

DIRECTORATE OF HUMAN RIGHTS
(DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND RULE OF LAW)
&
DIRECTORATE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND ANTI-DISCRIMINATION
(DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF DEMOCRACY)



Strasbourg, 4 December 2012

REGULAR SELECTIVE INFORMATION FLOW (RSIF)

FOR THE ATTENTION OF THE NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS STRUCTURES (NHRSS)

Issue n° 102
covering the period from 1 to 14 November 2012

*The **selection** of the information contained in this Issue and deemed relevant to NHRSS is made under the responsibility of the Directorate of Human Rights (DG I)*

For any queries, please contact:
eugen.cibotaru@coe.int

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
PART I: THE ACTIVITIES OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS	4
A. Judgments	4
1. Judgments deemed of particular interest to NHRs	4
2. Other judgments issued in the period under observation	9
3. Repetitive cases.....	13
4. Length of proceedings cases.....	13
B. The decisions on admissibility / inadmissibility / striking out of the list including due to friendly settlements	14
C. The communicated cases	19
D. Miscellaneous (Referral to grand chamber, hearings and other activities)	20
PART II: THE EXECUTION OF THE JUDGMENTS OF THE COURT	21
PART III: GENERAL AGENDA	22
PART IV: THE WORK OF OTHER COUNCIL OF EUROPE MONITORING MECHANISMS	23
A. European Social Charter (ESC)	23
B. European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT)	23
C. European Committee against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)	23
D. Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM)	23
E. Group of States against Corruption (GRECO)	23
F. Committee of Experts on the Evaluation of Anti-Money Laundering Measures and the Financing of Terrorism (MONEYVAL)	23
G. Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA)	23
PART V: THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL WORK	25
A. The new signatures and ratifications of the Treaties of the Council of Europe	25
B. Recommendations and Resolutions adopted by the Committee of Ministers	25
C. Other news of the Committee of Ministers	25
PART VI: THE PARLIAMENTARY WORK	26
A. Resolutions and Recommendations of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE)	26
B. Other news of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe	26
PART VII: THE WORK OF THE OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS	27
PART VIII: ACTIVITIES AND NEWS OF THE PEER-TO-PEER NETWORK (UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE DIRECTORATE OF HUMAN RIGHTS)	28
INDEX	29

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 two weeks 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 two and four weeks old.

The selection of the information included in the Issues is made by 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 feed-back that may allow for the improvement of the format and the contents of this tool.

The preparation of the RSIF is funded jointly by the Directorate of Human Rights (Directorate General of Human Rights and Rule of Law - DG I) and the Directorate of Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination (Directorate of Democracy - DG II). It is entrusted to Mr Thibaut Fleury, Ph.D, Associate Professor at Versailles University (France).

Part I: The activities of the European Court of Human Rights

A. Judgments

1. Judgments deemed of particular interest to 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**

ANCA MOCANU AND OTHERS V. ROMANIA ([in French only](#)) (nos. 10865/09, 32431/08 and 45886/07) – Importance 2 – 13 November 2012 – Violation of Article 2 – Excessive length of investigation into the death of a demonstrator – Violation of Article 6 § 1 – Excessive length of investigation into the ransacking of the applicant association’s premises – No violation of Article 3 – Applicant’s failure to promptly act to be recognized as a victim

The case concerned the crackdown by the Romanian authorities on the demonstrations, which took place in June 1990 in Bucharest. The applicants challenged the length and effectiveness of the investigations into the death of one of the demonstrator, the ill-treatment sustained by another one, and the ransacking of the premises of the association ‘21 December 1989’.

The Court found that the duration of the investigative procedures into the death of one of the applicant’s husband and the ransacking of the association’s headquarters had been excessive, in violation, respectively, of Articles 2 and 6 § 1. In contrast, the passivity shown by the applicant who complained about ill-treatment in failing to exercise his victim status for 11 years prevented the Court from finding a violation of Article 3 in this respect.

- **Prohibition of slavery and forced labour**

[C.N. V. THE UNITED KINGDOM \(n°4239/08\) – Importance 2 – 13 November 2012 – Violation of Article 4 – Lack of specific legislation criminalising domestic servitude amounting to the ineffectiveness of investigation into allegations of domestic servitude](#)

The applicant is a Ugandan national who worked as live-in carer for an elderly Iraqi couple settled in the UK. She alleged that she was permanently on-call day and night, that her salary was sent to an agent who had arranged her work with the couple and that her passport had been retained during the time she worked for it.

In view of its findings in the Siliadin judgment, the Court could only conclude that the legislative provisions in force in the United Kingdom at the time had been inadequate to afford practical and effective protection against treatment contrary to Article 4. Indeed, the authorities had been limited to investigating and penalising criminal offences, which often – but not necessarily – accompanied the offences of slavery, servitude and forced or compulsory labour. Victims of domestic servitude who had not also been victims of one of these related offences had been left. Due to this absence of specific legislation criminalising domestic servitude, the Court also found that the investigation into the applicant's allegations of domestic servitude had been ineffective. There had therefore been a violation of Article 4.

Under Article 41 (just satisfaction), the Court held that the United Kingdom was to pay the applicant EUR 8,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 20,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

- **Right to a fair trial**

MARGUS V. CROATIA (no. 4455/10) – Importance 2 – 13 November 2012 – No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) – Fairness of proceedings – No violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 – Justified reopening of criminal proceedings in respect of offences newly classified as war crimes

The case concerned the conviction, in 2007, of a former commander of the Croatian army of war crimes against the civilian population committed in 1991. He complained in particular that the same judge had participated in the proceedings terminated in 1997 and those in which he was later found guilty, and that he had been deprived of the right to give closing arguments. He also complained that the criminal offences of which he was convicted were the same as those which had been the subject of proceedings against him terminated in 1997 in application of a General Amnesty Act.

Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c)

The Court noted in particular that the judge indeed participated in both proceedings, but that the question of the applicant's guilt had not been examined in the first set. The judge had therefore not expressed an opinion on the merits of the case. As regards the applicant's removal from the courtroom, the Court accepted that the closing arguments were an important stage of the trial. However, where the accused disturbed the order in the courtroom, the trial court could not be expected to remain passive and to allow such behaviour. Therefore, there had been no violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c).

Article 4 of Protocol No. 7

The Court observed in particular that it had previously held that an amnesty was generally incompatible with States' duty to investigate acts such as torture and that the obligation to prosecute criminals should not therefore be undermined by granting impunity to the perpetrator in the form of an amnesty law that might be considered contrary to international law. The Court was of the opinion that the same had to hold true as regards war crimes. Granting amnesty in respect of crimes against humanity, war crimes and genocide was increasingly considered to be prohibited by international law. In that light, the Court accepted the Croatian Government's view that the granting of amnesty to Mr MARGUŠ in respect of acts which were characterised as war crimes against the civilian population had amounted to a fundamental defect in the proceedings within the meaning of the second paragraph of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7, which justified a reopening of the proceedings. There had accordingly been no violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7.

- **Right to respect for private and family life**

HRISTOZOV AND OTHERS V. BULGARIA (nos. 47039/11 and 358/12) – Importance 2 – 13 November 2012 – No violation of Article 2 – No obligation for domestic authorities to give access to unauthorised medicine to terminally ill patients – No violation of Article 3 – No obligation for domestic authorities to alleviate the disparities between levels of health care available in various countries – No violation of Article 8 – Fair balance struck between terminally-ill cancer patients' interests and public interest on account of domestic authorities' refusal to allow the use of experimental medicine

The case concerned the Bulgarian authorities' refusal to allow nine terminally ill cancer patients access to an unauthorised experimental anti-cancer drug which is not authorised in any country but is allowed in some other countries for "compassionate use".

Article 2

The Court noted in particular that Article 2 could not be interpreted as requiring that access to unauthorised medicine for the terminally ill be regulated in a particular way. It also noted that under European Union law this matter remained within the competence of the member States and that European States dealt differently with the conditions and manner of providing access to unauthorised medicinal products. There had therefore been no violation of Article 2.

Article 3

The Court observed in particular that it was true that the Bulgarian authorities' decisions had caused the applicant mental suffering, especially in view of the fact that the product was available on an exceptional basis in other countries. However, Article 3 did not oblige States to alleviate the disparities between the levels of health care available in various countries. There had therefore been no violation of Article 3.

Article 8

According to the Court, The Bulgarian authorities had chosen to balance the competing interests by allowing patients who could not be satisfactorily treated with authorised medicinal products, to obtain, under certain conditions, medicinal products which had not been authorised in Bulgaria, but only if those products had already been authorised in another country. The fact that this had not been the case for the experimental product, which the applicants wished to use, had been the main reason for the authorities' refusal. The solution chosen by the Bulgarian authorities tilted the balance between potential therapeutic benefit and medicine risk avoidance decisively in favour of the latter. However, in view of the State's broad margin of appreciation, the Court did not find that the solution fell foul of Article 8. It was moreover not contrary to that Article for a State to regulate important aspects of private life without making provision for the weighing of competing interests in the circumstances of each individual case. There had accordingly been no violation of Article 8.

Judge Kalaydjieva expressed a partly dissenting opinion. Judge De Gaetano expressed a dissenting opinion, joined by Judge Vučinić.

JOANNA SZULC V. POLAND (no. 43932/08) – Importance 2 – 13 November 2012 – Violation of Article 8 – Domestic authorities' failure to give woman swift access to her security file kept on during communist era

The case concerned the Polish authorities' refusal, for more than ten years, to grant a woman - who denied any collaboration with the security services during the communist era - access to all documents about her collected by those services.

The Court confirmed its approach taken in previous cases concerning applicants seeking access to their files created by the secret services under a totalitarian regime. It considered that the State should secure a person in the applicant's situation, seeking such access with a view to refuting any allegation of her supposed collaboration with those services, an effective and accessible procedure before the authority currently holding those files. In the applicant's case, the domestic authorities failed to do so, despite the clear indication of the domestic Constitutional Court. There had therefore been a violation of Article 8.

Under Article 41 (just satisfaction), the Court held that Poland was to pay the applicant EUR 5,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

- **Freedom of expression**

PETA DEUTSCHLAND V. GERMANY (no. 43481/09) – Importance 2 – 8 November 2012 – No violation of Article 10 – Domestic Courts' justified injunction against animal rights organisation's poster campaign evoking the Holocaust

The case concerned a civil injunction, which prevented the animal rights organisation PETA from publishing a poster campaign featuring photos of concentration camp inmates along with pictures of animal kept in mass stocks. The organisation complained that such an injunction violated its rights to freedom of expression.

The Court considered in particular that the facts of the case could not be detached from the historical and social context in which the expression of opinion took place. A reference to the Holocaust had to be seen in the specific context of the German past. The Court accepted the German Government's stance that they deemed themselves under a special obligation towards the Jews living in Germany. In that light, the Court found that the German courts had given relevant and sufficient reasons for granting the civil injunction. That finding was not called into question by the fact that courts in other jurisdictions might address similar issues in a different way. Furthermore, as regards the severity of the sanction, the proceedings had not concerned any criminal sanctions, but only a civil injunction preventing PETA from publishing seven specific posters. Finally, PETA had not established that it did not have other means at its disposal to draw public attention to the issue of animal protection. The Court concluded that there had been no violation of Article 10.

