negative stereotypes concerning migrants. Moreover, PACE called on member states to condemn the exploitation of migrants for political purposes. (Read the Report)</p>

PartOne

§4 - OTHER INFORMATION OF GENERAL IMPORTANCE

A. Information from the Committee of Ministers

■ European ministers adopt new legal standards for tackling foreign terrorist fighters (19.05.2015)

CM adopted the first set of legally-binding international standards to help tackle so-called "foreign terrorist fighters", through a protocol, that will require countries to outlaw various actions including intentionally taking part in terrorist groups, receiving terrorism training or travelling abroad for the purpose of terrorism. It also provides for a round-the-clock network of national contact points to rapidly exchange information. Participants at the meeting also adopted a political declaration and a three-year action plan on the fight against violent extremism and radicalisation leading to terrorism ([Read more](#) - [The political declaration](#) - [The three-year action plan](#)).

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly

■ Rapporteur on mass surveillance reacted to revelations of collusion between NSA and BND (04.05.2015)

PACE rapporteur stressed that the BND/NSA scandal breaking in Berlin was a case in point that an "Intelligence Codex" laying down the rules of fair play applicable to the secret services of like-minded countries is urgently needed ([Read more](#) - [Read the Report](#)).

■ Anne Brasseur recalled WWII sacrifices, hails democracy as antidote to war (09.05.2015)

In a speech, the PACE President said that working together to build and consolidate democracy, tolerance and living together was "the best tribute we can pay to the victims and heroes of the Second World War" ([Read more](#) - [Full speech](#)).

■ Rapporteur hailed LGBT people's 'right to be visible' (15.05.2015)

PACE rapporteur recalled on member states that transgender people, be they young people or adults, must be protected from transphobic crimes and discrimination. Furthermore, transgender people must also have access to quick, transparent and accessible legal gender recognition procedures, based on self-determination ([Read more](#)).

■ Conclusions of the first regional seminar on social rights in Eastern Partnership (19.05.2015)

The first regional seminar on social rights in Eastern Partnership countries focusing on the European Social Charter took place in Chisinau on 18 May 2015. Members of the national parliamentary committees dealing with social rights shared their experiences and considered ways of addressing the issues raised in the Conclusions of the European Committee of Social Rights on the conformity of national legislation and practice with the European Social Charter ([Read more](#)).

■ Urgent measures to combat judicial corruption (19.05.2015)

PACE Committee, through a report, called on member states to implement fully and in a timely manner all relevant recommendations of the organs and monitoring bodies of the Council of Europe, in particular those of the Group of States against corruption. Furthermore, the Committee recalled on the Committee of Ministers to elaborate a model code of conduct for judicial officials, and to gather figure-supported information on prosecutions and convictions of judges for corrupt conduct in member states ([Read more](#) - [Adopted Report](#)).

■ **'Joining in on large movement to say no to intolerance' (19.05.2015)**

PACE President commented on the worrying increase of intolerance and hate speech. Thus, PACE President proposed that the 'Council of Europe takes the initiative to ask all democratic political forces to join in one large movement to say NO to hate and intolerance' ([Read more](#) - [Address by Anne Brasseur](#)).

■ **Strategies and mechanisms to protect children from sexual abuse (21.05.2015)**

PACE stated that effective measures could be envisaged in many areas to ensure the effectiveness of child protection mechanisms, but that the lack of resources was a constant concern in most countries.

Thus, PACE called to assign sufficient budgets to such policies including through relevant decisions by national parliaments ([Read more](#)).

■ **Towards a new European Social Model (21.05.2015)**

The committee called for appropriate measures to address the continuous downgrading of employment and working conditions, and the reduction of the quality of public services ([Read more](#) - [Adopted report](#)).

■ **General rapporteur congratulated Nebraska on the abolition of the death penalty (28.05.2015)**

PACE General rapporteur welcomed the decision taken by the US state of Nebraska to abolish the death penalty and encouraged parliamentarians in other states to follow this outstanding example ([Read more](#)).

■ **Anne Brasseur: 'To be credible, FIFA must lance the boil and overhaul its governance' (28.05.2015)**

PACE President recalled for speedier reform of FIFA governance and the adoption of binding measures to ensure transparency in its decision-making ([Read more](#) - [PACE report on the reform of football governance](#)).

