

REGULAR SELECTIVE INFORMATION FLOW

for the attention of the National Human Rights Structures

Issue#149

[1 – 28 February 2017]

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.14)

B. Decisions on admissibility (p.18)

C. Communicated cases (p.19)

§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.22)

D. Information from the Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms (p.23)

PART II - INFORMATION BY COUNTRY (p.24)

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 (Paris Saclay). It is entrusted to Vincent Couronne, Priscille Descolas, Léa Guémené, Pavlos Aimilios Marinatos, Clara Michel, Albane Surville and Alex Vezina under the supervision of Laure Clément-Wilz, European Law Professor.

Index by Country

ALBANIA, 22	LATVIA, 46
ARMENIA, 23	LITHUANIA, 11, 47
AUSTRIA, 24	LUXEMBOURG, 48
AZERBAIJAN, 25	MONTENEGRO, 49
BELGIUM, 26 , 39	NETHERLANDS, 11
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, 15, 27	NORWAY, 50
BULGARIA, 16, 28	POLAND, 11, 15, 51
CHECK REPUBLIC, 33	PORTUGAL, 11, 52
CROATIA, 34	ROMANIA, 12, 54 , 56
CYPRUS, 35 , 76	RUSSIA, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 57
ESTONIA, 15	SERBIA, 13, 58
FINLAND, 36	SLOVAK REPUBLIC, 63
FRANCE, 1, 2, 5	SLOVENIA, 14, 64
GEORGIA, 37	SPAIN, 7, 65 , 75
GERMANY, 4, 9, 26, 38 , 39, 56, 75	SWITZERLAND, 67
GREECE, 11, 40	THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA, 5, 68
HUNGARY, 42	TURKEY, 14, 69
ICELAND, 45	UKRAINE, 14, 75
ITALY, 6, 10, 11	UNITED KINGDOM, 76

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 (1-28 February 2017) 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.

- **Right to life (Art. 2)**

MASLOVA V. RUSSIA (IN FRENCH ONLY) - No. 15980/12 - Importance 3 - 14 February 2017 - Violation of Article 2 and Article 3 - Domestic authorities’ failure to protect a man from ill-treatment resulting to his death in a police station and to effectively investigate into it

The case concerned the ill-treatment of the applicant’s brother in a police station, resulting in his death.

As to the substantive aspect of Articles 2 and 3, the Court observed that it was established that the police officer had abused his authority and had committed acts causing the applicant’s brother to suffer bodily harm. The Court also noted that the compensation awarded was insufficient.

It thus found that there had been a violation of Articles 2 and 3 in their substantive aspects.

As to the procedural aspects, the Court noted that the circumstances had not been established and that the suggested investigative acts had appeared not to have been carried out. Moreover, the Court observed that the investigation had not been comprehensive.

The Court thus found that the investigation had not been effective within the meaning of Article 2 of the Convention and that there had been a violation of that Article in its procedural aspect.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Russia was to pay the applicant EUR 50,600 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

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

S.K. v. RUSSIA (No. 52722/15) - Importance 2 - 14 February 2017 - Violation of Article 2 and 3 - Applicant's removal to Syria - Violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 2 and 3 - Domestic authorities' failure to conduct a rigorous scrutiny of the applicant's case - Violation of Article 5 § 1 - Domestic authorities' failure to pursue with due diligence proceedings relating to expulsion - Violation of Article 5 § 4 - Domestic authorities' failure to ensure the applicant with review of his detention

The case concerned the detention of the applicant, a Syrian national, and his removal to his home country.

Article 2 and Article 3

The Court first recalled the issue of the risks to one's life and limb in relation to returns to Syria. It observed that that the security and humanitarian situation and the type and extent of hostilities in Syria had deteriorated dramatically, and that there had been an increasing risk of civilian casualties. Furthermore, domestic authorities had not provided any evidence that the situation in the applicant's home town is sufficiently safe.

Therefore, there had been a breach of Articles 2 and 3 of the Convention.

Article 13 in conjunction with Articles 2 and 3

The Court considered two sets of remedies in relation to the penalty of administrative removal: the review of the impugned judgment within the administrative-offence proceedings, and the temporary asylum procedure. In regard to the first one, the Court noted that a pending appeal against the judgment imposing the penalty of removal did automatically suspend its enforcement. However, domestic authorities had not convincingly demonstrated that the domestic courts in this type of proceedings could provide the requisite scrutiny of the risks to life or limb arising from an eventual imposition and enforcement of the penalty of removal. In regard to the temporary asylum procedure, the Court did not rule out that this form of temporary protection could provide an effective solution in the type of situation faced by the applicant.

There had therefore been a violation of Article 13 of the Convention in conjunction with Articles 2 and 3.

Article 5 § 1

The Court first reiterated that detention with a view to expulsion will only be compatible with Article 5 § 1 of the Convention if the proceedings relating to expulsion are in process and pursued with due diligence, and if the detention is lawful and is not arbitrary. In this case, it should have been sufficiently evident to the domestic authorities that the removal of the applicant to Syria was not practicable. The Court took the view that they should have considered some alternative arrangements. However, once the order was made for him to be detained in a special detention facility for foreigners, his detention was not reassessed.

The Court therefore found a violation of Article 5 § 1.

Article 5 § 4

The Court recalled that under Article 5 § 4, when an individual has been detained he/she has the right to apply to a court, in order for it to speedily decide, inter alia, whether new factors have emerged which make the continuing detention unlawful or arbitrary. However, domestic law did not provide for a procedure which would have allowed the applicant to obtain a review of his detention and obtain release.

The Court therefore found a violation of Article 5 § 4.

- **Right to liberty and security (Art. 5)**

ILNSEHER V. GERMANY (Nos. 10211/12, 27505/14) - Importance 3 - 02 February 2017 - No violation of Article 5 § 1 or Article 7 - Justified retrospective preventive detention of convicted murderer - No violation of Article 5 § 4 - Justified speediness - No violation of Article 6 - Fair trial

The case concerned the applicant's complaint that his retrospective preventive detention had violated his right to liberty, and his right not to have a heavier penalty imposed than the one applicable at the time of his offence.

Article 5 § 1

The Court found that the domestic courts had been justified in finding that the applicant's mental disorder was such as to warrant his compulsory confinement. The Court also noted that the prison preventive detention centre provided a suitable therapeutic environment for the applicant and therefore his detention had been justified as the lawful detention of a person "of unsound mind."

Therefore, there had been no violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention.

Article 7 § 1

The Court found that because the applicant's preventive detention had been ordered because of and with a view to addressing his mental condition, the retrospective preventive detention orders in question could not be considered a "penalty". Accordingly, there is "no punishment without law".

Therefore, there had been no violation of Article 7 § 1 of the Convention.

Article 5 § 4

The Court noted that the proceedings had been relatively complex, both from a legal and a factual point of view. The Court considered that having regard to the special features of constitutional complaint proceedings, to the complexity of the proceedings in the instant case before the Federal Constitutional Court and to the particular circumstances of this case, the requirement of speediness has been respected also before that court.

Therefore, there had been no violation of Article 5 § 4 of the Convention.

Article 6 § 1

The Court found that one of the judges' alleged remark had amounted in substance to a confirmation of the Regional Court's finding in the judgment it had just delivered – namely, that the applicant was dangerous and posed a risk of reoffending if released. It further found that the mere fact that this judge had already been a member of the bench in the applicant's case was not enough to raise objectively justified doubts as to his impartiality.