Judge Zupančič expressed a concurring opinion joined by Judge Spielmann, which is annexed to the judgment.

- **Freedom of association**

REDFEARN V. THE UNITED KINGDOM (no. 47335/06) – Importance 3 – 6 November 2011 – Violation of Article 11 – Domestic legislation indirectly allowing the dismissal of an employee solely on account of membership of a political party

The case concerned a complaint by a member of the British National Party (“the BNP”) – a far-right political party which, at the time, restricted membership to white nationals – that he had been dismissed from his job as a driver transporting disabled persons, who were mostly Asian.

The Court noted in particular that it was the domestic authorities' responsibility to take reasonable and appropriate measures to protect employees, including those with less than one year's service, from dismissal on grounds of political opinion or affiliation, either through the creation of a further exception to the one-year qualifying period under a 1996 Act or through a freestanding claim for unlawful discrimination on grounds of political opinion or affiliation. A legal system which allowed dismissal from employment solely on account of an employee's membership of a political party carried with it the potential for abuse and was therefore deficient. Accordingly, the Court concluded that there had been a violation of Article 11.

The applicant did not submit a claim for just satisfaction.

Judges Bratza, Hirvelä and Nicolaou expressed a joint partly dissenting opinion.

- **Prohibition of discrimination**

HODE & ABDI V. THE UNITED KINGDOM (no. 22341/09) – Importance – 8 November 2012 – Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8 – Discrimination against refugees and their spouses who get married after they left their country of origin

The case concerned the refusal to grant a refugee's wife leave to enter the United Kingdom. Although the applicant was a refugee, he did not qualify for “family reunion” under the Immigration Rules because the marriage had taken place after he left Somalia. Moreover, as the applicant had only been granted five years' Leave to Remain, his wife could not join him as the spouse of a person present and settled in the United Kingdom.

The Court found in particular that the difference in treatment between the applicants and other categories of immigrants had not been objectively and reasonably justified. In doing so, it relied in part on a decision of the Upper Tribunal (Asylum and Immigration), in which no justification had been found for the particularly disadvantageous position of post-flight spouses of refugees. In that case the Tribunal had called on the Secretary of State to give urgent attention to amending the Immigration Rules. The Immigration Rules were subsequently amended in 2011 to permit refugees to be joined by post-flight spouses during their initial period of leave to remain. There had therefore been a violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 8.

Under Article 41 (just satisfaction), the Court held that The United Kingdom was to pay the applicants EUR 1,000 in respect of pecuniary damage and EUR 6,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

- **Protection of property**

ALISIC AND OTHERS V. BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, CROATIA, SERBIA, SLOVENIA AND "THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA" (no. 60642/08) – Importance 2 – 6 November 2012 – In particular, violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 by Serbia – Depositors' inability to recover "old" foreign-currency savings – Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and of Article 13 by Slovenia – Depositors' inability to recover "old" foreign-currency savings and lack of an effective remedy in that respect

The case concerned the applicants' inability to recover "old" foreign-currency savings - deposited with two banks in what is now Bosnia and Herzegovina - following the dissolution of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The Court considered it appropriate to apply the pilot-judgment procedure, as there were more than 1,650 similar applications pending before it, involving more than 8,000 applicants. The Court concluded that Slovenia and Serbia should undertake all necessary measures within six months from the date on which this judgment became final in order to allow the applicants and all others in their position to be paid back their "old" foreign currency savings under the same conditions as those who had such savings in domestic branches of Slovenian and Serbian banks. The Court also adjourned the examination of all similar cases during this period.

Under Article 41 (just satisfaction), the Court held that Serbia was to pay one of the applicant EUR 4,000 and Slovenia the same amount to other applicants in respect of non-pecuniary damage (see the case for more details).

Judge Zupančič expressed a dissenting opinion.

2. Other judgments issued 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	6 November 2012	DIMOV AND OTHERS (No. 30086/05)	2	Violation of Art. 2 (substantive and procedural)	Death of the applicants' relative during his arrest by police officers; lack of an effective investigation in that respect
		DIMOVI (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 52744/07)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Lack of an effective investigation into a fire in the building where the applicants' relative lived and which indirectly caused her death
		YAVASHEV AND OTHERS (No. 41661/05)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Unjustified interference with the applicants' right to property on account of domestic court's refusal to recognize the applicants' title to property
		ZDRAVKO STANEV (No. 32238/04)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 3 (c)	Deprivation of the applicant's right to free legal representation in criminal proceedings brought against him
CROATIA	6 November 2012	LONGIN (No. 49268/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention
		OSMANOVIC (No. 67604/10)	3	No violation of Art. 5 § 3	Justified remand in custody of the applicant for eight days
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Dismissal of the applicant's constitutional complaint to challenge the lawfulness of the eight days' detention solely on the ground that he had already been released
		TRIFKOVIC (No. 36653/09)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Excessive length of pre-trial detention (3 years and 6 months)
	Violation of Art. 5 § 4			Dismissal of the applicant's constitutional complaint to challenge the excessive length of his pre-trial detention without an examination of the merits	
	13 November 2012	BAJIC (No. 41108/10)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Lack of an effective investigation into the death of the applicant's sister, following surgery for an abdominal tumour and allegedly caused by medical negligence
DENMARK	13 November 2012	J.M. (No. 34421/09)	3	No violation of Art. 5 § 3	Reasonable length of pre-trial detention (1 year, 4 months, 13 days)