C. Information for the Commissioner for Human Rights

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

D. Information from the monitoring mechanisms

■ **CPT: Checklist for CPT visits to social care institutions where persons may be deprived of their liberty (22.05.2015)**

[Link to the publication](#)

■ **ECRI: Seminar of the committee for national independent authorities combating racism and intolerance - "The role of national Specialised Bodies in addressing underreporting of discrimination and hate crime" (26.05.2015)**

[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.

Azerbaijan

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 co-rapporteurs deeply concerned by the sentencing of opposition leader in Azerbaijan (08.05.2015)

PACE co-rapporteurs were deeply concerned by the sentencing of opposition leader, Deputy Head of the Musavat Party, Faraj Kerimli, to six and a half years of prison, considering that this sentencing was an arbitrary application of criminal legislation to limit freedom of expression. Thus, PACE co-rapporteurs called on the authorities to develop an inclusive political system and an environment favourable to political pluralism ([Read more](#)).

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

■ CM: Resolution on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by Bosnia and Herzegovina, 12 May 2015

In terms of priority, CM called on the authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina to amend the constitution and other relevant legal provisions so as to eliminate the exclusion of “others”, to take all necessary steps to eliminate segregation in education, to ensure that the existing common core curriculum is applied in every school in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to ensure that the implementation of the Action Plan on the Educational Needs of Roma and Other National Minorities is adequately funded and evaluated. – [Link to the Resolution](#)

C. Other information

■ FCNM: Adoption of Committee of Ministers' Resolution (12.05.2015)

[Link to the Resolution](#)

Bulgaria

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Asen Kostov (No. 48445/06)	26 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)54	Examination closed
“Bulves” AD (No.3991/03)	22 April 2009	CM/ResDH(2015)66	Examination closed
Business Support Centre (No. 6689/03)	18 June 2010	CM/ResDH(2015)66	Examination closed
Pfeifer (No. 24733/04)	17 May 2011	CM/ResDH(2015)67	Examination closed
Prescher (No. 6767/04)	7 September 2011	CM/ResDH(2015)67	Examination closed
Violeta Doycheva Doycheva (No. 65293/11)	9 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)74	Examination closed
Doychin Ivanov Konyarov (No. 63205/11)	30 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)74	Examination closed
Dancho Tsvetanov Stoyanov (No. 2065/06+)	9 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)74	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRECO: Publication of the Fourth Round Evaluation Report on Bulgaria (13.05.2015)

The GRECO has published its Fourth Round Evaluation Report on Bulgaria dealing with corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors. GRECO concluded that Bulgaria has, overall, a reasonably good legislative framework and that many institutions and tools are in place to deter corruption. Yet, the complex regulations and the abundance of reporting instruments and oversight bodies have failed to bring in the desired cumulative effect or help attain qualitative changes in corruption prevention efforts ([Read more](#) - [Link to the report](#)).

Croatia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Hrdalo (No. 23272/07)	27 December 2011	CM/ResDH(2015)60	Examination closed
Maravic Markes (No. 70923/11)	9 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)60	Examination closed
Camovski (No. 38280/10)	23 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)61	Examination closed
Josip Gabud (No. 3712/14)	23 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)68	Examination closed
Davor Giurasin (No. 21560/13)	23 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)68	Examination closed
Niko Ivkic and Mato Buljevic (No. 31302/13)	23 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)68	Examination closed
Zlatko Krtalic (No. 37455/13)	23 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)68	Examination closed
Gordana Pijaca and Ljubomir Cvjetanovic (No. 2981/14)	23 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)68	Examination closed
Branko Sladetic (No. 67250/13)	23 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)68	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ FCNM: Visit of the Advisory Committee on the FCNM (20.05.2015)

A delegation of the Advisory Committee on the FCNM will visit Croatia from 13 to 17 July 2015 in the context of the monitoring of the implementation of this Convention ([Read more](#)).

Cyprus

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Kyprianou (No. 73797/01)	15/12/2005	CM/ResDH(2015)47	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ ECRI: Commission to prepare report on Cyprus (12.05.2015)

A delegation of the ECRI visited Cyprus from 20 to 24 April 2015 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, and LGBT issues ([Read more](#)).

Czech Republic

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Sykora (No. 23419/07)	22 February 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)75	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].

Finland

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: Round-table (07.05.2015)

In co-operation with the Finnish Non-Discrimination Ombudsman, ECRI organised a round table in Helsinki to discuss the follow-up given to the recommendations contained in its report on Finland published in 2013 ([Read more](#)).

