

**Regular Selective Information Flow
(RSIF)
for the attention of the National Human Rights Structures (NHRSSs)**

**Issue n°92
covering the period from 21 May to 3 June 2012**

Funded
by the European Union
and the Council of Europe



EUROPEAN UNION



COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Implemented
by the Council of Europe

“Promoting independent national non-judicial mechanisms for the protection of human rights,
especially for the prevention of torture”
(“Peer-to-Peer II Project”)

Joint European Union – Council of Europe Programme

*The **selection** of the information contained in this Issue and deemed relevant to NHRSSs
is made under the responsibility of the Directorate of Human Rights*

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----------|
| INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| PART I: THE ACTIVITIES OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS | 5 |
| A. Judgments | 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| 1. | Judgments deemed of particular interest to NHRSS..... | 5 |
| 2. | Other judgments issued in the period under observation | 9 |
| 3. | Repetitive cases..... | 10 |
| 4. | Length of proceedings cases | 11 |
| B. | The decisions on admissibility / inadmissibility / striking out of the list including due to friendly settlements..... | 11 |
| C. | The communicated cases | 15 |
| D. | Miscellaneous (Referral to grand chamber, hearings and other activities) | 16 |
| PART II: THE EXECUTION OF THE JUDGMENTS OF THE COURT | | 17 |
| PART III: THE WORK OF OTHER COUNCIL OF EUROPE MONITORING MECHANISMS | | 18 |
| A. | European Social Charter (ESC)..... | 18 |
| B. | European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) | 18 |
| C. | European Committee against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) | 18 |
| D. | Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM)..... | 19 |
| E. | Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) | 19 |
| F. | Committee of Experts on the Evaluation of Anti-Money Laundering Measures and the Financing of Terrorism (MONEYVAL) | 19 |
| G. | Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA)..... | 19 |
| PART IV: THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL WORK..... | | 20 |
| A. | The new signatures and ratifications of the Treaties of the Council of Europe..... | 20 |
| B. | Recommendations and Resolutions adopted by the Committee of Ministers..... | 20 |
| C. | Other news of the Committee of Ministers..... | 20 |
| PART V: THE PARLIAMENTARY WORK | | 21 |
| A. | Resolutions and Recommendations of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) | 21 |
| B. | Other news of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe | 21 |
| PART VI: THE WORK OF THE OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS | | 23 |
| PART VII: ACTIVITIES AND NEWS OF THE PEER-TO-PEER NETWORK | | 24 |
| (UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE DIRECTORATE OF HUMAN RIGHTS)..... | | 24 |
| INDEX BY COUNTRIES | | 25 |

Introduction

This Issue is part of the "Regular Selective Information Flow" (RSIF). Its purpose is to keep the National Human Rights Structures permanently updated of Council of Europe norms and activities by way of regular transfer of information, which the Directorate of Human Rights carefully selects and tries to present in a user-friendly manner. The information is sent to the Contact Persons in the NHRs who are kindly asked to dispatch it within their offices.

Each Issue covers two weeks and is sent by the Directorate of Human Rights to the Contact Persons a fortnight after the end of each observation period. This means that all information contained in any given issue is between two and four weeks old.

The selection of the information included in the Issues is made by the Directorate of Human Rights. It is based on what is deemed relevant to the work of the NHRs. A particular effort is made to render the selection as targeted and short as possible.

Readers are expressly encouraged to give any feed-back that may allow for the improvement of the format and the contents of this tool.

The preparation of the RSIF is funded under the so-called Peer-to-Peer II Project, a European Union – Council of Europe Joint Project entitled “Promoting independent national non-judicial mechanisms for the protection of human rights, especially the prevention of torture”.

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

A. Judgments

1. Judgments deemed of particular interest to NHRs

The judgments presented under this heading are the ones for which a separate press release is issued by the Registry of the Court as well as other judgments considered relevant for the work of the NHRs. They correspond also to the themes addressed in the Peer-to-Peer Workshops. The judgments are thematically grouped. The information, except for the comments drafted by the Directorate of Human Rights, is based on the [press releases of the Registry of the Court](#).

Some judgments are only available in French.

Please note that the Chamber judgments referred to hereunder become final in the circumstances set out in Article 44 § 2 of the Convention: "a) when the parties declare that they will not request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber; or b) three months after the date of the judgment, if reference of the case to the Grand Chamber has not been requested; or c) when the panel of the Grand Chamber rejects the request to refer under Article 43".

Note on the Importance Level:

According to the explanation available on the Court's website, the following importance levels are given by the Court:

1 = High importance, Judgments which the Court considers make a significant contribution to the development, clarification or modification of its case-law, either generally or in relation to a particular State.

2 = Medium importance, Judgments which do not make a significant contribution to the case-law but nevertheless do not merely apply existing case-law.

3 = Low importance, Judgments with little legal interest - those applying existing case-law, friendly settlements and striking out judgments (unless these have any particular point of interest).

Each judgment presented in sections 1 and 2 is accompanied by the indication of the importance level.

- **Grand chamber judgments**

Idalov v. Russia (no. 5826/03) – Importance 1 – 22 May 2012 – Two violations of Article 3 – (i) poor conditions of detention and ; (ii) overcrowding in police vans during transfers to and from courthouse – Three violations of Article 5 – (i) excessive length of pre-trial detention; (ii) excessive length of appeal proceedings and; (iii) domestic authorities' failure to ensure the applicant's participation in appeal hearings – Violation of Article 6 – Exclusion of the applicant from criminal proceedings during the taking of evidence – No violation of Article 6 – Reasonable length of criminal proceedings – Violation of Article 8 – Interference with the applicant's right to respect for his correspondence on account of the opening of letters addressed to the Court

Arrested on suspicion of abduction, the applicant was placed in detention on 11 June 1999 and was officially charged one week later. His detention on remand was subsequently extended on a number of occasions until, in July 2001, he was released on bail. The same month, his case was submitted to a domestic court for trial. In October 2002, the court discontinued the bail and ordered his detention. The applicant complained that the conditions of his detention and transport had been appalling. He also complained about the length, unlawfulness and shortcomings in the review of his detention on remand. He maintained that the proceedings in his case had been excessively long and that, being removed from the courtroom, he had been deprived of the right to defend himself in person. He also complained that his correspondence with the Court had been viewed by domestic authorities.