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

FINLAND	13 November 2012	H. (No. 37359/09)	2	No violation of Art. 8	Justified interference with the applicant's right to private life on account of the obligation to turn her marriage into a civil partnership to obtain the full recognition of her new gender
				No violation of Art. 14 taken in conjunction with Art. 8	No discrimination resulting from domestic authorities' refusal to give the applicant a female identity number
FRANCE	8 November 2012	PASCAUD (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 19535/08)	3	Just satisfaction	
GERMANY	8 November 2012	NEZIRAJ (No. 30804/07)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1 taken together with Art. 6 § 3 (c)	Domestic Court's rejection of the applicant's appeal on formal grounds due to his failure to attend, despite the fact that his counsel had been present at the hearing and ready to defend him
GREECE	6 November 2012	LIN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 58158/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Unlawfulness of detention
HUNGARY	8 November 2012	Z.H. (No. 28973/11)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Poor conditions of detention
				Violation of Art. 5 § 2	Applicant's inability to understand the reasons for his arrest on a charge of mugging, given his disabilities (deafness and muteness)
ITALY	8 November 2012	AGRATI AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (Nos. 43549/08 AND 2 OTHERS)	3	Just satisfaction	
MALTA	6 November 2012	VASSALLO (No. 57862/09)	3	Just satisfaction	
MOLDOVA	13 November 2012	CONSTANTIN MODARCA (No. 37829/08)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Poor conditions of detention
POLAND	13 November 2012	Z. (No. 46132/08)	3	No violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Effective investigation into the alleged failure of doctors to provide the applicant's daughter, who died of septic shock at hospital, with adequate treatment
ROMANIA	6 November 2012	Miu (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 7088/03)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Deprivation of the applicant's right to access a Court on account of domestic courts' refusal to examine her claim on the merits

ROMANIA (CONTINUED)	13 November 2012	CUCU (No. 22362/06)	3	Two violations of Art. 3 (substantive and procedural)	Poor conditions of detention; lack of an effective investigation in that respect
				Violation of Art. 3 of Prot. No. 1	Automatic withdrawal of the applicant's voting right after his criminal conviction
		E.M.B. (No. 4488/03)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of criminal proceedings (still pending since July 2002)
		LACATUS AND OTHERS (No. 12694/04)	3	Violation of Articles 3 and 8	Destruction of the applicants' home during an attack on their Roma village by a mob of non-Roma villagers and the police; poor and cramped condition in which the applicants were then obliged to live in
Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Domestic courts' failure to provide reasons for the difference in damages awarded to three widows of the men killed during the attack				
Violation of Art. 14 taken in conjunction with Articles 6 and 8	Domestic courts' reference to the applicants in disparaging and discriminatory terms in the course of the proceedings to which they had been a party				
RUSSIA	6 November 2012	BORODIN (No. 41867/04)	3	No violation of Art. 3	No ill-treatment during certain period of detention; no failure of domestic authorities to investigate into those allegations of ill-treatment
				Violation of Art. 3	Excessive use of force against the applicant; domestic authorities' failure to effectively investigate into this use of force
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Reasonable length of proceedings (5 years and 3 months)
		MAKSIM PETROV (No. 23185/03)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Poor condition of detention and transportation
				Violation of Art. 6 § 2	Breach of the applicant's right to be presumed innocent on account of statements made to the press by a number of policemen assigned to his case
		STRELETS (No. 28018/05)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Deprivation of food and sleep during the applicant's transportation to Court house
	Violation of Art. 5 § 1			Unlawfulness of detention during the proceedings against the applicant	
	Violation of Art. 5 § 3			Unjustified pre-trial detention	
Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of speedy judicial review of the applicant's detention				

RUSSIA (CONTINUED)	13 November 2012	KOROLEVA (No. 1600/09)	3	No violation / violation of Art. 5 § 1	Lawfulness / unlawfulness of detention, depending on the periods concerned (see the case for more details)		
				Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Excessive length of pre-trial detention		
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Hearings in absence of the applicant		
				No violation of Art. 5 § 4	Adequate scope of the review of the detention's lawfulness (3 years, 2 months, 6 days)		
	13 November 2012	PYATKOV (No. 61767/08)	2	No violation / violation of Art. 5 § 1	Lawfulness / unlawfulness of detention, depending on the periods concerned (see the case for more details)		
				Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Excessive length of pre-trial detention (3 years, 5 months, 4 days)		
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Hearings in absence of the applicant		
	13 November 2012	KORYAK (No. 24677/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3	In particular, lack of adequate medical care for tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS in detention		
				Y.U. (No. 41354/10)	2	Violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities' failure to enforce a court judgment ordering that the applicant's son should live with her
SLOVAKIA	13 November 2012	I.G. AND OTHERS (No. 15966/04)	2	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive and procedural)	Sterilisation of the first and second applicants without their full and informed consent; lack of an effective investigation in that respect		
				Violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities' failure to comply with statutory provisions regarding sterilisation; lack of safeguards giving special consideration to the reproductive health of the first and second applicants		
				No violation of Art. 13	Full review of the applicants' claim regarding violation of Articles 3 and 8		
THE UNITED KINGDOM	6 November 2012	BEGGS (No. 25133/06)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of criminal proceedings (10 years)		
	13 November 2012	VAN COLLE (No. 7678/09)	2	No violation of Art. 2	No failure of domestic authorities' to protect the applicants' son who had been murdered by his former employee		
			No violation of Art. 8				

3. Repetitive cases

The judgments listed below are based on a classification which figures in the Registry's press release: "In which the Court has reached the same findings as in similar cases raising the same issues under the Convention".