France

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Kessaci (No. 6786/11)	26 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)55	Examination closed
Jean Larroche and Michel Larroche (No. 34309/13+)	15 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)56	Examination closed
Vosgien (No. 12430/11)	3 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)76	Examination closed
El Shennawy (No. 51246/08)	20 April 2011	CM/ResDH(2015)77	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]

Georgia

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: President congratulated Georgian authorities for the progress achieved (09.05.2015)

PACE President congratulated the Georgian authorities for the substantial progress the country achieved on the path of democratic reforms. Thus, PACE President strongly encouraged Georgian authorities to continue on this positive path and to intensify efforts aimed at strengthening state institutions, particularly concerning the judiciary, prosecutor's office and law enforcement system. Furthermore, PACE President called on Georgian authorities to resolutely combat all forms of hatred and intolerance. Regarding South Ossetia, Georgia, and Abkhazia, PACE President reiterated her support for Georgia's territorial integrity and sovereignty and raised concerns over the humanitarian situation in these areas ([Read more - Press conference - Lecture from Anne Brasseur to students at the Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University - President made official visit to Georgia](#)).

Germany

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Kübler (No. 32715/06)	5 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)78	Examination closed
B. B. and F. B. (No. 18734/09+)	16 June 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)79	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]

Hungary

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
A.C. and Others (No. 11044/11)	2 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)48	Examination closed
Sandorne Babel (No. 66845/13)	2 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)48	Examination closed
Imre Jozsef Forgacs (No. 38027/11)	2 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)48	Examination closed
Eva Hegyesiné Orsos (No. 40322/11)	2 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)48	Examination closed
Gyula Szava (No. 2719/10)	15 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)48	Examination closed
Laszloné Toth (No. 49935/09)	3 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)48	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Publication of the first report on Hungary (29.05.2015)

The GRETA has published its first evaluation on Hungary. In its report, GRETA welcomes the steps taken to prevent and combat trafficking in human beings in Hungary. These measures include the adoption of legislation criminalising human trafficking, two national strategies as well as the setting up of co-ordination structures. However, the report stresses the need to allocate sufficient resources to achieve the goals of the national strategy and ensure full involvement of civil society. ([Read more - Link to the report](#)).

Italy

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Marturana (No. 63154/00)	4 June 2008	CM/ResDH(2015)69	Examination closed
De Carolis and Lolli (No. 33359/05)	5 March 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)70	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]

Republic of Moldova

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Calin Vieru (No. 32476/09)	15 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)80	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Rapporteurs called for a new impulse to the much-needed reform process (19.05.2015)

PACE rapporteurs called on Republic of Moldova authorities to give a new impulse to the much-needed reform process and bring national legislation closer to European standards, in the interest of the population. Furthermore, PACE rapporteurs called on the authorities to address the disillusion of the population caused by corruption cases, especially a serious bank scandal involving the disappearance of one billion dollars from three national banks. Finally, PACE rapporteurs called on the parliament to start work on the revision of the Constitution that is needed to avoid a new political deadlock for the election of the President of the Republic, scheduled for spring 2016 ([Read more](#) - [Announcement of the visit](#)).

■ GRETA: Committee's second evaluation visit to Republic of Moldova (20.05.2015)

A delegation of the GRETA carried out an evaluation visit to the Republic of Moldova from 11 to 15 May 2015. 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 2011 ([Read more](#)).

Montenegro

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

■ CM Recommendation on the application of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages by Montenegro (12.05.2015)

CM called on Montenegrin authorities to take account of all the observations and recommendations of the Committee of Experts. In terms of priority, CM called on domestic authorities to develop a structured policy ensuring the application of the Charter in all areas, to take all necessary measures to ensure the use of Romani in education, and, finally, to clarify in the legislation that users of Albanian may submit oral or written applications to local branches of the State administration and receive a reply in this language. [Read the Recommendation](#).

■ Seminar on the non-accepted provisions of the European Social Charter by Montenegro, 5 May 2015

A meeting on the non-accepted provisions of the European Social Charter by Montenegro was held in Podgorica. The meeting was opened by Ms Tijana Prelević, Head of the Department for Labour Relations, Labour Directorate, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, and was attended by approximately 35 officials from various ministries as well as representatives of trade unions. Two members of the European Committee of Social Rights, Mr Lauri Leppik and Mr Marcin Wujczyk participated in this meeting. An exchange of views also took place on the Collective Complaints procedure and the European Code of Social Security ([Read more](#)).

