



REGULAR SELECTIVE INFORMATION FLOW

for the attention of the National Human Rights Structures

Issue#121

[1-30 June 2014]

CONTENTS

(click on a title to reach it)

Introduction (p.2)

Index by country (p.3)

PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION (p.4)

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

A. Judgments (p.5)

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

2. *Other judgments* (p.12)

B. Decisions on admissibility (p.23)

C. Communicated cases (p.23)

§2 - European Committee of Social Rights (p.27)

A. Resolutions & Decisions (p.27)

B. Other information (p.27)

§3 - Recommendations & Resolutions (p.28)

A. Recommendations (p.28)

B. Resolutions (p.28)

§4 - Other information of general importance (p.30)

A. Information from the Committee of Ministers (p.30)

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly (p.30)

C. Information from the Commissioner of Human Rights (p.31)

D. Information from the Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms (p.31)

PART II - INFORMATION BY COUNTRY (p. 33)

Information **selected** by the « Versailles St-Quentin Institutions Publiques » research centre (Versailles St-Quentin-en-Yvelines University, France), under the responsibility of the Directorate of Human Rights (DG I) of the Council of Europe
For any queries, please contact: eugen.cibotaru@coe.int

Introduction

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

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

The selection of the information included in the Issues is made by the "Versailles-St-Quentin Institutions Publiques" research centre (VIP – University of Versailles-St-Quentin-en-Yvelines, France) under the responsibility of the Directorate of Human Rights. It is based on what is deemed relevant to the work of the NHRs (including Ombudsman Institutions, National Human Rights Commissions and Institutes, Anti-discrimination Bodies). A particular effort is made to render the selection as targeted and short as possible. Readers are expressly encouraged to give any feedback that may allow for the improvement of the format and the contents of this tool.

The preparation of the RSIF has been supported as from 2013 by the "Versailles St-Quentin Institutions Publiques" research centre of the University of Versailles St-Quentin-en-Yvelines. It is entrusted to Léa Guémené, Alix Motais de Narbonne, Mahaliana Ravaloson, Barbara Sanchez-Cadinot, Mariella Sognigbé, Pavlos Aimilios Marinatos and Guillaume Verdier with the technical help of Quentin Michael and under the supervision of Thibaut Fleury Graff, Ph.D, Associate Professor at Versailles St-Quentin-en-Yvelines University.

Index by Country

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

- [ALBANIA](#), **32**
- [AZERBAIJAN](#), **33**
- BELGIUM, 23
- [BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA](#), **34**
- BULGARIA, 11, 35
- [CROATIA](#), 5, 9, 11, 12, 23, **36, 37**
- [CZECH REPUBLIC](#), **38**
- [FINLAND](#), **39**
- [FRANCE](#), 1, 2, 9, 10, 23, **40**
- [GEORGIA](#), **41**
- [GERMANY](#), **42**
- [GREECE](#), 12, **43**
- [HUNGARY](#), 12, 23, **44**
- [IRELAND](#), **45**
- [ITALY](#), 7, 12, 13, 22, 27, **46**
- LATVIA, 9, 13, 23
- [LITHUANIA](#), **47**
- [MOLDOVA](#), **48**
- [MONACO](#), **49**
- [MONTENEGRO](#), **50**
- [NETHERLANDS](#), 22, **51**
- [NORWAY](#), **52**
- [POLAND](#), 13, 23, 24, **53**
- PORTUGAL, 24
- [ROMANIA](#), 7, 13, 14, 22, **54**
- [RUSSIA](#), 6, 14, 15, 16, 23, 24, **55**
- [SERBIA](#), 16, 24, 30, **56**
- [SLOVAKIA](#), 8, **58**
- SLOVENIA, 17, 18
- [SWEDEN](#), 18, **59**
- SWITZERLAND, 18, 24
- ["THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA"](#), 18, 24, **60, 61**
- [THE UNITED KINGDOM](#), 25, **64**
- [TURKEY](#), 19, 20, 24, 25, **62**
- [UKRAINE](#), 21, **63**

PartOne

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

This information was issued during the period under observation (1-30 June 2014) by the European Court of Human Rights, the European Committee of Social Rights, the Committee of Ministers, the Parliamentary Assembly and other Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms.

A. Judgments

1. Judgments deemed of particular interest to the NHRs

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

Some judgments are only available in French.

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

Note on the Importance Level:

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

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

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

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

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

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

JELIĆ V. CROATIA (No. 57856/11) - Importance 1 - 12 June 2014 - Violation of Article 2 - Domestic authorities’ failure to effectively investigate the death of the applicant’s husband

The case concerned the death of the applicant’s husband, who was of Serbian origin and had been arrested during the war in Croatia in November 1991, then killed by Croatian police.

The Court observed that a part of the complaint had been inadmissible because at the time of the killing of the applicant’s husband - between November 1991 and February 1992 -, the Convention had not been in force in respect of Croatia. However, the complaint concerning the investigation had been admissible due to the fact that a considerable part of it had taken place after the entry into force of the Convention in respect of Croatia.

Even if the Court accepted that the case was complex and that domestic authorities had to face a high number of war crime cases, it observed that there could have been further investigative measures. Indeed, it is incontestable that Croatia was a newly-independent State and needed time to organise itself and that the suspects were high officials of the Sisak police so that the investigation had been

negatively impacted. Moreover, thanks to informations given by some witnesses since 2003, domestic authorities have had enough grounds to identify the direct perpetrators of the killing of the applicant's husband. However, a simple ballistic test had been done and nothing else.

In addition, the Court found that the investigation had been plagued by unjustified delays and interruptions, which had negative effects.

The Court noted that a high official had been convicted, but distinguished the command responsibility of high officials from the responsibility of their subordinates. Therefore, the conviction of the former deputy head of the Sisak Police could not exonerate the suspects of their own criminal responsibility.

Accordingly, there had been a violation of Article 2 as regards the authorities' procedural obligation to effectively investigate the death of the applicant's husband.

Under Article 41 (Just satisfaction), the Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 20,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 1,000 for costs and expenses.

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

SHCHERBINA V. RUSSIA (No. 41970/11) – Importance 3 – 26 June 2014 – Violation of Article 5 §§ 1 and 5 – Unlawful detention of the applicant and lack of a compensatory remedy in that respect – Violation of Article 5 § 4 – Lack of a prompt judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's detention

The case concerned the detention pending extradition from Russia to Kazakhstan of a man wanted by the Kazakh authorities, and in particular the duration of the review proceedings examining the lawfulness of his detention order.

Article 5 §§ 1 and 5

The Court found that the applicant's detention between 15 and 28 April 2011 had not been "unlawful" within the meaning of Article 5 § 1, as it had been ordered by a court acting within its competence and in accordance with the law.

As regards the period between 28 February and 15 April 2011, the Court noted that the domestic authorities conceded, as had been found by the competent district court on the latter date, that the applicant's detention had been unlawful. However, the Court could not agree with the domestic authorities' conclusion that he could therefore not claim to be a victim of a violation of the Convention. Under the Court's case-law, in order for an applicant to lose his victim status, the domestic authorities, in addition to acknowledging a violation of the Convention, had to provide him with sufficient redress. In the present case, the applicant did not receive any compensation for the unlawful detention; consequently the applicant had not lost victim status. The same situation (alleged inability to obtain a compensation) also raised an issue under Article 5 § 5 (enforceable right to compensation for unlawful detention). Concerning the provisions of domestic law mentioned by the domestic authorities, the Court was not persuaded that the applicant's claim for damages would have had chances of success. It observed in particular that the rules on compensation for damage caused by the application of a custodial measure contained in the domestic code of criminal procedure were not applicable to detention pending extradition to another country, as in his case. It was also doubtful whether the applicant had been entitled to seek compensation under the provisions of the domestic civil code on the basis of the authorities' strict liability for unlawful detention, as that liability was limited to certain forms of deprivation of liberty – such as in the context of criminal proceedings – and it was not certain whether those rules would cover detention pending extradition. In view of that uncertainty, the Court concluded that the applicant had not had an enforceable right to compensation for his unlawful detention. There had accordingly been a violation of Article 5 § 5 in conjunction with Article 5 § 1.

Article 5 § 4

The Court observed that the period between the applicant's appeal against the prosecutor's detention order and the district court's decision had amounted to 16 days. Such a period might not raise an issue under Article 5 § 4 in cases where the original detention was imposed by a court and then reviewed by a higher court. However, in the present case the original detention order had not been issued by a judge but by a prosecutor who was not a part of the judiciary. Furthermore, the decision-making process leading to the detention order had not offered the guarantees of due process. The Court therefore concluded that there had accordingly been a violation of Article 5 § 4.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that the relevant State was to pay the applicant EUR 6,500 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 1,650 in respect of costs and expenses

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

AZIENDA AGRICOLA SILVERFUNGHI S.A.S AND OTHERS V. ITALY (Nos. 48357/07, 52677/07, 52687/07 and 52701/07) – Importance 2 – 24 June 2014 – Violation of Article 6 § 1 – Domestic authorities’ failure to justify the use of retrospective legislation which had the effect of determining the pending proceedings in their favour – No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 – No failure of the domestic authorities to strike a fair balance between the demands of the general interest of the community and those of the applicant companies as the impugned measure did not impose an excessive burden on them

The case concerned proceedings before the Italian courts brought by a number of Italian agricultural companies based on their possible entitlement to a two-fold reduction of social security contributions. Pending these proceedings the Italian legislator passed a new retrospective law which determined that their benefits would be calculated alternatively, and not cumulatively.