Therefore, the Court found that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

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

AIT ABBOU V. FRANCE ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) (No. 44921/13) - Importance 3 - 02 February 2017 - No violation of Article 6 § 1 - Lawful pre-trial investigation in the applicant's absence

The case concerned the applicant's complaint that he had not had a fair trial.

The Court observed that the judicial investigation had been a key phase in the proceedings at issue, particularly as all steps aimed at gathering evidence had been taken at that stage by the authorities.

In its judgment, the Criminal Court had found that during a search the applicant had not been found at his parents' address, which he had given to the authorities. His brother, who was at home in the family flat, had stated that the applicant had gone away and that he had not had any news. The applicant's father had claimed not to have heard from his son for two years. At the hearing, the applicant had said that he had been living with a girlfriend, but had not given her name or address. He had added that he was on good terms with his family and regularly visited them. The Criminal Court also observed that on his arrest the applicant had given his parents' address. The court concluded that the applicant had always lived with his parents, that he could not have been unaware that he was wanted and that he had deliberately absconded.

The Court observed that when interviewed as a witness the applicant's father had stated that he could pass on to his son the telephone number of the senior police officer conducting the interview. Also interviewed one of the applicant's brothers said that, if he saw him, he would tell his brother to contact their father. The Court thus found that the applicant knew that he was a wanted man.

Therefore, there had been no violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

[SELMANI AND OTHERS V. "THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA"](#) (No. 67259/14) - Importance 2 - 09 February 2017 - Violation of 6 - Unfair hearing - Violation of Article 10 - Unlawful forcible removal of journalists during parliamentary debate

The case concerned the applicants' complaint about their removal from the Parliament gallery and about the lack of an oral hearing in the ensuing proceedings before the Constitutional Court.

Article 6

The Court observed that the Constitutional Court was the only body which had examined and decided on the merits of the applicants' case, acting as a court of first and only instance. The Constitutional Court's decision had been based on facts which the applicants had contested, notably: whether the reasons for the applicants' removal had been explained to them; the level of force used by the security officers; etc. However, no oral hearing had been held, even though the applicants had explicitly requested one. Moreover, the Constitutional Court had not given any reasons why it had considered that no hearing had been necessary.

Therefore, there had been a violation of Article 6 of the Convention.

Article 10

The Court reiterated the crucial role of the media as public watchdog.

The Court was satisfied that the applicants' removal from the Parliament gallery had been "prescribed by law". Furthermore, their removal had pursued the aims of ensuring public safety and the prevention of disorder.

However, the domestic authorities failed to convince the Court that it had been necessary or justified to remove the applicants from the gallery. As concerned the applicants' conduct, the domestic authorities had conceded that they had neither contributed to nor participated in the disturbance in the chamber; passive bystanders, they had simply been observing the events and doing their work. The applicants had in effect refused to obey the security officers' orders and leave the chamber, but their behaviour had not led to any proceedings being brought against them.

The Court noted that the applicants' removal from the gallery had prevented them from obtaining knowledge based on their personal experience of the events unfolding in the chamber.

Therefore, there had been a violation of Article 10 of the Convention.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that the "former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" was to pay the applicants EUR 5,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

TOMMASO V. ITALY (No. 43395/09) - Importance 1 - 23 February 2017 - Violation of Article 6 § 1 - Domestic authorities' failure to ensure a public hearing to the applicant - Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 - Lack of foreseeability in domestic law imposing preventive measures on the applicant

The case concerned preventive measures and especially compulsory residence order imposed for a duration of two years on the applicant.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

With regard to the fact that the hearings had not been held in public, the Court first reiterated that the obligation to hold such a hearing was not absolute. It noted that domestic law had not afforded individuals the opportunity to request a public hearing in proceedings for the application of preventive measures relating to property. Nevertheless, the Court took the view that the circumstances of the case had dictated that a public hearing should be held, bearing in mind that the domestic courts had had to assess aspects such as the applicant's character, behaviour and dangerousness, all of which had been decisive for the imposition and application of the preventive measure. The Court therefore held that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1.

Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4

The Court first observed that the preventive measures imposed on the applicant had had a basis on domestic law. Examining whether the effects of the Act had been foreseeable in terms of the individuals targeted by the preventive measures, the Court observed that the imposition of such measures remained linked to a prospective analysis by the domestic courts, since domestic law had not clearly identified the "factual evidence" or the specific types of behaviour which had to be taken into consideration in assessing the danger to society posed by the individual. It noted that the domestic court had based its decision on the existence of criminal tendencies of the applicant, without attributing any specific behaviour or criminal activity to him. The Court concluded that domestic law had not been formulated with sufficient precision to offer protection against arbitrary interferences and to enable the applicant to regulate his conduct and foresee to a sufficiently certain degree the imposition of the preventive measures.

As regards the measures imposed on the applicant, the Court observed that some of them were worded in very general terms and that their content was extremely vague and indeterminate, such as the obligations to "lead an honest and law-abiding life" and to "not give cause for suspicion". Accordingly, the imposition of preventive measures on the applicant had not been sufficiently foreseeable and had not been accompanied by adequate safeguards against the various possible abuses.

There had therefore been a violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 to the Convention.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Italy was to pay the applicant EUR 5,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 11,525 in respect of costs and expenses.

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

RUBIO DOSAMANTES V. SPAIN ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) - No. 20996/10 - Importance 2 - 21 February 2017 - Violation of Article 8 - Domestic authorities' failure to protect a famous singer's privacy

The case concerned a complaint by the pop singer Paulina Rubio that her honour and reputation had been harmed by remarks made on television about her private life.

The Court first observed that in various television programmes, frivolous comments had been expressed about certain aspects of the applicant's private life. Those comments concerned mainly her sexual orientation or her allegedly stormy relationship with her partner, including the claim that she had humiliated him and encouraged him to take drugs. The Court observed that the domestic courts had based their decisions merely on the fact that the applicant was famous. The fact that she was a well-known public figure as a singer did not mean that her activities or conduct in her private life should be regarded as necessarily falling within the public interest. Even assuming that there had been a public interest, in parallel to the commercial interest of the television channels in broadcasting the programmes, the Court found that those interests were trumped by a person's individual right to the effective protection of his or her privacy. As to the conduct of the applicant, the Court reiterated that any information brought to public attention by the person in question ceased to be secret and became freely available.

The Court nevertheless found that the fact that the applicant could have benefitted from such media attention did not authorise the TV channels in question to broadcast unchecked and unlimited comments about her private life. The Court took the view that the domestic authorities had not carefully weighed those rights and interests in the balance but stated that the comments in question had not impugned Ms Rubio's honour.

There had therefore been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The applicant had not submitted any request for just satisfaction within the time-limit, merely mentioning in her application an estimated amount in respect of the alleged damage.

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

[NAVALNYY V. RUSSIA](#) (Nos. 29580/12, 36847/12, 11252/13, 12317/13, 43746/14) - Importance 2 - 02 February 2017 - Violation of Article 5 - Unlawful deprivations of liberty - Violation of Article 6 - Unfair trials - Violation of Article 11 - Disproportionate reactions to peaceful political gatherings

The case concerned the applicant's complaint that the domestic authorities had repeatedly interrupted peaceful, non-violent gatherings, by arresting, prosecuting and eventually convicting him. His seven arrests (and two instances of pre-trial detention) had been unlawful and arbitrary deprivations of his liberty. The domestic authorities' actions had been politically motivated.

Article 11

The Court noted that in order to safeguard the right to freedom of assembly public authorities must show a certain degree of tolerance to such irregular meetings, when the gathering does not involve violence. The gatherings and the conduct of the applicant had been undeniably peaceful. Nevertheless, the meetings were dispersed, the applicant was arrested, and he was convicted of administrative offences – without any assessment of the disturbance the gatherings had caused.