Article 3

As regards the detention conditions in the remand prison, the Court was prepared to accept the applicant's claim that he had been detained in severely overcrowded cells for over a year with less than 3 square meters allocated to him. The Court had recently found violations of Article 3 in other

cases on account of overcrowding in the same remand prison at around the same time as the applicant had been detained there. The Government had failed to provide any original documents to refute his allegations, claiming that they had been destroyed after the expiry of the statutory time-limit for their storage. The Court therefore found that there had been a violation of Article 3.

As regards the conditions of the applicant's transfers to and from the courthouse, the Court accepted as credible his allegations concerning the overcrowding in the vans. Given their height (approximately 1.6 meters), detainees should have been kept there only in a seated position. However, given the size of their compartments - between eight and 11 square meters - it was not conceivable that between 25 and 36 people could have been provided with adequate seating and space during journeys of several hours. Those considerations, taken cumulatively, were sufficient to find a further violation of Article 3.

Article 5

The Court found in particular that the suspicion that the applicant had committed the serious offences with which he had been charged and the domestic court's finding that he had attempted to interfere with the course of justice while at liberty might have initially justified his detention. However, it was not convinced that those factors could have constituted relevant and sufficient grounds for his ongoing detention, in particular since he had already been detained for a considerable period of time at an earlier stage. There had accordingly been a violation of Article 5 § 3.

The applicant had lodged five appeals against the detention orders against him and it had taken the courts between 43 and 104 days, respectively, to schedule and hold the appeal hearings. In the Court's opinion, the issues before the appellate court had not been overly complex. Moreover, the Government had not provided any justification for the delays in those proceedings and had admitted that most of the delays had been unreasonable. There had accordingly been a violation of Article 5 § 4.

The applicant had been absent from the five appeal hearings concerning the lawfulness of his pre-trial detention. There was nothing to suggest that the appellate court had considered the question of whether he had been summoned to the hearing and whether his personal participation was required for the effective review of the lawfulness of his continued detention. There had accordingly been a further violation of Article 5 § 4.

Article 6

The Government had further admitted that the applicant's exclusion from the criminal trial against him during the taking of evidence amounted to a violation of his rights under Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) and (d). The Court did not see any reason to hold otherwise and found a violation of that Article.

The Court did not find a violation of Article 6 § 1 as regards the length of the criminal proceedings against the applicant. The proceedings had lasted approximately four years and eleven months, spanning the investigation stage and consideration of his case by the courts at two levels of jurisdiction.

Article 8

The Court considered that the opening of the letters had amounted to an interference with the applicant's right to respect for his correspondence and observed that the Russian Code on the Execution of Sentences expressly prohibited that interference. It had therefore not been in accordance with the law, in violation of Article 8.

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The Court held that Russia was to pay the applicant EUR 7,150 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 2,500 in respect of costs and expenses.

[Scoppola v. Italy \(n°3\)](#) (no. 126/05) – Importance 1 – 22 May 2012 – No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 – Domestic authorities' proportionate decision to disenfranchise a convicted prisoner

Under the Italian Criminal Code, the applicant's life sentence entailed a lifetime ban from holding any public office, which in turn meant the permanent forfeiture of his right to vote. The applicant complained that he had been deprived of the right to vote following his criminal conviction. In its [Chamber judgment of 18 January 2011](#), the Court found a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 because of the automatic and indiscriminate nature of the measure depriving the applicant of the right to vote.

The Court recalled and confirmed the [Hirst \(no. 2\) v. the United Kingdom \(no. 74025/01\)](#) judgment of October 2005, again holding that general, automatic and indiscriminate disenfranchisement of all serving prisoners, irrespective of the nature or gravity of their offences, is incompatible with Article 3 of Protocol No. 1. However, it accepted the United Kingdom Government's argument that **each State has a wide discretion as to how it regulates the ban, both as regards the types of offence that should result in the loss of the vote and as to whether disenfranchisement should be ordered by a judge in an individual case or should result from general application of a law.** Regarding the Scoppola case, the Court noted that it was not disputed by the parties that the applicant's disenfranchisement amounted to an interference with his right to vote. Having established that the interference pursued the legitimate aims of preventing crime and enhancing civic responsibility and respect for the rule of law and ensuring the proper functioning and preservation of the democratic regime, the Court had to examine the proportionality of the interference. The Court observed in particular that legal provisions in Italy defining the circumstances in which individuals could be deprived of the right to vote showed the legislature's concern to adjust the application of the measure to the particular circumstances of the case in hand, taking into account such factors as the gravity of the offence committed and the conduct of the offender. It was applied only in connection with certain offences against the State or the judicial system, or with offences which the courts considered to warrant a sentence of at least three years' imprisonment. The Court accordingly found that there had been no violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 as the margin of appreciation afforded to the Italian Government in this sphere had not been overstepped.

Judge Björgvinsson expressed a dissenting opinion.

- **Right to a fair trial**

[Shuvalov v. Estonia](#) (nos. 39820/08 and 14942/09) – Importance 2 – 29 May 2012 – No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 2 – No breach of a judge's right to be presumed innocent on account of the publication of press release and public statements made by a prosecutor about allegations of bribery

While sitting as a judge in a criminal case involving some businessmen, the applicant was accused of requesting a large bribe in exchange of passing judgment in favour of one of the defendants. In the days and months following the ensuing criminal proceedings against the judge, the prosecution issued press releases, and made a number of public statements in newspapers and on television. The applicant complained that the prosecutor's statements had breached his right to be presumed innocent and had made his trial unfair.