The role of the NHRs may be of particular importance in this respect: they could check whether the circumstances which led to the said repetitive cases have changed or whether the necessary execution measures have been adopted.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	CONCLUSION	KEY WORDS
ALBANIA	6 November 2012	CALE (No. 50933/07)	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Non-enforcement of a final judgment in the applicant's favour
BULGARIA	13 November 2012	KANEVA (No. 33606/05)	Violation of Art. 5 §§ 1 (e), 4 and 5	Confinement of the applicant in a psychiatric hospital; lack of an effective remedy in that respect
ITALY	8 November 2012	AMBROSINI AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (Nos. 8456/09 AND 17 OTHERS)	Violation of Articles 6 § 1 and 1 of Prot. No. 1	Excessive length of enforcement with "Pinto decisions"
		FERRARA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 65165/01)	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Domestic authorities' failure to formally expropriate or compensate the applicant

4. Length of proceedings cases

The judgments listed below are based on a classification which figures in the Registry's press release.

The role of the NHRs may be of particular relevance in that respect as well, as these judgments often reveal systemic defects, which the NHRs may be able to fix with the competent national authorities.

With respect to the length of non-criminal proceedings cases, the reasonableness of the length of proceedings is assessed in the light of the circumstances of the case and with reference to the following criteria: the complexity of the case, the conduct of the applicant and the relevant authorities and what was at stake for the applicant in the dispute (See for instance [Cocchiarella v. Italy](#) [GC], no. 64886/01, § 68, published in ECHR 2006, and [Frydlender v. France](#) [GC], no. 30979/96, § 43, ECHR 2000-VII).

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE
HUNGARY	8 November 2012	GUTMAN (No. 53943/07)
		GYULANE KOCSIS (No. 20915/07)
		MIKLOSNE KANYO (No. 30901/06)
POLAND	13 November 2012	BANCZYK AND SZTUKA (No. 20920/09)
PORTUGAL	8 November 2012	ESTEVES MONTEIRO AND NUNES REMESSO MONTEIRO (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 47001/10)
		PORTUGAL ET CORREA DE BARROS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 44230/10)
SLOVENIA	8 November 2012	ZELE (No. 21308/06)

B. The decisions on admissibility / inadmissibility / striking out of the list including due to friendly settlements

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 14 November 2012**. They are aimed at providing 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 VIOLATIONS (KEY WORDS)	DECISION
ALBANIA	13 November 2012	STRAZIMIRI AND OTHERS (No. 36483/10)	Articles 6 § 1, 13 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (non-enforcement of a final judgment in the applicants' favour)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
ARMENIA	6 November 2012	VAHANYAN AND OTHERS (Nos. 220/06 AND 32289/06)	In particular, Art. 6 (applicant's representative not allowed to make submissions and to lodge motions in appeal proceedings), Art. 8 (applicant's family's eviction from his flat despite the fact that the applicant was still the legal owner of the house), Art. 13 (lack of an effective remedy), Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 (unlawful deprivation of the applicant's property)	Struck out of the list (unilateral declaration of the Government)
CROATIA	6 November 2012	TOTH (No. 49635/10)	Art. 4 of Prot. No. 7 (two convictions for the same offence), Art. 6 (criminal proceedings instituted despite the fact that the injured parties had not lodged a criminal complaint), Art. 13 (lack of an effective remedy)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
GERMANY	6 November 2012	STÜRMER (No. 49372/10)	Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 read alone or in conjunction with Art. 14 (in particular, inadequate compensation for injuries the applicants had suffered because of the drug "Contergan")	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
	13 November 2012	LESTEBERG (No. 5937/12)	Art. 8 (return order – no further specifications)	Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue its application)
HUNGARY	13 November 2012	HAVAS (No. 3992409)	Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of civil proceedings)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
		KATHERIN UTAZASI IRODA (No. 28010/12)		
ITALY	13 November 2012	MATTEI (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 13891/05)	Articles 1 of Prot. No. 1 and 6 § 1 (unlawful expropriation and excessive length of proceedings)	Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue his application)
FINLAND	6 November 2012	E.J. (No. 68050/11)	Art. 3 (risk of ill-treatment in case of return to Iran), Art. 6 (lack of adequate reasoning in domestic court's decision)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
	13 November 2012	M.I. AND OTHERS (No. 65092/09)	Art. 8 (taking of the applicants into emergency care and placement of their children, restrictions on visiting rights), Articles 6 and 13 (unfairness and excessive length of proceedings), Art. 14 (discrimination against the applicant on ground of a poor	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

