

SECRETARIAT / SECRÉTARIAT

SECRETARIAT OF THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS
SECRÉTARIAT DU COMITÉ DES MINISTRES

COMMITTEE
OF MINISTERS
COMITÉ
DES MINISTRES



Contact: Ireneusz Kondak
Tel: 03.90.21.59.86

Date: 17/07/2026

DH-DD(2026)897

Document distributed under the sole responsibility of its author, without prejudice to the legal or political position of the Committee of Ministers.

Meeting: 1569th meeting (September 2026) (DH)

Communication from the applicant (15/07/2026) in the Buntov group of cases v. Russia (Application No. 27026/10).

Information made available under Rule 9.1 of the Rules of the Committee of Ministers for the supervision of the execution of judgments and of the terms of friendly settlements.

* * * * *

Document distribué sous la seule responsabilité de son auteur, sans préjuger de la position juridique ou politique du Comité des Ministres.

Réunion : 1569^e réunion (septembre 2026) (DH)

Communication du requérant (15/07/2026) relative au groupe d'affaires Buntov c. Russie (Requête n° 27026/10) **[anglais uniquement]**

Informations mises à disposition en vertu de la Règle 9.1 des Règles du Comité des Ministres pour la surveillance de l'exécution des arrêts et des termes des règlements amiables.

TO THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

DEPARTMENT FOR THE EXECUTION OF

JUDGMENTS OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

DGI

15 JUIL. 2026

SERVICE DE L'EXECUTION
DES ARRETS DE LA CEDH

1569th meeting, September 2026 (DH)

MEMORANDUM

Execution of Buntov group v. Russian Federation (Application No. 27026/10)

Application No. 27026/10, No. 40508/16 and No. 20666/19

Submissions under Rule 9(1) of the Rules of the CM-DH

Applicant **Buntov V.M.**

MOSCOW

2026

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE COMMUNICATION

This communication is submitted pursuant to Rule 9(1) of the Rules of the Committee of Ministers for the supervision of the execution of judgments, for the purpose of informing the Committee of the complete, continuing, and demonstrative failure of the Russian Federation to execute three judgments of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) rendered in respect of Russian national Vitaly Maratovich Buntov, born on 14 December 1976 (the Applicant).

Although the lead case of Buntov v. Russia has been under enhanced supervision of the Committee of Ministers (CM) for more than 14 years, the situation has not merely remained unresolved but has taken on the character of ongoing repression by the state authorities against the Applicant.

This communication is intended to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the Applicant has now been unlawfully deprived of his liberty for 24 years. The violations of Article 3 of the Convention established by three ECHR judgments, and the repression directed against him, continue. His health has been destroyed; he is disabled and has been able to move only on crutches for the past 10 years. The overall term of his imprisonment has been artificially increased by the authorities by 5 years (to 30 years), as an act of retaliation for his complaints of torture and his applications to the ECHR and the CM.

II. CHRONOLOGY OF THE PERSISTENT NON-EXECUTION OF THE THREE ECtHR JUDGMENTS

The Applicant is a unique victim of systemic violations by the Russian authorities, as confirmed by three independent ECtHR judgments. The authorities have not executed these judgments and have not restored the Applicant's rights. He continues to be subjected to violations of Article 3 of the Convention in even more brutal forms.

1. Buntov v. Russia, Application No. 27026/10, Judgment of 5 June 2012

Nature of the violation and the authorities' position: The ECtHR found that in 2010, at IK-1 in the Tula Region, the Applicant was subjected to barbaric torture (including the forcible extraction of all of his fingernails and toenails by colony staff, and the most brutal ill-treatment). The domestic investigation into the torture was completely obstructed. The Russian authorities categorically refuse to acknowledge the very fact that torture was applied. All of the individuals identified by the Applicant as responsible have been promoted in rank and position and rewarded by the authorities.

Act of retaliation: for the mere fact of filing complaints of torture, the Russian authorities brought a criminal case against the Applicant under Article 129 of the Russian Criminal Code ("defamation") and subjected him to two years of criminal prosecution, which caused the gravest harm to the Applicant's health, financial situation, and moral state. The Applicant has not been rehabilitated.

