



REGULAR SELECTIVE INFORMATION FLOW

for the attention of the National Human Rights Structures

Issue#120

[1 - 31 May 2014]

CONTENTS

(click on a title to reach it)

Introduction (p.2)

Index by country (p.3)

PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION (p.4)

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

A. Judgments (p.5)

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

2. *Other judgments (p.12)*

B. Decisions on admissibility (p.15)

C. Communicated cases (p.16)

§2 - European Committee of Social Rights (p.19)

A. Resolutions & Decisions (p.19)

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. It is entrusted to Léa Guémené, Alix Motais de Narbonne, Mahaliana Ravaloson, Barbara Sanchez-Cadinot, Mariella Sognigbé, Pavlos Aimilios Marinatos and Guillaume Verdier with the technical help of Quentin Michael and under the supervision of Thibaut Fleury Graff, Ph.D, Associate Professor at Versailles St-Quentin-en-Yvelines University.

Index by Country

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

[ARMENIA](#), 16, **25**
AUSTRIA, 12, 23
[AZERBAIJAN](#), 7, 8, **26**
BELGIUM, 16, 19
BULGARIA, 10, 12
CROATIA, 16
CYPRUS, 20, 23
[ESTONIA](#), **27**
FINLAND, 12, 19
FRANCE, 1, 2, 16
[GEORGIA](#), 16, 17, **28**
GERMANY, 5
[GREECE](#), 12, **29**
HUNGARY, 6, 8, 17
ITALY, 13, 19
[LITHUANIA](#), 13, 17, **30**
[MONTENEGRO](#), **31**

[NETHERLANDS](#), **32**
NORWAY, 20
[POLAND](#), **33**
PORTUGAL, 13
ROMANIA, 13, 15, 17
RUSSIA, 7, 13, 14, 17, 18
SLOVAKIA, 15
SLOVENIA, 14
SPAIN, 14
[SWEDEN](#), **34**
SWITZERLAND, 14, 23
["THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA"](#), **35**
THE UNITED KINGDOM, 5, 6, 9, 10
[TURKEY](#), 9, 10, 14, 18, **36**
[UKRAINE](#), 15, 17, 23, **37**

PartOne

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

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

PartOne

§1 - EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

A. Judgments

1. Judgments deemed of particular interest to the 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)**

GRAY V. GERMANY (No. 49278/09) – Importance 2 – 22 May 2014 – No violation of Article 2 (Procedural) – No failure of domestic authorities to conduct an effective investigation into the death of the applicants' father

The case concerned the death of a patient in his home in the United Kingdom as a result of medical malpractice by a German doctor, who had been recruited by a private agency to work for the British National Health Service. The patient's sons complained that the authorities in Germany, where the doctor was tried and convicted of having caused the death by negligence, had not provided for an effective investigation into their father's death.

Article 2

The Court underlined that States were obliged, under Article 2 of the Convention, to set up an effective independent judicial system so that the cause of death of patients in medical care could be determined and those responsible made accountable. The Court noted that the domestic authorities had started criminal investigations into the circumstances of the death of the applicants' father on their own initiative. Concerning the applicants' allegations that they had not been sufficiently involved in the criminal proceedings, the Court recognised that under domestic criminal procedure the prosecution authorities had not been obliged to inform the applicants on their own initiative about the proceedings.

In addition, it was arguable whether and to what extent the applicants' involvement as next of kin had been required under Article 2 of the Convention, as in cases of medical negligence - in contrast to cases where the responsibility of State officials for a victim's death was at issue - there was no requirement for a criminal law remedy. However, once the lawyer of one of the applicants had contacted the domestic prosecuting authorities, they had informed him of the proceedings.

Concerning the applicants' complaint about the fact that the doctor had been convicted in the relevant State and not in the United Kingdom - where he might have faced a heavier penalty - the Court noted that the domestic authorities had been obliged under domestic law to open criminal proceedings against him once they had learned of his involvement in the events surrounding the death of the applicants' father. Having regard to the domestic proceedings, they had consequently had a basis for their decision not to extradite the doctor under domestic and international law. Furthermore, the procedural guarantees under Article 2 of the Convention did not require for a particular sentence to be imposed.

Therefore, there had been no violation of Article 2.

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

LÁSZLÓ MAGYAR V. HUNGARY (No. 73593/10) – Importance 2 – 20 May 2014 – Violation of Article 3 – Irreducibility of life sentences – Violation of Article 6§1 – Excessive length of proceedings – Application of Article 46 – Domestic authorities required to put in place a reform of the system of review of whole life sentences

The case concerned domestic law, which did not allow life prisoners to know what they had to do to be considered for release and under which conditions. The applicant was sentenced to life imprisonment without eligibility for parole.

Violation of Article 3

The Court observed that domestic authorities should consider the progress made by the prisoner as to rehabilitation so that they could review life sentences. Then, life prisoners should be aware of what they have to do to be considered for release and under which conditions. Nevertheless, domestic law did not allow such consideration. So, as the applicant's sentence could not be regarded as reducible, there had been a violation of Article 3.

Violation of Article 6 §1

The Court found that the length of proceedings had been unacceptable and that the arguments given by domestic authorities to justify it were not convincing.

Article 46 (binding force and execution of judgments)

The Court observed that this case disclosed a systemic problem, which could give rise to similar applications. Therefore, for the proper implementation of this judgment, domestic authorities would be required to put in place a reform of the system of review of whole life sentences in order to guarantee the examination in every case of whether continued detention is justified on legitimate grounds. Then, whole life prisoners would be aware of what they must do to be considered for release and under what conditions.

The Court reiterated that States enjoyed wide margin of appreciation in deciding on the appropriate length of prison sentences for specific crimes. Therefore, review of life sentences does not lead necessarily to a release, and this fact is not a violation of Article 3.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 2,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 4,150 in respect of costs and expenses.