FINLAND (CONTINUED)	13 November 2012 i(continued)	TOLPPANEN (NOT YET AVAILABLE ON THE COURT'S WEBSITE) (No. 63729/10)	Articles 6 § 1 and 13 (excessive length of administrative proceedings and lack of an effective remedy in that respect)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
FRANCE	6 November 2012	SH. V. (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 16233/10)	Art. 3 alone or in conjunction with Art. 13 (readmission of the applicant in Greece in compliance with European Regulation "Dublin II" and lack of an effective remedy in that respect), Art. 5 (arrest of the applicant at the District premises where he was summoned to go)	Partly struck out of the list (it is no longer justified to examine the claim under Articles 3 and 13), partly inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies (concerning claim under Art. 5)
GEORGIA	6 November 2012	KAKULIA AND BULISKERIA (No. 3486/06)	Art. 3 (poor conditions of detention)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
GREECE	13 November 2012	VOURVACHAKIS (No. 15627/09)	Articles 6 § 1, 13, 17 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (delays in the enforcement of an administrative judgment)	Partly inadmissible as manifestly ill- founded (concerning claims under Articles 6 § 1, 13 and 17), partly incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the provisions of the Convention (concerning claim under Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1)
MOLDOVA	6 November 2012	COLDIN-DC AND COLISNICENCO (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 40274/06)	Articles 6, 13 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (non-enforcement of judgment in the applicants' favour)	Partly inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies (concerning the first applicant's claims), partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning the second applicant's claims)
		CRACIUNEAC (No. 77407/11)	Art. 3 (ill-treatment in police custody)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
	13 November 2012	SINDREVICI (No. 23929/04)	Art. 6 (incorrect judgments)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
POLAND	13 November 2012	GOLA (No. 52446/08)	Art. 2 (lack of effective and thorough investigation into the applicant's son's death as a result of an arson attack at his work place)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
		GOLONKO (No. 3463/11)	Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of civil proceedings)	
		RADKIEWICZ (No. 40548/10)	Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of criminal proceedings)	
		RADKIEWICZ (No. 41626/10)	Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of criminal proceedings)	
		WITKOWSKI (No. 1827/08)	Detention of the applicant, a non-smoker, in a cell for smokers (no article mentioned)	Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application)
ROMANIA	6 November 2012	BRETEAN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 25478/05)	Art. 3 (torture in detention)	Inadmissible for non- exhaustion of domestic remedies
		CALAN (No. 25685/07)	Articles 6 § 1 and 1 of Prot. No. 7 (detention with a view to deportation and extradition to Turkey)	Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the

ROMANIA (CONTINUED)	6 November 2012 (continued)	CATANA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 32072/06)	Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of criminal proceedings, unfairness of proceedings)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
		CEUTA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 1136/05)	Art. 5 § 4 (lack of speedy judicial review of the applicant's detention), Art. 3 (ill-treatment in detention)	
		ENE (No. 11295/06)	Art. 6 (lack of impartiality of domestic courts in divorce and custody proceedings)	Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application)
		GACIU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 39633/10)	In particular, Art. 3 (poor conditions of detention), Art. 8 (deprivation of the applicant's right to visit from his wife), Art. 5 § 3 (excessive length of pre-trial detention),	Partly adjourned (concerning claims under Articles 3 and 8), partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning claim under Art. 5 § 3)
		PULBERE (No. 60997/08)	Art. 2 (death of the applicant's mother in pre-trial detention)	Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application)
		RUS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 15887/06)	Art. 8 § 1 (monitoring of the applicant)	Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application)
		TUDOR (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 36825/05)	Art. 3 (poor conditions of detention amounting to the contraction of tuberculosis and hepatitis), Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of criminal proceedings)	Partly incompatible <i>ratione personae</i> with the provisions of the Convention (concerning claim under Art. 3), partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning the remainder of the application)
	13 November 2012	CAKIR (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 13077/05)	Art. 8 (domestic authorities' refusal to extend the applicant's residence permit), Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 (<i>de facto</i> expropriation)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
		ENACHESCU AND BOGOIU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 41490/05)	Articles 6 § 1 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (expropriation without compensation)	Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application)
		FLESERIU (No. 39679/05)	Articles 6 § 1 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (non-enforcement of a final judgment in the applicant's favour)	
		FRIMU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (Nos. 45312/11 AND 4 OTHERS)	Articles 6 and 14 (difference of treatment in the admissibility of applications in domestic courts)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
		MEDINTU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 5623/04)	Art. 5 §§ 3 and 4 (excessive length of pre-trial detention), Art. 5 §§ 1, 2 and 3 (unlawful detention and lack of adequate judicial review), Art. 6 §§ 1 and 2 (unfairness of proceedings), Art. 8 (unlawful taping of the applicant's conversation)	

ROMANIA (CONTINUED)	13 November 2012 (continued)	MINCULESCU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 7993/05)	In particular, Art. 3 (poor conditions of detention), Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 c) and d) (lack of legal representation of the applicant, applicant's inability to question a witness)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
		NEGRETU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 20319/11)	Art. 3 (poor conditions of detention)	Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application)
		TUNARU (No. 66381/09)	Articles 6 § 1, 14, 1 of Prot. 1 and 1 of Prot. 12 (different outcomes reached in similar cases on the basis of a differing interpretation of the same legal provisions)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
SLOVAKIA	6 November 2012	FILIPOVA (No. 75265/11)	Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of civil proceedings)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
		HEROLD TELEMEDIA, S.R.O., IVAN MATUSIK AND GUNTER SCHUSTER (No. 57238/00)	Art. 6 § 1 (unfairness of proceedings), Articles 1 of Prot. N. 1 and 13 (interference of public authorities with the applicants' right to property, lack of an effective remedy in that respect)	Incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the provision of the Convention
SLOVENIA	13 November 2012	BRAJDIC (No. 5778/10)	Articles 3 and 8 (poor conditions of detention)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
		STROPNIK (No. 28369/06)	Articles 6 § 1 and 13 (excessive length of proceedings and lack of an effective remedy in that respect)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
TURKEY	6 November 2012	ARIOGLU AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 11166/05°)	Articles 6 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (expropriation without compensation)	Inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
	13 November 2012	ATSAK (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 23600/10)	Unlawful detention and lack of an effective remedy (no article mentioned)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
		COLAK (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 31289/11)	Articles 6 § 1 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (judicial cancellation of a cadastral plan)	Incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the provisions of the Convention
		KUCUKKAYA (No. 13783/11)	Art. 5 §§ 3, 4 and 5 (excessive length of detention in remand)	Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached)
KUTLU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 73757/11)	Sanctions inflicted by military superiors and not by an impartial tribunal (no article mentioned)			

C. The communicated cases

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

Please note that the Irish Human Rights Commission (IHRC) issues a monthly table on priority cases before the European Court of Human Rights with a focus on asylum / immigration, data protection, anti-terrorism / rule of law and disability cases for the attention of the European Group of NHRIs with a

view to suggesting possible amicus curiae cases to the members of the Group. Des Hogan from the IHRC can provide you with these tables (dhogan@ihrc.ie).