The Court found that even if the actions of the domestic authorities had been carried out lawfully and in pursuit of a legitimate aim, the measures had been disproportionate. Furthermore, they had a

serious potential to have a chilling effect, by deterring future attendance at public gatherings, and preventing an open political debate – an effect amplified by the fact that a well-known public figure had been targeted, who was bound to attract wide media coverage.

Therefore, there had been a violation of Article 11 of the Convention.

Article 5

The applicant on seven occasions was deprived of his liberty from the time of his arrest and until his release, or, on two occasions, until his transfer to court. The domestic authorities submitted that this had been for the purpose of bringing him before the competent legal authority on suspicion of an administrative offence, and had therefore been lawful. However, under Article 27.2 of the Code of Administrative Offences, suspects could only be escorted to a police station for the purpose of drawing up an administrative offence if the reports could not be drawn up at the place where the offence was discovered. Once the reports had been drawn up at the police station, further remand in custody prior to a judicial hearing would have required special justification. No such justification was provided by the domestic authorities.

Therefore, the Court found that there had been a violation of Article 5 of the Convention.

Article 6

The appeal court had obtained the evidence of an independent private individual to corroborate the police reports, and had also examined a video recording submitted by the applicant. On the basis of all the evidence, the appeal court had found in the prosecution's favour. Given these considerations, the Court held that the appeal court's assessment was neither arbitrary nor unreasonable.

The courts in the other six sets of proceedings had based their judgments solely on the versions of events put forward by the police. Furthermore, they had systematically failed to check the police's factual allegations, refused the applicant's requests to adduce evidence, and automatically presumed bias on behalf of all witnesses who testified in his favour.

Therefore, there had been a violation of Article 6 of the Convention.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Russia was to pay the applicant EUR 1,025 in respect of pecuniary damage, EUR 50,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and EUR 12,653 in respect of costs and expenses.

[LASHMANKIN AND OTHERS V. RUSSIA](#) (Nos. 57818/09, 51169/10, 4618/11, 19700/11, 31040/11, 47609/11, 55306/11, 59410/11, 7189/12, 16128/12, 16134/12, 20273/12, 51540/12, 64243/12, 37038/13) - Importance 2 - 07 February 2017 - Violation of Article 11 - Unlawful limitations on the public protests against alleged corruption, ineffective governance and the repression of civil liberties - Violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 11 - Lack of effective remedy - Violation of Article 5 - Unlawful arrests during protesting - Violation of Article 6 - Unfair trial

The case concerned the applicants' complaint that the restrictions imposed on their proposed public events had breached their rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly – in numerous cases, by discriminating against them on the grounds of their political opinions or sexual orientation.

Article 11

The Court noted that interference with the right to freedom of assembly need not necessarily involve an outright ban of an event, but can occur through other restrictions such as the right to choose the time, place and manner of conduct of the assembly. The domestic authorities had refused to approve the arrangements for the public events put forward by the applicants, and had proposed alternatives. The applicants, considering that the authorities' proposals did not answer the purpose of their assembly, either cancelled the event altogether or decided to hold it as initially planned despite the

risk of dispersal, arrest and prosecution. The Court held that this interference had been based on legal provisions which did not meet the Convention's "quality of law" requirements, and that that the interference had not been "necessary in a democratic society". The Court found in some applications, the automatic and inflexible application of the time-limits for notification of public events – without taking into account that it was impossible to comply with the time-limit because of public holidays or the spontaneous nature of the event respectively – was not justified. By dispersing some of the applicants' public events and by arresting three of them, the domestic authorities failed to show the requisite degree of tolerance towards peaceful, albeit unlawful, assemblies. Furthermore, the domestic authorities acted in an arbitrary and discriminatory manner.

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

Article 13 in conjunction with Article 11

The Court held that the applicants did not have at their disposal an effective remedy which would allow an enforceable judicial decision to be obtained on the authorities' refusal to approve the location, time or manner of conduct of a public event before its planned date. Moreover, the scope of judicial review was limited to examining the lawfulness of the proposal to change the location, time or manner of conduct of a public event, and did not include any assessment of its "necessity in a democratic society" and "proportionality".

Therefore, there had been a violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 11 of the Convention.

Article 5 § 1

One of the applicants was escorted to the police station for the alleged purpose of producing an administrative offence report. However, under the Code of Administrative Offences, a person can only be taken to a police station for this reason if the report cannot be drawn up on the spot.

Three applicants had all been subjected to administrative arrest. Under the Code of Administrative Offences, such arrests can only be justified in an exceptional case, where arrest is necessary for the examination of the case and enforcement of a penalty. However, the domestic authorities had not provided any such justification.

Therefore, the Court found that there had been a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention.

Article 6 § 1

The Court found a breach of the principle of legal certainty, as a decision in the applicants' favour had been quashed by a supervisory review procedure, but without that procedure identifying any fundamental defect in the original judgment.

Therefore, there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Russia was to pay one of the applicants EUR 450 in respect of pecuniary damage. The Court held that Russia was to pay three applicants EUR 10,000, 14 applicants EUR 7,500, and five applicants EUR 5,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage. The Court held that Russia was to pay nine of the applicants a total of EUR 11,600 in respect of costs and expenses.

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

MITZINGER V. GERMANY (No. 29762/10) - Importance 3 - 9 February 2017 - Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8 - Discriminatory domestic law excluding children from inheritance rights if they were born out of wedlock before a certain cut-off point

The case concerned inheritance rights of children born outside marriage. The applicant complained that she could not assert her inheritance rights after her father's death in 2009, as she had been born out of wedlock and before a cut-off point provided for by legislation in force at the time. Notably, children born outside marriage before 1 July 1949 were excluded from any statutory entitlement to inherit and from the right to financial compensation.

The Court first noted that it was not dispute between the parties that there had been a difference in treatment in this case. Furthermore, it found that the aims pursued by the legislature for that difference in treatment, namely the preservation of legal certainty and the protection of the deceased and his family, had arguably been legitimate. However, it was not satisfied that the means employed, namely excluding children born out of wedlock before a certain cut-off point provided for by legislation, had been proportionate to the aims sought to be achieved. It noted that the applicant had not been a descendant whose existence had been unknown to her father's wife. It referred to its previous judgments, in which it had found that inequality of inheritance rights on the grounds of birth outside marriage was incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. There had therefore been a violation of Article 14 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 8.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that the question of the application of Article 41 was not ready for decision and reserved it for a later date.

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

MESSANA V. ITALY (IN FRENCH ONLY) - No. 26128/04 - Importance 3 - 9 February 2017 - Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 - Domestic authorities' failure to follow the standard expropriation procedure

The case concerned the deprivation of the property of landowners via indirect expropriation following the occupation of the land by the municipal authorities, with a view to building low-rent housing (HLM).

The Court noted that in the instant case there had been a deprivation of property within the meaning of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention. The Court observed that in applying the principle of indirect expropriation the domestic courts had held that the applicants had been deprived of their property as of the date of cessation of the period of legitimate occupation. However, in the absence of a formal expropriation decision, the Court considered that that situation could not be deemed "foreseeable", because it was only on the basis of a final judicial decision that the principle of indirect expropriation could be considered actually to have been applied and the acquisition of the land by the public authorities to have been confirmed.

Consequently, the applicants only had legal certainty as regards the deprivation of the land on the date the decision of the domestic Court of Appeal became final. Consequently, the impugned interference was incompatible with the legality principle, thus infringing the applicants' right to respect for their property.