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

**TARANENKO V. RUSSIA (No. 19554/05) – Importance 2 – 15 May 2014 – Violation of Article 5 §3 – Domestic authorities’ failure to give sufficient grounds to extend the applicant’s detention
Violation of Article 10 in light of Article 11 – Disproportionate length of detention**

The case concerned the detention and conviction of a participant in a protest against the President’s policies, organized by an opposition Party.

Violation of Article 5 §3

The Court observed that domestic authorities had not pointed to any aspect of the applicant’s character or behaviour in order to justify that she presented some risks. They had not considered her clean criminal record, neither her permanent residence or her employment. In addition, once the case had been submitted for trial, domestic authorities had used the same formula for all the protesters, in order to refuse their applications for release.

As they had not relied on sufficient grounds to extend the applicant’s detention, Article 5 §3 had been breached.

Violation of Article 10 in light of Article 11

The Court agreed that the arrest of the protesters could be justified by the demands of the protection of public order due to the fact that the entrance of the protestors in the President’s administration building had not complied with domestic procedures. Indeed, they had bypassed the security checks and pushed a guard aside. However, the Court observed that the protesters had not been armed; they had not caused any injuries. It also noted that compensation of all pecuniary damage in the administration building had been paid. So, the Court concluded that the lengthy period of detention and the long suspended prison sentence imposed on the applicant had not been appropriate to the legitimate aim pursued. As the interference had not been necessary in a democratic society, Article 10 interpreted in light of Article 11 had been breached.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 12,500 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

ILLGAR MAMMADOV V. AZERBAIJAN (No. 15172/13) – Importance 2 – 22 May 2014 – Violation of Article 5 §§ 1 and 3 – Absence of a reasonable suspicion against the applicant to justify his arrest and prolonged detention – Violation of Article 5 § 4 – Lack of an efficient judicial review concerning the lawfulness of the applicant’s detention – Violation of Article 6 § 2 – Infringement of the applicant’s right to the presumption of innocence – Violation of Article 18 in conjunction with Article 5 – Applicant’s restriction of liberty had other purposes that bringing him before a competent legal authority on reasonable suspicion of having committed an offence

The case concerned the arrest and detention pending trial of an opposition politician and blogger following his reports on street protests.

Article 5 §§ 1 and 3

Concerning the applicant’s complaint that there had not been a “reasonable suspicion” against him, within the meaning of Article 5 § 1, to justify his arrest and prolonged detention, the Court first noted that the initial charge of “organising public disorder” had subsequently been replaced by a more serious charge, “mass disorder”, without a change to the description of the facts. As regards the circumstances of his arrest, the Court found it significant that the applicant was an opposition politician, who had a history of criticising the domestic authorities. Furthermore, he had been charged with “organising” a riot that had already started one day before his visit to the town. Against this background, the prosecution had essentially accused him of having seized considerable control over the situation, established himself as the leader of the protestors, whom he had not known before, and had directly caused the subsequent disorder. The applicant had consistently submitted that the prosecution had failed to produce any evidence, giving rise to a reasonable suspicion that he had committed any of the crimes with which he was charged. The Court observed that the domestic authorities had not submitted any specific arguments to rebut his assertions. There had accordingly been a violation of Article 5 § 1.

Article 5 § 4

The applicant's detention had been ordered and extended, on each occasion, by courts at two levels of jurisdiction. However, the courts had consistently failed to verify the reasonableness of the suspicion against him. The domestic courts had simply copied the prosecution's written submissions and used short, vague and stereotyped formulae for rejecting his complaints.

Therefore there had been a violation of Article 5 § 4

Article 6 § 2

As regards the press statement issued by the domestic prosecutor general and the domestic ministry of internal affairs, the Court noted that, given that the applicant was a politician, it might have been considered reasonable for the authorities to keep the public informed of the criminal accusations against him. However, the Court considered that the statement, assessed as a whole, had not been made with the necessary discretion. Whereas the relevant paragraph concluded by stating that the applicant's actions would be "fully and thoroughly investigated" and would "receive legal assessment", this wording was contradicted by a preceding unequivocal declaration, in the same sentence, that those actions had been "illegal".

There had accordingly been a violation of Article 6 § 2.

Article 18

The Court had already found that the charges against the applicant had not been based on a "reasonable suspicion" for the purpose of Article 5 § 1. It could be concluded from this finding that the authorities had not acted in good faith. As the Court had found under Article 5 § 1, it was significant that the applicant was an opposition politician with a history of criticising the domestic authorities and he had nothing to do with the original incident, which had triggered the protests. Moreover, the Court considered that his arrest was linked to specific entries in his blog, in which he shed light on information which the domestic authorities attempted to withhold from the public. Those circumstances indicated that the actual purpose of the measures taken had been to silence or punish the applicant for criticising the domestic authorities and attempting to disseminate what he believed to be true information which the domestic authorities were trying to hide.

There had therefore been a violation of Article 18 in conjunction with Article 5.

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The court held that Azerbaijan was to pay the applicant EUR 20,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 2,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

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

BAKA V. HUNGARY (No. 20261/12) – Importance 3 – 27 May 2014 – Violation of Article 6 §1 – Applicant's inability to challenge the premature termination of his mandate as President of the Supreme Court – Violation of Article 10 – Unjustified termination of the applicant's mandate as President of the Supreme Court

The case concerned the premature end of the applicant's mandate as President of the Supreme Court of Justice after he had publicly criticized the judiciary system. He had not been able to have access to court to challenge the termination.

Violation of Article 6 §1

The Court reiterated the two conditions to meet in order to exclude civil servants from protection under Article 6: that domestic law should expressly exclude such access for the post or category of staff concerned; that the exclusion should be objectively justified on public interest grounds. In this regard, domestic authorities had to prove that these conditions had been met.