The Court noted that the applicant had not been named in the first of the press releases. By the time the applicant was named in the second press release, his name had become known to the public. In addition, most of the formulations used had been based on the bill of indictment and had served the purpose of informing the public that such a bill had been submitted to court. If taken separately, the wording of some parts of the information communicated might have been understood as presenting the charges as an established fact. However, given the context in which they had been made, it had been clear that the press releases – along with the way in which they had been expressed – had described the applicant as suspected of and charged with, not guilty of, the offences. As to the public statements made by the prosecutor in the press, the Court observed that they had been limited to short quotes of what had already been disclosed in the prosecution press releases. Finally, the Court found that the media interest in the case had existed independently from the information provided by the prosecution and had not been sparked by the press releases or statements in question. Having regard to all the above, the Court concluded that there had been no violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 2.

Judges Vajić and Sicilianos expressed a joint partly dissenting opinion.

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

[Santos Nunes v. Portugal \(in French only\)](#) (no. 61173/08) – Importance 2 – 22 May 2012 – Violation of Article 8 – Domestic authorities' failure to enforce a judgment granting custody of a child to her biological father

The applicant had a daughter from his casual relationship with a Brazilian national. After having acknowledged paternity, following a genetic test, he took steps to secure custody of the child, which he was granted. The mother had placed the child in the care of a couple, who refused to hand her over. The applicant complained of the inaction and lack of diligence of the Portuguese authorities and of the excessive length of the proceedings to have the decision granting him custody of his daughter enforced.

The Court noted that it had taken four years and five months to have the decision granting the applicant custody of his daughter enforced. It observed that the lack of cooperation shown by the couple who had the custody of the child was no excuse for the authorities not to have done everything in their power to protect the family ties. The Court was aware that this had been a delicate case, with media repercussions. However, the unusual situation the authorities were faced with, which went beyond a dispute between biological parents or with the State, did not dispense them from making every possible effort to have the decision granting the applicant custody of his daughter enforced. Therefore, the Court found that the proceedings had shown a distinct lack of diligence. It accordingly held that there had been a violation of Article 8.

Under Article 41 (just satisfaction), the Court held that Portugal was to pay the applicant EUR 15,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 5,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

- **Peaceful enjoyment of possession**

Flores Cardoso v. Portugal ([in French only](#)) (no. 2489/09) – Importance 2 – 29 May 2012 – Violation of Article 6 § 1 – Excessive length of proceedings – No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No.1 – No violation of the right to the peaceful enjoyment of possession on account of domestic authorities’ failure to maintain the purchasing power of sums deposited with banks

The applicants were born in Mozambique and had to leave the country in July 1976, leaving most of their property behind. They were nonetheless able to deposit 950,000 Mozambican escudos in cash with the Portuguese consulate in Maputo. In 1994 the Minister of Finance of Portugal announced that a sum of 1.4 billion escudos had been set aside for the purposes of compensating persons who had deposited sums in cash with the Portuguese consulates in Beira and Maputo. Those concerned would receive the “counter value” of the amounts in question in Portuguese escudos. The applicants complained that the length of the proceedings they had brought for damages had been excessive. They also complained about the failure to adjust the sum they had deposited.

Article 6 § 1

The proceedings for damages had lasted seven years and seven months at three levels of jurisdiction. As the Portuguese Government had failed to submit any fact or argument capable of leading to a different conclusion in the case of the applicants from that reached by the Court in many other similar cases, the Court found that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1.

Article 1 of Protocol No.1

The Court referred in particular to its well-established case-law according to which it could not be inferred from Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 that there was a general obligation on States to maintain, by means of systematic indexation, the purchasing power of sums deposited with banks or other financial institutions. This was all the more true regarding a non-financial institution such as a consulate. Moreover, in the absence of an explicit agreement between the depositary and the applicants regarding a possible adjustment of the sum at the time of repayment, in line with inflation and depreciation of the currency, the latter could lay claim only to repayment of the nominal value of the sum deposited. Furthermore, a “legitimate expectation” of obtaining enjoyment of a property right could only amount to a “possession” if there was a sufficient basis in domestic law, for example where there was settled case-law of the domestic courts confirming it. The Court accordingly concluded that the applicants could not claim, under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, an adjustment of the sum they had deposited with the consulate. Consequently, there had not been a violation of that provision.

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The Court held that Portugal was to pay the applicants EUR 2,600 in respect of non-pecuniary damages and EUR 1,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

Judges Popovic and Sajo expressed a joint partly dissenting opinion.

- **Cases concerning Chechnya**

[Damayev v. Russia](#) (no. 36150/04) – Importance 3 – 29 May 2012 – Two violations of Article 2 (substantive and procedural) – (i) Death of the applicant’s wife and five children during the aerial bombardment of their village, and; (ii) lack of an effective investigation in that respect – No violation of Article 3 – Anguish and distress experiences by the applicant does not amount to a violation of Article 3 given the fact that his wife and children had died instantaneously

2. Other judgments issued in the period under observation

You will find in the column "Key Words" of the table below a short description of the topics dealt with in the judgment. For more detailed information, please refer to the cases' links:

| STATE | DATE | CASE TITLE | IMP. | CONCLUSION | KEY WORDS |
|-----------|-------------|--|------|------------------------------------|---|
| BULGARIA | 31 May 2012 | Vasilev and Doycheva (in French only) (no. 14966/04) | 1 | Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 | Domestic authorities' lack of diligence in completing the formalities required to return collectivised agricultural lands to the applicants |
| | | | | Violation of Art. 13 | Lack of an effective remedy to assert the right to peaceful enjoyment of possession |
| | | | | Application of Art. 46 | General measures indicated by the Court to execute the judgment |
| CROATIA | 29 May 2012 | Bjedov (no. 42150/09) | 2 | Violation of Art. 8 | Unnecessary interference with the applicant's right to respect for her private and family life on account of her eviction from her flat despite her old age and fragile health, and the fact that she had no other home |
| ESTONIA | 29 May 2012 | Julin (nos. 16563/08, 40841/08, 8192/10 and 18656/10) | 2 | Violation of Art. 3 | Confinement of the applicant to restraint bed with no possibility of going to the toilet, drinking or eating |
| | | | | No violation of Art. 3 | Justified use of force against, and handcuffing of, the applicant; effective investigation in allegation of ill-treatment |
| | | | | Violation of Art. 6 § 1 | Lack of effective access to a court in connection with the applicant's complaint concerning strip search |
| | | | | No violation of Art. 6 § 1 | Effective access to a court in connection with the applicant's complaint concerning detention conditions |
| LITHUANIA | 31 May 2012 | Esertas (no. 50208/06) | 2 | Violation of Art. 6 § 1 | Overruling of a final and enforceable decision in the applicant's favour |
| POLAND | 31 May 2012 | Grzywaczewski (no. 18364/06) | 3 | Violation of Art. 3 | Inadequate medical care in detention |
| ROMANIA | 31 May 2012 | Lazar (in French only) (no. 23395/05) | 3 | Violation of Art. 5 § 3 | Excessive length (2 years and 3 months and a half) and unlawfulness of pre-trial detention |