There had therefore been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Italy was to pay the applicants jointly EUR 326,300 euros in respect of pecuniary damage, EUR 5,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 5,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

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
GREECE	9 February 2017	Igbo and Others (No. 60042/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (lack of personal space)
				Violation of Art. 13	Domestic remedy does not provide a way to improve the applicant's conditions of detention
	16 February 2017	D.M. (In French only) (No. 44559/15)	3	No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Adequate conditions of detention
				Violation of Art. 13 combined with Art. 3	Absence of an effective domestic remedy concerning the applicant's complaint about the conditions of detention
ITALY	9 February 2017	Solarino In French only (No. 76171/13)	3	Violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities not justifying the decision to limit the applicant's rights of access to his daughter
	23 February 2017	D'Alconzo (In French only) (No. 64297/12)	3	Violation of Art. 8	Excessive length of criminal proceedings
				No violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities' failure to take effective measures in order to enforce the applicant's contact rights
LITHUANIA	21 February 2017	Simaitiene (No. 55056/10)	3	No violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	No failure of the domestic authorities to take the necessary actions in order to return the applicant's property rights while she received the exact level of compensation indicated in the decision that she never challenged
NETHERLANDS	14 February 2017	Hokkeling (No. 30749/12)	2	Violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c)	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the applicant's absence during the court of appeal hearing which undermined his defence rights
POLAND	7 February 2017	Wdowiak (No. 28768/12)	3	No violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities taking all the steps necessary and which could reasonably be required of them in order to enforce the applicant's right to have contact with his son
PORTUGAL	14 February 2017	Martins O'Neill Pedrosa (No. 55214/15)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a prompt judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's detention

					(105 days)
ROMANIA	7 February 2017	Dinu (No. 64356/14)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Neither the domestic authorities investigating the case nor the domestic Government having convincingly shown that, in the particular circumstances of the present case, the force employed by the police officers against the applicant was proportionate
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Investigation by domestic authorities cannot be said to have been thorough and "effective" given that the relevant domestic legislation relied on by the domestic authorities allowed for interventions in various situations, and required that certain procedural steps be observed in the process
	14 February 2017	Patrascu (No. 7600/09)	2	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the domestic courts' failure to adequately investigate the applicant's allegations of police incitement
RUSSIA	7 February 2017	Bubon (No. 63898/09)	2	No violation of Art. 10	No interference with the applicant's right to receive information, as information he was seeking was therefore not only not "ready and available", but did not exist in the form the applicant was looking for
		Mkhchyan (No. 54700/12)	3	No violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Benefit for proper town and country planning and development and ensuring that no structures that were not related to the railway system were located within railway rights of way being considered proportionate to the inconvenience caused to the applicant by the removal of his garage
	14 February 2017	Allanazarova (In French only) (No. 46721/15)	2	Violation of Art. 3	Real risk of ill-treatment in case of the applicant's extradition to her country of origin
				Violation of Art. 13 combined with Art. 3	Ineffective domestic remedy concerning the applicant's claim

RUSSIA	14 February 2017	Karakhanyan (No. 24421/11)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (positive obligations, substantive)	Domestic authorities' failure to provide the applicant's husband with adequate medical care	
				Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the allegations that the applicant's husband's death had resulted from inadequate medical treatment	
	21 February 2017		Kushtova and Others (No. 2) (No. 60806/08)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	Applicants' relative may be presumed dead following his unacknowledged detention by state agents
					Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the circumstances of the disappearance and death of the applicants' relative
					Violation of Art. 3	Applicants' inability to ascertain the fate of their relative and the manner in which their complaints had been dealt with by the domestic authorities caused them mental distress and anguish
					Violation of Art. 5	Unlawful and unacknowledged detention of the applicants' relative by state agents
					Violation of Art. 13 in conjunction with Art. 2 and 3	Lack of an effective domestic remedy concerning the applicant's grievances under Art. 2 and 3
		Orlovskaya Iskra (No. 42911/08)	2	Violation of Art. 10	Unjustified interference with the applicant organisation's editorial choice to publish a text taking a critical stance and to impart information and ideas on matters of public interest	
		Ovakimyan (No. 52796/08)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Police ill-treatment which amounted to torture	
	Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)			Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the applicant's allegations of police ill-treatment		
Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant					
SERBIA	7 February 2017	Cvetković (No. 42707/10)	3	No violation of Art. 8	Eventual decision by the domestic authorities to award custody to the father not being regarded as disproportionate to the legitimate aim of protecting the child's best interests	

SLOVENIA	14 February 2017	Lekic (No. 36480/07)	2	No violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Proportionate interference with the applicant's property rights
TURKEY	7 February 2017	İrfan Güzel In French only (No. 35285/08)	2	No violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities having tapped the applicant's telephone being necessary in a democratic society in the interest of national security
				Violation of Art. 13 in conjunction with Art.8	Domestic authorities' depriving the applicant from an effective judicial remedy to contest the non-compliance with Art. 8
UKRAINE	16 February 2017	Gavrilov (No. 11691/06)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Unjustified restriction of the applicant's right of access to a court
		Andriy Karakutsya and Nadiya Karakutsya (No. 18986/06)	3	No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Applicants' failure to lodge an appeal on points of law within the additional time-limit
		Artur Parkhomenko (No. 40464/05)	3	No violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c)	Fairness of proceedings despite the decision to refuse the applicant access to a lawyer
				Violation of Art. 34	Domestic authorities' failure to give the applicant a copy of his request for a lawyer to be appointed
Kryvenky (No. 43768/07)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Deprivation of applicant's property without any compensation		

B. The decision on admissibility

These 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 30 November 2016**. They 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
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	15 November 2016	Simić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina (75255/10)	Violation of Art. 6 § 1 of the Convention (Lack of a public hearing, no opportunity for the applicant to present his case), Art. 10 of the Convention (Violation of the applicant's right to freedom of expression), and Art. 13 of the Convention (Lack of an effective legal remedy against the Constitutional Court's decision)	Rejected as ill-founded (No appearance of a violation of Art. 6 and 10 of the Convention, the absence of a remedy against the Constitutional Court's decision does not raise an issue under Article 13 of the Convention)
ESTONIA	8 November 2016	Savisaar v. Estonia (8365/16)	Violation of Art. 6 § 1 of the Convention (Violation of the applicant's right to a fair trial)	Rejected as incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the provisions of the Convention
POLAND	22 November 2016	Gajewski v. Poland (8951/11)	Violation of Art. 8 and 12 of the Convention (Refusal of a divorce to the applicant)	Rejected as inadmissible (Abuse of the right of application)
	22 November 2016	Piotrowski v. Poland (8923/12)	Violation of Art. 8 and 12 of the Convention (Breach of the applicant's right to a respect of his private life)	Rejected as ill-founded (No individual right to divorce)

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 December 2016** 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
BULGARIA	7 December 2016	DOKTOROV (No. 15074/08)	The applicant complains that it has been impossible for him to contest the legal presumption that he was the father of a child born during his marriage to the mother.
	7 December 2016	KOPANKOV AND OTHERS (No. 48929/12)	The applicants complain that even though the expropriation order in respect of their property was revoked, they were unable to get their house back, as in the meantime it had been pulled down, and that they were unable to obtain compensation for its demolition.
RUSSIA	14 December 2016	BAPINAYEVA (No. 48057/08)	The applicant complains that she has been subject to inhuman and degrading treatment and that the authorities unjustifiably interfered with her right to respect for her family life by refusing to return the body of her son for burial.