STATE	DATE OF DECISION TO COMMUNICATE	CASE TITLE	KEY WORDS OF QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE PARTIES
GERMANY	6 November 2012	TIERBEFREIER (No. 45192/09)	Art. 10 – Civil injunction prohibiting further dissemination of a film footage which documented the treatment of laboratory animals filmed by an employee with a hidden camera; Art. 6 – unfairness of proceedings; Art. 14 – discrimination against the applicant <i>vis-à-vis</i> other persons who had not been prevented from further disseminating the same footage
POLAND	7 November 2012	WOJCIECHOWSKI (No. 54511/11)	Art. 3 – Overcrowding and inadequate medical care during detention; Art. 9 § 1 – Unreasonable restrictions on the applicant’s right to manifest his religion
ROMANIA	6 November 2012	DIEAC (No. 41818/11)	Art. 2 – Domestic authorities’ failure to address the conflicting evidence regarding the death of the applicant’s husband, and domestic authorities’ dismissal without justification of the applicant’s requests for evidence; Art. 6 § 3 – Domestic authorities’ failure to question some of the witnesses
		GRIGORE (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 30745/04)	Art. 5 § 1 – Unlawful and arbitrary detention in psychiatric hospital; Art. 5 § 4 – Lack of an effective remedy in that respect; Art. 5 § 5 – Lack of an effective right to compensation in that respect; Art. 6 §§ 1, 2 and 3 – Unfairness of proceedings; Art. 10 – Disproportionate nature of the internment of the applicant; Art. 13 – Lack of an effective remedy in those respects
		OANCEA (No. 7291/09)	Art. 2 – Domestic authorities’ failure to place the applicants’ son in a prison where he could have continued to receive adequate treatment for his condition; Art. 6 – Domestic authorities’ failure to start criminal investigation into the death of the applicants’ son
TURKEY	6 November 2012	DUMAN AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 30126/11)	Art. 3 – Poor condition of detention in police custody; Articles 6 and 13 – Questioning of the applicants despite their severe fatigue; unlawful means of questioning; lack of an effective remedy in that respect; Articles 14 and 1 of Prot. No. 12 – Treatment grounded upon the applicants’ Kurdish origin

D. Miscellaneous (Referral to grand chamber, hearings and other activities)

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

Part II: The execution of the judgments of the Court

Decisions on execution of European Court of Human Rights judgments

The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe published the [decisions and resolutions](#) adopted at its third special human rights meeting for 2012 (24-26 September 2012).

Part III: General Agenda

The “General Agenda” presents events that either took place or were announced* during the period under observation (1 to 14 November 2012) for this RSIF.

November 2012

- 5 November:
 - Post-Monitoring visit to Turkey by PACE rapporteur ([Read more](#))

- 9 November:
 - Visit of the FCNM Advisory Committee to Bosnia and Herzegovina ([Read more](#))
 - Visit of the FCNM Advisory Committee to Switzerland ([Read more](#))

- 13 November:
 - Fact-finding visit to Belgrade by PACE rapporteur ([Read more](#))

- 29 November:
 - Round-table on the right to housing (Strasbourg – [Programme](#))

December 2012

- 6 December:
 - Seminar on the European Social Charter: discretion of States” (Strasbourg – [Programme](#))

* These are subsequently due to take place.

Part IV: The work of other Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms

A. European Social Charter (ESC)

Collective complaint: decision on admissibility concerning a case against Italy (7.11.2012)

The ESC adopted the [decision on admissibility](#) with regard to the complaint International Planned Parenthood Federation European Network (IPPF EN) v. Italy, No. 87/2012, at its last session on 22 October 2012 ([More information](#) – [Complaint No. 87/2012](#)).

B. European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT)

CPT urges States to set up national bodies to monitor places of deprivation of liberty (06.11.2012)

In its annual report, published on 6 November 2012, the CPT urges all Council of Europe member states to ratify a UN treaty and establish independent national bodies to monitor the treatment of persons deprived of their liberty ([Read more](#) – [Read the report](#)).

CPT published report on Ukraine (14.11.2012)

The CPT published on 14 November 2012 the report on its recent visit to Ukraine, in November/December 2011, together with the response of the Ukrainian authorities. The main objective of the visit was to examine the treatment of persons detained by the police. Numerous persons interviewed by the CPT's delegation, including women and juveniles, alleged that they had been subjected to physical ill-treatment at the time of arrest or during subsequent questioning by police officers. In several cases, the ill-treatment alleged was of such a severity that it could be considered to amount to torture. Moreover, medical evidence consistent with allegations of ill-treatment was gathered. The information at the CPT's disposal leaves little doubt that the phenomenon of police ill-treatment remains widespread and that persons run a significant risk of being subjected to ill-treatment when they do not rapidly confess to the criminal offence of which they are suspected ([Read more](#) – [Read the Report](#) – [Read the Response](#) of the Ukrainian authorities).