The applicant's access to Court had been impossible due to the fact that the termination of his mandate had been provided for by the Constitution and could not have been challenged. The Court had found his exclusion as unjustified as domestic authorities had failed to prove that the early termination of the applicant's sentence had been linked to the exercise of State power.

Violation of Article 10

The Court observed that the proposals relating to the termination of the applicant's mandate had happen a short time after he had publicly expressed his view on several legislative reforms affecting the judiciary. The Court also noticed that the applicant's professional behaviour had never been called into question. That is why the Court found that the early termination of the applicant's mandate is due to his public criticisms when he was President of the Supreme Court.

So, the Court examined whether such interference with his right to freedom of expression had been justified. It observed that the criticism had been a matter of public interest as well as it concerned the reforms in judicial domestic system; it also observed that it had been his duty as the President of the National Council of Justice to expose such views. It also found that the mandate had been terminated three and a half years before the end of the fixed term applicable under the domestic legislation in force at the time of his election, which had led to serious pecuniary consequences for the applicant. The Court took the view that such situation involved the risk that judges could be discouraged from making critical remarks about public institutions or policies. Then, as the premature termination of the applicant's mandate had not been subject to effective judicial review by domestic authorities, the interference had not been "necessary in a democratic society" and had amounted to a violation of Article 10.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court considered that question of just satisfaction had to be reserved having regard to a possible agreement between domestic authorities and the applicant (Rule 75 §§ 1 and 4 of the Rules of Court).

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

McDONALD V. THE UNITED KINGDOM (No. 4241/12) – Importance 2 – 20 May 2014 – Violation of Article 8 – Domestic authorities' *unlawful* decision under domestic law to reduce the amount allocated to her for weekly care – No violation of Article 8 – Domestic authorities' *justified* decision to reduce the amount allocated to the applicant

The case concerned domestic authorities' decision to reduce the amount allocated for the weekly care of the applicant, whose mobility is severely limited, arguing that her night-time toileting needs could be met by the provision of incontinence pads instead of a night-time carer.

The Court considered as an interference with the applicant's right to respect of family and private life, the fact that her care allowance had been reduced on the basis that she could use incontinence pads at night. It also observed that such interference had not been in accordance with domestic law. So, there had been a violation of Article 8 between 21 November 2008 and 4 November 2009, while further care plan review showed that the use of incontinence pads was a practical solution to the applicant. However, after this date, the Court found that domestic authorities' decision not to provide the applicant with night-time care to aid her toileting needs was in accordance with domestic law and pursued the legitimate aim of economic well-being of the State and in the interests of other care-users.

Then, from 4 November 2009 onwards, there had been no violation of Article 8

Under Article 41 (just satisfaction), the Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 1,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 9,500 to cover costs and expenses of her lawyer.

- **Freedom of expression (Art. 10)**

MUSTAFA ERDOGAN AND OTHERS V. TURKEY (Nos. 346/04 and 39779/04) - Importance 2 - 27 May 2014 - Violation of Article 10 - Disproportionate interference with the applicants' freedom of expression which had not been based on sufficient reasons and thus had not been necessary in a democratic society

The case concerned the complaint by a law professor, an editor and a publisher that they were ordered by the Turkish courts to pay damages to three judges of the Constitutional Court for insulting them in a journal article, which reported on a decision dissolving a political party.

The Court underlined in particular the importance of academic freedom and clarified that such freedom is not restricted to academic or scientific research but extends to an academics' ability to freely

express their views, even if controversial or unpopular, in the areas of their research, professional expertise and competence. In this case, the domestic courts did not place the language and expressions used in the article in the context and form in which they were expressed. Therefore, whilst some of the remarks made in the article were harsh they were largely value judgments, set out in general terms, with sufficient factual basis. They could not be considered gratuitous personal attacks on the three judges. In addition, the article was published in a quarterly law journal as opposed to a popular newspaper. Accordingly, the domestic courts had not struck the right balance between the applicants' right to express their opinion on a topic of general interest with the judges' right to be protected against insult. The Court therefore determined that the reasons given to justify interfering with the applicants' right to freedom of expression had not been sufficient to show that that interference had been "necessary in a democratic society" for the protection of the reputation and rights of others.

There had therefore been a violation of Article 10.

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The Court held that Turkey was to pay the applicant a sum in euros in respect of pecuniary damage equivalent to the damages paid by them in respect of the damages claims lodged by the three judges, and EUR 7,500 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

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

PAULET V. THE UNITED KINGDOM (No. 6219/08) – Importance 2 – 13 May 2014 – Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 – Domestic authorities' failure to analyse the confiscation case in terms of proportionality

The case concerned the confiscation of the applicant's wages, as he had been convicted of criminal offences while he obtained employment using a false passport.

The Court had to examine whether the applicant could reasonably put his case to domestic authorities so that they could establish a fair balance between the applicant's right to protection of his property and the requirements of the general interest.

Domestic authorities found that the confiscation had not been an abuse of process due to the appropriate link between the applicant's earnings and the criminal offences. They had not considered the confiscation in terms of proportionality under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1. Then the Court found the scope of review made by domestic authorities had been too narrow. So, in the circumstances of this case - as a judgement of 2012 in another confiscation case, domestic authorities found it would be preferable to analyse confiscation cases in terms of proportionality - there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 2,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 10,000 to cover the costs and expenses of his lawyer.

- **Article 2 of Protocol No. 1**

VELEV V. BULGARIA (No. 16032/07) – Importance 1 – 27 May 2014 – Violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 – Domestic authorities' failure to give significant grounds to justify the refusal of the applicant's enrolment in a Prison school

The case concerned domestic authorities' refusal to enrol a remand prisoner in a Prison school.