PartOne

§2 - EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF SOCIAL RIGHTS

A. Reclamations and Decisions

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

B. Other information

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

PartOne

§3 - RECOMMENDATIONS & RESOLUTIONS

A. Recommendations

AUTHOR	DATE	TEXT NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
CM	22 February 2017	CM/Rec(2017)1	Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member States on the European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st century	CM recommends that the governments of member States, amongst others, embrace and implement the strategy appended to this recommendation, at the appropriate governance levels, in compliance with their applicable national legal provisions and practice

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

■ 1276th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies (01.02.2017)

Amongst other items, the Deputies approved an Action Plan to provide assistance to the Republic of Moldova for the period 2017-2020 and instructed the Secretariat to implement it. They also took note of a report on the Council of Europe's co-operation activities in Kosovo* and instructed the Secretariat to continue implementing the current activities and to begin implementing the projects proposed in this report. ([Read more](#))

■ 1277th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies (09.02.2017)

The Deputies took note of numerous texts, including Opinion No. 19 (2016) on the role of court presidents, Opinion No. 11 (2016) on the quality and efficiency of the work of prosecutors, including when fighting terrorism and serious and organised crime, as well of texts from the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice. ([Read more](#))

■ 1278th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies (22 February 2017) (22.02.2017)

The Deputies adopted a recommendation to member States on the European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st century, which aims to redefine the place and role of cultural heritage in Europe and provide guidelines to promote good governance and participation in heritage identification and management. The Deputies also adopted a resolution in the context of the European Social Charter collective complaints procedure concerning the complaint by the European Roma and Travellers Forum (ERTF) against the Czech Republic. ([Read more](#))

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly

■ Making the most out of Kyrgyz Parliament's partnership with the Assembly (02.02.2017)

Meeting with Abdymanap Kutushev, Secretary General of the Parliament, the PACE Secretary General Wojciech Sawicki encouraged the Kyrgyz delegation to participate more actively in the work of the Assembly and its committees. ([Read more](#) – [Resolution 1984](#))

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

■ ECRI: Andorra has sharpened its criminal law but should reinforce its anti-discrimination body, says Council of Europe's Anti-racism Commission (28.02.2017)

In a published report, the ECRI concludes that Andorra has made progress in improving criminal law provisions to combat racism and discrimination. However, additional measures are needed, such as ensuring the existence of a specialised anti-discrimination body or the adoption of legislation introducing the principle of the sharing of the burden of proof in discrimination cases ([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.

Albania

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: Visit of the Committee (13.02.2017)

A delegation of the CPT carried out an ad hoc visit to Albania from 2 to 9 February 2017.

The main objective of the visit was to review progress made as regards the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee in the report on its 2014 visit. Particular attention was paid to the treatment and conditions of detention of persons in police custody and the situation of remand prisoners and forensic psychiatric patients ([Read more](#)).

Armenia

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: Pre-electoral mission to Armenia supports transparency of electoral process but fears that irregularities could recur (23.02.2017)

The pre-electoral delegation of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) supports the opinion of the Venice Commission, adopted in 2016, which concluded that the electoral legislation in Armenia allows for the organisation of free and democratic elections, if it is applied in good faith and if there is a political will. However, after having heard detailed explanations of the new electoral code, the delegation still felt that it was too complicated to be understood by the general public and believes that this may lead to confusion and add to existing distrust in the electoral process. ([Read more – Announcement of the pre-electoral mission](#))

Austria

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Adolf AND Elke BURGSTALLER 58461/13	31 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)25	Examination closed
GROSSMANN AIR SERVICE BEDARFSLUFTF AHRUNTUNTER-NEHMEN GMBH & CO KG 47199/10	2 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)26	Examination closed
BINDER 50627/09	2 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)26	Examination closed
HACKEL 43463/09	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)26	Examination closed
NADERHIRN 5136/10	5 July 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)26	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRECO: Austria should improve integrity rules in parliament and independence of the judiciary: anti-corruption report (13.02.2017)

In spite of commendable progress that Austria has made in recent years in domestic anti-corruption policies, those for parliamentarians are still at an early stage. Rules are needed to manage conflicts of interest when they arise and a code of conduct should be put in place to improve poor public perceptions of elected officials, according to a new report by the GRECO ([Read more](#)).

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

■ CPT: The committee holds high-level talks in Azerbaijan (22.02.2017)

Representatives of the CPT have recently returned from high-level talks in Baku, Azerbaijan.

The objective of the talks, which took place on 16 and 17 February 2017, was to discuss the state of co-operation between the CPT and the Azerbaijani authorities and, in particular, the implementation of the CPT's long-standing recommendations concerning law enforcement agencies, prisons, psychiatric hospitals and social care homes ([Read more](#)).

Belgium

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
OUABOUR 26417/10	2 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)27	Examination closed
BOUYID 23380/09	28 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)46	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ ECRI: The committee assesses implementation on its priority recommendations (28.02.2017)

The ECRI has published its conclusions on the implementation of its priority recommendations made in 2014 to Germany and Belgium.

In its latest report on Belgium, ECRI recommended that the authorities promptly assess the application and effectiveness of the legislation against racism and intolerance, in order to identify any gaps to be closed. ECRI notes a number of positive developments. However at the time of the adoption of its conclusions (December 2016) ECRI assessed that its recommendation was not yet fully implemented.

The second recommendation to the Belgian authorities was to conclude as soon as possible the legislative process to turn the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism into a fully independent inter-federal institution dedicated to helping all victims of discrimination. ECRI is pleased to note that its recommendation has been implemented ([Read more](#)).

Bosnia and Herzegovina

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
AL HUSIN 3727/08	9 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)28	Examination closed
MOMIĆ AND OTHERS 1441/07+	15 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)29	Examination closed
MILINKOVIĆ 21175/13	8 July 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)29	Examination closed
MUSLIJA 32042/11	14 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)30	Examination closed
Goran PRANJIĆ LUKIĆ AND 4 OTHER APPLICATIONS 65062/11+	17 November 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)47	Examination closed
Momir SIMIČIĆ 74246/13	7 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)55	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ ECRI: The committee denounces a lack of political willingness to build an inclusive society (28.02.2017)

The ECRI has published its third report on Bosnia and Herzegovina in which it analyses recent developments and outstanding issues and makes recommendations to the authorities.

The report welcomes that political representatives are now usually quick to condemn attacks against returnees when such incidents occur. It also notes positively that the strategy for the implementation of Annex VII of the Dayton Peace Agreement on the rights of returnees has been revised, focusing on support for housing, infrastructure and employment ([Read more](#)).