2. Buntov v. Russia, Application No. 40508/16 (within the framework of the Judgment of 14 December 2017 in Kotov and Others v. Russia, No. 40122/16 and others)

Nature of the violation and the authorities' position: The ECtHR found a violation of Article 3 of the Convention on account of the inhuman conditions in which the Applicant was held in correctional institutions between 2012 and 2016, which caused irreparable harm to his health. The authorities did not remedy the violations and continued to hold the Applicant in inhuman conditions grossly violating Article 3 of the Convention. The Applicant reported these to the Committee of Ministers in previous communications.

In addition, between 2021 and 2024 the Applicant personally initiated 21 sets of court proceedings in Russian courts, consistently challenging the inhuman, degrading, and unlawful conditions of his detention in the colonies. However, the Russian courts at every level arbitrarily dismissed all of the Applicant's complaints, even where the facts of the violations were confirmed by irrefutable evidence, photographs, witness testimony, statutory provisions, and official forensic examinations. At present, the Applicant's health has been completely destroyed by the authorities; he has been diagnosed with more than 20 serious chronic illnesses, and for 10 years he has been able to move only on crutches, as confirmed by forensic medical examination No. 237 of 16 August 2019.

3. Buntov v. Russia, Application No. 20666/19 (within the framework of the Judgment of 15 September 2022 in Sovetov and Others v. Russia, No. 32992/13 and others)

Nature of the violation: The ECtHR found a violation of Article 3 of the Convention on account of the inhuman conditions of the Applicant's transport between correctional colonies and his confinement in metal cages during court hearings. Russia, however, continues to this day to subject the Applicant to numerous torturous transfers between correctional colonies and isolation in iron courtroom cages, in violation of Article 3 of the Convention. The just satisfaction awarded by the ECtHR in the case has not been paid to the Applicant.

For example, in 2022 the Applicant was transferred between correctional colonies from IK-6 (Melekhovo, Vladimir Region) to IK-5 (Kleotki, Ryazan Region), the straight-line distance between which is only 242 km. Instead, the authorities repressively routed the Applicant from Vladimir to Nizhny Novgorod, then to Saratov, then to Samara, then to Ryazan, and only after that — to IK-5 in the village of Kleotki. The total distance of this repressive transfer between correctional colonies amounted to 2,200 km. The Applicant was forced to spend 19 hours in prisoner-transport vehicles, 71 hours in prisoner-transport railcars and 518 hours in complete isolation in pre-trial detention facilities and transit holding points (TPP). The torture of convoy transport (etapirovanie) lasted continuously for 27 days.

The Applicant challenged these violations of Article 3 of the Convention in court, relying on the ECtHR's precedent judgment in *Sovetov and Others v. Russia*, but the Russian courts arbitrarily refused to acknowledge the violations.

Torture by cage confinement in courts: In addition, between 2021 and 2024, while participating in the 21 sets of court proceedings referred to above (cases Nos. 2a-3810/2022, 2A-30/2022, 2A-1358/2022, 2A-257/2022, 2a-2120/2021, 2a-1869/2022, 2-2555/2022, 2a-2854/2022, 2a-2377/2021, 2A-5986/2021, 2a-389/2021, 2a-1751/2024, 2-3/2023, 2a-29/2023, 2a-35/2024, 2A-44/2023, 2A-1442/2022, 2-11/2023, 2A-388/2023, 2a-324/2024, and 2a-470/2024), in violation of Article 3 of the Convention, the authorities confined the Applicant in degrading metal courtroom cages on 244 occasions.