The Court reiterated that Article 2 does not oblige Contracting States to organise educational facilities for prisoners while such facilities are not already in place. But such a possibility is available in Stara Zagora Prison. Then, it should not be subject to arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions.

The Court observed that domestic authorities had not give sufficient grounds to justify the refusal of the applicant's access to the Prison school. The only express provision existing in domestic law concerning the rights of remand prisoners to education was the effect that the prison authorities should encourage the participation of those prisoners in prison educational programmes. It was not convinced by domestic authorities' argumentation to protect the applicant from the other prisoners. There is no

proof about such security risk, but anyway, the applicant had not objected to attend school with convicted prisoners. Then, it was not convinced by the justification that the ultimate length of remand prisoners' pre-trial detention was uncertain, so that they could be deprived of access to educational facilities. Nor had domestic authorities provided any information about the resources at the school to justify their position. Finally, the Court did not consider as legitimate the fact that the applicant was kept apart from other prisoners because due to the risk that he would be sentenced as a recidivist. In conclusion, the Court found that the refusal to enrol the applicant in the Prison school had not been sufficiently foreseeable, had not pursued a legitimate aim and had not been proportionate to that aim.

So, Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 had been breached in this case.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 2,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 1,406 for his lawyer's 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 judgment¹.

For more detailed information, please refer to the cases.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	IMP.	CONCLUSION	KEY WORDS
AUSTRIA	7 May 2014	SAFARI (No. 44689/09)	3	No violation of Art. 3	Applicant's transfer to Greece under the Dublin Regulation had not constituted a violation of Art. 3 as, despite the domestic authorities' awareness of the serious deficiencies in the Greek asylum procedure, it had not been established that they ought to have known that those deficiencies had reached the threshold required under Art. 3 of the Convention
BULGARIA	27 May 2014	RADKOV AND SABEV (Nos. 18938/07 AND 36069/09)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Applicants' handcuffing during a court hearing in prison
				Violation of Art. 13	Lack of an effective remedy in that respect
FINLAND	20 May 2014	GLANTZ (No. 37394/11) PIRTTIMAKI (No. 35232/11) HAKKA (No. 758/11) NYKANEN (No. 11828/11)	3	Violation of Art. 4 of Prot. No. 7 (concerning the first and the fourth case)	Proceedings had been brought against the applicants for the same matter as that of which they had already been convicted
			2	No violation of Art. 4 of Prot. No. 7 (concerning the second and third case)	Applicant's possibility to prevent double jeopardy by seeking rectification and then appealing against the taxation decisions within the time-limit (concerning the third applicant) while, concerning the second applicant, the two sets of proceedings brought against him had not arisen from identical facts as the legal entities involved in these proceedings were not the same
GREECE	28 May 2014	TSOKAS AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 41513/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)
				Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Inadequate medical treatment
				No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Domestic prison authorities cannot be blamed for not having established a specific treatment or for not having taken measures to render the applicant's pathology less painful, likewise, the domestic judicial authorities cannot be blamed for having rejected the requests to suspend the execution of the sentence

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

ITALY	13 May 2014	BORDONI AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (Nos. 6069/09 AND 16797/09) CAPONETTO (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 61273/10) MARINO AND COLACIONE (IN FRENCH ONLY) (Nos. 45869/08 AND 47348/08) PEDUZZI AND ARRIGHI (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 18166/09)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1 (in all cases)	Domestic authorities' legislative intervention which intended to put an end to the dispute between the applicants and the relevant state had not been justified by compelling and overriding reasons in the general interest
		Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 (concerning the third applicant)		Domestic authorities' legislative intervention had imposed an excessive burden on the applicants that had not been justified by compelling reasons in the general interest	
	27 May 2014	RUMOR (No. 72964/10)	3	No violation of Art. 3 alone and in conjunction with Art. 14	No failure of the domestic authorities to put in place a domestic legislative framework in order to take measures against persons accused of domestic violence
LITHUANIA	27 May 2014	ALBERGAS AND ARLAUSKAS (No. 17978/05)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Lack of adequate compensation following a deprivation of property
PORTUGAL	28 May 2014	MARTINS SILVA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 12959/10)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the failure to communicate the medical report which had provided new and important elements and which had served as the basis for the domestic court's decision, thus depriving the applicant of the opportunity to respond to it
ROMANIA	20 May 2014	BINISAN (No. 39438/05)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the circumstances surrounding the applicant's accident in order to identify those liable
RUSSIA	7 May 2014	NIZAMOV AND OTHERS (Nos. 22636/13, 24034/13, 24334/13 AND 24528/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Real risk of ill-treatment in case of the applicants' removal to their country of origin
		SERGEY CHEBOTAREV (No. 61510/09)	3	No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Applicant's inadequate conditions of detention had not reached the threshold of severity required to constitute a violation
		Violation of Art. 5 § 1		Unlawful detention of the applicant (the decision authorizing his detention had not been based on any grounds while no time-limit had been set for his remain in custody)	
	28 May 2014	AKRAM KARIMOV (No. 62892/12)	2	Violation of Art. 3	Real risk of ill-treatment in case of the applicant's removal to his country of origin
	No violation of Art. 5 § 1 (f)	Lawful detention pending extradition of the applicant			
			Violation of Art. 5 § 1 (f)	Unlawful detention pending extradition of the applicant (absence of a specific legal basis under domestic law)	
			Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a judicial review concerning the lawfulness of the applicant's detention pending extradition	