Article 6 § 1

The Court noted in particular that the enactment of such legislation pending the outcome of the companies’ proceedings had effectively decided the result of the dispute, and had made it pointless for the companies to continue with their litigation. The Court considered that even assuming that the interference was necessary, as it was enacted to clear up uncertainty in the domestic law, and had given one of the possible meanings to the original text, in the circumstances of the case, there had not been a compelling general interest reason, which had been capable of outweighing the dangers of retrospective legislation, to justify the application of such legislation retroactively. There had therefore been a violation of Article 6 § 1.

Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

The Court noted that laws introduced by the legislator to interfere with the payment of taxes or other contributions must strike a fair balance between the general interest of the community and the protection of the individual’s fundamental rights. The Court noted in particular that they had all uninterruptedly paid the contributions without the concessions being applied to them, and therefore had clearly not been in a position where the payment of contributions meant that they could no longer afford to run their businesses. Bearing in mind a State’s discretion to regulate their economic or social strategy, and the fact that the companies were still in receipt of the remaining exemptions, the Court held that the application of the benefits as alternative to one another had not imposed an excessive burden, nor had it fundamentally interfered with the financial position. Therefore, there had been no violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The court held that the relevant State was to pay the applicant companies up to EUR 106,900 in respect of pecuniary damage, EUR 1000 to each company in respect of non-pecuniary damage; and up to EUR 21,700 in respect of costs and expenses.

ROSIANU V. ROMANIA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No 27329/06) – Importance 2 – 24 June – 2014 – Violation of Article 6 § 1 – Domestic authorities’ refusal to enforce the final judicial decisions ordering disclosure of public information to the applicant – Violation of Article 10 – Domestic authorities’ failure to demonstrate that the interference with the applicant’s right had been prescribed by the domestic law or that it pursued a legitimate aim

The case concerned the refusal by the mayor of Baia Mare to disclose information about the use of public money by the municipal administration to a journalist who had submitted a request to that effect. The mayor had also refused to comply with court decisions ordering him to hand over the information

Article 6 § 1

The Court noted in particular that the applicant had never been informed, through a formal administrative decision, of any grounds which would have made it objectively impossible for the authorities to execute the decisions. By refusing to enforce the final judicial decisions ordering

disclosure of public information to the applicant, the domestic authorities had deprived him of an effective access to a court. There had been a violation of Article 6 § 1.

Article 10

The Court noted that the applicant was involved in the legitimate gathering of information on a matter of public importance, namely the activities of the domestic municipal administration. Given that the journalist's intention had been to communicate the information in question to the public and thereby to contribute to the public debate on good public governance, his right to impart information had clearly been impaired. The Court reiterated that it had concluded under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention that the letters sent by the mayor of the municipality to the applicant inviting him to come to the town hall to obtain thousands of pages of photocopies from several different documents, could not possibly amount to execution of a judicial decision ordering disclosure of information of a public nature. In those circumstances, there had not been adequate execution of the judicial decisions in question. Lastly, the Court noted that the mayor had never alleged that the requested information had been unavailable. The complexity of the requested information and the considerable work that would have been entailed for the town hall in compiling it had been referred to solely to explain the impossibility of providing that information rapidly. The Court considered that the domestic authorities had adduced no argument showing that the interference with the applicant's right had been prescribed by law, or that it pursued one or several legitimate aims. The Court concluded that there had been a violation of Article 10.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that the relevant State was to pay the applicant EUR 4,000 euros in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 4,748 in respect of costs and expenses.

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

LÓPEZ GUIÓ V. SLOVAKIA (No. 10280/12) - Importance unspecified - 3 June 2014 - Violation of Article 8 - Domestic authorities' failure to provide the applicant with proceedings for the return of his child

The case concerned an international abduction of a child. The latter had been taken by the mother to Slovakia although they lived in Spain with the father. Domestic authorities had held, as regards the interests of the child, that he has to remain in Slovakia.

The Court agreed with domestic authorities that the main interference with the applicant's right to respect of his family life was due to the mother who wrongfully abducted the child in Slovakia, and was not domestic authorities' failure. Therefore, the Court had examined whether they had to act for the protection of the applicant's right.

The Court considered that domestic authorities' decision had been lawful and had pursued the legitimate aim of protection the best interest of the child. However, it also observed that the applicant could not intervene in the proceedings before the Constitutional Court, neither as a plaintiff, nor as a defendant, nor as third parties. In addition, he did not know, at the relevant time, that a constitutional complaint had been brought by the child's mother.

So, the Court concluded that as domestic authorities did not provide the applicant with proceedings for the return of his child as regards the requirements of Article 8, they had failed to secure his right to respect of his family life. Therefore, Article 8 had been breached.

Under Article 41 (Just satisfaction), the Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 19,500 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 7,500 in respect of costs and expenses.

I.S. V. GERMANY (No. 31021/08) - Importance unspecified - 5 June 2014 - No violation of Article 8 - Domestic authorities' justified decision to refuse contact between the applicant and her biological children

The case concerned the applicant's complaint about domestic authorities' decision consisting in not allowing her to have regular contact and to receive information about her biological twin children who had been adopted with her consent.

The Court agreed that domestic authorities' decision had been in accordance with domestic law for the purpose of Article 8. There could have been a contact if it could serve the best interests of the children. However, domestic authorities observed that the two children had spent less than three weeks with the applicant, so that they considered that a social and family relationship had not been established. In addition, the Court found that under domestic law, the applicant, due to her valid consent, lost her right as a parent. Furthermore, as to the Court, domestic authorities' decision had pursued the legitimate aim of protecting the interests of the children, so as to allow them to develop in their adoptive family without disruption. Then, as the applicant's rights with regard to the children had been severed due to her full knowledge of the consequences, the Court found that domestic authorities' decision had been proportionate as they gave more importance to the privacy and family interests of the adoptive family.

MARIĆ V. CROATIA (No. 50132/12) - Importance 2 - 12 June 2014 - Violation of Article 8 – Domestic authorities' unlawful disposal of stillborn child as clinical waste

The case concerned the disposal of a stillborn child together with clinical waste by a public hospital. Therefore, the parents had not been able to be informed of the whereabouts of the remains.

The Court observed that the manner in which the hospital had dealt with the stillborn child's remains ambiguous. Indeed, according to the nurse in charge of the body and a hospital's pathologist, there were no existing documents relating to what would happen to the child's remains because domestic law did not require such consent forms. The Court could not therefore accept that, by an oral agreement, the applicant and his wife had tacitly accepted that the child's body would be disposed together with clinical waste. Furthermore, domestic authorities had failed to point the relevant legislation which endorsed such manner of disposal. In addition, the Court agreed with domestic authorities when saying that the disposal of the child's body together with clinical waste was not in accordance with domestic law. Finally, due to domestic authorities' saying that the procedure in such cases was not coherently regulated, the Court raised questions about the adequacy of domestic law in this regard. It concluded that Article 8 had been breached because such disposal of the body, leaving no trace of the remains or their whereabouts, had not been in accordance with domestic law.

Under Article 41 (Just satisfaction), the Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 12,300 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

PETROVA V. LATVIA (No. 4605/05) - Importance 2 - 24 June 2014 - Violation of Article 8 - Domestic authorities' failure to inform the applicant about an organ removal

The case concerned the removal of the organs of the applicant's son, without informing her.

The Court observed that domestic law at the relevant time provided for the right, in case of death, of the closest relatives of the deceased person, to express their wishes as to the removal of organs. Domestic authorities had argued that while the closest relatives were not present in the hospital, which was the case of the applicant, domestic law did not impose the doctors to try to find whether there was an objection about organ removal, so that consent would be presumed to be given. The Court observed that domestic law, as applied at the relevant time of the death of the applicant's son, had not been clear and could raise problems for legal protection against arbitrariness. So, as the organ removal of the applicant's son had not been in accordance with domestic law, there had been a violation of Article 8.

Under Article 41 (Just satisfaction), the Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 10,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 500 in respect of costs and expenses.

MENNESSON V. FRANCE (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 65192/11) LABASSEE V. FRANCE (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 65941/11) – Importance 2 – 26 June 2014 – No violation of Article 8 – Justified interference with the applicants' right on account of domestic authorities' refusal to recognize the legal parent-child relationship between the applicants and their children born as a result of surrogacy – Violation of Article 8 – Domestic authorities' failure to respect the children's right to respect for their private life on account of the prevention of the recognition and establishment of the children's legal relationship with their biological father

The cases concerned the refusal to grant legal recognition in France to parent-child relationships that had been legally established in the United States between children born as a result of surrogacy

treatment and the couples who had had the treatment.