4. The authorities continue to subject the Applicant to repression: In 2017, the Gubakha City Court of Perm region, in a fabricated case, sentenced the Applicant to an additional 5 years' imprisonment under Article 306 of the Russian Criminal Code ("knowingly false denunciation") for his complaints of torture. The total term of imprisonment was artificially increased to 30 years (until 2031). The proceedings took place under conditions of complete denial of the defendant's right to defense (he and his lawyer were simply removed from the courtroom for the entire proceedings); he was denied access to doctors and deprived of medical assistance; he was entirely excluded from participating in the proceedings. The Applicant categorically denies guilt; the charge was fabricated on falsified evidence. His lawyer was subjected to repression. The authorities forcibly imposed on the Applicant knowingly unlawful lawyers with unlawful warrants (confirmed by the Russian Ministry of Justice), whom he refused and who harmed him during the proceedings. **The authorities have blocked the Applicant's domestic remedies in this case — the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation arbitrarily returns all of the Applicant's supervisory-review complaints without examination.** Since 2010, the Applicant has been subjected to 85 disciplinary penalties (#1). For many years he was isolated in solitary confinement cells (SHIZO, PKT, EPKT, BM — with total deprivation of rights and privileges), as well as in strict-regime units (SUS). In 2019 he was transferred for 3 years to the harshest prison regime as a "persistent violator," solely in retaliation for his complaints.

III. UNLAWFULNESS, ARBITRARINESS AND REPRESSIVE NATURE OF THE DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY

Execution of the aforementioned ECtHR judgments is inextricably linked to the need to adopt individual measures in the form of quashing the arbitrary deprivation of the Applicant's liberty. In fact, the Applicant has been arbitrarily deprived of his liberty for more than 24 years (since 30 November 2001), on the basis of a judgment of 18 July 2002 rendered by an unlawful and incompetent court composition in violation of Russian and international law. The deprivation of the Applicant's liberty is entirely unlawful and arbitrary. Below is an exhaustive, detailed analysis of five independent and cumulative grounds establishing the illegitimacy of the court's composition and the arbitrariness of the deprivation of liberty.

GROUND 1 — Complete absence of authority of the lay assessors.

Under Article 164 of the RSFSR Constitution and Article 29 of the RSFSR Law “On the Judicial System of the RSFSR,” lay assessors were elected for a term of **five** years. In 2018, an inspection carried out by the State Archive of the Russian Federation established that Ms. Savelyeva V.G. and Ms. Kirillova A.I. had been elected lay assessors of the Khabarovsk Regional Court on 10 July 1987. Their term of office expired on 10 July 1992. By decision of the Small Council of the Khabarovsk Regional Council of People's Deputies of 16 May 1993, No. 97, new lay assessors of the Khabarovsk Regional Court were elected, taking the seats of Savelyeva and Kirillova. From 1992 until 18 July 2002 (the date the Applicant's judgment was rendered), they were not re-elected in the manner prescribed by law. The Decrees of the President of the Russian Federation of 25 December 1993 No. 2289, of 23 January 1997 No. 41, and of 25 January 2000 No. 103 extended the terms only of serving lay assessors and did not apply to Savelyeva and Kirillova, since by the time the first Decree was issued they had already, *de jure* and *de facto*, ceased to be judges for one year and five months, their seats having been taken by other, lawfully elected, lay assessors. In 2001 they attempted to be elected as lay assessors, but their lists were not approved. Only on 31 July 2002 — two weeks after the Applicant's judgment was rendered — were Savelyeva and Kirillova elected as lay assessors of district courts.

Documentary evidence: Archival extract of the KGBU GAKhK of 23 July 2018, No. 05.2-13/1562 (#2); Resolution of the Legislative Duma of Khabarovsk Krai of 31 July 2002, No. 329 (#3) and 30 further documents from the State Archive of the Russian Federation.

National legal provisions violated: Article 164 of the RSFSR Constitution; Article 29 of the RSFSR Law of 8 July 1981 “On the Judicial System of the RSFSR”; Article 10 of the USSR Law “On the Status of Judges in the USSR” (authority terminates upon expiry of the term).

Legal characterization: Persons not vested with the lawful authority of judges cannot constitute a “tribunal established by law” within the meaning of Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention and Articles 9 and 14(1) of the ICCPR.

GROUND 2 — Exceeding the lawful terms and limits of judicial service by lay assessors.