C. European Committee against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

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

D. Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM)

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

E. Group of States against Corruption (GRECO)

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

F. Committee of Experts on the Evaluation of Anti-Money Laundering Measures and the Financing of Terrorism (MONEYVAL)

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

G. Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA)

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

Part V: The inter-governmental work

A. The new signatures and ratifications of the Treaties of the Council of Europe

COUNTRY	CONVENTION	RATIF.	SIGN.	DATE
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	Convention on Contact concerning Children (ETS No. 192)	X		14 November 2012
	Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse (CETS No. 201)			
GERMANY	Protocol No. 3 to the European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities concerning Euroregional Co-operation Groupings (ECGs) (CETS No. 206)	X		8 November 2012
NORWAY	Second Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters (ETS No. 182)	X		6 November 2012
THE NETHERLANDS	Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (CETS No. 210)		X	14 November 2012

B. Recommendations and Resolutions adopted by the Committee of Ministers

NATURE OF THE TEXT	TEXT NUMBER	OBJECT	DATE
RESOLUTION	CM/RESCSS(2012)20E	Application of the European Code of Social Security by Ireland	14 November 2012

C. Other news of the Committee of Ministers

Education will be top priority of Andorra's Council of Europe chairmanship (09.11.2012)

Education in human rights, democracy and the rule of law, the Council of Europe essential values, is the top priority of the Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Principality of Andorra, which started on 9 November 2012. The Andorran Chairmanship will carry out a number of activities relating to education for democratic citizenship and human rights, with a particular focus on youth. One of the key actions will be the launch of a campaign using online social networks to promote knowledge of the European Convention on Human Rights in co-operation with youth organisations and schools ([Priorities of the Andorran Chairmanship](#) – [Web file of the Andorran Chairmanship](#) – [Andorra and the Council of Europe](#)).

Part VI: The parliamentary work

A. Resolutions and Recommendations of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE)

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

B. Other news of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

➤ *Countries*

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

➤ *Themes*

States bear “primary responsibility” for ensuring human rights standards are applied effectively (13.11.2012)

States Parties bear the “primary responsibility” for ensuring the European Convention on Human Rights is applied effectively at national level – alongside the Strasbourg Court and Committee of Ministers – according to PACE’s Legal Affairs Committee. Approving a report by Serhii Kivalov (Ukraine, EDG) during a meeting on 12 November 2012 in Paris, the committee deplored the fact that the Court was “still overloaded with a large number of repetitive cases revealing widespread dysfunctions in national legal orders” ([Read more](#) – [Read the provisional version of the report](#)).

HIV/AIDS : President condemned inequality of access to health care, particularly for migrants (14.11.2012)

“There can be no serious efforts to combat the spread of HIV if at the same time we ignore a section of the population which is infected,” said Jean-Claude Mignon, President of the PACE, speaking in Zürich on 14 November 2012 at a conference on discrimination against immigrants infected by HIV/AIDS and ways of preventing the disease. Mr Mignon pointed out that the major international texts guaranteed the rights of “all persons”, including those who were not citizens of the countries where they were living, and particularly migrants in an irregular situation ([Read more](#) – Read the speech [\[in French only\]](#)).

PACE mobilises national parliaments to combat sexual violence against children (14.11.2012)

PACE convened its network of contact parliamentarians to stop sexual violence against children on 20 November in Moscow on the occasion of Universal Children’s Day. The discussion, directed at the topic of « sexual abuse inflicted on children within the circle of trust », enabled the parliamentarians to strengthen prevention and protection policies as well as sanctions at national level ([Read more](#)).

Part VII: The work of the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights

➤ *Countries*

Albania should make its legal aid system more accessible (06.11.2012)

“In spite of recent legislative steps aimed at improving the free legal aid system in Albania, concerns remain about its compatibility with the Council of Europe standards in this field” said on 6 November 2012 the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Nils Muižnieks, publishing a [letter](#) addressed to the Minister of Justice of Albania, Mr Eduard Halimi ([Read more](#)).

Enhancing freedom of expression in Azerbaijan (08.11.2012)

At the end of a meeting with the Azerbaijani media on the safety of journalists held yesterday in Baku, Nils Muižnieks, Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Dunja Mijatovic, OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media and Neelie Kroes, Vice-President of the European Commission, stated that they stand ready to support progress in Azerbaijan in the field of securing the right to freedom of expression and media freedom, both offline and online ([Read more](#)).

➤ *Themes*

States must take resolute measures to end school segregation of Roma (08.11.2012)

“Roma children are experiencing segregation and substandard education in the school systems in the majority of the 47 Council of Europe member states. The consequences are devastating. It makes it very hard for these children to escape poverty and marginalisation later on in life. Non-integration also generates large – and unnecessary – costs for society at large” ([Read more](#)).

Part VIII: Activities and news of the Peer-to-Peer Network (under the auspices of the Directorate of Human Rights)

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

INDEX

- Albania**, 13, 14, 24
- Andorra**, 22
- Armenia**, 14
- Azerbaijan**, 24
- Bosnia and Herzegovina**, 8, 20, 22
- Bulgaria**, 5, 6, 9, 13, 18
- Croatia**, 5, 8, 9, 14
- Denmark**, 9
- Finland**, 10, 14, 15
- France**, 3, 10, 13, 15
- Georgia**, 15
- Germany**, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22
- Greece**, 10, 15
- Hungary**, 10, 13, 14
- Italy**, 10, 13, 14, 21
- Malta**, 10
- Moldova**, 10, 15
- Norway**, 22
- Poland**, 6, 10, 13, 15
- Portugal**, 13
- Romania**, 4, 10, 11, 15-18
- Russia**, 11, 12
- Serbia**, 8
- Slovakia**, 12, 17
- Slovenia**, 8, 13, 17
- "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"**, 8
- the Netherlands**, 22
- the United Kingdom**, 4, 7, 12
- Turkey**, 15, 17, 18, 20
- Ukraine**, 21, 23