The Court found that Article 8 was applicable in both its “family life” aspect and its “private life” aspect. Firstly, there was no doubt that the applicants had cared for the twins as parents since the children’s birth and that the four of them lived together in a way that was indistinguishable from “family life” in the accepted sense of the term. Secondly, the right to identity was an integral part of the concept of private life and there was a direct link between the private life of children born following surrogacy treatment and the legal determination of their parentage. The Court noted that the interference with the applicants’ right to respect for their private and family life resulting from the domestic authorities’ refusal to recognise the legal parent-child relationship had been “in accordance with the law” within the meaning of Article 8.

The Court accepted that the interference in question had pursued two of the legitimate aims listed in Article 8, namely the “protection of health” and the “protection of the rights and freedoms of others”. It observed that the refusal of the domestic authorities to recognise the legal relationship between children born as a result of surrogacy treatment abroad and the couples who had the treatment stemmed from a wish to discourage French nationals from having recourse outside France to a reproductive technique that was prohibited in that country with the aim, as the authorities saw it, of protecting the children and the surrogate mother. The Court then found that a fair balance had been struck between the applicants’ interests and those of the State, in so far as their right to respect for their family life was concerned.

However, with regard to the twins’ right to respect for their private life, the Court noted that they were in a state of legal uncertainty: the French authorities, although aware that the twins had been identified in another country as the children of the applicants, had nevertheless denied them that status under French law. The Court considered that this contradiction undermined the children’s identity within French society. Moreover, although their biological father was French, they faced worrying uncertainty as to the possibility of obtaining French nationality. In thus preventing the recognition and establishment of the children’s legal relationship with their biological father, the French State had overstepped the permissible margin of appreciation. The Court held that the children’s right to respect for their private life had been infringed, in breach of Article 8.

Under Article 41 (Just satisfaction), the Court held that the relevant State was to pay Eur 5,000 to each of the children in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 15,000 to the applicants in respect of costs and expenses.

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

COUDERC ET HACHETTE FILIPACCHI ASSOCIES V. FRANCE (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 40454/07) – Importance 2 – 12 June 2014 – Violation of Article 10 – Domestic authorities’ failure to strike a fair balance between the restrictions imposed on the applicants’ right to freedom of expression and the legitimate aim pursued

The case concerned the exercise of freedom of expression of the press in relation to the protection of the reputation and rights of others.

The Court agreed that a distinction had to be made between the core message of the article and the details contained in it. The article and the photographs published had concerned the descendants of a reigning Prince, revealing the existence of a son born outside marriage of which the public had previously been unaware. Even though, under the Constitution of Monaco as it currently stood, the child in question could not succeed his father to the throne, his very existence was apt to be of interest to the public and in particular to the citizens of Monaco. Accordingly, the requirements of the protection of the Prince’s private life and the debate on the future of the hereditary monarchy had been in competition. As this was an issue of political significance, the Court found that the public had had a legitimate interest in knowing of the child’s existence and being able to conduct a debate on the possible implications for political life in the Principality of Monaco.

The Court observed that the material published has also included elements relating exclusively to the private, or even intimate, life of the Prince and the child’s mother. However, the Court pointed out that it was not just the Prince’s private life that had been at stake, but also that of the child’s mother and the child himself. It was difficult to see how the private life of one person – in this instance the Prince – could act as a bar to the claims of another person – his son – seeking to assert his existence and have his identity recognised. The Court noted that the child’s mother had consented to publication on her

own behalf and that of her son and that it was she who had taken the initiative to inform the press. The photographs accompanying the article had not been taken without the Prince's. The Court concluded that, in disclosing the information, the child's mother had sought to secure public recognition of her son's status and of the fact that the Prince was his father, factors which were crucial in ending the secrecy surrounding him. Thus, she had made public, in addition to the facts concerning the child's paternity, certain information that had not been necessary since it came within the sphere of private life. In conclusion, the Court observed that the judgment against the applicants had made no distinction between information which formed part of a debate of general interest and that which merely reported details of the private life of a public figure. The Court considered that, in spite of the margin of appreciation left to States, no reasonable relationship of proportionality existed between the restrictions imposed on the applicants' right to freedom of expression and the legitimate aim pursued. Therefore, there had been a violation of Article 10.

As the applicants had not submitted any claim under Article 41 of the Convention (just satisfaction), the Court did not make an award under that head.

2. Other judgments issues in the period under observation

You will find in the column "Key Words" of the table below a short description of the topics dealt with in the judgment¹.

For more detailed information, please refer to the cases.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	IMP.	CONCLUSION	KEY WORDS
BULGARIA	3 JUNE 2014	KHADZHIEV (No. 44330/07)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention pending extradition of the applicant as the second request for his extradition had been based on the same charges as the first one and thus the extradition proceedings had been from the beginning devoid of any purpose
	17 JUNE 2014	KARAIANOVA AND MILEVA (No. 37857/05)	3	No violation of Art. 6 § 1	No failure of the domestic courts to respect the principle of legal certainty
				Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Applicants' legitimate expectations had been affected by the lengthy delays in the restitution procedure of their plot
	24 JUNE 2014	PETKOV AND PROFIROV (Nos. 50027/08 AND 50781/09)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicants (based on unreasonable grounds)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 2	Domestic authorities' failure to inform the applicants of the reasons for their arrest
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicants' detention
				Violation of Art. 5 § 5	Lack of a compensatory remedy concerning the violations under Art. 5
CROATIA	5 JUNE 2014	EGIC (No. 32806/09)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Disproportionate interference with the applicant's right to access to court on account of the first-instance and appellate courts' decision to erroneously set the value of the property claim below the statutory

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

					threshold applicable for admissibility of an appeal on points of law, an assessment endorsed by the domestic supreme court which declared the applicant's appeal inadmissible
CROATIA (CONTINUED)	5 JUNE 2014	MARGARETIC (No. 16115/13)	2	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Domestic county court's failure to assess the correct amount of bail applicable in the circumstances of the applicant's case while no real consideration was given to the possibility of releasing the applicant under alternative preventive measures
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Denial of judicial review of the applicant's detention on the sole basis that he was at the time detained under a new decision
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Fairness of proceedings despite the applicant's absence during the hearing as he was given a reasonable opportunity to present his case effectively through a representative
GREECE	5 JUNE 2014	CHRISTODOULOU AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 80452/12)	3	Two violations of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a promptly judicial review concerning the lawfulness of the applicant's detention while the refusal of his demand to appear in person during the review proceedings without any justification, given the applicant's health state and his invalidity level (90%), had deprived him of the possibility to challenge the reasons forwarded for the maintenance of his detention
	26 JUNE 2014	DE LOS SANTOS AND DE LA CRUZ (IN FRENCH ONLY) (Nos. 2134/12 AND 2161/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention in police premises (overcrowding, lack of meals, inadequate sleeping arrangements, poor access to light, lack of recreational activities)
HUNGARY	3 JUNE 2014	HARRISON MCKEE (No. 22840/07)	2	No violation of Art. 6 § 1	No restriction of the applicant's right to access to court on account of the imposition of a significant sum of court fees as he had indicated an excessive amount in his claim when instituting the proceeding (the domestic law provided adequate safeguards in order not to constitute a disproportionate financial burden to good-faith claimants)
ITALY	24 JUNE 2014	ALBERTI (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 15397/11)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Ill-treatment of the applicant at the hands of the police
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the applicant's complaints of ill-treatment

ITALY (CONTINUED)	24 JUNE 2014	BIRAGHI AND OTHERS (Nos. 3429/09, 3430/09, 3431/09, 3432/09, 3992/09, 4100/09, 11561/09, 15609/09, 15673/09, 15649/09, 15761/09, 15783/09, 17111/09, 17371/09, 17374/09, 17378/09, 20787/09, 20799/09, 20830/09, 29007/09, 41408/09 AND 41422/09) CATALDO AND OTHERS (Nos. 54425/08, 58361/08, 58464/08, 60505/08, 60524/08 AND 61827/08)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1 (in both cases)	Domestic authorities' legislative intervention in their favour while the applicants' proceedings had still been pending before the domestic courts had breached the applicants' right to a fair trial
LATVIA	24 JUNE 2014	A.K. (No. 33011/08)	2	Violation of Art. 8 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to properly examine the applicant's claim that she had not received adequate medical care and information, in accordance with the domestic law, which would have indicated the risk of her foetus having a genetic disorder
POLAND	10 JUNE 2014	P.K. (No. 43123/10)	3	No violation of Art. 8	No failure of the domestic authorities to take all the necessary steps to facilitate the enforcement of the contact arrangements between the applicant and his son, namely by the repeated imposition of fines on the applicant's former wife, the limitation of her parental authority by the assignment of a guardian charged with supervising her in the exercise of her parental rights and the order to attend family therapy with a view to improving communication with the applicant
ROMANIA	10 JUNE 2014	BUJOREAN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 13054/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, lack of hygiene, lack of hot water, defective ventilation system, poor lighting)
		CONSTANTIN AURELIAN BURLACU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 51318/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)
		MIHAI LAURENTIU MARIN (No. 79857/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, lack of heating)