Under Article 9 of Federal Law No. 37-FZ of 2 January 2000 “On Lay Assessors of the Federal Courts of General Jurisdiction of the Russian Federation” (Federal Law No. 37-FZ), lay assessors may be called upon to perform their duties no more than once a year and for a period not exceeding 14 days. In breach of this provision, Ms. Savelyeva V.G. and Ms. Kirillova A.I., from 8 May to 27 June 2002 (51 days), tried the cases of citizens Pionka S.V. and Ovechkin A.P. Thereafter, from 4 to 18 July 2002, they tried the Applicant's case as part of the same court composition. They thus grossly exceeded the statutory 14-day limit and were called upon to perform their duties more than once a year.

Documentary evidence: Judgment of the Khabarovsk Regional Court of 27 June 2002 in the case of Pionka S.V. and Ovechkin A.P. (#4); Response of the Khabarovsk Regional Court of 31 July 2013, No. 9-11 (#5), confirming that the case of Pionka and Ovechkin lasted 51 days and was heard by the same court composition as the Applicant's case; the Applicant's judgment of 18 July 2002 (#6).

National legal provisions violated: Article 9 of Federal Law No. 37-FZ.

Legal characterization: A court composition formed in breach of the statutory terms and limits governing the service of lay assessors is not a “competent and lawful tribunal” within the meaning of Articles 9 and 14(1) of the ICCPR and Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention.

GROUND 3 — The lay assessors were not selected by drawing of lots.

Under Articles 5 and 6 of Federal Law No. 37-FZ and the Resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation of 14 January 2000 “On the Procedure for the Selection of Lay Assessors,” the selection of lay assessors to sit on cases before the regional court must be carried out by random selection by the court's president from the general lists of the district courts, followed by the drawing of lots by the judge hearing the specific case. The results of the selection and the drawing of lots must be retained by the court. In breach of these requirements, lay assessors Savelyeva and Kirillova were never selected by the President of the Khabarovsk Regional Court from the general lists and were never selected by Judge Pavlova A.A. by drawing of lots for the hearing of the Applicant's case. The Khabarovsk Regional Court has no documents whatsoever recording “a record of the selection of lay assessors Savelyeva and Kirillova by random selection and drawing of lots.”

National legal provisions violated: Articles 5 and 6 of Federal Law No. 37-FZ; Resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation of 14 January 2000.

Legal characterization: The absence of a random-selection and drawing-of-lots procedure renders the court's composition unlawful and arbitrary, in violation of Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention and Articles 9 and 14(1) of the ICCPR.

GROUND 4 — The case should have been heard by a judge sitting alone.

Under Articles 1 and 7 of Federal Law No. 177-FZ of 18 December 2001 “On the Entry into Force of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation” (in force from 18 December 2001 to 2004), criminal cases concerning offences punishable by life imprisonment were to be heard at first instance by a judge sitting alone, or, where the defendant had submitted a written request, by a panel composed of a judge and two lay assessors. The Applicant never submitted such a request (it does not physically exist in the case file), and his criminal case should therefore have been heard by a judge sitting alone. In breach of the express prohibition of federal law, his case was heard collegially, with the participation of two unlawful lay assessors.

Documentary evidence: The Applicant's judgment of 18 July 2002 and other case materials.

National legal provisions violated: Articles 1 and 7 of Federal Law No. 177-FZ.

Legal characterization: Hearing a case with a court composition that federal legislation prohibits from hearing that category of case renders the judgment unlawful and arbitrary, in violation of Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention and Articles 9 and 14 of the ICCPR.

GROUND 5 — The question of the court's composition was not resolved during preparation for trial.

Under Articles 228 and 230 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure, a judge, when preparing a case for trial, is required to resolve the question of “whether the case is to be heard by a judge sitting alone or collegially” and to record that decision solely in the order scheduling the court hearing. The RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure provided for no other procedures or documents for legitimizing the composition of the court. Yet the order of Judge Pavlova A.A. scheduling the court hearing, dated 13 May 2002, contains no decision whatsoever on the composition of the court that was to hear the Applicant's case. The composition of the court was never determined, never approved, and never recorded in the documents required by the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Documentary evidence: Order scheduling the court hearing of 13 May 2002 (#7).