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

| | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|---|--|---|
| RUSSIA | 29 May 2012 | Kovalenko (no. 41716/08) | 3 | Violation of Art. 5 § 3 | Excessive length of pre-trial detention |
| | | Suslov (no. 2366/07) | 3 | No violation of Art. 5 § 1 Violation of Art. 5 § 1 Violation of Art. 5 § 3 | Lawfulness of one period of detention Unlawfulness of another period of detention Domestic authorities' failure to display "special diligence" in the conduct of criminal proceedings |
| SERBIA | 22 May 2012 | Mladenovic (no. 1099/08) | 3 | Violation of Art. 2 | Domestic authorities' failure to effectively investigate the death of the applicant's son |
| TURKEY | 22 May 2012 | Hasdemir (no. 44027/09) | 3 | Violation of Art. 5 § 3 Violation of Art. 5 § 5 Violation of Art. 6§1 | Excessive length of pre-trial detention (10 years and 8 months) Lack of an enforceable right to compensation for the applicant's deprivation of liberty |
| | | Hatice Duman (no. 43918/08) | 3 | Violation of Art. 5 § 3 Violation of Art. 5 § 4 | Excessive length of pre-trial detention (More than 8 years) Lack of an effective remedy to challenged pre-trial detention's lawfulness |

3. Repetitive cases

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

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

| STATE | DATE | CASE TITLE | CONCLUSION | KEY WORDS |
|----------|-------------|---|--|---|
| ITALY | 22 May 2012 | Borghesi (in French only) (no. 60890/00) | Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 | Unlawful expropriation and lack of compensation for the properties expropriated |
| PORTUGAL | 22 May 2012 | Soares (in French only) (no. 43359/07) | Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 | Lack of a "just compensation" for expropriation |
| ROMANIA | 31 May 2012 | Jarnea and Others (nos. 36268/02, 25416/04, 25500/04, 43454/06, 24717/07, 16297/08 and 17068/08) | Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 | Infringement of the applicants' right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possession on account of domestic regulations concerning relations between landlords and tenants |
| TURKEY | 22 May 2012 | Fikri Yakar (in French only) (no. 23639/10) | Violation of Art. 5 § 3 Violation of Art. 5 § 4 | Excessive length of pre-trial detention (almost 8 months) Lack of an effective remedy to challenge the lawfulness of pre-trial detention |
| | | Turgut Özkan (in French only) (no. 23601/10) | Violation of Art. 5 § 3 | Excessive length of detention (1 year) |
| | 31 May 2012 | Akhan (in French only) (no. 34448/08) | Violation of Articles 6 § 1 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 | Non-enforcement or partial judgments in the applicants' favour |
| | | Gulizar Cevik (in French only) (no. 34450/08) | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | Cetinkaya and Others (in French only) (no. 34453/08) | | |
| | Karaca and Others (in French only) (no. 34452/08) | | |
| | Kaynak and Cokkalender (in French only) (no. 34445/08) | | |

4. Length of proceedings cases

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

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

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

| STATE | DATE | CASE TITLE |
|---|-------------|---|
| ITALY | 22 May 2012 | Maio (in French only) (no. 684/03) |
| PORTUGAL | 22 May 2012 | Ferreira Da Silva e Brito and Others (in French only) (no. 46273/09) |
| | 31 May 2012 | Sociedade de Construcoes Martins and Vieira, LDA and Others (in French only) (nos. 58103/08 and 58158/08) |
| SLOVAKIA | 31 May 2012 | Franc (no. 20986/10) |
| | | Laduna (no. 11686/10) |
| | | TNS s.r.o. (no. 15702/10) |
| "THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA" | 29 May 2012 | Ogražden Ad (nos. 35630/04, 53442/07, 42580/09) |

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

Those decisions are published with a slight delay of two to three weeks on the Court's Website. Therefore the decisions listed below cover **the period from 7 to 20 May 2012**. They are aimed at providing the NHRs with potentially useful information on the reasons of the inadmissibility of certain applications addressed to the Court and/or on the friendly settlements reached.

| STATE | DATE | CASE TITLE | ALLEGED VIOLATIONS (KEY WORDS) | DECISION |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|--|
| AUSTRIA | 10 May 2012 | Krakolinig (no. 33992/07) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of criminal proceedings) | Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded |
| BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA | 10 May 2012 | Kapor (no. 53349/07) | Applicant's inability to return to his pre-war military flat in Sarajevo (various articles mentioned) | Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached) |