RUSSIA (CONTINUED)	28 May 2014	KOPNIN AND OTHERS (No. 2746/05)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Domestic authorities' failure to enforce the binding judgment in favour of the applicants
				Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Domestic authorities' failure to take promptly sufficient measures with regard to the enforcement of monetary awards had prevented the applicants from benefitting from it for a considerable period of time (1 year and 10 months)
				Violation of Art. 13	Lack of an effective remedy in that respect
SLOVENIA	15 May 2014	MAVRIC (No. 63655/11)	3	Violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d)	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the applicant's impossibility to examine witnesses as he and his lawyer had not been informed of the hearing
SPAIN	27 May 2014	DE LA FLOR CABRERA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 10764/09)	3	No violation of Art. 8	Proportionate interference with the applicant's right to privacy as recordings were incorporated as evidence in the civil proceedings and remained limited to the purposes of the trial
SWITZERLAND	27 May 2014	BUCHS (No. 9929/12)	2	No violation of Art. 8	Domestic courts' decision to oppose to the applicant's request for shared parental authority fell within the margin of their appreciation as a joint request had not been submitted by both parents
				No violation of Art. 14 in conjunction with Art. 8	No distinction had been made based on the parents' gender
TURKEY	13 May 2014	AÇAN AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 15234/05)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Excessive length of pre-trial detention (9 years and 6 months)

B. The decision on admissibility

Those decisions are published with a slight delay of two to three weeks on the Court's website. Therefore the decisions listed below cover the period from 1 to 30 April 2014. Those decisions are selected to provide the NHRs with potentially useful information on the reasons of the inadmissibility of certain applications addressed to the Court and/or on the friendly settlements reached.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	ALLEGED VIOLATION	DECISION
ROMANIA	15 April 2014	M.P. AND OTHERS (No. 39974/10)	Art. 8 (birth of the minor applicant as a disabled child as a result of a medical negligence), Art. 6 (unfairness and excessive length of the proceedings)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
ROMANIA	15 April 2014	PAPUC (No. 1952/06)	Mainly Art. 8 (unlawful interception of the applicant phone conversations), Art. 2 of Protocol No. 4 (unlawfulness of the international arrest warrant issued on his name)	Partly incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the provisions of the Convention (concerning claim under Art. 8), partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning the remaining claims)
SLOVAKIA	1 April 2014	Z. K. (No. 13606/11)	Mainly Art. 3 (forced and unlawful sterilisation of the applicant, lack of an effective and prompt investigation in this respect); Art. 8 (unlawful sterilisation)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
UKRAINE	1 April 2014	REPRESENTATION OF THE UNION OF COUNCILS FOR JEWS IN THE FORMER SOVIET UNION AND UNION OF JEWISH RELIGIOUS ORGANISATIONS OF UKRAINE (No. 13267/05)	Mainly Art. 9 (inadequate protection of the Jewish cemeteries and construction on those sites)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

C. The communicated cases

The European Court of Human Rights publishes on a weekly basis a list of the communicated cases on its website. These are cases concerning individual applications which are pending before the Court. They are communicated by the Court to the respondent state's Government with a statement of facts, the applicant's complaints and the questions put by the Court to the Government concerned. The decision to communicate a case lies with one of the Court's Chamber, which is in charge of the case. A **selection** of those cases is proposed below. Those decisions are published with a delay on the Court's website. Therefore the decisions listed below cover only the period from 11 to 31 December 2013.

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
ARMENIA	18 December 2013	HOVHANNISYAN (No. 8049/10)	The applicant was dismissed from his job for breach of the principle of political restraint by a civil servant but he claims that he was not on duty when he expressed his political views in favour of the opposition
BELGIUM	17 December 2013	OUABOUR IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 26417/10)	If sent to Morocco, the applicant fears inhuman treatments because he is suspected of terrorism there
CROATIA	12 December 2013	PAJIĆ (No. 68453/13)	The domestic authorities refused the applicant's request for a family-reunification residence permit on the grounds that only married different-sex couples and different-sex couples living in an extramarital relationship are allowed to apply for such a permit
FRANCE	12 December 2013	H.T. IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 77481/13)	If sent back to Bangladesh, the applicant fears inhuman treatments because of his political views
	20 December 2013	A.F. IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 80086/13)	If sent back to Sudan, the applicant fears inhuman treatments
GEORGIA	18 December 2013	DE PITĂ (No. 22958/11)	Failure of the domestic authorities to react to the abduction of the applicant's daughter by his former wife
		IDENTOBA AND OTHERS (No. 73235/12)	Failure of the domestic authorities to protect the applicants from the verbal and physical attacks perpetrated by the counter-demonstrators which resulted in the disruption of their demonstration promoting the rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender persons in Georgia

GEORGIA (CONTINUED)	18 December 2013	MODEBADZE (No. 43111/10)	The domestic authorities refused to accept the results of a DNA test, which confirmed the biological bloodline between the applicant's child and the respondent putative father for a procedural reason.
		SMIRNOVA (No. 2361/13)	Refusal of the domestic authorities to order the return to Ukraine of the applicant's son who was taken and left in Georgia by his father.
		TORTLADZE (No. 42371/08)	The applicant's conditions of transfer and wait on the premises of the trial court were very bad and he was placed in a metal cage during the proceedings
HUNGARY	12 December 2013	CAVANI AND OTHERS (No. 5493/13)	Failure of the domestic authorities to enforce a legally binding court decision granting the applicant child access and custody rights since his two daughters were brought illegally abroad by their mother
LITHUANIA	12 December 2013	MATIOŠAITIS AND 7 OTHER APPLICATIONS (No. 22662/13)	The applicants argue that life imprisonment, without a possibility of parole, could be described as a social death sentence and the imposition of life imprisonment means that their sentences are, in effect, irreducible, which is considered as inhuman treatment by the Convention
ROMANIA	18 December 2013	BALEA IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 27262/10) BERGHEA (No. 45054/13) COZIANU IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 29101/13) CURELARIU (No. 45825/13) ELEFTERIADIS (No. 53104/11) RADOVANCOVICI IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 45358/13) RADU (No. 36614/13)	Really bad conditions in the prisons which are overcrowded and sometimes do not have any room for prisoners to eat
RUSSIA	19 December 2013	AVYASOV (No. 78035/13)	The residence permit of the applicant was annulled and his presence in Russia declared undesirable on account of his HIV-positive status
		DZHALAGONIYA (No. 33330/11)	The applicant can neither find employment nor receive medical assistance since the domestic authorities refused to renew his Russian passport