National legal provisions violated: Articles 228 and 230 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure.

Legal characterization: A court composition that has been neither determined nor approved by the procedural decisions required by law is illegitimate and violates Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention and Articles 9 and 14 of the ICCPR.

DENIAL OF MANDATORY LEGAL ASSISTANCE IN THE SECOND-INSTANCE COURT (DEPRIVATION OF DEFENSE)

Article 14(3)(d) of the ICCPR and Article 6 of the Convention guarantee every accused the right to assigned counsel whenever the interests of justice so require. Russian domestic law directly reflects this obligation: Article 51 of the Russian Code of Criminal Procedure makes the participation of counsel mandatory in second-instance proceedings in cases where the accused may be sentenced to life imprisonment, and obliges the court to ensure that counsel is provided.

Despite this unequivocal obligation under international and national law, the Applicant was entirely denied defense counsel in the second-instance proceedings before the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation on 30 October 2003 (#8). The Supreme Court deliberately examined and dismissed his cassation appeal (then the equivalent of an appeal) at a public hearing in the absence of counsel, even though the Applicant held the status of a person sentenced to life imprisonment and counsel should have been provided to him as a mandatory matter.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PRECEDENTS:

The unlawfulness of a court composition that has violated the rules governing the formation of panels is not a matter open to debate. Under Article 389.17(2) and Article 412.9 of the Russian Code of Criminal Procedure, an unlawful court composition and a violation of the right to defense are unconditional grounds for quashing a judgment in every case. The Presidium of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation has quashed judgments in virtually identical cases (Rulings Nos. 399p03, 56-Dp04-61, 951p05, 48-O09-69, 3P10, 404-P10, 11P-11, and 18-P17). The ECtHR has consistently found violations of Articles 5 and 6(1) of the Convention in cases where courts were composed with the participation of lay assessors who had exceeded their terms of service (*Posokhov v. Russia*, *Fedotova v. Russia*, *Shabanov and Tren v. Russia*, *Laryagin and Arestov v. Russia*, *Moskovets v. Russia*, *Zakharkin v. Russia*, and *Yefimenko v. Russia*). Likewise, the examination of a cassation appeal without counsel has been recognized as a grave violation both by the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation (Rulings Nos. 257-O-P, 799-O, 283-O, and 708-O) and by the UN Human Rights Committee (*A.K. and M.K. v. Russia*; *S.P. et al. v. Russia*). Yet the authorities apply diametrically opposite standards in respect of the Applicant, which confirms the arbitrary and repressive nature of the deprivation of his liberty.

THE AUTHORITIES HAVE DISCRIMINATORILY BLOCKED DOMESTIC REMEDIES FOR THE APPLICANT.

Supreme Court of the Russian Federation: From 2012 to 27 December 2024, it issued 11 refusal rulings, disregarding irrefutable archival (and other) evidence of the unlawfulness of the court's composition and the denial of counsel. Correspondence with the Applicant was unlawfully terminated. The most recent refusal is dated 27 December 2024 (#9).

Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation: From 2013 to 25 March 2026, it sent 24 formal refusal responses without examining or assessing the complaints. Correspondence has also been terminated. Upon reviewing the Applicant's file at the Prosecutor General's Office, it emerged that the Office had never conducted any inquiry into his complaints and that all of his complaints are dismissed arbitrarily. The most recent refusal is dated 25 March 2026 (#10).

Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation: In its Ruling of 27 March 2025, No. 620-O, it declined to examine the complaint on the contrived pretext that the former cassation chapter of the Code of Criminal Procedure had become invalid — even though the Applicant had not challenged that chapter and had not even mentioned it in his complaint. All complaints concerning the denial of counsel and the courts' refusal to review the judgment were dismissed without examination. The Applicant was denied the right to rely on the Constitutional Court's own settled doctrine.

The Human Rights Commissioner of the Russian Federation avoids performing his duties, consistently returning complaints without examination.

The Applicant has filed complaints regarding these violations with the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.