| | | | | |
|----------|-------------|--|---|--|
| BULGARIA | 10 May 2012 | Dimitrova-Mihova (no. 8250/05 and 9 others) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of civil proceedings) and, in some cases, Articles 13 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (lack of an effective remedy) | Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached) |
| | | Dimitrovi (no. 21345/06 and 6 others) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of civil proceedings) and, in some cases, Articles 13 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (lack of an effective remedy) | Struck out of the list (unilateral declaration of the Government concerning Art. 6 § 1 and in some cases Articles 13 and 1 of Prot. No. 1) |
| | | Georgievi (no. 40265/04) | Art. 6 § 1 (Domestic courts' dismissal of the first applicant's request for an extension of time for appealing on point of law), Art. 6 (lack of legal assistance concerning the second applicant) | Partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning claim under Art. 6 § 1), partly inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies (concerning claim under Art. 6) |
| | | Karadimova (no. 15077/06 and 10 others) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of civil proceedings) and, in some cases, Art. 13 (lack of an effective remedy) | Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached) |
| | | Petrovi (no. 36863/07) | Articles 6 § 1, 13, 14 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (allegedly arbitrary deprivation of property without adequate compensation) | |
| | | Simeonov (no. 35482/08) | Art. 5 § 4 (alleged lack of judicial review of the applicant's request for release) | |
| | | Slavov and others (no. 41095/05 and 6 others) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of criminal proceedings), and, in some cases, Art. 13 (lack of an effective remedy) | |
| | | Stoyanova (in French only) (no. 25716/05) | Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 (delay in the enforcement of final judgment in the applicant's favour), Art. 14 in conjunction with Articles 6 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (lack of access to proceedings to challenge the delayed enforcement of a final judgment) | Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded |
| | 15 May 2012 | Hadzhiyska (no. 20701/09) | Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 (domestic authorities' alleged failure to take measures to prevent and mitigate floods that damaged the applicant's house), Art. 6 § 1 (lack of an effective access to a court to obtain compensation, lack of public proceedings, unreasoned judgment), Art. 13 (lack of public hearings and alleged domestic court's failure to deal with the merits of the case) | |
| | | Krstev (no. 33065/05) | Domestic court's delayed delivery of the reasons of a judgement, allegedly amounting to a thwarting of the applicant's right to appeal against the judgment | |
| FINLAND | 15 May 2012 | Rautonen (no. 26813/09) | Art. 6 (excessive length of proceedings) | |
| FRANCE | 10 May 2012 | Magnin (in French only) (no. 26219/08) | In part. Art. 6 (lack of public hearings), Articles 6, 13, 17 (in particular, unfairness of proceedings, breach of the principle that penalties must be lawful, breach of the <i>non bis in idem</i> principle) | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|--|---|---|
| GEORGIA | 10 May 2012 | Musaev (no. 10076/10) | Articles 2 and 3 (allegedly inadequate medical care in detention) | Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application) |
| GERMANY | 10 May 2012 | Braunig (no. 22919/07) | Articles 5 § 4, 5 § 1 (a) and 6 § 1 (unfairness of proceedings concerning the applicant's continued detention) | Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded |
| ITALY | 10 May 2012 | E.O. (in French only) (no. 34724/10) | Art. 3 (lack of adequate medical treatment of HIV in case of deportation to Nigeria) | |
| | | Rubeca (in French only) (no. 36773/02) | In particular, Art. 6 (excessive length of civil proceedings and delayed in the payment of the "Pinto" amount) | |
| | | Ruffolo (in French only) (no. 21359/05 and 2 others) | | |
| | | Tirone (in French only) (no. 56699/09 and 4 others) | Articles 8, 9, 11, 14 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (applicant's inability to ban hunting on their properties) | Struck out of the list (the applicants no longer wished to pursue the application) |
| MOLDOVA | 10 May 2012 | Popa (in French only) (no. 8968/06 and 4 others) | Non-execution or delayed execution of judgments in the applicants' favour (no article mentioned), Art. 6 § 1 (lack of an effective remedy in that respect) | Inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies |
| | | Soiuz Agro-Intex S.R.L. (in French only) (no. 46269/08 and 2 others) | Excessive length of civil proceedings and of enforcement of judgments (no article mentioned) | Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application) |
| | | Stratan (in French only) (no. 23979/04 and 3 others) | Excessive length of civil and criminal proceedings (no article mentioned) | Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded |
| POLAND | 10 May 2012 | Sliwa (no. 17519/08) | Art. 6 § 1 (alleged deprivation of the applicant's right to a fair hearing by an impartial tribunal established by law) | Inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies |
| | | Trojak (no. 60606/09) | Art. 3 (poor conditions of detention) | Struck out of the list (unilateral declaration of the Government) |
| | 15 May 2012 | Wiater (no. 42290/08) | Art. 2 (denial of health care which the authorities were allegedly required to make available to the population generally) | Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded |
| PORTUGAL | 10 May 2012 | Alexandre (in French only) (no. 26997/10) | Art. 6 (allegedly unjustified striking out of the applicant's case by a domestic court), Art. 13 (lack of an effective remedy in that respect) | Inadmissible for non-respect of the six-months requirement |
| | | Ferreira Alves (in French only) (no. 5219/10) | In particular, Articles 6 § 1, 13, 14 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (excessive length of proceedings to obtain fees payment and lack of an effective remedy in that respect) | |
| | | Sociedades de construcoes Martins & Vieira, LDA and Others (in French only) (no. 57062/08) | In particular, Articles 6 § 1, 13 and 14 (excessive length of proceedings and lack of an effective remedy in that respect) | Partly inadmissible for non-respect of the six-months requirement (excessive length of one proceeding), partly incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the provisions of the Convention (excessive length of another proceeding), partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (lack of an effective remedy) |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|--|
| ROMANIA | 10 May 2012 | Petrache (in French only) (no. 24569/05) | Articles 6 § 1, 1 of Prot. No. 1 and 5 of Prot. 7 (difference of treatment concerning the division of family property following a divorce) | Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application) |
| | 15 May 2012 | Smeu (no. 35161/04) | Articles 6 § 2 and 8 (publication of a defamatory article about the applicant and impossibility for her to obtain compensation for the alleged damage) | Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application) |
| SERBIA | 10 May 2012 | Radivojevic (no. 32635/10 and 13 others) | Articles 6 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (non-enforcement of judgments in the applicants' favour) | Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached) |
| SLOVENIA | 15 May 2012 | Crnic (no. 26742/06) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of proceedings), Art. 13 (lack of an effective remedy in that respect) | Partly inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies (concerning claim under Art. 6 § 1), partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning claim under Art. 13) |
| | | Hocevar (no. 289/07) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of proceedings), Art. 13 (lack of an effective remedy in that respect) | Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded |
| | | Kovac (no. 6618/07) | | |
| SPAIN | 10 May 2012 | Jayata Kattan (in French only) (no. 7108/08) | Art. 6 § 1 (conviction of the applicant on ground of allegedly insufficient evidence) | Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded |
| THE NETHERLANDS | 10 May 2012 | Olgun (no. 1859/03) | Art. 8 (domestic authorities' refusal to allow the applicant to reside in the Netherlands) | |
| TURKEY | 10 May 2012 | AY (in French only) (no. 56229/11) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of proceedings) | Struck out of the list (friendly settlement reached) |
| | | Demir (no. 27241/09) | | |
| | | Doruk (no. 26708/09) | Articles 6 § 1, 13 and 1 of Prot. No. 1 (non-enforcement of a judgment in the applicant's favour) | Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application) |
| | Taş (in French only) (no. 702/11) | Articles 5 §§ 3, 4, 5 and 13 (excessive length of detention and lack of an effective remedy in that respect), Art. 6 § 3 (lack of legal assistance in police custody) | Inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies | |
| | 15 May 2012 | Aydin (in French only) (no. 40806/07) | Art. 8 (alleged infringement of the applicants' right to respect for their private and family life on account of the building of a dam), Art. 6 (domestic courts' decision to exempt a water dam project from an environmental impact assessment) | Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded |
| | | Koc and Others (in French only) (no. 35211/08) | Art. 5 § 3 (excessive length of pre-trial detention), Articles 5 § 4 and 6 § 3 b) (restriction of the applicants' right to get access to their cases' files), Art. 5 § 5 (lack of an application for compensation in case of violation of Art. 5 §§ 3 and 4), Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of proceedings), Art. 6 § 2 (infringement of the applicants' right to being presumed innocent on account of the excessive length of their detention), Art. 6 § 3 c) (lack of legal assistance in police custody), Art. 13 (lack of an effective remedy concerning claims under Articles 5 and 6) | Partly adjourned (concerning the excessive length of detention and proceedings, the restriction to access to the cases' files, and the lack of an effective remedy), partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning claim under Art. 5 § 4), partly inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic proceedings (concerning claim under Art. 6 § 3) |
| | | Yasar and Others | Articles 2, 6, 13 and 14 | Inadmissible for non- |