ROMANIA (CONTINUED)	10 JUNE 2014	VOICU (No. 22015/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, lack of hygiene)
				No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Absence of evidence suggesting that the applicant had been transported in conditions that had breached the requirements of Art. 3
				Violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities' failure to safeguard the information in their possession in order to secure the applicant's right to respect for his private life and to offer any means of redress once the breach of his rights occurred
	17 JUNE 2014	MARIAN TOMA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 48372/09)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, lack of hygiene)
				Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of criminal proceedings (8 years)
		ZAMFIRACHI (No. 70719/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, lack of hygiene)
24 JUNE 2014	IONUT-LAURENTIU TUDOR (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 34013/05)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)	
			Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Unjustified pre-trial detention of the applicant	
			Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Domestic courts' failure to properly assess the data available concerning the maintenance of the applicant's detention while the same domestic judges who had ordered the continuation of the applicant's detention had also dismissed his appeal without really responding to his arguments	
RUSSIA	5 JUNE 2014	TERESHCHENKO (No. 33761/05)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, lack of sleeping arrangements)
				Violation of Art. 13 in conjunction with Art. 3	Lack of an effective remedy concerning the applicant's complaint of inadequate conditions of detention
				Violation of Art. 8	Unlawful interference with applicant's right to respect for family life on account of the domestic district court's failure to properly deal with the question of visits by the applicant's mother while no other means of communication, such as the telephone, had been considered
		No violation of Art. 34	Absence of sufficient factual basis suggesting that there had been a domestic authorities' interference with the applicant's right of petition		
	12 JUNE 2014	BIBLICAL CENTRE OF THE CHUVASH REPUBLIC (No. 33203/08)	2	Violation of Art. 9 interpreted in the light of Art. 11	Disproportionate and unnecessary interference in a democratic society on account of the dissolution of the applicant organisation

RUSSIA (CONTINUED)	12 JUNE 2014	<u>CHUPRIKOV</u> (No. 17504/07)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention
				Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Extension of applicant's pre-trial detention on insufficient grounds
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Domestic courts' failure to consider the substance of the applicant's appeal before rejecting his request for release
				Violation of Art. 5 § 5	Lack of a compensatory remedy concerning the violation of Art. 5 §§ 1 and 3
		<u>PRIMOV AND OTHERS</u> (No. 17391/06)	2	Violation of Art. 11	Applicants' impossibility to demonstrate why the domestic authorities' response to entirely block the village had been an excessive measure
				No violation of Art. 11	Domestic authorities' overall response to the blocking of the road and the aggressive behaviour of a big group of protesters had been proportionate given that, against this background, the use of the special equipment and even firearms by the police had been justified
			No violation of Art. 11	Lawful arrest and detention of the applicant which pursued a legitimate aim while given the complexity of the case, the two months' detention had been reasonable	
	19 JUNE 2014	<u>SHEKHOV</u> (No. 12440/04)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1 in conjunction with Art. 6 § 3 (c)	Domestic judicial authorities' failure to provide legal assistance to the applicant
				Violation of Art. 34	Hindrance to the applicant's right of individual petition (opening of the letters and withholding of the enclosures)
		<u>UNIYA OOO AND BELCOURT TRADING COMPANY</u> (Nos. 4437/03 AND 13290/03)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Unlawful destruction of the applicant company's consignment of alcohol and domestic courts' refusal to offer any compensation in that respect
Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Procedural barriers had deprived the applicant companies of an effective right to court				

RUSSIA (CONTINUED)	26 JUNE 2014	EGAMBERDIYEV (No. 34742/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Real risk of ill-treatment in case of the applicant's expulsion to his country of origin
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1 (f)	Applicant's continued detention with a view to extradition had exceeded the maximum penalty for an administrative offense (30 days) and its preventive measure, in terms of gravity, had been much more serious than the punitive one given that the domestic courts had not set a specific time-limit for the applicant's detention and that, after the expiry of the two-year time limit which implies the release of the detainee, the applicant would be again liable to expulsion and to detention on that ground, since the applicant would clearly remain in an irregular situation in terms of immigration law
		GABLISHVILI (No. 39428/12)	2	Violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities' failure to strike a fair balance between the general public interest and the protection of the applicant's fundamental rights given that the expulsion and exclusion orders were made or upheld without taking into consideration his family ties in the relevant state
		KRUPKO AND OTHERS (No. 26587/07)	2	Violation of Art. 5	Unlawful detention of the applicants (lack of any legitimate purpose)
				Violation of Art. 9	Interference with the applicants' right to freedom of religion as the deployment of armed riot police in order to disrupt the religious ceremony, which had not shown to create any disturbance or danger to the public order, followed by the applicants' arrest and three-hour detention, had been a disproportionate measure to the aim sought
SERBIA	3 JUNE 2014	HABIMI AND OTHERS (No. 19072/08)	2	Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the applicants' allegations of ill-treatment
				No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Absence of sufficient evidence to confirm the applicants' allegations of ill-treatment at the hands of the police officers and/or prison guards, largely due to the lack of an effective investigation by domestic authorities

SLOVENIA	5 JUNE 2014	HIT D.D. NOVA GORICA (No. 50996/08)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Lack of impartiality on account of the domestic constitutional court panel's composition as one of the judges had taken part in proceedings on the same case
	12 JUNE 2014	BERGER-KRALL AND OTHERS (No. 14717/04)	2	No violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	No failure of the relevant state to balance the exceptionally difficult and socially sensitive issues involved in reconciling the conflicting interests and to ensure a distribution of the social and financial burden involved in the housing reform which had not exceeded its margin of appreciation
				No violation of Art. 8	Necessary interference with the applicants' right to respect for their home
				No violation of Art. 14 taken in conjunction with Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	No failure of the relevant state to take significant steps to provide the applicants with a fair possibility of access to real- estate ownership and to compensate them for the disadvantage created by the existence of a previous owner
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Applicants' exclusion from the denationalization proceedings had not been directly decisive for the applicants' civil rights as the object of those proceedings was to determine the ownership of the property subject to restitution while the applicant, since they were tenants, had not any arguable claim for restitution
	No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Sufficient access to court as the applicants had been given the possibility to challenge the constitutionality of the housing reform by bringing their claim before the domestic constitutional court			

SLOVENIA (CONTINUED)	12 JUNE 2014	L.M. (No. 32863/05)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful deprivation of liberty on account of the applicant's involuntary confinement in two psychiatric hospitals (concerning the applicant's stay in the close and open ward of the first hospital and her stay in the close ward of the second one)
				No violation of Art. 5 § 1	Absence of sufficient evidence suggesting that the applicant had been involuntarily confined during the four-day period she spent in the open ward of the psychiatric hospital
				Violation of Art. 5 § 2	Lack of proper information concerning the reasons for the applicant's confinement in both psychiatric hospitals
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a speedy judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's confinement in both psychiatric hospitals
				Violation of Art. 5 § 5	Lack of a compensatory remedy concerning the applicant's confinement in both psychiatric hospitals
				Violation of Art. 8	Applicant's medical treatment had not been legally safeguarded against arbitrary interference with her physical and moral integrity
SWEDEN	26 JUNE 2014	M.E. (No. 71398/12)	2	No violation of Art. 3	No real risk suggesting that the applicant would be submitted to ill-treatment in case of his return to the country of his origin in order to apply for family reunion
SWITZERLAND	24 JUNE 2014	UKAJ (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 32493/08)	3	No violation of Art. 8	No failure of the relevant state to strike a fair balance between the applicant's interests and its own concerning the applicant's expulsion as, relying on the seriousness of the convictions against him, the dissolution of the marriage bond and the fact that he spent most of his life in his country of origin, the respondent state had not exceeded the margin of appreciation available to it
"THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA"	12 JUNE 2014	DONCEV AND BURGVOV (No. 30265/09)	2	No violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d)	Fairness of proceedings despite the applicants' impossibility, under the rules applicable to protected witnesses, to attend the examination or to cross-examine the key witness, given that the applicants had deprived themselves of the opportunity to challenge the veracity of the evidence produced by the protected witness when they refused to question him in writing