Bulgaria

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
VELIKOVI AND OTHERS 43278/98+	24 July 2008	CM/ResDH(2017)31	Examination closed
GEORGIEVA and / et MUKAREVA 3413/05	2 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)31	Examination closed
KALINOVA 45116/98	27 February 2009	CM/ResDH(2017)31	Examination closed
KIROVA AND OTHERS 31836/04	2 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2017)31	Examination closed
TSONKOVI 27213/04	2 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2017)31	Examination closed
TONOV AND OTHERS 48704/07	30 October 2012	CM/ResDH(2017)31	Examination closed
BEKIRSKI 71420/01	2 September 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)48	Examination closed
Tsvetan Tsenov DAMYANOV 17203/13	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)56	Examination closed

Iliya Stefanov MURDZHEV AND OTHERS 20314/11	17 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)56	Examination closed
Georgi Lukov VRAGOV 20699/09	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)56	Examination closed
Teodora Nikolaeva RUNTOVA AND Christian Georgiev GEORGIEV 6168/09	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)56	Examination closed
ARABADZHIEV and ALEXIEV 20484/05	21 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
ATANASOV 19315/04	9 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
DELOV 30949/04	24 February 2011	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
DIMITROV VASKO YORDANOV 50401/99	3 May 2006	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
F.G. 17911/03	4 March 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
HRISTOV IVAN 32461/02	20 March 2008	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed

IVANOV 67189/01	24 May 2007	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
IVANOV 27776/04	25 November 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
KALPACHKA 49163/99	2 November 2006	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
KARAGYOZOV 65051/01	25 November 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
KAROV 45964/99	16 November 2006	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
KECHEV 13364/05	26 July 2012	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
KOLEV 50326/99	28 April 2005	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
KOLEV ILIYA 21205/04	13 January 2011	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
KONOVSKI 33231/04	2 September 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
LISEV 30380/03	26 February 2009	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
MYASHEV 43428/02	8 January 2009	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed

NALBANTOVA 38106/02	27 September 2007	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
NEDYALKOV 44241/98	3 November 2005	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
OSMANOV and YUSEINOV 54178/00+	23 September 2004	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
RANGELOV and STEFANOV 23240/04	1 April 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
REZOV 56337/00	15 February 2007	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
SIDJIMOV 55057/00	27 January 2005	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
SODADJIEV 58733/00	5 October 2006	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
STEFANOV and YURUKOV 25382/04	1 April 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
TERZIEV 62594/00	12 April 2007	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
VALKOV 72636/01	8 January 2009	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed

VASILEV AND OTHERS 61257/00	8 November 2007	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
YANKOV and MANCHEV 27207/04+	22 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
YANKOV AND OTHERS 4570/05	23 September 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
YANKOV No. 2 70728/01	7 February 2008	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
ZHBANOV 45563/99	22 July 2004	CM/ResDH(2017)57	Examination closed
ZHELEV 39143/06	15 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)57	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]

Check 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

CM	22 February 2017	CM/ResChS(2017)2	European Roma and Travellers Forum (ERTF) v. Czech Republic	CM taking note of the report of the European Committee of Social Rights by which it stated that there is a violation of Article 16 of the 1961 Charter on the ground of forced evictions and a violation of Article 11 of the 1961 Charter on the grounds of exclusion in the field of health and of inadequate access to health care services
-----------	------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

C. Other information

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

Croatia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
J. 18572/12	1st March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)32	Examination closed
Jasminka KAČIĆ BARTULOVIĆ 28126/15	17 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)58	Examination closed
Slaven ŠIMIĆ 38451/13	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)58	Examination closed
Nenad GRBA GALIJANIĆ 56929/13	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)58	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]

Cyprus

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: Visit of the Committee (14.02.2017)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a visit to Cyprus from 2 to 9 February 2017. It was the Committee's seventh visit to the country.

The CPT's delegation reviewed the measures taken by the Cypriot authorities to implement recommendations made by the Committee after its 2013 visit. To this end, it examined the treatment of persons detained by the police (including immigration detainees) and the safeguards offered to them. Particular attention was paid to the effectiveness of investigations into allegations of ill-treatment by public officials. The delegation also examined the situation at Nicosia Central Prison, Menoyia Detention Centre for Illegal Immigrants and Athalassa Psychiatric Hospital and visited a number of social care homes ([Read more](#)).

Finland

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
KIVIOJA 27025/04	13 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2017)49	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

AUTHOR	DATE	TEXT NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
CM	1 February 2017	CM/ResChS(2017)1	Finnish Society of Social Rights v. Finland	CM taking note of the report transmitted by the European Committee of Social Rights, in which the Committee concluded unanimously that there is no violation of Article 24 of the Charter

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
JSC VAZIANI 19377/09	13 September 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)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]

Germany

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Eljwer RAMADANOVIC 33095/15	7 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)50	Examination closed
BROSA 5709/09	17 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)60	Examination closed
RANGELOV 5123/07	22 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2017)61	Examination closed
HEINISCH 28274/08	21 July 2011	CM/ResDH(2017)62	Examination closed
ANAYO 20578/07	21 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)63	Examination closed
SCHNEIDER 17080/07	15 September 2011	CM/ResDH(2017)63	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ ECRI: The committee assesses implementation of its priority recommendations (28.02.2017)

The ECRI has published its conclusions on the implementation of its priority recommendations made in 2014 to Germany and Belgium.

As for Germany, in its latest report ECRI reiterated its recommendation to the authorities to ratify Protocol No. 12 to the European Convention on Human Rights as soon as possible. The Protocol provides for general prohibition of discrimination. The German authorities have informed ECRI that they maintain their position and do not wish to ratify it. ECRI concludes that this recommendation has not been implemented ([Read more](#)).

Greece

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
George AZERARISULI 78383/11	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Georgios CHATZOVOULOS AND 3 OTHER APPLICATIONS 56162/11	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Antrei DIRZOU 25525/12	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Lazaros GIANNOUKAKIS 51570/11	17 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Georgios LEPETES AND OTHERS AND Panagiota ARISTERIDOU AND OTHERS 53332/14+	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Kalliopi MINTZA AND 5 OTHER APPLICATIONS 38021/14	10 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Akram NOUJRA 5159/15	6 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed

Ioannis PANAGIOTAKIS 54642/10	10 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Apostolos PAPAKONSTANTINOU 19651/13	23 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Stephanos STAVROS 48441/12	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
T.U. 63405/11	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Ioannis TSERPES 27805/13	26 April 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Theodoros VLASTARIS AND Dimitrios KYRIAKIDIS 28769/12+	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)51	Examination closed
Eleni XYNOPOULOU AND Georgios PAPAZOGLU 62674/12	21 April 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)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]

Hungary

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
József BALOGH 77723/11	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Ildikó Katalin BOROSNÉ SZÜTS AND OTHERS 44734/11	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Imréné CSÉPÁNY AND OTHERS 37467/11	15 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Judit CSIHA 172/12	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
László CZIGLER and Enikő CZIGLERNÉ TAKÁCS 36230/15	23 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
László CZIGLER 44732/11	23 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Zoltán DEMETER 5322/12	19 January 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed

Zsolt FÁBOS 46549/12	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
István FEHÉR 49155/11	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Szilvia FRANKNÉ KOVÁCS 77545/11	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Ferenc GERENCSÉR 60660/11	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Erzsébet GY NÉMETH 76883/11	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
László HARSÁNYI 65926/11	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Edit JÁVORNÉ VÉGH 67591/11	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
László József LIZIK 16471/12	3 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Kata Orsolya MOLNÁR 54608/11	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed

POLITREFF KFT 13045/11	19 January 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Márta SCHNEIDER 5378/12	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Gyula TÓTH 5379/12	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	Examination closed
Z.L.B. 56872/12	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)33	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]

Iceland

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: The committee concerned about increasing racist discourse in Iceland, but finds good progress in LGBT rights (28.02.2017)

The ECRI has published its fifth report on Iceland in which it analyses recent developments and outstanding issues and makes recommendations to the authorities.

ECRI welcomes Iceland's appointment of a police officer to investigate hate crime in Reykjavik and creation of a data base to monitor on-line hate speech, in particular the growing anti-Muslim sentiment. The respect of LGBT rights is overall good, with a positive climate of acceptance. An action plan is being developed to improve further the situation of "LGBTI" persons in the areas of education, including bullying in schools, health care, legal gender recognition and asylum ([Read more](#)).