| | | | | |
|---------|-------------|--|--|--|
| | | (in French only) (no. 48576/08) | (extrajudicial killings of the applicants' relative on ground of his ethnic origins, lack of an effective investigation and remedy) | respect of the six-months requirement |
| UKRAINE | 10 May 2012 | Konosh (no. 24466/07 and 1 other) | Non-enforcement of judgements in the applicants' favour (no article mentioned) | Partly struck out of the list (unilateral declaration of the Government concerning some of the judgments), partly inadmissible for no violation of the Rights and Freedoms protected by the Convention (concerning the non-enforcement of the other judgments) |
| | | Litovchenko (no. 35174/06) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length and unfairness of proceedings), Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 (infringement of the applicants' property rights) | Partly struck out of the list (unilateral declaration of the Government concerning the excessive length of proceedings), partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning the claim under Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1) |
| | | Orekhova (no. 27218/06) | Art. 6 § 1 (excessive length of civil proceedings) | Struck out of the list (the applicant no longer wished to pursue the application) |

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.

There is in general a gap of three weeks between the date of the communication and the date of the publication of the batch on the Website.

The list itself contains links to the statement of facts and the questions to the parties. This is a tool for NHRs to be aware of issues involving their countries but also of other issues brought before the Court which may reveal structural problems. Below you will find a list of cases of particular interest identified by the Directorate of Human Rights.

NB. The statements of facts and complaints have been prepared by the Registry (solely in one of the official languages) on the basis of the applicant's submissions. The Court cannot be held responsible for the veracity of the information contained therein.

Please note that the Irish Human Rights Commission (IHRC) issues a monthly table on priority cases before the European Court of Human Rights with a focus on asylum/ immigration, data protection, anti-terrorism/ rule of law and disability cases for the attention of the European Group of NHRs with a view to suggesting possible amicus curiae cases to the members of the Group. Des Hogan from the IHRC can provide you with these tables (dhogan@ihrc.ie).

Communicated cases published on 21 May 2012 on the Court's Website and selected by the Directorate of Human Rights

The batch of 21 May 2012 concerns the following States (some cases are however not selected in the table below): Denmark, Greece, Italy, Poland, Russia, the United Kingdom and Turkey.

| STATE | DATE OF DECISION TO COMMUNICATE | CASE TITLE | KEY WORDS OF QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE PARTIES |
|---------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| DENMARK | 11 May 2012 | Biao (no. 38590/10) | Art. 8 taken alone or in conjunction with Art. 14 – Alleged infringement of the applicant's right to respect for family life on account of domestic authorities' refusal to grant a resident permit, in particular on account of a domestic rule which provides that family reunification is possible only when one of the family members has lived in Denmark for at least 28 years. |
| GREECE | 9 May 2012 | Gurgenidze (no. 19406/11) | Art. 3 – Poor condition of detention in Immigration Police's premises; Art. 5 §§ 1 and 4 – Unlawful detention pending deportation. |
| ITALY | 9 May 2012 | Paradiso and Campanelli (no. 25358/12) | In particular, Art. 8 – Domestic authorities' refusal to take into account the parentage of children born abroad through surrogacy; Art. 6 – Unfairness of domestic proceedings which declared the children abandoned; Art. 14 taken in conjunction with Art. 8 – Discrimination against children born through surrogacy. |

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

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

Part II: The execution of the judgments of the Court

Decisions on execution of European Court of Human Rights judgments

The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe published the [decisions and resolutions](#) adopted at its first special human rights meeting for 2012. Those decisions and resolutions concern the following states : Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovak Republic, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom

More information on the execution process and on the state of execution in cases pending for supervision as well as important reference texts (including the new working methods) can be found on the website of the [Committee of Ministers](#), on the special website of the [Department for the execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights](#), and in the Committee of Ministers' [Annual Reports](#) on its execution supervision. The 2011 report is due to be issued on 12 April 2012. **Please note that some of the decisions and resolutions adopted by the Committee of Ministers will be analyzed in forthcoming issues of the RSIF.**

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

A. European Social Charter (ESC)

The activity report 2011 of the European Committee of Social Rights is public (25.05.2012)

The European Committee of Social Rights has made public its [activity report 2011](#) which contains information on the conclusions and decisions adopted by the Committee on the compliance of the States Parties with their obligations under the European Social Charter and covers articles of the Charter relating to the rights of children, both inside and outside the labour market, the right to maternity protection, rights related to the protection of the family, the rights of migrant workers and the right to housing in the 39 States Parties ([More information](#)).