TURKEY	3 JUNE 2014	AHMET ERYILMAZ (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 23501/07)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 3 (c) in conjunction with Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the lack of legal assistance afforded to the applicant while in police custody
		AKTEPE AND KAHRIMAN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 18524/07)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to truly seek and determine the responsibility of each medical and military authority concerning the death of the applicants' relative while the domestic military court gave no positive response to the applicants' request to instruct a wider investigation in that respect
		BULDU AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 14017/08)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Applicants' criminal prosecutions and convictions on account of their refusal to serve in the army, taking into consideration their severity and their repetition, had amounted to an inhuman and degrading treatment
				Violation of Art. 9	Domestic authorities' measures taken against the applicants on account of their refusal to carry out their military service for reasons of conscience had constituted an unnecessary interference with their right to freedom of religion
				Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Lack of independence and impartiality of the domestic military court
		YIGITDOGAN (No. 72174/10)	3	No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Absence of sufficient evidence to confirm the applicant's allegation of ill-treatment during his arrest and while in police custody, largely due to the lack of an effective investigation by the domestic authorities
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment
				Violation of Art. 6 § 3 (c) in conjunction with Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the lack of legal assistance afforded to the applicant while in police custody
		17 JUNE 2014	ASLAN AND SEZEN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 43217/04) ASLAN AND SEZEN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 2) (No. 15066/05)	3	Violation of Art. 10 (in both cases)

TURKEY (CONTINUED)	17 JUNE 2014	BELEK AND OZKURT (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 2) (No. 28470/08)	3	Violation of Art. 10 (in all cases)	Unjustified interference with the applicants' right to freedom of expression given that the article contained no incitement to the use of violence, armed resistance or an uprising and did not constitute hate speech
		BELEK AND OZKURT (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 3) (No. 28516/08)		Violation of Art. 6 (in all cases)	Disproportionate interference with the applicants' right to access to court given their impossibility to appeal before the domestic cassation court
		BELEK AND OZKURT (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 4) (No. 4323/09)			
		BELEK AND OZKURT (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 5) (No. 4327/09)			
		BELEK AND OZKURT (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 6) (No. 4375/09)			
	BELEK AND OZKURT (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 7) (No. 10752/09)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a prompt judicial review concerning the lawfulness of the applicants' detention	
	KARAOZMANOGLU AND OZDEN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 4807/08)		Violation of Art. 5 § 5	Lack of a compensatory remedy concerning the violations under Art. 5 § 4	
	24 JUNE 2014	YARASHONEN (No. 72710/11)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant in view of his deportation (absence of clear legal provisions in domestic law)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 2	Domestic authorities' failure to inform the applicant of the reasons for his detention
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a prompt judicial review concerning the lawfulness of the applicant's detention pending deportation
Violation of Art. 5 § 5				Lack of a compensatory remedy concerning the violations under Art. 5	
Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)				Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, absence of regular exercise, lack of hygiene)	
Violation of Art. 13 in conjunction with Art. 3				Lack of an effective remedy regarding the poor conditions of detention	

UKRAINE	5 JUNE 2014	<u>AKOPYAN</u> (No. 12317/06)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful deprivation of liberty on account of the applicant's confinement in a psychiatric hospital while she did not have access to remedies capable of putting an end to the continued detention
				No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Insufficient evidence to conclude that the applicant's involuntarily neuroleptic treatment had seriously affected her in order to reach the threshold of Art. 3
				Violation of Art. 8	Unlawful interference with the applicant's family life on account of the lengthy confinement in a psychiatric hospital, even though she could have been discharged shortly after her admission if she had not been wrongly diagnosed, which impeded her communication with her daughters, who were minors, and prevented her from seeking access to them
	26 JUNE 2014	<u>SUKHANOV AND ILCHENKO</u> (Nos. 68385/10 AND 71378/10)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Domestic authorities' failure to take any measures in order to determine the amount of the supplement to the applicants' pension had constituted an unjustified interference with their right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions

B. The decision on admissibility

Those decisions are published with a slight delay of two to three weeks on the Court's website. Therefore the decisions listed below cover the period from 1 to 31 May 2014. Those decisions are selected to provide the NHRSS with potentially useful information on the reasons of the inadmissibility of certain applications addressed to the Court and/or on the friendly settlements reached.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	ALLEGED VIOLATION	DECISION
ITALY	6 May 2014	DURISOTTO IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 62804/13)	Articles 8 and 14 (impossibility for the applicant's daughter to get a therapy according to the "Stamina" method contrary to other patients), Art. 6§1 (lack of an effective remedy in this regard)	Partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning claims under Articles 8 and 14), partly incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the provisions of the Convention (concerning claim under 6§1)
ROMANIA	27 May 2014	SHYTI (No. 39756/07)	Art. 3 (the negative effects on the applicant mental state due to the use of handcuffs during court hearings, the applicant classification as dangerous prisoner and the security measures taken in this regard), Articles 6§1 and 7 (unlawful conviction for evasion), Art. 14 (breaches due to the applicant Albanian nationality)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
THE NETHERLANDS	6 May 2014	NDIKUMANA (No. 4714/06)	Articles 2 and 3 (failure of the domestic authorities to provide for the asylum seeker applicant basics needs), Art. 14 (the applicant had to live on the streets without any assistance because he was an asylum seeker)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded

C. The communicated cases

The European Court of Human Rights publishes on a weekly basis a list of the communicated cases on its website. These are cases concerning individual applications which are pending before the Court. They are communicated by the Court to the respondent State's Government with a statement of facts, the applicant's

complaints and the questions put by the Court to the Government concerned. The decision to communicate a case lies with one of the Court's Chamber which is in charge of the case. A **selection** of those cases is proposed below, covering the period from 1 to 20 January 2014.

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

STATE	DATE OF DECISION TO COMMUNICATE	CASE TITLE	KEY WORDS OF QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE PARTIES
BELGIUM	6 January 2014	BAMOUHAMMAD IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 47687/13)	The applicant's mental health has deteriorated due to the conditions of detention. No effective possibility for prisoners to complain at the domestic authorities.
	16 January 2014	SAMIM IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 53775/11)	Risk of torture if sent back to Afghanistan since the applicants already underwent inhuman treatments there.
CROATIA	7 January 2014	SABALIĆ (No. 50231/13)	Lack of an appropriate procedural response of the domestic authorities to an act of violence by a private party motivated by the applicant's sexual orientation.
FRANCE	8 January 2014	S.M. IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 1324/14)	Fear of inhuman treatments if sent back to Bangladesh since the applicant was involved in false judicial cases there.
	16 January 2014	L.O. IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 4455/14)	Fear of inhuman treatments if sent back to Nigeria since the applicant was victim of slave traffic there.
HUNGARY	20 January 2014	KÁROLY NAGY (No. 56665/09)	Allegedly discriminatory denial of access to a court on account of domestic authorities' decision that the applicant's claims belonged exclusively to the ecclesiastical jurisdictions and could not be pursued before State courts.
LATVIA	16 January 2014	ARACKIS (No. 14912/07) O.G. (No. 6752/13)	Unlawful transfer and placement in a psychiatric hospital.
POLAND	16 January 2014	A. B. (No. 60692/13) A. B. (No. 61368/13)	Risk of ill-treatment if expelled and sent to Russia.

POLAND <i>(CONTINUED)</i>	20 January 2014	<u>KASPRZAK</u> (No. 19149/11)	During his detention, the applicant was systematically strip-searched after visits with his family at the prison and after being taken to the court and these searches were monitored via CCTV.
PORTUGAL	16 January 2014	PHOSTIRA EFTHYMIOU AND RIBEIRO FERNANDES <u>IN FRENCH ONLY</u> (No. 66775/11)	The domestic authorities asked for the return of the first applicant to Cyprus while they did not examine with attention the familial situation and the fact that the applicant blended in Portugal.
RUSSIA	7 January 2014	<u>SUPRUN</u> (No. 58029/12)	The applicant was prevented from collecting and disseminating information on victims of Soviet repression.
	14 January 2014	<u>ABDULKHANOV</u> (No. 35012/10)	The police unlawfully kept the applicant in a clinical hospital and prevented him from receiving required specialised medical assistance outside the Chechen Republic which resulted in his disability.
SERBIA	10 January 2014	<u>NIKOLIĆ AND 1 OTHER APPLICATION</u> (No. 3551/08)	Continued failure of the domestic courts to adopt final decisions in the applicants' paternity cases left them in a state of prolonged uncertainty regarding their personal identity.
	14 January 2014	<u>POPADIĆ</u> (No. 7833/12)	Excessive length of the proceedings concerning a matrimonial dispute, which prevented the applicant from having overnight and holiday contact with his son for several years
SWITZERLAND	18 January 2014	KAISER <u>IN FRENCH ONLY</u> (No. 35294/11)	Refusal of the domestic authorities to grant the applicant judicial assistance whereas she is deaf.
"THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA"	14 January 2014	<u>V.Z. AND OTHERS</u> (No. 56649/11)	The third applicant was placed in an orphanage, which prevented the first and second applicants from living together while the proceedings about the custody and the applicants' parental rights were still pending.
TURKEY	6-8 January 2014	<u>CAN</u> (No. 2437/08) <u>DEMIREL</u> (No. 30733/08)	The applicants could not work as security guards for a company since they did not fulfil the requirement of "having completed military service", a duty which is fulfilled only by men in Turkey.