RUSSIA (CONTINUED)	19 December 2013	OSTANKO (No. 32325/06)	Eviction of the applicant and her family from the municipal flat while the domestic authorities failed in providing them a new accommodation as they asked for
		KOCHEROV AND SERGEYEVA (No. 16899/13)	Restriction by domestic authorities of the first applicant's parental rights over the second applicant because of the first applicant's mental disability
TURKEY	12 December 2013	EYGI (No. 43731/05))	The applicant was convicted for committing incitement to hatred as he had deliberately used provocative language in expressing his criticism in his article according to the domestic authorities, while he merely criticised an approach restricting religious freedom and those who, according to his religious understanding, damaged Islam and the country
		GÜLER AND TEKDAL (No. 65815/10)	Unlawful killing of the applicants' relative by soldiers and no investigation conducted but to prosecute their deceased relative for membership of the PKK
		SARUR IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 55949/11)	Failure of the domestic authorities to protect its citizens' lives as no mine-clearing was conducted in the area concerned before and after the applicant's accident. The applicant also complains about the fact that he was declared guilty of his accident and about discrimination by the domestic authorities on the grounds of his Kurdish origins

A. Reclamations and Decisions

1. Reclamations

STATE	COMPLAINANT	RECLAMATION NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER
ITALY	ASSOCIAZIONE SINDACALE "LA VOCE DEI GIUSTI"	105/2014 [Italian only]	Alleged breach of Article 10 (right to vocational training) due to the impossibility for a certain category of teaching staff to undertake or continue specialised studies in view of the increasing burden of workload imposed.
FINLAND	FINNISH SOCIETY OF SOCIAL RIGHTS	106/2014	Alleged breach of Article 24 (right to protection in cases of termination of employment) as the State legislation does not provide for the possibility of reinstatement in case of unlawful dismissal, and as the dismissal compensation is subject to an upper limit
	FINNISH SOCIETY OF SOCIAL RIGHTS	107/2014	Alleged breach of Article 24 based on the interpretation of the "valid and proper cause" for dismissal, which allows collective dismissals in order to increase profit, without economic necessity, or for outsourcing and subcontracting
	FINNISH SOCIETY OF SOCIAL RIGHTS	108/2014	Alleged breach of Article 12 (right to social security), as the State is not maintaining a system of social security at a satisfactory level, or endeavours to raise progressively this system to a higher level
BELGIUM	MENTAL DISABILITY ADVOCACY CENTER (MDAC)	109/2014	Alleged breach of Article 15 and 17 concerning children with mental disabilities who are denied access to mainstream education and to the supports necessary to ensure their inclusion, and in regard to the State's failing to provide education and training for this children

2. Decisions

STATE	COMPLAINANT	RECLAMATION NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
CYPRUS	ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF ALL CHILDREN (APPROACH)	97/2013	Withdrawal of the complaint; No circumstances which would require a continued examination of the case	Struck out of the list
NORWAY	BEDRIFTSFORBUNDET	103/2013	Alleged breach of Article 5 (right to organise)	Admissible

B. Other information

■ International workshop on the role of judges in the protection of economic and social rights in times of economic crisis, Brazil (05.05.2014)

An international workshop on the role of judges in the protection of economic and social rights in times of economic crisis was held in Ouro Preto, Brazil on 5 and 6 May 2014. On this occasion the President of the ECSR addressed the conference by a broadcasted message ([More information on the conference](#)).

PartOne

§3 - RECOMMENDATIONS & RESOLUTIONS

A. Recommendations

AUTHOR	DATE	TEXT NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
PACE	23 May 2014	2045	Combating sexual violence against children: towards a successful conclusion of the ONE in FIVE Campaign	The PACE recommended to prolong the ONE in FIVE Campaign for one year and proposed the establishment of an European day to fight sexual violence against children (Read more - Read the report)

B. Resolutions

AUTHOR	DATE	TEXT NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
PACE	23 May 2014	1996	Migrant children: what rights at 18?	The PACE called on the States to establish a transition category, between the ages of 18 and 25, to help young migrants' integration and to prevent them to lose their rights at their majority (Read more - Read the report)
PACE	23 May 2014	1997	Migrants and refugees and the fight against Aids	The PACE asserted HIV-positive migrants' right to free access of treatment, and considered they should not be expelled if adequate treatment in their country is not possible (Read more - Read the report)
PACE	23 May 2014	1998	Improving co-operation between NHRIs and parliaments in addressing equality and non-discrimination issues	The PACE called on States and NHRIs to improve their co-operation, and encouraged them to share information (Read more - Read the report).

PartOne

§4 - OTHER INFORMATION OF GENERAL IMPORTANCE

A. Information from the Committee of Ministers

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

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly

■ Ensuring access to quality-assured diagnosis and treatment for all breast cancer patients (12.05.2014)

The Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development urged member States to reduce inequalities in diagnosis, screening and treatment of breast cancer, and ensure that patients have the level of care that they are entitled to. Breast cancer patients also need to be protected from discrimination in employment and assurance ([Read more](#) - [Read the report](#)).

■ For a child-friendly juvenile justice (13.05.2014)

The Committee on Social Affairs called on States to implement the relevant standards in order to respect children's rights and improve juvenile justice practices. It recommended that the minimum age of criminal responsibility should be set at least at 14 years of age ([Read more](#) - [Read the report](#) - [Speech by the Commissioner for Human Rights on child-friendly justice](#)).