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

Visit to Italy (31.05.2012)

A CPT delegation carried out a periodic visit to Italy from 13 to 25 May 2012. During the visit, the delegation reviewed the measures taken by the Italian authorities in response to recommendations made by the Committee after previous visits. Particular attention was paid to the treatment and fundamental safeguards applied to persons deprived of their liberty by law enforcement agencies and the conditions under which foreign nationals are held in an identification and expulsion centre. The delegation also examined in detail various issues related to prisons, including prison health care and the situation of prisoners who are subject to a maximum security regime. In addition, it also carried out visits to a judicial psychiatric hospital (OPG) and a civil psychiatric department of a general hospital where patients may be subjected to "involuntary medical treatment" (TSO). For the first time in Italy, the delegation visited a residential institution (therapeutic community centre) where forensic patients are held on an involuntary basis ([Read more](#)).

C. European Committee against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

Publication of ECRI's conclusions on the implementation of its priority recommendations in respect of Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Slovakia and Switzerland (22.05.2012)

On 22 May 2012, ECRI published its conclusions on the implementation of a number of priority recommendations made in its country reports on Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Slovakia and Switzerland which had been released in 2009. As part of the fourth round of ECRI's monitoring work, a new process of interim follow-up has been introduced with respect to up to three recommendations made in each of ECRI's country reports. Two years following the publication of each report, ECRI addresses a communication to the Government concerned asking what has been done in connection with the recommendations for which priority follow-up was requested ([Read more](#) | Read the conclusions concerning [Belgium](#) – [the Czech Republic](#) – [Germany](#) – [Slovakia](#) – [Switzerland](#)).

New report on Denmark (22.05.2012)

On 22 May 2012, ECRI published its new report on Denmark. ECRI's Chair, Mr. Jenö Kaltenbach, welcomed positive developments, but regretted that a number of concerns persisted. For example, discrimination in employment, education and housing remained and the already strict rules for spousal reunification had become even stricter ([Read more](#) | Read the report : [\[en\]](#) – [\[fr\]](#) – [\[dk\]](#)).

Report on Andorra (22.05.2012)

On 22 May 2012, ECRI published its fourth report on Andorra. ECRI's Chair, Mr Jenö Kaltenbach, said that, despite positive developments, there were issues of concern, such as incidents of direct and

indirect discrimination in employment based on citizenship and the Government's reluctance to enact comprehensive legislation against racism and racial discrimination ([Read more](#) | Read the report : [\[en\]](#) – [\[fr\]](#) – [\[cat\]](#)).

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

Bosnia and Herzegovina: receipt of the 3rd cycle State report (22.05.2012)

On 22 May 2012, Bosnia and Herzegovina submitted its third [State report](#) in English, pursuant to Article 25, paragraph 2, of the FCNM. It is now up to the Advisory Committee to consider it and adopt an opinion intended for the Committee of Ministers.

Advisory Committee: adoption of an opinion on Sweden (23.05.2012)

The Advisory Committee on the FCNM adopted a country-specific [opinion](#) on Sweden under the third cycle of monitoring the implementation of this convention in States Parties. It is restricted for the time being. The opinion will be submitted to the Committee of Ministers, which is to adopt conclusions and recommendations.

Georgia: receipt of the 2nd cycle State report (30.05.2012)

On 30 May 2012, Georgia submitted its second [State report](#) in English, pursuant to Article 25, paragraph 2, of the FCNM. It is now up to the Advisory Committee to consider it and adopt an opinion intended for the Committee of Ministers.

E. Group of States against Corruption (GRECO)

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

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

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

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

1st evaluation round: GRETA visited Norway (30.05.2012)

A GRETA delegation carried out a country visit to Norway from 21 to 24 May 2012. 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 (2010-2013) ([Read more](#)).

Report on Romania (31.05.2012)

On 31 May 2012, GRETA has published its first evaluation report on Romania. In the report, GRETA welcomes the steps taken by the Romanian authorities to combat trafficking in human beings, including through the adoption of anti-trafficking legislation, the setting up of the National Agency against Trafficking in Persons, and the introduction of a national identification and referral mechanism for victims of trafficking. However, GRETA considers that the Romanian authorities should reinforce co-ordination and co-operation between all anti-trafficking actors. In the area of prevention, GRETA stresses the need for further measures aimed at tackling the root causes of trafficking, especially through fostering access to education and jobs for vulnerable groups ([Read more](#) – [Read the report](#))

Part IV: The inter-Governmental work

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

| COUNTRY | CONVENTION | RATIF. | SIGN. | DATE |
|------------|---|--------|-------|-------------|
| COLOMBIA | Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters as amended by its 2010 Protocol (ETS No. 127) | | X | 23 May 2012 |
| FINLAND | Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (CETS No. 197) | X | | 30 May 2012 |
| MALTA | Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (CETS No. 210) | | X | 21 May 2012 |
| MEXICO | Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters (ETS No. 127) | X | | 23 May 2012 |
| | ----- Protocol amending the Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters (CETS No. 208) | | | |
| MONTENEGRO | Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport (EPAS) | X | | 1 June 2012 |
| SLOVAKIA | Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (CETS No. 199) | | X | 23 May 2012 |

B. Recommendations and Resolutions adopted by the Committee of Ministers

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

C. Other news of the Committee of Ministers

122nd Session of the Committee of Ministers (24.05.2012)

On 23 May 2012, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the 47 member States of the Council of Europe held their annual session in Strasbourg. On this occasion, the representatives adopted a certain number of measures aiming to secure the long term effectiveness of the supervisory mechanism of the European Convention on Human Rights. These measures follow on from the Conference held in April in Brighton on this issue in the framework of the United Kingdom Chairmanship. The Session also allowed the ministers and their representatives to take stock of the policy of the Council of Europe towards neighbouring regions, which entered into force one year ago. Council of Europe action to support democratic transition in countries of North Africa, the Middle East and central Asia was encouraged. The participants also expressed their determination to continue to develop this policy on the basis of the values of the Council of Europe. They subsequently held an informal discussion on the best way of achieving this objective. The 122nd Session was marked by the transfer of the Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers from the United Kingdom to Albania ([Session file](#)).