Latvia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
L.H. 52019/07	29 July 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)64	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]

Lithuania

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
KASPEROVIČIUS 54872/08	20 February 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)34	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ FCNM: Receipt of the 4th cycle State Report (28.02.2017)

Lithuania submitted its fourth State Report in English on 23 February 2017, pursuant to Article 25, paragraph 2, of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. It is also available in Lithuanian.

It is now up to the Advisory Committee to consider it and adopt an opinion intended for the Committee of Ministers ([Read the report](#)).

Luxembourg

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: Xenophobia on the internet, a weak equality body and lack of a new action plan on integration are issues of high concern (28.02.2017)

The ECRI has published its fifth report on Luxembourg, in which it analyses recent developments and makes recommendations to the authorities.

On the positive side, ECRI highlighted a process of creating a House of Human Rights, the fact that politicians and the media do, in general, not resort to hate speech, a firm response of the judiciary to hate speech, free pre-school education, major efforts for good-quality reception of refugees and low rates of racist and homophobic/transphobic violence ([Read more](#)).

Montenegro

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
BULATOVIĆ 67320/10	22 October 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)35	Examination closed
VUKELIĆ 58258/09	4 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)36	Examination closed
ŽIVALJEVIĆ 17229/04	15 September 2011	CM/ResDH(2017)37	Examination closed
STAKIĆ 49320/07	2 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)38	Examination closed
BUJKOVIĆ 40080/08	6 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)38	Examination closed
NOVOVIĆ 13210/05	23 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)38	Examination closed
Budislav MINIĆ AND 5 OTHER APPLICATIONS 17335/07	26 April 2006	CM/ResDH(2017)39	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]

Norway

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
KRISTIANSEN 1176/10	17 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)40	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRECO: Fourth Round Compliance Report on Norway (15.02.2017)

The authorities of Norway have confirmed publication of the Fourth Round Compliance Report on Norway ([Read more](#)).

Poland

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
MOGIELNICKI 42689/09	15 December 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)41	Examination closed
OLSZEWSKY 99/12	3 November 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)52	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]

Portugal

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
COMPANHIA AGRÍCOLA DA APARIÇA, SA 12474/12	14 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)42	Examination closed
Nuno Gonçalo ABREU DE FREITAS 75410/13	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)65	Examination closed
António BRUNHETA GIL GASPAS AND 2 OTHER APPLICATIONS 63606/13	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)65	Examination closed
Bregiste CARDOSO TEIXEIRA PINTO 69636/13	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)65	Examination closed
Djubairato DJAU and Bemba SEIDI 54866/13	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)65	Examination closed
António Maria JÚNIOR AND 3 OTHER APPLICATIONS 59706/13	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)65	Examination closed

Alzira PESTANA CAMPOS 8632/13	17 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)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]

Romania

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
AURELIAN OPREA 12138/08	19 January 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)43	Examination closed
Aureliana ANGHEL 16979/12	30 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Gheorghe CĂLIN 17615/14	16 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Bogdan ISTRATE 61295/10	17 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Alin Daniel IUGA AND 11 OTHER APPLICATIONS 47022/14	2 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Vladimir Pavel KAŞAI 69367/14	30 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Adorjan LASZLO AND 7 OTHER APPLICATIONS 29975/15	16 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed

Mihai-Ştefan LUNGU AND 6 OTHER APPLICATIONS 21815/14	30 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Iulian MANOLE 23358/13	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Nicolae MILITARU AND 23 OTHER APPLICATIONS 78651/13	19 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Mihăiţă-Marian SPIREA AND Andi-Mihai NEGREANU 32136/15+	2 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Elena STĂTESCU AND 4 OTHER APPLICATIONS 56574/10	24 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
Adalbert Csoaba VARGA AND Mihail Oane FILIŞAN 27756/14	16 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed

Gabriel-Laurențiu VASILE AND 4 OTHER APPLICATIONS 52488/14	2 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)53	Examination closed
--	-------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRECO: Statement on the current situation in Romania (02.02.2017)

“We are following developments in Romania closely. The Secretary General has been in touch with the Romanian authorities, recalling that the Council of Europe’s anti-corruption body GRECO is available to provide its expertise in the current situation”. ([Read more](#))

■ PACE: Rapporteur alarmed by the emergency decree decriminalising certain forms of corruption in Romania (02.02.2017)

“I am seriously alarmed by the Romanian government’s emergency decree, passed on Tuesday night and given immediate effect, which will decriminalise many, even serious cases of corruption and abuse of public office,” said Bernd Fabritius (Germany, EPP/CD), PACE rapporteur on ‘strengthening the rule of law in south-east European countries through targeted reform of the legal system’. ([Read more](#))

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: Rapporteur urges Russia to drop charges against journalist in Crimea (17.02.2017)

A rapporteur of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe has urged Russia to drop the charges against Mykola Semena, a Crimean journalist whose trial for “separatism” and related offences is due to begin today ([Read more](#) – [PACE Resolution 2141 \(2017\)](#) – [PACE Resolution 2133 \(2016\)](#))

Serbia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Rajna ANTIĆ 34835/08	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Verica ARIZANOVIĆ 48181/13	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Saveta ARSIĆ AND 3 OTHER APPLICATIONS 54054/08+	17 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Jovan BILIĆ 4281/14	2 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Begza BOGUĆANIN 76639/12	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Semiha BUKVIĆ and Vesna JANKOVIĆ 9990/12+	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Šahida CRNOVRŠANIN 52957/12	16 December 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed

<p>Stanijanka CVETKOVIĆ AND 5 OTHER APPLICATIONS</p> <p>5349/13</p>	<p>23 September 2014</p>	<p>CM/ResDH(2017)44</p>	<p>Examination closed</p>
<p>Jovica CVETKOVIĆ AND 6 OTHER APPLICATIONS</p> <p>7760/13</p>	<p>21 October 2014</p>	<p>CM/ResDH(2017)44</p>	<p>Examination closed</p>
<p>Nada DIDANOVIĆ AND 6 OTHER APPLICATIONS</p> <p>21305/13+</p>	<p>2 September 2014</p>	<p>CM/ResDH(2017)44</p>	<p>Examination closed</p>
<p>Žarko ĐOKIĆ AND 8 OTHER APPLICATIONS</p> <p>10859/13+</p>	<p>15 April 2014</p>	<p>CM/ResDH(2017)44</p>	<p>Examination closed</p>
<p>Vasko EFTIMOV AND 11 OTHER APPLICATIONS</p> <p>6249/11+</p>	<p>2 September 2014</p>	<p>CM/ResDH(2017)44</p>	<p>Examination closed</p>
<p>GAJIĆ AND 101 OTHER APPLICATIONS</p> <p>27056/12+</p>	<p>17 December 2012</p>	<p>CM/ResDH(2017)44</p>	<p>Examination closed</p>
<p>Ljutvo HANUŠA</p> <p>56538/13</p>	<p>2 June 2015</p>	<p>CM/ResDH(2017)44</p>	<p>Examination closed</p>
<p>Aska HRISTOV</p> <p>46827/13</p>	<p>3 February 2015</p>	<p>CM/ResDH(2017)44</p>	<p>Examination closed</p>