■ IDAHO day: let LGBT people express themselves (16.05.2014)

The PACE general rapporteur on the rights of LGBT people pointed out that freedom of expression for sexual and gender minorities is currently under threat, not least because of the bans on so-called "homosexual propaganda" enacted or proposed in several CoE member states ([Read more](#)).

■ Call for additional measures to strengthen the independence of the ECHR (27.05.2014)

The PACE Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights cited additional measures such as the ratification of the Sixth Protocol to the CoE's General Agreement on Privileges and Immunities in order to strengthen the independence of the ECHR ([Read more](#) - [Draft resolution](#)).

C. Information for the Commissioner for Human Rights

■ Keep the press free (02.05.2014)

The Commissioner underlined that press freedom is instrumental in protecting all other human rights. He denounced the use of police violence against journalists covering demonstrations, the threat of non-State actors and the use of lawsuits to arrest journalists, using defamation laws ([Read more](#) - [Read in French](#), [Italian](#), [Russian](#)).

■ A boy or a girl or a person – intersex people lack recognition in Europe (09.05.2014)

The Commissioner highlighted the neglect by most countries of the human rights problem that the discrimination and prejudice against intersex people is. He underlined intersex people encounter huge barriers to the enjoyment of their human rights ([Read more](#) - [Read in Russian](#)).

■ **Conclusions of the workshop on developing and implementing national action plans for human rights (27.05.2014)**

The first “wave” of NAPs emerged ten years ago, and currently, a second “wave” of NAPs is being witnessed. In the conclusions of the workshop on developing and implementing NAPs, the usefulness of such tools for identifying and addressing gaps in human rights protection was underlined ([Read more](#)).

■ **1st quarterly activity report 2014 (28.05.2014)**

The Commissioner for Human Rights released its 1st quarterly activity report ([Read the report](#)).

D. Information from the monitoring mechanisms

■ **ECRI: Seminar of the ECRI for national independent authorities combating racism and intolerance (21.05.2014)**

The ECRI organised a seminar for national independent authorities combating racism and intolerance to review examples of partnerships between these institutions and local authorities in countering hate speech and racist and homo/trans phobic violence and in facilitating the integration of vulnerable groups ([More about the seminar](#)).

■ **FCNM: Adoption of the first opinions under the 4th cycle of monitoring by the Advisory Committee (23.05.2014)**

The Advisory Committee on the FCNM adopted the first country-specific opinions under the fourth cycle of monitoring the implementation of this convention in States Parties. The Opinion on Denmark was adopted on 20 May and the opinion on Liechtenstein was adopted on 21 May. They are restricted for the time-being. These opinions will be submitted to the Committee of Ministers, which is to adopt conclusions and recommendations.

■ **Adoption of two resolutions by the Committee of Ministers (28.05.2014)**

Resolution on the implementation of the FCNM by the Netherlands ([Read more](#)).

Resolution on the implementation of the FCNM by the Switzerland ([Read more](#)).

■ **Statement on the situation of national minorities in Crimea by the Advisory Committee (30.05.2014)**

During its plenary session in Strasbourg from 19-22 May 2014, the Advisory Committee again discussed the situation of national minorities in Ukraine, particularly in Crimea.

As a result of this discussion, the members of the Advisory Committee adopted an Open Statement regarding Crimea to express their continued commitment to protect and promote minority rights throughout Europe, even in difficult political situations.

■ **MONEYVAL: Publication of the annual activity report for 2013 (27.05.2014)**

[Read the report](#).

■ **GRETA: The committee launched second evaluation round (15.05.2014)**

GRETA launched the second evaluation round of implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by sending the new questionnaire to the first three parties to be evaluated (Austria, Cyprus and the Slovak Republic).

PartTwo

INFORMATION BY COUNTRY

This part presents a selection of pieces of information, which are 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.

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

■ CPT: Visit in Armenia (30.05.2014)

A delegation of the CPT carried out an ad hoc visit to Armenia from 20 to 23 May 2014.

The main objective of the visit was to review the measures taken by the Armenian authorities vis-à-vis life-sentenced prisoners and, in particular, those held at Yerevan-Kentron Prison, in the light of specific recommendations made by the Committee after the 2010, 2011 and 2013 visits to Armenia ([Read more](#)).

Azerbaijan

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: The country heading the '47' should “lead by example” on human rights (23.05.2014)

The President asserted States chairing the Committee of Ministers should first of all lead by example, addressing in an open and constructive manner the most pressing human rights issues at home. Referring to the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh, she stressed upon their accession to the CoE, both Armenia and Azerbaijan had committed themselves to use only peaceful means to settle the conflict. She also hoped that the ECHR judgement in the case of Ilgar Mammadov, Director of the CoE School of Political Studies in Baku, which found that his arrest and extended detention pending trial was in violation of the Convention, will lead to him now being freed from detention ([Read more](#) - [President's speech](#) - [Ogtay Asadov: Azerbaijan will work to reinforce the fundamental principles of the CoE](#)).

■ GRETA: Publication of the first report on Azerbaijan (23.05.2014)

The GRETA has published its first evaluation report on Azerbaijan ([Read the report](#)).

■ Committee condemned abusive use of Convention on transfer of sentenced persons by Azerbaijan in the Safarov case (27.05.2014)

PACE's Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights condemned the use of Article 12 of the Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons by Azerbaijan in the case of Ramil Safarov, “as a violation of the principles of good faith in international relations and of the rule of law”. Indeed, this Convention provides for the transfer of foreign prisoners to their home countries, but a rapporteur noted with concern that it was invoked in order to justify the immediate release upon transfer to Azerbaijan of Ramil Safarov, an Azerbaijani soldier convicted for murdering a fellow Armenian participant of a NATO “Partnership for Peace” training course in Hungary ([Read more](#) - [Draft resolution](#)).