IV. THE LINK BETWEEN THE ARBITRARY DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY AND THE CONTINUING VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE 3 IN RESPECT OF THE APPLICANT: THE APPLICANT'S RELEASE AS A NECESSARY INDIVIDUAL MEASURE

The Applicant has knowingly been arbitrarily deprived of his liberty for 25 years, by persons who had no lawful authority to do so, and in denial of his right to defense. For a quarter of a century he has been unlawfully and wrongfully deprived of all the rights and freedoms of a full citizen. Separated from his wife and children, denied any part in their lives and any opportunity to support them, he has become merely a consumer of their resources and an object of their anxiety for his well-being and safety. He has been deprived of social development and growth, and of the skills needed to survive in civil society. A quarter of a century in isolation from society has turned him into a defenseless social invalid. This situation is beyond the comprehension of any civilized citizen; it is an excessively prolonged, corrosive environment that has continuously inflicted the gravest suffering for 25 years, deforming and destroying the human personality.

In *Ilașcu and Others v. Moldova and Russia* (No. 48787/99) and *Catan and Others v. Moldova and Russia*, the **ECtHR expressly held** that the detention of persons on the basis of decisions of “courts” lacking any legal basis or recognition constitutes a continuing unlawful deprivation of liberty which, having regard to the conditions of detention, escalates into a violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

In *Grioua v. Algeria* (Communication No. 1327/2004), the **UN Human Rights Committee held** that holding a person in conditions of complete legal uncertainty and arbitrary official conduct causes moral suffering equivalent to torturous treatment.

The Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers has repeatedly emphasized that where a violation of the Convention (for example, an unfair trial under Article 6) has produced such destructive and continuing consequences as excessively prolonged detention, the only adequate means of achieving *restitutio in integrum* (restoration of the original position) is a review of the case or the immediate release of the Applicant (see the practice in *Öcalan v. Turkey* and *Ilgar Mammadov v. Azerbaijan*).

Thus, the arbitrary deprivation of liberty itself, continuing for 25 years, constitutes a form of torturous treatment in violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

But the uniqueness of this situation lies in the fact that, specifically in respect of the Applicant, this arbitrary deprivation of liberty — this 25-year continuing violation of Article 3 of the Convention — is itself the source, environment, and generator of numerous other torturous violations of Article 3 of the Convention against the Applicant:

1. The Applicant has always maintained his innocence, confirmed by witness testimony and irrefutable official evidence. The investigator who fabricated the case was officially caught falsifying evidence in it, but was spared punishment by the authorities. To know of one's proven innocence while nonetheless arbitrarily bearing the punishment and humiliation of a "criminal" for 25 years is an extremely severe stress and psychologically traumatic suffering that violates Article 3 of the Convention for any human being.
2. For a year and a half, from 18 July 2002 to 30 October 2003, the Applicant was held with the status of a person sentenced to life imprisonment. Given his awareness of his innocence and the extremely harsh conditions of detention, the Applicant endured the gravest suffering and restrictions, in violation of Article 3 of the Convention, throughout this arbitrary deprivation of liberty and status.
3. The Applicant was forced to initiate hundreds of court proceedings and thousands of applications to all state bodies, complaining of the abuses of power, inhuman conditions, and deprivations of rights applied to him. All of these complaints proved ineffective. The Applicant's archive contains more than a hundred kilograms of court and other documents relating to these appeals. Over the decades, this situation has cost the Applicant an enormous expenditure of effort, time, and resources, as well as the most severe stress and suffering, in violation of Article 3 of the Convention.
4. Through torture, inhuman conditions of detention, and denial of effective medical care, the authorities have caused the Applicant more than 20 serious chronic illnesses that he did not have prior to his arrest. He now lives the life of a disabled person; for 10 years he has been able to move only on underarm crutches, and he endures the most severe moral and physical suffering, in violation of Article 3 of the Convention.
5. Since 2010 he has been subjected to 85 disciplinary penalties; for more than 10 years he has been isolated in solitary cells of PZh, SIZO, TPP, BM, SHIZO, PKT, EPKT, and prison, under conditions of chronic sensory deprivation with total deprivation of all rights and privileges, and under extremely harsh regime requirements. This psychologically traumatic atmosphere grossly violates Article 3 of the Convention in respect of the Applicant, given the arbitrariness of the deprivation of his liberty.
6. The Applicant possesses irrefutable evidence of the arbitrariness of the deprivation of his liberty. For decades he has observed that Russian legislation requires his unconditional release, and that the judicial practice of the Supreme Court, the Prosecutor General's Office, and the Constitutional Court of the