Miroslav ILIĆ AND 99 OTHER APPLICATIONS 27622/12+	17 December 2012	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Mladoljub JOCOVIĆ 24706/12+	15 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Dušan KOKOVIĆ AND 10 OTHER APPLICATIONS 24769/09+	7 April 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Neđo KRNDIJA AND 3 OTHER APPLICATIONS 16285/10+	3 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Milan LAZAREVIĆ AND 10 OTHER APPLICATIONS 74163/10	25 November 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Mira LUKIĆ AND 2 OTHER APPLICATIONS 52412/12+	10 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Dragoljub MARKOVIĆ AND 7 OTHER APPLICATIONS 45715/08+	31 March 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Branko MIŠOVIĆ AND 26 OTHER APPLICATIONS 8170/12	16 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed

Radoslav PEŠIĆ AND 12 OTHER APPLICATIONS 61205/12	21 October 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Milka PIPER AND 15 OTHER APPLICATIONS 73409/13+	31 March 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Milan RADETIĆ AND 7 OTHER APPLICATIONS 47174/08	15 December 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Zuhra SIJARIĆ 49470/11	31 March 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Milan STANIĆ 46704/11	24 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Milena STANOJEVIĆ 10833/13	20 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Mile STANOJEVIĆ AND 6 OTHER APPLICATIONS 7014/10+	16 December 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Dragan ŠTEFLJA 43569/10	31 March 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Jasmina VUJANOVIĆ 53799/13	7 April 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed

Mile VULOVIĆ 42257/11	2 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)44	Examination closed
Predrag BOŽOVIĆ 25905/12	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)66	Examination closed
Dragan MILOŠEVIĆ 25718/08	26 April 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)66	Examination closed
Rajko VASILJEVIĆ 43488/07	26 April 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)66	Examination closed
Ljubomir TOFILOVSKI AND OTHERS AND 3 OTHER APPLICATIONS 33607/07+	24 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)67	Examination closed
Petar ZDRAVKOVIĆ AND 2 OTHER APPLICATIONS 10143/10+	17 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)67	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
Karol HAMI 54888/15	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)68	Examination closed
Radomír JAKAB 53963/15	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)68	Examination closed
Marian JÁNOŠÍK 37839/15	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)68	Examination closed
Ľudovít JUHÁS 43096/15	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)68	Examination closed
Viliam KUNZO 57465/11	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)68	Examination closed
Maria SCHMUTZOVÁ and Alojz VITTEK 53549/13	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)68	Examination closed
Pavel SZIJJÁRTÓ 54891/15	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)68	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]

Slovenia

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: Second Interim Compliance Report (Fourth Evaluation Round) on Slovenia (15.02.2017)

The authorities of Slovenia have authorised publication of the Second *Interim* Compliance Report of Fourth Round on Slovenia ([Read the report](#)).

Spain

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
IGUALL COLL 37496/04	10 March 2009	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
MARCOS BARRIOS 17122/07	21 September 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
GARCIA HERNANDEZ 15256/07	16 November 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
ALMENARA ALVAREZ 16096/08	25 October 2011	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
LACADENA CALERO 23002/07	22 November 2011	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
VALBUENA REDONDO 21460/08	13 December 2011	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
SERRANO CONTRERAS 49183/08	20 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
VILANOVA GOTERRIS and LLOP GARCIA 5606/09+	27 November 2012	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed

NIETO MACERO 26234/12	8 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
SAINZ CASLA 18054/10	5 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
PORCEL TERRIBAS AND OTHERS 47530/13	8 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)69	Examination closed
GÓMEZ OLMEDA 61112/12	29 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)69	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

[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: Call for ratification and implementation of the Council of Europe Criminal Law Convention on Corruption at the 2nd International Forum for Sports Integrity in Lausanne (15/02/2017)

At the Second International Forum for Sports Integrity, the IOC and representatives of governments, international organisations, sports betting operators, national regulating authorities and Olympic movement stakeholders called for the ratification and implementation of the Council of Europe Criminal Law Convention on Corruption, as a tool for fighting corruption and enhancing good governance in sport. They also launched an International Sports Integrity Partnership to help prevent corruption risks in sports and facilitate cooperation between the key stakeholders in this field ([Read the full text of the Declaration](#)).

“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
LESNINA VELETRGOVIN A DOO 37619/04	14 October 2010	CM/ResDH(2017)45	Examination closed
Hasan ASANI AND 12 OTHER APPLICATIONS 18358/15	21 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)70	Examination closed
‘KOMNIKO’ DOOEL - VLADO 42244/06	6 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)70	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Second evaluation visit to the “former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (28.02.2017)

A delegation of the GRETA carried out an evaluation visit to “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” from 20 to 23 February 2017. 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 2013 ([Read more](#)).

Turkey

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Habibe AÇIL 24640/06	12 January 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Özgür AĞDAŞ 23126/06	15 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Ömer AKKAN 62087/12	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Muradiye ATAY 66505/09	12 January 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Cengiz AYAR 70941/10	15 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Fatih Hür BEKTAŞ 38683/11	1 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Hayrettin BEŞTAŞ AND / ET Beşir BARAN 16857/12	17 May 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed

Elvan BİLİCİ AND 69 OTHER APPLICATIONS 31139/10	8 December 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Umut ÇATAL 40623/11	12 January 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Hasan DENİZ AND 12 OTHER APPLICATIONS 56702/10	8 December 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Tolga EYİBİL 5429/12	12 January 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Çilem İLASLAN 26457/12	2 September 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed

Cahit İLBOĞA AND 3 OTHER APPLICATIONS 39978/07	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
KINALIOĞLU 63666/09	15 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Abdullah KÖÇER 5070/12	15 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
MADAK 50114/09	26 March 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Ali MERCAN 38924/11	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed

MURAT YILMAZ 26388/05	10 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Cemal NAYIR 63447/12	9 February 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
ÖZDEMİR 19053/09	26 March 2013	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Olca ŞAHİN 28543/11	15 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Servet ŞİMŞEK 55125/11	8 December 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed

Hasan Erim TOPRAK 58458/10	15 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
Oğuz ZENGİN 41585/10	8 December 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)54	Examination closed
BEKMEZCİ AND OTHERS 37087/97	27 June 2002	CM/ResDH(2017)71	Examination closed
AŞILI DOĞAN AND OTHERS AND 2 OTHER APPLICATIONS 62781/10	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)72	Examination closed
Ahmetcan BAYDENİZ 14010/08	13 January 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)72	Examination closed

İshak Şadi ÇARSANCAKLI AND OTHERS 37783/08	28 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)72	Examination closed
Saime KAVAK and Özlem ORAL 13597/12	14 June 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)72	Examination closed
Funda KENAR 23587/08	16 December 2014	CM/ResDH(2017)72	Examination closed
Sinan SEZEN AND 12 OTHER APPLICATIONS 63332/12	15 March 2016	CM/ResDH(2017)72	Examination closed
Arzu YILDIRIM AND OTHERS AND 2 OTHER APPLICATIONS 58268/10	8 December 2015	CM/ResDH(2017)72	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

[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: Ukraine: deep concern over escalation of ceasefire violations in Avdiivka (01.02.2017)

The co-rapporteurs of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe for Ukraine, Jordi Xucla (Spain, ALDE) and Axel Fischer (Germany, EPP/CD), have expressed their deep concern at the escalation of violence and ceasefire violations around the Ukrainian town of Avdiivka which have led to several fatalities on both sides over recent days. ([Read more](#))

United Kingdom

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: Visit of the Committee to the UK Sovereign Base Areas on Cyprus (17.02.2017)

A delegation of the CPT carried out, for the first time, a visit to the United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas (SBA) of Akrotiri (Western Sovereign Base Area) and Dhekelia (Eastern Sovereign Base Area) on Cyprus from 9 to 11 February 2017 ([Read more](#)).