Norway

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Vilnes and Others (No. 52806/09+)	24 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)81	Examination closed
Kristiansen and Tyvik AS (No. 25498/08)	2 August 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)82	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]

Poland

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Dlugolecki (No. 23806/03)	24 May 2009	CM/ResDH(2015)49	Examination closed
Kaczmarek No. II (No. 5665/10)	16 November 2010	CM/ResDH(2015)71	Examination closed
Klonowski (No. 1344/11)	6 December 2011	CM/ResDH(2015)71	Examination closed
Wartecki (No. 37357/09)	25 January 2011	CM/ResDH(2015)71	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]

Romania

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Carlos Ionescu (No. 41317/08)	15 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)57	Examination closed
Romulus George De Pratto and Ana Maria Adela Stefanescu (No. 47113/10)	1 July 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)57	Examination closed
Dragomir Rusu (No. 73765/12)	21 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)57	Examination closed
Sandru and Others (No. 22465/03)	10 May 2010	CM/ResDH(2015)58	Examination closed
Lapusan and Others (No. 29007/06+)	15 September 2011	CM/ResDH(2015)58	Examination closed
Pastor and Ticlette (No. 30911/06+)	19 July 2011	CM/ResDH(2015)58	Examination closed
Acatrinei and Others (No. 10425/09+)	9 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)58	Examination closed
Lupsa (No. 10337/04)	8 September 2006	CM/ResDH(2015)50	Examination closed
Kaya (No. 33970/05)	12 January 2007	CM/ResDH(2015)50	Examination closed

Abou Amer (No. 14521/03)	24 August 2011	CM/ResDH(2015)50	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: Russia's new law on 'undesirable' foreign NGOs endangers the right of free expression, said PACE co-rapporteurs (29.05.2015)

PACE co-rapporteurs called on the Russian authorities to facilitate the work of Russian activists, NGOs and media organisations and to promptly bring the legislative framework on NGOs fully into line with the Council of Europe standards ([Read more](#)).

Serbia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Milosavljev (No. 15112/07)	22 October 2012	CM/ResDH(2015)62	Examination closed
Mladenovic (No. 1099/08)	22 October 2012	CM/ResDH(2015)63	Examination closed
Momcilovic (No. 23103/07)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)64	Examination closed
Andelkovic (No. 1401/08)	9 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)65	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]

Slovak Republic

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Gabriela Brachova (No. 60028/09)	23 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)83	Examination closed
Jan Hrbal' (No. 76645/12)	27 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)83	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]

Switzerland

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Roduit (No. 6586/06)	17 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)72	Examination closed
Ruiz Riviera (No. 8300/06)	18 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)73	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]

“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”

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: Appeal for calm following armed incidents in “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (13.05.2015)

PACE rapporteur called on all the parties elected to the Macedonian Parliament to overcome the prevailing deep divisions along political and ethnic lines to ensure a peaceful coexistence and interaction between the different ethnic communities ([Read more](#)).

Turkey

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Hüseyin Akin (No. 24122/12)	13 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Durhasan Altiner (No. 47899/12)	13 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Altinisik (No. 23271/09)	7 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Osman Armutcuoglu (No. 12603/12)	13 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Egemen Bataray (No. 9259/12)	3 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Oguz Alp Cakmak (No. 21337/12)	3 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Canberk Demirci (No. 13550/12)	13 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Hüseyin Gedik (No. 48849/12)	3 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Sedat Ipekisen (No. 36675/10)	13 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Metin Orhan and Engin Ant (No. 11941/12)	3 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Rüzgar (No. 46301/11)	11 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed

Sahin and Others (No. 4006/11)	11 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Servet Simsek (No. 40914/13)	13 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	Examination closed
Ahmet Topcu (No. 6228/12)	3 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)51	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]

Ukraine

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Karpenko (No. 53450/11)	9 April 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)59	Examination closed
Maystrenko (No. 11023/12)	9 April 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)59	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]

United Kingdom

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Paul Mason (No. 3138/09)	24 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)52	Examination closed
Fraser Brian Summers (No. 17749/12)	4 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2015)52	Examination closed
M. H. (No. 11577/06)	22 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2015)53	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].