Estonia

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ FCNM: Receipt of the 4th cycle State Report (05.05.2014)

Estonia submitted on 2 May 2014 its fourth State Report in English and Estonian pursuant to Article 25, paragraph 2, of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. It is now up to the Advisory Committee to consider it and adopt an opinion intended for the Committee of Ministers ([Read the report](#)).

Georgia

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ Commissioner for Human Rights: Georgia has to improve the administration of justice and promote tolerance (12.05.2014)

The Commissioner released a report on his January visit to Georgia, in which he expressed the need to assess and prioritise the cases of serious human rights abuse, to reinforce judicial independence and to support the participation of minorities in elected bodies and public service ([Read more](#) - [Read in Georgian](#) - [Commissioner's report](#) - [Report in Georgian](#) - [State's comments](#)).

■ Rapporteurs called for investigation of attack on former Georgian Ambassador to the CoE (28.05.2014)

The co-rapporteurs on the honouring of obligations and commitments by Georgia called on the State to conduct a full and transparent investigation into the attacks on leading United National Movement (UNM) members Nugzar Tsiklauri and Zurab Tchiaberashvili (former Georgian Ambassador to the CoE), particularly in view of the UNM's allegations that these attacks were politically motivated ([Read more](#)).

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Rapporteur reacted to Aegean migrant boat tragedy (07.05.2014)

The PACE Rapporteur on “Lives lost in the Mediterranean” noted that human rights groups accused Greece of pushing back migrants intercepted in its waters, and called on the State to thoroughly investigate the circumstances of the accident and the response of the coastguard authorities ([Read more](#) - [Read the resolution “Lives lost in the Mediterranean”](#) - [PACE inquiry](#)).

■ PACE: PACE President called for greater solidarity (09.05.2014)

The PACE President, at the end of an official visit to Greece, has welcomed the State’s commitment to CoE values, democracy and human rights. She also emphasized that the State, which is facing two major challenges in terms of human rights, the management of migratory movements and the combating of racism and xenophobia, must not fight these battles alone. She recalled that greater solidarity should be shown ([Read more](#)).

Lithuania

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRETA: The committee's first evaluation visit to Lithuania (26.05.2014)

A delegation of the GRETA carried out an evaluation visit to Lithuania from 19 to 22 May 2014. The visit was organised in the context of the first round of evaluation of the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. ([Read more](#)).

Montenegro

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: Publication of a report on Montenegro (22.05.2014)

The CPT has published a report on its second periodic visit to Montenegro, which took place in February 2013 together with the Montenegrin Government's response ([Read more](#)).

Netherlands

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ Commissioner for Human Rights: The Netherlands should improve protection of the rights of asylum seekers, migrants and children (23.05.2014)

The Commissioner called on the State to stop automatic detention of asylum seekers arriving at Dutch international ports or airports from non-Schengen countries. He also asked to ensure that basic needs, including shelter, clothes and food, of persons at immediate risk of destitution are met, and supported a request made for the same purpose by the ECSR in October 2013. However, the Commissioner also welcomed the solid legal and institutional framework for the protection and promotion of human rights, strengthened by the establishment of the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights and the adoption of the country's first National Human Rights action plan ([Read more](#)).

■ CPT: The committee has visited the Caribbean part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (27.05.2014)

A delegation of the CPT has recently carried out an eleven-day visit to the Caribbean part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The visit began on 12 May 2014. It was the sixth visit of the CPT in the Caribbean part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands ([Read more](#)).

Poland

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ FCNM: Receipt of the comments on the 3rd ACFC Opinion (21.05.2014)

The comments of the authorities on the 3rd Opinion of the Advisory Committee on the FCNM were received in English and Polish and made public today ([Read more](#)).

Sweden

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Publication of the first report on Sweden (27.05.2014)

[Link to the report.](#)

“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Monitoring Committee’s statement on “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (16.05.2014)

The Monitoring Committee noted that fundamental freedoms were respected and candidates were able to campaign without obstruction in the parliamentary elections on 27 April. However the committee urged the authorities to look into the credible allegations of intimidation and pressure exerted on voters, in particular among public sector employees, as well as into allegations of vote-buying ([Read more](#) - [Read the report](#)).

■ GRECO: Publication of a second compliance report (20.05.2014)

[Read the report](#).

Turkey

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

■ Turkey-YouTube: PACE rapporteur welcomed Constitutional Court decision (30.05.2014)

The PACE rapporteur on “post-monitoring dialogue with Turkey” has welcomed the Constitutional Court decision requiring the ban on YouTube to be lifted, a demand that had also been made by the PACE. She invited the State to implement that decision without delay. She also pointed out that in the justice sphere, reform and independence of the judiciary and prosecution service remains a key point ([Read more](#) - [Rapporteur called for greater social and political stability](#)).

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: All stakeholders in Ukraine must put an immediate end to violence (13.05.2014)

The PACE President once again called on all sides in Ukraine to stop violence and ensure that human rights are effectively respected on the whole territory. She strongly regretted the holding of the so-called “referendums” in the regions of Donetsk and Luhansk, as the PACE rapporteurs for the monitoring of Ukraine also did ([Read more - Ukraine rapporteurs regretted holding of referendums in Donetsk and Luhansk](#)).

■ Despite violence in east, high turnout and resolve to guarantee fundamental freedoms (26.05.2014)

The election observers in Ukraine noted genuine efforts were made by the State to conduct voting throughout the country, despite continued unrest and violence in the east, which seriously impacted the election environment, negatively affected the human rights situation, obstructed meaningful observation, and had a significant adverse effect on preparations ([Read more](#)).