Russian Federation recognizes the unlawfulness of, and quashes, judgments for all other citizens in analogous situations. Yet the authorities deny justice and the rule of law to him alone. This inhuman discrimination has for decades caused the Applicant the most severe stress and suffering, in violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

7. For 2 years, from 2010 to 2012, the authorities subjected the Applicant to criminal prosecution under Article 129 of the Russian Criminal Code for his complaints of torture. The Applicant has not been rehabilitated. For 3 years, from 2015 to 2018, the authorities subjected the Applicant to criminal prosecution under Article 306 of the Russian Criminal Code for his complaints of torture. His sentence was increased by 5 years' imprisonment, bringing the total term to 30 years' imprisonment. These prolonged situations have cost the Applicant an enormous expenditure of effort, time, and resources, as well as the most severe stress and suffering, in violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

8. In the course of this arbitrary deprivation of liberty, the authorities committed violations of Article 3 of the Convention against the Applicant that were established by the three ECtHR judgments referred to above, as well as others that the Applicant has reported to the Committee of Ministers in all preceding years.

Thus, this arbitrary deprivation of liberty is a "poisoned tree" bearing, as its crown, the branches of violations described above. As long as the "tree" exists, the "branches" will exist too, because it is the tree that grows, sustains, and protects them. The arbitrary deprivation of liberty, taken together with all of the aforementioned numerous violations of Article 3 of the Convention, constitutes a single, continuing, complex, and exceptionally grave violation of Article 3 of the Convention which, by its cumulative and combined effect, represents the most severe form of continuous torture to which the Applicant has been subjected for 25 years now.

In view of the foregoing, the only effective individual measure for the execution of the three aforementioned ECtHR judgments will be the immediate annulment of the said arbitrary judgment of conviction and detention, and the unconditional release of the Applicant from custody.

The Applicant has challenged the said arbitrary deprivation of his liberty before the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (the complaint was filed with the WGAD on 2 July 2026), and the competent opinion of this international expert body would undoubtedly assist the Committee of Ministers in assessing the situation under review and in forming a well-founded position.

**FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS (AND ON THE BASE OF ALL PREVIOUS STATEMENTS) THE
APPLICANT ASKS THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE:**

- 1.** To request the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, insofar as compatible with its working methods, to examine the Applicant's communication (filed with the WGAD on 2 July 2026) as a matter of priority, and to transmit a copy of its adopted Opinion to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe for inclusion in the supervision file No. 27026/10, Buntov Group v. Russia, since that Opinion will assist the Committee of Ministers in properly assessing the situation relating to the arbitrary deprivation of the Applicant's liberty and in forming a well-founded position in light of the conclusions of a competent international expert body.
- 2.** To find that the Russian Federation has persistently failed to execute the ECtHR judgments in Buntov v. Russia, No. 27026/10, Judgment of 5 June 2012, as well as the Judgment of 14 December 2017 in Kotov and Others v. Russia, No. 40122/16 and others, and the Judgment of 15 September 2022 in Sovetov and Others v. Russia, No. 32992/13 and others, insofar as they relate to the Applicant.
- 3.** To recognize the direct link between the refusal to quash the Applicant's unlawful judgment of conviction and the continuing torture and inhuman treatment inflicted on him in Russian penitentiary institutions.
- 4.** To adopt a Resolution calling on the respondent State to immediately quash the Applicant's unlawful judgment of conviction and release him from custody, as the only sufficient individual measure capable of ending the continuing violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

The Applicant stands ready to provide the Committee of Ministers, upon request, with all documents referred to in this communication, as well as evidence of all facts set out herein.

Applicant **BUNTOV V.M.**

July 14, 2026

Бунтов Виталий Маратович