TURKEY (CONTINUED)	6 January 2014	GERÇEL <u>IN FRENCH ONLY</u> (No. 55839/09) MERİÇLİ <u>IN FRENCH ONLY</u> (No. 55836/09) YÜKSEL <u>IN FRENCH ONLY</u> (No. 55835/09)	While put in custody, there was no element of proof to convict the applicants of belonging to an illegal organisation.
	7 January 2014	<u>GÜZEL</u> (No. 29483/09)	The applicant was convicted because he did not, as the meeting chairperson at a party meeting, prevent certain delegates from speaking Kurdish, their mother tongue, instead of Turkish.
		<u>KESKIN AND OTHERS</u> (No. 63639/09)	While distributing leaflets as members of a non-governmental organisation to draw attention to the terms of a new draft law on the social security system, the applicants were violently arrested by the police.
	8 January 2014	<u>R.M.</u> (No. 81681/12)	The extradition of the applicant to Uzbekistan would give rise to a real risk of ill-treatment according to him.
	9 January 2014	<u>KALKAN</u> (No. 54698/13)	The applicant was convicted for having organised a press conference concerning the general problems of Kurdish people.
UNITED KINGDOM	7 January 2014	<u>BIG BROTHER WATCH AND OTHERS</u> (No. 58170/13)	The applicants are likely to have been the subject of generic surveillance by GCHQ and/or that the United Kingdom security services may have been in receipt of foreign intercept material relating to their electronic communications.
	13 January 2014	<u>I.A.A. AND OTHERS</u> (No. 25960/13)	Refusal of the domestic authorities to grant the applicants entry into the United Kingdom for the purposes of reuniting with their mother.

PartOne

§2 - EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF SOCIAL RIGHTS

A. Reclamations and Decisions

1. Reclamations

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

2. Decisions

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

B. Other information

■ Reform of the reporting and monitoring system of the European Social Charter (no date indicated)

On 2 April 2014, the Committee of Ministers adopted changes to the reporting and monitoring system with respect to the European Social Charter, which are to be put in place with immediate effect. This change allows the State Parties having accepted the collective complaints procedure to benefit from a simplified reporting procedure. Moreover, at the level of the Governmental Committee of the European Social Charter and the European Code of Social Security, only cases of non-conformity selected by the ECSR will be discussed ([Read more - CM decision - Full document on "Ways of streamlining and improving the reporting and monitoring system of the European Social Charter"](#)).

PartOne

§3 - RECOMMENDATIONS & RESOLUTIONS

A. Recommendations

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

B. Resolutions

AUTHOR	DATE	TEXT NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
PACE	24 June 2014	1999	The “left-to-die boat” : actions and reactions	The “left-to-die boat” incident was the occasion for the PACE to reassert that all push-back practices and practices of rescue at sea must be compliant with the right to seek asylum and the right to be protected against <i>refoulement</i> . In its recommendation, the PACE has referred to the Steering Committee for Human Rights and to the <i>Hirsi Jamaa and others v. Italy</i> judgment of the ECHR (Recommendation 2046 - Read more - Crucial gaps in the legal framework on search and rescue in the Mediterranean).
PACE	24 June 2014	2000	The large-scale arrival of mixed migratory flows on Italian shores	The PACE notably called on Italy to respect <i>non-refoulement</i> . At the same time, it called on all CoE member States to promote changes in the Eurodac regulations, in order to facilitate the identification of migrants and asylum seekers through the use of DNA records in addition to fingerprints (Read more - Recommendation 2047)
PACE	24 June 2014	2001	Violence in and through the media	The member States must combat media incitement to violence and cyber-bullying, but should respect Article 10 of the ECHR. Thus, their measures must be prescribed by law and justified in a democratic society (Read more - Recommendation 2048)

PACE	25 June 2014	2005	Identities and diversity within intercultural societies	Member States must promote cultural diversity, while harmonising civil rights laws for all citizens, in order to prevent discrimination and racism (Read more - Recommendation 2049)
PACE	25 June 2014	2006	Integration of migrants in Europe: the need for a proactive, long-term and global policy	The PACE advocated a series of measures relating notably to discrimination and family reunification (Read more - Adoption of the report on "Integration of migrants in Europe")
PACE	26 June 2014	2008	Europe's public administrations in flux: public service under threat?	The economic and budgetary crisis should not undermine the respect of economic, social and cultural rights, recalled the PACE to States members. It strongly supported the recommendations of the Commissioner for Human Rights (Read more - Recommendation 2050)
PACE	27 June 2014	2009	Reinforcement of the independence of the ECHR	The PACE introduced additional measures in order to strengthen the ECHR independence, and thus, ensure impartial judgments (Read more - Recommendation 2051)
PACE	27 June 2014	2010	Child-friendly juvenile justice: from rhetoric to reality	Faced with an unsatisfactory situation of children in juvenile detention, the PACE prescribed steps to respect children's rights as regards juvenile justice (Read more - Video of the debate)

PartOne

§4 - OTHER INFORMATION OF GENERAL IMPORTANCE

A. Information from the Committee of Ministers

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

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly

■ PACE to launch “No Hate Parliamentary Alliance” (03.06.2014)

The PACE Committee on Equality decided to launch a “No Hate Parliamentary Alliance” at its October session. By joining the Alliance, parliamentarians commit to taking open, firm and pro-active stands against racism, hatred and intolerance, to promote non-discrimination, conduct campaign activities and exchange information on law and best practice in these fields ([Read more](#) - [Charter of commitments for membership in the No Hate Parliamentary Alliance](#)).

■ Moving “trans-rights” forward in national parliaments (05.06.2014)

Regretting that only twenty CoE member States explicitly include gender identity as a prohibited ground of discrimination, the PACE stressed the urgent need to promote the rights of transgender persons in national parliaments ([Read more](#)).

■ World Refugee Day: It is vital to create safe legal channels to Europe, said PACE President (19.06.2014)

On World Refugee Day, the PACE President called on States to create safe legal channels to Europe or other countries through resettlement, relocation or humanitarian visas ([Read more](#)).

■ The Kyrgyz Parliament signed the Partner for democracy status (23.06.2014)

Kyrgyzstan and PACE President signed the Partner for democracy status granted in April 2014. This is an important step for the human rights protection in this state, which abolished the death penalty in 2007 ([Read more](#)).

■ Total ban on trading human organs must stay (24.06.2014)

The PACE’s Social Affairs Committee reasserted that the prohibition to trade human organs is a “fundamental principle” of human dignity, enshrined in CoE, EU and WHO texts ([Read more](#) - [Full text of declaration](#) - [Videobox : Liliane Maury Pasquier \[french only\]](#)).

■ PACE aims to raise the status of vocational education and training (24.06.2014)

Approving a report, the PACE’s Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media called on States to make the right to vocational training a binding obligation by signing up to the relevant parts of the revised European Social Charter ([Read more](#) - [Read the report](#)).

■ Parliamentarians debated on the application of CoE values during “free debate” (24.06.2014)

Around 18 parliamentarians spoke in this “free debate”, which gives PACE members the opportunity to speak on any subject that is not already on the agenda. Among the topics, human rights issues such as the threat of big corporations, the situation of human rights in China, and prisoners’ freedom of expression ([Read more](#) - [Video of the debate](#)).

■ Anne Brasseur: “Creating an international order without dialogue is impossible” (25.06.2014)

The PACE President underlined that the right to peace and the right to a life without fear should be guaranteed by the CoE ([Read more](#) - [Video of the speeches](#) - [Commemoration ceremony of the 100th anniversary of the First World War \[french only\]](#)).

C. Information from the Commissioner for Human Rights

■ Youth human rights at risk during the crisis (03.06.2014)

The Commissioner for Human Rights expressed his worries as regards youth unemployment in time of crisis, which can have long-term negative effects and impact their enjoyment of human rights. He emphasized that any temptation to lower labour standards and social protection when employing young people must be resisted ([Read more](#) - [Read in Russian](#)).

D. Information from the monitoring mechanisms

■ ECRI: Publication of conclusions on the implementation of its priority recommendations in respect of Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Lithuania, Monaco and Serbia (03.06.2014)

The ECRI published conclusions on the implementation of a number of priority recommendations made in its country reports on Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Lithuania, Monaco and Serbia, which had been released in 2011 ([Read more](#)).

■ 64th plenary meeting of the ECRI (23.06.2014)

The ECRI held its 64th plenary meeting in Strasbourg on 17-20 June 2014. It exchanged views with the President of the European Court of Human Rights, the Personal Representatives on tolerance and non-discrimination of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office and the Chairman of the UN Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration ([Read more](#)).

■ GRECO: Little progress on political funding transparency for Council of Europe anti-corruption group (19.06.2014)

In its annual report, GRECO partly attributes this situation to the political sensitivity of party and campaign funding, and to the fact that, by evaluating states in this field, GRECO's monitoring has extended to areas beyond direct governmental control and under the influence of political parties and parliaments themselves ([Read more](#)).