Part V: The parliamentary work

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

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

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

➤ Countries

Visit of PACE monitoring co-rapporteurs to Bosnia and Herzegovina (01.06.2012)

Karin Woldseth (Norway, EDG) and Egidijus Vareikis (Lithuania, EPP/CD), co-rapporteurs for the monitoring of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE), made a fact-finding visit to the country from 3 to 7 June 2012 to assess the implementation of its commitments and obligations as a Council of Europe member state ([Read more](#)).

➤ Themes

Situation of human rights defenders ‘far from satisfactory’ (21.05.2012)

“Today the situation of human rights defenders in Europe is far from satisfactory. In some Council of Europe member states they risk their own personal security, especially when they champion sensitive issues such as fighting the impunity of state officials for serious crimes including murder, torture and corruption, or promoting the rights of oppressed minority groups,” said Mailis Reps (Estonia, ALDE) in her report on the situation of human rights defenders in Council of Europe member states ([Read more](#)).

PACE Social Committee recommends profound re-orientation of austerity programmes (22.05.2012)

Adopting a report on “Austerity measures – a danger for democracy and social rights”, prepared by Andrej Hunko (Germany, UEL), the PACE Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development said it was concerned that the restrictive approaches currently pursued may not reach their objective of consolidating budgets, but risk further deepening the crisis and undermining the social rights as they mainly affect lower income classes and the most vulnerable categories of the population ([Read more](#)).

Access to healthcare – putting a stop to discrimination (23.05.2012)

“In view of the growing inequalities and current challenges, the Assembly should demand equal access to health-care and treatment for everyone living in Europe, without discrimination on the basis of financial means, residence status or place of residence,” said Jean-Louis Lorrain (France, EPP/CD) in his draft report on equal access to healthcare ([Read more](#)).

Measures to combat unemployment, underemployment, poverty and exclusion among young people (23.05.2012)

In a draft resolution adopted on 22 May 2012 on “The young generation sacrificed: social, economic and political consequences of the financial crisis”, the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development of PACE noted that the young generation is disproportionately hit by the unemployment/underemployment-poverty-exclusion trap, a situation that could have tragic consequences.

Measures to protect Jewish cemeteries (25.05.2012)

There are numerous Jewish cemeteries in Europe and they need to be protected and preserved. They are part of the European cultural heritage and constitute an important element of the Jewish religion, PACE's Standing Committee said today at its meeting in Tirana. Considering that these cemeteries are probably more at risk than those of other confessions represented in Europe, the adopted text, based on the proposals by the rapporteur (Piet De Bruyn, Belgium, NI), calls on Governments, members of Jewish communities and heritage organisations to develop appropriate forms of co-operation to ensure their protection ([Adopted Text \[provisional version\] and report](#)).

Roma face 'double stigmatisation' when they are on the move (01.06.2012)

Roma face "double stigmatisation" when they are on the move, firstly as a persecuted and victimised minority and secondly as migrants, according to PACE's Migration Committee. In a draft recommendation approved today in Paris, based on a report by Annette Groth (Germany, UEL), the committee points out this stigma is "based on three deep-rooted prejudices, namely that all Roma are nomads, they all come from abroad, and their migration is illegal" ([Read more](#)).

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

➤ *Themes*

National Human Rights Structures can help mitigate the effects of austerity measures (31.05.2012)

Effective protection of human rights at national level requires good laws and efficient judiciaries – but also strong, independent national human rights structures (NHRs). **This need is especially evident in times of crisis and austerity. NHRs – independent commissions, general or specialised ombudsmen, equality bodies, police complaints mechanisms and similar institutions – protect human rights for everybody, but they are particularly important to the most vulnerable groups.** They provide an easily accessible helping hand to children, older persons, people with disabilities, Roma, migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees. These vulnerable people - who have a difficult time defending their rights in the best of times - have often been hit hardest by budget cuts in many European countries. NHRs often prioritise helping such groups by doing outreach work and site visits, organising special telephone hotlines, providing legal assistance and representation in courts, and drawing the attention of the broader public and politicians to their plight ([Read more](#)).

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

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

A

Andorra, 18, 19
AUSTRIA, 11, 17
Azerbaijan, 17

B

Belgium, 17
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, 11, 19, 21
Bosnia and Herzgovina, 17
BULGARIA, 9, 12

C

COLOMBIA, 20
CROATIA, 9, 17
Czech Republic, 17

D

DENMARK, 16, 18

E

Estonia, 7, 9, 21

F

FINLAND, 12, 17, 20
FRANCE, 11, 12, 17, 21

G

GEORGIA, 13, 17, 19
GERMANY, 13, 18, 21, 22
GREECE, 16, 17

H

Hungary, 17

I

Italy, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18

L

Latvia, 17
LITHUANIA, 9, 21

M

MALTA, 20
MEXICO, 20
MOLDOVA, 13, 17
MONTENEGRO, 20

N

Norway, 19, 21

P

POLAND, 9, 13, 16, 17
Portugal, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17

R

ROMANIA, 9, 10, 14, 17, 19
Russia, 5, 6, 8, 10, 16

S

San Marino, 17
SERBIA, 10, 14
Slovak Republic, 17
SLOVAKIA, 11, 18, 20
SLOVENIA, 14
SPAIN, 14, 17
Sweden, 19
Switzerland, 17, 18

T

the Czech Republic, 18
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA, 11
THE NETHERLANDS, 14
the United Kingdom, 17
TURKEY, 10, 14, 16, 17

U

UKRAINE, 15