■ GRETA: 20th meeting (from 30.06.2014 to 04.07.2014)

[List of the decisions](#)

■ World Refugee Day - Victims of trafficking in human beings are too often deprived of their right to international protection (20.06.2014)

On the occasion of World Refugee Day, the GRETA expressed deep concern that victims of trafficking are often denied international protection in Europe. *"A victim of trafficking may be subject to persecution once back in her/his country because of belonging to a particular social group as defined by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) or for having denounced the traffickers"*, warns Nicolas Le Coz, President of GRETA ([More](#)).

PartTwo

INFORMATION BY COUNTRY

This part presents a selection of pieces of information, which are deemed to be mainly relevant for only one country.

Please, refer to the index above (p.3) to find the country you are interested in. Only countries concerned by at least one piece of information issued during the period under observation are listed below

Albania

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ **GRECO: the committee urged Albania to step up corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors (27.06.2014)**

GRECO acknowledges that, while detailed anti-corruption and conflicts of interest regulations are in place, the existing legal framework is highly complex, and its stability is undermined by numerous and frequent amendments which are often subject to contradictory interpretation. Additionally, the rules mainly focus on restrictions and prohibitions, to the detriment of public disclosure and transparency, which curtails their effect ([Read more](#)).

Azerbaijan

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Rapporteur expressed concern at human rights defenders' situation (20.06.2014)

The Rapporteur on "Strengthening the role and protection of human rights defenders in CoE member States" highlighted the deterioration of human rights defenders' situation, who are subject to various intimidation measures. He called for an immediate release of the "prisoners of conscience" ([Read more - Information memorandum about the situation of human rights defenders](#)).

■ PACE: Azerbaijan will confront double standards in international relations (24.06.2014)

In an address to the PACE, the State declared that there are no political prisoners in Azerbaijan and underlined its commitment to the norms and principles of international law ([Read more - State's allocution - Azerbaijan presented communication to PACE](#)).

Bosnia and Herzegovina

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Bajic (No. 47643/08)	10 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)86	Examination closed
Bozicic (No. 11373/07)	10 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)86	Examination closed
Cicovic (No. 30492/08)	10 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)86	Examination closed
Mitrovic (No. 17427/07)	10 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)86	Examination closed
Pejic (No. 65814/10)	21 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)86	Examination closed
Salipurovic (No. 39364/08)	7 February 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)86	Examination closed
Spasojevic (No. 11375/07)	31 May 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)86	Examination closed
Topic (No. 45282/08)	24 May 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)86	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ MONEYVAL: Public statement on Bosnia and Herzegovina (01.06.2014)

MONEYVAL issued a public statement on Bosnia and Herzegovina.

At the 44th MONEYVAL plenary meeting (March 31 – April 4, 2014), the Committee adopted a public statement under Step 3 of its Compliance Enhancing Procedures in the light of continued lack of progress on legislation to address MONEYVAL's concerns. The Committee however deferred its issue until 1 June 2014 in order to allow Bosnia and Herzegovina further time to adopt all necessary amendments to the preventive Law and the Criminal Code.

The necessary legislation has not been adopted by the Parliament of Bosnia and Herzegovina within the MONEYVAL deadline. Accordingly the Chairman has authorised the issuing today of this public statement, as adopted by MONEYVAL in April 2014 ([Read the statement](#)).

Bulgaria

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Iordan Iordanov and Others (No. 23530/02)	2 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)67	Examination closed
Shopov (No. 11373/04)	2 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)68	Examination closed
Kroushev (No. 66535/01)	3 October 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)77	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

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

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Stevan Antonic (No. 65625/11)	28 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Ivan Anzulovic (No. 9017/11)	28 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Bradic (No. 70000/11)	12 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Buric (No. 70177/11)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Curic Hrvatinic (No. 58692/12)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Graberski (No. 70177/12)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Ivan Filip Gregovic (No. 61305/09)	28 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Jalusic and Others (No. 70398/10)	16 October 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Japuncic (No. 2650/12)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Juras (No. 40154/12)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Juric (No. 6279/12)	18 June 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Justament (No. 51597/12)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Kljajic (No. 58709/11)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Jovanka Lolic (No. 35830/10)	28 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Maric (No. 71647/11)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Natriin (No. 24040/10)	18 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Paic and Others (No. 5058/12)	12 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Alan Praunspenger (No. 28286/10)	28 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed

Sablic (No. 69384/12)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Saric (No. 4449/11)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Schubert tepsic and Others (No. 37777/12)	12 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Schwenk Muehlbauer (No. 8097/12)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Seljacka Sloga SKZ in liquidation (No. 5562/12)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Skala (No. 51573/12)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Sladetic (No. 7736/12)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Spoljar (No. 66229/11)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Szabo (No. 23042/12)	12 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Stjepan Trupeljak and Drago Trupeljak (No. 70265/12+)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Ujevic and Others (No. 40165/12)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Usaj (No. 64995/11)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Vojnovic (No. 1286/10)	18 June 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed
Zadrzail (No. 58696/12)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)87	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRECO: Council of Europe's Anti-corruption Group calls on Croatia to raise public confidence in judiciary and bolster anti-corruption measures in parliament (26.06.2014)

In a report published on 25.06.2014, the GRECO gives credit to the efforts made by Croatia to fight corruption in public life. However, despite the many encouraging steps taken, Croatian citizens' trust in their key institutions remains low. This negative perception is particularly troublesome with respect to the judiciary and politicians ([Read more](#)).

Czech Republic

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Eremiasova and Pechova (No. 23944/04)	20 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)69	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

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

Finland

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRETA: First evaluation visit to Finland (17.06.2014)

A delegation of the GRETA carried out an evaluation visit to Finland from 9 to 13 June 2014. The visit was organised in the context of the first round of evaluation of the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings ([Read more](#)).

France

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Medvedyev and Others (No.3394/03)	29 March 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)78	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

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

Georgia

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Rapporteurs expressed concern about withdrawal of opposition candidates for local elections (06.06.2014)

The co-rapporteurs of the PACE for the monitoring of Georgia expressed their concern about alleged pressure on opposition candidates ([Read more](#)).

Germany

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ FCNM: Adoption of the 1st cycle resolution concerning Georgia (11.06.2014)

[Read the resolution.](#)

■ GRETA: First evaluation visit to Germany (24.06.2014)

A delegation of the GRETA carried out an evaluation visit to Germany from 13 to 20 June 2014. The visit was organised in the context of the first round of evaluation of the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings ([Read more](#)).

Greece

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Bekir-Ousta and Others (No. 35151/05)	11 January 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)84	Examination closed
Emin and Others (No. 34144/05)	1 December 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)84	Examination closed
Tourkiki Enosi Xanthis and Others (No. 26698/05)	29 September 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)84	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

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

Hungary

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Ferencz (No. 1971/11)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)64	Examination closed
Kék (No. 27643/10)	19 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)64	Examination closed
Sevcsuk (No. 62600/10)	19 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)64	Examination closed
Spider KFT (No. 69070/10)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)64	Examination closed
Strasser (No. 28454/13)	19 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)64	Examination closed
Szakonyi (No. 28450/13)	19 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)64	Examination closed
Vallent (No. 41476/10)	19 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)64	Examination closed
Zsak (No. 71747/11)	19 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)64	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ ECRI: Commission to prepare report on Hungary (18.06.2014)

A delegation of the ECRI visited Hungary from 2 to 6 June 2014 as the first step in the preparation of a monitoring report. During its visit, ECRI's delegation gathered information on legislation, hate speech, violence, integration policies, LGBT issues and other topics ([Read more](#)).

Ireland

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
E. (No. 42734/09)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)70	Examination closed
Magee (No. 53743/09)	20 November 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)79	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: President urged Ireland to use its experience to help solve ongoing conflicts (12.06.2014)

PACE President praised the State for its execution of sensitive ECHR judgments, and encouraged it to ratify certain European Conventions, as well as to take action on recommendations of the different monitoring bodies of the CoE ([Read more](#)).

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Hamidovic (No. 31956/05)	4 December 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)65	Examination closed
Buffalo S.R.L. in liquidation (No. 38746/97)	15 December 2004	CM/ResDH(2014)71	Examination closed
Villa (No. 19675/06)	4 October 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)80	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Italy needs a more structured response to large-scale arrival of migrants (04.06.2014)

The PACE Migration Committee adopted a report underlining that the State's emergency responses are insufficient for addressing reception and protection needs in the long run of the migrants. The Migration Committee also recommended that the Committee of Ministers considers ways of introducing a new international crime, possibly defined as a crime against humanity, when a person receives a financial benefit for transporting people in a vessel which is unsafe for the purpose and which may cause death or injury at sea ([Read more](#) - [Read the report](#)).

■ Commissioner for Human Rights: Defamation in Italy, a draft law to be changed (08.06.2014)

The Commissioner renewed his call to reform State's legislation on defamation which undermines freedom of expression and media ([Read more](#)).

Lithuania

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: Publication of a report on Lithuania (04.06.2014)

The CPT has published the report on its most recent visit to Lithuania, which took place from 27 November to 4 December 2012, together with the response of the Lithuanian Government ([Read more](#)).

Republic of Moldova

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Sperciuc (No. 16938/06)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)88	Examination closed
Petru Livadari et Vasile Livadari (No. 47619/10)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)88	Examination closed
Banari (No. 74450/11)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)88	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

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

Monaco

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ **MONEYVAL: Report on the 4th round assessment visit to Monaco (30.06.2014)**

[Link to the report \(French only\).](#)

Montenegro

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ Commissioner for Human Rights: Overcoming wartime legacy and strengthening media freedoms remain priorities (23.06.2014)

The Commissioner stressed the need to effectively investigate the human rights violations committed during the wars of 1990s, and called on the State to stop Roma's ghettoisation in the Konik camps. In his conclusions, he also pointed out the lack of journalists' freedom of expression, which he already underlined in a previous report in 2008. This last conclusion was denounced by the State as inaccurate ([Read more](#) - [Read the report](#) - [State's comments](#)).

Netherlands

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ ECRI: Round table in the Netherlands (24.06.2014)

In co-operation with the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights, ECRI organised a round table in The Hague on 30 June 2014 to discuss the follow-up given to the recommendations contained in its 2013 report on the Netherlands ([More](#)).

■ GRETA: Publication of its first report on the Netherlands (18.06.2014)

The GRETA has published its first evaluation report on the Netherlands. In the report, GRETA welcomes the steps taken by the Dutch authorities to combat trafficking and support victims, including the adoption of relevant legislation, the appointment of an independent National Rapporteur, and the setting up of co-ordination structures and specialised units. The report further commends the introduction of the system of advance payment of compensation to victims when the convicted trafficker has not paid the full amount of compensation eight months after the court judgment ([Read more](#)).

Norway

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRECO: Council of Europe praised Norway for its commitment to preventing corruption among members of parliament, judges and prosecutor (25.06.2014)

The members of these professional categories enjoy high levels of public trust, thanks to a zero tolerance approach to corruption and a system that relies mainly on openness, trust and public scrutiny ([Read more](#)).

Poland

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Grzelak (No. 7710/02)	22 November 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)85	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: Publication of a report on Poland (25.06.2014)

The CPT has published the report on its most recent visit to Poland, which took place from 5 to 17 June 2013, together with the response of the Polish authorities ([Read more](#)).

Romania

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Luka (No. 34197/02)	21 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)66	Examination closed
Anton (No. 51930/09)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)81	Examination closed
Corfaru (No. 56449/11)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)81	Examination closed
Draghia (No. 24048/05)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)81	Examination closed
Gerhardt-Manaila (No. 16955/05)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)81	Examination closed
Grosu (No. 64319/11)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)81	Examination closed
M. (No. 27587/06)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)81	Examination closed
Oprea (No. 26808/07)	4 June 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)81	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: Visit of the committee in Romania (19.06.2014)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a visit to Romania from 5 to 17 June 2014. The visit formed part of the CPT's programme of periodic visits for 2014 ([Read more](#)).

■ ECRI: Publication of a report on Romania (03.06.2014)

The ECRI published its fourth report on Romania. ECRI's Chair, Mr Christian Ahlund, noted progress as well as a number of outstanding issues, such as the problematic application of the legislation on religious freedom and the slow implementation of strategies for Roma integration ([Read more](#)).

Russian Federation

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Rapporteur expressed concern at the implementation of the “Foreign Agents Law” (03.06.2014)

The PACE rapporteur on “Strengthening the role and protection of human rights defenders in CoE member States”, speaking about the “Foreign Agents Law”, denounced a state-orchestrated campaign. She also pointed out a recent decision ordering a prominent human rights NGOs to register as a “foreign agent”, as well as the latest amendment to the “Foreign Agents Law”, in contradiction with the State’s promise to revise the said law ([Read more](#)).

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Andric and 23 other Applications (No. 45710/08+)	11 December 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Bozanic (No. 65052/09)	12 February 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Bunardzic and 29 other Applications (No. 46877/08+)	11 December 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Corovic and 8 other Applications (No. 50045/08)	10 July 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Gogic and 8 other Applications (No. 47324/08)	19 June 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Grahovac (No. 35449/08)	13 November 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Gunjak (No. 18565/12)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Hinic (No. 3548/08)	9 April 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Hodzic and 4 other Applications (No. 17401/09+)	2 October 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Husovic and 5 other Applications (No. 3718/09+)	4 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Ljubisavljevic (No. 40411/07)	20 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Mijalovic (No. 14680/08)	9 April 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Mosilovic and 29 other Applications (No. 48833/08+)	6 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Perisic and 42 other Applications (No. 42/10)	4 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Petkovic (No. 31169/08)	6 December 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed

Ramicevic (No. 61635/09)	5 June 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Randelovic (No. 37766/07)	26 March 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Turinski (No. 31398/08)	29 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Tutic and 14 other Applications (No. 47893/08+)	14 February 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Vasovic (No. 39882/09)	4 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed
Vukojicic and 9 other Applications (No. 57016/08+)	11 December 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)89	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ FCNM: Publication of the 3rd ACFC Opinion (30.06.2014)

[Read more.](#)

Slovak Republic

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Ferencikova (No. 39912/09)	25 December 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)72	Examination closed
Herstek (No. 40685/08)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed
Jendriskova (No. 12799/10)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed
Jupiter SK s.r.o. (No. 12800/13)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed
Vincent Kavalec (No. 916/09)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed
Roman Kavavec and two Other Applications (No. 3397/09+)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed
Matula (No. 27424/09)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed
Mutnansky (No. 22881/08)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed
Sarkocy (No. 80277/12)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed
Sinak (No. 11937/09)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed
Zadjorova (No. 70336/10)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)82	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

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

Sweden

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Rousk (No. 27183/04)	25 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)73	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

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

“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Alievski and Others (No. 53199/08)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Antonievska and Others (No. 41050/06)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Blazevski and 3 Other Applications (No. 49966/08+)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Hristovski and 8 other Applications (No. 46270/08+)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Koteska and Others (No. 11795/06)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Lutfiu and 5 other Applications (No. 7163/06+)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Matica Na Iselenici and 8 other Applications (No. 11775/06)	28 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Nesik (No. 2454/08)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Pavlovik Latas and Others and 4 other Applications (No. 5367/06)	29 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Petkovska (No. 14985/08)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Petkovski (No. 43348/08)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Risteski and Others (No. 48556/08)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Angela Ristevska and Goran Risteovski (No. 54344/07)	2 July 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Ristov and Ademi (No. 43287/08+)	1 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Tasevska and Others (No. 3758/07)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed
Zugik and 10 Other Applications (No. 3921/07)	29 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)90	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Elections conducted efficiently but marred by irregularities (23.06.2014)

The PACE Committee pointed out, during the election campaigns, credible allegations of voter intimidation, in particular among public sector employees, and credible allegations of vote-buying. It was also underlined that the media displayed a lack of independent reporting. However, the Committee concluded that in general, the election day was conducted efficiently and in accordance with the national legislation ([Read more](#) - [Read the report](#)).

■ MONEYVAL: Report on the 4th round assessment visit in “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (10.06.2014)

[Link to the report](#)

■ GRETA: First report on “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (17.06.2014)

The Macedonian authorities have taken a number of important steps to prevent and combat trafficking in human beings, but several important challenges remain, according to a report published today by the Council of Europe’s expert group on human trafficking, GRETA ([Read more](#)).

Turkey

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Baydoğan (No. 73602/11)	21 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)83	Examination closed
Beki (No. 40679/10)	25 June 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)83	Examination closed
Cağrı (No. 26357/11)	7 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)83	Examination closed
Dedeoğlu (No. 42319/11)	15 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)83	Examination closed
Korkmaz (No. 77724/11)	15 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)83	Examination closed
Kurt and Others (No. 69611/10)	7 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)83	Examination closed
Tamaç (No. 44475/09)	7 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)83	Examination closed
Hüseyin Yorgun (No. 47946/11)	28 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)83	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

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

Ukraine

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Chaykovskiy (No.2295/06)	1 March 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)74	Examination closed
Kechko (No. 63134/00)	8 February 2006	CM/ResDH(2014)75	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ Commissioner for Human Rights: Crucial to pursue police and judicial reforms and address needs of displaced persons (20.06.2014)

The Commissioner called on State not to delay the adoption on the law on the public prosecutor's office, and once again urged to ensure effective investigations into human rights violations ([Read more](#) - [Read in Ukrainian](#)).

■ PACE: Eastern Ukraine, children's welfare and safety must be ensured (26.06.2014)

The PACE General Rapporteur for Children urged all sides concerned to ensure children's welfare and safety and to allow a safety humanitarian corridor for children and their families ([Read more](#) - [Jordi Xuclà: Ukraine's President must also reach out to the East - Concern at the consequences of the ongoing conflict for the humanitarian situation in Ukraine](#) - [Debate on the consequences of the crisis in Ukraine](#)).

The United Kingdom

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Berry and Others and Amapo and Others (No. 19064/07+)	12 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)76	Examination closed
Goggins and Others (No. 30089/04+)	8 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)91	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

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